

**REFUTATION  
OF THE NEW LEADERS  
OF THE CPSU  
ON "UNITED ACTION"**



5-435

FOREIGN LANGUAGES PRESS  
PEKING

**REFUTATION  
OF THE NEW LEADERS  
OF THE CPSU  
ON "UNITED ACTION"**

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

(November 11, 1965)

FOREIGN LANGUAGES PRESS  
PEKING 1965

## CONTENTS

THE UNITY OF THE INTERNATIONAL PROLETARIAT MUST BE BASED ON PRINCIPLE	1
THE KHRUSHCHOV REVISIONISTS HAVE UNDERMINED THE COMMON BASIS OF UNITY	6
UNITED ACTION IS IMPOSSIBLE WITH THOSE WHO TRANS- POSE ENEMIES AND FRIENDS	10
THE NEW LEADERS OF THE CPSU ARE TAKING UNITED ACTION WITH THE UNITED STATES ON THE QUESTION OF VIET NAM	15
"UNITED ACTION", SO CALLED, IS A MEANS OF PROMOTING SPLITTISM	22
"UNITED ACTION", SO CALLED, IS A SLOGAN TO DECEIVE THE SOVIET PEOPLE	26
PERSEVERE IN THE STRUGGLE AGAINST KHRUSHCHOV REVISIONISM	31

## **THE UNITY OF THE INTERNATIONAL PROLETARIAT MUST BE BASED ON PRINCIPLE**

The history of the international communist movement is one of struggle by Marxism against opportunism and revisionism, a history of struggle by Marxists to safeguard the international unity of the proletariat and to oppose attempts by opportunists and revisionists to divide it.

Upholding the revolutionary theory of Marxism-Leninism, the Communist Party of China has always held aloft the great banner of international proletarian unity. We maintain that in the struggle against capitalism and imperialism and in the course of the world revolution, the international proletariat can defeat the enemy only through uniting its own forces and uniting with all other forces that can be united.

The founders of communist theory, Marx and Engels, advanced the fighting slogan, "Workers of all countries, unite!" This slogan has educated and inspired workers all over the world and stimulated united struggle by the working class for its emancipation. The international unity of the proletariat advocated by Marx and Engels is one of struggle to fulfil its great historical mission on a world-wide scale.

Succeeding to the cause of Marx and Engels, Lenin carried Marxism forward to a new stage. Leninism is Marxism of the epoch of imperialism and proletarian revolution. Lenin steadfastly persevered in international proletarian unity on the basis of Marxism. In the historical conditions of rising struggle by the oppressed nations against imperialism, he put forward the fighting slogan, "Workers and oppressed nations of the world, unite!" This slogan stimulated united struggle by the working-class movement of the countries in the West and the national liberation movement of the oppressed nations

in the East. It represented a still broader unity of the international revolutionary forces.

In the light of the new changes in international class relations and the balance of forces after World War II, Comrade Mao Tse-tung advanced the slogan of establishing an international united front against U.S. imperialism. This united front has the unity of the international proletariat as its core and the unity between the international proletariat and the oppressed nations as its foundation. It means uniting closely with the masses of the people, who constitute over 90 per cent of the world's population, uniting with all the political forces subject to U.S. aggression, control, interference or bullying, and making use of every possible contradiction, all for the purpose of isolating U.S. imperialism, the main enemy of the people of the whole world, to the maximum extent and dealing it the hardest possible blows. This is the way to mobilize all the positive factors conducive to world revolution for the achievement of victory in the people's revolutionary struggle in every country. It is a strategic principle of vital importance formulated by Comrade Mao Tse-tung on the question of world revolution in the new historical conditions.

Under Comrade Mao Tse-tung's leadership, the Communist Party of China has always upheld international proletarian unity, the unity of the workers and the oppressed nations of the world, and the unity of all the forces opposing U.S. imperialism. We have carried out this line unswervingly and with great success.

Marxism-Leninism teaches us that the international unity of the proletariat is revolutionary unity, unity based on principle. Its achievement demands resolute and unequivocal struggle against all brands of opportunists and splitters.

Marx taught us that in the struggle to achieve international proletarian unity, there should be "no haggling about principles". When speaking on the need for principled struggle against the opportunists to achieve genuine unity, Engels said, "Unity is quite a good thing so long as it is possible, but there

are things which stand above unity", and "the development of the proletariat proceeds everywhere amidst internal struggles".<sup>1</sup> He also said that "people of limited intelligence . . . want to stir everything into one nondescript brew, which, the moment it is left to settle, throws up the differences again but in much sharper contrast because they will then be all in one pot".<sup>2</sup> Marx and Engels declared explicitly that "it is . . . impossible for us to cooperate with people who wish to expunge this class struggle from the movement".<sup>3</sup>

Lenin strongly condemned the revisionists of the Second International for betraying Marxism and the common cause of opposition to imperialism, for siding with the bourgeoisie of their own countries and degenerating into flunkys of monopoly capital, into social-chauvinists and social-imperialists.

He pointed out that, far from undermining the unity of the proletarian party, the struggle against opportunism and revisionism was indispensable for its achievement. He said,

Without struggle there cannot be any sorting out, and without sorting out there can be no successful advance, and also no *solid* unity. And those who are now beginning to struggle are by no means *destroying* unity. There is already no unity, it has already been destroyed, destroyed all along the line . . . and open and direct struggle is one of the essential conditions for restoring unity.<sup>4</sup>

It was precisely from the principled stand of Marxism-Leninism that the Communist Party of China waged a long

---

<sup>1</sup> "Engels to A. Bebel, October 28, 1882", *Selected Correspondence of Marx and Engels*, Eng. ed., Foreign Languages Publishing House, Moscow, p. 427.

<sup>2</sup> "Engels to A. Bebel, June 20, 1873", *Selected Correspondence of Marx and Engels*, Eng. ed., FLPH, Moscow, p. 345.

<sup>3</sup> "Marx and Engels to A. Bebel, W. Liebknecht, W. Bracke and Others ('Circular Letter'), September 17-18, 1879", *Selected Correspondence of Marx and Engels*, Eng. ed., FLPH, Moscow, p. 395.

<sup>4</sup> V. I. Lenin, "To A. A. Yakubova", *Collected Works*, Russ. ed., SPPL, Moscow, 1950, Vol. XXXIV, p. 32.

struggle against the revisionist leadership of the CPSU headed by Khrushchov in order to uphold the unity of the international communist movement based on Marxism-Leninism and proletarian internationalism and to consolidate and broaden the united front against U.S. imperialism.

Why was it that we published the two articles on the historical experience of the dictatorship of the proletariat in 1956? Why was it that we insisted on a series of revolutionary principles and delivered a memorandum on the question of peaceful transition to the Central Committee of the CPSU when the 1957 Declaration was being drawn up? Why did we publish "Long Live Leninism!" and the two other articles in 1960? Why did we systematically criticize Khrushchov's revisionist, divisive and great-power chauvinist views in our reply of September 1960 to the letter of information from the Central Committee of the CPSU? Why was it that we insisted on reaffirming a number of revolutionary principles and distributed our memorandum on the question of peaceful transition among all the fraternal Parties when the 1960 Statement was being drawn up? Why did we publish "A Proposal Concerning the General Line of the International Communist Movement", giving a comprehensive explanation of our views on a series of fundamental problems of the contemporary world revolution? Why did we publish the nine comments on the open letter of the Central Committee of the CPSU, publicly repudiating Khrushchov revisionism? Why did we publish a series of documents and articles to criticize the Soviet-U.S.-British treaty, exposing the traitorous action of the Khrushchov clique in allying itself with U.S. imperialism against the people of the world? Why did we warn the Khrushchov clique in the numerous talks and exchanges of letters between the Chinese and the Soviet Parties that it must rein in on the edge of the precipice? The purpose of all this was to defend Marxism-Leninism, the unity of the international communist movement based on Marxism-Leninism and the unity of all the forces opposing U.S. imperialism and its lackeys.

It was precisely the series of resolute struggles waged by the Chinese Communist Party and other Marxist-Leninist Parties that hastened the bankruptcy of Khrushchov revisionism and drove its founder into an impasse and finally into the grave he had dug for himself.

One year has elapsed since the fall of Khrushchov and the rise of the new leaders of the CPSU. How do the new leaders compare with Khrushchov? Have they changed Khrushchov's revisionist and divisive line? All the evidence shows that they are still pursuing his line but with double-faced tactics more cunning and hypocritical than those of Khrushchov.

In numerous speeches, documents and articles the new leaders of the CPSU have been vociferously advocating "united action" on the part of the Communist Parties and the socialist countries. They are incessantly spouting such fine words as "unity", "common struggle against the enemy", "unity against imperialism" and "joint support for the struggle of the Vietnamese people". But this is all false. Their deeds run counter to their words. At the plenary session of the Central Committee of the CPSU in September of this year, Brezhnev, First Secretary of the Central Committee of the CPSU, openly denounced the Communist Party of China while prating about "unity against imperialism". This has laid bare the ugly features of the new leaders of the CPSU as protagonists of sham unity and real hostility towards China.

Just as the U.S. imperialists, the most aggressive of all the imperialists, try to disguise themselves as angels of peace, so the biggest revisionists and splitters seek to present themselves as ardent lovers of unity. The call of the new leaders of the CPSU for "united action" is nothing but a fraud.

Let us now take the lies of the new leaders of the CPSU about "united action" and refute them one by one. Let us expose their fraudulence by citing their misdeeds both internationally and at home in the course of the past year.

## **THE KHRUSHCHOV REVISIONISTS HAVE UNDERMINED THE COMMON BASIS OF UNITY**

One of the arguments of the new leaders of the CPSU for "united action" is that all the Communist Parties have "a common ideology" and "a common programme".

Indeed, the Communist Parties should have a common ideology in Marxism-Leninism and a common programme in the revolutionary principles jointly drawn up in the Declaration of 1957 and Statement of 1960. But the Khrushchov revisionists have completely betrayed this common ideology and common programme and thoroughly undermined the common basis for unity among the Communist Parties.

The new leaders of the CPSU have faithfully taken over the mantle of Khrushchov. They have not changed into Marxist-Leninists or even into semi-Marxist-Leninists; they remain out-and-out Khrushchov revisionists, pursuing Khrushchov revisionism but without Khrushchov. In November 1964 they told the members of the Chinese Party and government delegation to their faces that there was not a shade of difference between themselves and Khrushchov on the question of the international communist movement or of relations with China. Time and again they have categorically stated that the general line adopted by the 20th and 22nd Congresses of the CPSU "was, is and will be the only, immutable, line in the entire home and foreign policy of the Communist Party and the Soviet state".<sup>1</sup>

Like Khrushchov, the new leaders of the CPSU try to negate and oppose all anti-imperialist revolutionary struggles by preaching that "today peaceful coexistence . . . is the most important condition for the social renovation of the world",<sup>2</sup> that "peaceful competition" between the two systems is the sole means for the "victory of communism over capitalism

---

<sup>1</sup> L. I. Brezhnev, Speech at the Reception of the Soviet Cosmonauts, October 19, 1964.

<sup>2</sup> N. V. Podgorny, "Great October", *Cuba Socialista*, November 1964.

on an international scale"<sup>1</sup> and that the "chances" of peaceful transition "grow many times over".<sup>2</sup>

Like Khrushchov, the new leaders of the CPSU insist on abolishing the dictatorship of the proletariat and the Party of the proletariat and on setting up the "state of the whole people" and the "party of the entire people". Moreover, they say that "like the dictatorship of the proletariat, the state of the whole people is a stage conforming to law and common to all countries in the development of the socialist state"<sup>3</sup> and that "the transformation of our Party into a Party of the entire people" is "of great significance far beyond the borders of our country".<sup>4</sup>

The new leaders of the CPSU have further developed Khrushchov revisionism by openly spreading the fallacy that socialism can be achieved without the leadership of the proletariat. They say that in the capitalist world "the transition to socialist transformation in one country or another can also take place without the direct leadership of the working class".<sup>5</sup> Shamelessly emasculating Lenin's theory on the dictatorship of the proletariat, they allege that "Lenin did not connect the transition to the non-capitalist road with the obligatory establishment of political power under the leadership of the proletarian Party, i.e., in fact with the dictatorship of the proletariat".<sup>6</sup> According to this allegation of theirs, the pro-

---

<sup>1</sup> *The International Revolutionary Movement of the Working Class*, edited by B. N. Ponomarev (editor-in-chief) and others, Russ. ed., SPPL, Moscow, 1964, p. 214.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 269.

<sup>3</sup> A. Andreyev, "The Development of the Marxist-Leninist Doctrine Concerning the Socialist State in the Programme of the CPSU", *Kommunist Sovetskoi Latvii*, No. 12, 1964.

<sup>4</sup> Y. Frantzev, "The Role of the Masses of the People in the Historical Process", *Kommunist*, No. 18, 1964.

<sup>5</sup> *The International Revolutionary Movement of the Working Class*, edited by B. N. Ponomarev (editor-in-chief) and others, Russ. ed., SPPL, Moscow, 1964, p. 325.

<sup>6</sup> K. Brutentz, "The Contemporary Stage of the National Liberation Movement", *Kommunist*, No. 17, 1964.

letarian revolution and the dictatorship of the proletariat are totally unnecessary and the Communist Party can very well be dispensed with. In propagating this ultra-reactionary theory, which is a thorough betrayal of Marxism-Leninism, the new leaders of the CPSU are not only giving an ideological weapon to the reactionaries, who are hostile to communism and the people, but are trying to confuse those nations and peoples who are in the stage of national-democratic revolution with regard to the aim of their present struggle and to induce them to abandon their task of combating imperialism, colonialism and neo-colonialism.

The essence of the Khrushchov revisionist theory and line, which the new leaders of the CPSU are persisting in and developing further, is to protect imperialist rule in the capitalist world and restore capitalism in the socialist world.

Between the Marxist-Leninists and the Khrushchov revisionists there is a difference of fundamental line, a major difference between what is right and what is wrong. In the circumstances, how can there be "a common ideology" and "a common programme" between the Marxist-Leninists and the Khrushchov revisionists? How can there be a common basis for unity? In the circumstances, the relation between the Khrushchov revisionists and ourselves is certainly not one in which "what binds us together is much stronger than what divides us", as alleged by the new leaders of the CPSU; on all the fundamental issues of the present epoch the relation is one of sharp opposition; there are things that divide us and nothing that unites us, things that are antagonistic and nothing that is common.

Since there is such a difference of fundamental line, the achievement of unity requires either that we discard Marxism-Leninism and follow their revisionism, or that they renounce revisionism and return to the path of Marxism-Leninism. These are the only alternatives. It is impermissible and indeed utterly wrong if we take an equivocal or vague position on such a sharp question.

Are we expected to follow the new leaders of the CPSU in order to achieve unity under their revisionist programme? Wouldn't that mean that we must join them in betraying Marxism-Leninism, in putting down the people's revolutions in various countries and in acting as accomplices of the imperialists? It goes without saying that we will never do so.

Are we expected to look on and remain completely silent without criticizing, exposing and opposing the new leaders of the CPSU, while they are betraying all the fundamental principles of Marxism-Leninism, striving for Soviet-U.S. collaboration to dominate the world and opposing the people's revolutions in various countries? Wouldn't that mean that we must also abandon Marxism-Leninism, act as their ally in opposing the people's revolutions and become the accomplice of imperialism? It goes without saying that we will never do that either.

If the new leaders of the CPSU really want unity with the Marxist-Leninists, they must change their revisionist line and honestly admit their mistakes. They must publicly and solemnly admit before the Communists and the people of the world that their Khrushchov revisionism, great-power chauvinism and splittism are wrong, publicly admit that the revisionist line and programme decided upon at the 20th and the 22nd Congresses of the CPSU are wrong, and publicly guarantee not to repeat the errors of Khrushchov revisionism. Is it possible that they will do all this?

The antagonism between Marxism-Leninism and Khrushchov revisionism is a class antagonism between the proletariat and the bourgeoisie; it is the antagonism between the socialist and the capitalist roads and between the line of opposing imperialism and that of surrendering to it. It is an irreconcilable antagonism.

As Lenin said, "Unity is a great thing and a great slogan. But what the workers' cause needs is the *unity of Marxists*,

not unity between Marxists, and opponents and distorters of Marxism."<sup>1</sup>

## **UNITED ACTION IS IMPOSSIBLE WITH THOSE WHO TRANSPOSE ENEMIES AND FRIENDS**

The new leaders of the CPSU argue that even if there are differences of theory and line, these can be put aside and that "united action" should be taken and "unity against the enemy" achieved in practical struggle against imperialism.

The sharpest difference of theory and line between Marxism-Leninism and Khrushchov revisionism concerns precisely the question of handling our relations with enemies and friends, in other words, the question of whether to oppose or unite with imperialism, and above all the question of whether to oppose or unite with U.S. imperialism. This difference is decisive for all the most important practical actions in the international class struggle. How can it possibly be put aside in favour of an unprincipled unity that does not distinguish between enemies and friends?

The reactionary nature of Khrushchov revisionism is expressed in concentrated form in the line of Soviet-U.S. collaboration for the domination of the world. The Khrushchov clique completely transposed enemies and friends; it regarded U.S. imperialism, the arch enemy of the people of the world, as its closest friend, and the Marxist-Leninists of the world, including those of the Soviet Union, as its principal enemy.

It was precisely on this question that Khrushchov revealed himself as a renegade. It was on this question that the Marxist-Leninists of the whole world waged the sharpest struggle against the Khrushchov revisionists. And it was on this question that the Khrushchov revisionists were spurned by the revolutionary people of the world.

---

<sup>1</sup> V. I. Lenin, "Unity", *Collected Works*, Eng. ed., Progress Publishers, Moscow, 1964, Vol. XX, p. 232.

How have the new leaders of the CPSU acted on this question? Have they changed the line of Soviet-U.S. collaboration for world domination? Have they stopped transposing enemies and friends? Have they changed from being a force allied with U.S. imperialism to one opposing it?

The facts show they have not.

Let us consider the facts:

ONE. Immediately after taking office, the new leaders of the CPSU extolled Johnson as "sensible" and "moderate". They have continued to proclaim that the Soviet Union and the United States are two super-powers on which the fate of the world depends, that "there are sufficiently broad areas for cooperation" between them, and that "there are still many unutilized potentialities".<sup>1</sup> Even after the rabid expansion by U.S. imperialism of its war of aggression in Viet Nam, they have kept on stressing their desire for the "development and improvement of relations with the United States of America". At times they find it necessary to talk about a tendency towards a "freeze" in Soviet-U.S. relations, but behind the scenes they are stepping up their secret diplomacy and their deals with the United States.

TWO. The signing of the partial nuclear test ban treaty by the Soviet Union, the United States and Britain was an important landmark in Khrushchov's alliance with the United States against China. Not only have the new leaders of the CPSU accepted this legacy, but with this treaty as a basis they are actively plotting new deals with the United States for the "prevention of nuclear proliferation" and similar so-called "disarmament" measures in an effort to maintain the monopoly of the two nuclear overlords, the Soviet Union and the United States, against China and all other independent countries.

---

<sup>1</sup> A. A. Gromyko, Speech at the Plenary Session of the 19th General Assembly of the United Nations, December 7, 1964.

THREE. U.S. imperialism has been using the United Nations as a tool for opposing the revolutions of the people of the world. Catering to U.S. imperialism, Khrushchov used the United Nations as a stock exchange for the domination of the world by two great powers, the Soviet Union and the United States. The new leaders of the CPSU have continued this reactionary policy. They have again brought up Khrushchov's proposal for a standing U.N. armed force. They voted in the United Nations for a "cease-fire" and for the realization of "national reconciliation" in the Congo (L.), and they also voted for the "cease-fire" in the Dominican Republic. Wherever the people rise up in armed struggle against U.S. imperialism or win victories in such struggle, and wherever U.S. imperialism suffers defeats and finds itself in a predicament, the new leaders of the CPSU hurriedly come forward to help it out. Together with the U.S. imperialists, they are using the United Nations to attack, weaken and divide the forces opposing imperialism, colonialism and neo-colonialism, and to save, strengthen and extend U.S. imperialist positions. They serve as a fire-brigade for U.S. imperialism trying to stamp out the flames of revolution.

On April 7 this year, together with his proposal for "unconditional discussions" on the question of Viet Nam, Johnson publicized the scheme for "the international development of Southeast Asia" in order to undermine the struggle against U.S. imperialism waged by the people of Viet Nam and the other Southeast Asian countries and to step up economic infiltration, and he expressed the hope that the Soviet Union would join in. The United States regards the establishment of the "Asian Development Bank" as a means of putting this scheme into practice. In response to Johnson's call, the new leaders of the CPSU went so far as to send a delegation to Bangkok in October to sit together with delegations from the United States, Japan, and such puppet cliques as the Chiang Kai-shek gang, South Korea and "Malaysia" and take an active part in preparing for the establishment of the "Asian

Development Bank". Such is the ardour of the new leaders of the CPSU for united action with U.S. imperialism.

FOUR. The new leaders of the CPSU have taken over and expanded the enterprises of the firm of Kennedy, Nehru and Khrushchov which Khrushchov worked hard to establish. They have carried further their alliance against China with the Indian reactionaries who are controlled by the U.S. imperialists. During Shastri's visit to the Soviet Union, they granted India aid to the tune of U.S. \$900 million in one go, which is more than all the loans Khrushchov extended to India in nine years. They have speeded up their plans for military aid to India and are working hand in glove with the United States to help India's arms expansion, so that the Indian reactionaries are able to use Soviet-made weapons against China and other neighbouring countries.

Recently, during India's armed aggression against Pakistan and also in connection with the Sino-Indian boundary question, the new leaders of the CPSU revealed in all its ugliness their support of the aggressor and their alliance with the United States and India against China. The Soviet Union and the United States joined in an anti-China chorus both inside and outside the United Nations. In September 1965, in statements on the armed conflict between India and Pakistan, Tass attacked China by insinuation, and *Pravda* even openly sided with India against China on the Sino-Indian boundary question. People will recall that it was precisely with a Tass statement on the Sino-Indian boundary question that Khrushchov started his public attacks on China in September 1959. But his attacks pale into insignificance in comparison with those of the present leaders of the CPSU. They have discarded even the small figleaf Khrushchov used in order to feign neutrality. Small wonder that the U.S. imperialists are gleefully hailing a "new era" in U.S.-Soviet co-operation.

The new leaders of the CPSU are able to deceive people because they sometimes make a few verbal attacks on U.S. imperialism. Why do they have to do this? The answer is

that this meets the need of the U.S. imperialists as well as the revisionists themselves. The Khrushchov revisionists have to give the appearance of opposing the United States in order to render effective help to U.S. imperialism, hoodwink the masses and sabotage revolution. Otherwise, they could not play this deceptive role, and that would not be to the advantage of U.S. imperialism. Minor attacks in words but major help in deeds—such is the way the new leaders of the CPSU serve U.S. imperialism.

Some people ask, why is it that the Marxist-Leninists and the revolutionary people cannot take united action with the new leaders of the CPSU, yet can unite with personages from the upper strata in the nationalist countries, and strive for united action with them in the anti-imperialist struggle, and can even exploit the contradictions among the imperialist countries in the struggle against the United States?

The reason is that in the contemporary world opposition to or alliance with U.S. imperialism constitutes the hallmark for deciding whether or not a political force can be included in the united front against the United States.

In Asia, Africa and Latin America, with the exception of the lackeys of imperialism, personages from the upper strata in many nationalist countries desire in varying degrees to oppose imperialism, colonialism and neo-colonialism headed by the United States. We should co-operate with them in the anti-imperialist struggle.

In the imperialist countries which are in sharp contradiction with the United States, some monopoly capitalists follow the U.S. imperialists, but there are also others who desire in varying degrees to oppose the United States. In the struggle against the United States, the people of the world can take united action with the latter on some questions and to a certain degree.

The crux of the matter is that, so far from opposing U.S. imperialism, the new leaders of the CPSU are allying themselves and collaborating with it to dominate the world.