

81 Parties' Statement, the two Parties strongly support the struggles being waged by the peoples of Asia, Africa and Latin America and the entire world to build a new life free from exploitation and oppression. **The two Parties agree that the contradiction between imperialism and the oppressed peoples fighting for independence is the main contradiction in the world today.**"

U.S. imperialism as the ringleader of world imperialism is the main obstacle of the Geneva agreements on Indo-China, the statement says. The two Parties condemn U.S. imperialist aggression against the Democratic Republic of Viet Nam and demand that all U.S. imperialist war bases and troops be withdrawn from Indo-China.

The two Parties protest strongly against the barbaric aggression launched by the U.S. imperialists together with the Belgian imperialists, and support the people of the Congo (Leopoldville) who, under the leadership of the National Council for Liberation of the Congo, are waging an armed struggle against the U.S. and Belgian imperialist robbers and their lackeys of the Tshombe ilk.

The two Parties affirm the strong support of the Indonesian and Australian working people for the people of Cuba who are resisting U.S. aggression and subversion unremittingly and courageously, for the peoples of Venezuela, Guatemala, Colombia, Bolivia and other Latin American countries who are taking up arms to fight against the domestic reactionary regimes which fully serve U.S. imperialism.

The statement says, "the two Parties enthusiastically welcome the successful testing of a nuclear weapon by

the People's Republic of China. In contrast with the revisionists the two Parties are of the opinion that this nuclear bomb test not only further consolidates the defence of the socialist camp but also strengthens the struggle of the people of the whole world for independence and genuine peace. China's nuclear bomb test has altered the balance of forces in the world to the advantage of the new emerging forces and to the disadvantage of the old established imperialist force."

Khrushchov's downfall, it says, is a victory for the constantly expanding Marxist-Leninist forces throughout the world. Khrushchov's downfall testifies to the bankruptcy of the modern revisionist domestic and foreign policy of capitulation to imperialism, of the policy of splitting the international communist movement. It benefits the international communist movement. But the two Parties are fully aware that the imperialists as well as the modern revisionists will always do all they possibly can to ensure that Khrushchov's disastrous line continues to be applied. **Thus, the fall of Khrushchov does not mean that the struggle against modern revisionism has now come to an end. Marxist-Leninists throughout the world must firmly unite and actively oppose "modern revisionism without Khrushchov." With or without Khrushchov, modern revisionism must be vigorously opposed!**

"For the cause of unity of the international communist movement, the two Parties hold that an international conference or meeting of the Communist and Workers' Parties can only be justified if it is preceded by adequate preparations in which the Communist and Workers' Parties of all the socialist countries participate," the statement concludes.

The Indonesian C.P. Will Not Participate in Schismatic Meeting in Moscow

— Reply to the Central Committee of the C.P.S.U.

Following is a translation of the December 14 press release of the Information Bureau of the Indonesian Communist Party. — Ed.

SOVIET Ambassador Mikhailov on December 14, 1964, called at the headquarters of the Central Committee of the Indonesian Communist Party to meet D.N. Aidit, Chairman of the Central Committee of the Party. During the meeting they discussed the question of a visit to the Soviet Union by the Central Committee of the Indonesian Communist Party at the invitation of the Central Committee of the C.P.S.U. The Central Committee of the Indonesian Communist Party has accepted the invitation. The date of the visit will be agreed upon by both Parties later and it will also de-

pend on developments in the international communist movement.

In the name of the Central Committee of the Indonesian Communist Party, Aidit handed to Mikhailov the reply of the Central Committee of the Indonesian Communist Party to the letter of the Central Committee of the C.P.S.U. dated December 1, 1964. In its letter the Central Committee of the C.P.S.U. invited the Central Committee of the Indonesian Communist Party to attend the international conference of Communist and Workers' Parties to be convened in Moscow on March 1, 1965.

The Central Committee of the Indonesian Communist Party stated in its reply that unless the most

adequate preparations were made before the conference and unless the Communist and Workers' Parties of all the socialist countries took part in it, the Indonesian Communist Party could not and would not take part in any international conference.

In other words, in view of the fact that adequate preparations have not been made for the international conference and that not all the Communist and Workers'

Parties of the socialist countries will take part in it, the Indonesian Communist Party will not participate in the conference to be held on March 1, 1965.

D.N. Aidit then told Mikhailov that instead of convening such a conference it would be better not to convene it at all, because it would further split the international communist movement and further sharpen the contradictions in it.

Talks Between V.G. Wilcox and E.F. Hill

V.G. WILCOX, General Secretary of the Communist Party of New Zealand, visited Melbourne recently and held informal talks with E.F. Hill, Chairman of the Australian Communist Party (Marxist-Leninist) and other Party leaders, according to a Melbourne report quoting *Vanguard*, organ of the Australian Communist Party (M.-L.).

In their talks, the two sides discussed matters deeply affecting the world Marxist-Leninist movement. They agreed that the main danger, the force causing disunity in the international communist movement today, was constituted by the activities of the modern revisionists in all countries.

Both sides held that although the C.P.S.U.'s removal of the arch-revisionist Khrushchov from office opened up possibilities of reunification, many difficulties still stood in the way of achieving in the communist movement in all countries principled unity based on Marxism-Leninism, on the 1957 Declaration and the 81 Parties' Statement of 1960.

They also agreed that it was a proletarian and communist duty to continue to vigorously fight for this objective.

Taking part in the talks were also P. Malone and C.L. O'Shea, Vice-Chairmen of the Australian C.P. (M.-L.) and F. Johnson, Secretary of the Party.

"Writing About Middle Characters"— A Bourgeois Literary Notion

Following is the second and concluding instalment of a slightly abridged translation of an article by the editorial department of "Wenyi Bao" (Literary Gazette) which appeared in its September 30 issue. The first instalment appeared in our last issue. Subheads and boldface emphases are "Wenyi Bao's." — Ed.

Distortion of Engels' and Chairman Mao's Words Must Be Opposed

THE advocate of writing about "middle characters" has unscrupulously distorted the meaning of what Engels and Chairman Mao have written and has used this wrong interpretation as the theoretical basis for his call to "write about middle characters." This too must be refuted.

He has gravely misinterpreted the letter written to Margaret Harkness by Engels. The basic spirit of this letter is an earnest hope and demand that writers energetically portray the advanced characters of the working class and describe its revolutionary struggles.

Such descriptions, the letter said, "may lay claim to a place in the domain of realism." Engels criticized the authoress of *City Girl* presenting an untypical, too passive image of the workers and for failing to present correctly the ethos of the 1880s. Engels was evidently not satisfied with this novel and he placed his hopes on another work by the same authoress. He earnestly urged her in her future writings to pay attention to describing the active side of the working class. How can such a letter filled with revolutionary spirit be distorted to make out that Engels also approved of stressing the description of the passive side of the working class and writing a great deal about "middle characters" who are neither good nor bad?

As we all know, Chairman Mao from the beginning to the end of his *Talks at the Yen'an Forum on Literature and Art* called on revolutionary writers and artists to sing the praises of the proletariat, the workers, peasants and soldiers and of the bright things of life; he called on writers to write about the new people and the new world. He called on writers and artists to