

Radio Free Europe/Munich  
Research and Evaluation Department  
Background Information USSR

*Sino-Soviet*

27 October 1961

FOR MOLOTOV READ MAO (II)

- I. Introduction
- II. Conflicting Claims of Communist Leaders  
(The Times, 27 October 1961)

Introduction

In the past eighteen hours, the evidence for the theory that Sino-Soviet relations have been strained to near the flash point has been accumulating rapidly. It is now clear that in Peking the full text of Hoxha's reply to Khrushchev, describing the Soviet leader as an anti-Marxist slanderer,<sup>1</sup> has been published in People's Daily. Moreover according to Reuter (27 October 1961), which is quoting diplomatic sources:

"China is ready to announce that she stands with Albania against the Soviet Prime Minister...and other Communist leaders."

From London, the New York Times (October 27, 1961) reports that the "best informed" sources there see the Soviet denunciation of Albania and attacks on Molotov and the anti-party group as

"indirect indictments of the Chinese communist leadership's inflexibility and unawareness of modern nuclear strategy."

From Moscow comes O.V. Kuusinen's speech to the 22nd Congress,<sup>2</sup> in which the Soviet spokesman who provided Khrushchev's reply to Peking on Lenin's anniversary in 1960, at the beginning of the acute stage of the overt Sino-Soviet controversy, now accuses Molotov of "concocting some sort of sectarian platform." Kuusinen went on:

"Molotov had evidently decided to fish in troubled waters, hoping that some miserable little fish might bite, if not here in some waters then at least somewhere in someone else's water."

The New York Times' plausible and restrained comment on this statement is:

"Mr. Kuusinen thus appeared to suggest that Mr. Molotov's 'hard-line' views might find a sympathetic reception in Communist China and Albania."

<sup>1</sup>Albanian statement of October 20, 1961.

<sup>2</sup>Radio Moscow, October 27, 1961.

However, this is to put the most charitable interpretation on Kuusinen's intent, and the elderly Secretary of the CC, CPSU was not in his most charitable mood. Like Mikoyan and Ilyichev before him, he may have been suggesting more than mere "sympathy". Of Hoxha, Kuusinen said that:

"even last year at the meetings of the representatives of the fraternal parties, the Albanian leaders caused general indignation with their slanderous attacks on the CPSU and comrade Khrushchev.

"The CC of our party tried several times to reach agreement with them but they were bluntly provocative, not wishing even to hear of any agreement. Later they began to arrest Albanians advocating friendship with the USSR and to send back the Soviet specialists who had arrived on the invitation of the Albanian government. In order to arouse unfriendly feelings among the people towards the USSR, they began to spread heinous rumors to the effect that the Soviet Union supports Greek claims to the Southern regions of Albania or that the USSR had ceased to deliver wheat to Albania. How low must one fall to descend to these monstrous fabrications!"

To return to Molotov, a German analysis of the speech by Mikoyan (Frankfurter Allgemeine Zeitung, 26 October 1961) finds that:

"As at the 20th Congress, Mikoyan has again assumed the role of an 'agent-provocateur'. In an unusual attack on Molotov, he placed in the mouth of the deposed old Bolshevik all the words and ideas which for two years past have been regularly appearing in Red Flag or in the speeches of Chinese leaders..." (For a similar view of Mikoyan's speech see Background Information, 24 October 1961).

Subsequently a number of other orators at the 22nd Congress have used the same gambit. This is how Leonid Ilyichev, head of agitprop, described Molotov's article submitted to Kommunist on April 18, 1960:

"It created the impression that the difficulties through which our country passed in 1921 as a result of foreign intervention and the civil war were inevitable also for other countries which would take the road of socialist development. It revised the dicta of the 20th Congress on international relations. It underestimated the new correlation of forces which came about after World War II, such as the increased might of the states of the socialist camp, primarily of the USSR, as well as the political activity of the masses in the capitalist countries. The article denied the real possibility of averting another world war in our time..." (Radio Moscow, October 25).

This brief synopsis was drawn up by Ilyichev in such a way that it is also an accurate summary of the contents of Red Flag's article, "Long Live Leninism!" which was published on April 16, 1960. In other words, if Molotov was wrong on "questions of theory", as Ilyichev claimed, Mao was wrong too.



The next agitprop expert to speak was P. Satyukov, the editor of Pravda. He said Molotov

"was seeking to push us on to the course of adventurism, on to the course of war...The Party will not go in for this. It is not this that Lenin teaches us and we should not be Leninists if we listened to the Molotovs of this world."

A similar charge of adventurism was brought by Satyukov's paper against the Chinese party on June 12, 1960 when it published the notorious article by N. Matkovsky ridiculing the contemporary leftist followers of Blanqui.

Satyukov's ambitious rival, Adzhubei of Izvestia, pinned yet another Maoist deviation on Molotov particularly and the anti-party group in general when he said:

"They opposed direct contacts between Soviet leaders and leaders of the capitalist world. Yet developments have shown that the international authority of the USSR is growing as a result of visits to foreign countries..." (Tass, October 26, 1961).

Of all the speakers who ridiculed Molotov by name and Mao by implication, Pospelov was perhaps the most virulent:

"Molotov now comes out against the conclusion that war can be prevented in our time. He comes out against the thesis of peaceful coexistence and thereby demonstrates his own departure from Marxism-Leninism. According to him, communism can win new followers by war, but this is precisely what its greatest enemies impute to it...Now this is clear dogmatism or ignorance...This is obtuse, factionalist obstinacy...his own putrid, anti-Leninist line." (Tass, October 26, 1961).

The use of this type of abusive language to describe theories recently advocated in public by Chinese spokesmen, but not publicly advocated to the best of the free world's knowledge for many years past by Molotov, cannot have improved the atmosphere in Peking. The Khrushchevian fall-out of words from the 22nd Party Congress over the eternal city may yet prove to have more serious, far-reaching and enduring effects on China than the radio-active clouds of debris now approaching the northern and north-western borders of Mao's xenophobic empire.

r.r.g.

27 October 1961

Background Information/USIA

Research and Evaluation Department

Radio Free Europe/Munich

CONFLICTING CLAIMS OF THE COMMUNIST LEADERS

The Times  
October 27, 1961

The Peking People's Daily yesterday printed in full what Mr. Khrushchev said about Albania at the Soviet Communist Party congress last week, according to the New China news agency quoted by Reuter. It also published Albanian statements.

Mr. Khrushchev touched off a series of flat contradictions between China and Albania on the one hand and on the rest of the communist countries on the other. A few of them are quoted below. All were made at the congress except the comments by Mr. Lu Ting-yi, a Chinese deputy Prime Minister, who was speaking at a fete for visiting Albanians in Peking on September 26.

1. Should the Differences be Aired?

"Any public, one sided censure of any fraternal party does not help unity and is not helpful in resolving problems." - Mr. Chou En-lai (China).

"Our party will continue, as Lenin teaches, to unmask uncompromisingly any distortions, and deviations from Marxism-Leninism." - Mr. Kosygin (Russia).

"(Against) the present harmful attitude of the Albanian leaders...the CPSU Central Committee, led by Comrade Khrushchev, has come out in the only manner that is worthy of Leninism." - Mr. Kádár (Hungary).

"The wrecking activity of the present Albanian leaders against our cause (is) obvious" - Mr. Novotný (Czechoslovakia)

"The Albanian leaders...have sent us a letter...a mixture of hypocrisy and slanderous insinuations." - Mr. Suslov (Russia).

"No force in the world exists, or will ever exist, which by slander or intrigue can harm or separate the Albanian Workers' Party and Albanian people from the CPSU and Soviet Peoples." Albanian message to the congress.

"The slanders and anti-Marxist attacks of Khrushchev..." - Albanian Government statement of October 20.

2. Has Albania Departed from Marxist-Leninist Principles?

"The Albanian leaders...have begun to depart from the generally agreed line of the whole international communist movement...using the same methods as were current in our country at the time of the personality cult." - Mr. Khrushchev.



"...Riding roughshod over the Leninist norms of party life." - Mr. Suslov.

"The personality cult and arbitrariness flourish.. Enver Hoxha and Mehmet Shehu have created an intolerable atmosphere in the party...Terrorism reigns." - Mr. Kosygin.

"Under the correct leadership of the long-tested Albanian Workers' Party headed by Enver Hoxha, holding aloft the banner of Marxism-Leninism, the heroic Albanian people has achieved brilliant successes...The Albanian Communists are fine fighters in defence of Marxism-Leninism and in opposing modern revisionism." (Russian as distinct from Yugoslav revisionism ) - Mr. Lu Ting-yi.

3. Is Albania still a member of the Socialist Camp?

"They must...return to the road of unity and close collaboration in the fraternal family of the socialist community." - Mr. Khrushchev.

"Our socialist camp...is a single entity...from the Democratic Republic of Vietnam to the Albanian People's Republic." - Mr. Chou En-lai.

"The Albanian Workers' Party...firmly defends the unity of the socialist camp." Mr. Lu Ting-yi.