

PREFACE

This volume is concerned with the issues that have troubled and divided the international Communist movement since the XXII Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, held in October, 1961. It may be considered a sequel to two earlier publications—one, dealing with Khrushchev's attack on Stalin at the XX CPSU Congress and its repercussions in other Communist parties; the other, with the dramatic events in Poland and Hungary in 1956.¹ The purpose of these volumes is to provide the reader with the most important available documentation on major trends within the international Communist movement.

When this collection was first conceived, in the months following the XXII Congress, there was still considerable doubt and disagreement about the reality and depth of differences among Communist parties and states. Even then it was apparent that behind the open Soviet-Albanian rift lay, on the one hand, the crucial balance of Sino-Soviet relations and, on the other, Khrushchev's continuing search for a definition of post-Stalin communism. More broadly, one could speculate whether communism, as a world movement, had not come to the most important crossroad of its history. As the documents in this collection illustrate, the remarkably frank discussion of a wide range of topics gained in scope and content from the simultaneity of queries, pressures, and arguments generated in many

¹ *The Anti-Stalin Campaign and International Communism: A Selection of Documents*, edited by the Russian Institute, Columbia University (New York: Columbia University Press, 1956); and *National Communism and Popular Revolt in Eastern Europe: A Selection of Documents on Events in Poland and Hungary, February-November, 1956*, edited by Paul Zinner (New York: Columbia University Press, 1956).

quarters. Nor has the Sino-Soviet contest been by any means the only focus of debate.

Without ever coming to a full stop, the overt debate of contentious issues diminished markedly in April, 1962, as a result of what we now know to have been an effort of various Communist parties to mute, if not to resolve, the disagreements, as a matter of self-interest or political survival. That effort failed, and by the fall a combination of events ushered in a new phase of the conflict, which rapidly "escalated" into a severe crisis. The unprecedented bluntness and publicity of the debate, which now centered on Sino-Soviet relations, incidentally validated the earlier interpretations arrived at by more "intuitive" techniques.

An understanding of international communism requires the close study of those remarkable periods—such as mid-1956, the winter of 1961–62, and the winter of 1962–63—when the deeply ingrained discipline and secretiveness among Communists proved incapable of preventing the exposure of internal debate and dissension to the scrutiny of outsiders. While of course the public pronouncements and exchanges of Communist elites do not normally reflect the full spectrum of resentments and disagreements, the documents are here reproduced on the explicit assumption that they are of genuine and substantive significance in the disputes.

Yet it is remarkable how at all times—even after the shock engendered by Khrushchev's revelations about Stalin, the public excommunication of Albania, or the conflicting strategies pursued in the Cuban and Sino-Indian crises—some inhibitions remain, some efforts are made to "paper over" the issues, and some lip service is paid to the fetishes of "unity" and historical inevitability. So much the more important is it, then, to be "tuned in" on the debates which are, more often than not, carried on in a variety of indirect ways. Indeed, for many readers it may be a surprise to discover that most of the issues ventilated by the Communist parties since October, 1962, existed earlier, although they were debated in other terms.

This is one reason for the attention devoted in this volume

to the year “before Cuba”—a year which provided the evidence essential for an understanding of the differences among Communists and of the “esoteric” terms in which they were frequently expressed.

The sheer quantity and the verbosity of Communist publications on these issues have necessitated a strict selection of materials and the use of excerpts. Many items of interest that were not related to the major issues and others which were substantially repetitive had to be omitted for reasons of space. Since the voluminous proceedings of the XXII CPSU Congress are available in other English-language publications, the selections included here have been kept to the essential minimum. Similarly, both Russian and Chinese Communist collections of some key documents for the period from December, 1962, to March, 1963, are available in English translation. Hence it has once again been possible—and necessary—to reproduce only the most significant statements for these months. As these lines are being written, new documentary evidence accumulates on the positions taken within “third” parties on the latest issues dividing the Communist world. Most of it must, regrettably, be omitted from this book.

No uniform organization of the evidence can be entirely satisfactory for the reconstruction of an international process in which numerous elites simultaneously respond to the same problems and in turn influence each other's views. It has seemed most useful to combine a chronological framework with a treatment by geographic areas.

The source material divides into three somewhat distinct groups. Chapters I through IX offer detailed evidence from all parties for the period from October, 1961, to April, 1962. Chapter X, covering the following year, is rather in the nature of an extensive summary, largely limited to Soviet and Chinese documents. Finally, the documents reproduced in the Appendix are of somewhat earlier vintage. These are the French and Italian Communist Party publications concerning their delegations' activities at the Moscow Conference of Eighty-one Communist Parties in November-December, 1960. Because of the

new and important light they shed on the background of the dispute and on the nature of discourse among leading Communists "behind closed doors," the essential parts of these documents deserve reproduction here.

The problems of assembling, analyzing, translating, and verifying the texts proved to be considerably greater than any of the editors or sponsors of this volume had foreseen. Wherever possible, the translations have been based on texts in the original language. If these were not available, official government translations or translations by the Communist party issuing the document were used. Unfortunately, as one consequence of this procedure, the same concept or term is at times rendered in two or more different ways. (Thus, "cult of the personality," "cult of the individual," and "personality cult" of course all refer to the current circumlocution for the abuses of Stalinism. Likewise, different parties speak of a "plenum," a "plenary session," or a "plenary meeting" of their Central Committees.) It need hardly be said that a variety of terms, such as "Liquidators," "Economism," "adventurists," "class nature," or "repression," have a specific, value-laden meaning in Communist parlance, evoking unmistakable judgments and precedents.

Among the several phrases which have recently come into use and often appear in the documents in abbreviated form, a few deserve identification: the *Bucharest Conference* is the meeting of representatives of Communist parties held on June 21–26, 1960, in conjunction with the III Congress of the Rumanian Workers Party. The *Moscow Declaration* is the document signed by the twelve "ruling" Communist parties (but not the Yugoslavs) as a result of their first major post-Stalin conference in November, 1957. The *Moscow Statement* is the document adopted by the representatives of eighty-one Communist parties who met in Moscow for several weeks in November–December, 1960.² The "*anti-Party group*" is the current

² The 1957 Moscow Declaration is available in English in *The Current Digest of the Soviet Press*, IX, No. 47 (January 1, 1958), 3–7; and in *The New York Times*, November 22, 1957, p. 6. The 1960 Moscow Statement is available in English in *The Current Digest of the Soviet Press*, Vol. XII, Nos. 48–49 (December 28, 1960, and January 4, 1961);

Soviet label for the amalgam of leaders who in June, 1957, joined to form what more properly should be called the "anti-Khrushchev group" (Molotov, Malenkov, and Kaganovich in particular)—momentarily controlling seven out of eleven votes in the CPSU Presidium but promptly finding themselves outplayed and purged by Khrushchev.

In some instances, available official translations have been revised (on the basis of the original documents) for the sake of greater precision and intelligibility. Even so, occasional infelicities of style, awkwardness of expression, and obscurity of Communist jargon remain.

In view of the political significance of purposeful deletions, omissions, and distortions in the republication of these materials by other Communist parties, an effort has been made to indicate at least the major variant versions.

The advice and assistance of many individuals have been essential for the completion of the work which this volume required. Professor Zbigniew Brzezinski, Director of the Research Institute on Communist Affairs, Columbia University, worked with the editors in planning the original contents of the volume and was co-author of the introductory essay, which is designed to help the reader as he threads his way through the unfamiliar fabric of Communist debate. Professor Henry L. Roberts, then Director of the Russian Institute and of the Program on East Central Europe, Columbia University, generously advised on fundamental matters of selection and organization, accuracy and authenticity of materials, and was instrumental in working out publication arrangements.

Mr. Jonathan Harris, Associate in Government in Columbia College, had the interminable burdens of coordinating the pro-

New Times, No. 50 (1960). Supplement: *World Marxist Review*, December, 1960, pp. 4-25; and *The New York Times*, December 7, 1960, pp. 14-17. Both are also translated in *The Sino-Soviet Dispute*, edited by G. F. Hudson, Richard Lowenthal, and Roderick MacFarquhar (New York: Frederick A. Praeger, 1961), and *The New Communist Manifesto and Related Documents*, edited by Dan N. Jacobs (New York: Harper & Brothers, 1962).

duction of the manuscript, securing documents, arranging for translations, and supervising the selection of excerpts used in Chapters I-IX.

Dr. Grey Hodnett, Instructor in Government in Columbia College, had the responsibility for the painstaking review of the entire manuscript, including the checking of terminology, accuracy of translations, and editorial comment, as well as the production of Chapter X.

Thomas Bernstein, Seweryn Bialer, Marshall Shatz, and Jane Perlberg Shapiro made valuable contributions by surveying, selecting, and editing materials for individual chapters. It is a pleasure to acknowledge the assistance in making, editing, or verifying translations of Professor Stavro Skendi, Paul Horwitz, Jane Harris, Allen Krause, Edith Rogovin, Richard Sorich, Rudolf Tökes, Pio Uliassi, Barbara Wolfe, as well as the conscientious and competent research of James E. Connor, Ilpyong Kim, Julie Martin, and Thomas W. Robinson. C. M. Alphonso, Inna Buld, Frances Kohn, Seena Krizman, Edith Rogovin, Mary Tökes, and Barbara Zimmerman struggled valiantly with various parts of the typescript. Special recognition is due to Christine Dodson and Anne Miller for secretarial, editorial, and proofreading assistance of high quality.

Henry H. Wiggins, William Bernhardt, and the Editorial Department of Columbia University Press were most understanding and helpful in seeing this volume to difficult completion. Miss Louise E. Luke, Editor at the Russian Institute, Columbia University, repeatedly shared with the editors her unerring competence on matters of sense, style, and format.

Dr. William E. Griffith, of the Center for International Studies, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, was good enough to offer, at an early stage, his very knowledgeable comments and suggestions on the coverage of the volume, and later, to supply verifications of some translations. Leo Gruliov, editor of *The Current Digest of the Soviet Press*, on behalf of the publishers, the Joint Committee of Slavic Studies, kindly authorized the use of some translations that appeared in the *Digest*.

The unselfish and often painstaking assistance of the above

was instrumental for the success of an undertaking which proved to be far more instructive than satisfying, and far more time-consuming than editors, sponsors, or publishers had assumed. Perhaps no academic institution is as yet adequately staffed and organized so as to procure, translate, and analyze with facility the overt and official pronouncements of the nearly one hundred Communist parties around the globe.³ Above all else, an appreciation of the inherent interest and importance of the subject-matter—substantive and methodological—and the relative unavailability of a large part of the documentation, spurred the editors and the staff to see this project through to completion.

ALEXANDER DALLIN

May, 1963

³ It may be mildly comforting to note that even the Soviet Union seems to be experiencing similar difficulties in collecting and following the widely scattered evidence. As the introduction to a global survey of Communist parties puts it, "The authors, in preparing this book, encountered certain difficulties related either to the lack of data or to the lack of certainty about the nature of this new type of publication. One must take into account the fact that the latest comparable Marxist publications appeared more than thirty years ago." (*Akademiia nauk SSSR, IMEMO, Rabochee dvizhenie v kapitalisticheskikh stranakh, 1959–1961 gg.* [Moscow, 1961], p. 7.)

