

# PEKING REVIEW

33

August 16, 1963

## Chairman Mao Tse-tung's Statement

Calling Upon the People of the World to  
Unite to Oppose Racial Discrimination by  
U.S. Imperialism and Support the American  
Negroes' Struggle Against It

## Statement by the Spokesman of The Chinese Government

A Comment on the Soviet Government's  
Statement of August 3

At the 9th World Conference Against  
A & H Bombs

*Sino-Somali Joint Communique*

北  
京  
周  
報

A WEEKLY MAGAZINE OF CHINESE NEWS AND VIEWS

# Works of Mao Tse-tung

IN PAMPHLET FORM



## During the First Revolutionary Civil War Period (1924-1927)

Analysis of the Classes in Chinese Society

Report of an Investigation Into the Peasant Movement in Hunan

## During the Second Revolutionary Civil War Period (1927-1937)

Why Can China's Red Political Power Exist?

On the Rectification of Incorrect Ideas in the Party

A Single Spark Can Start a Prairie Fire

Mind the Living Conditions of the Masses and Attend to the Methods of Work

On the Tactics of Fighting Japanese Imperialism

Strategic Problems of China's Revolutionary War

The Tasks of the Chinese Communist Party in the Period of Resistance to Japan

On Practice

On Contradiction

## During the War of Resistance Against Japan (July 1937-1941)

Two Policies and Programmes to Combat Japanese Invasion and Two Perspectives

Struggle to Mobilize All Forces in Winning Victory in the Armed Resistance

Combat Liberalism

The Situation of the Anti-Japanese War After the Fall of Shanghai and Taiyuan and Our Tasks

Strategic Problems in the Anti-Japanese Guerrilla War

On the Protracted War

The Role of the Chinese Communist Party in the National War

The Question of Independence Within the United Front Problems of War and Strategy

The Orientation of the Youth Movement

Introductory Remarks to "The Communist"

The Chinese Revolution and the Chinese Communist Party

On New Democracy

New-Democratic Constitutionalism

Tactics in the Anti-Japanese United Front

On Policy

## During the War of Resistance Against Japan (1941-August 1945)

Preface and Postscript to "Rural Surveys"

Reform Our Study

Speech Before the Assembly of the Shensi-Kansu-Ningsia Border Region

Rectify the Party's Style of Work

Oppose Stereotyped Party Writing

Talks at the Yen'an Forum on Literature and Art

Economic and Financial Problems During the Anti-Japanese War

Some Questions Concerning Methods of Leadership

Our Study and the Current Situation

On Coalition Government

Let Us Get Organized

We Must Learn to Do Economic Work

## During the Third Revolutionary Civil War Period (1945-1949)

The Situation and Our Policy After the Victory in the War of Resistance Against Japan

On the Chungking Negotiations

Talk With the American Correspondent Anna Louise Strong

The Present Situation and Our Tasks

On Some Important Problems of the Party's Present Policy

Speech at a Conference of Cadres in the Shansi-Suiyuan Liberated Area

On Strengthening the Party Committee System

Carry the Revolution Through to the End

Report to the Second Plenary Session of the Seventh Central Committee of the Communist Party of China

On the People's Democratic Dictatorship

On the U.S. White Paper

Size: 18.5 × 13 cm.

Half-cloth and paper covers

Published by:

**FOREIGN LANGUAGES PRESS**

Pai Wan Chuang, Peking (37), China

Distributed by:

**GUOZI SHUDIAN**

P.O. Box 399, Peking, China



# PEKING REVIEW

北京周报

(BEIJING ZHOUBAO)

A WEEKLY MAGAZINE OF CHINESE  
NEWS AND VIEWS

August 16, 1963 Vol. VI No. 33

## CONTENTS

THE WEEK	3
ARTICLES AND DOCUMENTS	
Chairman Mao Tse-tung's Statement	6
Statement by the Spokesman of the Chinese Government (August 15, 1963)	7
Premier Kim Il Sung Supports Chinese Government Proposal	9
The New Zealand Communist Party Supports Chinese Government Statement	10
Statement of the Soviet Government (August 3, 1963)	16
Why the Tripartite Treaty Does Only Harm and Brings No Benefit? — Observer	20
The American Negroes Will Triumph — Our Correspondent	24
Joint Communique of Chinese and Somali Governments	26
At the 9th World Conference Against Atomic and Hydrogen Bombs — Hsiao Ming	28
Greetings to 9th Anti-A & H Bombs Conference From Premier Chou En-lai	29
Appeal for International Common Action	32
A Proposal to World Conference Against Atomic and Hydrogen Bombs	33
Smash the Imperialists' Nuclear War Schemes — Nhandan Editorial	34
The Chorus Is Getting Increasingly Wild	35
ROUND THE WORLD	37
PHOTOGRAPHY	39

Published every Friday by PEKING REVIEW  
Pai Wan Chuang, Peking (37), China  
Cable Address: Peking 6170

Post Office Registration No. 2-922  
Printed in the People's Republic of China

# THE WEEK

Among the major events of the week:

- Chairman Mao Tse-tung issued a statement on August 8 calling on the people of the world to unite to oppose the racial discrimination practised by U.S. imperialism and support the American Negroes' struggle against it.

- A spokesman of the Chinese Government issued a statement on August 15, commenting on the Soviet Government's statement of August 3 which attacked the Chinese Government's statement of July 31 on the complete prohibition and thorough destruction of nuclear weapons.

- Renmin Ribao* on August 10 published a commentary by Observer entitled "Why the Tripartite Treaty Does Only Harm and Brings No Benefit?"

- The Chinese press gave frontpage prominence to Korean Premier Kim Il Sung's letter to Premier Chou En-lai, supporting the Chinese Government's proposal for a conference of the government heads of all countries of the world; it also frontpaged the statement by Comrade V.G. Wilcox, General Secretary of the Communist Party of New Zealand, supporting the Chinese government statement of July 31.

- Renmin Ribao* last week published in excerpts: an editorial (August 9) and two commentaries (August 11 and 12) from the Vietnamese paper *Nhandan*; an editorial (August 10) and a commentary (August 5) from the Indonesian paper *Harian Rakjat*. All criticize the tripartite partial nuclear test ban treaty.

- Giving enthusiastic support to Chairman Mao's statement, 10,000 Peking people from all walks of life held a mass rally to back up the American Negroes' struggle against U.S. racial discrimination.

- Prime Minister Abdirashid Ali Shermarke of the Somali Republic ended his successful visit to China. A Sino-Somali joint communique was issued.

- The 9th World Conference Against Atomic and Hydrogen Bombs held in Hiroshima drew public attention in China. The Chinese press hailed its success as a tremendous victory of the Japanese people in their struggle against U.S. imperialism and an important victory for the people of the world who are fighting against imperialism and in defence of world peace.


- Young Chinese surgeons in Shanghai hit the front page. They scored a rare surgical achievement in rejoining to his arm the completely severed hand of an engineering worker. Premier Chou En-lai and Vice-Premier Chen Yi last week received the doctors and nurses who worked on the case and commended the fine job they had done.

## Chairman Mao Receives African Guests

Chairman Mao Tse-tung received a large group of visitors from Africa on August 8 in Peking. They were: the delegation of the Basutoland Congress Party led by G.M. Kolisang, the Party's General Secretary; Ali Mohamed Shamy, President of the National-Liberation Movement of Comoro; the delegation of the Federation of Students of Black Africa studying in France led by Gedeon Dasoundo, Foreign Affairs Secretary of the Federation; Trynos Makombe, representative in Cairo of the Zim-

babwe African People's Union of Southern Rhodesia; and G. Kahengeri a writer from Kenya.

At this reception, Chairman Mao made a statement, expressing on behalf of the Chinese people resolute support for the American Negroes in their struggle against racial discrimination and for freedom and equal rights and calling on the people of the world to unite in resistance to racial discrimination by U.S. imperialism and to support the American Negroes in their just struggle against racial dis-



Chairman Mao Tse-tung with his African guests

crimination. (For full text of the statement, see p. 6.)

Chairman Mao and these many friends from Africa had a most cordial and friendly talk. He condemned racial discrimination in the United States, in South Africa and in every other part of the world. "Racial discrimination," he said, "is found in Africa, in Asia and in other parts of the world. The racial question is in essence a class question. Our unity is not one of race; it is the unity of comrades and friends. We should strengthen our unity and wage a common struggle against imperialism, colonialism and their lackeys, and for complete and thorough national independence and liberation."

After recalling how China's revolutionary struggle had won through to victory, Chairman Mao said: "This proves that a revolution by the people can triumph and that imperialism and its lackeys can be defeated. The tide of anti-imperialism and anti-colonialism is sweeping through all Africa. All countries, whether they have attained or have still to attain independence, will sooner or later win complete and thorough independence and liberation. All the Chinese people support you. The people of Africa are awakening with each passing day; so are the people of the world as a whole. The workers, peasants, revolutionary intellectuals and all other revolutionary people, who constitute

over 90 per cent of the world population, can be united in the fight for the victory of the revolution."

"In the fight for thorough emancipation," Chairman Mao continued, "the oppressed peoples rely first of all on their own struggle and then, and only then, on international assistance. The people who have triumphed in their revolution should help those still struggling for liberation. This is our internationalist duty."

Chairman Mao's African guests then told of their own struggles for national independence and liberation. They expressed their thanks to the Chinese people for giving them sympathy and support. All expressed full support for Chairman Mao's statement against racial discrimination by U.S. imperialism and in support of the American Negroes' struggle against it.

### Sino-Somali Friendship

Prime Minister Abdirashid Ali Shermarke of the Somali Republic and his party left Peking on August 10 after a successful week-long visit. Premier Chou En-lai and other government leaders and thousands of citizens of the capital gave them a warm send-off at the airport.

The distinguished Somali guests arrived in Peking on August 4. During their brief stay in the country, they met and had friendly and cordial talks

with Chairman Mao Tse-tung and Chairman Liu Shao-chi. Prime Minister Shermarke held talks with Premier Chou En-lai on questions of common interest in the political, economic and social fields, and exchanged views on international affairs. Complete agreement was reached, and a joint communique of the two Governments was issued. (For full text of the communique, see p.26.) The two Premiers also signed an agreement on economic and technical co-operation between the two countries.

These and the Somali guests' visits to places of interest and contacts with the Chinese people in Peking and Shanghai — which have helped promote mutual understanding and co-operation — have written a new page in the history of Sino-Somali friendship. As Prime Minister Shermarke said in his farewell speech at the Peking airport: "Our short stay in China has been marked with extreme friendliness and hospitality on the part of the Chinese Government and people. This visit will be a new milestone in the good relations and friendship between our two countries and two peoples."

The Somali Prime Minister took home with him the deep friendship of the Chinese people. This friendship, based on the Five Principles of Peaceful Coexistence and the ten principles of the Bandung Conference, was given full expression in the mass rally held by 10,000 citizens of the capital in his honour. Greeting the Somali guests on that occasion, Vice-Mayor Wan Li paid tribute to the Somali people for their long and glorious history of struggle against imperialism and colonialism. The Vice-Mayor took the occasion to denounce the Western colonialists' policy of racial discrimination against the African people and condemn the U.S. Government for its ruthless repressions against the American Negroes — who are descendants of the African people in the United

States — when they demand democracy and freedom. He pledged the Chinese people's resolute support for their just struggles. The huge gathering rose to give Prime Minister Shermarke a tremendous ovation when the Vice-Mayor, on behalf of the people of Peking, presented him with a big red satin banner embroidered with the inscription: "May the friendship between the Chinese and Somali peoples be everlasting!"

## **Peking Welcomes Asian-African Writers**

Peking held a rally on August 10 to welcome several Asian and African writers who came to visit China after attending the meeting of the Executive Committee of the Afro-Asian Writers' Conference held recently in Indonesia. Sponsored by the Union of Chinese Writers and five other people's organizations, the rally was attended by 1,500 people, including Vice-Premier Chen Yi and other leaders as well as visitors from many Asian and African countries.

Speakers at the rally hailed the success of the recent meeting of the Executive Committee of the Afro-Asian Writers' Conference. They pledged that they would continue to uphold the line of the Afro-Asian literary movement against imperialism and colonialism and supporting national independence, as laid down at the Cairo conference last year. They sternly denounced the tripartite partial nuclear test ban treaty as a big fraud, and condemned the Soviet Government's shameless capitulation to the U.S. imperialists.

In his address to the rally, noted Chinese writer Mao Tun, who is Chairman of the Union of Chinese Writers and Chairman of the Chinese Liaison Committee of the Afro-Asian Writers' Conference, said that the recent Executive Committee meeting was a great success. Noting that the meeting pointed out that neo-colonialism as represented by U.S. imperialism was the most dangerous enemy of the Afro-Asian peoples and the common enemy of all the other peoples of the world today, he praised the Executive Committee meeting for carrying out resolute struggle against the treacherous activities of modern revisionists aimed at disrupting the Afro-Asian literary movements. He condemned the U.S.-U.K.-U.S.S.R.

treaty on the partial cessation of nuclear test which, he said, betrayed the Soviet people and the peoples of the socialist countries and sold out the interests of the peoples of the world. He voiced the Chinese people's support for Chairman Mao Tse-tung's statement on giving firm support to the American Negroes in their struggle against racial discrimination. "We Chinese people," he declared, "resolutely support the struggle of the American Negroes, the South African Negroes and Negroes all over the world against racial discrimination."

Korean writer Choi Yung Wha hailed the recent Executive Committee meeting as an important milestone in the literary movement in Asia and Africa and exposed the schemes of the revisionists in literature and art. "In the sphere of literature and art," he said, "the modern revisionists are doing their utmost to prettify U.S. imperialism and spread counter-revolutionary illusions about imperialism. They play up the horrors of war and bourgeois 'pacifism' and talk glibly about 'pure human nature,' 'supra-class humanism embracing all mankind' and the 'eternal theme,' in their attempt to lull the revolutionary fighting will of the people and their class consciousness. We must wage an uncompromising struggle against such ideas and aesthetic trends which are opposed to Marxism-Leninism."

Tan Cuong, a Vietnamese writer, called on Asian-African writers to heighten their vigilance and guard against the schemes of U.S. imperialism. This, he stressed, had a greater importance today than at any time in the past. Warmly welcoming Chairman Mao Tse-tung's statement of August 8, he said: "We firmly believe that this statement, which has won the enthusiastic support of all progressive mankind, will be a forceful inspiration to the American Negroes and the American people as a whole in their struggles."

G. Kahengeri of Kenya said that the recent Executive Committee meeting in Indonesia was a hard blow to the enemy. "Using our pens, as well as other means," he continued, "we Asian-African writers are dedicated to the national struggles for political, economic and cultural independence to wipe out colonialism and imperialism from the face of the world." Referring to the Moscow treaty, he

said that a total ban on nuclear weapons was the wish of the people of the world. "We endorse the Chinese Government's statement of July 31 advocating the complete prohibition and destruction of nuclear weapons and proposing a conference of the heads of the world's governments," he declared.

The Japanese woman writer Tsuyako Miyake also denounced the tripartite partial nuclear test ban treaty. "It is a sheer fraud," she said. "It pushes peace farther and farther away from the people." She fully supported the Chinese Government's July 31 statement, saying that it "reflected the universal desire of the people." "It is not nuclear weapons that will destroy mankind, but mankind that will destroy nuclear weapons," she concluded.

T. Makombe of Zimbabwe told the rally that today the imperialists, colonialists, reactionaries, revisionists and capitulationists were ganging up. "They all have one aim," he said, "and that is to sabotage and subvert the just struggles for national liberation, democracy, socialism and peace, which the oppressed and revolutionary people of Asia, Africa and Latin America are waging. In the face of this new alignment of world forces, it is now more imperative than ever before for the peoples of Asia, Africa and Latin America to strengthen their unity and increase their vigilance."

Speaking of the partial nuclear test ban treaty, Makombe said that peace-loving people of the world must not be fooled by this phoney treaty. Its initialling, he said, was not surprising, since for some time reaction and modern revisionism had been raising their head at Afro-Asian conferences and other international gatherings. "At least one country, which we used to count in our camp," he said, "has now come out openly in favour of naked capitulation to the imperialist camp." He also spoke of Chairman Mao's statement in support of the American Negroes. "All peace-loving people of the world," he declared, "should come out and give it their full support."

## **Chairman Mao Receives Indonesian Women's Delegation**

Chairman Mao Tse-tung received and had a cordial talk with the Indonesian Women's Delegation led by Madame Mudikdio on August 10.



# Chairman Mao Tse-tung's Statement

## Calling Upon the People of the World to Unite to Oppose Racial Discrimination by U.S. Imperialism and Support the American Negroes in Their Struggle Against Racial Discrimination

August 8, 1963

**A**N American Negro leader now taking refuge in Cuba, Mr. Robert Williams, the former President of the Monroe, North Carolina Chapter of the National Association for the Advancement of Coloured People, has twice this year asked me for a statement in support of the American Negroes' struggle against racial discrimination. I wish to take this opportunity, on behalf of the Chinese people, to express our resolute support for the American Negroes in their struggle against racial discrimination and for freedom and equal rights.

There are more than 19 million Negroes in the United States, or about 11 per cent of the total population. Their position in society is one of enslavement, oppression and discrimination. The overwhelming majority of the Negroes are deprived of their right to vote. On the whole it is only the most back-breaking and most despised jobs that are open to them. Their average wages are only from a third to a half of those of the white people. The ratio of unemployment among them is the highest. In many states they are forbidden to go to the same school, eat at the same table, or travel in the same section of a bus or train with the white people. Negroes are frequently and arbitrarily arrested, beaten up and murdered by U.S. authorities at various levels and members of the Ku Klux Klan and other racists. About half of the American Negroes are concentrated in 11 states in the south of the United States, where the discrimination and persecution they suffer are especially shocking.

The American Negroes are awakening and their resistance is growing ever stronger. In recent years the mass struggle of the American Negroes against racial discrimination and for freedom and equal rights has been constantly developing.

In 1957 the Negro people in Little Rock, Arkansas, waged a fierce struggle against the barring of their children from public schools. The authorities used armed force against them, and there resulted the Little Rock incident which shocked the world.

In 1960 Negroes in more than 20 states held "sit in" demonstrations in protest against racial segregation in local restaurants, shops and other public places.

In 1961 the Negroes launched a campaign of "freedom riders" to oppose racial segregation in transport, a campaign which rapidly extended to many states.

In 1962 the Negroes in Mississippi fought for the equal right to enrol in colleges and were greeted by the authorities with a blood bath.

The struggle of the American Negroes this year started in early April in Birmingham, Alabama. Unarmed, bare-handed Negro masses were subjected to wholesale arrests and the most barbarous suppression merely because they were holding meetings and parades against racial discrimination. On June 12 Mr. Medgar Evers, a leader of the Negro people in Mississippi, was murdered in cold blood. These Negro masses, aroused to indignation and defying brutal suppression, carried on their struggle even more courageously and quickly won the support of Negroes and all sections of the people throughout the United States. A gigantic and vigorous nationwide struggle is going on in nearly every state and city in the United States; and the struggle keeps mounting. American Negro organizations have decided to start a "freedom march" on Washington on August 28, in which 250,000 people will take part.

**T**HE speedy development of the struggle of the American Negroes is a manifestation of the sharpening of class struggle and national struggle within the United States; it has been causing increasing anxiety to the U.S. ruling circles. The Kennedy Administration has resorted to cunning two-faced tactics. On the one hand, it continues to connive at and take part in the discrimination against and persecution of Negroes; it even sends troops to suppress them. On the other hand, it is parading as an advocate of the "defence of human rights" and "the protection of the civil rights of Negroes," is calling upon the Negro people to exercise "restraint," is proposing to Congress the so-called "civil rights legislation," in an attempt to lull the fighting will of the Negro people and deceive the masses throughout the country. However, these tactics of the Kennedy Administration are being seen through by more and more of the Negroes. The fascist atrocities committed by the U.S. imperialists against the Negro people have laid bare the true nature of the so-called democracy and freedom in the United States and revealed the inner link between the reactionary policies pursued by the U.S. Government at home and its policies of aggression abroad.

I call upon the workers, peasants, revolutionary intellectuals, enlightened elements of the bourgeoisie and other enlightened personages of all colours in the

world, white, black, yellow, brown, etc., to unite to oppose the racial discrimination practised by U.S. imperialism and to support the American Negroes in their struggle against racial discrimination. In the final analysis, a national struggle is a question of class struggle. In the United States, it is only the reactionary ruling circles among the whites who are oppressing the Negro people. They can in no way represent the workers, farmers, revolutionary intellectuals and other enlightened persons who comprise the overwhelming majority of the white people. At present, it is the handful of imperialists, headed by the United States, and their supporters, the reactionaries in different

countries, who are carrying out oppression, aggression and intimidation against the overwhelming majority of the nations and peoples of the world. We are in the majority and they are in the minority. At most, they make up less than 10 per cent of the 3,000 million population of the world. I am firmly convinced that, with the support of more than 90 per cent of the people of the world, the American Negroes will be victorious in their just struggle. The evil system of colonialism and imperialism grew up along with the enslavement of Negroes and the trade in Negroes, it will surely come to its end with the thorough emancipation of the black people.

# Statement by the Spokesman of the Chinese Government

— A Comment on the Soviet Government's Statement of August 3

August 15, 1963

- The Soviet statement cannot deny the fact that the Soviet Government has betrayed itself and sold out the interests of the Soviet people and the people of the world.
- The signing of the tripartite treaty is a result of open capitulation by the Soviet leaders to U.S. imperialism. This treaty is one which meets from beginning to end the requirements of the U.S. imperialist global strategy. It creates an illusion of peace and lulls the vigilance of the people of the world. The treaty legalizes underground nuclear tests and makes it easier for U.S. imperialism to gain nuclear superiority. It can in no way prevent the United States from carrying out nuclear proliferation, and it tends to strengthen the aggressive forces of the imperialist camp.
- The Soviet leaders, seeking for relaxation through capitulation, are indulging in a moment's ease only to incur a century of suffering.
- The Soviet leaders' collusion with U.S. imperialism in the hope of binding China hand and foot does not begin from today.
- The signing of the tripartite treaty proves that the line followed by the Soviet leaders in foreign affairs is one of out-and-out capitulation; the attempt to gamble with the desire of the people of the world for peace will fail in the end.
- The Soviet leaders have dropped the banner of the complete prohibition of nuclear weapons, and it is our duty to raise it still higher.
- The Chinese Government's proposal is firm, clear-cut and realistic.
- To defend Marxism-Leninism, one must expose acts of betrayal of Marxism-Leninism and of proletarian internationalism.

ON August 3 the Government of the Soviet Union issued a statement, attacking the Chinese Government's statement of July 31 on the complete prohibition and thorough destruction of nuclear weapons and defending the treaty on the partial halting of nuclear tests which was concluded by the Soviet Union with the United States and Britain. The Soviet Government of course has the right to defend its own action. However, after carefully studying this statement of the Soviet Government's, we regret to say that it is a poor defence, rambling

haphazard, full of pointless talk and lacking any reasoned arguments.

I

There is a fatal weakness in the Soviet Government's statement, namely, it evades the fact that the conclusion of the treaty was a result of the abandonment of the Soviet Government's previous correct stand, the acceptance of the stand of the United States steadily upheld by two



Administrations and unprincipled concessions to imperialism. The statement of the Chinese Government solemnly pointed out that the Soviet leaders made a 180 degree about-face, betrayed themselves and sold out the interests of the people of the Soviet Union and the world.

The Soviet statement is furious over the words "betrayal" and "sell-out" and asserts that there is no inconsistency in the Soviet stand, because "life does not mark time, science and technology are developing tempestuously, and what was unacceptable only yesterday may prove useful, even very useful, today." It insolently asks us who is more competent to be the judge on the question of whom the treaty benefits—"those who possess nuclear weapons and carry out tests, or those who only know about them from literature"? It appears that the Soviet leaders want to have a monopoly not only of nuclear weapons but also of the right to speak on the question of nuclear weapons.

No one can monopolize the right to speak on the question of nuclear weapons. But since the Soviet leaders regard themselves as competent to speak, let us hear what they have said in the past.

The United States put forward the proposal for the cessation of nuclear tests, excluding underground tests, for the first time on April 13, 1959. In his letter to Eisenhower of April 23 of that year, Khrushchov, Chairman of the Council of Ministers of the Soviet Union, called it a "dishonest deal."

On September 3, 1961, the United States and Britain issued a joint statement proposing the conclusion of an agreement on banning nuclear tests in the atmosphere alone. On September 9, Soviet leader Khrushchov issued a statement on the matter, saying that:

Each line of the statement by the President of the United States and the Prime Minister of Great Britain reveals a desire, cost what it may, to ensure for the Western powers and their allies in aggressive military blocs unilateral military advantages to the detriment of the security interests of the Soviet Union and the other socialist states.

It is a dishonest deal. Of course, the Soviet Government cannot and will not strike such a bargain.

On September 28, 1961, the Soviet Government published a memorandum on the question of nuclear weapon tests, saying that:

As to the question regarding underground and space test explosions of these weapons, it was separated from the suggested agreement and this again showed the tendency on the part of the United States and Britain to reserve for themselves the possibility of carrying out nuclear tests and to tie the hands of the Soviet Union in taking measures to improve its defence ability.

To allow such a situation to develop would be tantamount to encouraging the aggressors to carry out their designs, which are dangerous for the whole of mankind.

On August 27, 1962, the United States and Britain put forward a draft treaty on the partial halting of nuclear tests. On August 29 Kuznetsov, head of the Soviet Delegation, pointed out at a meeting of the Disarmament

Commission in Geneva that this draft contained a serious danger. He said that,

The United States of America has been using underground tests to improve its nuclear weapons for many years already. . . . Should underground nuclear tests be legalized with a simultaneous prohibition of such tests in the atmosphere—this would mean that the United States could continue improving its nuclear weapons, increase their yield and effectivity, whereas the Soviet Union would have its hands bound in the question of strengthening its defence potentiality.

The Soviet Government persisted in its stand of rejecting the partial stoppage of nuclear tests. As late as June 9, 1963, it notified the Chinese Government that the Western powers' position on the halting of nuclear tests could not yet serve as a basis for agreement, and that whether negotiations could yield any results depended entirely on the Western powers.

On June 15, 1963, answering questions put by the editors-in-chief of *Pravda* and *Izvestia* on the U.S. President's speech of June 10, the Soviet leader Khrushchov said:

As far as the Soviet Union is concerned, we are ready to sign an agreement on the discontinuance of all nuclear tests today. It is up to the West now. We agreed to a meeting between the representatives of the three powers in Moscow, to try once again to reach an agreement on this question. But the success of this meeting will depend on what the United States and British representatives bring with them to our country.

On July 25, 1963, the Soviet leaders suddenly changed their above stand, accepted the refurbished version of the U.S.-British draft treaty and signed the treaty on the partial halting of nuclear tests.

The Soviet leaders say the situation has changed. When did it change? How did it change? Why is it that what was unacceptable on June 15 became acceptable on July 25, and very useful into the bargain? What changes took place within those forty days? Why did you not provide a little explanation? Why did you not give some reasons? If what you said yesterday no longer counts today, will what you say today no longer count tomorrow? You were either insincere then, or you are deliberately deceiving people now. The Soviet leaders' betrayal of the Soviet people, of the countries in the socialist camp and of the people of the whole world can by no means be denied.

## II

The circumstances remain unchanged. The policy of U.S. imperialism has not changed. It is the Soviet leaders who have changed.

The conclusion of a treaty on the partial halting of nuclear tests was an object persistently pursued by the United States over a number of years.

In his message to the U.S. Senate dated August 8, U.S. President Kennedy said,

It grows out of the proposal made by President Eisenhower in 1959 and the resolution passed by the Senate in the same year. . . . Nothing has happened since then to alter its importance to our security.

# Premier Kim Il Sung Supports Chinese Government Proposal

*Kim Il Sung, Premier of the Cabinet of the Korean Democratic People's Republic, sent a reply on August 13 to Chou En-lai, Premier of the State Council of the People's Republic of China, expressing support for the proposal of the Government of the People's Republic of China on convening a conference of the government heads of all countries of the world to discuss the question of totally prohibiting and destroying nuclear weapons.*

*Following is the text of Premier Kim Il Sung's reply. — Ed.*

**Comrade Chou En-lai, Premier of the State Council of the People's Republic of China**

**Esteemed Comrade Premier:**

I received your letter dated August 2nd.

The Government of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea supports the proposal of the Government of the Chinese People's Republic on convening a conference of the government heads of all countries of the world to discuss the question of totally prohibiting and destroying nuclear weapons.

The Government of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea has consistently advocated the prohibition of the testing, manufacture and use of nuclear weapons and striven for the relaxation of international tension and world peace.

Today the U.S.-led imperialists are feverishly engaged in an arms race and new war preparations.

Though a nuclear test ban treaty was concluded in Moscow this time by the three countries of the Soviet Union, the United States and Britain, it failed to restrain the nuclear war preparations of the U.S. imperialists and settle the fundamental question of removing the threat of a nuclear war.

The U.S. imperialists are continuously menacing peace and openly talking about securing military supremacy over the socialist camp.

Under such conditions, it is an important means of consolidating world peace to realize the total prohibition and destruction of nuclear weapons.

We consider that in order radically to solve such a question directly concerning the interests of the peoples of all countries of the world as the total prohibition and destruction of nuclear weapons, all the peace-loving forces of the world should wage a resolute struggle in firmer unity.

With my sincere respect.

**KIM IL SUNG**

*Premier of the Cabinet of the Korean Democratic People's Republic*

August 13, 1963.

The Soviet statement says that the conclusion of the tripartite treaty is the first step towards freeing mankind from the threat of nuclear war.

It does not seem so to us. On the contrary, in our view the conclusion of the tripartite treaty increases the danger of nuclear war.

On the question of nuclear weapons, don't you respect only what is said by those who possess nuclear weapons? Let us then hear what those who possess nuclear weapons have said.

In the period between July 26 and August 8, Kennedy repeatedly and outspokenly said that the tripartite treaty

— does not prohibit the United States to conduct underground nuclear tests,

— does not halt the production of nuclear weapons by the United States,

— does not reduce the U.S. nuclear stockpiles,

— does not hinder the United States from spreading nuclear weapons to its allies,

— does not restrict the use of nuclear weapons by the United States in time of war,

— does not prohibit the nuclear arms race,

— does not mean an end to the danger of nuclear war, and

— does not assure world peace.

At the ceremony of the formal signing of this treaty, Rusk said relentlessly, "It is not possible for us to guarantee now what the significance of this act will be."

The treaty was signed primarily between the Soviet Union and the United States. If the pronouncements of Kennedy and Rusk were wrong, why did not the Soviet leaders refute them? To assert that this treaty represents a so-called first step towards preventing nuclear war is a deliberate attempt to fool the people of the world.

What is more, this treaty is highly advantageous to the forces of war headed by U.S. imperialism and highly detrimental to the forces of world peace.

Kennedy said that the first advantage of this treaty to the United States is that it legalizes underground nuclear tests "in which the United States has more experience than any other nation," and the second advantage is that it prohibits nuclear tests in the atmosphere through which "other powers could develop all kinds of weapons more cheaply and quickly than they could underground."

It is by no means a treaty preventing war and strengthening peace, as the Soviet leaders allege; it is a treaty U.S. imperialism can use to pursue its war aims by exploiting the desire of the people of the world for peace. In no sense does the conclusion of this treaty show that U.S. imperialism has become sensible; it is the result of open capitulation by the Soviet leaders to U.S. imperialism.

## III

Why did the U.S. imperialists desire such a treaty?

After dropping the first atom bomb on Hiroshima in August 1945, U.S. imperialism tried to exploit its monopoly of nuclear weapons in order to push its policies

---

## The New Zealand Communist Party Supports Chinese Government Statement

VIC G. WILCOX, General Secretary of the New Zealand Communist Party, has issued a statement on behalf of the Party's National Secretariat, supporting the Chinese Government's statement of July 31, according to an Auckland report.

The statement of the Chinese Government calls for the complete, thorough, total and resolute prohibition and destruction of nuclear weapons and proposes a conference of the government heads of all countries of the world.

In his statement, Wilcox says that the call of the Chinese Government is one that should receive the active support of all peace-lovers throughout the world.

Wilcox's statement is printed in the August 14 issue of the *People's Voice* (weekly), organ of the Central Committee of the New Zealand Communist Party.

His statement says, "Response to the Chinese Government's call not only strikes a big blow for world peace but is plain common sense."

He points out that the Chinese statement calls for the complete banning of all nuclear tests, the destruction

of existing stockpiles of nuclear weapons and a complete stop to their further manufacture. It also calls for a conference of the government heads of all the countries of the world to discuss the question of the complete prohibition and thorough destruction of nuclear weapons and the adoption of four measures to realize this step by step.

The Chinese Government's call "is also the complete answer to our Prime Minister Mr. Holyoake and others who prattle that People's China wants nuclear war as the road to world socialism," his statement continues.

Referring to the U.S.-British-Soviet partial nuclear test ban treaty, the statement says that it "does not remove the danger of nuclear war, of further underground tests or of the continued manufacture of nuclear weapons as well as the maintaining of existing stockpiles."

The statement asks all organizations interested in peace to forward immediately resolutions asking the New Zealand Government to come out with firm support for the call of the Chinese Government.

---

of aggression and war, to enslave the peoples and lord it over the whole world. But the U.S. policy of nuclear blackmail was unable to prevent the peoples of China, Korea, Viet Nam, Cuba and other countries from winning great victories in their revolutionary struggles. The Soviet possession of nuclear weapons smashed the nuclear monopoly of the United States and placed the U.S. imperialists in the position of courting self-destruction in case they tried to destroy others. At the same time, all the world's peace-loving countries and people unfolded increasingly powerful struggles against nuclear war and for the banning of nuclear weapons. All this rendered the U.S. imperialist policy of nuclear blackmail more and more ineffective.

In the face of this unfavourable situation, U.S. imperialism, while maintaining the means of "massive retaliation," had to adopt and stress the "strategy of flexible response," which means preparing for both nuclear war and conventional war and both continuing the development of strategic nuclear weapons as means of nuclear blackmail and threats and energetically developing tactical nuclear weapons in preparation for launching "limited nuclear wars" when necessary.

It was in pursuit of this counter-revolutionary strategy that the United States needed a treaty on halting nuclear tests which would

— divorce the cessation of nuclear tests from the general task of banning nuclear weapons and, by such a cessation, provide a screen for U.S. nuclear war preparations,

— exclude a prohibition on underground nuclear tests, so that the United States could improve its strategic nuclear weapons and develop tactical nuclear weapons,

— ensure that the United States and its allies will gain nuclear superiority over the Soviet Union and further develop it, and

— bind all the socialist countries except the Soviet Union and all countries subjected to aggression, without hindering the United States from proliferating its nuclear weapons among its allies and countries under its control.

From beginning to end, the tripartite treaty which has just been concluded satisfies these requirements of the U.S. imperialist global strategy.

### IV

By completely divorcing the cessation of nuclear tests from the general task of banning nuclear weapons, the tripartite treaty creates an illusion of peace, lulls the vigilance of the people of the world and provides a screen behind which U.S. imperialism can continue to manufacture, develop and proliferate nuclear weapons, gain nuclear superiority and prepare for a nuclear war.

The authors of the Soviet Government's statement completely forget what the Soviet leaders more than once pointed out, i.e., that a treaty exclusively concerned with the halting of nuclear tests is a deal for deceiving the people. On the contrary, they boast that the tripartite treaty can protect mankind against the dangerous consequences of contamination by radioactive substances. They are cajoling support for the tripartite treaty by exploiting

the peoples' natural desire to avoid contamination by radioactive substances.

It should be pointed out firstly that the United States must bear the full responsibility for the pollution of the atmosphere. It was the United States which first tested, manufactured and used atomic weapons and it is the United States which has engaged in the frenzied expansion of nuclear armaments and conducted hundreds of nuclear tests, mostly on the high seas in the Pacific. The great majority of the nuclear tests conducted on this planet have been the work of the United States. According to any principle of equity, the United States should have stopped testing long ago.

In fact, under the pressure of popular demand and world opinion and because it has obtained enough technical data, the United States has already stopped all forms of nuclear tests except underground ones. In the absence of the tripartite treaty, the United States, weighing the advantages and disadvantages, would not dare lightly to resume these forms of nuclear testing. With the tripartite treaty, however, not only is this state of affairs not fixed, but the United States is given the right to resume these forms of nuclear testing at any time. As soon as the tripartite treaty was initialled, Kennedy declared that the United States remains ready to resume nuclear tests in the atmosphere. He openly said that the tripartite treaty "does not assure the world that it will be for ever free from the fears and dangers of radioactive fallout from atmospheric tests." Unless one's purpose is to deceive the people of the world, how can one describe the treaty as a protection for mankind against contamination by radioactive substances?

Radioactive substances are indeed harmful, but the harm done by a nuclear war will be a hundred times, a thousand times more serious. The Soviet leader Khrushchov once exposed the imperialist scheme as follows:

There is an apt saying: if the head is gone, it is no use crying over the coiffure. The imperialist gentlemen are preparing death for people in the fire of war and they chatter about people's health.

Now it is enough for us to present the Soviet leaders with the same words. It would be superfluous to add to them on this point.

## V

By omitting the prohibition on underground nuclear tests, the tripartite treaty legalizes such tests and makes it easier for the United States to improve its strategic nuclear weapons, develop tactical nuclear weapons, conduct nuclear blackmail and prepare for "limited nuclear wars."

According to data published by the United States, it has carried out more than seventy underground nuclear tests since 1957, and has gained rich experience. It has set up huge, well-equipped underground testing grounds. It is already able to conduct underground medium nuclear tests with the yield of the equivalent of several hundred thousand tons of TNT. The tripartite treaty gives the United States freedom to conduct about 80 per cent of

the nuclear tests it deems necessary. The reservation on underground nuclear testing is most advantageous to the United States.

The U.S. Defence Secretary McNamara said on August 13 that the United States is determined to maintain its nuclear superiority over the Soviet Union. If testing continued indefinitely without limit, the most likely ultimate result would be technical parity between the United States and the U.S.S.R. Since the United States has more experience in underground nuclear tests, to ban other forms of nuclear testing while preserving underground tests will retard Soviet progress and enhance the superiority of the United States. An underground nuclear explosion was demonstratively conducted by the United States only a week after the formal signing of the tripartite treaty.

The United States can continue to improve its strategic nuclear weapons by means of underground tests. These strategic weapons are increasingly becoming a means of political blackmail as they and their means of delivery are being developed more and more and being manufactured and stockpiled in ever greater quantities, and a nuclear stalemate has arisen as a result.

At present, the United States is eagerly seeking to develop tactical nuclear weapons. It intends to use tactical nuclear weapons in local wars in order to deal with non-nuclear socialist and other peace-loving countries and people, and in particular to deal with the Asian, African and Latin American countries and people which are subjected to oppression and aggression.

If this U.S. imperialist scheme should be allowed to succeed, and if U.S. imperialism should be permitted to win in one local war after another and so change the international balance of forces, it would in turn definitely increase the danger of a total nuclear war. This situation cannot but rouse the people's serious vigilance.

It is an indisputable fact that the tripartite treaty facilitates continued nuclear blackmail and threats by U.S. imperialism and its continued suppression of popular revolutionary movements and national-independence movements. In signing this treaty, the Soviet leaders have ignored the vital interests of the oppressed peoples and nations of the world. This is indeed to "play irresponsibly with the destiny of millions upon millions of people."

## VI

The tripartite treaty can in no way prevent the United States from carrying out nuclear proliferation, and it tends to strengthen the aggressive forces of the imperialist camp.

Feigning ignorance on this point, the Soviet statement retorts:

Thus it follows that if nuclear weapons spread throughout the world, if the way was opened for the West German revanchists to gain possession of these weapons, and if one series of nuclear explosions carried out by



scores of states would succeed another, this would apparently serve the interests of peace and would not constitute a capitulation to imperialism!

Well, let us see in what way the treaty helps to prevent nuclear proliferation, and what sort of nuclear proliferation it prevents.

Can this treaty prevent U.S. imperialism from proliferating its nuclear weapons, and the technical data for their manufacture, among the West German revanchists and other allies of the United States and countries under its control?

No, absolutely not. The U.S. Government has constantly stressed that it cannot, and the Soviet leaders are aware of this, too. Please look at the facts.

On July 31, Harriman openly stated that there was nothing in the treaty to prevent the United States from disclosing nuclear secrets to its allies. And the United States has already approached France on this matter.

As the whole world knows, the so-called plan for a "multilateral nuclear force" which the United States has been promoting is one of nuclear proliferation among its allies, including the West German revanchists. The conclusion of the tripartite treaty in no way hinders the promotion of this plan. After the initialling of the tripartite treaty, the United States immediately resumed the meeting in Washington to discuss the building of a "multilateral nuclear force."

On the very day that the tripartite treaty was initialled, West German Defence Minister von Hassel serenely remarked that the tripartite treaty did not ban all nuclear tests and that it affected neither the building of a "multilateral armed force" nor the conception of NATO and the West German armed forces as a whole.

On August 12, Rusk went a step further and declared outright that the treaty would not hinder the United States from arming its allies with nuclear weapons and that therefore it would not prevent the construction of the multilateral NATO nuclear force proposed by the United States.

The facts are all here. Who will believe that this paper treaty can possibly prevent the United States from proliferating nuclear weapons and nuclear secrets among its allies and countries under its control, especially West Germany? The Soviet leaders are attempting to justify their act of capitulation by playing on the righteous feelings of the people of Europe against the revival of West German militarism. This attempt has failed in the face of iron-clad facts and will go thoroughly bankrupt in the end.

## VII

The object of U.S. imperialism in advocating the prevention of nuclear proliferation is not at all to manacle itself but to manacle socialist countries other than the Soviet Union.

The United States is trying to achieve this object by consolidating the nuclear monopoly position of the United States, Britain and the Soviet Union. The Soviet leaders are fully supporting this plot and playing an active part in carrying it out.

The statement of the Soviet Government says,

Is it not a fact that what the Statement of the PRC Government terms a nuclear monopoly, i.e. the possession by the Soviet Union of these weapons, did play a definite, one might even say the decisive, role in preventing the socialist countries, including the PRC, from becoming objects of imperialist aggression and in enabling them successfully to build socialism and communism?

We cannot agree with this view.

In fighting imperialist aggression and defending its security, every socialist country has to rely in the first place on its own defence capability, and then—and only then—on assistance from fraternal countries and the people of the world. For the Soviet statement to describe all the socialist countries as depending on the nuclear weapons of the Soviet Union for their survival is to strike an out-and-out great-power chauvinistic note and to fly in the face of the facts.

The Chinese Government has always fully appreciated the importance of the Soviet Union's possession of nuclear weapons. However, such possession must in no way be made a justification for preventing other socialist countries from increasing their own defence capabilities. The Moscow Statement of 1960 points out, "So long as there is no disarmament, the socialist countries must maintain their defence potential at an adequate level." If the Soviet Government is earnest about abiding by the Moscow Statement and really wants to fight the imperialist policies of aggression and war and to defend world peace, there is no reason why it should try so hard to obstruct other socialist countries from increasing their defence capabilities.

With regard to preventing nuclear proliferation, the Chinese Government has always maintained that the arguments of the U.S. imperialists must not be echoed, but that a class analysis must be made. Whether or not nuclear weapons help peace depends on who possesses them. It is detrimental to peace if they are in the hands of imperialist countries; it helps peace if they are in the hands of socialist countries. It must not be said indiscriminately that the danger of nuclear war increases along with the increase in the number of nuclear powers. Nuclear weapons were first the monopoly of the United States. Later, the Soviet Union also came to possess them. Did the danger of nuclear war become greater or less when the number of nuclear powers increased from one to two? We say it became less, not greater.

Nuclear weapons in the possession of a socialist country are always a means of defence against nuclear blackmail and nuclear war. So long as the imperialists refuse to ban nuclear weapons, the greater the number of socialist countries possessing them, the better the guarantee of world peace. A fierce class struggle is now going on in the world. In this struggle, the greater the



strength on our side, the better. Does it make sense to say the less the better?

However, after attaining possession of nuclear weapons themselves, the Soviet leaders began to echo the arguments of the U.S. imperialists and to endeavour to have the monopoly of nuclear weapons among the socialist countries. This is a total repudiation of the Moscow Statement and a total repudiation of proletarian internationalism.

The Soviet leaders turn a blind eye to U.S. imperialism's proliferation of nuclear weapons to West Germany and do their utmost to prevent other socialist countries from strengthening their defence capabilities. While undermining its allies, U.S. imperialism cannot completely ignore the common interests of the bourgeoisie of different countries; the Soviet leaders, however, are bent on crushing their own class brothers, without showing an iota of proletarian internationalism.

Formerly we thought the Soviet leaders were genuinely afraid of the West German militarists' coming into possession of nuclear weapons. Now we see that they trust U.S. imperialism and think it does not matter if the West German militarists possess nuclear weapons provided they are under the control of the United States. And in order to curry favour with U.S. imperialism, they would not hesitate to obliterate the international position of the German Democratic Republic. They do not really oppose the possession of nuclear weapons by the West German militarists. Nor do they take any interest in strengthening the might of the socialist camp as a whole. The real aim of the Soviet leaders is to compromise with the United States in order to seek momentary ease and to maintain a monopoly of nuclear weapons and lord it over in the socialist camp.

## VIII

The Soviet statement says that one must not oppose the tripartite treaty and that whoever opposes it is opposing the relaxation of international tension. What a broad accusation!

True, Soviet-U.S. relations appear to be somewhat relaxed because the Soviet leaders, treating enemies as friends, have struck a political bargain with U.S. imperialism which is entirely to the advantage of the United States.

But at what price is this kind of relaxation achieved? It is achieved at the price of the interests of the Soviet people, of the socialist camp and of the people of the whole world, and at the price of facilitating the nuclear superiority of U.S. imperialism through its manufacture, development and proliferation of nuclear weapons.

Numerous facts show that, in the struggle against imperialism, relaxation that is won through struggle is a genuine relaxation, while relaxation bought by capitulation is a false relaxation. The so-called relaxation now appearing between the United States and the Soviet Union is only a transient and superficial phenomenon and a false relaxation. It is just what U.S. imperialism can

exploit in being more unscrupulous in pushing its global strategy of enslaving the people of the whole world. The danger of war has increased. This line of action of the Soviet leaders is, as the old Chinese saying goes, "indulging in a moment's ease only to incur a century of suffering."

Can such relaxation lead to the solution of major international issues? On the contrary, to seek relaxation through surrender only leads to greater demands and more exacting conditions on the part of the imperialists and feeds their appetite, and thereby making the solution of major international issues increasingly difficult, unless further steps to surrender are taken.

Clearly, such relaxation runs counter to the wishes of the people of the world.

## IX

Socialist countries do not want nuclear weapons. Nuclear weapons cannot be eaten. No one would be happier than we if nuclear weapons were thoroughly destroyed. The Chinese Government and people have always stood in the forefront of the fight to prohibit them. We maintain that a complete ban on nuclear weapons is an attainable goal and that there are ways of banning them step by step. The three-point proposal of the Chinese Government for the complete prohibition of nuclear weapons sets the general goal of completely prohibiting and thoroughly destroying nuclear weapons, puts forward four concrete measures for its attainment step by step and makes the reasonable suggestion of a conference of the government heads of all countries in the world. The Chinese proposal is firm, clear-cut and realistic.

Yet the Soviet statement attacks the Chinese attitude as one of "all or nothing" and slanders us as being out of touch with reality.

One might ask, is it unrealistic for the people of the whole world to demand the dismantling of military bases, including nuclear bases, on foreign soil?

Is it unrealistic for many countries to demand the establishment of nuclear weapon-free zones?

Is it unrealistic to demand the prohibition of the export and import of nuclear weapons and technical data for their manufacture and a genuine prohibition of nuclear proliferation?

Is it unrealistic to demand the cessation of all nuclear tests, including underground ones?

In fact, it is the concrete measures we propose that constitute the first step towards the complete prohibition of nuclear weapons. Take the proposal concerning the nuclear weapon-free zones, for instance. If only the nuclear powers undertake their due obligations, a nuclear weapon-free zone in Latin America and a nuclear weapon-free zone in Africa could be established at once. The peoples in these two areas all eagerly desire to place themselves beyond nuclear threats, so that they may successfully develop their countries. They will not menace the nuclear powers. Why cannot the nuclear powers under-

take such obligations and respect these peoples' desire for the establishment of nuclear weapon-free zones?

By using the word "unrealistic," the authors of the Soviet statement try to dismiss the earnest desire of millions upon millions of people throughout the world. Clearly, in their eyes, the countries and people that do not have nuclear weapons are not worth a single glance, and the struggle waged in the interests of the people of the world is unrealistic. All they see is nuclear weapons, and in their opinion the only thing that is realistic is to divide spheres of influence with the imperialists who possess nuclear weapons.

The authors of the Soviet statement assert that there is nothing new in the Chinese proposal. It is true that what we propose now we have consistently advocated in the past. In this sense, there is indeed nothing new in our proposal. They also say that they have previously advocated everything in our present proposal. That, too, is basically true. But there is one difference. They no longer advocate it now. Occasionally, they still refer to it, but that is merely for show and for deceiving the people. Our present proposal has become a new one precisely because they have betrayed the correct position they once persistently held to.

The Soviet leaders have let fall the banner of the complete prohibition of nuclear weapons, and it is our duty to raise it still higher.

The authors of the Soviet statement assert that by not joining in their fraud, we are siding with the imperialist "madmen" and opposing the people of the world, while conversely, by collaborating with the imperialists to fool the people of the world, they have become fighters shaking the imperialist forces of aggression and become the representatives of the people of the world.

Let us then ask, who represents the imperialist forces of aggression? As the Moscow Statement points out, U.S. imperialism is the biggest international exploiter, the chief bulwark of world reaction, the mainstay of colonialism today, the international gendarme, the main force of aggression and war and the enemy of the people of the whole world.

As everybody knows, this imperialism is represented by Kennedy, Rusk, Harriman and the like. It may be asked: Is it you or is it we who call these imperialist big guns "peace fighters" and brothers and warmly embrace them?

## X

The conclusion of the tripartite treaty once again shows that the Soviet leaders seek only to preserve themselves and would leave other people to sink or swim. They have repeatedly said that so long as they themselves survive and develop the people of the world will be saved. The fact is they are selling out the fundamental interests of the people of the world in order to seek their own momentary ease. All countries and peoples subjected to oppression and aggression are now engaged in earth-shaking struggles against imperialism and old and new colonialism headed by the United States and for their own

independence and freedom. Yet the Soviet leaders, of one mind with U.S. imperialism, have collaborated with it in a fraud and want the people of the world to believe that the U.S. imperialists are "peace fighters," thus lulling their fighting will and undermining the cause of world peace. But the people of all countries will not likewise regard enemies as friends. Their own bitter experience will enable them to realize gradually that they can save themselves and ensure world peace only by carrying through to the end the struggle against imperialism and old and new colonialism headed by the United States.

It should be understood that the relationship between the Soviet people and the other peoples of the world is one of mutual reliance, like that between lips and teeth. The existence and development of the Soviet Union are a support to the revolutionary struggles of other peoples, while in turn these peoples' revolutionary struggles and victories support the Soviet Union. There is no reason whatsoever to think that the Soviet Union no longer needs others' support. In fact this is not the case. If the lips are gone, the teeth are exposed. If U.S. imperialism should be given a free hand to put down the revolutionary struggles of other peoples and if the Soviet leaders should ally themselves with U.S. imperialism against the fraternal countries, eventually it will not be possible for the Soviet Union itself to be preserved.

The present trend of events merits the vigilance of all peoples. Having long hoped for a ban on nuclear weapons, people understandably rejoice at hearing of a partial halting of nuclear tests. They hope it will lead to a complete cessation of nuclear tests and a complete prohibition of nuclear weapons. But the paper treaty concocted by the three nuclear powers is not to be depended on. In order to realize the complete prohibition of nuclear weapons step by step it is necessary to carry on an unswerving struggle. As a minimum, it is necessary, in the light of the proposal of the Chinese Government, first of all to compel the nuclear powers to undertake not to use, or test, or proliferate nuclear weapons and undertake to respect the nuclear weapon-free zones. Only when these undertakings are secured can we regard the situation as having advanced a step towards peace. We are convinced that, after all, a fraud is a fraud and will not be able to stand the test of time. In the end, the attempt to use the desire of the people of the world for peace to carry out speculation will fail.

## XI

It is not only at present that the Soviet leaders have begun to collude with U.S. imperialism and attempt to manacle China.

As far back as June 20, 1959, when there was not yet the slightest sign of a treaty on stopping nuclear tests, the Soviet Government unilaterally tore up the agreement on new technology for national defence concluded between China and the Soviet Union on October 15, 1957, and refused to provide China with a sample of an atomic bomb and technical data concerning its manufacture. This was done as a presentation gift at the time the Soviet leader went to the United States for talks with Eisenhower in September.

On August 25, 1962, two days before the United States and Britain put forward their draft treaty on the partial halting of nuclear tests, the Soviet Government notified China that U.S. Secretary of State Rusk had proposed an agreement stipulating that, firstly, the nuclear powers should undertake to refrain from transferring nuclear weapons and technical information concerning their manufacture to non-nuclear countries, and that, secondly, the countries not in possession of nuclear weapons should undertake to refrain from manufacturing them, from seeking them from the nuclear powers or from accepting technical information concerning their manufacture. The Soviet Government gave an affirmative reply to this proposal of Rusk's.

The Chinese Government sent three memoranda to the Soviet Government, on September 3, 1962, October 20, 1962, and June 6, 1963, stating that it was a matter for the Soviet Government whether it committed itself to the United States to refrain from transferring nuclear weapons and technical information concerning their manufacture to China; but that the Chinese Government hoped the Soviet Government would not infringe on China's sovereign rights and act for China in assuming an obligation to refrain from manufacturing nuclear weapons. We solemnly stated that we would not tolerate the conclusion, in disregard of China's opposition, of any sort of treaty between the Soviet Government and the United States which aimed at depriving the Chinese people of their right to take steps to resist the nuclear threats of U.S. imperialism, and that we would issue statements to make our position known.

We hoped that after such earnest counsel from us, the Soviet leaders would rein in before reaching the precipice and would not render matters irretrievable. Unfortunately, they did not pay the slightest attention to our counsel. They finally concluded the treaty on the partial halting of nuclear tests with the United States and Britain, thereby attempting to bring pressure to bear on China and force her into commitments.

The whole course of events amounts to this: First the Soviet Government tried to subdue China and curry favour with U.S. imperialism by discontinuing assistance to China. Then it put forward all sorts of untenable arguments in an attempt to induce China to abandon its solemn stand. Failing in all this, it has brazenly ganged up with the imperialist bandits in exerting pressure on China.

In view of all the above, China has long ceased to place any hope in the Soviet leaders in developing its own nuclear strength to resist the U.S. nuclear threats.

## XII

The authors of the Soviet statement claim that since the Soviet Government put forward a proposal for the complete banning of nuclear weapons as far back as 1946 and has all along worked for a ban on nuclear weapons, it cannot possibly err on issues related to nuclear weapons. On the contrary, in our view, their error is all the more serious because they have now betrayed their past correct position.

From 1946 to 1956, the Soviet Government insisted on the complete prohibition of nuclear weapons. They were correct then and we firmly supported them. In his summary report to the 20th Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union in 1956, the Soviet leader divorced the cessation of nuclear tests from the question of disarmament. Subsequently, they were wrong on certain issues and correct on others, and we supported them in all their correct views. But on July 25, 1963, they went altogether wrong, and it is quite natural that we should resolutely criticize them.

The authors of the Soviet statement charges China with disrespect for the sovereignty of the Soviet state and slanders the authors of the Chinese statement as having gone out of their minds and as attempting to set the Soviet people against the Soviet Government. It pretentiously asks: Is not the Chinese Government "taking too much upon itself"? We can tell them frankly that we are not taking too much upon ourselves at all. We are Communists. According to the correct criteria they once put forward themselves, and according to Marxism-Leninism and the Moscow Declaration and the Moscow Statement, it is our proletarian internationalist duty to point out that they have now betrayed the interests of the Soviet people and the entire socialist camp. If indeed anyone has gone out of his mind, it is definitely not the Chinese people, who have consistently maintained a correct stand; it is the Soviet leaders, who have betrayed their own position midway.

If the Soviet leaders consider that betrayal of the interests of the Soviet people is within the sovereign rights of the Soviet state, then of course they are entitled to say so. But if you try to gag us on the pretext of non-interference in internal affairs, you will not succeed. To defend Marxism-Leninism, one must expose acts of betrayal of Marxism-Leninism and of proletarian internationalism. Anyone who does not expose such acts of betrayal ceases to be a Communist.

By concluding the tripartite treaty the Soviet leaders are trying to show the correctness of the so-called general line of peaceful coexistence which they have been following since the 20th Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union. To glory in one's shame—this can only make people split their sides. What does the conclusion of the tripartite treaty show? It merely shows that the line followed by the Soviet leaders in foreign affairs is one of out-and-out capitulation. The imperialists are of course willing to coexist with those who surrender to them. However, this is not peaceful coexistence but capitulationist coexistence.

The Soviet leaders have already gone far along the wrong road. We hope they will reconsider their position and return to the road of Marxism-Leninism and proletarian internationalism, to the road of unity with the countries in the socialist camp and the people of the world.

The Soviet Government has published the July 31 statement of the Chinese Government in its press; that is not a bad thing and is in conformity with the principle of reciprocity. We hope the Soviet leaders will carry on this good practice and publish our present statement.



# Statement of the Soviet Government

August 3, 1963

*Following is the full text of the statement of the Soviet Government. Boldface emphases are the same as those appearing in "Renmin Ribao," which published the Soviet government statement on August 15.—Ed.*

**T**HE peoples have joyfully welcomed the news of the initialing in Moscow of the Treaty on banning nuclear weapon tests in the atmosphere, in outer space and under water. An endless stream of messages and telegrams from heads of state and government leaders, from the world's most prominent political and public leaders, from rank-and-file people is arriving at the address of the Soviet Government and its head Comrade N. S. Khrushchov. They stress the tremendous service the Soviet Union rendered in advancing the proposal to end nuclear weapon tests, a proposal which became the starting point for the successful Moscow talks. These messages and telegrams express gratitude to the Soviet Government for its wise, statesmanlike approach to the solution of a most important problem of our time. **A practical step has been taken and a good beginning made in settling international problems in the spirit of the peaceful coexistence principles.** The governments of many states have already declared their intention to sign the Treaty.

On July 31 the Government of the People's Republic of China made a Statement concerning the outcome of the Moscow talks on banning nuclear weapon tests in the atmosphere, outer space and under water. In this Statement, the Government of the People's Republic of China announces that it is opposed to the Treaty on banning nuclear weapon tests and refuses to join it. The Government of the PRC even characterises the Treaty as a "fraud", alleging that it "duplicates the peoples of the whole world" and "contradicts the hopes of the peaceloving peoples of all countries".

In this connection the Soviet Government deems it necessary to state the following.

The Treaty on banning nuclear weapon tests has a significance of principle from the point of view of the continued search for ways of settling the outstanding issues that divide the world. **The fact that states with different social systems, great powers, moreover, whose contradictions have more than once threatened to plunge mankind into the abyss of world war, have been able to find a mutually acceptable solution to a topical international problem, proves the correctness and viability of the policy of peaceful coexistence.** The peoples have seen that there is a real possibility of reducing international tension, a possibility of curtailing the arms race, the grave burden of which presses down on them.

The results of the Moscow talks give room for hope that outstanding international issues on which the strengthening of peace on earth depends can be settled. This is what **the Soviet Government is working for, and it again advanced during the Moscow three-power talks a broad programme of action aimed at consolidating peace.** This programme envisages a number of urgent measures to remove the danger of a thermonuclear conflict, **above all the conclusion of a non-aggression pact between the NATO and Warsaw Treaty countries.** **The Soviet Government once more called for the elimination of the vestiges of World War II, for the signing of a German peace treaty and for the normalisation of the situation in West Berlin on its basis.**

The programme of struggle to strengthen peace advanced by the Soviet Union accords with the fundamental interests of

the peoples. It has met with warm support from the governments and peoples of the socialist states, from large sections of the public in the countries of Asia, Africa and Latin America, from millions of working people in the capitalist countries, and from all progressive people in the world.

The collective opinion of the socialist countries on the question of ending nuclear tests was expressed in the decision of the Conference of First Secretaries of Central Committees of Communist and Workers' Parties and heads of government of the Warsaw Treaty countries. "The agreement reached on the problem of nuclear weapon test ban," this document says, "is a result of the consistent peaceloving foreign policy of the Soviet Union and all the socialist countries, a triumph of the Leninist policy of peaceful coexistence among states having different social systems. The Conference holds that this Treaty will be conducive to a relaxation of international tension and will be a positive factor in the peoples' struggle for peace and against the threat of a new world war."

**Fraternal Marxist-Leninist Parties on all continents have expressed their complete approval of the agreement.** They see in it an important result of the consistent implementation of the communist movement's general line of strengthening the forces of peace and progress. All who cherish peace unanimously approve of the results of the Moscow talks.

Amidst this unanimous approval one can count on the fingers of one hand those who venture to openly oppose the Treaty on banning nuclear weapon tests. And there is nothing surprising in this: **those who are opposing today the prohibition of nuclear tests, whatever verbal contrivances they may resort to, reveal themselves as the opponents of peaceful coexistence, opponents of the line of relaxing international tension and undermining the forces of aggression and war.**

The few days that have passed since the meeting of representatives of the three powers in Moscow have already clearly revealed those to whom the important new success of the forces of peace is unpalatable.

These include, above all, the "madmen" in the United States who are brandishing the bogey of the "communist threat" and screaming that the Treaty will prevent the United States from creating a still more destructive weapon. They include the extremists from the camp of the West German militarists and revanchists who are still hatching plans for new military gambles. They include the extremists from the camp of the French ruling circles who, for unknown reasons, have decided that the greatness of France lies not in contributing to the cause of easing international tensions or in friendship with other nations, but in friendship with the nuclear bomb, in creating a stockpile of nuclear weapons at all costs.

When such views are expressed by representatives of the most bellicose imperialist circles, there is nothing surprising in it. But when the Treaty on banning nuclear weapon tests is opposed by Communists, and what is more by Communists standing at the head of a socialist country, this cannot but arouse justified amazement. How can the leaders of a socialist country reject out of hand an international agreement which serves to strengthen peace, accords with the aspirations of the peoples, and conforms to their vital interests? **Only disregard of the vital interests of the peoples, who have long been demanding an end to nuclear explosions, could lead to the interpretation of the aims and meaning of the Treaty that the Chinese Government seeks to give in its Statement.**

The Government of the PRC claims in its Statement that the aim of the Treaty is to "consolidate the nuclear monopoly" of the three powers, and that the Soviet Union's participation in this Treaty is a "capitulation to American imperialism".

One could not imagine any greater absurdity. In pressing for the conclusion of a treaty banning nuclear weapon tests, the Soviet Union and all peaceloving forces see it as an important measure protecting mankind against the dangerous consequences of the contamination of the atmosphere, water and outer space by radioactive substances. And those who level accusations against the USSR, bracketing a socialist state with capitalist states, are seeking to present this as the Soviet Union's striving for nuclear monopoly, and even as a "capitulation".

Thus it follows that if nuclear weapons spread throughout the world, if the way was opened for the West German revanchists to gain possession of these weapons, and if one series of nuclear explosions carried out by scores of states would succeed another, this would, apparently, serve the interests of peace and would not constitute a capitulation to imperialism! No, it is exactly the other way round. **That would mean irresponsibly playing with the destiny of millions upon millions of people, and everyone who is concerned about the present and future of his people, about the preservation of peace not only in words but in deeds, cannot fail to realise this.**

The Government of the Chinese People's Republic is trying to completely ignore facts known to the whole world. **The entire groundlessness of the attempts to cast aspersions on the Soviet Union's position on the question of nuclear weapons is proved by the fact that it was the Soviet Union which as far back as 1946 first proposed to ban atomic weapons once and for all and to destroy stockpiles.** Although possessing the most advanced nuclear weapons and the most advanced means of delivery, the Soviet Union has for many years been resolutely and consistently fighting for the banning of atomic and hydrogen weapons, for the discontinuation of their production, for the destruction of all stockpiles, for the ending of tests, and for the scrapping of the entire military machinery of different states.

In 1959, N. S. Khrushchov, the head of the Soviet Government, speaking from the rostrum of the United Nations General Assembly, advanced the proposal for general and complete disarmament which has become the banner of the peoples in the struggle for lasting peace. The basis and backbone of the Soviet disarmament programme is the banning and complete destruction of all nuclear weapons, as well as of all the means of delivering them to their targets. It is well known that the Soviet Government is also waging a struggle for the immediate realisation of such measures to check the nuclear arms race as the establishment of nuclear-free zones in various areas of the world and the dismantling of military bases on foreign territories.

Can one say that in proposing all these measures the Soviet Union is guided only by its own interests, and not by the interests of the entire socialist community and of all the peoples? **Is it not a fact that what the Statement of the PRC Government terms a nuclear monopoly, i.e. the possession by the Soviet Union of these weapons, did play a definite, one might even say the decisive, role in preventing the socialist countries, including the PRC, from becoming objects of imperialist aggression and in enabling them successfully to build socialism and communism?**

Further, the Statement of the Chinese Government contends that the nuclear test ban Treaty does not wholly solve the question of banning all kinds of nuclear weapons, of destroying nuclear stockpiles, and of discontinuing their pro-

duction. It is true that the Treaty does not solve all these questions. It is, of course, plain to all that the wider the agreement the better. An ideal solution would be to conclude an immediate treaty on general and complete disarmament. We are pressing for such a treaty now, as we did before. **Maybe the Chinese leaders know the secret of how to solve the entire problem at one go? As far as we are concerned, we consider it better to achieve a part than to achieve nothing, when an agreement on a partial measure of this kind is in the interests of peace, in the interests of socialism. If in present-day conditions it is not yet possible to solve the whole problem at once, the only reasonable way out is to solve it step by step. One must be completely out of touch with reality to advance the alternative "all or nothing" in matters involving the fate of the world and the lives of millions of people.**

It is not difficult to throw out right and left the simple and easy formula of "all or nothing". In practice, however, such a demand is devoid of any real content. Can this approach to international affairs be qualified as realistic? It is the duty of Communists, above all of Communists who are the leaders of states, to work, even though step by step, to free the peoples of the danger of nuclear war and annihilation. The Soviet Government is convinced that there is not a single country on earth whose people would give their seal of approval to a policy that would doom human beings to breathe radioactive air, and would approve of plans for an unrestrained nuclear arms race, plans to give access to nuclear weapons to the most adventurous circles of the imperialist camp, including the West German revanchists. There is no such people!

**The test ban Treaty can be objected to only by people who stand aside from the peoples' struggle against nuclear war and who cover up with glib phrases in favour of the most radical disarmament measures their lack of readiness or desire to achieve disarmament. Only those people can object who view the struggle for general and complete disarmament as mere by-standers, and to whom real success in the struggle for peace is of no consequence.** To those who do wage this struggle, every step toward this great goal is important. The Chinese leaders, incidentally, have to admit themselves in their Statement that the complete prohibition of nuclear weapons should be reached "gradually". But if they recognise the need for such approach—and there is no other alternative in present-day conditions—why then, one may ask, are they reproaching the Soviet Union for not being able to secure the solution of the entire problem at one go?

Apparently the Chinese leaders, carried away by polemics, consider that they need not be bound by logic in this case. On the one hand the Statement of the Government of the PRC contends that the Treaty on banning nuclear weapon tests does not give anything to the peoples, since it does not provide for the complete prohibition and destruction of nuclear weapons. And on the other hand the Statement claims that the Treaty is bad because it does not cover underground nuclear tests. Hence the Chinese Government too recognises in principle that the ending of nuclear weapon tests is a good thing, and that the peoples demand this. But a few lines further on in its Statement the Chinese Government produces a series of contrived arguments against the Treaty, such as the claim that the Treaty on banning nuclear weapon tests is a "fraud" because it does not provide a complete solution to the problem of getting rid of nuclear weapons.

A Treaty on banning nuclear tests, even if extended to underground tests, is of course only a partial measure, only a step in the direction of disarmament, providing more favourable conditions for it. But the question arises: **does this measure facilitate or impede the solution of the cardinal task,**



the task of disarmament? With the exception of the most outspoken enemies of peace in the camp of the imperialist powers, everybody admits that the reaching of an agreement on ending nuclear tests creates more favourable conditions for progress in disarmament as well. Communists in capitalist countries and the Communist Parties standing at the head of the socialist countries answer this question in the affirmative: the conclusion of the Treaty on banning nuclear weapon tests facilitates the struggle for general and complete disarmament. But the Government of the People's Republic of China asserts the opposite. Thus it follows that the whole world is mistaken and that only the Government of the People's Republic of China knows the truth.

But who then is in fact deceiving the peoples? Those who having achieved the first tangible results call for the following up of the success achieved, for the stepping up of efforts in the struggle against the aggressive forces of imperialism, in the struggle for the solution of other important problems, or those who treat with disdain the efforts of the fighters for peace and their achievements, and thus disorientate the peoples and engender lack of confidence in their ability to prevent war?

The whole of this concept of the Government of the People's Republic of China reeks of hopelessness and pessimism. Its essence can be compared with the saying that was used in our country in the past: Neck or nothing. This concept would probably be understandable coming from those doomed by history, from those under whose feet the ground was shaking. But it is incomprehensible that the government of a country building a socialist society should take such a stand.

Who can be inspired by such a concept of hopelessness? No, people derive energy not from advancing nearer and nearer to the black abyss of a thermonuclear war but from deep confidence in their ability and the possibility to fetter the forces of war, to ensure genuine peace and progress.

The Government of the People's Republic of China claims that the conclusion of the Treaty on banning nuclear weapon tests results in "American imperialism gaining a military advantage", while the peaceloving countries, including China, lose the "possibility of strengthening their defence potential".

Strange logic, this! Even our enemies admit that the Soviet Union has the most powerful nuclear weapons in the world today, and the most advanced means of delivering them to any targets. This powerful nuclear-rocket shield ensures the security of not only the Soviet Union but of all the socialist countries, including the PRC, and is the mainstay of peace throughout the world.

Does the conclusion of the Treaty banning tests change the existing balance of forces? No, it does not. The Soviet Government would never have agreed to the conclusion of such a treaty if it placed us in an unequal position, if it gave unilateral advantages to the other side. None of this requires any special proof.

Lastly, if the question of who will benefit most by this Treaty is raised, would it not be more correct to assume that on this question of nuclear tests the Soviet Union, as the nuclear power in the community of socialist states, is in a better position to judge whether the balance of forces changes or not, and if it does change, then in what direction? Does not the Government of the PRC take too much upon itself in coming to conclusions for the Soviet Government and the Soviet Union on this question?

No, it is not concern for the defence potential of the socialist camp that has prompted the Statement of the PRC Government. What lies behind all this is evidently a desire, regardless of the standpoint of the socialist camp and of all

peaceloving forces, to follow a special policy on the question of what is to be done about the most destructive weapons—nuclear weapons: whether to destroy them, or whether to open the flood-gates for their unhindered spread all over the Earth.

The Chinese leaders should have pondered over the fact that by refusing to sign the Treaty on banning nuclear weapon tests they have put themselves in the company of those in the imperialist bloc who oppose the Treaty. No one could convince the Soviet Government that such a position accords with the interests of any people, whether it be the people of Europe or America, Asia or Africa; the people of a small state or a big one.

Apparently the PRC Government itself realises how unpopular a negative position is in our time on the problems of strengthening peace, on the problems of disarmament. That is why in its Statement it tries to present matters as though it had its "own" programme on the problems of nuclear disarmament, an even more radical one than that advocated by the Soviet Union and other socialist countries.

But in the first place, this "programme" set forth in the Statement of the PRC Government contains nothing new. All the proposals listed in it have already been advanced previously by the Soviet Union and other socialist countries. The PRC Government has merely repeated these proposals. All the world knows that the Soviet Union and the other socialist states have waged and are continuing to wage, in alliance with the peaceloving forces of the whole world, an active struggle for the realisation of the programme of general and complete disarmament which they have advanced and which includes the complete destruction of nuclear weapons.

Secondly, the essence of the Statement of the PRC Government does not lie at all in the radical programme which lists proposals long since submitted by others, but in the fact that in this case an attempt is made to use this programme to cover up the refusal of the PRC Government to sign the Treaty on banning nuclear weapon tests.

The Chinese Government has not a single convincing argument to support its negative attitude to the nuclear test ban Treaty. And indeed, a government cannot have such arguments if it builds its policy solely in the interests of peace and socialism, in the interests of the peoples.

The Soviet Union, together with the other socialist countries, has fought and is still fighting indefatigably for the realisation of general and complete disarmament. The Soviet Government was always glad when in the past the PRC stood in the same ranks, making its contribution to the struggle for disarmament, to the consolidation of peace among nations.

The Soviet Union and the other socialist countries regard the Statement of the PRC Government as an unprecedented and most regrettable act. No friends of peace and socialism can help feeling sorry that on a question involving the vital interests of all the peoples of the world, the government of a socialist country has taken a step which is in gross contradiction to the common policy of the socialist states in the international arena, in gross contradiction to the fundamental principles guiding these states in their foreign policy and to which on two occasions—in 1957 and in 1960—the leaders of the People's Republic of China affixed their signatures. The position of the PRC Government runs counter to the Leninist policy of peaceful coexistence between states with different social systems. The Chinese leaders thereby openly place themselves in opposition to the socialist community, to the whole of the world communist movement, and to all the peaceloving peoples of Europe, Asia, Africa and America.

The Chinese Government cannot fail to realise that by embarking on such a road it is inflicting direct damage on

the unity of the socialist camp, and weakening the united front of struggle against imperialism. Such actions can only bring joy to the enemies of peace, whose cherished goal is to disunite and alienate the socialist countries, to disrupt the great unity of the peoples of the socialist community, to undermine the world socialist system from the inside.

It is equally impossible not to see that the Statement of the Chinese Government containing attacks on our country, on the policy of the Soviet Union, is one more proof that the Chinese leaders are carrying ideological differences into interstate relations. It is impossible to explain in any other way the appearance in this document of such impudent allegations as that by concluding the Treaty on banning nuclear weapon tests, the Soviet Government "betrayed the interests of the Soviet people, betrayed the interests of the peoples of the socialist countries, including China, betrayed the interests of the peaceloving peoples of the whole world".

It is difficult to say which predominates here, political irresponsibility or irritation on the part of those whose reckonings are being dashed to the ground by life itself.

Who empowered the Government of the People's Republic of China to speak in the name of the Soviet people, on behalf of it? Who asked it to speak for the peoples of the other socialist countries? The authors of the Statement must be losing their nerve if, disregarding the elementary standards of relations between states, let alone standards of relations between fraternal socialist countries, they seek in their Statement to counterpose the Soviet people to the Soviet Government. The futility of such attempts has long been realised even by the imperialists who, in the years of the intervention and then in the years of World War II, came to grief against the monolithic unity of the Soviet people with the Soviet Government and the glorious Communist Party. This was a vote by blood and life for Soviet power in our country, for the policy of the Communist Party and our own Soviet Government. And today, by their magnificent labour achievements in building communism, the Soviet people vote for the peaceful policy of their Government, and express unlimited confidence in and support for the Communist Party of the Soviet Union and its Central Committee.

In whose footsteps do the Chinese leaders intend to follow? In the Statement of the Government of the People's Republic of China one cannot discover, even with the help of a microscope, the least trace of respect for the sovereignty of the Soviet state, though Communists and the socialist countries not only proclaim but should consistently uphold the principles of sovereignty and non-interference in internal affairs in international relations, including relations among socialist countries. What then can one counterpose, on the question of national sovereignty, to the imperialist policy of trampling upon the sovereign rights of peoples, if the government of a socialist state flouts the principle of respect for sovereignty and goes as far as to make insulting attacks on fraternal countries and fraternal peoples.

Only people who have barricaded themselves off with a wall of dogmatic notions from the matters that agitate mankind, from the concerns and hopes of the working people, can either fail to see or pretend not to see the tremendous changes taking place on our planet, and can fail to believe in the reason and will of the peoples who are today capable of preventing a world thermonuclear war.

The Government of the PRC is trying to find some contradictions in the standpoint of the Soviet Union. But in artificially selecting quotations and juggling with words, they forget the simple truth that life does not mark time. Science and technology are developing tempestuously, and what was unacceptable only yesterday may prove useful, even very useful, today.

This is precisely the case with the banning of nuclear weapon tests in the atmosphere, in outer space and under water. There can hardly be any doubt over who is more competent to be the judge in this—those who possess nuclear weapons and carry out tests, or those who only know about them from literature. There can be no two opinions on this score.

As regards the proposal of the PRC Government to call an international conference with the participation of the heads of government to discuss relevant problems, including the problem of disarmament, the Soviet Government, of course, cannot object to this since it was its own proposal. This is one of the proposals repeatedly made by the Soviet Government. In making this proposal we went on the basis, and we stated this, that **no one can undertake any commitments for the People's Republic of China except its Government, and that consequently the question of China's commitments can be discussed only with the participation of the PRC Government.** And at present the Soviet Government is continuing to adhere firmly to this standpoint.

In this connection the question arises why the PRC Government found it necessary just at this time to advance a proposal for an international conference to deal with the disarmament question and a number of other international problems, and to claim that this is something new? Again, **it was in order to camouflage their refusal to sign the Treaty on banning nuclear weapon tests.**

In their efforts to discredit in the eyes of the peoples the undoubted successes achieved in the struggle to lessen the war threat, in their efforts to vilify the peaceful foreign policy of the Soviet Union, the Chinese leaders have shown the whole world that **their policy leads to the aggravation of international tensions, to the further stepping up of the nuclear arms race, to the even greater expansion of its range and scale. This position is tantamount to actual support for those who advocate a world thermonuclear war, who are against the solution of the outstanding international problems round the conference table.** There is no doubt that this position must meet and is meeting with resolute condemnation by the peoples of the socialist countries and of all peaceloving states; by all those for whom the cause of peace and progress is dear.

Expressing the will of the entire Soviet people, the Soviet Government **rejects the fabrications concerning the foreign policy of the Soviet state, contained in the Statement of the PRC Government.** No conjectures or attacks can change the course of the Soviet Union's foreign policy which was charted by the great Lenin and further developed in the decisions of the 20th and 22nd Congresses of our Party and in the Programme of the CPSU, and was unanimously approved by the entire Soviet people and by the international communist movement. Guided by this course, the Soviet Union will continue to steadfastly pursue the policy of peace and international friendship, to work for general and complete disarmament, for a peaceful settlement of international issues, including those involving the security of Europe, and for the triumph of the Leninist principles of peaceful coexistence.

It goes without saying that the Soviet Government would be sincerely glad if the foreign policy of the People's Republic of China were based on the cohesion of the socialist states, whose banner is the struggle to avert the danger of a thermonuclear war, the struggle for peaceful coexistence, for the freedom of all the peoples and their right to build their life as they see fit. This is what the interests of international communist solidarity, the interests of socialism and communism, and the interests of peace demand.

*(The English text of the statement as published in "Moscow News.")*

# Why the Tripartite Treaty Does Only Harm and Brings No Benefit?

by OBSERVER

*Following is a translation of a commentary by Observer published in "Renmin Ribao" on August 10. Boldfaced emphases are ours. — Ed.*

**T**HE U.S. imperialists and their followers now have many thousands of nuclear bombs and are manufacturing more. These nuclear weapons are a constant threat to the people of all countries. With the sole exception of the U.S. imperialists and their followers who rely on nuclear weapons to intimidate and blackmail others and commit aggression, all the 3,000 million people of the world are anxious for the complete, thorough, total and resolute prohibition and destruction of nuclear weapons.

It was on August 5 that the Foreign Ministers of the United States, Britain and the Soviet Union formally signed the partial nuclear test ban treaty. The Soviet leaders described the treaty as a good beginning, weakening the forces of aggression and war. How nice! But what are the facts? The facts are that this treaty does only harm and brings no benefit.

## 1. The Current Partial Halting of Nuclear Tests Is Not the Result of This Treaty

Some people think that since the U.S.-British-Soviet treaty provides for a halt to nuclear tests in the atmosphere, outer space and under water, contamination from nuclear fallout in the air and water can be reduced a bit. This at any rate is a good thing, they think, and, therefore, it is better to have than not to have this treaty.

Is this really so in fact? We feel that it is not.

It is completely understandable that the people of the various countries should want an end to nuclear tests, a reduction and even elimination of nuclear fallout contamination in the air and water. But so far as the halting of nuclear tests is concerned, it must be pointed out that all responsibility for the failure to halt nuclear tests in the past rests with U.S. imperialism.

It was the United States which first manufactured and used the atomic bomb. It is the United States which is frantically expanding its nuclear armaments, and which is trying its utmost to retain its nuclear monopoly and gain nuclear superiority.

For this purpose, it has been conducting an endless series of nuclear tests of various kinds. According to official U.S. figures, from July 1945 to last June, the United States conducted 259 nuclear tests. This means that most of the nuclear tests in the world have been conducted by the United States. It is precisely this frenzied U.S. policy of nuclear arms expansion and blackmail

which has compelled the socialist countries to conduct the necessary tests, in order to safeguard their security and break the U.S. nuclear monopoly.

**World Pressure Against U.S. Nuclear Tests.** Furthermore, since most of the U.S. atmospheric and outer space nuclear tests have been conducted over the high seas, in the Pacific Ocean, they have gravely endangered the lives and health of the peoples of all countries in Asia and along the Pacific, particularly the Japanese people. The people throughout the world have long since demanded that the United States stop these nuclear tests, and their demand has built up into a pressure on a world-wide scale.

At the present time, nuclear tests in the atmosphere, outer space and under water have in fact stopped. But this is by no means because of the signing of this treaty, but because the peoples of all countries are strongly opposed to nuclear tests, and the countries possessing nuclear weapons, the United States in particular, have already acquired enough data from nuclear tests so that even a complete halt to nuclear tests in the atmosphere, outer space and under water will not affect their continued mass production of nuclear weapons.

USIS also said on July 26: "By prohibiting testing of nuclear weapons in the atmosphere, in outer space and under water, the treaty does not change the situation that now exists for the three great nuclear powers. None has conducted tests of this kind recently, and none has good reason for wanting to resume such testing in the foreseeable future."

**U.S. Needs Underground Tests.** On the other hand, what the United States needs now is more underground nuclear tests, and this treaty has actually legalized such tests. This is exactly what the United States wants. When the tripartite treaty was initialled, UPI reported that the U.S. military chiefs would support this treaty. "A persuasive factor with the Joint Chiefs of Staff, however, is that the agreement will leave America free to do about 80 per cent of the atomic testing deemed necessary, by resorting to underground explosions."

Commenting on the tripartite treaty, Allal Al Fassi, President of the Moroccan Istiqlal Party, pointedly said: "Since you have decided to preserve the infernal devices in your possession and since you have not undertaken any obligation not to explode them by testing them or to punish those who are not in agreement with you, what is the use of deceiving the people by such an agreement?"

"If you ban testings in space and reserve complete freedom to carry on underground tests, what difference does this make between this or that way of destruction?"



It seems to me it is all the same whether lightning strikes us from the sky or from underground. They are all annihilating, incendiary bombs."

**Soviet Leaders Capitulate to Imperialists.** It is not as if the Soviet leaders did not understand this truth as pointed out by Fassi. Khrushchov once said: "If a decision were adopted to ban tests only in the atmosphere, this would shatter the people's hopes of a complete discontinuance of tests." He also pointed out that this was a "deal" to "deceive the peoples." Now, the Soviet Government, in partnership with the imperialists, has made this deal to deceive the peoples. This shows that the Soviet leaders have openly capitulated to the imperialists.

## **2. This Treaty Can in No Way Constrain the Nuclear Powers, But Only Bind the Other Countries Hand and Foot**

Some people may say: Granting that it is not because of this treaty that no nuclear tests have recently been carried out in the atmosphere, outer space and under water, what is wrong with the treaty if it can constrain the nuclear powers and perpetuate the current suspension of these forms of nuclear testing?

This is not true. The treaty cannot constrain the signatory countries this way. It cannot ensure the perpetuation of the current state of affairs as mentioned above.

Article four of the treaty stipulates: "Each party shall in exercising its national sovereignty have the right to withdraw from the treaty if it decides that extraordinary events, related to the subject matter of this treaty, have jeopardized the supreme interests of its country. It shall give notice of such withdrawal to all other parties to the treaty three months in advance."

This means that any nuclear power, chiefly the United States can "exercise its national sovereignty" under the pretext of the occurrence of any "extraordinary events" and withdraw from the treaty at any time and resume nuclear tests in the atmosphere, outer space and under water, without having to consult with other signatory countries and obtain their affirmation.

What a treaty this is!

### **The Treaty Can Be Violated by Simple Unilateral Decision.**

According to normal international practice, any international treaty should have a certain and equal binding force upon the signatory countries. However, the partial nuclear test ban treaty signed in Moscow has no binding force whatsoever on the nuclear powers. Any of them can make unilateral "decisions" and tear up the treaty. Therefore, this treaty is no treaty at all. Even U.S. General Lauris Norstad, former NATO Supreme Allied Commander in Europe, said: "It is something that can be violated by just unilateral decision. It's nothing you can enforce." No wonder as soon as the treaty was initialled U.S. President Kennedy made haste to announce: "We remain ready to withdraw and to resume all forms of testing, if we must."

It is well known that this treaty is a refurbished version of the draft treaty proposed by the United States and Britain on August 27, 1962. The only difference is that the signatory countries to this treaty can withdraw from it freely without having to hold any meeting. Therefore, it is all the more devoid of binding force on the

three nuclear powers, the United States in particular, than the U.S.-British draft.

What is even more absurd is that though the treaty has no binding force on the three nuclear powers, they are using it to inveigle other countries into signing it and make them undertake unconditionally the obligation not to conduct any nuclear weapon tests. According to the stipulations of this treaty, the three nuclear powers may continue underground nuclear tests while the non-nuclear countries cannot conduct any nuclear test. For, as everyone knows, the testing of nuclear weapons must begin with tests in the atmosphere. Without the data accumulated through this kind of tests it would be impossible to manufacture any nuclear weapons at all, not to speak of conducting underground tests for the improvement of such weapons.

**Three Power Monopoly in Nuclear Weapons and Diplomacy.** Furthermore, it is obligatory that all other countries acceding to the treaty abide by it while enjoying no right to make amendments. The tripartite treaty stipulates explicitly that "any amendment to this treaty must be approved by a majority of the votes of all the parties to this treaty, including the votes of all of the original parties." In other words, the treaty assures the three nuclear powers an inviolable right of veto. The accession of even a hundred countries to the treaty would therefore not change its character in the least.

What is more, but for this treaty, nuclear powers like the United States, in face of the increasingly strong pressure of the people of the various countries against nuclear tests, would have to think twice before they resume such tests in the atmosphere, outer space and under water. Now, with the conclusion of this treaty, they can easily find a pretext to legalize their resumption of such nuclear tests.

Commenting on the question of Japan's accession to the treaty, the Japanese bourgeois paper *Mainichi Shimbun* said that "this can only bring about the consequence of recognizing the monopoly of the three powers not only in nuclear weapons but in diplomacy based on nuclear armaments" and that this was tantamount to "disregarding" the "principle of sovereignty and equality." The Pakistan paper *Hurriyat* (Freedom) in an editorial rightly said: "Though the Soviet Union is a socialist country it is strange that it has united with the Western imperialists."

What is this line of action followed by the Soviet leaders if not capitulation to imperialism?

## **3. The Treaty Benefits U.S. Imperialism in Its Drive for Nuclear Supremacy and Increases the Danger of Nuclear War**

Some people argue: Granting that the treaty cannot constrain its signatories, things will at most be the same as if there were no such treaty at all, so how can it be said that it is worse to have than not to have this treaty?

Yes. We declare that it is indeed worse, and far worse, to have than not to have this treaty and we are not exaggerating at all, since:

**Firstly, this treaty tends to mislead the people of the various countries, paralyse their spirit and disorganize their struggles.**

The peace-loving people throughout the world have all the time been maintaining a heightened vigilance

against the U.S. imperialist policies of the nuclear arms drive, nuclear war preparations and nuclear blackmail and have risen in ever growing numbers to fight against the threat of nuclear war and for a total ban on nuclear weapons. Now that the United States, Britain and the Soviet Union have cooked up this fraudulent treaty and that there are people who have lauded it to the skies, asserting that it was "a turning-point in history" and that it "had blazed a path towards completely freeing mankind from atomic and hydrogen calamities," and so on and so forth, an illusion has been created in the world that the few nuclear powers have taken steps capable of eliminating the threat of nuclear war, that they have done something beneficial to world peace and that the people of the world can rest in peace.

As the Burmese paper *Ludu* has pointed out, the tripartite treaty may create an illusion among the people that U.S. imperialism loves peace and so it can be a great political gain for the U.S. imperialists.

All this, of course, is favourable only to the U.S. imperialist policies of nuclear arms expansion and nuclear war preparations and unfavourable to the struggle of the people of the world against the threat of nuclear war and for a total ban on nuclear weapons. As a result, the danger of nuclear war, far from lessening, will increase immensely.

**A "Disservice to the Cause of Peace."** It is not as if the Soviet leaders had not perceived this in the past. In a statement in connection with the joint statement of the U.S.-British heads of government on nuclear weapon tests, Khrushchov pointed out on September 9, 1961: "Agreement on the cessation of one kind of tests only—in the atmosphere—would be a disservice to the cause of peace. It would mean deceiving the peoples. Such agreement could create the harmful and dangerous illusion among the peoples that steps were being taken to put an end to the arms race, while in fact nothing of the kind would have been done." But now they have joined hands with U.S. imperialism in spreading such a harmful and dangerous illusion and their voice has been louder than that of U.S. imperialism. This is truly a "disservice to the cause of peace."

**Secondly, it is all the more necessary to point out that this treaty legalizes underground nuclear tests by the U.S., thus gravely jeopardizing world peace.**

The Kennedy government, being well aware that by launching a major nuclear war it will bring serious consequences upon itself, is laying the stress of U.S. military strategy on preparations for limited nuclear wars. Present U.S. policy in nuclear war preparations is to develop tactical nuclear weapons energetically while continuing to improve strategic nuclear weapons. The United States is devoting special attention to the establishment of its tactical nuclear force in preparation for waging "limited nuclear wars" against the socialist countries, and particularly against the national independence movement of the Asian, African and Latin American peoples. In view of the fact that the most up-to-date conventional weapons and even the inhuman bacteriological and chemical weapons used by the United States in Korea and south Viet Nam have failed to bring victory, the United States is anxious to resort to tactical nuclear weapons to save itself from defeat.

**General Taylor's New Military Concept.** These assumptions and preparations of the United States serve its

"strategy of flexible response." This was made fairly clear long ago by Maxwell Taylor, Kennedy's military adviser and the Chairman of the U.S. Joint Chiefs of Staff, in his book *The Uncertain Trumpet*. After analysing the disadvantageous position of the United States in its relative conventional military strength and nuclear military strength, he proposed the formulation of a new state military plan which would include:

1. Renouncing reliance on the strategy of massive retaliation and declaring that "the United States will prepare itself to respond anywhere, any time, with weapons and forces appropriate to the situation."

2. Accepting "the limitations of our atomic retaliatory forces" and using them only in case of "an atomic attack on the continental United States or the discovery of indisputable evidence that such an attack was about to take place," and "a major attack upon Europe."

3. Revision of the definition of general war and limited war. The term general war "will designate a conflict in which the forces of the United States and the U.S.S.R. are directly involved and in which atomic weapons are assumed to be used from the outset." Limited war "will be considered to be a conflict short of general war in which the United States forces will use atomic weapons as required to achieve national objectives."

He wrote: "With regard to atomic weapons, it would provide our forces with small tactical atomic weapons. . . . In the design of tactical atomic weapons, emphasis should be placed upon developing those of very low yield, which offer no hazards of fallout or serious danger to friendly troops and allied populations."

The existing U.S. policy of nuclear armament was worked out precisely in accordance with these strategic ideas. This was what Kennedy meant when he declared after the initialling of the tripartite treaty that "the United States has deliberately chosen to concentrate on more mobile and more efficient weapons, with lower but entirely sufficient yield." The United States needs to and can depend on underground nuclear tests both to continue to improve its strategic nuclear weapons and to develop vigorously its tactical nuclear weapons. John MacCone, former Chairman of the U.S. Atomic Energy Commission, stated that "[nuclear] weapons, large and small, can be developed and improved by testing underground."

The United States needs continued underground nuclear tests and the tripartite treaty legalizes the continuation by the United States of precisely such tests. It gives it a free hand in conducting the nuclear armament drive under cover of this treaty without being condemned by world public opinion.

**Thirdly, this treaty helps the imperialist countries but shackles the socialist countries and all oppressed countries.**

This treaty can neither hamper the United States from spreading its nuclear bases, nuclear equipment, nuclear submarines and aircraft carrying nuclear bombs to many parts of the world, nor can it prevent the United States from supplying nuclear weapons and technical data for their manufacture to the countries under U.S. control. Kennedy indicated at a press conference held on August 1 that in spite of the tripartite treaty U.S. nuclear weapons could still be sold to its allies and that the United States was willing to provide nuclear aid to France. Har-



riman also stated on July 31 that the treaty had no provisions whatsoever which hindered the United States from providing its allies with nuclear secrets.

**U.S. Is Stepping Up Its Plan to Spread Nuclear Arms.** What deserves attention is that the Kennedy Administration is stepping up its plan for a "multilateral nuclear force." This is, in essence, a plan to spread nuclear arms within the Western camp. It will enable more Western countries to acquire nuclear weapons and strengthen the nuclear force of the entire imperialist camp. The conference on establishing a "multilateral nuclear force" resumed its work in Washington immediately after the signing of the tripartite treaty. The West German news agency DPA disclosed that the United States was engaged in intense diplomatic activity in an effort to drag more countries into the talks. Kennedy has publicly confirmed the U.S. intention to give a number of "nuclear secrets" to France in exchange for the latter's support for the tripartite treaty. All existing signs indicate that the United States is vigorously preparing to spread nuclear weapons to its allies. What it is striving for is simply to place these countries under its direct control before spreading nuclear arms to them.

On the other hand, the treaty is aimed at binding the hands of all socialist countries, except the Soviet Union, and of all countries being oppressed by the United States, rendering it impossible for them to strengthen their defence capability against the nuclear threat of U.S. imperialism. But the Soviet Government actually regards this treaty as a step in preventing the spread of nuclear arms. While raising no objection whatever to the activity of the United States to spread nuclear arms among its allies, it does its utmost to prevent the other socialist countries and all oppressed countries from acquiring nuclear weapons. This can only result in facilitating the efforts of the imperialist camp headed by the United States to attain nuclear supremacy.

The Indonesian paper *Bintang Timur* has correctly described the treaty as being favourable to imperialism and unfavourable to the people of the world. It said that the treaty "means handing a pass to imperialism, enabling it to continue its policy of nuclear blackmail."

The Soviet Government is servilely meeting the needs of U.S. imperialism, helping the United States to consolidate its position of nuclear monopoly, strengthening the imperialist camp and weakening the socialist camp and all oppressed countries. What is it actually doing if not perpetrating out-and-out betrayal and capitulation?

#### **4. The Treaty Is Not a First Step Towards Peace But A Step to Increase the Danger of War**

Some people have admitted that the partial nuclear test ban treaty cannot eliminate the threat of nuclear war, but, they argue, it is nevertheless a step towards the total prohibition of nuclear weapons and the prevention of nuclear war. They ask: Since a total ban on nuclear weapons cannot be realized at once, why should one object to the taking of a first step?

The Chinese Government has always called for the achievement, step by step, of the complete prohibition of nuclear weapons. In its statement on July 31, it proposed, among other things, four feasible measures which should be adopted first.

But what is the tripartite treaty like?

As was repeatedly pointed out by the Soviet Government before, the discontinuance of nuclear tests will have meaning only if it is a part of a whole disarmament programme and is one of the measures for a total ban on nuclear weapons. The tripartite treaty, however, divorces the discontinuance of nuclear tests completely from the prohibition of nuclear weapons and makes no mention whatsoever of the banning of nuclear weapons. By legalizing underground tests, it relegates far into the background even a total ban on nuclear tests.

**Rusk Left No Cover for the Capitulationists and Traitors.** At the signing ceremony of the tripartite treaty in Moscow, U.S. Secretary of State Dean Rusk said: "The treaty we have signed today is a good first step—a step for which the United States has long and devoutly hoped. . . . It does not end the threat of nuclear war. It does not reduce nuclear stockpiles. It does not halt the production of nuclear weapons. It does not restrict their use in time of war." He added: "It is therefore not yet possible for us to guarantee now what the significance of this act will be." Those who try to gloss over their capitulation are taking pains to present the treaty as one of historic significance. But apparently Rusk was more interested in enumerating its benefits to the United States than in leaving a shred of cover to the capitulationists and traitors.

It may be recalled that when the Soviet Union agreed last year to consider discontinuance of nuclear tests in the atmosphere, outer space and under water, it still stuck to its position that no underground nuclear tests should be conducted pending an agreement on their control. But now the tripartite treaty gives a free hand to the nuclear powers to conduct underground nuclear tests. This being the case, does not the treaty serve precisely as an obstacle standing in the way of realization of the complete prohibition of nuclear tests?

**Ban on Underground Tests Not in Sight.** Immediately after the initialling of the tripartite treaty, Kennedy openly declared that the United States would continue to conduct underground tests. W.C. Foster, Director of the U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency, also said plainly that it was not likely to ban underground tests at an early date. Since even such a step as the banning of underground tests is something very remote, how can the tripartite partial nuclear test ban treaty be counted as a first step?

Far from being a first step towards a total ban on nuclear weapons and towards general disarmament, the tripartite treaty has made the realization of these urgent tasks even more difficult.

**Further Obstacles to Total Nuclear Ban and General Disarmament.** If the Soviet Government had adhered to the correct stand which it had adopted previously on the prohibition of nuclear weapons and the reduction of armaments and mobilized the people of the world to struggle for the realization of this aim, the greater would have been the possibility of forcing the United States and its followers to undertake concrete commitments. In fact, the struggle of the people of various countries for the establishment of nuclear weapon-free zones and for the dismantling of foreign military bases, including nuclear bases, has been mounting in recent years, and the United States is finding itself in a serious fix. But now the Soviet Union has concluded with the United States and Britain

this fraudulent treaty which they call the partial nuclear test ban treaty, and is declaring that at present the demands for the establishment of nuclear weapon-free zones and the removal of foreign military bases are both unrealistic so it is asking the people of all lands to place their hopes for the prevention of nuclear war on the reaching of agreement "step by step" among the three nuclear powers. Is it not true that this has pushed aside the complete prohibition of nuclear weapons and other pressing tasks? Is it not true that this has placed more obstacles in the way of the achievement of a total ban on nuclear weapons and of general disarmament.

Radio Ghana pointed out in a commentary on August 3 that in the space of barely one week after the tripartite treaty was initialled, "the elation of the peace-loving world is turning into doubt and even dejection." It said: "The first cause of concern is the growing realization that underground tests, which are not covered by the test ban treaty, enable scientists to conduct research into practically every field of nuclear armament. The second cause of concern is the painful realization that the Moscow treaty has left

the vital problem of destroying the stocks of nuclear weapons completely unsolved." The commentary has thus rightly pointed out that "the loopholes of the Moscow treaty would bring the world nearer nuclear war."

Obviously, the tripartite treaty, viewed from any angle, is absolutely not a first step towards peace, as alleged, but rather a serious step to increase the war danger and a serious step on the part of the Soviet leaders in open capitulation to imperialism.

**Fresh Deal in the Making.** What warrants attention is that a further political deal is in the making. The people of the world must maintain a heightened vigilance towards this.

The tripartite treaty is a fraud and a very dangerous one at that. It is an urgent task of the struggle of all peace-loving countries and peoples of the world at this present time to expose this fraud, smash it and forestall any new ones, and to hold higher the banner for a total ban on and thorough destruction of nuclear weapons, and the banner of opposing imperialism and defending world peace.

# The American Negroes Will Triumph

by OUR CORRESPONDENT

CHINA'S 650 million people firmly support the heroic struggle of the American Negroes against racial discrimination and for freedom and equal rights. They stand by the statement made by Chairman Mao Tse-tung calling upon the people of the world to unite to oppose the racial discrimination practised by U.S. imperialism and support the American Negroes in their struggle against it.

## Peking Rally

To demonstrate this support for the American Negroes' struggle, more than 10,000 people from all walks of life in Peking gathered in the Great Hall of the People on August 12. They paid tribute to the broad masses of the American Negroes who are waging a heroic struggle under extremely difficult conditions. This great rally was sponsored by the National Committee of the Chinese People's Political Consultative Conference and ten people's organizations. Premier Chou En-lai, Vice-Premiers Chen Yi and Lo Jui-ching and the leading personnel of the democratic parties, people's organizations and various government departments were present. Diplomatic envoys of the African countries in China, American friends in Peking and foreign guests from Asia, Africa and Latin America attended.

**U.S. Imperialism — Ferocious Enemy of All Oppressed Nations and Peoples.** In his opening speech, Kuo Mo-jo, Vice-Chairman of the National Committee of the C.P.P.C.C., branded U.S. imperialism as the ferocious enemy of all the oppressed nations and peoples and the people of the whole world, the American people included. He said: "It is surprising that certain self-styled Marxist-Leninists should now have tried to make the oppressed nations and peoples accept 'peaceful coexistence' with imperialism and the reactionary ruling classes and submit to humiliation. This is a betrayal of the interests of the people of the

whole world; it is resolutely opposed by all the revolutionary people."

**The Path of Unity and Struggle.** Liu Ning-I, President of the All-China Federation of Trade Unions, addressing the rally on behalf of the various people's organizations, pointed out that the current struggle of the American Negroes which started in Birmingham, Alabama, in April this year, had grown into a mighty mass movement, unprecedented in the history of the American Negro struggle in scale, duration and steadfastness. This heroic struggle has dealt and is still dealing heavy blows at the reactionary rule of the Kennedy Administration, Liu Ning-I said. The rapid development of this struggle, he added, demonstrated the increased awakening of the American Negroes and working people, their fighting determination and strength. "It shows that the American Negroes have discovered the correct path for their struggle, that is, the path of unity and resolute struggle against the reactionary ruling class."

"The reactionaries and the modern revisionists are doing their utmost," Liu Ning-I said, "to induce them to pin their hopes on the kindness of the U.S. rulers and refrain from struggle. But bitter reality has taught the American Negro masses that in winning freedom, equal rights and their own liberation, they cannot rely on begging alms from the reactionary ruling class, who will never willingly grant them freedom and equal rights, and that by merely relying on the method of legal struggle in the law courts and Congress, the Negroes will never be able to extricate themselves from the tragic position of racial discrimination and enslavement." Now, having finally abandoned their illusions about the reactionary ruling class, the broad masses of American Negroes had come out of the courts into the streets and were waging resolute

struggles. Here lay the real hope of the liberation of the American Negroes, Liu Ning-I said.

**Sign of Sharpening Class Struggle.** The rapid development of the American Negroes' struggle was a manifestation of the daily sharpening of the class struggle in the United States, Liu Ning-I pointed out. Aiming to relax these sharpening class contradictions within the United States, the U.S. monopolies were resorting more and more to racial discrimination to whip up racial conflicts. Within the American proletariat and among the working people, they tried to sow discord between Negroes and whites in an attempt to divert the attention of the proletariat and working people and weaken their fighting strength. The Kennedy Administration was using all sorts of deceptions and tricks to confuse the American Negroes and get them to relax their struggle, Liu Ning-I said, and he added: "This counter-revolutionary two-faced tactic of the Kennedy Administration will be exposed sooner or later. The schemes of the U.S. monopoly capitalist groups to split the American proletariat and working people will never succeed. Their dual method of using both violence and deception and their aim to undermine the struggle of the American Negroes will surely end in ignominious defeat."

**Close Link With Aggressive and War Policies Abroad.** Liu Ning-I pointed out that the fascist policy and the policy of intensified suppression of the Negroes pursued by U.S. imperialism at home were closely linked with its policies of aggression and war abroad. As U.S. imperialism intensified its counter-revolutionary global strategy, it was inevitable that, at home, it should strengthen its fascist rule and step up its attacks on the Negroes and the working people. But the fascist atrocities committed by the Kennedy Administration in suppressing the struggle of the Negroes have once more opened the eyes of the people of the world to the aggressive and deceptive nature of U.S. imperialism and exposed the hypocrisy of its so-called campaign of "kinship" with Africa, thus heightening the people's vigilance against U.S. neo-colonialism. "No matter how hard those self-styled Marxist-Leninists try to absolve Kennedy of his crimes and prettify him, the predatory nature of U.S. imperialism can never be camouflaged. No force on earth can put down the great struggle of the world's people against U.S. imperialist policies of war and aggression."

**Revolutionary Struggle in Heartland of U.S. Imperialism.** The struggle of the American Negroes is a component


part of the revolutionary struggle of the oppressed peoples and nations all over the world, said Liu Ning-I. "This revolutionary struggle breaking out in the heartland of U.S. imperialism is of a very great significance to the common struggle of the peoples of the world against imperialism headed by the United States, as well as a powerful support to the peoples of different countries who are in the midst of their struggles. The workers, peasants, revolutionary intellectuals, enlightened members of the bourgeoisie and other enlightened personages of all colours in the world, black, yellow, white, brown, etc., should unite on a wide scale and resolutely support the just struggle of the American Negroes against racial discrimination," Liu Ning-I said.

In his speech Liu Ning-I also expressed the Chinese people's support for the people of South Africa in their struggle against the policy of racial discrimination and racial segregation pursued by the Verwoerd government. The revolutionary struggle of the South African people against racial discrimination, imperialism and colonialism was also a powerful support to the struggle of the peoples of other countries, Liu Ning-I pointed out.

**Dark Days Will End.** Concluding his speech Liu Ning-I said: "Although the struggle of the American Negroes will be protracted, complicated and tortuous, the dark night will eventually end. By relying on their firm unity and resolute struggle, with the support of the broad masses of the American working people and progressives and with the sympathy and solidarity of the world's people, our American Negro brothers will win great victory in their just struggle against racial discrimination and for freedom and equal rights. The future of the United States definitely does not belong to the U.S. monopoly capitalist class and the racists but to the American people, including the American Negroes. The American Negroes and the rest of the American people will become the true masters of their country."

Speaking on behalf of the democratic parties and the All-China Federation of Industry and Commerce, Huang Yen-pei expressed firm support for the American Negroes in their just struggle. He said that the series of ruthless measures taken by the Kennedy Administration in suppressing the American Negroes had enabled the people of the world to see more clearly the wicked and bestial features of U.S. imperialism, and this had dealt a telling blow to those who prettify and embrace the U.S. imperialists.

The rally was also addressed by John D. Marks, Chairman of the National Executive Committee of the African National Congress of South Africa; Frank Coe, a friend from the United States; G. Kahengeri, Chairman of the Union of Kenya Writers; and Gedeon Dasoundo, Head of the Delegation of the Federation of Black African Students Studying in France. A recorded speech by the American writer Anna Louise Strong was also broadcast at the meeting. She spoke on behalf of four other American friends and one Canadian who live



Kennedy's Art

Cartoon by Ke Ming



and work in China but were unable to attend the meeting because they were on holiday at Peitaiho. They sternly condemned U.S. imperialism for its crimes of racial discrimination and expressed support for the American Negroes' heroic struggle. They felt greatly encouraged by Chairman Mao's historic statement made on August 8 and unanimously expressed the warmest support for the statement.

John D. Marks pointed out that the struggles of the Negroes for political, economic and social equality was part and parcel of the anti-imperialist struggle for national liberation and independence of the peoples of Asia, Africa and Latin America. The growing intensity of the struggle, he said, was indicative of the realization by the Negro masses that the only way open to them was the revolutionary way.

Frank Coe stressed that discrimination against the U.S. Negro people, the exploitation of the bulk of the American people and the aggression and oppression practised by U.S. imperialism all over the world were the very core of U.S. monopoly capitalism. "We cannot get rid of these deadly evils without destroying U.S. monopoly capitalism itself. And it must be destroyed at home and abroad," he said. He condemned the modern revisionists in the United States and pointed out that they were not only lagging behind the masses, Negro and white, in this great struggle, they were also trailing behind Kennedy. Frank Coe added: "To these revisionists, Kennedy is pro-Negro, and certain militant mass organizations are 'too extreme' and therefore 'reactionary' and anti-Negro. The American masses ignore this rubbish."

The rally unanimously adopted a message voicing the Chinese people's heartfelt admiration for the fearless and indomitable spirit of their American Negro brothers and expressing the most resolute support for their just demands.

#### **Robert Williams Thanks Chairman Mao**

A message of greeting to the rally from Robert Williams, the former President of the Monroe, North Carolina Chapter of the National Association for the Advancement of Coloured People, was read at the meeting.

Robert Williams was forced to leave the United States and is now in Cuba. It was at his request that Chairman

Mao Tse-tung issued his statement of August 8. On receiving it, he expressed deep thanks on behalf of the American Negroes to Chairman Mao Tse-tung and the Chinese people for their resolute support to the American Negroes in their struggle against racial discrimination and for freedom and equal rights. Robert Williams said that Chairman Mao's statement had an important significance to the American Negroes and would give them added confidence in their struggle. He added that the U.S. ruling class wanted the Negroes not to struggle but to wait with patience. Certain persons also advised them not to struggle but to wait with patience. That was an expression of great-power chauvinism. The American Negroes were the oppressed, and wanted to stand up to fight and had the right to carry out struggles for liberation, he said.

#### **"Renmin Ribao's" Editorial**

All leading newspapers in Peking carried editorials pledging resolute support for the American Negroes' struggle against racial discrimination and for freedom and equal rights.

**Blow at Base of Kennedy Administration's Rule.** *Renmin Ribao's* editorial on August 12 pointed out that the Negro people's steadfast struggle has laid bare before the whole world the ugly features of American society, exposed the hypocrisy of Kennedy's much-vaunted talk of "peace," "democracy," "freedom," and "justice" and dealt a telling blow to the deceitful policy pursued by the Kennedy Administration abroad, particularly its neo-colonialist policy in Africa. The struggle of the American Negroes being waged on an unprecedented scale has threatened the very foundations of the Kennedy Administration's rule, the paper said.

"Every success in the American Negroes' campaign provides vigorous support and inspiration for the revolutionary movement of the people of all countries. The revolutionary people of all countries firmly stand by the American Negroes and value highly their just struggle," *Renmin Ribao* said. In conclusion, the paper voiced the confidence that though the American Negroes may have to meet various kinds of setbacks, with the support of more than 90 per cent of the people of the world, they are sure to gain victory in their just struggle, as Chairman Mao said in his statement.

#### **Document**

## **Joint Communiqué of Chinese and Somali Governments**

*Following is the text of the joint communiqué of the Government of the People's Republic of China and the Government of the Somali Republic issued on August 10. — Ed.*

AT the invitation of the Premier of the State Council of the People's Republic of China Chou En-lai, His Excellency Abdirashid Ali Shermarke, Prime Minister of the

Somali Republic, paid a friendly visit to China from August 4 to August 10, 1963.

Accompanying Prime Minister Shermarke on his visit were: His Excellency Ali Mohamed Hirave, Minister of Information; Ali Sheikh Mohamed, Head of Department of Ministry of Public Works; Mohamoud Issa, Head of Department of Ministry of Agriculture; Dr. Ahmed Dahir Hassan, Director of National Society of Agriculture and

Industry; Ismail Nahar, Director of National Agency of Foreign Trade; Dr. Abdul Rahman Farah, Private Secretary to the Prime Minister.

Prime Minister Shermarke and the other distinguished Somali guests accompanying him on the visit toured Peking and Shanghai and were accorded enthusiastic welcome and friendly hospitality by the Chinese Government and people.

During their visit, Chairman of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of China Mao Tse-tung and Chairman of the People's Republic of China Liu Shao-chi received Prime Minister Shermarke and the other distinguished Somali guests and had cordial and friendly talks with them.

During their visit, Premier Chou En-lai and Prime Minister Shermarke held talks on the present international situation, the further development of the relations of friendship and co-operation between China and Somalia and other questions of common concern. The talks proceeded in an atmosphere of cordial friendship and mutual respect, and identical views were reached between the two parties.

Taking part in the talks on the Chinese side were: Vice-Premier of the State Council Chen Yi, Director of Central Bureau for Economic Relations With Foreign Countries Fang Yi, Vice-Minister of Foreign Affairs Huang Chen, Vice-Minister of Foreign Trade Lu Hsu-chang, Vice-Chairman of Commission for Cultural Relations With Foreign Countries Chang Chih-hsiang, Chinese Ambassador to Somalia Chang Yueh, Director of West Asian and African Department of Ministry of Foreign Affairs Wang Yu-tien.

Taking part in the talks on the Somali side were: His Excellency Ali Mohamed Hirave, Minister of Information; Ali Sheikh Mohamed, Head of Department of Ministry of Public Works; Mohamoud Issa, Head of Department of Ministry of Agriculture; Dr. Ahmed Dahir Hassan, Director of National Society of Agriculture and Industry; Ismail Nahar, Director of National Agency of Foreign Trade; Dr. Abdul Rahman Farah, Private Secretary to the Prime Minister.

The two parties agreed that the current international situation is advantageous to world peace and the struggles of all peoples against the imperialists and the old and new colonialists.

The two parties noted with pleasure that a series of new emerging African countries have freed themselves from imperialist colonial rule and embarked on the road of independent development. These countries are making unremitting efforts for the thorough elimination of colonialist influence and the development of their national economy. The Somali Prime Minister pointed out that the African countries, after attaining independence, should further consolidate their political independence and fight for economic independence. To this end, it is necessary to transform step by step their colonial economy into an independent national economy. The Chinese Premier expressed his full agreement with this view. The two parties held the agreed view that assistance rendered to any country must respect the independence and sovereignty of the recipient, help promote its independent economic development and have no political strings attached.

The two parties held that the Summit Conference of the Independent African States recently held in Addis

Ababa made positive contributions towards strengthening the unity of the African peoples and promoting the common cause of opposing imperialism and old and new colonialism. The two parties expressed the sincere hope that the relevant important resolutions and principles adopted at that conference will be realized step by step through the joint efforts of the governments of the African states.

The two parties expressed their resolute support for the African people still under colonial rule in their just struggles against colonial rule and oppression and for national independence and freedom and regarded these struggles as a support for themselves. The two parties strongly condemned the policies of racial discrimination and racial segregation pursued by the South African colonial authorities and other countries. The two parties expressed the firm conviction that the just struggles of the Asian, African and Latin American peoples against foreign interference and for national independence and the defence of state sovereignty will win in the end.

The two parties supported the resolution of the Addis Ababa Conference of heads of African states on general disarmament and the banning of nuclear weapons.

The two parties stressed that the solidarity and co-operation among Asian and African countries is a reliable guarantee for world peace and against imperialism and old and new colonialism. The two parties expressed their determination to continue their joint efforts to strengthen Asian-African solidarity. The two parties agreed that, in the interests of Asian-African solidarity, disputes between Asian-African countries should be settled by peaceful means.

The two parties pointed out with satisfaction that since the establishment of formal diplomatic relations between China and Somalia in 1960, the political, economic and cultural relations of friendship and co-operation between the two Governments have continuously developed on the basis of the Five Principles of Peaceful Coexistence and the ten principles of the Bandung Conference. The present visit of Prime Minister Shermarke has made important contributions to the promotion of friendship and mutual understanding between the Chinese and Somali peoples and between the Chinese and the entire African peoples.

The Chinese side appreciated the policy of peace and neutrality pursued by the Somali Republic and held that the efforts made by the Somali Government for consolidating its independence, opposing imperialist aggression and strengthening its defence capability were necessary and in conformity with the interests of the Somali people and the entire African people. The Somali side expressed its support for the restoration of the legitimate rights and seat of the People's Republic of China in the United Nations.

During Prime Minister Shermarke's visit, China and Somalia concluded the Agreement on Economic and Technical Co-operation Between the Governments of the People's Republic of China and the Somali Republic. This marked a significant development in the relations of friendship and co-operation between China and Somalia. Both parties held that the consolidation and development of the relations of friendship and co-operation between the two countries were not only in keeping with the vital interests of the people of the two countries, but also conducive to the cause of promoting Asian-African solidarity and defending world peace.

# At the 9th World Conference Against Atomic and Hydrogen Bombs

by HSIAO MING

**T**HE 9th World Conference Against Atomic and Hydrogen Bombs dealt a resounding blow against the threat of nuclear war. Between August 5 and 7, last week in Hiroshima, first victim of the atomic mass murder initiated by the United States, representatives of the peoples of the five continents pointed out that at present "the most serious threat to world peace comes from the nuclear war policy of the U.S. ruling group" and called on the people of the whole world to unite still more closely and take concerted action against this U.S. policy so as to eliminate the nuclear threat and defend world peace. They called for the strengthening of the movement for the relief of the atomic bomb victims; they appealed for common international action to achieve all these and other demands for peace.

The conference powerfully demonstrated the determination of the Japanese people and the people of the world at large to combat imperialism headed by the United States. It was a victory for the Japanese people in their patriotic anti-U.S. struggle, a victory for all who struggle against imperialism to defend world peace.

## **Underhand Activities of the Soviet Delegation And Its Hangers-on Smashed**

But victory did not come easily. This is a time of acute struggle in the world arena against imperialism and modern revisionism. The champions of peace of Japan, China and other Asian-African countries had to foil the many schemes of the Soviet delegation and the Right-wing Japanese social democrats, its hangers-on, before they could get the conference to meet and get going successfully.

More than 10,000 Japanese delegates came to the conference from all parts of the country to meet with 71 foreign delegates representing 20 countries of the five continents and seven international organizations. These countries are: China, Korea, Indonesia, Ceylon and India (Asia); the Sudan, Zanzibar, Kenya, Ghana, the Congo and Cameroon (Africa); the Soviet Union, Hungary, Rumania, Czechoslovakia, France, West Germany and Yugoslavia (Europe); the United States (America) and New Zealand (Australasia). The international organizations are: Afro-Asian People's Solidarity Organization, Peace Liaison Committee of the Asian and Pacific Regions, Afro-Asian Journalists' Conference, Permanent Bureau of the Afro-Asian Writers' Conference, World Peace Council, World Federation of Trade Unions, and Women's International Democratic Federation. The majority of the foreign delegates, in spite of differences of nationality, colour and political creed, and the Japanese delegates from

all parts of Japan had a common aim to make the conference a success in the militant tradition of the previous eight conferences, to oppose the enemy of peace, U.S. imperialism and its nuclear war policy and help the national-liberation movement and the cause of world peace.

But there were also the Soviet delegation and a handful of its followers, who, working hand in glove with the Right-wing Japanese social democrats and the anti-Party revisionists expelled by the Japanese Communist Party, tried by every means to obstruct the opening of the conference and, when this failed, to undermine it.

**Japanese Rightists Walked Out.** Before the conference opened, the Soviet Union's primary aim was to impose on it the line she had followed last year at the Moscow congress on general disarmament. It vainly hoped that the conference participants would praise and rubber-stamp the tripartite partial nuclear test ban treaty. In line with this Soviet intrigue, the leaders of the Right-wing of the Japanese Socialist Party and of the General Council of Trade Unions of Japan (SOHYO) insisted on making their erroneous stand of "opposing nuclear testing by any country" the "basic policy" of the Hiroshima conference. They even tried to control the conference by putting the Hiroshima Council Against Atomic and Hydrogen Bombs which was controlled by the Right-wing social democrats, in charge of the preparatory work and the management of the conference. But when they found that even then they could not control the conference in the face of the strong desire of the Japanese people to oppose the U.S. imperialist threat of a nuclear war, they suddenly announced that they would not take part in the conference and would hold one of their own. In so doing they hoped they could lure away many delegates and thus torpedo the world conference. To their dismay, they only succeeded in inducing a part of the delegates to attend their "conference" on August 6, which practically fizzled out.

**Japanese C.P. Statement.** On August 3, the Political Bureau of the Japanese Communist Party issued a statement in which it proclaimed its clear-cut stand to make the conference a success. Under the heading "The Banner for a Total Ban on Nuclear Weapons Must Be Held Aloft and Unity Must Be Maintained," it declared that "we must in any case adhere to the stand of relying on the people's forces to combat the enemy of peace." It called on all parties concerned "to unite in the struggle for a total ban on nuclear weapons and to prevent Japan's nuclear armament."

The statement explained that "to regard the conclusion of the [Moscow] treaty as the 'first step towards the



---

# Greetings to 9th Anti-A & H Bombs Conference

From Premier Chou En-lai

July 31, 1963

“ON the occasion of the convening of the 9th World Conference Against Atomic and Hydrogen Bombs in Hiroshima, allow me, on behalf of the Chinese Government and people, to convey my regards to the Japanese people and friends from other countries to the conference, and my warm greetings to the conference.

“I avail myself of this opportunity to tender my sincere respects to the thousands upon thousands of friends throughout Japan who took part in the sixth peace march in support of the world conference.

“The Japanese people who have suffered from the scourge of nuclear weapons have always been in the forefront of the heroic struggle of the world's people against them. The World Conference Against Atomic and Hydrogen Bombs initiated by the Japanese people, which has been held every year, is a concentrated embodiment of the aspirations and demands of the peoples for peace. The struggles of the Japanese people and those of the rest of the world's peoples exert strong pressure on U.S. imperialism, which pushes forward its policy of nuclear threats. Under strong pressure from the people of the world, U.S. imperialism, which already possesses many nuclear weapons, resorts to various decep-

tive tricks to hide its continued development and manufacture of nuclear weapons, and continues its use of nuclear threats and nuclear blackmail. The danger of nuclear war instead of being reduced, has increased. It is therefore of special importance to make this year's conference a success.

“The Chinese Government and people hold that only by completely, thoroughly, totally, and resolutely prohibiting and destroying nuclear weapons and by taking effective measures agreed upon by all can the threat of nuclear war be removed.

“The threat of nuclear war does exist. But we are convinced that so long as we adhere to the correct line and persevere in struggle, this threat can be removed, atomic and hydrogen bombs can be prohibited, and peace in the Far East and the rest of the world can be preserved. You are being threatened by nuclear weapons and so are we. The people of our two countries are brothers. However complicated the situation may be, the Chinese people will always stand on the side of the Japanese people who resolutely demand the prohibition of nuclear weapons.

“I wish the conference every success!”

---

reduction of the threat of nuclear war and towards a total ban on nuclear weapons' will mean licensing the nuclear war preparations of U.S. imperialism—the arch-criminal who is the first in the world that has ever used nuclear weapons, and tying the hands of the peoples who are combating U.S. imperialism and striving for peace and independence. Such an approach, it must be pointed out, will indeed invite the danger of nuclear war.”

The statement also proposed to remove the obstacles to unity by proposing to the conference that it should not be forced to settle the issue of “opposing nuclear tests by any country.” It declared that Communists were against that view because “they take the stand that a clear line of distinction must be drawn between imperialism and socialism” and believed that a declaration in favour of “opposing nuclear tests by any country” would dim that distinction. It asked: If we fail to work out at the forthcoming conference a programme for the present movement with the total ban on nuclear weapons as its theme, and instead, direct our main efforts towards the dispute over that issue, how can we meet the expectations of the broad masses who hope for the unity of the conference?

It also proposed that the conference “should not be forced to pass a resolution supporting or opposing the partial nuclear test ban treaty.” In view of the serious differences existing on that issue in the anti-A and H

bombs movement, the statement pointed out, any attempt to solve this important issue by a hurried discussion and to pass a resolution supporting or opposing the treaty would only deepen disunity.

**Soviet Plot Against Conference.** On August 4, the Soviet delegation had a “sincere talk” with the leaders of the Japanese Socialist Party to plot against the conference. It was reported that Zhukov, head of the Soviet delegation particularly stressed the “great significance” of the tripartite partial nuclear test ban treaty while the Socialist Party also agreed that “positive appraisal should be given to the partial test ban treaty at the world conference.”

Zhukov also demanded that the conference hold no international session so as to obliterate the world conference's international character. He threatened not to take part in the conference should it “become a conference to try the Soviet Union as the enemy of the people.” He also tried to prevent the foreign delegates from exposing the true nature of the treaty and actually insulted delegates from the Asian-African countries, declaring that “some of them are fugitives and it is doubtful whether they have the right to serve as representatives.”

**A Strange Document.** Precisely at this moment on the afternoon of August 4 when difficulties faced the open-

ing of the conference due to the obstruction of the Japanese Right-wing social democrats, Yves Sholier, a Frenchman, and George Pirinsky, a Bulgarian, who claimed to represent the World Peace Council handed to Kaoru Yasui, Chairman of the Japan Council Against Atomic and Hydrogen Bombs, a "statement of the delegation of the World Peace Council" which was also circulated among the various foreign delegates. The "statement" asked for "the verification of credentials of the overseas participants to determine their real national and international authority." With the aim of reducing the international status of the conference, they proposed that "overseas participants" should be given the status of "observers" and gave a lead by declaring that they themselves would "participate in the conference as observers."

The strange thing was that at a meeting of foreign delegates held on the previous day (August 3), Sholier, finding that no one would back him up, had also agreed that the meeting should appeal to Kaoru Yasui to convene the conference as a real world conference as soon as possible. At that time the Soviet delegation had not yet arrived in Hiroshima. But when the Soviet delegation arrived on the evening of August 3, Sholier immediately turned around to make his new proposal on the following day. But this trick failed to trap anyone; it simply provoked public indignation.

On the evening of August 4, indignant at this sabotage and condemning Sholier's statement, delegates from nine Asian and African countries, New Zealand and West Germany and five international organizations submitted their proposal to the Japan Council Against Atomic and Hydrogen Bombs calling for an international session of the conference so that the foreign delegates could express their views.

Kaoru Yasui accepted this legitimate proposal and announced on the morning of August 5 that, except for those who preferred to be observers, foreign delegates would take part in the conference as fullfledged delegates. The Japan Council also agreed to the holding of an international session. This was a heavy blow to the Soviet delegation which had tried to reduce the world conference to one in name only.

### At the Opening Session

The 9th World Conference Against Atomic and Hydrogen Bombs opened in the Peace Memorial Park. There was thunderous applause when Yoshitaro Hirano, Chairman of the Japan Peace Committee, declared the conference open. He told the delegates that solidarity in the struggle against nuclear war was more powerful than nuclear weapons.

Ichiro Moritaki, Director General of the Hiroshima Council Against Atomic and Hydrogen Bombs, in his keynote report, pointed out that now was the time to take widespread and powerful mass action in the struggle against the nuclear war policy and the policy of arming Japan with nuclear weapons pursued by the U.S. Government.

Anou of the Afro-Asian Writers' Conference spoke on behalf of the international organizations which were represented in the conference. He said that the tripartite

treaty was a fraud. "That treaty," he said, "betrayed the people of the world who are fighting U.S. imperialism. The task of prohibiting nuclear weapons cannot be entirely entrusted to certain big powers, but should be negotiated by all countries, regardless of their size and the colour of their people."

**Phoney Peace, Actual War Preparations.** Chao Pu-chu who headed the Chinese delegation addressed the opening session. He paid tribute to the Japanese people who have set a brilliant example in their anti-U.S. struggle and warned the world not to be taken in by the three-power nuclear fraud.

The present danger of nuclear war, the senior Chinese delegate said, arose from the fact that U.S. imperialism possessed large quantities of nuclear weapons, was ceaselessly manufacturing them, threatened to use them at any moment and pursued a policy of nuclear blackmail throughout the world.

The Moscow partial test ban treaty, he went on, was one which brought a phoney peace while actually facilitating war preparations; one which consolidated a nuclear monopoly and encouraged nuclear blackmail; one which helped only U.S. imperialism to the detriment of the people; and one which gave only the aggressors the right to slaughter others and gave no right to the victims of aggression to defend themselves.

The leader of the Chinese delegation was warmly applauded while addressing the conference.

**Soviet Tactics Rebuffed.** When Chao began to speak, 14 Soviet delegates stood up and planted themselves in front of the arched monument in memory of the atomic bomb victims. They were joined by delegates of India, Czechoslovakia, Yugoslavia, Hungary and other followers of the Soviet Union. They turned their backs to the podium and stood there with their heads bowed low as Chao denounced the tripartite treaty. They did not return to their seats until Chao had finished his speech. Their demonstration, however, failed to stop the participants of the conference from warmly applauding Chao's speech.

### At the International Session

**Tripartite Treaty Denounced.** The international session finally met on August 6. The Soviet delegation continued to play a disruptive role. Zhukov, its leader, was interested in only two things at this session: to boost the tripartite treaty and attack the Chinese and Asian-African delegates. Following his cue some delegates of Yugoslavia, India and France paid compliments to the treaty. A majority of speakers at the session, however, exposed the fraudulent nature of the U.S.-U.K.-U.S.S.R. partial nuclear test ban treaty and stressed that there should be no relaxation in the anti-imperialist struggle. The following are typical of their speeches.

Miraji M. Ali (Zanzibar): The African people have not forgotten the lesson of Lumumba and do not believe at all in the "wisdom" of the imperialists.

Mrs. Flora Gould (New Zealand): To say that China is a threat to peace is an intentional distortion; no people on earth will be fooled like that.

Mrs. Theja Gunawardhana (Ceylon): The tripartite treaty is a dangerous one which in point of fact is a diplomatic intrigue of selling oneself to imperialism.

**Opposing Real Enemy of Peace.** The Chinese delegate Chu Tzu-chi also took the floor. He said that the tripartite treaty did the people of the world harm and that, instead of giving publicity to it at the conference, it should be resolutely denounced.

Chu Tzu-chi said that he could not agree that the erroneous line pursued by the World Congress of General Disarmament and World Peace held in Moscow last year should be made the line of this conference, because that line went counter to the demands of this conference and did not pinpoint the enemy of peace, because it failed to oppose imperialism or to support the national independence movement and was a disgrace that did not deserve any publicity. Chu Tzu-chi was one of the members of the Chinese delegation to the Moscow congress where the Chinese delegation had made important reservations.

To win a genuine peace, Chu Tzu-chi said, it was necessary

- to eliminate all nuclear weapons by opposing the real enemy of peace;
- to expose U.S. imperialism as the enemy of the people of the world and of peace;
- to support the peoples who are engaged in patriotic anti-U.S. struggles and to extend relief to the victims of atomic bombs;
- to support unreservedly the national-liberation struggles of the Asian and African people.

**100 Cases of Soviet Capitulation to Imperialism.** Zhukov, who professed in his earlier speech that he did not come to Hiroshima "to slander others," again took the floor in an openly provocative manner. He had the effrontery to cite the incident in the Taiwan Straits in 1958 and the events in the Caribbean last October to show that Soviet nuclear armaments were "at the service of all socialist countries."

Knowing perfectly well that they were not in a position to enlist popular support, the Soviet delegation nevertheless saw to it that the revisionists expelled by the Japanese Communist Party were there to cheer and back them up. This they did; they gave the Soviet delegation leader the needed ovation.

The Chinese delegate Chu Tzu-chi protested. He said that it was an insult to the Chinese people when Zhukov claimed that the Soviet Union protected China with its nuclear weapons. He said that the Chinese people relied mainly on their own strength to discourage U.S. imperialism from attacking their country. "In the Cuban crisis," Chu said, "you committed both the error of adventurism and the error of capitulationism. You and U.S. imperialism have been helping a third country with arms to attack socialist China. You said that by possessing nuclear weapons the Soviet Union has protected the socialist camp. But how can we trust you in any way?"

Chu Tzu-chi said: "We can list one hundred cases of your capitulation to imperialism. But can you give a single case of the Chinese people capitulating to imperialism? No, you cannot and never will!"

The Soviet delegation head also caused trouble at the committee for drafting documents for the conference. He insisted that the conference appeal for international common action should include a section lauding the Moscow treaty. His unjustified demand met with the stiff opposition of the Chinese and other delegates and the demand was in the end rejected.

### Voice of Peace

On the third day of the conference which brought it to a successful conclusion, it unanimously adopted two resolutions—one on strengthening the present united action and another on strengthening the movement for the relief of atomic bomb victims and an appeal for international common action (see p.32).

Hailing the victory of the world conference, *Renmin Ribao* on August 10 published an editorial entitled "Powerful Voice of the Forces of Peace" in which the significance of these documents was stressed.

*Renmin Ribao* said: The resolutions adopted by the world conference are not only the Japanese people's programme of action in their fight against U.S. imperialism and in defence of world peace but concern questions of vital significance to the people of all lands in their present struggle for the preservation of world peace. In particular, the call to smash the U.S. plot to turn Japan into a nuclear base will prove a heavy blow to U.S. imperialist preparations for nuclear war and will help greatly to safeguard peace in the Far East and the world.

The fight for world peace, wrote *Renmin Ribao*, is inseparable from the struggle of all oppressed nations and people of the world against imperialism, colonialism, both old and new, and for national liberation. Whoever genuinely cherishes peace will give unqualified support to the national-liberation movement of the Asian, African and Latin American peoples. The Appeal for International Common Action adopted by the world conference, said *Renmin Ribao*, expresses resolute support for the struggle of the Korean and Vietnamese peoples against U.S. imperialism and for the independence and peaceful unification of their countries, and the other national-liberation struggles in the Asian and African regions. The conference pointed out that the imperialist forces carrying out inhuman repression, military interference and real limited war in many parts of the world are the very forces that are creating menace of nuclear war. This is absolutely correct. The national-liberation struggles of the Asian, African and Latin American peoples naturally form a mighty force in defence of world peace.

*Renmin Ribao* declared that "our epoch is no longer one in which a few big powers can decide the course of the world." It described as a very timely call to the people of the world the one given in the appeal: "For a genuine solution of nuclear war problems affecting the destiny of all mankind, all nations, big or small, must grasp the destiny of the world in their own hands and themselves orient world politics."



Renmin Ribao said that "the Chinese people warmly greet the important achievements of the Hiroshima conference, fully support its various resolutions, and will work, resolutely and to the best of their ability, to carry them out."

## Documents

# Appeal for International Common Action

*Following is the text of the Appeal for International Common Action adopted by the 9th World Conference Against Atomic and Hydrogen Bombs on August 7, in Hiroshima, Japan. — Ed.*

**I**T is with deep pleasure that, we, participants from various countries in the 9th World Conference Against Atomic and Hydrogen Bombs declare that this conference has achieved great success in spite of unprecedentedly great difficulties.

Overseas participants in this world conference have expressed their warm support to and firm solidarity with the Japan Council Against Atomic and Hydrogen Bombs which prepared for and sponsored this world conference, overcoming all sorts of obstacles. We firmly believe that by holding this present world conference we have been able to reaffirm resolutions and decisions as well as inherit and carry forward traditions of the past eight world conferences against atomic and hydrogen bombs.

But the true success or failure of the present conference is dependent upon our concrete action to be taken hereafter. There is no more secure guarantee against repetition of the tragedies of Hiroshima and Nagasaki than common action of the peoples of the world.

Therefore from Hiroshima which has become symbol of the determination of the peoples of the world for prevention of nuclear war, we appeal to all people of goodwill in the world that they further increase their efforts in their struggle against imperialism and arms race as well as for freedom, national independence and peace and take the following international united action.

(1) U.S. polaris submarines, the F-105D fighter-bombers capable of carrying hydrogen bombs that have been recently stationed in Japan, are greatly aggravating dangers of nuclear war.

Japan has been turned by U.S. imperialism into a nuclear base directed against the Soviet Union, China, Korea, Viet Nam and other peace-loving nations of Asia.

The plot to form a so-called Northeast Asia treaty organization that links south Korea and Taiwan with Japan as its pivot has been virtually strengthened.

It is shown in the fact that the Japan-"ROK" talks prevent the independence and peaceful unification of Korea.

We consider it our urgent duty that we confront these actual war policies and smash them. Now is the time that mass movements currently rising in every corner of

"In the joint struggle against imperialism and in defence of world peace," Renmin Ribao declared, "the 650 million Chinese people will always stand shoulder to shoulder with the Japanese people and the people of other countries."

the world in opposition to the stationing of U.S. nuclear submarines be stepped up with increased steadfastness.

(2) No less dangerous are foreign military bases and military troops stationed in various countries. The existence of military bases and troops in foreign countries is not only threatening the security of the neighbouring countries and world peace but also infringing upon the sovereignty of the countries concerned, thus threatening the liberty and security of the people. The struggle for the dismantlement of foreign military bases and withdrawal of foreign troops is a decisive step in the fight against the dangers of war and towards the establishment of a lasting world peace.

(3) For the prevention of nuclear war and towards the achievement of general and complete disarmament including a total ban on nuclear weapons, we must resolutely block the French plan supported by imperialists headed by the U.S.A. to further test nuclear weapons in the Sahara and in the Pacific, condemn the continuance of underground nuclear tests by the U.S.A. and get the Asian and Pacific region as nuclear weapon-free zone, including the U.S.A., U.S.S.R., China, Japan and other nuclear weapon-free zones established. All this can be secured only by the concrete struggles of all the peoples defending peace and national independence.

(4) The movement against nuclear weapons by the Japanese people who three times experienced nuclear disasters has exerted a strong influence upon all peoples in the world. Visiting the centre of suffering, Hiroshima, we heard the cry from the hearts of 300,000 victims and learnt that it is a major support for the Japanese people's movement. It is our duty to maintain firm solidarity with victims still suffering 18 years after the disasters, to feel hearts of sufferers with our own hearts and to extend support to them. We reaffirm that relief for the victims is one of the major tasks to be fulfilled by all nations of the world.

(5) We express our firm solidarity with the national-liberation movements in Asia, Africa and Latin America fighting against colonialism, old and new.

We support the struggle of the Korean and Vietnamese peoples for the evacuation of U.S. imperialist troops from the southern parts of their countries as well as for the independence and peaceful unification of their fatherlands.

The imperialist forces carrying out inhuman repression, military interference and real limited war in south Korea, Okinawa, south Viet Nam, Laos, North Kalimantan, Angola, Portuguese Guinea, South Africa, Southern Rho-

desia, Mozambique and many other territories are the very forces that are creating menace of nuclear war. We welcome the coming independence for the Kenyan and Zanzibar peoples as well as the Addis Ababa Unity Charter. For a genuine solution of nuclear war problems affecting the destiny of all mankind, all nations, big or small, must grasp the destiny of the world in their own hands and themselves orient world politics. Thousands of millions of people are now deprived of these rights by old and new colonialism.

In realizing these goals of action, the international situation is in our favour. In every country, people are carrying on magnificent actions against the war forces. The entire old world dominated by colonialism and imperialism is shaken by a huge united offensive without precedent in the history of the people's peace movement in various countries growing every year, of the irresistible upsurge of the national-independence movement in the Asian, African and Latin American countries, and of states standing for peace.

Of course, we do not believe that victory of peace will be brought about automatically. The aggressive forces

have created new tension and have never given up preparations on an incredible scale for nuclear war.

We must definitely point out that as shown by the recent world situation itself, the most serious threat to world peace comes from the present nuclear war policy of the U.S. ruling group.

Any concessions which we gain from the war forces must always be secured through the positive, broad and resolute struggles of the masses of the people who never lose their vigilance. We demand not sweet words but actions. The war forces will fail in their attempts to beguile us with illusions.

We appeal from Hiroshima to all people fighting for peace and national independence, to all people of goodwill seeking peace.

Let us rise in united action in every part of the world in order to consolidate our unity and get rid of the threats of nuclear war. We will never tolerate the war forces utilizing our differences of opinion.

We will perform our solemn duty to the more than 200,000 victims of U.S. atomic bombings.

## A Proposal to World Conference Against Atomic and Hydrogen Bombs

*Following is the full text of the proposal submitted by delegates of nine Asian and African countries, New Zealand and three international organizations attending the 9th World Conference Against Atomic and Hydrogen Bombs to the Presidium of the International Session of the Conference. — Ed.*

**E**VERYONE rejoices at the successful holding of the 9th World Conference Against Atomic and Hydrogen Bombs. We hail the success of this world conference.

The favourable international situation is: the upsurge of the people's movements for independence and peace, against imperialism and war. Today a more favourable situation for the people's struggle for peace prevails. The duty of all peace fighters is to muster their forces for the liquidation of imperialism, colonialism, old and new, to consolidate world peace.

The imperialist forces of aggression and war are creating new tension, committing aggression and making war preparations. (Laos, south Viet Nam, Japan, south Korea, North Kalimantan.) In Africa, neo-colonialism headed by the U.S.A. is trying to replace old colonial system. (Angola, Mozambique, Portuguese Guinea, etc.) In Latin America, exploitation through monopolies, dictatorship and puppet regimes are met with increasing resistance by a growing revolution inspired by the Cuban revolution.

In Europe, there is rearmament of West Germany, and there is a vast network of military bases serving U.S. policy of aggression.

The recent partial test ban treaty legalizes underground tests, stockpiling and manufacture of nuclear weapons. It can in no way meet the just wishes of all people

for the guarantee of peace. We demand the banning of all tests, including underground tests, prohibition of the production and use of all nuclear weapons, and destruction of all existing nuclear weapons. We are for the establishment of a nuclear weapon-free zone for the Asian and Pacific regions including the U.S.A.

We support the Japanese people's struggle against U.S. imperialism, against the U.S.-Japan "Security Pact," nuclear-powered submarines, F-105D planes, and their struggle for the return of Okinawa to Japan. We support the struggle of the Korean, south Viet Nam, Laotian as well as Afro-Asian, Latin American peoples.

The key problems of the world including the banning of nuclear weapons must be discussed and solved by all nations, big and small, to ensure prevention of nuclear war and to safeguard world peace. The peace forces of the people have become a mighty power fighting against the forces of war, particularly those of the U.S.A. — the most dangerous enemy of peace.

We call from Hiroshima on every fighter for peace and independence to strengthen unity, raise vigilance, continue struggle, fight against and defeat the forces of aggression and war headed by the U.S.A., and win the sacred battle for world peace. Peace cannot be won by begging imperialism. We are fully confident that the people of the world who are united, vigilant and fighting determinedly will win world peace.

The proposal was made in the name of the Asian and Pacific Peace Liaison Committee, the Afro-Asian Journalist Association, the Afro-Asian Writers Permanent Bureau, Zanzibar, Kenya, Korea, Ghana, Sudan, Cameroon, New Zealand, Ceylon, Indonesia, and China.

# Smash the Imperialists' Nuclear War Schemes!

*Following is an abridged translation of the August 9 editorial of "Nhandan," organ of the Viet Nam Workers' Party. Its original title is "Ceaselessly Heighten Vigilance; Unite and Struggle to Smash the Imperialists' Plots to Prepare a Nuclear War." Subheads are ours. — Ed.*

**T**HE partial nuclear test ban treaty signed by the United States, Britain and the Soviet Union does not tie the imperialists' hands in building up the NATO bloc's nuclear forces but on the contrary restricts and hampers the strengthening of the national defence forces of the socialist camp—the great bulwark of world peace. In face of this situation the peace-loving people and Communists loyal to proletarian internationalism cannot help thinking things over and feeling perturbed.

To prohibit nuclear tests in the atmosphere, in outer space and under water without banning underground tests is tantamount to legalizing an extremely vicious plot of the U.S. and British imperialists. Moreover, to prohibit only the testing of the nuclear weapons by the U.S. and British imperialists in the atmosphere, in outer space and under water, without banning their manufacture, stockpiling, export and use, is no different from legalizing the dangerous actions they are taking in their preparations for a new world war with nuclear weapons.

## **Imperialists Rejoice at Their Success**

Less than a year ago, the U.S. and British imperialists put forward a proposal for a partial nuclear test ban, exactly as stipulated in the Soviet-U.S.-British treaty of August 5. At that time the forces of world peace laid bare in time the schemes of the imperialists. It was the Soviet Union which eloquently and flatly refuted and categorically rejected the deceitful arguments of the U.S. and British delegations. Today, with the signing of the Soviet-U.S.-British treaty which tallies with the above proposal, the U.S. and British imperialists have ample reason to clap and cheer and drink toasts to their success.

The questions raised by people are: Have the imperialists, headed by the U.S. imperialists, changed their line and policies, shifting from their policy of the arms race and active preparations for a nuclear war to a sincere desire for peace and disarmament? Is the newly signed partial nuclear test ban treaty of practical value for the peace and security of nations, as certain persons try to make out? An analysis of concrete points in the partial nuclear test ban treaty newly signed in Moscow, coupled with the statements and deeds of the Kennedy clique before and after the signing of the treaty, provides a clear-cut answer: absolutely no!

Under present conditions, to prohibit nuclear tests in the atmosphere, in outer space and under water without banning underground tests in effect only benefits the imperialists. Nuclear weapons, like other new and com-

plicated products of modern science and technology, must be tested time and again before their mass production is possible. With their tests, the U.S. imperialists want to reach the aim of, firstly, manufacturing and stockpiling as many nuclear weapons as they can; secondly, exporting and using them to start a nuclear war, and finally carrying out their fiendish design—which they have never given up—of invading other countries and enslaving all the peoples of the world.

## **U.S. Plots Further Encroachments**

Hardly had they secured an advantageous position than Kennedy and Co. disclosed their scheme to take advantage of the treaty and they took the initiative in seeking to make further encroachments, according to the old saying "give him an inch and he'll take an ell."

Kennedy is really a very cunning ringleader of the reactionaries. The words, deeds and signatures of Kennedy and his followers never proceed from the desire to act in the interest of peace. A dangerous thing is that the U.S. and British imperialists are actively using the partial nuclear test ban treaty to pit the Soviet Union and China against each other, and split up the international communist movement and the world peace movement. At a time when divergences of views have arisen between the Soviet Union and China on problems related to the strategy and tactics of the international communist movement, which include the problems of war and peace, and of peaceful coexistence, the U.S. imperialists have resolutely gone ahead with their "strategy of peace."

They pretend to have "goodwill for peace," and make whatever high-faluting promises they can, provided they can carry out their dark design to deepen further the contradictions among the socialist countries and create more differences within the international communist movement thus weakening the struggle of the world people to safeguard peace. But it is certain that sooner or later their insidious schemes and stratagems will be foiled. The Communists and peace fighters will resolutely smash these schemes of imperialism and will struggle perseveringly in accordance with the correct line for the defence of peace mapped out long ago on the basis of Marxist-Leninist principles and theories and of the Declaration and Statement of the conferences of representatives of Communist and Workers' Parties held in Moscow in 1957 and 1960. The Viet Nam Workers' Party, the Government of the Democratic Republic of Viet Nam and the Vietnamese people always hold to this path. We have never stood aloof from the struggle against nuclear war; we have never been indifferent to the struggle for disarmament or to the struggle for real successes for peace.

## **Viet Nam's Stand**

We will spare no efforts in making active contributions to the common struggle of the world's people to save



mankind from another Hiroshima-Nagasaki tragedy and from the threat of radioactive fallout. Nobody can deny our ardent love for peace. Nobody either can obscure our correct stand—which we have firmly upheld over the past years—on the question of preventing the danger of nuclear war. We have in fact stood for:

—The prohibition of all kinds of nuclear weapons, strategic and tactical alike; this should comprise the prohibition of the production, stockpiling, export, import, use and testing of these weapons anywhere (under water, in the atmosphere, in outer space and underground);

—The destruction of all existing nuclear weapons and the means to deliver them, the disbanding of all establishments in the world for research in and testing and manufacture of nuclear weapons;

—The dismantling of all military bases, including nuclear bases, on foreign territories;

—The abolition of all aggressive military blocs;

—The setting up of an atomic weapon-free zone in the Pacific region, Central Europe, Africa and Latin America;

—The carrying out of effective disarmament, as a step towards general and complete disarmament;

—With regard to south Viet Nam in particular, we resolutely demand that U.S. imperialism withdraw all its troops and weapons from south Viet Nam, so as to allow the Vietnamese people themselves to settle the problem of the peaceful reunification of their country.

These measures are closely related to each other and form a comprehensive whole. Of course, we do not consider that all these measures must be carried out simultaneously, we do not say “everything or nothing.” We know that the path of struggle for the defence of peace is a tortuous, complicated and hard one, and that one must advance step by step, in accordance with concrete conditions. We also do not oppose the settlement of international disputes by peaceful negotiations but we hold that every step must be a steady and real step forward, taken while keeping the initiative, and in the right direction, so as to gradually defeat the enemy's schemes. We absolutely cannot commit ourselves to something that is high-sounding but is of no practical value, and that can be used by the enemy to camouflage their schemes or inch their way forward, while making the world's people nurture illusions and relax their vigilance. To this end, we absolutely cannot allow ourselves to be confused about the nature of the imperialists headed by the U.S. imperialists or about certain faked prospects of peace. Nor can we rely only on negotiations with the imperialists. The only correct way is to constantly heighten vigilance, strengthen the unity of the socialist camp, strengthen the national defence potentials of the socialist countries, strengthen the unity of the international communist movement, strengthen the solidarity among the peoples of the various countries and the forces of peace all over the world, to act in unison and step up the struggle against the policy of war and aggression of the imperialists.

## **Anti-China Campaign**

# **The Chorus Is Getting Increasingly Wild**

**T**HE recent attacks made on the Chinese Communist Party in the Soviet Union, the German Democratic Republic, Czechoslovakia and Bulgaria have lost all sense of decency and justice.

### **Strange and Stupid Slanders in Soviet Press**

Launched with the publication of the July 14 open letter of the Central Committee of the C.P.S.U., the Soviet propaganda campaign against the C.P.C. is being intensified and is expanding. Since the Soviet Union in partnership with the United States and Britain perpetrated the fraud of the partial nuclear test ban treaty every day has seen the development of a concentrated attack on China in the Soviet press. Incomplete statistics show that on July 30 and 31 alone more than 20 editorials and articles and many more “readers’ letters” were published by the *Pravda*, *Izvestia*, *Red Star* and other papers as well as the TASS News Agency. This was followed up on August 1 by nine long articles in the *Pravda*, *Izvestia* and four other papers. On August 6 more than 20 more editorials, articles, commentaries, “readers’ letters” and other anti-China material were carried in the *Pravda*, *Izvestia* and other papers. In the next two days, 15 more articles,

editorials and other fabricated materials were published by the Soviet papers.

One of the central targets of attack is the correct stand and views of the C.P.C. on the question of the national-liberation movements. In a 5,000-word editorial board article published on August 7, the *Pravda* put the C.P.C. on a par with the imperialists. The paper nonsensically said that the C.P.C. is “carrying out a line leading to the isolation of the national-liberation movement from the socialist countries and the international working-class movement and rousing nationalistic, even racist, prejudices.”

The paper wrote: “The Chinese comrades . . . groundlessly give themselves out to be practically the sole defenders of the aspirations of the peoples of Asia, Africa and Latin America.” “But,” the paper went on, “no matter what subterfuges the Chinese leaders have resorted to, it is clear that their stand has nothing in common with concern for the national-liberation movement. By trying to sow among the peoples of Asia, Africa and Latin America distrust in the Soviet Union and its policy, the Chinese leaders do harm to the national-liberation struggle and impede it and act in fact as a reactionary force.”

In its August 7 editorial, the *Pravda* said: “The views preached by the Chinese leaders can bring only harm to the anti-imperialist forces in general, and the national-liberation movement in particular. . . . They, in fact, attempt to separate the national-liberation movement from other contemporary revolutionary forces. . . . They try to set the peoples struggling for their national liberation against other peoples and against the countries

of the socialist system and the working class of the developed capitalist countries. By calling for armed uprisings everywhere in disregard of the concrete situation, they are pushing the national-liberation movement to failure, to defeat. Finally, the Chinese leaders would like to incite the peoples who are waging liberation struggles to oppose the line of the international communist movement and the policy of the socialist countries aimed to avert a thermonuclear conflict and realize the principles of peaceful coexistence. These actions of theirs are incompatible with a real understanding of Marxism-Leninism, add grist to the mill of the most aggressive and bellicose imperialist circles and colonialists who are dreaming of restoring their rule."

Another target of attack by the Soviet press is the Marxist-Leninist general line of the international communist movement as insisted upon by the C.P.C. In its July 30 editorial, the *Pravda* charged that "the stand of the leaders of the Central Committee of the C.P.C. in opposing their own special and extremely fallacious 'general line' to the common line of the communist movement is strange and shocking." In an editorial carried in its No. 11 issue, the *Communist*, a magazine of the Central Committee of the C.P.S.U., hurled various invectives against the C.P.C.'s Marxist-Leninist viewpoints on the general line of the international communist movement. The magazine accused the leaders of the C.P.C. of "attempting to impose their erroneous viewpoints on the world communist movement." "Starting from their Left opportunist and nationalist stand," the magazine alleged, "they make a complete change in the programmatic documents on all the basic questions of the world communist movement." "We have seen a typical example of distorting Marxism-Leninism in the spirit of 'Left' opportunism, the 'Left' opportunist pseudo-revolutionary slogans, the dogmatic quotations and the splitting programme of sectarianism," the magazine added.

In smearing the C.P.C. the attackers only exposed their true colours. In a signed article carried in the *Izvestia* of August 1, the author stressed the need for international discipline in mutual relations between the fraternal Parties and stubbornly insisted that the differences in principles in the international communist movement should be solved by the voting method whereby the minority must obey the majority. In its July 31 editorial, the *Pravda* attacked the C.P.C.'s correct policy of building socialism by relying mainly on one's own efforts, slandering it as one of isolation and alienation from the socialist countries.

What is behind these attacks is clear enough. They mean that certain people should continue wielding their baton to impose their views on others and persist in their selfish, big-nation chauvinism at the expense of other countries.

These writers in the Soviet press have obviously given full rein to their imaginations in reviling the C.P.C. Here is strange talk about "the science of history in the People's Republic of China" being "full of the real individual cult of Genghiz Khan" and that more than once in the Chinese press there have appeared sayings which seem to "attribute the dominant position in world history to the yellow people" (an article in the *Red Star* of July 20). There are even calumnies against the domestic policies of the C.P.C. and against the internal affairs of

China, alleging that in order to "divert attention from the real causes of failure in the internal life of China," the Central Committee of the C.P.C. began to incite nationalism, extolling first the special nature of a nation and then of a race (an editorial in the magazine *Communist*, No. 11).

### Echoes in Berlin, Prague and Sofia

The recent third plenary session of the Central Committee of the Socialist Unity Party of Germany (S.E.D.) virulently attacked and slandered the C.P.C. The communiqué of the session, made public on July 31, said: "The open letter of the C.P.S.U. Central Committee of July 14, 1963, has been unanimously approved by members and alternate members of the S.E.D." The communiqué falsely charged: "By their 'Left' sectarian, dogmatic and nationalist conceptions, by their sectarian splitting activities, by their vilifications of the C.P.S.U. and our Party, by coming out in defence of Stalin's personality cult and extending ideological differences to state relations, the C.P.C. leaders have brought harm to the struggle for peace, national liberation and socialism." It is not difficult to see where these charges against the C.P.C. have originated, if one is familiar with the voice from Moscow.

Following the session, a nationwide anti-China campaign on an unprecedented scale has been launched by the leadership of the S.E.D. Towards this end, meetings were held inside and outside the Party, reports given and resolutions passed. At the same time, the newspapers, radio stations and news agency of the German Democratic Republic have all been mobilized to launch wanton attacks against the foreign and domestic policies of the C.P.C. The *Junge Welt* (Young World) of July 25, for instance, accused the C.P.C. of "accommodating the reactionary forces—U.S. imperialism and its European allies—in their struggle against the world socialist system, the national-liberation movement and the world peace movement." Any fair-minded people would have to ask who after all is meeting the needs of U.S. imperialism. Indeed, the leaders of the S.E.D. had better look at themselves in a mirror.

In slinging mud at the C.P.C., the Czechoslovak press has also stepped forward to lend a hand. Large numbers of editorials and articles have been published in the national and local newspapers for this purpose. They accused the C.P.C. of adopting a policy of splittism, dogmatism, sectarianism and adventurism and of losing faith in the future of the revolution.

In the anti-China chorus, the leaders of the Bulgarian Communist Party are also playing a role not to be envied. The anti-China campaign they launched in their country is mounting. Newspapers have been publishing large numbers of editorials and articles to traduce the C.P.C. An article carried in the paper *Labour* of August 1 distorted the views of the C.P.C. on the question of the national-liberation movement. It asserted that in the opinion of the C.P.C. "the petty bourgeoisie or the national bourgeoisie or even 'certain patriotic-minded kings, princes and aristocrats' must be the leaders of the world's struggle against imperialism." It is clear that running hither and thither in response to a baton, the attackers in the Bulgarian press just repeated, with their eyes closed, whatever nonsenses other people had said.

# ROUND THE WORLD

## U.S. Imperialism

### War Preparations Go On

Has the tripartite partial nuclear test ban treaty relaxed world tension, slowed down U.S. war preparations or tied the hands of the U.S. atomaniacs, or hasn't it? We say it hasn't, and cite the following developments:

**In U.S.A.** On August 4, the day before a big U.S. delegation headed by Secretary of State Rusk signed the partial test ban treaty on behalf of the Kennedy Administration, the U.S. army staged its biggest home manoeuvres since the end of World War II. Operation "Swift Strike 3" in South Carolina will last two weeks with 100,000 U.S. soldiers taking part.

On August 12, a week after the partial test ban treaty was signed, the U.S. carried out another underground nuclear test in Nevada, the 11th this year and the 69th conducted at the site since September 1961.

**In Asia.** On July 25, the U.S. 7th Fleet held a nuclear weapons exercise in the waters off north Taiwan. Watched by the traitor Chiang Kai-shek and U.S. "Ambassador" to Taiwan, Wright, U.S. ships and aircraft went through a series of sea and air operations; these included the firing of air-to-air and air-to-ground rockets, simulated "atom bomb" strikes and the cleaning up of warships contaminated by "atomic fallout."

On July 29, U.S. Defence Secretary McNamara told a House Armed Services subcommittee that the Pentagon has stationed three "floating armouries" (modified warships) in the Far East; they will stock weapons on the spot ready for use at any time by troops flown in to "trouble spots" from U.S. bases.

Press reports say that a U.S. nuclear naval squadron will be operating in the Far East and Asia in 1964. The French *National Defence Review* (published on July 31), disclosing this deployment, noted that the U.S. already had two squadrons of atomic submarines in the North Atlantic and Mediterranean, while a fourth squadron would later operate in the Indian Ocean, to comprise a world nuclear squadron "belt."

**In Latin America.** The Mexican magazine *Politica* reported in late July that the U.S. and Venezuelan Governments "have reached a secret agreement allowing the Pentagon to deposit atomic bombs and nuclear warheads in Venezuela."

**In Europe.** On August 5, U.S. Secretary of Defence McNamara disclosed that, during his recent visit to West Germany, he concluded a number of military agreements with Bonn Defence Minister Von Hassel. These cover arrangements for joint research and development of new weapons and the setting up of a joint committee on logistics for U.S. and West German forces. Meanwhile, two more squadrons of U.S.-designed and West German-built F-104Gs became operational this month with U.S. help. The Bonn air force already has two squadrons of these nuclear-capable fighter-bombers. A stock of U.S. one megaton bombs has been delivered to underground bunkers at a West German airfield near Cologne.

Washington is also speeding up its massive buildup of nuclear striking power in Britain. According to the London *Daily Worker* (August 10), this plan envisages the re-equipment and reconstruction of four major U.S. air bases and two administrative centres, as well as an increase in the H-bomb stockpile. This is part of the recently disclosed U.S. air force's \$700 million programme to expand its world complex of bases during fiscal 1964 (beginning July 1963) covering Britain, France, West Germany, Italy, Turkey and Greece in Europe and Japan and the Philippines in the Far East. The U.S. air force vice-chief of staff who testified for this programme confirmed that American "ballistic missiles are coming into the inventory at a rapid rate — better than one a day."

### Korea

#### Trouble-Making on 38th Parallel

Yet another area where the U.S. imperialists are creating tension is Korea. Here, the U.N. Command (euphemism for U.S. occupation forces in south Korea) recently invented several "intrusions" and "incidents" in the demilitarized zone and raised

a hue and cry about the "threat from the north."

On August 7, the Central News Agency of the Korean Democratic People's Republic issued an authorized statement characterizing these U.S. allegations as "groundless fabrications and whopping lies." Washington, it pointed out, is using these fabricated "incidents" to whip up tension and a war psychosis, to divert the attention of the people from the catastrophic political and economic situation in south Korea and to stave off the current crisis of its unpopular colonial rule.

There has been a noticeable increase in U.S. provocations and war preparations in south Korea. Recently, the area was put on a "wartime footing," and there have been a series of joint "U.S.-ROK" military exercises. In the past month, the Korean-Chinese side has captured over 40 armed espionage agents who were sent by the U.S. across the demarcation line in violation of the armistice agreement. During the ten years following the Korean armistice agreement, as many as over 7,000 cases of U.S. armistice violations and provocations have been recorded.

On July 26, the eve of the 10th anniversary of the Korean armistice, the State Department issued a statement making very clear its intention to continue the U.S. armed occupation of south Korea. Guy Meloy, Commander of the U.S. 8th Army and head of the 55,000 U.S. occupation forces in south Korea, took the occasion to threaten "Korea technically is still at war."

### India

#### New Delhi Cries "Wolf!"

New Delhi is again rattling mythical Chinese sabres. After the fiasco of the non-existent "Chinese post" it discovered in Ladakh (see *Peking Review*, No. 28) the Nehru government and its propaganda machine have come out with still more fantastic tales of "Chinese concentrations" along the Sino-Indian borders.

As usual, this alleged "Chinese threat," that is now being used to generate war hysteria and create tension, was launched by the spokesman of the Indian External Affairs Ministry. This was followed by expressions of "alarm" by high Indian officials, including Home Minister Shastri, Defence Minister Chavan and even Nehru



himself. The Indian press carried such scary headlines as "Chinese poised for attack all along border, 13 divisions moved to striking positions" (*Times of India*, July 28) and such reports as "about 1,000 Chinese aircraft were concentrated at bases not far from the northeast frontier, with another 1,000 aircraft stationed in the rear" (*Hindustan Standard*, July 29). In the resulting atmosphere of hysteria, Nehru held several meetings with cabinet ministers, while Chavan flew to Kashmir and Army Chief-of-Staff General Chaudhuri hurried to Assam to confer with local commanders. There were also reports of a stepped-up military airlift in Ladakh and a concentration of Indian forces on the eastern border.

There are several obvious reasons for New Delhi's current anti-China campaign. For one thing, this latest flurry of scare reports mounted to a new climax right after the announcement of the Indian agreement with the U.S. and Britain to hold joint air exercises in India—a move which drew severe criticism both inside and outside India. For another, anti-China slander has now become Nehru's routine method of getting more aid from the imperialists and distracting popular dissatisfaction at home. This was admitted even by bourgeois papers in the West, which have learnt from past experience to treat such Indian stories with caution and ridicule. "Some of the stories coming out of India recently are more the products of imagination and designed to justify Anglo-American military aid," declared the British paper *Tribune*. "Nehru, masterhand at double play, wants to obtain bigger assistance, both military and financial, from the West and the Soviets at the same time," noted the French *L'Aurore*. The London *Daily Express* said the cries of Chinese buildup should be "regarded with suspicion," because Nehru "is facing many internal difficulties and no doubt welcomes any event that diverts public attention."

Perhaps it was Nehru himself who gave the best explanation for the cry of "wolf." In a public speech he declared: "As time passed we began growing complacent and mutual quarrels started again. We have to be on our guard against such tendencies. . . . When the country's security is in danger we must unite and

face the enemy," and later he warned of the need for "further sacrifices."

## Africa

### Successful Armed Struggle

The armed struggle in Portuguese Guinea is developing successfully. On August 3 it entered its third year. The nationalist guerrillas are now in control of the southern part of the country, the rich, rice-growing plain between the Corubal River and the Guinean border. Portuguese colonial troops still occupy several towns and harbours there, but they are loath to venture out in the countryside even in daytime. About the only thing the colonialists can do is to send out their aircraft to vent their fury on the people by wanton bombing.

The guerrillas recently extended their operations to the key zone between the Rivers Corubal and Geba and, in the latter part of July, they liberated a vital communications triangle linking Bissau, the capital with the interior and opened new fronts in the northern and central regions. The colonialist troops suffered heavy casualties.

In an interview with the Lisbon paper *Diario Popular* on July 17, Manuel Gomes de Araujo, Portuguese Defence Minister, was forced to admit that the guerrillas operating in Portuguese Guinea have created an "un-

comfortable and disagreeable situation" for his troops. He acknowledged that the guerrillas are "numerous and well armed," supplied by the population with "housing, food and information" and have the "advantage of an exceptionally difficult terrain, many water courses, channels, woods, etc."

Meanwhile, the national-liberation struggle is also gathering momentum in Angola. According to the Algiers representative of the National Front for the Liberation of Angola, the National Liberation Army (N.L.A.) has now freed one-sixth of Angolan territory, including nearly all the areas bordering the Congo and Northern Rhodesia. Thirty thousand armed men are under the revolutionary colours of the N.L.A. while thousands more are in training.

The struggle of the people of Portuguese Africa is gaining more international support. In response to the call of the Conference of African Heads of State in Addis Ababa, nine African countries have broken off diplomatic relations with Portugal and about the same number of countries have contributed to the African Liberation Fund which is to be used to help free dependent African countries.


The situation becomes steadily more favourable for the Africans fighting for their freedom against the Portuguese colonialists.

## THE PASSING SHOW

### When You Sup With the Devil, Bring a Long Spoon

A Kennedy Administration speciality is a pretty name for poison. No exception is the "Food for Peace" scheme billed as magnanimous U.S. aid by which millions round the world sup free at America's table. Its director Reuter now admits that this scheme which has sent "surplus" U.S. farm products into 114 countries and colonies in the past eight and a half years was "conceived as a vehicle for getting rid of our [U.S.] agricultural surpluses" and that the cost of shipping these farm products abroad is less than it would cost to store them in the U.S. But there is clearly more to it than that. Reuter has a chart room at his headquarters that looks like the command centre of a military operation. U.S. wheat, beans and corn are weapons in the cold war to disrupt normal trade, bribe officials, exert economic pressure and get a foothold for U.S. propaganda, capital, trade and neo-colonialism.

And anyway, how "surplus" are these goods in an America where as Kennedy himself admits 17 million Americans go to bed hungry every night?




# PHOTOGRAPHY

## 40 Years Behind the Camera

Chang Yin-chuan, Vice-President of the All-China Photographic Society, is a versatile artist. In over 40 years of work with his camera, he has created a gallery of memorable portraits, genre, landscape and bird-and-flower studies. The recent exhibition of 220 of his best prints at the Museum of Chinese Art in Peking shows the growth of his many-sided art.

His creative life falls roughly into four periods: 1921-27, when at 22, he took up amateur photography; 1928-37, when he turned from landscape work to reflecting the life of the labouring people and the dark realities of society; 1938-49, which he devoted mainly to research; and 1949 up to the present, when his art has flourished again in the congenial air of New China.

His finest, most telling, photographs are those of social life in which his camera has caught not alone the object on which it is focused but its invisible links with its time. Among these are stark records of reactionary rule before liberation. *Submerged Cities and Towns* is an aerial view showing a limitless expanse of water in which clusters of rooftops stick out like matchboxes; it is a damning record of corrupt Kuomintang rule when the Chingchow dykes in Hupeh were allowed to fall into such disrepair that in 1935 they were breached and



Transporting Fertilizer (1962)

Photo by Chang Yin-chuan

a great area was flooded making countless people homeless and destitute. His *Dockworkers* are shown thin and half-starved, staggering under loads twice their own sizes. *Two Beggars in the Snow*, *Wandering* and *Homeless* show old men, women and children caught in moments of the most abject misery, despair in their eyes. He has a deeply compassionate study of an old peasant, ribs showing through thin parchment-like skin, plaiting a basket with unsteady hands.

The grey tone of these pictures of old China form a striking contrast with others taken after the liberation.

These are filled with an irrepressibly bright and joyous mood. His *Youth Shock Brigade* shows the confidence and enthusiasm of young people working at a rural people's commune. The freshness of dawn over wide pastures on which plump sheep graze is caught in *Commune Sheep*. *Magnolias* is a humorous study of holiday crowds at the Summer Palace taking snapshots of the first magnolias of the season.

Another central feature of Chang Yin-chuan's art is his ability to catch a movement at the height of the action. A fine example of this is *Catching a Line* — a fisherman in a sampan rocking on a rough sea just at the moment he is straining to catch a rope thrown from a neighbouring boat.

Chang Yin-chuan's landscapes and bird-and-flower pictures are traditional Chinese paintings translated into modern photographic terms. Here is the lyricism — the visualized poetry, the artistic use of "blank" space, the misty effects of distance that one is accustomed to see in "typical" Chinese landscape scrolls. This is not surprising: the artist, up to 1930, devoted much of his time to painting bird-and-flower paintings. After that year he turned away from painting but it was only to introduce the traditional elements of Chinese painting with superlative effect into his life-time hobby — photography.



Catching a Line (1935)

Photo by Chang Yin-chuan

WELCOME TO THE

# CHINESE EXPORT COMMODITIES FAIR *at Canton*

Sponsored by the China National Foreign Trade Corporations

*Autumn 1963*

October 15 — November 15

In the Chinese Export Commodities Exhibition Hall

Every facility for doing business will be at your service.

Whether you wish to BUY or SELL, representatives of every branch of China's foreign trade will be at the Fair ready to discuss trade with you.

**CHINA TRAVEL SERVICE (HONGKONG) LTD.**

6 Queen's Road Central, Hongkong

acting for **CHINA INTERNATIONAL TOURIST SERVICE**  
will be pleased to look after all your travel arrangements

For full information, please write to

**CHINESE EXPORT COMMODITIES FAIR**

Canton, China

Cable Address: CECFA CANTON

---