

take a position which divorces the national liberation movement from the world proletarian movement. □

## VI

## On the Concept of Peaceful Coexistence

OUR CRITICS SAY THAT INSTEAD OF RUTHLESSLY exposing the deception of the CPSU leadership, the C.C. Draft explains it away as though the CPSU leadership's estimation of the new epoch is due to an erroneous definition, "oversimplified formulas subjectively drawn, presenting utopian and false perspectives", etc.

The dissatisfaction arises because for them no analysis is necessary of the CPSU leadership's formulations, nor any arguing about them. For them the only thing that is to be stated in the controversy is that the CPSU leaders are imperialists who, like any other imperialists, are seeking for world domination. Let them then be frank and say openly that they regard the Soviet Union as an imperialist Power. This is really what they want to convey. And their criticism and anger follow from the fact that the C.C. has not described the Soviet Union as collaborating with American imperialism for world domination; their anger comes from the fact that the C.C. document describes the Soviet Union as a socialist country.

Their arguments lead to the conclusion that a socialist Soviet Union is no longer in existence; therefore a socialist camp does not exist. The logical conclusion of this line is that there should be a world struggle against the joint domination of these two Powers, the Soviet Union and the USA, and, therefore, it is futile to propose any joint action with the Soviet Union. If you put all the pieces of their wonderful reasoning together this is

what you get. No wonder that they are not satisfied with the criticism made in the C.C. document.

Now to come to their charge that the C.C. Draft considers that the CPSU leadership's conception of the new epoch is only due to an erroneous definition, oversimplified formulas, etc. What does the C.C. Draft say? "Modern revisionism while pretending fidelity to this new definition of the epoch *conveniently* and *deliberately* underplays certain salient features of the epoch while exaggerating and laying lopsided emphasis on certain other aspects of the same. It paints a picture as though colonialism is more or less dead, is rendered ineffective and a period of more or less peaceful transition to socialism has set in... It is this erroneous outlook that emboldened people like Khrushchov, the father of modern revisionism, to go into demagogic descriptions of imperialism as a 'button fastened on a coat' and 'a wolf to encounter and render harmless easier'... Such an erroneous definition of the new epoch or its lopsided and distorted interpretation immensely harms the cause of the proletariat rather than assisting it in its struggle for emancipation."

Is this just explaining away the CPSU leadership's viewpoint, giving them a good conduct certificate or concretely nailing down the specific method by which the revisionists try to cheat the people and the working class? For our critics it would have been sufficient if it had just been stated that the revisionist conception of the new epoch is treacherous and is designed to help American imperialism. But for anyone who takes the menace of revisionism seriously, who knows that in all countries there are thousands of honest people who continue to be its victims, a patient exposure of its formulations is absolutely essential.

Why did Lenin and Stalin analyze the content and methods of revisionism in articles after articles? Why did they not content themselves with saying, oh, these are all the doings of imperialist agencies? Because they both taught the working class that revisionism, though it serves the interests of their class enemies, is a trend which arises inside the working class movement, inside the Marxist camp, and pretending to be Marxist bases itself on the illusions of the backward sections of the working class. At each and every place it is necessary to rebuff concretely its claim to



represent Marxism and expose the premises on which it stands. Only in this way can the people and the working class be really educated against revisionism.

The C.C. Draft correctly exposes the erroneous premises of the revisionist outlook and unmasks its anti-revolutionary character. No doubt the C.C. Draft does say that this is an erroneous outlook, that the revisionists are creating a dream-land of their own, etc., but is this all that is said? Has it not been emphasized that the whole theory amounts to liquidation of revolutionary struggles? Then, what is the complaint? The complaint is: Why do you call it erroneous? Say in one word they are all agents of imperialism and nothing need be added. This is what their criticism amounts to.

Our critics argue that the essence of the policy of peaceful coexistence of the revisionist leadership has also been all-round peace with the exploiting classes throughout the world; this is a policy of negation of all revolutions and collaboration with the class enemy; friendship with America is demonstrated to be the heart and soul of the policy. This great betrayal and global collaboration with U.S. imperialism is being painted by the C.C. Draft as though the CPSU leadership merely "tends to shield the aggressors", "seeks to conceal the constant imperialist aggression", etc.

They seek to create an impression that all that is said in this connection is "shielding the aggressors"; as if no analysis is made and the revisionist policies are not exposed in detail. Consider the following from the C.C. Draft: "They tend to reduce the concept of peaceful coexistence to the opportunist meaning of 'peacefully' putting up with the blatant aggressive actions of world imperialism when they shamelessly extend this concept to the relations between the inherently aggressive states of the imperialists and the victim states. Instead of boldly exposing how the world imperialists, particularly the U.S., through their frenzied drive for colonial and neo-colonial domination of the world, are making peace and peaceful coexistence...impossible, the revisionists tend to shield the imperialist aggressors as though they are reconciled to peace and peaceful coexistence... treat the U.S. imperialist rulers as those with whom real and lasting peaceful coexistence is possible and with whom the socia-

list states can collaborate in the struggle for peace and amity among nations."

Then it is finally stated: "No Marxist-Leninist can accept such an opportunist interpretation and practice of the concept of peaceful coexistence, since it seeks to conceal the constant imperialist aggression and to appease the aggressor, and it disarms the revolutionary proletariat of the world in its uncompromising fight against imperialism—economic, political, ideological and military."

This is again a concrete exposure of the revisionists, how they appear before the people, and of the objective results of their policies. Our critics are not satisfied. They especially direct their attention against such sentences as "tend to shield the aggressors, seek to conceal the constant imperialist aggression". Why are they opposed to this formulation? Do they think that the revisionists do not *seek* to conceal the aggression? Do they think they do not *seek* to appease the aggressors? (Whether they succeed or not is a quite different matter.) Their real objection is: Why do you distinguish between the American imperialists and Soviet revisionists? When you say the latter seeks to appease the former, you distinguish between the two, making the American imperialists the major enemy. Otherwise there is no reason for any sane person to oppose a formulation which says through their peaceful coexistence policy the revisionists 'seek' to appease imperialism.

#### PEACEFUL COEXISTENCE OPPOSED

Our critics perform an amazing feat when they directly oppose peaceful coexistence. They oppose the following formulation from the C.C. Draft: "Peaceful coexistence is of course an essential part of the Leninist foreign policy obligatory to every socialist state." According to them this is not in consonance with Lenin who said: "Alliance with the revolutionaries of the advanced countries and with all the oppressed peoples against any and all the imperialism—such is the external policy of the Russian Revolution."

They thus contrast "peaceful coexistence" to alliance with the revolutionaries of the advanced countries and oppressed peoples.



Lenin who advocated both is made to look inconsistent and jacking in revolutionary zeal. The idea that "peaceful coexistence" means negation of revolutionary alliance with oppressed peoples, etc., is a revisionist distortion against which the Marxist-Leninists have been fighting.

But our critics seem to agree with the revisionists that peaceful coexistence constitutes such negation. Therefore, they demand the rejection of the very concept of peaceful coexistence and therefore unwittingly pass from Leninism to Trotskyism. Had they not been the victim of revisionist distortion, they would not have discarded peaceful coexistence as opposed to revolutionary alliance, etc.

What is the source of their error? It arises from the fact that they fail to understand that the concept of peaceful coexistence is applied only as between states representing different social systems—as between socialist and capitalist states. Such a policy is directed against imperialist plans of intervention against socialist countries, against allowing them to sidetrack the class struggle in their own country.

In accordance with the nature of their social system socialist countries give support and sympathy to all oppressed people and oppressed nations in their struggles for liberation. But socialist countries will never launch external wars as a substitute for revolutionary struggles. This is what is meant by Marxist-Leninists when they say revolutions cannot be exported or imported. This is also the meaning of the concept of peaceful coexistence as between states having different social systems.

The application of the policy of peaceful coexistence by the socialist countries is advantageous for achieving a peaceful international environment for socialist construction, for exposing the imperialist policies of aggression and war. It cannot be argued that all these are non-essential things—isolation of imperialism, exposing its policies of aggression and war—and, therefore, peaceful coexistence is a non-essential part of the foreign policy of a socialist country.

Besides, as the C.C. Draft puts it: "Lenin's concept of peaceful coexistence is a fighting and revolutionary concept, a concept which permits of no breeding of pacifist and utopian illusions about imperialism, a concept that has nothing in common with

the concept of status quo, i.e., imperialism and socialism living side by side peacefully. It is a concept of respite to be correctly utilized to consolidate the socialist state economically, politically and militarily so that imperialist aggression might be successfully met and the imperialists of the world vanquished." Therefore, while applying the principle of coexistence the struggles between the socialist and imperialist countries are inevitable. Our critics seem to miss this Leninist meaning of peaceful coexistence and demand that the socialist states be disarmed of one of their important weapons against imperialism.

And when they oppose peaceful coexistence to revolutionary alliance with oppressed classes and oppressed countries, they again betray an unforgivable lack of knowledge of the entire concept.

Marxist-Leninists support peaceful coexistence only in its application to the relationship between states belonging to different social systems. But this does not in the least affect support to revolutionary movements in other countries. The principle does not apply in relation to them, and the socialist states and the working class of a socialist country are in duty bound to support the revolutionary struggles all over the world. This is why the C.C. Draft says: "every Marxist-Leninist has to combine the strictest and most loyal adherence to the principle of peaceful coexistence as between states having different social systems with (a) the perfection of such a united and vigilant armed force of the socialist camp that any aggressive act of the imperialists can be met with a devastating counter-blow; and (b) the rendering of such concrete assistance—economic, political and others—to the national revolutionary movements".

It is only the revisionists that have been spreading the misconception that peaceful coexistence applies to the internal class struggle in each country, to the struggle between oppressor and the oppressed countries, and that a socialist state pursuing the policy of peaceful coexistence cannot give direct support to the revolutionary movements but must on the other hand attempt to tone them down, liquidate them because even a small struggle might land the world in a big war. It is amazing that our critics accept this distortion as a correct representation and demand an end to all mention of peaceful coexistence. Instead of fighting



the revisionist distortion, instead of asserting the relevancy of coexistence only in relation to states belonging to two different systems, they want to throw out the Leninist concept because they wrongly counterpose it to revolutionary alliance with oppressed peoples.

At the Eighteenth Congress of the CPSU(B) Stalin summarized the Leninist foreign policy in the following words : (1) We stand for peace and the strengthening of business relations with all countries... (2) We stand for peaceful, close and friendly relations with all the neighbouring countries which have common frontiers with the USSR ... (3) We stand for the support of nations which are the victims of aggression and fighting for the independence of their country... (4) We are not afraid of the threats of aggressors.....

Is there any Party calling itself Marxist-Leninist which opposes peaceful coexistence as one of the essential principles of the foreign policy of a socialist state ? There is none. On the other hand, every Marxist-Leninist Party, while upholding the principle and its correct meaning, has fought the revisionist misrepresentation that the struggle between the two systems can be resolved through peaceful competition, or that the principle means that the socialist states should refrain from supporting the world working class or oppressed peoples.

Our critics strongly object to our formulation that peaceful coexistence is an essential part of the Leninist foreign policy obligatory to every socialist state as adding grist to the policies of the CPSU leadership, etc. We have said, no Party in the world opposes peaceful coexistence as one of the principles of a socialist state's foreign policy. See how the Communist Party of China puts the question: "It was Lenin who advanced the thesis that it is possible for the socialist countries to practise peaceful coexistence with the capitalist countries... Since its founding, the People's Republic of China, too, has consistently pursued the policy of peaceful coexistence with countries having different social systems (Oh ! horror of horrors, our critics will say.) and it is China which initiated the Five Principles of Peaceful Coexistence" (Still more horror ! ) (*Proposal Concerning a General Line, etc.*)

The slanderous charge that China does not stand for peaceful

coexistence is repudiated and the Leninist stand is asserted. It is firmly stated that People's China, since its foundation, consistently pursued the policy of peaceful coexistence—not, of course, because it was a non-essential part of a Leninist foreign policy. Because of revisionist distortion, the CPC does not repudiate the principle itself as our critics do. It says : "Lenin's principle of peaceful coexistence is very clear and readily comprehensible by ordinary people. Peaceful coexistence designates a relationship between countries with different social systems and must not be interpreted as one pleases. It should never be extended to apply to the relations between oppressed and oppressor nations, between oppressed and oppressor countries, or between oppressed and oppressor classes, and never be described as the main content of the transition from capitalism to socialism..." The statement further says, even while applying the principle of peaceful coexistence the struggles between the socialist and imperialist countries are inevitable.

It cannot be argued that all these are non-essential things— isolation of imperialism, etc.—and therefore peaceful coexistence is a non-essential part of the foreign policy of a socialist country. What is objected to is the attempt to make peaceful coexistence the general line of foreign policy of the socialist countries, for then it is "impossible to handle correctly either the relations between the socialist countries or those between the socialist countries and the oppressed peoples and nations". In the following quotation a proper place is assigned to peaceful coexistence at the same time the other essential aspects of the foreign policy are stated—the foreign policy of the socialist countries should have the following content : "to develop relations of friendship, mutual assistance and cooperation among the countries of the socialist camp in accordance with the principles of proletarian internationalism ; to strive for peaceful coexistence on the basis of the Five Principles with countries having different social systems and oppose the imperialist policies of aggression and war ; and to support and assist the revolutionary struggles of all the oppressed peoples and nations".

It will be thus seen that all Marxist-Leninist Parties regard peaceful coexistence as an essential part of the Leninist foreign policy. Our critics, in objecting to the C.C. formulation, reject

this understanding and are taking an anti-Leninist stand. It will be further seen that no Marxist-Leninist Party counterposes peaceful coexistence to a revolutionary alliance with oppressed peoples as our critics do. It is only the revisionists that distort the principle in this fashion. Our critics adopt this revisionist stand when they attack peaceful coexistence as inconsistent with a revolutionary alliance, etc. □