

Public Polemics Help the Return of the Movement To Marxist-Leninist Position

Says V.G. Wilcox, General Secretary of the Communist Party of New Zealand

THE struggle against imperialism and modern revisionism must be carried through to the end, declared V.G. Wilcox, General Secretary of the Communist Party of New Zealand, in a report presented to a meeting of the National Committee of the Party on July 24-25, on behalf of the Party's political committee.

The report, published in the September issue of the *Communist Review*, organ of the Communist Party of New Zealand, exposed the revisionists' scheme for sham unity but a real split and pointed out that public polemics help the return of the whole international movement to a position of Marxism-Leninism and repudiated the revisionists' call to suddenly stop polemics.

REFERRING to the international situation, Wilcox said, "American imperialism is now rapidly extending its aggressive war in Viet Nam. It is active in Laos, it threatens Cambodia, it is desperately trying to draw its satellites, including New Zealand, into an open conflict."

"The 'men of peace' in Washington, referred to so lovingly by Khrushchov and other revisionists in days gone by, have shown their true colours. **They are proving in practice that their talk of peace, their concern for liberty, for democracy, is but a cloak to cover their aggressive actions.**"

Wilcox continued, "By their actions the imperialists today are **giving Marxist-Leninists a clear picture that now, as in the past, there are no peaceful imperialists.** The classic Marxist interpretation of the nature of imperialism and of its inevitable actions remains as correct today as when it was so brilliantly expounded by Lenin. . . .

"We should not be afraid of these developments, nor should we attempt to turn away and try to compromise with imperialism. The imperialists are acting in this way in sheer desperation. Within the imperialist camp difficulties are growing daily. The strongest imperialism, U.S. imperialism, is committed on a widely-flung field, so wide that there are ever-greater difficulties in holding it at all points. . . .

"Contradictions within the imperialist camp are growing. France continues to move to a more independent imperialist role in opposition to United States imperialism. The once monolithic NATO grouping is no longer united. SEATO . . . is in a worse position."

Referring to the tasks of the Communist Party of New Zealand, Wilcox said, "**Two major tasks face our Party. The first is to develop to the full and under our conditions the anti-imperialist struggle, the struggle against imperialist policy everywhere, headed as it is by the United States.**" He added: we have stood consistently firm. The main enemy to be attacked is U.S. imperialism.

He then dwelt on the great advance of the forces for progress, the anti-imperialist forces in the world which had weakened the imperialist position. "The whole socialist camp and our whole movement," he said, "**has been strengthened in this period by the successful developing of the nuclear bomb by socialist China.** A very necessary development in view of the nuclear blackmail attempted by the United States imperialists and the obvious reluctance of the Soviet Union to defend the socialist camp and the people of the world from this United States pressure."

He noted that recent events had shown that "no matter how much manoeuvring is done, how many rumours are spread, military equipment (to Viet Nam) is **not coming through** yet in any quantity from the country which had boasted for years that it not only has more weapons than the United States but it has superior ones."

"In this period, too, the attempts of neo-colonialism, to the dismay of the imperialists, are meeting with greater resistance in many of the newly liberated countries. Indonesia is an example of this. There the correct stand of the Indonesian Communist Party against all the persuasive wiles of modern revisionism is bearing fruit. . . . The attempt over many years by United States imperialism to woo the Indonesian national-liberation revolutionary leaders and gain a privileged place in Indonesian economy, is failing. A great blow against imperialism."

The second major task facing the Communist Party of New Zealand, he said, arises from the first, "**that is, to continue the fight against revisionism, the main danger in our world movement and in our Party. . . .** It is so because if the ideas of the modern revisionists in any way affect either our thinking or our activity, then . . . no fully developed fight against imperialism on all fronts can be developed." "**With any tinge of revisionism, for example, we could never stand firm on the Viet Nam call. . . . There would be words but not deeds. We would fall for ideas that lead to negotiation**

with the United States while the United States holds its armed forces in a position of strength."

SPEAKING of carrying forward the struggle against revisionism through to the end, he said, the ideas of Khrushchov, the arch-leader of modern revisionism, "still prevail in the leadership of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union and many other Parties. The attempts by revisionism to defeat or split those Parties standing firm on a Marxist-Leninist position have been defeated, in spite of the many unscrupulous actions and interferences by overseas revisionists. This is so in the N.Z. Party as it is so in the Japanese and Indonesian Parties."

The statement of the March divisive meeting convened by the new leadership of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union "contained good words on the struggle against imperialism on a world scale, but made no move for a return to a Marxist-Leninist approach in theory and practice, on the vital questions of peaceful coexistence, peaceful transition possibilities, world peace and disarmament. . . . It issued a call for unity, not based on Marxism-Leninism, not on principled discussion of differences. . . . It is a false cry to say, 'Let's unite now because the things that separate us are much less than the things we agree on.' To accept this is to accept their revisionist ideas and the defeat it would lead to. In other words, in practice, this call, if acted on, would mean, 'unite now, act on revisionist policy and theory, stop polemics and let time work things out.' This call was either sheer idealism or a cunning attempt to create differences within Parties holding firmly to Marxism-Leninism. It was not a genuine call for principled unity. **There can, and will be, no real unity in our world movement until there is an acceptance by all of the need for an objective, critical and self-critical examination of all that has happened from at least the time of the 20th Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union.**"

IN regard to the question of a world meeting, he said, "This should, in our opinion, be delayed for a considerable period. Nothing but more trouble causing delight to our imperialist enemies would come from any early meeting." The principle of equality between Parties in any discussion must be encouraged "in order to eradicate the dangerous paternalism or 'big Party' attitude that has been encountered in Moscow. . . . Every effort must be made to ensure that the leadership of the C.P.S.U. see the grave errors made at the 22nd Congress in relation to the leadership of the Albanian Party of Labour. . . ."

"We repeat that no sudden discussion, no undue haste on a false call for unity can replace the necessity for time and proper patient preparation, for lengthy prior discussion before any world meeting. Certainly all Parties of the socialist world must agree to attend if any meeting is to be held. This is our firm view."

Referring to polemics, he said, "Khrushchov made the whole issue one of public polemics when he apparently considered that this would strengthen revision-

ism. Those polemics now, of necessity, have to continue until all Parties are satisfied that they have stated their full case. The tactics of Khrushchov, started openly in 1960, forced this situation upon our movement. It was not done by Marxist-Leninists. Therefore the call for the cessation of public polemics is, to say the least, premature. . . . Public polemics today have reached the nodal point whereby they are now helping the return of the whole of our movement to a position of Marxism-Leninism on a world scale. Therefore we must reject any revisionist call to suddenly stop polemics."

Dwelling on theories of the revisionists, Wilcox said, "When our delegation went to Moscow for the bilateral talks you will remember the rather lengthy attack by Comrade Suslov on our statement concerning the storm-centres of world revolution. We said they were today in Asia, Africa and Latin America. . . . The struggle in these areas, the weak points of imperialism, must not only be continued but assisted in all possible ways. Not only as a proletarian international duty, but as the only way to place on the agenda, in our countries of the imperialist world, the question of the socialist revolution. To talk, as the revisionists do, and say that the role of the working-class in the main capitalist countries is belittled and underestimated in this approach is sheer nonsense. . . ."

"They say to the Communists and the revolutionary forces of the world — including those in areas where revolution has matured, 'you must wait until you can strike at the strongholds of imperialism.' That means you must accept the status quo in all parts of the world indefinitely."

"If we place that as the first priority, illusions of peaceful transition to socialism everywhere are created. It fits in with waiting. We work for a 'world without arms, a world without war' while imperialism still exists. It is an impossibility. While colonialism still exists, while neo-colonialism develops, are we to place the question of assistance to the full to the storm-centres (those in actual fighting combat with imperialism) as secondary? If we do, emphasis logically develops on negotiation rather than struggle, on compromise rather than firmness. **The revisionists do not see the full significance of the victory of the national-liberation revolution on a world scale. They do not see the vital necessity of taking that revolution forward to the socialist revolution. They do not see that if that is not done then not only will neo-colonialism have many victories, but also that capitalism will grow in the newly liberated countries.**"

WILCOX said, the revisionists "automatically fail to understand the nature of the contradictions in the world today. They see in the world of 1965 the contradiction between imperialism and socialism as not just the major one, but the only one of importance. They merely give lip service to other important contradictions which all Marxists must take fully into account when forming policy, when developing tactics."

The growing contradiction between and within imperialism is ignored as being unimportant in the present era. The contradictions between the imperialists and the proletariat in the imperialist countries is dulled by a wrong concept of 'peaceful coexistence' Is all of this not reflected too in the 'peaceful transition' propositions? Most important, the tremendous importance of the contradictions between the oppressed peoples of the colonial and former colonial world and imperialism, the contradiction that produces the revolutionary storm-centres is . . . ignored." "It is the merging of this contradiction with . . . that between imperialism and socialism that produces the conditions

for further advance by our world movement." Wilcox repudiated the modern revisionist theory on the building of communism in any one country and the policy of big-nation chauvinism of the Soviet Union in trying to place the economic construction of other socialist countries to suit its needs. He noted: before the victory of socialism in both town and country and while imperialism still exists, it is foolish to speak of advance to full communism. "A sound, socialist economy cannot be built at this stage of history in any one country if it is tied to a policy of development designed to meet the immediate needs of one socialist country, the Soviet Union."