

# New Zealand C.P. on March Moscow Meeting

- The C.P.S.U. leadership's adherence to Khrushchov's line can only deepen the split in the international communist movement.
- Only when capitulation to imperialism is abandoned can there be unity.

*Following is the full text of the statement issued by the Political Committee of the Communist Party of New Zealand on the schismatic March Moscow meeting. — Ed.*

**T**HE Political Committee of the Communist Party of New Zealand met on March 19 to consider the communique issued by the meeting of the representatives of 19 Parties held in Moscow from March 1 to March 5, 1965. Assessing the meeting and communique, the Political Committee adopted the following views:

1. The communique, behind a facade of "fair words," shows the intention of the leadership of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union to continue the bankrupt policies and tactics of Khrushchov and to continue working for a split in the world communist movement by attempting to force a revisionist line on all Communist and Workers' Parties.

2. The form and character of the meeting was down-graded from that of a drafting commission to prepare a new world meeting and instead was called a

"consultative meeting." Nevertheless, the fact that it was held at all in face of opposition and protests from a number of Communist Parties, including the Communist Party of New Zealand, shows the intention of the convenors—the Communist Party of the Soviet Union leadership—to pursue basically the same course as Khrushchov towards the Parties adhering to Marxism-Leninism.

3. The communique attempts concretely to continue the tactics of working for a split by its proposal for an 81 Parties' "consultative meeting," to prepare a new world conference.

Such a "consultative meeting" held in circumstances in which the leaderships of those Parties supporting Khrushchov's revisionism in practice follow the path of capitulation to imperialism, must inevitably lead to an open split. The Political Committee calls attention to the following points in connection with both the 19 Parties' meeting and the communique.

Firstly, the meeting took place at a time when the U.S. imperialists were conducting flagrant acts of

aggression against a socialist country, the Democratic Republic of Viet Nam. This aggression—which is aggression against the whole socialist camp—is continuing unabated. Despite this, neither during the meeting or since, have the leaderships of the C.P.S.U. and the other seven socialist countries participating taken concrete steps in practice to repulse the aggression.

This fact exposes the words of the communique calling for unity to fight imperialism as being no more than hollow deception. Events show with absolute clarity that the practice being followed by the modern revisionists is the practice of capitulation to imperialism.

The united action against imperialism called for in the “fair words” of the communique cannot be built on the practice of capitulation. Such a unity would be a fraud. It would mean subordinating the genuine anti-imperialist forces to the requirements of imperialism.

The test of any Communist Party is its practice. In a situation where imperialism is waging aggressive war against a socialist country, the only firm, the only possible basis for uniting the socialist camp and the world communist movement is the abandonment by the revisionists of capitulation in practice, of which the absence of action in defence of socialist Viet Nam is a glaring example.

Without such practical evidence of willingness to wage a real struggle against imperialism, “fair words” on unity were worthless.

Secondly, the changes in the form and title of the meeting in Moscow were impelled by the fact that seven of the 26 Parties invited refused to attend. These included the Communist Parties of five socialist countries—Albania, China, Viet Nam, Korea and Rumania plus the Communist Parties of Indonesia (the largest in the capitalist world) and Japan. As well as this, a number of the Parties participating had previously expressed their reluctance to proceed with the type of meeting envisaged by Khrushchov—one that would immediately force an open split.

Thus the down-grading of the meeting was brought about by growing opposition to revisionist methods, not through any conscious recognition by the revisionists of the previous wrong methods of treatment of other fraternal Parties. There was, and has been, no open admission of erroneous practices in terms of the methods laid down in the 81 Parties’ Statement for maintaining comradesly relations between Parties and for settling differences between them. As the C.P.N.Z. and other fraternal Parties have repeatedly pointed out, the very holding of the 19 Parties’ meeting was in contravention of the methods laid down in the Statement. The convening of this meeting from the point of view of the world communist movement as a whole was thus illegal and the meeting can have no status in relation

to the calling of any meetings or conferences of the world movement. In this respect nothing can ensue from it, other than deeper division.

Thirdly, the proposal of the 19 Parties for a “consultative meeting” of the 81 Parties to prepare a world meeting, as stated in the communique, is an attempt to impose on the world communist movement the same objectives which were originally sought by Khrushchov in illegally convening a “drafting commission,” for December 1964. The postponement of that meeting following Khrushchov’s downfall had clearly not been motivated by an abandonment of Khrushchov’s policies, tactics and methods. These have already done great damage to the unity of the socialist camp and the struggles of the international working class and the national-liberation movements against imperialism.

It appears from the fact that the leaders of the C.P.S.U. still proceeded with the meeting, even in its down-graded form, and from the proposal of the communique, that they are bent on forcing the acceptance of these policies, tactics, and methods on all Parties.

As the C.P.N.Z. has consistently pointed out, the procedures laid down in the 1960 Statement must be adhered to if there is to be a world meeting productive of Marxist-Leninist unity.

The leaders of the C.P.S.U. did not comply with the procedures of the Statement in the calling of the Moscow meeting. Now again, they are not complying with these procedures, but are substituting their own, that of calling an 81 Parties’ “consultative meeting,” to prepare a world conference of Parties.

In the absence of real conditions to make such a “consultative meeting” productive, such a gathering would have virtually the same results as the conference planned by Khrushchov—the open splitting of the world movement through attempts to impose on all of the Parties the anti-Marxist-Leninist revisionist line of the C.P.S.U. leadership.

The Political Committee therefore rejects this proposal. It calls instead for bilateral talks, in which the modern revisionists can start a thoroughgoing self-criticism of their mistakes, and an abandonment of attempts to impose their capitulationist practice and theory on the world communist movement. It calls for immediate steps by the leaders of the C.P.S.U. and the other participants to demonstrate in practice that they are prepared to defend the integrity of the socialist camp by rendering all possible and necessary assistance to the Democratic Republic of Viet Nam in repulsing the imperialist aggressors.

Only when the practice of capitulation and its theoretical justification are abandoned, can there be a real prospect of establishing the unity of the world communist movement on a firm, truly Marxist-Leninist foundation. That sort of unity is what the Political Committee of the C.P.N.Z. desires. This is what it has fought for. This is what it will continue to fight for.