

# **COMMUNIST PARTY of GREAT BRITAIN**

**Executive Committee statements on :**

## **THE INTERNATIONAL COMMUNIST MOVEMENT**

**Price Two Shillings and Sixpence**

## *Statement of the Executive Committee of the Communist Party of Great Britain adopted January 12th, 1963*

The present position in the international Communist movement arouses the deep concern of every Communist.

The public display of division and discord causes immense satisfaction to our enemies. The capitalist governments, press, radio and television are bent on exploiting these divisions between the Communist Parties and the Socialist States, and are speculating on the possibility of a split in the international Communist movement. They will seek to use this situation to press ahead with their war plans and the spread of nuclear weapons.

Any split would be a disastrous setback to the international working class and the cause of peace. It is unthinkable to any Communist Party worthy of the name. On the contrary, the most urgent duty facing every Communist Party is to do everything in its power to restore the unity of the world Communist movement and resolve its differences in a principled fashion on the basis of Marxism-Leninism.

We do not believe that the present method of public polemic can resolve the differences. Nor do we believe, as is said by our opponents, that the dispute is a Soviet-Chinese quarrel. The basis for international Communist unity exists in the unanimously adopted statements of the world meetings of the Communist Parties in 1957 and 1960. All Communist Parties supported and signed these statements, including the great Communist Party of China, a Party which we hold in high respect, a Party which led the Chinese people to victory in the momentous Chinese revolution, an event second in importance only to the historic October 1917 revolution.

No differences occurred in the 1957 Conference. The 1960 Conference took place because of differences which occurred subsequently. These were not differences between the CPSU and the Chinese Communist Party, but between the Chinese Communist Party supported to a large degree by a few others, and the overwhelming majority of the Communist Parties. In our view, in the preparatory discussions preceding the 1960 Conference, the Chinese Communist Party had an erroneous standpoint on a number of key issues. But the important point to note is that the statement of the 81 Parties in November 1960 was adopted unanimously.

The present controversy is, as before, a dispute between the overwhelming majority of the Parties of the international Communist movement, and the Chinese Communist Party and those who share its views.

We must express our grave concern at this turn of events. It is a

position which worries Communists everywhere. Far from the present public debate resolving the differences, it is more likely to strengthen the tendencies making for a split. Such a debate acquires a momentum of its own. Positions harden. Differences proliferate. A solution inevitably becomes more difficult.

All Communist Parties are independent and have equal rights. They make their own decisions based on Marxism-Leninism. At the same time, however, the 81 Parties assembled in Moscow recognised that there must be established rules of conduct and recognition of the internationalist duties of the Parties. We all declared then that the "supreme internationalist duty" of every Marxist-Leninist Party was to work continuously for the greater unity of the world Communist movement. This was the essential pre-condition for our common victory.

It is now the over-riding duty and responsibility of every Communist Party to fulfil that pledge.

Our meeting further declared and we all unanimously agreed, that "The interests of the Communist movement require solidarity by every Communist Party in the observance of the estimates and conclusions on the common tasks in the struggles against imperialism, for peace, democracy, and socialism, jointly reached by the fraternal Parties at their meetings." This, in our view, is the essential basis for restoring the unity of the international Communist movement. Unity is the burning need, not division into "minorities" and "majorities" of Parties in our movement. This brings no solution and is fraught with danger.

If the road of public debate is not the solution to our differences, what is? What now must be considered is the preparation for a further international conference to promote the unity of our movement.

Our Soviet comrades in the *Pravda* article wrote that the Communist Parties have a tested method of settling contentious issues by way of collective discussion. The CPSU has always advocated this method. Our Chinese comrades have also suggested that the issues be settled by international conference.

In addition, the CPSU have made approaches to our Chinese comrades for joint discussion. To our regret they have not taken this up. We hope it will yet be considered.

What is at issue is not the principle of international consultation which is common to all Parties, but the approach to international discussion in the present position in our movement.

A further international conference must be dedicated to promoting the unity of our movement and be approached and governed by that spirit. To assemble in a spirit of perpetuating division would be worse than useless. In such a case it would be better if no conference took place.

In the light of this we think that the following provisions are vital if an international conference is to succeed in this task.

- ① First, the present public polemic between Parties should stop and be replaced by serious internal preparation for such a conference.

Second, completely adequate time must be taken to prepare the conference. The matter cannot be hurried if success is to result. We need as much preparation as is necessary calmly and in a Communist fashion to examine and weigh up honestly held differences, to assess how far, in fact, they exist and what are the possible lines of solution. Only the preparation itself will show how much time we need.

If this kind of approach is made we are sure that our Marxist-Leninist Parties will reach a common solution. The whole international situation and our responsibility to preserve peace and promote the cause of international working class solidarity and socialism demand this of us.

It may be that differences on international policy will occur during this period. But every effort must be made to avoid them, to keep them within our movement and present a united front to our common class enemy. Certainly no Party should intervene in the internal affairs of another.

### **THE KEY ISSUES**

The issues of dispute in our international movement are the key questions confronting humanity—war and peace, peaceful co-existence instead of thermo-nuclear war, disarmament, national liberation and forms of transition to socialism.

They are vital for the correct development of the working class movement and the Communist Party. On all of them our Party Congresses since 1951 have taken clear and unequivocal decisions. Above all, they concern the substance of our programme, *THE BRITISH ROAD TO SOCIALISM*.

### **WAR AND PEACE**

The supreme issue is how to preserve peace, banish the threat of thermo-nuclear war and replace it with peaceful co-existence.

For the past fifteen years our Party has made the struggle for peace its central and urgent concern. All along the Communist Party has worked with the confidence, expressed in our programme published in 1951, that war is not inevitable and that new and powerful forces have emerged which can prevent it.

The daily growing strength of socialism, the splendid victories of the peace policy of the Soviet Union, the victories of the national liberation movement and the growth of the powerful peace movements in the capitalist countries have given us greater confidence than ever that peace can be preserved.

What, then, is the essence of the dispute in the international Communist movement?

The struggle of the Communist Parties to preserve peace, has been based on the November 1960 Statement of the 81 Parties. This declared that world war was not inevitable. It called for mass action of the people to preserve peace based on the conviction that forces exist which, if united, could prevent war.

The time has come when the attempts of the imperialist aggressors to start a world war can be curbed. World war can be prevented by the

joint efforts of the world socialist camp, the international working class, the national liberation movements, all the countries opposing war and all peace-loving forces.

Our Chinese comrades in their *People's Daily* editorial of December 31st say that they agree that world war can be prevented, but that the new situation "has not changed the aggressive nature of imperialism and cannot possibly change it". They further argue that those who oppose their position actually "oppose the exposure of imperialism", "they prettify U.S. imperialism in a hundred and one ways".

No Communist Party has said that the nature of imperialism has changed. To suggest, even by inference, that the CPSU has said so is completely incorrect. The CPSU has shown its understanding of the nature of imperialism in its entire foreign policy, in the United Nations, and especially in political and material help to the national liberation struggle. Its policy in this respect has been a model for all Communists.

Our Party has fought imperialism since its very birth. We have never prettified imperialism, and never will. Our record stands for itself. For years our Party has struggled against the stream in Britain in exposing and resisting the new post-war imperialist Anglo-American NATO alliance as the centre of the war danger. We have consistently exposed the role of US imperialism, fought to get Britain to break with the alliance, and led the struggle against the rebirth of West German imperialism.

The Chinese comrades say that the struggle for colonial liberation is inseparable from the struggle for peace. We agree. But where we disagree is on their repeated statements and suggestions that those who are in dispute with them "are in fact placing the struggle in defence of world peace in opposition to the movement of national liberation".

Our Party has fought against every colonial war and repression conducted by British imperialism. Our record in relation to the Middle East, Africa, Guiana, etc. is well known. Far from the successful development of the peace movement undermining support for national liberation, the solidarity movement in Britain has seldom been more widespread than it is today. We have exposed and resisted all forms of "neo-colonialism", especially in the Common Market.

The point is not whether imperialism has changed, but whether the balance of world forces has changed so that imperialism can no longer do what it likes. As the Statement puts it:

"Had the imperialists been able to do what they wanted, they would already have plunged mankind into the abyss of the calamities and horrors of a new world war. But the time is past when the imperialists could decide at will whether there should or should not be war."

This is what is new.

## **PEACEFUL COEXISTENCE**

But the real issue is much greater than this. It was put clearly and unambiguously in the 1960 Statement:

"Peaceful coexistence of countries with different systems, or destructive war—this is the alternative today. There is no other choice."

Our Chinese comrades signed this Statement. In their *People's Daily*

editorial of December 31st they reiterate that they believe in peaceful coexistence. They add that "it is inconceivable that peaceful coexistence be achieved without struggle", and it is equally inconceivable that it can "eliminate class struggle in the world arena and can abolish the antagonism between oppressed and oppressor nation".

No Communist Party says that peaceful coexistence can be achieved without struggle, so why do the Chinese comrades raise this question? The socialist states are waging a prolonged struggle for peaceful coexistence by a variety of means. The capitalist states are bitterly resisting. We will make the battle for peaceful coexistence a central feature of our Congress, for what is involved is the political defeat of the entire NATO cold war policy of British imperialism, and setting Britain on an entirely new course.

In the same editorial, our Chinese comrades write that they recognise the necessity to "enter into negotiations on one issue or another with the Governments of the imperialist countries . . . for the purpose of easing international tension, reaching some kind of compromise and arriving at certain agreements, subject to the principle that such compromises and agreements must not damage the fundamental interests of the people." Compare this half-hearted statement with the comprehensive and detailed aims outlined in the 81 Parties Statement. It declared that peaceful coexistence is a basic Leninist principle, the "firm foundation" of socialist foreign policy. The statement spelled out in detail what the aim was:

"By upholding the principle of peaceful coexistence, Communists fight for the complete cessation of the cold war, disbandment of military blocs and dismantling of military bases, for general and complete disarmament under international control, the settlement of international disputes through negotiation, respect for the equality of states and their territorial integrity, independence and sovereignty, non-interference in each other's internal affairs, extensive development of trade, cultural and scientific ties between nations."

We firmly believe this is a realistic aim which can be won by struggle, partial victories leading to greater victories, despite setbacks and trials.

Do the Chinese comrades think so? The whole effect of their current statements is to imply a challenge to this position. This is particularly seen in their attitude over the settlement on Cuba.

In practical terms the struggle for peaceful coexistence involves the issue of negotiation between the socialist and capitalist powers. If it is not to be war between the states, it must be negotiation between the opposing states.

We have always rebutted the vicious slander that the Chinese Communists and the Chinese People's Republic want war. In their statements on the Cuban settlement, however, the Chinese comrades used statements implying that the Cuban settlement was a "Munich". Subsequently, they said in the *People's Daily* editorial, 31st December, that they did not think that the avoidance of thermo-nuclear war in the Caribbean was a "Munich". "What we did strongly oppose, still strongly oppose, and will oppose in the future, is the sacrifice of another country's sovereignty as a means of reaching a compromise with

imperialism; a compromise of this sort can only be regarded as one hundred per cent appeasement, a 'Munich' pure and simple." At the same time they add that the Cuban people succeeded in winning another great victory over United States imperialism.

The Cuban crisis was the most dangerous world crisis since 1945. The world was on the brink of thermo-nuclear catastrophe. The aim of Soviet policy on Cuba, an aim endorsed by progressive opinion all over the world, was to prevent nuclear war and to prevent the invasion of Cuba. Nuclear war was prevented. Cuba was not invaded. For this world humanity must above all thank the Soviet Union.

The agreement was a compromise settlement with the United States, with the imperialists. Has it undermined Cuba's sovereignty and national independence? No. On the contrary, the Soviet Union made clear its uncompromising support of Fidel Castro's five points. We know Munich well. Munich mutilated Czechoslovakia's frontiers as a prelude to Hitler's invasion. Cuba's frontiers have been preserved. It remains a bastion of socialism in the Western hemisphere. The Cuban settlement was a victory for Cuba and for world peace. The danger of American aggression remains, but the Cuban people, backed by the Soviet Union and the entire socialist camp and progressive people everywhere can avert future dangers as they averted the present crisis.

Of course the antagonism between the two social systems will continue. But the point is to avoid that struggle between the capitalist and socialist states being resolved by war, to conduct it above all in the sphere of economic competition in which the superiority of socialism spells inevitable victory.

Of course the antagonism between oppressed and oppressor nations will continue. But the experience of the national liberation struggle to date shows that the struggle can be won without world war.

As for the condition that such agreements must not damage the interests of the people: this is common ground to Communists. None of the aims set out in the section on peaceful coexistence would damage the interests of the people: on the contrary, they are all vital for the interests of the people.

Does the struggle for a policy of peaceful coexistence waged by a Communist Party in a capitalist country lead it to preach class collaboration in internal affairs? No. In our country our Party has fought the Tories, the monopolists, and the right-wing Labour leaders on every issue of class struggle. Indeed, the winning of workers who understand the need for class struggle on home affairs to the understanding to fight for a class position in foreign affairs is to win them for one of the highest forms of class struggle.

In view of all this, how can a responsible Communist journal like *Red Flag*, the theoretical organ of the Chinese Communist Party, argue that what are called "the modern revisionists" believe that under present historical conditions, "it would be good enough just to muddle along, so what point is there in differentiating classes, differentiating the proletariat from the bourgeoisie, imperialism from the oppressed nations, capitalism from socialism, just wars from unjust wars and revolution from counter-revolution". Everyone knows

that the phrase "modern revisionist" means the Communist Parties who disagree with our Chinese comrades. Such totally irresponsible charges simply cannot be taken seriously.

## NUCLEAR WAR

Our Chinese comrades grossly underestimate what a thermo-nuclear war involves. True, they say that it would be an "unprecedented calamity". But then they argue that the existence of nuclear weapons changes nothing in principle. They say in the *People's Daily* editorial, 31st December, that if nuclear war does break out "it would result in the extinction of imperialism and not in the extinction of mankind". "In the final analysis," they argue, "neither nuclear teeth nor any other teeth can save imperialism from its fate of inevitable extinction". The people, not nuclear weapons, will decide the destiny of mankind.

In the same editorial, they say the way to ban nuclear weapons does not lie in being afraid and in trembling. "In no circumstances must Communists act as voluntary propagandists for the US imperialist policy of nuclear blackmail". Presumably they use such statements to imply there are socialist states and Communist Parties who retreat in face of nuclear weapons, are afraid and systematically make concessions. If socialist statesmen act in a responsible way to prevent nuclear war, they are not cowards, but deserve the support of all progressive humanity. The Soviet Union has both done this and rejected imperialist atomic blackmail over Suez, Iraq and Cuba.

It is certain that nuclear war would result in the extinction of imperialism. It is even possible that some part of mankind would survive, but what incalculable damage would be caused to socialism in the process.

For Britain, nuclear war could well mean our national extinction. Who would be left to build socialism in the heap of radio-active ruins that would remain?

It is the Tory Government which systematically hides from the people the real consequences of a thermo-nuclear war for Britain. They are well aware that if the people knew the truth, there would be an ever greater revolt against their criminal and suicidal foreign policy. The movement against nuclear weapons in Britain is the strongest in the capitalist world, and one reason for that success has been the spreading by the peace movement and the Communist Party of the real truth concerning nuclear war.

Far from this making the British people afraid and trembling and susceptible to US atomic blackmail, it has roused them to fight US imperialism, to break with US policy, to clear out US bases. At the greatest testing time on Cuba, the threat of nuclear war did not result in the demand to "Let the US have Cuba"—anything to avert nuclear war. On the contrary, the slogan was "Save Cuba—Save Peace".

The fact that the Soviet Union possesses nuclear arms along with their unprecedented destructive power has created a new situation. For the first time in history a war waged with nuclear weapons could destroy capitalism. This is a fact which caused division in the ranks



of imperialist statesmen. It is a powerful basis for agreement to ban them, a powerful argument in favour of peaceful coexistence.

Of course in the final analysis, nuclear teeth or any other teeth cannot save imperialism. But what is the purpose of arguing like this? The supreme issue for us and for humanity is to prevent thermo-nuclear disasters. Peace is the ally of socialism. We want to, we can, and we must advance to socialism without nuclear war. Communists have no need of war to bring socialist transformation, least of all, nuclear war.

A ban on nuclear weapons would rob imperialism of its supreme weapon. There is nothing imperialism resists more at the moment. Certainly the people, not nuclear weapons, will decide humanity's fate. It is because we have faith in the fighting ability of the people that we are confident they will win the battle to ban nuclear weapons, and that imperialism will be finished without dooming hundreds of millions of people to nuclear death.

The Statement of the 81 Parties puts the issue correctly: "The struggle against the threat of a new war must be waged now and not when atom and hydrogen bombs begin to fall."

## **FORMS OF TRANSITION TO SOCIALISM**

The 81 Parties Statement declared that the Communists seek to achieve the socialist revolution by peaceful means.

There were two possible ways to achieve socialism—peaceful and non-peaceful, the latter depending on the exploiting classes resorting to violence against the working class. The actual possibility in each individual country depends on the concrete historical conditions.

What was new in the 1960 Statement of the 81 Parties and in the 1957 Statement, was the conclusion reached that in the new world situation in a number of capitalist countries the opportunity now exists "to win state power without civil war" and secure a firm majority in Parliament, and "transform Parliament into an instrument serving the working class".

All this was endorsed by the Chinese Communist Party at both world conferences. The statements they continue to make show, however, that they do not really accept this. True, they still say that "whenever the possibility of peaceful transition appears in a given country the Communists should strive for its realisation". But they then argue that "possibility and reality . . . are two different things. Hitherto history has not witnessed a single example of peaceful transition from capitalism to socialism". (*People's Daily*, 31st December.)

Our Party's position regarding the transition to Socialism in Britain is well known. It was stated in *THE BRITISH ROAD TO SOCIALISM* in 1951. It has been endorsed in every Congress since.

Our Programme declared that in Britain, due to historical and political conditions and the change in the balance of world forces, the peaceful way to the social revolution was possible. Political power could be won and Parliament transformed to carry out fundamental social change. This required mass political struggle, working class unity, and a broad political alliance embracing the overwhelming majority of the people, isolating the Tories and monopolies. It warned

of the resistance a Socialist Government could expect, but was confident that with the support of the working class it would have the power to defeat all resistance.

The ruling class while never hesitating to use the forces of the State against the people, have always distorted the Communist attitude to violence. But the Marxist-Leninist position is clear—it is that in the event of the exploiting classes resorting to violence against the people, they will be answered in a similar fashion.

But the Chinese statements show that they do not believe in the possibilities of peaceful transition. We see no reason for revising our Programme. It is they, not us, who are questioning the Statement of the World Communist Parties, which is the Leninist position.

## **REVISIONISM AND DOGMATISM**

The 81 Parties Statement called for “a determined struggle on two fronts—against revisionism, which remains the main danger, and against dogmatism and sectarianism”. And it added “Dogmatism and sectarianism can also become the main danger at some stage of development of individual Parties”.

The struggle against revisionism has been waged successfully in our Party. Revisionism was routed and the basic Communist positions defended. As a result, our mass work has extended and the Party is steadily growing.

Like other Parties, we criticised the revisionist position of the programme of the Yugosláv League of Communists, a criticism which we still maintain. But surely the efforts of the Soviet Union to bring Yugoslavia back into the Communist family are worthy of support. In this effort, the CPSU has not attempted to cover up differences, but is concerned to see how they can be resolved on a principled Marxist-Leninist basis.

As before, the battle must be fought on both fronts. The struggle against all revisionist trends must be continued. But the public debate shows that the danger of dogmatism has increased in the international Communist movement. The most extreme example of this is shown in the political position of the Albanian Party of Labour and the disruptionist activities which have arisen from it.

The struggle against dogmatism in the international Communist movement is vital for its practical political implication, whether the Parties are to have a correct political line to win the masses to defeat war, combat imperialism, defend democracy from fascist and authoritarian attack, build up the mass anti-monopolist front and advance to socialism.

## **RESTORE UNITY**

It is with extreme reluctance that we have joined in a public debate on the issues raised by the Communist Party of China, a great Party which we respect and admire.

But in view of the scale this debate has now assumed and its treatment in the capitalist press, it is our duty to our members to make our position clear.

In preparation for the 1960 Conference of the 81 Parties, our Executive Committee discussed the issues publicly raised by the Communist Party of China in their booklet, "Long Live Leninism". We reported back to our Party on the position our delegation intended to take at the international conference. That position, based on our programme and the decisions of our Congresses, disputed many of the positions taken up by our Chinese comrades. After the Conference, we reported back on the key issues of the debate, the position taken up by the main parties and how the issues were resolved, to membership meetings. We fully supported the decisions of the world conference which coincided with our own views. They have animated our work since.

We reiterate, the basis for the unity of our movement already exists in the observance of the 1960 World Statement.

The critical test facing all our Parties now is how we fulfil our responsibility and duty to promote the international unity of our movement on the basis of Marxism-Leninism. The road to the split is the road to disaster.

At this moment the imperialist Western Alliance is riddled with divisions. But feverish efforts are being made to patch them up and present a united front against socialism, national liberation and peace. The efforts will fail because these differences are insoluble and the working class movement alongside the efforts of the socialist states and the national liberation struggle will win the battle for peaceful co-existence, national freedom and socialist revolution.

Our differences are not insoluble, they have no objective basis in the socialist system or our class position. On the contrary they can and must be overcome.

Let us reply to imperialist disunity with Communist unity, and our common victory is certain.

## *Resolution adopted by the Executive Committee of the Communist Party of Great Britain on September 14th, 1963*

In its statement of January 12th on Problems of the International Communist Movement, the Executive Committee expressed its extreme concern and advanced its proposals for the restoration of the unity of our movement.

We appealed for an end to the public polemic, for bilateral talks between the Communist Party of the Soviet Union and the Communist Party of China, and adequate preparation for a World Conference of Communist Parties to promote unity on the basis of the strict observance of the unanimously agreed principles of the November 1960 World Communist Conference.

At the same time, in a principled and moderate way we dealt with our differences with the Chinese Communist Party on the issues of war and peace, peaceful coexistence, nuclear war and the forms of transition to socialism.

Our Twenty-Eighth National Congress, attended by 461 delegates, endorsed this statement, with only four votes against and ten abstentions.

In the delegations to the C.P.S.U. and the C.P.C. respectively prior to the Congress, we presented our views on the method of solution to the problems.

## **A NEW AND DANGEROUS STAGE**

For a short time there seemed to be some positive signs. There was widespread agreement with the aim of the cessation of public polemics. In March the C.P.S.U. and the C.P.C. agreed to meet on the initiative of the C.P.S.U. All Communist Parties hoped that progress would be made.

But the publication by the C.P.C. on June 14th of a letter, "A proposal concerning the general line of the International Communist Movement" on the eve of the talks, restarted the public polemic in a still sharper form and extended it to a series of new issues at a time when the utmost restraint was needed. Despite this, the C.P.S.U. proceeded with the talks which opened on July 5th, and did not publish its views on this document until July 14th.

On July 21st the talks were recessed at the request of the C.P.C.

On July 31st the Chinese People's Government in a statement denouncing the partial Test Ban Treaty, said that "the policy pursued by the Soviet Government is one of allying with the forces of war to oppose the forces of peace, allying with imperialism to oppose Socialism, allying with the United States to oppose China, and allying with the reactionaries of all countries to oppose the peoples of the world."

On August 15th the Chinese Government, through a spokesman, issued a further statement on Nuclear Weapons and the Test Ban Treaty, containing many further violent denunciations of the Soviet Union.

In the course of this statement the Chinese Government stated that in June 1959 the Soviet Union had refused to supply China with a sample of an atom bomb and technical data for its manufacture.

The statement laid down the principle that the spread of nuclear weapons among other Socialist countries would be desirable and accused the Soviet Government of lining up with U.S. imperialism against China.

On September 6th the Chinese journals *People's Daily* and *Red Flag* issued a further statement launching a full offensive against the line of the Twentieth Congress of the C.P.S.U. and all the subsequent policies of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, and declaring that "the leadership of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union has allied itself with U.S. imperialism . . . against all Marxist-Leninist Parties, in open betrayal of Marxism-Leninism."

With these developments the whole problem has reached a new and far more dangerous stage than at the time of our January statement and Congress resolution.

## THE NEW FEATURES

The new features are:—

1. In place of veiled attacks, formally directed against Yugoslav revisionism, or against “certain comrades” un-named, or against particular statements of other non-Soviet Communist Parties, with no direct reference to the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, the attack is now openly directed against the Communist Party of the Soviet Union and against the Soviet Government.

2. The previous controversy was presented on a Party level, but has now been brought to the governmental plane by the Chinese Government publicly denouncing the Soviet Government in the most violent terms.

3. The anti-Soviet denunciation is conducted in language hitherto only found in some of the more extreme anti-Soviet organs, accusing the Soviet Government of “selling out”, of “betrayal” of the Soviet people, of the countries in the Socialist camp, and of the peoples of the whole world, of “great power chauvinism”, etc.

An article on “The New Holy Alliance” published in *Red Flag* on September 9th, compares the early 19th century “Holy Alliance” of feudal-monarchist reaction of Tsar Alexander and the Kings of Prussia and Austria against the bourgeois democratic revolution, with what the Chinese leaders are pleased to call “the new Holy Alliance” of counter-revolution of the Soviet Union, the United States and other reactionaries against socialism and communism and the national democratic revolution. This kind of scurrilous language has passed out of the range of intelligent controversy.

4. The previous generalised ideological form of controversy has now been still further developed into a direct offensive on the concrete issues of action in the international situation.

The first example of this handling of a concrete issue was over the action in connection with the American threat to Cuba last autumn. Here the action of the Soviet Union, which simultaneously saved the independence of Cuba against the American plans for invasion and saved world peace, was attacked with allusive references to “a Munich”.

In contrast to this attack Fidel Castro gave his view when he said: “It will always be a great country, which for the sake of the defence of a small people living thousands of miles away, risked the well-being achieved in forty-five years of creative work, and at the price of tremendous sacrifices in a thermo-nuclear war!

“The Soviet Union, which lost more lives in the great Patriotic War against the fascists than the entire population of Cuba so as to defend its right to existence and to develop its tremendous resources, did not hesitate to take the risk of a big war in defence of a small country. History has never known such an example of solidarity. This is true internationalism! This is Communism!”

With the attack on the Test Ban Treaty this offensive on concrete issues of the international situation has been extended to cover directly all the immediate issues of action in the fight for peace and peaceful coexistence and nuclear disarmament, all Soviet foreign policy, and all

the relations of the National Liberation Movement to the socialist camp and the fight for peace.

In our January resolution, endorsed by the Twenty-Eighth Party Congress, we defined our position on the general ideological questions raised by the statement of the Chinese Party:

1. War and Peace;
2. Peaceful Coexistence;
3. Nuclear War;
4. Forms of transition to Socialism;
5. Revisionism and Dogmatism.

We reaffirm the viewpoint set out in this resolution on these questions, and do not propose here to repeat the ground covered in our previous statement.

It is necessary now to examine the new questions raised by the criticism of the Test Ban Treaty, as well as by the Chinese letter of June 14th and subsequent statements, and the consequent present stage of the problem of restoring the unity of the International Communist Movement.

### **THE TEST BAN TREATY**

In our Political Committee's statement of July 31st we made clear that we welcomed the partial Test Ban Treaty on the grounds that "(i) it means a halt to the poisoning of the atmosphere by the main nuclear Powers; (ii) it opens the way to further negotiations on nuclear disarmament; and (iii) it opens the way to further negotiations on all key issues with a view to making a break in the cold war and reaching agreement on specific questions."

For similar reasons the Labour and peace movement in Britain also welcomed the treaty.

We have made clear the limitations of the Test Ban Treaty: it does not in itself end the war danger, the arms race or the manufacture of nuclear weapons; nor would this be the case even if we won a ban on underground explosions.

For all these things an arduous struggle is needed. At the centre of the struggle in Britain at this moment is the need to win the fight for the removal of American nuclear bases, the renunciation of nuclear weapons by Britain, and the defeat of the NATO multilateral nuclear force.

The Chinese criticisms alleged that the Soviet approval of the partial Test Ban Treaty in July 1963 represented a change of line from the rejection of a partial test ban in the preceding year.

This fails to recognise that the technical and nuclear advance of the Soviet Union has now made it possible to make such an agreement on a basis which ensures the defence and security of the socialist camp and that further negotiations for a complete ban are envisaged by the treaty.

We rejoice that this advance has been possible, while recognising the necessity of carrying forward the most active fight for a total ban, for general nuclear disarmament and for ending the cold war.

We reject absolutely the presentation in the Chinese Government's statement which lumps the nuclear Powers together as upholders of a "nuclear monopoly". This is to equate socialism with imperialism, and to abandon a class analysis of the international situation.

We always have campaigned for, and continue to campaign for, a Summit Conference of all Heads of States, including People's China for the complete abolition of nuclear weapons. But while struggling for this, we will fight for and support every partial demand in that direction. To counterpose the two is false and can in no way hasten the winning of the meeting of the Heads of States.

The Communist Party of Great Britain always will support the great Chinese Revolution. We will do all in our power to defend China from imperialist slanders (as we did in the Indo-Chinese Border dispute last autumn) and imperialist attacks.

We must continue and extend our work for ensuring that the Chinese People's Republic takes its rightful place in the United Nations. This is vital, not only as a recognition of the elementary rights of the Chinese people, but for peace and peaceful coexistence.

But we cannot agree with the general line advanced in the recent Chinese statements. It is in contradiction to the 1960 Statement and is against the interests of the entire socialist camp and the world Communist movement.

## **NUCLEAR WEAPONS AND NUCLEAR DISARMAMENT**

The Chinese Government's statement of August 3rd lays down that "the greater the number of socialist countries possessing nuclear weapons the better".

But it is obvious that if the socialist countries were to adopt the principle of favouring the extension of nuclear weapons in their camp, this would facilitate the imperialist aim of extending nuclear weapons to other countries in the imperialist camp, to West Germany, Japan, Chiang Kai-Shek and others.

This would *increase* the danger of nuclear war. It would be a step not to peace but to war. Therefore it is necessary to fight against the extension of nuclear weapons, with a view to carrying forward this fight to the banning and destruction of all nuclear weapons.

The nuclear strength of the Soviet Union is already sufficient to fulfil the requirements of defence of the socialist camp and has consistently fulfilled this task and continues to fulfil it by protecting the security of the socialist camp against imperialist aggression.

The Chinese Government has a Pact of Friendship, Alliance and Mutual Assistance with the Soviet Union, and it knows that the full nuclear strength of the Soviet Union and its rocket capacity would be used to defeat an American attack on China.

As Premier Khrushchov said in his speech to his electors on February 27th, 1963: "if an attack is made on the Chinese People's Republic . . . the Soviet Union will come to the rescue of its friends and deliver a crushing blow at the aggressors."

## PEACEFUL COEXISTENCE

While proclaiming support for the aim of peaceful coexistence set out in the 1960 Statement, and in words recognising the necessity of negotiation with the imperialists for this aim, the Chinese Communist Party in practice attacks every negotiation conducted by the Soviet Union with imperialism and attacks every partial agreement reached as equivalent to capitulation.

But the aim of peaceful coexistence requires negotiation with the imperialists and successive partial agreements with the imperialists.

The basis for the possibility of such negotiations and partial agreements is not a change in the nature of imperialism but the change in the balance of the world situation analysed by the 1960 Statement, which compels the leaders of imperialism to take account of the new balance of the world situation and makes it possible for the socialist and peace camp to win these successive partial agreements.

The Chinese letter of June 14th states that peaceful coexistence "should never be extended to apply to relations between oppressed and oppressor countries or between oppressed and oppressor classes." The implication here is that some Communist Parties advocate this.

This is gross misrepresentation. It is not the policy of the C.P.G.B. and we know of no Communist Party which advocates this. Why do the Chinese leaders persist in such general accusations?

In practice such distorted statements have the effect of confusing and holding back the development of the peace forces and undermining their confidence in their own strength. Above all, such statements are used to attack and hold back the actual progress made by the socialist states and the mass movement in forcing negotiations to end the cold war and win progress on disarmament.

Once again we repeat that the 1960 Statement declared peaceful coexistence is the "firm foundation" of socialist foreign policy, and that:

"By upholding the principle of peaceful coexistence, Communists fight for the complete cessation of the cold war, disbandment of military blocs and dismantling of military bases, for general and complete disarmament under international control, the settlement of international disputes through negotiation, respect for the equality of states and their territorial integrity, independence and sovereignty, non-interference in each others internal affairs, extensive development of trade, cultural and scientific ties between nations."

This has been the principled basis of the policy of the Soviet Union and the socialist states, the Communist Parties and the mass peace movement. It has been the consistent policy of our Party reaffirmed unanimously at repeated Congresses and at the 28th National Congress.

## GENERAL AND COMPLETE DISARMAMENT

Similarly the Chinese letter of June 14th professes agreement with the aim of general and complete disarmament set out in the 1960 Statement. But it would appear from the further statements in this letter that the slogan of general disarmament is regarded as just a tactic.



“We have always maintained” says the letter, “that, in order to *expose and combat* the imperialists’ arms expansion and war preparations, it is necessary to put forward the proposal for general disarmament” (our italics). While “some kind of agreement on disarmament” can be reached, general disarmament is an “illusion”, and can only come when imperialism is abolished.

This is in flat contradiction to the 1960 Statement, which declared that disarmament “has now become a fighting slogan of the masses, a pressing historical necessity”, that “through an active, determined struggle by the socialist and other peace-loving countries, by the international working class and the broad masses in all countries, it is possible to isolate the aggressive circles, foil the arms race and war preparations, and force the imperialists into an agreement on general disarmament” and “to realise this programme means to eliminate the very possibility of waging war between countries.”

## **THE NATIONAL LIBERATION MOVEMENT IN THE PRESENT WORLD SITUATION**

The strength of the new balance of forces in the world is based on the co-operation of the socialist camp, the newly-independent countries and national liberation movement, and the working class and peace movement in the imperialist countries.

All the strategy of imperialism is directed above all to endeavour to disrupt this unity. Any disruption of this co-operation plays the game of imperialism.

The Chinese comrades, while professing to accept this principle of anti-imperialist unity, in practice present the main contradiction in the world situation not as the contradiction between socialism and imperialism, but as the contradiction between the national liberation movements and imperialism.

In this way they present the role of the national liberation movement in isolation from the socialist camp and from the international working class and peace movement. Thus the letter of June 14th declares:

“The various types of contradictions in the contemporary world are concentrated in the vast areas of Asia, Africa and Latin America; these are the most vulnerable areas under imperialist rule and the storm-centres of world revolution dealing direct blows at imperialism. . . . In a sense, therefore, the whole cause of the international proletarian revolution hinges on the outcome of the revolutionary struggles of the people of these areas.”

On the basis of this analysis is developed the harmful “three-continent theory”. This has the effect of isolating the national liberation movement in these three continents from the socialist camp and international working class and peace movement.

Chinese representatives have even opposed the participation of representatives of the Soviet Union (whose Asian nationalities were the first nations to win freedom from imperialist oppression) at Afro-Asian anti-imperialist and solidarity conferences.

Thus this theory supports in practice the most reactionary and conservative trends of bourgeois nationalism in these countries, which also strive for the separation of the national movement from the socialist camp and Communism.

Such a line would disrupt and weaken the national liberation movement both within each country and internationally, and leave it at the mercy of imperialism.

This propaganda encourages the most reactionary trends of racialist separatism, and of the non-Marxist classless analysis of a line of division between "have and "have not" nations in place of between the camp of imperialism and the camp of socialism and national liberation.

Only the victory of the socialist revolution and the strength of the socialist camp, and of the Soviet Union in the first place, has made possible the victories of national liberation in the modern era.

Only the practical support of the socialist camp, and of the Soviet Union in the first place, and of the entire international working class together with the anti-imperialist unity of the socialist camp, the international working class and the national liberation struggle, are making possible the further victories of national liberation.

The Chinese letter of June 14th claims that the leaders of the C.P.S.U. "deny the great international significance of the anti-imperialist revolutionary struggles", and that on this question they "are in fact protecting the interests of monopoly capital, betraying those of the proletariat, and degenerating into Social Democrats."

We can only express our amazement that such a Party as the Chinese can make such accusations, which do not stand up to serious examination. The language is the traditional language of some of the worst vilifiers of the Communist movement over the years.

The record of the C.P.S.U. and the Soviet Union on these issues is there for all to see. The Soviet Union has assisted the national liberation struggle everywhere, and in particular, the Arab and African struggle, Algeria, Cuba, Indonesia, in the most concrete and telling ways.

Our Communist Party has been engaged in the anti-imperialist struggle since its foundation, teaching that socialist victory in Britain was a common struggle with the cause of national liberation in the British Empire, and that the colonial masses and the British working class fought a common enemy. Whatever particular shortcomings, we have a proud record of over forty years of anti-imperialist struggle, including support of the great Chinese revolution.

The practical effect of the Chinese accusations is to play off the national liberation struggle and the socialist camp, the colonial struggle and the working class movement in the capitalist countries against one another. It is false and fraught with danger. It contradicts the line of the November 1960 Statement, which declared:—

"The peoples who are building socialism and communism, the revolutionary movement of the working class in the capitalist countries, the national liberation struggle of the oppressed peoples and the general democratic movement—these great forces of our time are merging into one powerful current that undermines and destroys the world imperialist system."

## FORMS OF TRANSITION TO SOCIALISM

In their letter the Chinese leaders once again show that they do not support the 1960 Statement that in a number of capitalist countries the possibility now exists "to win state power without civil war."

The Statement argues that the Communists seek to achieve the socialist revolution by peaceful means; that there are two ways of achieving the revolution—peaceful and non-peaceful: the latter depending on the ruling class resorting to violence, and that "the actual possibility of the one or the other way to socialism in each individual country depends on the concrete historical conditions."

Only the Communist Party of each country can decide its way to socialism. No other Communist Party has the right to dictate the programme and tactics of another.

Our Communist Party decided in 1951 that in the actual conditions of Britain in the present period a peaceful transition to socialism is possible. This position embodied in our programme, *THE BRITISH ROAD TO SOCIALISM*, has been endorsed by every Congress since.

There is no basis for the assertion in the Chinese letter that the international Communist movement has "one-sidedly reduced" the teachings of the 1960 Statement to "peaceful transition".

While a number of Communist Parties have said that a peaceful transition is possible, others have said their countries face the way of non-peaceful transition due to their conditions. No Communist Party has questioned their decision in this respect.

The Chinese comrades, while professing acceptance of the statement of the 1960 Declaration regarding the possibility of two ways of achieving Socialism, in all their actual arguments deny the possibility of the peaceful path.

They emphasise that there is no historical precedent for peaceful transition. They say: "To the best of our knowledge, there is still not a single country where this possibility (of peaceful transition) is of any practical significance." (Appendix to *People's Daily* and *Red Flag* article of September 6th, 1963.)

By these arguments, despite professing acceptance of the two paths, the Chinese comrades are in practice one-sidedly trying to impose on other Communist Parties the road of non-peaceful transition.

As our January Executive Statement and *THE BRITISH ROAD TO SOCIALISM* make clear, it is our duty to warn of the resistance a Socialist Government could expect, while at the same time stressing our confidence that with the full support of the working class such a government would have the power to defeat all resistance.

A peaceful transition to socialism calls for the mobilisation and unity of action on an unprecedented scale of the working class and all its allies in a broad alliance to gain power peacefully and resist successfully the possible acts of violence on the part of the ruling class.

Abstract left-phrase mongering in fact simply means the avoidance of the patient but genuine mass work in Britain to build unity, protect

and extend democracy against the monopolists, the real fight for socialism in our conditions to isolate and defeat the Tory reactionaries. Such a line would result not in socialism but in our sectarian isolation and the triumph of reaction.

## **THE TWENTIETH CONGRESS**

On a number of occasions the C.P.C. have attacked the significance of the Twentieth Congress of the C.P.S.U. for the development of the whole world Communist movement. In the document of September 6th a full offensive has been launched against the Twentieth Congress, stating that "the Twentieth Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union was the first step along the road to revisionism," that "the criticism of Stalin at the Twentieth Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union was wrong both in principle and in method" and that "the Twentieth Congress produced not 'wonderful' or 'majestic' results but a discrediting of the Soviet Union, of the dictatorship of the proletariat and of socialism and communism."

In sharp contrast the November 1960 Statement declared "The historic decisions of the Twentieth Congress of the C.P.S.U. are not only of great importance for the C.P.S.U. and communist construction in the U.S.S.R. but have initiated a new stage in the world Communist movement and have promoted its development on the basis of Marxism-Leninism."

What is the significance here? The general decisions of the Twentieth Congress, the rectification of the errors associated with the cult of the individual, the full restoration of Party democracy, etc. not only greatly speeded up the construction of socialism and the prestige of socialism in the world.

They led to important new developments and initiatives in foreign affairs, overcame stagnation in Communist thought and unleashed new developments which helped every Communist Party.

These developments, whatever the temporary difficulties involved and the attempts of the class enemy and the revisionists to take advantage of the situation, were a vital historic necessity. All over the world the Communist movement has advanced organisationally and politically as a result.

In essence the whole Chinese letter is an attack on these developments and in particular in relation to the rectification of the cult of the individual (it is referred to as the "so-called" cult). Our Chinese comrades are attempting to repudiate some of the most important new and correct developments which have occurred in the last few years in the international Communist movement.

We cannot agree to this. To turn back would be a disaster. On the contrary, we should resolutely adhere to the line of these new developments, spelled out in the 1960 Statement, and forge ahead to new victories.

## **RESTORE THE UNITY OF THE WORLD COMMUNIST MOVEMENT**

All Communists will regard this new and dangerous turn in the international Communist movement with the greatest anxiety and concern. It demands from all of us the greatest discipline and effort to defend Communist principle and restore the unity of our world movement.

The essential basis both for restoring our world unity on the basis of Communist principle and ensuring the continued advance of the socialist camp, the working class movement and national liberation is strict support of and adherence to the 1960 Statement.

The objective basis for unity is there despite all the obstacles and difficulties. It consists of the common aims of all Communists to defeat imperialism and create socialism; in the common interests of the Soviet, Chinese and the peoples of all other socialist states; in the common interests of all working people against capitalism and in the common interests of the working class and the national liberation movement against imperialism. It consists in our common basis of proletarian internationalism.

We refuse to accept that a split in the international Communist movement is inevitable as there is no justification for a split in the objective conditions. A split will only help our enemies. Already it is only too clear how the imperialists are building on and exploiting every division in our movement and praying that the U.S.S.R. and People's China will increasingly find themselves at loggerheads.

We deeply regret that the vital bilateral talks between the C.P.S.U. and the C.P.C. were suspended on the initiative of the C.P.C. We urge their resumption as soon as possible and that real negotiations on the problems take place.

In the meantime we ask all Communist Parties to consider the necessity to start preparations for a world Conference some time next year. No Communist Party ever considered the bilateral talks between the C.P.S.U. and the C.P.C. as an alternative to a world conference but as a very important step towards such a conference. It is in this sense we urge a resumption of these talks.

What are the conditions needed for the successful preparation of a World Conference? That the approach of each Party should be the restoration of our unity on the basis of the 1960 Statement; that no Communist Party should interfere in the internal affairs of any other and that all factionalism should be rejected.

For the purpose of preparing for such a conference we believe that a renewed effort should be made to end the present violent and acrimonious public debate and replace this method by serious negotiations.

The Chinese Party has made its position clear and public with its June 14th letter and subsequent materials. So has the C.P.S.U. and other Parties. We have done so with this statement of our views on the letter of the Chinese comrades and their other statements.

Can not we now resume serious negotiation and suspend public debate in order to facilitate negotiation or, if this is not possible, at

any rate in the interest of all Parties keep the debate on a serious political level and avoid wild and irresponsible accusations?

The whole international situation demands this. In carrying through this policy we call on the whole Party to press ahead boldly on the basis of the decisions of our Twenty-Eighth National Congress.

Already this line has ensured new growth in the Party, the most extensive electoral battle and a growth in our political influence. New possibilities of political advance are opening up.

We should not allow our advance to be hindered or suffer any setback by the state of the differences in the international Communist movement. We should reject any attempt from any quarter to factionalism or disruption.

The British political situation, the imminence of the General Election, the need for clarity in the Labour movement, not only to defeat the Tories but to ensure this defeat is not just a repetition of 1945, demand the utmost mass activity and unity of our Party.

We call on every Party branch to discuss the issues in the international Communist movement and reach clarity on the position of our Party, which is based on the decisions of the 1960 Statement, and expressed in the Statement of the January Executive meeting, our Twenty-Eighth National Congress Resolution and this statement. At the same time let us boldly step up our mass activity in every way.

The essence of the British political situation is that Britain needs a new policy. We need in international affairs a break with the policies of the cold war and NATO, and the fight for peaceful coexistence and disarmament.

On the home front we need to step up the battle against the Tories and the employers in every way, against all class collaboration and right wing Labour policies, for an end to wage restraint, for socialist nationalisation and attack on the monopolies.

This is the line of our National Congress, the basis of our challenge in the coming General Election.

Our Twenty-Eighth National Congress was a Congress of unity on our present political line. On this basis let us go forward to new successes.

## *Statement of the Executive Committee of the Communist Party of Great Britain, May 23rd, 1964*

The Executive Committee of the Communist Party views with concern the latest developments in the dispute in the international Communist movement as shown in the exchange of letters between the Communist Party of the Soviet Union and the Communist Party of China.

Not only have the conciliatory and positive proposals of the CPSU to bring about an improvement in the situation been brushed aside, so

have the efforts of the Rumanian Workers Party. For a period the CPSU stopped the public polemic. The Rumanian Party tried to get all Parties to stop. The Communist Party of China, however, continued the polemic.

In our view, in their letter dated May 7th, the Communist Party of China have now adopted a position which is equivalent to refusing serious bilateral talks with the Communist Party of the Soviet Union and in opposition to a world conference of the Communist Parties.

In relation to Soviet-Chinese bilateral talks, the Communist Party of China first proposed that these be resumed in October 1964. When the Communist Party of the Soviet Union suggested an earlier date (May) the Communist Party of China then went back on its own proposal and suggested May 1965. It further stated that if either side considered that the time was not ripe "they can be further postponed".

In relation to the preparatory committee for the world conference, the Communist Party of China proposed it comprise the Parties of 13 Socialist countries and the Communist Parties of Indonesia, Japan, France and Italy. The Communist Party of the Soviet Union made the counter proposal that the preparatory Committee should be on the same basis as that of the 1960 World Conference, namely the Communist Parties of 13 Socialist countries and the Communist Parties of Argentine, Australia, Brazil, Britain, France, Finland, Indonesia, India, Italy, Japan, Syria, USA and West Germany.

The Communist Party of China have rejected this on the grounds that they recognise the splitter groups in Australia and Brazil as separate "Parties" and dismiss the Indian Communist Party because they disapprove of the policy of its elected leadership.

They thus put a premium on efforts to split the Communist Parties in the capitalist countries and attempt to confine any preparation of a world Communist Conference to the Communist Parties of the Socialist countries and only four of the Communist Parties in capitalist countries.

We totally reject both approaches.

In relation to the world conference the Communist Party of China said it "consistently advocates and actively supports" such a meeting but suggested no date. When the Communist Party of the Soviet Union proposed Autumn 1964 the Chinese reply was "judging by present circumstances, it may require four or five years, or even longer, to complete these preparations". In other words they want the conference postponed indefinitely and in the meantime will continue their present type of unprincipled polemics and do all in their power to encourage splits in the various parties.

While there are understandable differences of opinion regarding the timing of any world conference among the Communist Parties which support the 1960 Statement these have nothing in common with the attitude of the Chinese Communist Party.

The approach of the Communist Party of China simply means the indefinite postponement of any real efforts and steps to restore the unity of our movement and can only cause the greatest harm.

The struggle for peace and disarmament, the efforts to end the wars of colonial aggression in Aden, Viet Nam and elsewhere, solidarity with

the national liberation movement and successful struggle against the monopolists and for political advance in the capitalist countries require the fighting unity of all Communist forces. Each Communist Party, we are convinced, will not be deflected from its serious political work. Favourable conditions for political advance are opening up in all the main capitalist countries, further successes for the national liberation struggle are developing, great new victories will be won in socialist construction. All that has taken place since the November 1960 Statement bears out the correctness of its general line.

The Executive Committee calls on the entire Party to continue its positive work and the political struggle on the basis of the decisions of the 28th National Congress and our programme, *The British Road to Socialism*. It reaffirms its statements of January 12th 1963 and September 14th 1963 on the international Communist movement which state the position of the Communist Party of China on the issues in question. These statements were further elaborated in a series of articles in *the Worker* and there is no need to repeat them here.

We call on the Party to follow up our municipal election campaign with a great political effort in the coming General Election to sweep away the Tories and win a Labour and Communist majority.

It will resolutely deal with any attempts from whatever quarter to disrupt the fighting unity of our Party.

It asks all branches and district committees to discuss and deepen the understanding of our policy with a view to developing the utmost political campaigning in support of it.

We will maintain our political position and, as and when necessary, explain it in public statements and articles so long as the present public polemic continues while reiterating that the best step to restore the unity of the world Communist movement would be an agreement to end the public polemic.

We hope that the Communist Party of China will yet respond in a positive fashion to the appeal of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union for bilateral talks.

There is no international organisation of the world Communist movement. Each Party is sovereign and responsible for its own policy and its own affairs. This is the position best corresponding to the diverse political conditions confronting the Parties. But we have a common ideology, there is need to restore and preserve the unity of our world movement on common problems in the face of the imperialist enemy; the unity of the world socialist camp is more vital than ever and we must observe proper relations and non-interference between the Communist Parties.

The aim of any world conference should be to restore the unity of our movement. There can be no question of "excommunication"; but its aim also should be to end the present position and impermissible practices. For this adequate preparation is necessary. But we reject the Communist Party of China's position of endless postponement and a further five years of public wrangle. We also reject the proposal to confine the preparatory committee to a small group of Communist Parties.

If the Communist Parties at present cannot agree on a common date



for the world conference then they should try to arrive at agreement on the composition and convening of the preparatory committee. The progress of the work of such a committee could then determine when the conference could be held.

*Resolution adopted by the Executive Committee, Communist Party of Great Britain  
January 9th—10th, 1965*

The Executive Committee has had under consideration the decision announced on December 11, to postpone the Preparatory Committee for an international Communist conference to March 1.

The Executive Committee considers it unwise to fix a date for the Preparatory Committee in the absence of agreement between the main parties on its convocation and date.

Our opinion has always been that an international Communist conference to help to resolve differences and promote the unity of the international Communist movement must be all-inclusive.

It is also our view that a Preparatory Committee for such an international conference can only be effective in preparing an agreed, inclusive international Communist conference if it includes representatives of the main parties involved in the present differences.

For this reason we urge the postponement of the proposed Preparatory Committee on March 1 until an agreed date is reached by the main parties. We urge that such agreement be reached as speedily as possible in view of the damage being done to the international movement by the present position.

We express our readiness to participate in any consultations which could assist in the convening of an agreed representative Preparatory Committee.