

Moscow, Novosti Press Agency Publishing House, 1964

## IN CONNECTION WITH MAO TSE-TUNG'S TALK WITH A GROUP OF JAPANESE SOCIALISTS

*Pravda*, editorial, September 2, 1964

Mao Tse-tung's talk with a group of Japanese Socialists who visited Peking was recently published in Japan. Bourgeois newsmen lauded his statements to the sky: they liked what the Chairman of the Communist Party of China had said. The content of the conversation was such that at first it was difficult to believe its authenticity. Indeed, bourgeois newspapers may write all sorts of things in an effort to poison the international atmosphere, to provoke quarrels between socialist countries.

It was believed that Peking would refute the report but no denial was forthcoming. On the contrary, Chinese leaders made it clear that Mao Tse-tung's interview published by the Japanese press did actually take place. A Soviet representative in Peking asked Wang Ping-nan, Deputy Minister of Foreign Affairs of the People's Republic of China, for an explanation and the latter declared that "if Mao Tse-tung had had said so he agreed with him". On August 1, the Japanese newspaper *Asahi* published a statement by Chou En-lai. This statement actually contained the same ideas as were expressed in Mao Tse-tung's talk.

Consequently no doubt was left that the Japanese press was really reproducing the statement of the Chairman of the Communist Party of China.

This interview lays bare the aims and positions of the Chinese leadership which hitherto it had only spoken about in whispers. Therefore this talk is worth publishing so that the Soviet people may see how far the CPC leaders have gone in their struggle against our people, the peoples of other countries of socialism, the entire world communist movement.

It is well known that when the Chinese leadership started its attacks on the CPSU and other Marxist-Leninist Parties it tried to present things as if it was coming out in defence of Marxism-Leninism, "safeguarding" the interests of the world revolutionary and liberation movement. Moreover, the CPC leaders shamelessly alleged that when vilifying our Party and our country and speaking about the "bourgeois degeneration of the Soviet people" they were showing concern for the interests of our country and of other countries of socialism. '

When in 1960 the CPC leaders started a polemic about the character of our epoch, about the possibility of preventing world war, about peaceful and non-peaceful transition to socialism and other questions, one could think that they disagreed with the CPSU and other Marxist-Leninist Parties on ideological issues only. However, the more they developed the polemic, the more doubts, appeared: do the CPC leaders really think what they write? The unseemly political aims of the CPC leaders became more and more clearly discernible behind the theoretical controversies. Mao Tse-tung's talk is further confirmation of this.

As follows from the interview of the CPC Chairman, the Chinese leaders are now not even trying to camouflage their expansionist aspirations. According to the Japanese press, Mao Tse-tung does not even mention the ideological issues. There is not a single word in the talk about Marxism-Leninism, about socialism, about the unity of the working class, about the struggle for the interests of the world workers' and national-liberation movement. In it there is not even a hint of any class analysis of the contemporary world, of any class approach to the choice of friends and allies in the struggle against imperialism. Mao Tse-tung's main concern is to whip up anti-Soviet feelings, to speculate on the nationalist sentiments of the most reactionary forces.

## I.

Mao Tse-tung began his talk with statements about the so-called intermediate zone. This theory had come into being as early as 1946. In its original form it boiled down to the following: the Chinese leaders split the entire globe into three parts or zones. The first—American imperialism, the USA. The second—the Soviet Union and other socialist countries. The third zone, as if lying between them (hence-intermediate), —mainly the countries of Asia, Africa and Latin America.

Now Mao Tse-tung is amending this "theory". Slanderously declaring that the USSR "had entered into a complot with the United States to struggle for world domination", he actually combines the two main zones into one. This scheme leaves him with two zones: "Soviet-American" and the so-called "intermediate" which actually includes China as well. The division of the world into two opposing social systems, recognised by all Marxists, thus disappears.

According to the Chinese theoreticians, the intermediate zone represents revolution and progress. As regards the Soviet Union and the United States, they, according to this theory, "entered into a complot" to struggle for world domination. Hence the conclusion is drawn that the peoples of the intermediate zone must fight American imperialism and, at the same go, against the Soviet Union. Such is the main purpose of the theoretical exercises of the Chinese leadership.

To say that the theory of the intermediate zone has nothing in common with Marxism is to say very little. This is not just a non-Marxist but a militant anti-Marxist, anti-Leninist concept.

The basic principle of Marxism-Leninism consists in a class approach to all phenomena of the life of the society, in the assessment of all these phenomena from the positions of the most progressive class—the proletariat. Precisely such an approach underlies the analysis of our epoch given by the Communist and Workers' Parties of the world in the Declaration and the Statement of the Moscow Meetings. The contemporary world is divided not into geographical zones but into opposing social systems—the socialist and the capitalist systems. Revolutionary transition from capitalism to socialism is the basic content of our epoch: all the revolutionary forces of our time—the world system of socialism, the workers' movement in the capitalist countries, the national liberation movement—merge into a single front and jointly exert pressure against imperialism, achieving more and more successes in the struggle for peace, democracy and socialism.

But this class approach does not suit the Peking theoreticians. They brush it aside completely. Their "intermediate zones" include on an equal footing both the countries fighting against imperialism, for their national independence and the imperialist states; both the working class, the working masses of the capitalist countries and the ruling bourgeoisie. In other words, "horses and men all mixed up" as a poet said. Thus Chairman Mao mixes together in the intermediate zone the exploiters and the exploited, the oppressors and the oppressed.

In the talk it was stated: "all the peoples of Asia, Africa and Latin America come out against imperialism. Europe, Canada and other countries also come out against imperialism." Note, not the working people of Europe and Canada but the whole of Europe and the whole of Canada, including capitalist monopolies, the reactionary bourgeois parties, the French "ultras", the Bonn revanchists, and the like. All these, it turns out, are fighters against imperialism, and the revolutionary movement has no other alternative but to welcome to their ranks Messrs. Krupps, Thyssens, Rothschilds, and, maybe even General Franco himself.

In accordance with the intermediate zone theory the course of events in the world is not determined by the struggle of antagonistic classes and opposing social systems but by the

struggle of some powers and geographical regions against others. This theory actually ignores the nature of the social system of this or that country. Not only does it simply ignore the class approach but replaces it by a purely nationalistic approach prompted by the aims of the great-power policy of the CPC leaders.

Guided by such an approach, the Chinese leaders are playing their dangerous political game. Since they regard the socialist camp as an obstacle on the way to the realisation of their hegemonistic schemes with regard to the national-liberation movement, they are trying to cut off this movement from the world system of socialism. This is why they build up the first intermediate zone of the countries of Asia, Africa and Latin America, including China. Since the Chinese leaders are also looking for rich economic partners and potential allies in the international arena among the developed capitalist countries, they include practically the whole of the capitalist world into the intermediate zone and issue it a mandate of "fighter against imperialism".

Besides, Chairman Mao issues from time to time personal mandates to those imperialist countries with which Peking is flirting with particular zeal. It was but yesterday that Chinese propagandists referred to General de Gaulle as a "fascist and a bandit". But it was enough for him to hint at the possibility of a rapprochement with Peking and the General became one of the most active fighters against American imperialism. Furthermore, the Chinese leaders clearly hint in a number of pronouncements that "France can restore her influence in Asia".

Examples of this kind are also found in the talk published today. Japan is a developed country, Mao Tse-tung says, "she may help us in many ways. Politically we must also support each other". This invitation to cooperate is immediately substantiated by a mandate issued not to the country as a whole but to its ruling class. "Japanese monopoly capital belongs to the second intermediate zone," Mao Tse-tung says. "Even this capital is displeased with the USA, and some of its representatives openly come out against the United States. Although monopoly capital of Japan is now dependent on the USA, time will pass and it will throw off the American yoke." Thus it follows that it will be not the Japanese people, not the working class that will throw off the yoke of their own and foreign oppressors, as the progressive representatives of the Japanese working people say, but the monopoly capital will throw off the yoke of its American counterpart.

Thus the French and Japanese monopoly capitalists are classed with the anti-imperialists. And what will happen if tomorrow the United States' monopolies find it advantageous for themselves to revise their policy of non-recognition of the PRC and offer it economic cooperation? Will they also be issued a mandate of "fighters against imperialism"? Will it then be necessary to include the United States into the "intermediate zone", too?

We should be grateful to Chairman Mao Tse-tung: no one exposed the actual aims of the Chinese leadership better than he did. The theory of the intermediate zone is a hopeless, flimsy attempt to provide some "ideological basis" for the overtly nationalistic policy. Of course, there are contradictions between the imperialists of the United States and Japan as well as between France and other capitalist countries and a struggle is waged for markets and spheres of capital investments. The revolutionary forces are making use of these contradictions. But to use the contradictions in the camp of imperialism in the interest of the common struggle for the cause of peace and social progress is one thing and to flirt and form blocs with the class enemy is something quite different. The Chinese leaders who call themselves internationalists are actually ready to come to agreement with anybody in the name of the struggle against the friends and allies of People's China—the Soviet Union and the other countries of socialism.

Mao Tse-tung described the struggle waged by the CPC leadership against the Soviet Union and other socialist countries as a "paper war" and added that such a war does nobody any harm since no one is killed in it. This in the first place contains a recognition of the fact that the Chinese leaders regard their polemic with the CPSU and other fraternal Parties as "a kind of war". Secondly, this clearly reveals the supercilious attitude of the CPC leaders to the interests of the unity of the world communist and liberation movement. The Communists of the whole world express deep concern for the situation that has taken shape in the international communist movement through the fault of the Chinese leaders. The damage they have inflicted to the cause of the people's struggle for peace, national independence and social progress is obvious to everybody. And here is Mao Tse-tung declaring: no reason to worry, this is a war without any killed or casualties!

No, we cannot agree with the Chinese leaders' assessment of their own actions. Their struggle against the CPSU, against the world communist movement, against the USSR and other countries of socialism is not a "paper war". As regards its fierceness, its scale and methods, it does not differ from the "cold war" of imperialism against the countries of socialism.

## II.

Mao Tse-tung's pronouncements on the territorial issue show clearly how far the Chinese leaders have gone in the cold war against the Soviet Union. He is not just claiming a particular part of Soviet territory but is portraying his claims as a part of some "general territorial issue".

We are confronted with an openly expansionist programme with far-reaching claims.

This programme did not appear today or yesterday. In 1954 a textbook on modern history was put out in the PRC with a map of China showing her as she was, in the opinion of its authors, before the first opium war. This map included Burma, Vietnam, Korea, Thailand, Malaya, Nepal, Bhutan and Sikkim as parts of China; in the north the border ran along the Stanovoi Mountain Range, cutting off the Far East territory from the USSR; in the west part of Kirghizia, Tajikistan, Kazakhstan (up to Lake Balkhash) was also included in China. Sakhalin was also shown as Chinese territory. If one is to believe the textbook all these lands and countries were "state territory of China" and were taken away from her.

At that time it seemed that the publication of such a textbook was the result of an oversight or the provocative activities of nationalistic elements. But subsequent events disproved this assumption. Maps showing various parts of the Soviet Union and other countries neighbouring on China as Chinese territory continued to be published in the PRC.

Chinese representatives have lately begun to mention with increasing frequency hundreds of thousands of square kilometres of Soviet territory which allegedly belong "by right" to China.

A recent issue of the Peking magazine *Lishih Yenchiu* (No. 4, 1964) contends that "Russia captured vast lands to the north of the River Heilungkiang (the Chinese name for the River Amur—*Ed.*) and to the east of the River Ussuri"... "Russia has at various times annexed vast lands in Sinkiang and in the north-east area."

Now Mao Tse-tung has declared in his talk: "About a hundred years ago the area to the east of Baikal became the territory of Russia and from then on Vladivostok, Khabarovsk, Kamchatka and other points are the territory of the Soviet Union. We have not yet presented a bill for this list!"

By what right, however, are the Chinese leaders claiming lands that did not belong to China? They refer to the fact that many hundreds of years ago Chinese troops came to these areas and that once the Chinese Emperor collected tribute from the local people. Indeed, if the question involved were not so serious, such "historic arguments" could not be called anything but

childish.

The history of mankind is full of examples of the emergence and fall of states, and the resettlement of peoples in the course of which borders between states have changed repeatedly. By resorting to the method of "historical references" on the question of borders one can prove anything. For instance, one can prove that Britain is French territory because she was once the possession of the Duke of Normandy. One can prove, on the contrary, that France is British possession because in her time, during the 100 Years' War, she was almost completely conquered by the English. With the help of such arguments one can also prove that the borders of the PRC pass only along the line of the Great Wall of China which is less than 100 kilometres away from Peking. Indeed, the border of China did once pass there and the wall itself is testimony of this.

But even if one takes the references to "historical rights" seriously it will come out that in this case they do not correspond in any way to facts. As is known, in the middle of the 17th century China's possessions reached only to the Khingan Mountain Range, that is considerably to the south of the River Amur. The territories to the north of Khingan were populated by local indigenous tribes (Evenks, Daurs, etc.) who were subjected from time to time to raids by the Manchurians and paid tribute to them. There was no indigenous Manchurian and Chinese population in the Amur area. The process of defining the actual borders took place with the development by Russia of the northern half of the Amur basin and of the southern part by China. More than a hundred years ago this state of the border was endorsed in the Aigun and Peking treaties.

No one is arguing about the fact that the tsarist government carried out a predatory policy just as the Chinese emperors themselves did to the extent of their abilities.

At various times first one and then another was stronger and took the upper hand. This resulted in a certain change in the settlement of the peoples. But the working people did not think about any territorial gains. They worked on the land they had to live on, watering it with their sweat. One can only be amazed that there are people questioning the right of workers and peasants to the land on which they have been living and working from ancient times on the sole grounds that once upon a time one emperor defeated another and then himself suffered defeat.

Do those who question the Soviet Union's ownership of a territory of more than one and a half million square kilometres think of how these claims will be viewed by Soviet people who have been living and working on this land for several generations and consider it their homeland, the land of their forefathers.

That is why we say that the present border has developed historically and has been fixed by life itself, and the border treaties are a basis which cannot be disregarded.

The CPSU headed the struggle of the working class and working masses of Russia against tsarism and routed it completely. It is well known that in the very first years of its existence the Soviet Government abrogated all the unequal treaties with China. Continuing the Leninist policy, the Soviet Government gave up the naval base in Port Arthur and handed over free of charge to the PRC Government all its rights in the joint management of the Chinese-Changchun Railway with all the property belonging to the railway. V. I. Lenin wrathfully condemned the seizure of Port Arthur by the tsarist government and the infiltration of Manchuria. But it was none other than Lenin who said: "...Vladivostok is far away, but this city is ours."

The Soviet Union is an absolutely new state formation which emerged as a result of the voluntary unification of Soviet Republics created on the ruins of the tsarist empire. And whereas the borders of tsarist Russia were determined by the policy of imperialist invaders, the borders of

the Soviet Union were formed as a result of the voluntary expression of the will of the peoples on the basis of the principle of free self-determination of nations. The peoples who joined the Soviet Union will never allow anyone to encroach upon their right to settle their own fate.

In his talk Mao Tse-tung bemoans the fate of Mongolia which, he says, the Soviet Union "placed... under its rule". This can evoke nothing but indignation. Everybody knows that the Mongolian People's Republic has been a sovereign socialist state for more than 40 years now and enjoys all the rights of an independent country. Why did Mao Tse-tung have to make such obviously wild statements? The fact is that the existence of an independent Mongolian state which maintains friendly relations with the USSR and other socialist countries does not suit the Chinese leaders. They would like to deprive the MPR of independence and make it a Chinese province. It was precisely on this that the PRC leaders proposed the "reaching of agreement" to N. S. Khrushchov and other Soviet comrades during their visit to Peking in 1954.

N. S. Khrushchov naturally refused to discuss this question and told the Chinese leaders that the destiny of the Mongolian people was determined not in Peking and not in Moscow but in Ulan Bator, that the question of Mongolia's statehood could be settled only by the country's working people themselves and by nobody else.

As has been already noted above, the Chinese leaders are trying to elevate territorial claims to the level of some universal principle. But this involves the fundamentals of international relations. What would happen if all states were to follow the Peking recipe and start presenting reciprocal claims to each other for a revision of historically formed borders? There is no difficulty about answering this question. Such a road would mean the inevitable aggravation of international tensions, would be fraught with military conflicts with all the ensuing consequences.

The question of territorial disputes and borders is tremendously complicated. One has to distinguish the nature of territorial issues. It is one thing when it is a question of the just striving of the peoples to liquidate the remnants of the shameful colonial system, to get back ancient territories populated by the nation concerned and held by the imperialists. For instance, the right of the Indian people to restore Goa to their motherland was indisputable. Just as indisputable was Indonesia's right to restore West Irian to the Republic. We have declared and we still declare that People's China has every right to press for the liberation and reunification of Taiwan and Hong Kong which are part of the country and the majority of whose population are Chinese. Such examples are numerous.

Territorial claims stemming from attempts to revise historically formed borders between states, to force in some form or other a revision of treaties and agreements concluded after World War II as a result of the rout of Hitler's fascism and Japanese militarism are another thing. The nations that won victory at the price of millions upon millions of lives will never agree to such aspirations.

In his talk with the Japanese Socialists Mao Tse-tung dismissed with amazing ease the entire system of international agreements which were concluded after World War II and which conform to the interests of strengthening peace and the security of the peoples. He declared: "The places occupied by the Soviet Union are too numerous"—and even named some territories with the obvious aim of adding combustible material to fan nationalistic passions. It is hard to believe that the Chinese leader does not understand the causes and the historical circumstances that led to the establishment of the present borders between states in Europe and Asia. It is hard to assume also another thing—that he is not aware of the most dangerous consequences to which any attempt to recarve the map of the world could lead in the present conditions. Mao Tse-tung

pretends to be attacking the interests of our country alone, but it is clear to everybody that such a provocative appeal to revise borders (if taken seriously) would inevitably generate a whole number of reciprocal claims and insoluble conflicts between countries in Europe and Asia. The self-evidence of all this is unquestionable and gives ground to state that only people who find it profitable for some reason to sow mistrust and animosity among the peoples of socialist countries can act in such a manner.

It is precisely with this aim that Mao Tse-tung is trying to fabricate so-called territorial issues between a number of socialist countries. But these attempts are doomed to failure in advance. No one will succeed in undermining the friendship and cooperation of the peoples of socialist countries.

For a long time now the rulers of the capitalist world have been watching the nationalism of the Chinese leaders, their great-power behaviour. It is not fortuitous, therefore, that the representatives of the Right wing of the Japanese Socialists, too, put the question of the Kuril Islands precisely to Mao Tse-tung and received from the Chairman of the CPC exactly the same answer they needed.

It is known that these islands passed into the full possession of the Soviet Union not at all as a result of Soviet expansion, as Mao Tse-tung is trying to contend. This act was dictated by the need to cut short the aggressive policy of Japanese imperialism which since 1918 had harboured plans for capturing Soviet territories in the Far East and had repeatedly tried to implement them. The Kuril Islands were given a special role in the aggressive plans of the Japanese militarists—the role of an important beachhead for attacking the Soviet Far East. It is quite understandable that the Japanese military had to be deprived of such an opportunity. This was done and in the past the Chinese representatives more than once expressed approval of this security measure. The statement of the PRC Government of August 15, 1951, pointed out: "...the Kuril Islands must be handed over, and the southern part of Sakhalin and all its adjacent islands returned to the Soviet Union".

Can one say that the situation in this area has changed radically since then and that the threat of aggression against the USSR and the other countries of socialism has finally ceased to exist? Of course not. Militarist forces which would like to lead the country along the old road of military ventures are active in Japan contrary to the will of her people. There are US military bases in Japan which are being kept, not without reason, by the Pentagon near the Soviet Union and other socialist countries in Asia. Only a few days ago the Japanese Government, having succumbed to the pressure of the United States, granted it the right to bring nuclear submarines into Japanese ports, that it permitted the United States to use these ports as its military bases. In these circumstances the statement that the USSR must hand the Kuril Islands over to Japan plays into the hands not only of the Japanese but also the American militarists.

If we proceed from Mao Tse-tung's so-called historical principle then all the rights to this territory belong to the Soviet Union. But Chairman Mao has an absolutely unprincipled attitude to the principles he himself advances. He quotes them when he finds it profitable and flouts them if his political schemes so require.

There are no, nor can there be, any legal or moral grounds for claims to the Kuril Islands. This, however, does not mean that in changed circumstances the search of solutions that would not infringe upon the interests of the USSR and would meet the needs of the Japanese people would be excluded.

Mao Tse-tung cannot fail to realise that the Chinese leadership's position on the territorial question is remote from internationalism. To dampen down this impression he appeals not only

to history but also to "justice". His thesis actually boils down to the fact that the population of the globe is distributed unevenly and that justice demands the reallocation of territory.

The demagogic nature of this thesis is clear to everybody. The distribution of people in the world is the result of a long and complicated development due to which different peoples live in different conditions. The Communists are fighting precisely to secure a better life for all peoples. When socialism triumphs throughout the world and the productive forces achieve a high level everywhere, the process of the rapprochement of nations will result in a gradual disappearance of the difference in the living conditions of the peoples of different countries and state frontiers will lose their importance. In these conditions the solution of the problem of a more even distribution of people in the world will become possible.

But this is a matter of the future. To raise this question now, when opposing social systems exist, when an objective process of consolidation of statehood and sovereignty is in train, is extremely harmful.

Incidentally, it should not be forgotten that there are many cases in history of most reactionary wars being started with a view to expanding "lebensraum". Thus Mao Tse-tung's pronouncements about "unfair distribution of territory" are not so very new. He has predecessors whom he can hardly be proud of.

Nor can one discount Mao Tse-tung's statements about the "grandeur of Japan", statements which are quite surprising coming from a Communist. The great-power views of the CPC leaders and their admiration for the factor of brute force in international relations are clearly discernible in these statements.

In what does Mao Tse-tung see the grandeur of the Japanese people? In their industriousness? In the fact that they succeeded in bringing their country up to the level of the foremost powers of the world within a short space of time and creating wonderful material and spiritual culture? No, his attention is not attracted by these facts. With extraordinary inspiration he speaks about the crimes of the Japanese military who in the early forties occupied enormous expanses in South-East Asia and Oceania. That is to say, Chairman Mao declares the aggressive actions of the Japanese samurai to be Japan's national grandeur, a thing the Japanese people themselves regard as their national disgrace.

History teaches that no country has ever achieved grandeur along the road of military gambles and aggressions. True grandeur of the peoples is achieved along the road of social progress, friendship and cooperation. We are convinced that the vital interests of the Chinese people also lie along this path.

No one who cherishes the interests of socialism, the interests of preserving peace and the security of nations can fail to condemn most emphatically the expansionist views of the PRC leaders, their attempt to start a gambling venture around questions which affect the destiny of the peoples.

The true intentions of the Chinese leaders are becoming obvious. These intentions have nothing in common with the interests of the struggle for the victory of the cause of peace and socialism. They are permeated through and through with great-power chauvinism and a desire for hegemony. Mao Tse-tung's talk with Japanese Socialists is the most eloquent and graphic evidence of this.

## MAO TES-TUNG'S TALK WITH JAPANESE SOCIALISTS

"Chairman Mao tells the SPJ Delegation: the Kurils Must be Returned to Japan"—under this title *Shekai shuho*, a weekly published by the Jiji Tsushin-Sha, carried an article in its a issue of August 11 on the recent visit to the People's Republic of China of a group of members of parliament, socialists, headed by Kozo Sasaki. Below follows a slightly abridged translation of the article.

\* \* \*

A group of members of parliament of the anti-main group of the SPJ consisting of five people headed by Kozo Sasaki, had a long talk with Mao Tse-tung, Chairman of the CPC in Peking on July 10. During the talk Mao Tse-tung declared that he "supports Japan's position in the question of the return of the Kurils". Arriving in Hong Kong on July 12 the group told this to the Japanese correspondents accredited there. The contents of the talk deserves special attention.

Akio Kasahara, Secretary of the headquarters of the SPJ, who accompanied the Sasaki group, explained the contents of Mao Tse-tung's talk with the Socialists basing himself on the notes made by Kozo Sasaki, Sitiro Matsumoto and Sigeo Oshiba. These explanations may be characterised as valuable material revealing Chairman Mao's views.

The talk, which was held in the Hall of the People's Congress lasted two hours and 40 minutes, an unusually long time. Present at the talk on the Japanese side, apart from the five members of the Sasaki group and Mr. Kasahara, were Hisao Kuroda group of three people that arrived in Peking separately from the Sasaki group; the Kanemitsu Hososako group of five people; the Tetsuo Ara group of four people; the Suketsugu Soga group of eleven people; Haruo Okada and Minoru Ono as well as Kinkazu Saionji who lives in Peking—in all 32 people. Present on the Chinese side apart from Mao were Liao Cheng-chi, Chao An-po and other influential leaders in the field of relations with Japan.

We give below the views expressed by Chairman Mao.

### Concerning the Intermediate Zone Theory

At the beginning Chairman Mao raised the following subject: "Japan and China must act in unity, cooperate with each other. Japan is a relatively developed country in the industrial sense. Therefore, it can render us help in many respects. We must support each other politically, too. Is it possible to oppose each other as it was a few years ago?" Having exchanged with Kozo Sasaki and other leaders remarks on Japan's aggression against China in the past, Chairman Mao touched upon the question of American imperialism, intermediate zones, and developed the following idea.

As a result of the war Japan came under the domination of American imperialism. American imperialism also dominates in South Korea, the Philippines, Thailand, etc. The United States has stretched its hand to the Western Pacific and South-East Asia. These stretched hands are too long.

The United States dominates over Europe, Canada and entire Latin America, with the exception of Cuba. It has stretched its hands up to Africa.

All peoples of Asia, Africa and Latin America come out against imperialism. Imperialism is also opposed by Europe, Canada and other countries. Imperialists also come out against

imperialists. Is not de Gaulle an example of this?

There are now two intermediate zones in the world. Asia, Africa and Latin America make up the first, and Europe, North America and Oceania—the second. Japanese monopoly capital refers to the second zone. Even this monopoly capital is discontented with the United States, while some of its representatives openly oppose it. Though the monopoly capital of Japan is now dependent on the United States the time will pass and it will throw off the American yoke.

The Japanese people is a great nation. It waged war against the United States, Britain and France. It attacked Pearl Harbour, occupied Vietnam, the Philippines, Thailand, Malaya and Indonesia. Its offensive reached the eastern part of India.

This, clearly, does not mean that I agree to a repetition of the aggression of Japanese imperialism.

However, I do not think that the monopoly capital of Japan will allow the United States to be a burden to it. Nothing would have been better if Japan, having become completely independent, established contact and cooperation with the forces in Asia striving for national independence.

### **On Chinese-Soviet Dispute**

Dwelling on the so-called Chinese-Soviet dispute, Mao mentioned the Soviet military aid to India, the recall of Soviet specialists and technicians from China, etc. Pointing out that "the relations between us and the Soviet Union since the 20th Congress of the CPSU in 1956 have been worsening", he further said:

"We have been challenged and we are giving a rebuff. We were offered to cease the open discussion for at least three months. We said that we would not cease it even for three days. We were waging war in the course of 25 years. Twenty-two years of them were the civil war and the war against Japan, three years were the war in Korea. Before that I was a teacher. I did not know what war was. Three teachers taught me war. One of them was Chiang Kai-shek, the other—Japanese imperialism and the third—American imperialism. Everyone knows what war means: when it is waged, people die. In these 25 years of war the losses of the Chinese people were several tens of millions of killed and wounded.

"As for war on paper, no people are killed in such war. We have been waging it for several years now, but not a single man has died. And we are ready to continue this war for another 25 years."

### **On Territorial Question**

Head of the delegation of the headquarters of the Socialist Party on the island of Hokkaido, Tetsuo Ara asked: "While we remained unaware, the Kuril Islands were taken away from us under the Yalta agreement and Potsdam declaration. We demand returning them, and would like to hear the opinion of Chairman Mao on this score."

The reply was as follows:

There are too many places occupied by the Soviet Union. According to the Yalta agreement, the Soviet Union, under the pretext of guaranteeing the independence of Mongolia, has actually placed that country under its domination. Mongolia occupies a considerably larger area than the Kuril Islands. In 1954, when Khrushchov and Bulganin came to China, we raised this question, but they refused to talk with us. They have appropriated part of Rumania. Having separated part of East Germany, they expelled the local inhabitants to the Western part. Having separated part of Poland, they included it into Russia, giving to Poland in compensation part of East Germany. The same happened in Finland. They have separated everything that could be separated. Some people have stated that Sinkiang area and the territories north of the Amur River must be

included in the Soviet Union. The USSR is concentrating troops on its border.

The Soviet Union occupies an area of 22 million square kilometres, and its population is only 200 million people. It is high time it stopped the division. Japan occupies an area of 370,000 square kilometres, and its population is 100 million people. About a hundred years ago the area east of the Baikal became Russian territory, and since then Vladivostok, Khabarovsk, Kamchatka and other places are territory of the Soviet Union. We have not yet requested settling this account. As for the Kuril Islands, this question is clear for us. They must be returned to Japan.

*Pravda*, September 2, 1964