



New Zealand

**COMMUNIST  
REVIEW**

JUNE, 1965

Price 1/6

- ☆ Contradictions and Revisionism
- ☆ Full Statement on Moscow Meeting
- ☆ Role of Branch Bulletin
- ☆ Apartheid and Freedom
- ☆ Revisionism in 20th Congress

New Zealand

THE

REVIEW



JUNE 1963

Price

of Communications and Revisionism  
by the Government on Moscow Meeting  
of the State of Affairs Bulletin  
of the State and Freedom  
of the State in 5th Congress

# CONTENTS

- Contradictions and Revisionism**  
(By V. G. Wilcox) Page 2
- Full Political Committee Statement on  
the March Moscow Meeting**  
Page 6
- Speech at the Congress of the Social-  
Democratic Party of Switzer-  
land, November 4, 1916**  
(By V. I. Lenin) Page 21
- The Frontiers of Freedom**  
(From The African Communist)  
Page 24
- The Branch Bulletin in Party Work**  
(By N. Gould) Page 35
- C.P.S.U. 20th Congress—Root of All  
Evils of Khrushchov Revisionists**  
(From Peking Review) Page 42

Published 9/6/65.

Registered at the G.P.O., Wellington, as a Magazine.

---

Published by the In Print Publishing Co. Ltd., 109 Nelson St., Auckland;  
and printed by Wilson Printery Ltd., 109 Nelson St., Auckland.

# Contradictions and Revisionism

By V. G. WILCOX

**TO-DAY** many Communists and others who look towards a world without imperialism, a world of peace, a socialist world, give full support to the struggle of the oppressed people in Asia, Africa and Latin America.

They welcome the many victories of the national liberation movement in many former imperialist colonies over imperialism headed by the United States imperialists. They are fully aware of the dangers of neo-colonialism as imperialism's way of coming back in the back-door after being driven out the front, but they totally fail to see the vital connection between the victories of the national liberation movement over imperialism and the question of the victory of the masses in the imperialist countries themselves led by the working class. They fail to see that national liberation victories on a world scale, the defeat of all their neo-colonialist attempts and the carrying-forward of the national liberation revolution to the socialist revolution, as Lenin so clearly indicated was essential, creates, by its very economic and political weakening of the main capitalist countries, the conditions that place on the agenda the question of revolution in the imperialist strongholds of to-day.

In this they are consciously or unconsciously following the lead of modern revisionism. How do the present-day revisers of Marxism-Leninism approach this subject? First, they do not see the full significance of the victory of the national revolution on a world scale, nor do they see the need to assist in carrying that victorious revolution forward to the socialist revolution. They, therefore, give lip-service to the struggles of the oppressed peoples, they give insufficient practical aid, particularly when faced with firm opposition from U.S. imperialism.

Has not this situation emerged in South-East Asia? Is it not a fact that the present position there, the extent of the U.S. actions, the escalating across the border into socialist North Vietnam, would never have occurred if essential practical aid had been given at an earlier period instead of a lot of talk? And is it not a fact that the revisionists

do not see the need for the people under the leadership of the Marxist-Leninist party carrying forward from national liberation to Socialism?

By in practice allowing the concept of national liberation, no matter how progressive the leadership, to be the end, by accepting in those countries what is, in fact, petty-bourgeois socialism, or, shall I put it, a new form of social-democratic socialism, accepting a one-party system not based on proletarian state power and a party of Marxism-Leninism, they create the conditions for the rise of a strong native bourgeoisie in the newly-liberated countries and open the door to imperialism through neo-colonialism.

This, in fact, has happened. It has happened in India; it could happen elsewhere.

### **Revisionism Undermines National Liberation**

Marxist-Leninists can, and should, welcome and support, for example, the anti-imperialist stand of Nasser in Egypt, but they cannot ignore the complete suppression and torture by his regime of those suspected of Communist leanings; yet the revisionists, in practice, do just that. The revisionists speak glibly of the key role of the working class in imperialist strongholds and of the advance to Socialism in those strongholds, but they ignore or call dogmatists those who say that, for the advance to revolution in the imperialist strongholds to become a practical possibility, further and complete victories must be achieved in what are to-day the storm-centres of world revolution, Asia, Africa and, to a degree, Latin America.

They even have the impudence to speak of those who do not agree with their negative non-revolutionary position as just "agrarian revolutionaries," not Communists. As glibly as Kautsky of old, they speak of proletarian victory in the capitalist world but fail to help create the conditions that will make that victory possible. In other words, they are but talkers. Precisely what they accuse those who they say are dogmatists of doing they do. In fact, it is obviously a well-used trick of modern revisionism to accuse others of their own worst sins. In practice, they attempt, by over-emphasis on negotiation with imperialism and by lack of effective assistance, to hold back the struggle in the revolutionary storm-centres of to-day. It is there where people are fighting imperialism with guns in their hands, mainly captured from the imperialists, dying in the struggle, but delivering heavy blows against imperialism.

It is the duty of all Marxist-Leninists to understand the

position in the countries of the imperialist strongholds. It is our proletarian duty to do so in New Zealand. We must not listen to glib talk of peaceful co-existence. Peaceful co-existence not in Lenin's sense but in the concept of possible long-term peace with imperialism, to over-emphasis of the possibilities of peaceful transition to Socialism on a world scale, to ideas of the possibility of total disarmament shortly while imperialism exists and fights.

We must, in ordinary every-day language, explain our position to our masses and we must explain our policy based on a Marxist-Leninist approach and not on revisionist idealistic illusions. Only in that way can we move forward in the countries of imperialism, not just in words, not just by waving a little red flag, but by actually doing something.

Recently in some countries we have seen, including New Zealand, considerable activity, demonstrations against the United States imperialists following the bombing of North Vietnam, and support for the struggle for the people of South Vietnam and of South-East Asia against U.S. imperialism. This has been on a fairly wide basis.

### **Revisionists Ignore Main Contradictions**

The Communist Party of New Zealand itself has quite a proud record over recent months in regard to this, both in the demonstrations outside U.S. Consular offices and the poster-parade activity of Party branches, the national leaflets, special branch bulletins, public meetings and so on. But it has not only been the Communist Party. Quite a considerable section of the people in other organisations have been well and truly on the job carrying out anti-imperialist activity.

But let us look at this on a world scale. Did the revisionists like these kind of actions? Judging by the speed with which demonstrators outside the U.S. Embassy in Moscow recently were crudely suppressed, the answer is "No." In fact, the speed of apologising to the U.S. imperialists was almost like greased lightning.

**This raises the question of what is the basic cause of the modern revisionists getting into this position? Is it not that on many questions they have revised Marxism to such a point that, on essential aspects of understanding the nature of the contradictions in the world to-day they are totally astray? Consistently they make it plain that for them they see the contradiction between Socialism and imperialism, not just as the major contradiction but as the**

only one of any importance. They merely give lip-service to other contradictions in our world.

What do they, in fact, ignore by doing this? They ignore such main contradictions as those between imperialism and the proletariat of the imperialist world, the growing contradictions between the various imperialist powers themselves, and, finally and most important, the contradiction between the imperialists and the people of the oppressed colonial world and the newly-liberated world.

They fail to see or deliberately ignore the primary importance from a revolutionary Marxist-Leninist approach of the contradiction between imperialism and the oppressed people of the colonial world and the newly-liberated areas at this stage of history. They ignore the fact that to-day, in 1965, it is the merging of the contradictions between the imperialists and the old colonial world—the oppressed people of Asia, Africa and Latin America—that is the storm-centre of revolutionary struggle against imperialism, and therefore, for Marxist-Leninists both in the socialist countries and outside, the forwarding of this struggle in those areas is the core of successful anti-imperialist struggle. They fail to see that its success is a step nearer to the final defeat of imperialism, its death on a world scale.

Our struggle against international and internal monopoly will never reach its final success internally in New Zealand or Australia without those other victories. For us in New Zealand to fully grasp this and its significance is not just a matter of being correct on theory; it is not even just a matter of giving every possible practical aid to the national liberation struggle against imperialism as an international proletarian duty. No, it is a matter that we can, only from this, fully understand and see the correct road forward, clearly see that the victory over imperialism in the present revolutionary storm-centres places on the agenda the possibility of defeat of a then-weakened imperialism in the strongholds of imperialism, the old capitalist world, of which we are part. For us in New Zealand it would then be an immediate task to advance and put into practical activity our policy, New Zealand's Road to Socialism, not, as at present, preparing the way for the future, but by direct assault on the citadels of Capitalism.

# Full Political Committee Statement on the March Moscow Meeting

Adopted by the Political Committee, C.P.N.Z.,  
March 24, 1965.

## **I**NTRODUCTION:

Once again the Marxist-Leninist line of the C.P.N.Z. has been verified by life itself. The moves of the leadership of the C.P.S.U. to compel the world parties to embrace a revisionist line have met with another setback.

A meeting of 19 Parties was convened in Moscow on March 1, 1965, by the leadership of the C.P.S.U. The Political Committee of the C.P.N.Z. has made a critical Marxist-Leninist analysis of this meeting and of its communique. It also studied the role of the meeting and its organisers in the conditions of the undeclared war which U.S. imperialism is waging against the socialist world.

The main conclusions which the Political Committee arrived at are briefly summed up as follows:

- (1) By attempting to foist this improper meeting upon the World Communist Movement the organisers have continued to do harm to the cause of Communism and the world's working class.
- (2) The communique is an attempt, under cover of soft words and Marxist-Leninist phrases, to create further disunity in the world movement.
- (3) It makes clear that the leaders of the C.P.S.U. (and their supporters in other places) persist in their revisionist ideas and are determined to impose them upon the world movement.
- (4) The practical effect of the meeting is to encourage imperialism to continue its war of destruction in Vietnam, threaten China with attacks and intensify its ruthless suppression of national liberation struggle.
- (5) That the World Communist Movement must stand firm on the ground that an attack on any one soci-



alist country is an attack on all socialist countries, and must be met by their combined might. The vital task of the C.P.N.Z. is to strive to win the working class to lead the struggle to stop the U.S. war against Socialist Vietnam and to force the withdrawal of U.S. troops from South Vietnam.

- (6) That the struggle against revisionism (opportunism) within the world parties is the road to the revolutionary unity of the movement—the necessary condition for new victories for Socialism and the defeat of imperialism with its continuous threat of war.

### **Background to the Meeting**

From the time the leadership of the C.P.N.Z. first became aware of the world ideological dispute, it has always been in favour of the holding of an international meeting of the world parties—provided such a meeting was held with the object of reaching ideological unity and not with the object of forcing an organisational split. That is why it has always insisted that such a meeting be preceded by bi-lateral discussion between the parties involved in differences.

It considers this essential, first, because it complies with the procedure laid down by the 81 Parties' Meeting in 1960. Secondly, because it is necessary for the parties involved to study problems from a critical and self-critical point of view in order to provide a real Marxist-Leninist foundation for such a world meeting.

Together with the Workers' Party of Vietnam and the Communist Party of Indonesia, the C.P.N.Z. was among the first parties to call for discussions between the Communist Party of the Soviet Union and the Albanian Party of Labour and the Communist Party of the Soviet Union and the Communist Party of China. In February, 1962, it wrote to the three parties concerned asking them to hold such discussions. The letter arose from the concern of the C.P.N.Z. at the action of Khrushchov in publicly attacking the Albanian Party of Labour at the 22nd Congress of the C.P.S.U. late in 1961.

Although the Communist Party of China had indicated its willingness, no talks were held. The situation deteriorated. Toward the end of 1962, a series of conferences of fraternal Parties in Eastern Europe and in Italy were used as forums from which to attack both the Albanian Party of Labour and the Communist Party of China. The 1963 National Conference of the C.P.N.Z. endorsed a confidential report which critically examined the dispute and

characterised the line of the leadership of the C.P.S.U. as revisionist. For reasons stated later, the C.P.S.U. changed its line from opposition to one in favour of a world meeting. The C.P.N.Z. insisted that bi-lateral talks between the Parties concerned must first be held. Some such talks were arranged. It soon became apparent that the C.P.S.U. leadership had no intention of allowing the talks to become a down-to-earth search for the truth in a Marxist-Leninist manner. The Communist Party of China's representatives met in Moscow on July 15, 1963. But on the day preceding, the leaders of the C.P.S.U. published to the world its infamous attack on the Chinese Party contained in the now notorious Open Letter. Despite this, the C.P.C. proceeded with the talks. It became clear that the leadership of the C.P.S.U. was quite unable to provide a Marxist-Leninist answer to the fundamental criticisms of its line which were made by the Chinese Party.

In subsequent talks held with other Parties, C.P.S.U. leaders showed only too clearly their total unwillingness to examine doubts and criticisms concerning their line in a thorough-going Marxist-Leninist manner.

The talks held by our own Party delegation in Moscow in 1963 makes this very clear. Our frank and free presentation of views was, as comrades know, met with the same tirade of abuse and subjectivism which had been inflicted upon other Party delegations seeking a similar down-to-earth critical and self-critical study of problems on the basis of Marxist-Leninist science.

The attitude of the C.P.S.U. leaders may be summed up: "There shall be no criticism of our line. You must submit to this line even though you consider it revisionist. This line is the line to which all world Parties must adhere without question. We shall see to it that any who do not do so are ostracised from the world movement." Thus the line of "compulsory unity with revisionism" or open split emerged as the line of the C.P.S.U. leaders. The Albanian Party of Labour was arrogantly told by Khrushchov and his colleagues that they would be re-admitted to the family without difficulty only if they would accept without question the revisionist line of the leaders of the C.P.S.U. Consequently no talks have yet been held between the C.P.S.U. and the A.P.L. Khrushchov and his colleagues clearly felt powerful enough to enforce their line on the world movement. It underlay their switch in early 1963 from a policy of opposition to a world meeting to that of pressing for one. Relying on their followers in the leadership of a number of other Communist Parties,

they pressed on with their intention of enforcing their revisionist line on all Communist Parties or openly splitting the movement. They insisted on convening a preparatory committee in contravention to the requirements of the World Parties' Statement of 1960.

### **Revisionists Call Preparatory Meeting**

It is against this background that the C.P.N.Z. and other Marxist-Leninist Parties and groups throughout the world strongly opposed the unilateral and improper action of the revisionist leaders of the C.P.S.U. in their attempts to set up a committee to prepare and convene a meeting of world parties. The C.P.N.Z. opposed these moves because it had become firmly convinced that the aim was not to re-establish world unity of the Communist movement on the firm foundations of Marxism-Leninism, but, on the contrary, to attempt once again to impose upon it the revisionist line developed by Khrushchov and his colleagues and to bring about an open split.

Khrushchov had fixed the date for December 15, 1964. In the meantime Khrushchov fell.

It is clear from statements and criticisms made at the time and subsequently that Khrushchov was removed from all positions for the reason (among others) that bourgeois individualism (capitalist ideology) had become dominant in his world outlook. Marxist-Leninists know that this bourgeois outlook could not develop in a vacuum. The surrounding soil must be favourable. With such strong bourgeois characteristics no individual could conquer the foremost position in the C.P.S.U. unless this bourgeois ideology had also become prevalent in the outlook of his influential colleagues, at least on the Presidium. Neither could this bourgeois ideology amongst the top leaders be confined merely to crude and blatant mannerisms. Bourgeois ideology and methods will inevitably be reflected in policy that is anti-Marxist and counter-revolutionary, i.e., anti-working class. And this is precisely what happened in the top leadership of the C.P.S.U. The Marxist-Leninist scientific foundations of Communist policy were undermined and policies which served imperialism (but which were still garnished with Marxist-Leninist phraseology) were dished up to the Communist Parties and the world working class. Here are the roots of the present-day ideological struggle in the world Communist movement.

Consequently, it is not correct to conclude that Khrushchov's dismissal from his positions was due to the admitted fact of his bourgeois individualism. It is necessary to see

that the wrong policies developed by him and his colleagues were running into difficulties. They were not winning the desired allies in the world movement. The crude and blatant manifestations of bourgeois ideology in Khrushchov's personal attitude were increasingly hampering his colleagues in putting them across. The tactics had to be changed. A smoother line was necessary. That is why Khrushchov had to go. This was proven by the fact that the meeting Khrushchov insisted upon calling was suspended but not cancelled. His successors persisted in forcing the meeting on the world movement. They set a new date, March 1, 1965, despite the opposition of an increasing number of world parties and groups, including some which had previously supported the Khrushchov tactics. Others, as for example, the Communist Party of Australia, continued to support the Khrushchov tactics to the full, as the following quote from the Tribune (10/2/65) proves:

**"The Central Committee of the Communist Party of Australia last week-end endorsed the report of its delegation (Messrs. L. Aarons and J. Moss), which had held discussions with the leaderships of the Communist Parties of the Soviet Union, Italy and France.**

**"The committee decided its views on the situation in the world Communist movement and gave directions to its delegation (Messrs. L. L. Sharkey and L. Aarons) to the proposed preparatory committee for a meeting of the world Communist movement.**

**"IT CONSIDERED THAT SUCH A PREPARATORY MEETING SHOULD BE HELD EVEN IF SOME PARTIES REFUSE TO ATTEND AND THAT IT SHOULD CONVENE A MEETING OF AS MANY PARTIES AS POSSIBLE."**

Again, we should note the determination of the organisers to avoid the proper preparation as laid down in the 81 Parties' Statement. The necessity for bi-lateral talks between Parties on a free and equal basis is once again spurned, and with it any serious attempt to establish a real Marxist-Leninist foundation for building world Communist unity.

Revolutionary unity of Communist Parties can only develop on the basis of their ideological unity on the principles of Marxism-Leninism. Any other approach can be nothing else but a futile attempt to reconcile irreconcilable opposites—revisionism and Marxism-Leninism, i.e., capitalist-class ideology and working-class ideology. This cannot develop revolutionary unity. It can create only fur-

ther disunity.

It is this kind of "unity"—"unity of the working-class with its enemy, imperialism"—which the leaders of the C.P.S.U. offered our Party and other Marxist-Leninist Parties. It is, as we shall see later, this kind of "unity" which the 19 Parties are trying to foist on the world Parties under the cover of Marxist-Leninist phrases.

Consequently, it is necessary to see that plan outlined in the communique to convene a meeting of the 81 Parties to consider whether an international conference should be held is merely a new revisionist trick to achieve their anti-Marxist-Leninist objectives under the pretence of "overcoming the differences and strengthening the solidarity of the world Communist movement."

### **The Failure of the "Preparatory Meeting"**

On the date of the meeting only 19 of the 26 invited Parties attended. Significant absentees included five of the Parties from the socialist world, namely, Albania, China, Korea, Rumania and Vietnam. Indonesia (the largest Communist Party outside of the socialist world) and Japan also refused to attend.

The pressures of the world Parties (including some like Italy and Britain, who attended) and the failure to get a representatives gathering forced a change in the character of the meeting—from one which was to organise and prepare a meeting of world Parties in 1965 to a downgraded "consultative meeting." This was a setback for the revisionist leaders of the C.P.S.U., the organisers of the meeting.

A second blow was that the meeting itself was forced to recognise that it could not prepare and proceed to convene a conference of world Parties. But it is equally clear from the communique that the organisers have not given up their hopes of imposing their revisionist ideas on the world movement.

In furtherance of this, they have now decided that ALL Parties shall be consulted on the holding of a preliminary conference of the 81 Parties which would be held to consider the suitability of holding another international conference.

Such are the ridiculous antics which the revisionist leaders have to perform in an effort to save face and in the hope of prolonging their declining influence. It is a futile effort to avoid the real issue—a thorough-going critical and self-critical analysis of their false theories and practice by the scientific Marxist-Leninist method.

## World Events and Revisionist Practice Expose Revisionism

The third and most telling blow to the organisers of the Moscow Meeting was struck by world events.

American bombs were raining down on socialist soil as the representatives of the 19 Parties sat down in Moscow to solve the problems of the world Communist movement. Lives of men, women and children were being destroyed in socialist Vietnam. The property of the socialist toilers was being blown to smithereens. The delegates talked on. Yes, they mentioned Vietnam. In the communique of the meeting, it is dismissed in a single sentence. Here is the extract from the Tribune (10/3/65):

"In their statement, the participants of the meeting expressed their solidarity with the heroic Vietnamese people and the Workers' Party of Vietnam and called for international solidarity in the struggle against the aggressive actions of the American militarists."

True, they also issued what is described as a call for "world-wide public action to support the people of Vietnam." But it cannot by any means be described as a clarion call. There were representatives of some eight socialist countries present at the meeting, but there was not a single reference to the fact that acts of war against one socialist country are acts of war against them all. The Statement failed to record what has been readily forthcoming on other occasions, i.e., that the might of the whole socialist camp will be used to defend the socialist soil—sacred to the world's working class—wherever it may be.

It is not idle to ask: Would the communique have been so lacking in fighting spirit had the American bombs been falling on the soil of the Soviet Union?

To the imperialists, the 19 Parties' communique would come as a welcome re-assurance that the Khrushchov line still prevailed in the Soviet leadership and among their supporters in the leadership of other Communist Parties.

The hollow ring of the communique, despite liberal use of Marxist-Leninist phraseology, would go far to convince the U.S. Government that, for the time being at least, an empty barrage of words was the only obstacle their bombers were likely to meet from the quarters that might otherwise have ended their missions of death.

Surely, a sorry contrast to the days of Stalin and Molotov. Then the statements of Soviet leaders were recognised to mean what was said. Then a healthy respect was engendered in the imperialists for the inviolability of

the territories of the Soviet Union and other socialist lands. And this, too, prevailed even while the U.S. still held a complete monopoly of atomic weapons.

And so, once again, the line of the revisionists is exposed as the line of capitulation to imperialism. The working class of the world is learning from life. Deeds, not words, are rapidly becoming its test of Parties and leaders. From the Cuban crisis to Vietnam, the working class has been faced with the manoeuvring of the revisionists in the leadership of the C.P.S.U. Many were temporarily taken in. The capitulation involved in the Partial Test-Ban Treaty was believed by many to be a big step towards the elimination of the threat of nuclear war. Daily, too, the phoney theories on war and peace, peaceful transition and peaceful co-existence with the "reasonable imperialists" are being exploded by life.

The actions of Khrushchov and his colleagues towards Albania; the embracing of the revisionist Tito (whose role as a servant of imperialism has become more thoroughly exposed); the arming of India against socialist China; the disruption of the Trade Union, Peace, Youth and Women's Congresses; the attempt to break up the Tokyo Conference on A- and H-Bombs; the interference through diplomatic channels in the internal affairs of Communist Parties; and the encouragement of local revisionists to split Parties adhering to Marxist-Leninist principles—the significance of all these things has become much more widely known and understood. More and more workers are becoming clear that revisionism does not serve their class but the enemies of the working class. As a consequence, the Marxist-Leninist Parties throughout the world are gaining in prestige and support. This is shown by the resounding defeat of the revisionist Communist Party in Kerala which was supported by the Soviet leadership.

### **Two Lines on Unity**

The phoney theories referred to before and which have given rise to the disgraceful acts mentioned are manifested in the communique of the 19 Parties. One excerpt suffices to establish this (Tribune, March 10, 1965):

"Even in the presence of differences concerning political line and many important problems of theory and tactics, it is quite possible and necessary to strive to achieve unity of action in the struggle against imperialism, in world support of the liberation movement of the peoples, in the struggle for universal peace and peaceful co-existence of states with different social systems, whether they are large countries or small, and in the struggle for the vital interests and historical tasks of the working class."

Here the revisionist line developed at the 20th Congress, C.P.S.U., under the leadership of Khrushchov and his colleagues, is clearly continued. The communiqué abounds in references to "unity on the basis of Marxism-Leninism," "proletarian internationalism," "the line established by the Declaration of 1957 and the Statement of 1960," "unite for the common struggle against imperialism, colonialism and neo-colonialism," etc., etc. The meeting, it was claimed, was motivated by "a spirit of active effort to consolidate the world Communist movement so that it may fulfill its great historic tasks." "Unity, unity and still more unity," is the cry! The Tribune quotation discloses the kind of "unity" they seek. It is "unity" on the basis of revisionism. Its purpose is to consolidate the phoney policies of revisionism. They as good as say to the vanguard parties of the proletariat: "We don't care what your differences are on theory, politics or tactics. We must have 'unity'."

Every class-conscious trade unionist is wide awake to this self-same trick so often put across by right-wing trade union leaders. From bitter experience he has learned how right-wing calls for "unity" in "the workers' interests" can turn an imminent victory of a working-class struggle into a defeat.

What militant unionist has not heard this theme-song from the Labour Party leaders? Even Messrs. Holyoake and Nordmeyer "fight for peace." Are not both "united" in backing the U.S. action to impose a "U.S. peace" on the Vietnamese people? So, too, is the British Prime Minister, Harold Wilson.

So we see that the same words have totally opposite meanings to different people, depending upon the class they represent.

The prostitution of the words, "fight for peace," by Holyoake, the open mouthpiece of imperialism in New Zealand, is readily recognised by the working class. There is a growing recognition that Nordmeyer, despite the Labour Party label, gives his allegiance to the same class enemy of the working class as does Holyoake. It is less widely recognised that the spokesmen for revisionism hidden behind the revolutionary phrases of Marxism-Leninism are also the servants of imperialism. They are even more dangerous enemies of the working class because they parade as its revolutionary leaders. At the same time they render invaluable aid to imperialism by disrupting the world Communist movement from within. For this reason, every Marxist-Leninist has a national and



international responsibility to critically analyse the communique of the 19 Parties by the scientific method of Marxism-Leninism.

This revisionist communique implies that for Communist Parties it is words that are all important. Agreement on the words as such, like "fight for peace," "fight against imperialism," "unity," etc., etc., is the all-important thing. This, it purports, is a firm basis for Communist unity. If you agree on these words, you may disagree on the politics, theory or tactics. In other words, the revisionists put forward the idea that there is no relation between the words and the "unity" founded on them, and the class stand, the class struggle, or the scientific method of Marxism-Leninism. The communique implies it is not necessary for Communist Parties to be united on the general lines of class action whereby such words and slogans are to be realised in practice. Consequently, in this revisionist context, the words bear no relationship to the practical activities of the Communist Parties in the fight against imperialism and for peace.

All this exposes the communique as a complete negation of Marxism-Leninism. It is not an expression of the world outlook of dialectical materialism. There is nothing dialectical or materialist about it. It is idealism pure and simple. There is no necessity to base oneself on facts or make a Marxist analysis of reality. Thus, there is no longer need for the Communist Party to be a vanguard party. Every militant can be in. That is where the line of the revisionists on "unity" lands us. And so this line gets us right back to the struggle of Lenin and the Mensheviks in 1903, on the membership rule of the Party. Lenin insisted that the membership rule must require members to belong to and work in one of the organisations of a revolutionary workers' party. According to the line of the 19 Parties, Lenin was wrong and the Mensheviks were right.

The line of the revisionists on "unity" leads to the liquidation of the Communist Parties. It transforms them from revolutionary parties of the proletariat into Labour Parties, Social-Democratic Parties, reformist parties. How well this would serve imperialism.

Just as we have seen how imperialism in the early part of the century turned Labour leaders into "the Labour lieutenants of Capitalism in the ranks of the working class," so it is necessary for us to understand how important it is for imperialism to-day, when the influence of the Labour Party is declining, to find its Communist lieutenants.

tenants in the rising Communist movement. This is the role which is filled by the revisionists. Stripped of its facade of Marxist-Leninist phrases, we expose behind the communique naked, revisionist betrayers of the Communist movement and the world working class.

**The "unity" the revisionists advocate is not the revolutionary unity of the working class which means death to imperialism and colonialism. It is not the unity of the world working class and progressive forces that leads to decisive action against imperialist aggression and war. It is a "unity" that enforces inaction or sabotages revolutionary action wherever it arises. It is a "unity" which disarms the working class, a "unity" in which Marxism-Leninism is to be submerged beneath revisionist ideas which aim at the adaptation of the working class and its Communist Parties to the ideology, economics and politics of Capitalism.**

Revisionist "unity" is disunity. It stifles united action by the working class. It gives the green light to imperialism to extend its military attacks on Socialism and the national liberation movement and reduce the working-class movement in the capitalist countries to impotency. Revisionist "unity" is capitulation to imperialism. Again and again, life is demonstrating this truth.

But our Party cannot become complacent. The communique of the 19 Parties discloses the dangerous designs of the revisionist organisers of the Moscow Meeting to bring the world movement under their hegemony. Though they cannot succeed, it is necessary to recognise that even the extent to which it prevails in a number of Parties to-day intensifies the danger of new capitulations to imperialism. We have got to recognise that, so long as revisionism dominates the leadership of the C.P.S.U., the danger exists of its capitulation to U.S. imperialism on the question of Vietnam. Thus it becomes the foremost duty of our Party to intensify our efforts to bring the New Zealand working class and all progressive forces into continuous action for the cessation of American aggression on the socialist North and for the withdrawal of all U.S. troops from the South. At the same time, we must not hesitate to speak out fearlessly against the danger of further capitulation to U.S. imperialism, and which could be masked by phrases such as "in the interests of peace" or "avoiding a new world war." This is the sacred duty of all Marxist-Leninist Parties.

We can confidently say that in the end the designs of the revisionist leaders are doomed to failure. The

scientific laws of social development ensure this. The world-wide demonstrations and actions of the working class and progressive forces are providing abundant evidence. The false revisionist theories of peaceful transition to Socialism, peaceful co-existence by coming to agreement with "reasonable imperialists," are being tested in practice and found wanting. The victory of Marxism-Leninism is inevitable. It will be assisted to the extent that our Party, basing itself on Marxism-Leninism, continues to raise higher the level of our own understanding of it and utilises it in unifying the New Zealand working class in delivering decisive blows against imperialism in New Zealand.

Communist Parties, the revolutionary parties of the working classes, the vanguard parties of the class, do not arise by accident. Neither are they the creation of some outstanding individual. They come into being as a result of the operation of the universal laws of development of all things. They are based on and rely upon these scientific laws which are expressed in the laws of social change of human society to higher forms of social organisation. The class stand, method of work, leadership and organisation and the method of thinking of Communist Parties reflect these scientific laws. This outlook and method of the Communist Parties is known as Marxism-Leninism. Marxism-Leninism is a science. Stalin, in "Marxism and Linguistics," says:

"Marxism-Leninism is the science of the laws governing the development of nature and society, the science of the revolution of the oppressed and exploited masses, the science of the victory of Socialism in all countries, the science of building Communist society."

### **The Struggle Against Revisionism is the Road to Marxist-Leninist Unity of the Working Class**

Communist Parties are the outcome of the law of the unity and struggle of opposites within the working-class movement.

Communist Parties were born and grew strong in the struggle against opportunism.

Opportunism is the sacrifice of the fundamental interests of the working class for temporary gain.

Modern revisionism is opportunism within the Communist Parties and the world Communist movement—the sacrifice of the fundamental interests of the socialist revolution and of the socialist world for an illusory gain.

Opportunism and modern revisionism are the ideology of the capitalist class within the working-class movement

and its Communist Parties. The ascendancy of bourgeois ideology within the working-class movement or its political parties ends in their adaptation (capitulation) to Capitalism and imperialism. The struggle between Marxism-Leninism and revisionism is a class struggle.

Communists cannot and must not hide or gloss over these class contradictions. They must bring them out, recognise them and take an active part in overcoming them. Not to do so is to permit Marxism-Leninism to be overcome by revisionism, to permit the revolutionary party of the working class to be transformed into its opposite—a reformist party—a party of Capitalism.

It has not been easy for some comrades to understand this or to recognise that it is not impossible for a Communist Party or the top leaders of such a Party to be transformed into their opposite. Despite the experience of Tito and the League of Communists of Yugoslavia, there are still some comrades in our Party who are unable to conceive that such a thing could happen in the C.P.S.U. They conclude that the glorious Bolshevik Party of Lenin and Stalin could not be transformed temporarily into its opposite under any conditions and irrespective of whether it was led by Marxist-Leninists or revisionists. They accept without question the belief that the leaders of such a party cannot but be unshakeable adherents of the Marxist-Leninist stand, viewpoint and method. They adhere to this view, despite the exposure of the erstwhile "hero," Khrushchov, an ideologist of the bourgeoisie, and who had, in fact, attained the foremost position as leader of that glorious party. They have been encouraged in this view by Khrushchov's recent colleagues who also seek to hide their bourgeois characteristics under the honoured mantle of Lenin.

Some comrades have, unfortunately, fallen for the same trick with which the revisionists hope to trap the world Parties into a world meeting designed to split the world Communist movement. All genuine Communists will recognise that the Marxist-Leninist qualities of any Communist Party are not developed or strengthened by loud shouts or the parading of honoured banners, but by relying on and utilising the essential law of development—the struggle of opposites within the Communist Parties and the world movement.

Every Communist knows that the Marxist-Leninist method of giving effect to this law is the use of criticism and self-criticism, the concrete analysis of a party's policies and practical activities and methods of work and

leadership. Consequently, a real Marxist-Leninist Party cannot but welcome and seriously study the criticism of its members or of other fraternal Parties. Any other attitude could only amount to accepting the idea of "infallibility."

The fifth conclusion from the summing-up of the historical experience of the Bolshevik Party (see "Short History of the C.P.S.U.") is particularly rich in lessons on this question. We quote it in full:

**"5. The history of the Party further teaches us that a party cannot perform its role as leader of the working class if, carried away by success, it begins to grow conceited, ceases to observe the defects of its work, and fears to acknowledge its mistakes and, frankly and honestly, to correct them in good time.**

**"A Party is invincible if it does not fear criticism and self-criticism, if it does not gloss over the mistakes and defects in its work, if it teaches and educates its cadres by drawing the lessons from the mistakes in Party work, and if it knows how to correct its mistakes in time. A Party perishes if it conceals its mistakes, if it glosses over sore problems, if it covers up its shortcomings by pretending that all is well, if it is intolerant of criticism and self-criticism, if it gives way to self-complacency and vainglory and if it rests on its laurels.**

**"The attitude of a political party towards its own mistakes,' Lenin says, 'is one of the most important and surest ways of judging how earnest the party is and how it IN PRACTICE fulfils its obligations towards its CLASS and the toiling MASSES. Frankly admitting a mistake, ascertaining the reasons for it, analysing the conditions which led to it, and thoroughly discussing the means of correcting it—that is the earmark of a serious party; that is the way it should perform its duties, that is the way it should educate and train the CLASS, and then the MASSES.'"**

—(Lenin, "Collected Works," Russian Edition, Vol. XXV, Page 200.)

And, further:

**"All revolutionary parties which have hitherto perished did so because they GREW CONCEITED, failed to see where their strength lay, AND FEARED TO SPEAK OF THEIR WEAKNESSES. But we shall not perish, for we do not fear to speak of our weaknesses and will learn to overcome them."**

—(Lenin, "Collected Works," Russian Edition, Vol. XXVII, Pages 260-61.)

Can anyone claim that the practice of Khrushchov and his colleagues reflected these vital lessons. We know, on the contrary, that the approach of the leadership of the C.P.S.U. has been a negation of these lessons. There has been a significant absence of self-criticism.

In the complete negation of Stalin at the 20th Congress, C.P.S.U., and subsequently, there has not been one word of self-criticism by Khrushchov and his recent colleagues, of their share of responsibility for the alleged state of affairs. It is as well to recall that in Stalin's day Khrushchov himself occupied the important post of Chairman of the Central Control Commission. Likewise, neither has there been, since the removal of Khrushchov, a single word of self-criticism by his colleagues for the part they played and their lack of Marxist-Leninist vigilance in promoting and maintaining Khrushchov and his bourgeois ideology into the leading position.

What is the attitude of the leaders of the C.P.S.U. toward criticisms of its line and policy? Were they welcomed, studied, analysed, verified or, where necessary, corrected? Comrades know from the development of the ideological dispute that this was not the approach of the leaders of the C.P.S.U. On the contrary, it was an arrogant, conceited and commandist stand. Stand-over methods and economic and political pressures were exerted in an effort to enforce the Soviet leadership's point of view. Under the cover of words like "proletarian internationalism," its opposite, great-power chauvinism, was enforced. On the ideological front, the theoretical bankruptcy of the Soviet leaders became quickly exposed. Abuse of other parties and distortions of Lenin were used in an attempt to bolster an impossible case. Quotations from "Left-Wing Communism," by Lenin, became favourite missiles to hurl at all who dared to criticise the policy of the Soviet leadership from a fundamental Marxist-Leninist viewpoint.

There is, of course, much which our Party has yet to learn of how to struggle more effectively against opportunism and revisionism. We have to work much harder to find the way to bring socialist consciousness to the industrial worker and explain that the opportunist character of the Labour Party cannot but undermine and defeat the struggles of the New Zealand working class for its basic demands. So, also, with the struggle against opportunism in the trade union movement which strives to divert the growing consciousness of the need for working-class leadership for political struggle against

foreign monopoly into trade union struggles around economic demands.

In the struggle against revisionism in the C.P.N.Z., we have already rich experience. The lessons of the victory of Marxism-Leninism over the Scott faction have been of tremendous significance to our Party. For it has shown us in life itself that the Party is strengthened by purging itself of opportunists. It has heightened the vigilance of our membership. It has awakened a recognition that revisionism anywhere is a threat to Marxism-Leninism everywhere.

Thereby it has placed squarely before us the inescapable responsibility to contribute to the maximum of our ability to the struggle for the victory of Marxism-Leninism in the world Communist movement.

---

# Speech at the Congress of the Social-Democratic Party of Switzerland, November 4, 1916

By V. I. LENIN

(From Vol. 23, "Lenin's Collected Works,"  
English edition)

[A NOTE BY THE EDITOR: The following short speech by Lenin is reprinted here because the views he expresses on the role of social democracy and on the question of violence have a bearing on the ideological struggle in the world Communist movement to-day.]

**T**HE Social-Democratic Party of Switzerland recently had the honour of rousing the ire of the leader of the official Danish Social-Democratic Party, Herr Minister Stauning. In a letter to another quasi-socialist Minister, Vandervelde, dated September 15 of this year, Stauning

proudly declared that "we (the Danish party) have sharply and definitely disassociated ourselves from the organisationally pernicious splitting activities conducted on the initiative of the Italian and Swiss parties under the name of the Zimmerwald movement."

In greeting the Congress of the Social-Democratic Party of Switzerland on behalf of the Central Committee of the Russian Social-Democratic Labour Party, I do so in the hope that this party will continue to support the effort to unite the revolutionary Social-Democrats internationally, which began at Zimmerwald and which must end in a complete rupture between Socialism and its ministerial and social-patriotic betrayers.

This split is maturing in all countries of developed capitalism. In Germany, Karl Liebknecht's colleague, Comrade Otto Ruhle, was attacked by the opportunists and by the so-called Centre when he declared in the Central Organ of the Germany party that the split had become inevitable ("Vorwärts," January 12, 1916). The facts, however, make it increasingly clear that Comrade Ruhle was right, that in reality there are two parties in Germany, one helping the bourgeoisie and the government wage the predatory war, the other, which for the most part is working illegally, spreading really socialist manifestos among the real masses and organising mass demonstrations and political strikes.

In France, the Committee for the Re-establishment of International Contacts recently published a pamphlet, "The Zimmerwald Socialists and the War," in which we read that three main trends have developed within the French party. The first, comprising the majority, and branded in the pamphlet as socialist-nationalists, social-patriots, has entered into a "holy alliance" with our class enemies. The second, according to the pamphlet, represents a minority and consists of followers of Members of Parliament Longuet and Pressemane, who on key issues go hand in hand with the majority and unconsciously bring grist to the mill of the majority by attracting the discontented elements, lulling their socialist conscience and inducing them to follow the party's official policy. The third trend, the pamphlet says, are the Zimmerwaldists. They maintain that France was involved in the war not because Germany declared war on her, but because she pursued an imperialist policy which, through treaties and loans, bound her to Russia. This third trend unambiguously proclaims that **"defence of the fatherland is not a socialist cause."**



Practically the same three trends have arisen in Russia, as well as in England and in the neutral United States of America—in fact, all over the world. The struggle of these trends will determine the course of the labour movement in the immediate future.

Permit me to say a few words on another point which is being very much discussed these days and on which we Russian Social-Democrats are particularly rich in experience, namely, the question of terrorism.

We have no information yet about the Austrian revolutionary Social-Democrats. We know that there are revolutionary Social-Democrats in Austria, but information about them is very meagre anyway. Consequently, we do not know whether the assassination of Sturgkh by Comrade Fritz Adler was the application of terrorism as tactics, i.e., systematic organisation of political assassinations unconnected with the mass revolutionary struggle; or whether it was a single act in the transition from the opportunist, non-socialist defence of the fatherland tactics of the official Austrian Social-Democrats to the tactics of revolutionary mass struggle. The latter assumption seems to fit in more with the circumstances. The message of greeting to Fritz Adler, proposed by the Central Committee of the Italian party and published in "Avanti!" of October 29, therefore, deserves the fullest sympathy.

At all events, we are convinced that the experience of revolution and counter-revolution in Russia has proved the correctness of our Party's more than twenty-year struggle against terrorism as tactics. We must not forget, however, that this struggle was closely connected with a ruthless struggle against opportunism, which was inclined to repudiate the use of all violence by the oppressed classes against their oppressors. We have always stood for the use of violence in the mass struggle and in connection with it. Secondly, we linked the struggle against terrorism with many years of propaganda, started long before December, 1905, for an armed uprising. We have regarded the armed uprising not only as the best means by which the proletariat can retaliate to the government's policy, but also as the inevitable result of the development of the class struggle for Socialism and democracy. Thirdly, we have not confined ourselves to accepting violence in principle and to propaganda for armed uprising. For example, four years before the Revolution we supported the use of violence by the masses against their oppressors, particularly in street demonstrations. We sought to bring to the whole country the lesson taught by every such demonstra-

tion. We began to devote more and more attention to organising sustained and systematic mass resistance against the police and the army, to winning over, through this resistance, as large as possible a part of the army to the side of the proletariat in its struggle against the government, to inducing the peasantry and the army to take a conscious part in this struggle. These are the tactics we have applied in the struggle against terrorism, and it is our firm conviction that they have proved successful.

I conclude, comrades, by once again greeting the Congress of the Social-Democratic Party of Switzerland and by wishing you success in your work. (Applause.)

---

## Frontiers of Freedom

(Reprinted from *The African Communist*, a quarterly journal of the South African Communist Party).

**A**LL through Africa the battle lines run. Now on one side, now another, they erupt into action, hitting world headlines. Tshombe's hired assassins, with the backing of regular United States and Belgian troops, recapture Stanleyville—and for a while the world is reminded of the bitter warfare that will never cease smouldering and flaring up in the Congo until Lumumba's vision of independence is realised and his murderers brought to justice. In "Portuguese" Guinea, Angola, Mozambique, Salazar's army of occupation continue their merciless slaughter of patriots and of terror against villagers, men, women and children—only rarely does the outside world get a glimpse of this unceasing terror, as when a story comes out of the desperate plight of homeless families who have fled for their lives into neighbouring Tanzania.

In the far south, there are no frontiers—or, rather, the frontier is everywhere. Nkomo is captive in Smith's concentration camp; Mandela on bleak Robben Island; the symbol of thousands jailed by Verwoerd and Vorster for claiming their birthright of a free South Africa. And still the cramming of the jails goes on, as "trials" of patriots and democrats continue to be staged in Johannesburg, Durban, Cape Town and many other centres. Mkwai, Maharaj, Kitson, Matthews and Chiba, all of whom had already received long sentences for sabotage at the time of writing these notes; Abram Fischer and 13 others, who

are being charged with being members of the Communist Party and taking part in its activities; M. P. Naicker and others, upon similar charges in Durban. . . . All these and scores of other current and pending proceedings bear witness to the fact that 17 years after the post-war election victory of the Afrikaner Nationalist Party and 15 years after the passing of the Suppression of Communism Act, designed to eradicate "Communism" and all forms of militant opposition to apartheid, the fires of resistance in South Africa are burning brighter than ever.

Following the race-obsessed psychopath, Verwoerd, and with the acquiescence and tacit support of the great majority of the white population, the ruling circles have set themselves the impossible task of maintaining the extreme south of the continent as a preserve of rabid racialism, African enslavement and white mastery, a refuge and last-ditch stronghold of the forces of colonialism that have been, and are being, thrust back and overcome, country by country and area by area, from the Mediterranean to the Zambesi River. They have set themselves to trample out the veld-fire of resistance in South Africa itself. And, it is true, that—as in every other country where the forces of oppression have thrown overboard all civil liberties, all rule of law—they have had their empty "victories."

Thousands of great-hearted resistance leaders have been subjected to the most barbarous tortures. The special branch studied and made use of the techniques of the Gestapo, the O.A.S. and the Portuguese Pide how to break down human beings not only in body and in mind but also in spirit. With a few, they succeeded. But it is not those few whom history will remember, the Mtolos, Beylevelds, Leftwiches or Mtembus. It is the thousands whom no torture could break; the men like "Babla" Saloojee and "Looksmart" Ngudle, who took their own lives rather than betray their comrades; like Morris Matsomelo, who refused to testify in Court against leaders of Umkonto we Sizwe and was himself jailed for his loyalty; like Vuyisile Mini, who died as he had lived, a true son of Africa, filled with contempt for the murderers of African freedom and confidence in ultimate victory.

Yes, the special branch did break a few people, who from now till their dying day will live with the sour taste of treachery in their mouths and look no man in the eye. They were able to find a spy like Ludi, the consummate liar who succeeded for a while in passing himself off as a genuine opponent of apartheid and came to Court to boast

of his exploits as a seducer. As a result, many whose "crime" was to defy the innumerable laws against freedom of speech and organisation have gone through the solemn farce of a "legal trial." They have been condemned to prolonged terms of imprisonment—many, like the men of Rivonia and Wilson Mkwayi, to lifetime sentences. To-day, so far from being accorded the dignity customarily accorded to political prisoners, they are jailed under the worst conditions permitted under the (atrocious, at their best) South African prison regulations; graded as "Category D," usually reserved for the most hardened and habitual common criminals.

With the "laws" he has at his disposal, a negation of every concept of a law-governed society, Vorster does not, however, need Court convictions to preclude his opponents from political activity, or to wreak his implacable vengeance against consistent democrats and anti-fascists, no matter how long ago it was that they stood up to be counted, or how careful they have been not to infringe his government's legislation since. What does it matter whether a Court imposes a lifetime sentence or five years—when, as the Sobukwe case shows, Vorster has, and uses, powers to keep political prisoners in jail long years after their sentences have expired? Court trials are a farce because, without any trial, without any charge, without any opportunity for a hearing, men and women are arbitrarily victimised all over South Africa at the whim of the Minister, acting on the advice and information of the proved liars of his special branch. The "ninety-day, no trial," clause has been suspended—how little this means is well analysed in Z. Nkosi's article on this subject in *The African Communist* of January-March, 1965—but all over the country men and women are still under house-arrest, or in enforced exile, or forbidden to leave the areas where they live, to attend meetings, to write or prepare material for publication—and a score of other mediæval persecutions devised by the sadistic mind of this fanatical Nazi.

Everyone with a past record of radical opposition to apartheid theories and practices, even if he were a Communist twenty years ago when the Party was legal, is hedged around with a barbed-wire fence of bans, surveillance and prohibitions which make it impossible for him not only to exercise citizenship rights, but even to make a living and carry on a normal life. Men like Dr. Eddie Roux and Professor Jack Simons are summarily ordered out of senior teaching posts at universities. All "listed"

lawyers will soon be barred from the practice of their profession—thinning still further the already sadly-depleted ranks of legal men who have the courage to defend political cases—and this at a time when the number of such cases threatens to break all records.

### **A New Phase**

What in practice has the neo-Nazi "National Party" achieved after 17 years? They have piled up a mountain of apartheid legislation to make the indigenous majority of inhabitants statutory "foreigners" in their motherland and to deprive them of even the token representation and the other few grudging acknowledgments of their fundamental humanity and citizenship which the highly illiberal regimes of Smuts and his predecessors had once been compelled to concede. They have piled up a second mountain of repressive legislation to quell the mass opposition which such drastic infringements of peoples' rights inevitably called forth. Beginning with Communism, they have made it illegal to advocate and propagate the entire body of humanitarian and progressive thought, of which Communism is a part, and which finds its broadest expression in the Charter of the United Nations. They have murdered some of the finest sons of our country—crimes for which in due course they will be sternly called to account—and filled the prisons with patriots. They have, in peace-time, militarised the country to an extent, and at an expense, far higher than ever before, even in time of war, and built up a vast machinery of police and army repression and aggression, full-time and part-time, in which white South Africans are being indoctrinated, trained and prepared to fulfil their appointed role, as Verwoerd sees it, of coppers' narks, and last-ditch defenders of alien rule in Africa from Cape to Cairo.

Now Vorster looks proudly round South Africa at his handiwork, and boasts that all resistance has been smashed and subdued. "We are within sight of the end of organised internal sabotage and subversion," he said. He imagines that because he has, with methods of brute force, silenced, in one way or another, all those who in the past spoke up publicly against the swinishness of his government, he has thereby extinguished opposition and resistance altogether. It is not the first time the spokesmen of the Broederbond Republic have announced "the end of subversion and Communism," only within a few months to demand and receive still more drastic powers to "deal with" the "menace" already supposedly ended. This

boastful Nazi is wrong again. Neither fascist legislation nor fascist terror-tactics can destroy resistance and struggle for democracy in South Africa, for freedom is as necessary to our people as the very air they breathe.

It was in 1950 that the government outlawed the Communist Party, yet in 1965, all over the country men and women are facing trial accused of belonging to the Communist Party. The African National Congress has been unlawful since 1960 and yet the courts are filled with cases of men and women accused of A.N.C. membership. Most of these trials are unreported and unknown to the public, in South Africa as well as abroad. For example, in two months (September 9 to November 11, 1964), no less than 231 people were convicted for A.N.C. membership in the two small Eastern Cape Province towns of Somerset East and Graaff Reinet.

The price for such "victories" of Vorster and his Gestapo is fearful. The special branch army of spies and sneaks has proliferated in the country like a cancerous growth. The S.A.B.C. radio service has become a gramophone for propaganda directed by the Broederbond (Verwoerd's secret fascist movement that dominates South Africa). Censorship of all kinds is being tightened up. Hated by the masses of the people at home, treated with ever-increasing contempt and isolation in the outside world, the white supremacy regime knows no answer but further militarisation of the state and the economy. All this is done, and consented to by the white minority, in the name of preserving white privileges and of "security." Yet there is no security. Behind locked doors and barred windows, afraid to venture alone into the streets at night, wives and children practising how to kill with pistols, the whites of South Africa are living in a state of constant tension. Never have fear and insecurity stalked the land to the extent that they do to-day.

And all, in the end, to no purpose. Vorster's terror can no more destroy the Communist Party, the African National Congress and the alliance for the Freedom Charter, than the similar methods of his predecessors in other countries could succeed in the past in similar objects. At the height of the Nazi occupation of France, the slogan appeared on the walls in many French cities: "**You can kill Communists but you cannot kill Communism!**" Hitler and Mussolini, the much-admired heroes of Verwoerd, built up the most efficient, expensive and ruthless machine ever known to "destroy Communism." The first died like a dog in a cellar in Berlin, the second was hung up by

his feet, like a dead pig. The Marxist and democratic parties whose members they murdered and persecuted survived to form people's governments in the German Democratic Republic and the occupied countries of Eastern Europe; in France and Italy the Communists have the largest parties. Despite Franco and Salazar terror, the Communist Parties in Spain and Portugal are very much alive and the leading force of the democratic opposition, as frequent current reports of new prosecutions and persecutions testify. If we look at the current experience of national liberation movements under colonialist persecution, the lesson is the same. Names of men like Nehru and Nkrumah, who emerged from jail to head popular governments, symbolise the truth that the persecution of their leaders can never stop the onward march of a people determined to win freedom. Vorster can persecute Mandela, Sisulu, Kathrada, Fischer, but let him not deceive himself that he has thereby quelled resistance to apartheid.

In the last analysis the whole oppressed and democratic people is the enemy of apartheid. You cannot jail such an "enemy" without bringing to a stop the entire economy, with none to dig gold and diamonds, labour in farms and factories, construct buildings and roads.

The frontiers of the freedom struggle are everywhere in South Africa; they run through every factory and mine compound, every city and township, every reserve. The freedom-soldiers wear no uniform; they are part of and merged with the toiling masses. They fight on every battlefield in every way; their weapons are truth against lies, vigilance and discipline against repression and spies, retaliation against force. And for every patriot and democrat captured or betrayed to the enemy, a dozen, a hundred, a thousand will come forward from the inexhaustible ranks of the people. This is not a conspiracy to be destroyed by the discovery and imprisonment of a few leaders and spokesmen, no matter how great and talented; it is a great upsurge of the people for freedom that can never be stopped until it has attained its goal.

### **All Over the World**

South Africa is and will remain the crucial battlefield; but our frontiers run far beyond the borders of our country. Our fight for a free South Africa is inextricably linked with the movement of all the peoples of Africa against colonialism, neo-colonialism and foreign domination. It is a part of the struggle of all mankind against

imperialist war and aggression, against oppression and exploitation everywhere. We who fight apartheid in South Africa are side by side with the brave guerrillas of the Revolutionary Government of the Congo; they are fighting our battle against white domination in South Africa, and we are fighting their battle as well as our own. We are with the soldier-peasants of South Vietnam fighting back against gross aggression and savage terrorism by the United States and its puppets in Saigon. We are with the peoples of the socialist lands who work to strengthen their economies and their defences against imperialist aggression, and to help defend the independence of the newly-liberated victims of colonialism everywhere. We are with our allies, the Communist and labour movements in the developed capitalist countries. And they are with us. This is the peoples' international.

Verwoerd and his fascist regime do not stand alone either. Backing them—and sharing in the bloody profits of apartheid—is a very different “international”—imperialist finance-capital, whose only standard of morality is profit, regardless of the cost in human dignity and suffering, in starvation and blood. For such profits, United States and Belgian paratroopers flew from the British base of Ascension to shoot Congolese patriots; American 'planes rain death and destruction on Vietnam villages; British troops fight in the Malayan jungles.

It is the same unholy crew—or an important section of them—who stand behind and hold up the Verwoerd regime in South Africa. Their strength and influence is such that they can defy public opinion, solidly ranged against apartheid throughout the world, and over-rule governments whose views and national interests are equally opposed to apartheid.

In a foreword to the important pamphlet, “The Collaborators,” published last year by the Anti-Apartheid Movement in London, Mrs. Barbara Castle welcomed it “because it compels us to face the truth that British firms and British people are profiting from apartheid.” The pamphlet shows that Britain is the heaviest investor in South Africa—the total of over £1,000 million of British money in the Republic exceeds the total invested in the rest of Africa. Britain takes a third of South Africa's total exports, excluding gold. Some 333 British companies have South African associates or subsidiaries—many are listed in the pamphlet. The Labour Government has pledged that (though it has licensed the export of Buccaneer aircraft contracted for under the Tory government) it will



supply no further armaments to South Africa. This action was bitterly resisted by the powerful "South Africa Lobby" in the City of London, with their vast South African holdings, and spreading its tentacles into both Houses of Parliament and big sections of the newspaper press.

There can be no doubt that such opposition is one of the reasons why the Labour Government has thus far taken no steps to "examine the issue of economic sanctions seriously and urgently, as the United General Assembly has urged us to do," as proposed by Mrs. Castle, now Minister for Overseas Development in the British Cabinet, and, like Mr. Wilson and other Ministers, a member of the Anti-Apartheid Movement. How can one explain that, despite vigorous condemnation of the disgraceful Tory policies on such questions as apartheid, the High Commission territories in South Africa, and many others, the Labour Government has in all main respects been content to continue such policies? In opposition, Mr. Wilson condemned Duncan Sandys' shabby manoeuvre to oust the Jagan Government as "a fiddled constitution" — but refused to heed urgent representations to halt the cheating elections under this constitution. Nor can any African forget Britain's collaboration in the U.S.-Belgian aggression in the Congo.

The answer to such questions cannot be dealt with in terms of such over-simplifications as that the Labour leaders are hypocritical, or that they have changed their opinions since assuming office. Once having undertaken to maintain Capitalism, in accordance with the thoroughly muddled and bourgeois political and economic ideas of British Social Democracy, the Labour Party finds itself subjected to overwhelming pressure from the powerful financial and capitalist interests which dominate the economy; pressure which could only be resisted by mobilising the organised strength of the entire Labour movement for the implementation of progressive policies to which the party is pledged.

Of critical importance, in this connection, will be the future of British policy towards apartheid and Southern Africa. On no question have the Labour leaders and the Trade Union Congress, responding to overwhelming membership opinion, pledged themselves more clearly and specifically. Nor is this only a matter of the feelings of labour people and other humanitarians against a vile, racialistic police state. National interests are involved, of far greater weight than those of the relatively small, if

excessively noisy, section in Britain which reaps rich dividends from sweated African labour in the Rand mines. Britain's international standing has been seriously damaged in the past, especially among the non-aligned states of Africa and Asia, by the revolting hypocrisy of her Southern Africa policy. Should this policy continue, in the coming period of increased urgency of this grave all-African and world problem, it can hardly be doubted that the boycott of South African goods will be extended to those who arm, invest in, have defence and diplomatic agreements with, and trade with the aggressive apartheid republic.

Other leading **collaborators** with apartheid, and saboteurs of the United Nations General Assembly resolution on the severance of trade and diplomatic relations with the Broederbond Republic, are the United States, France, West Germany and Japan. All these countries, no doubt, value their profitable trade and other relations with the independent states of Africa and Asia. The time is coming closer when they will all be forced to choose between this trade and the odious traffic with apartheid which they are at present continuing and striving to increase.

It is particularly distasteful to find among this company an Asian country, Japan. According to Japanese Government statistics, trade with South Africa rose by about one-third in 1964. In the nine months from January to September, Japan bought R82,860,000 worth of South African goods (over £40 million—2 rands (R) equals £1 sterling). Japanese dockers refused to handle South African goods designed for exhibition at the Osaka International Trade Fair, but means were found nevertheless to display such goods, and participation on a yet bigger scale is planned at the Tokyo Fair in April.

It is true that through this large trade the Japanese Government has succeeded in purchasing an exemption for Japanese citizens from the apartheid definition of "non-white." Japanese commercial delegations are thereby entitled to stay at South African hotels reserved for whites and—if they care to risk the inevitable gross insults which are sure to come their way—participate in other privileges normally set aside for the exclusive use of those of "European descent." Against this doubtful "honour" must be set the very real national humiliation which the Japanese ruling classes, in their fanatical search for profits, are inflicting on their people as a whole by seeking and obtaining this "exemption" so profoundly wounding to national dignity. Moreover, by thus sabotag-

ing the Afro-Asian campaign to boycott the apartheid state, the Japanese authorities are deliberately cutting themselves away from the Asian community and the Afro-Asian community. Accustomed as they are to humiliating themselves before arrogant United States imperialism, national honour may be something of small value to the millionaire monopolies which rule Japan to-day. But they have to reckon with the outraged indignation of the Japanese masses, and also with the wreck of their hopes to expand friendly trading and other relations with the countries of Africa and Asia. The Japanese Anti-Apartheid Movement and other progressive and democratic forces have a most serious international obligation which is also a patriotic duty to bring these facts forcefully before the public in their country. And the African and Asian countries—the great majority of whom are making real sacrifices in their sincere support of South African freedom—should make it very clear to Japan's ruling circles that in continuing this disgraceful traffic with South Africa they are playing with fire and risking very costly losses.

What we have said of Britain and Japan applies in like terms to all the capitalist countries whose trade and aid sustains the monstrous Verwoerd regime in Africa. Everywhere the interests of the great majority of the people, expressed with greater or lesser degrees of clarity and militancy by the labour and democratic movement, are opposed to apartheid and in favour of the policy upheld by the African, Asian and socialist countries of sanctions, boycott and isolation of South Africa while white domination lasts. And everywhere these interests are opposed by powerful minority groups with a stake in maintaining apartheid.

These minorities are powerful because of their intimate links with international financial institutions and with sections of the ruling economic and political establishment in each capitalist country. And they are organised internationally and backed by the South African Embassies in every capitalist country, massively financed, with numerous specialised departments to issue and place propaganda material whitewashing apartheid, to attract investment and trade, to reinforce the inflow of white emigrants. They are backed also by the powerful "South Africa Foundation" which unites all the big capitalist firms in the country, irrespective of their party affiliations, in an attempt to "sell" apartheid abroad, and includes Harry Oppenheimer's vast Anglo-American Corporation which,

with De Beer's Consolidated Mines, spreads its tentacles all over Africa. In Britain the "South Africa Lobby" also enjoys widespread organised support ranging from the National Association of Manufacturers to the "League of Empire Loyalists" and crudely fascist outfits.

Against these purposeful, well-organised and massively-financed forces, the forces opposing apartheid and supporting the concept of a free South Africa, though they do, in fact, comprise the overwhelming majority of mankind, are insufficiently coherent, lacking the clarity and unity of purpose and effectiveness of executive action to realise their tremendous potential superiority. One of the major tasks of the innumerable supporters of the heroic South African liberation movement throughout the world during 1965, therefore, will be to overcome these weaknesses and to translate the passionate indignation and protest of freedom-loving humanity against the horrors of apartheid into effective action to help its victims to free themselves.

To-day, more clearly than ever before, we must realise that the epic South African struggle is a world issue. The crucial battles, as always, will be fought in the cities, villages and rural areas of South Africa itself; but the frontiers and the battle-lines run throughout the world, wherever men and women value freedom and human dignity.

# The Branch Bulletin in Party Work

By N. GOULD

**I**N our society, as is well known, we are all subjected to a continuous stream of reactionary bourgeois ideas, prejudices, distortions and downright lies. The object and motive is to endeavour to isolate the Party from the working people, their best defender, and to ensure that the workers remain docile, contented wage-slaves.

The Communist Party, the vanguard of the working people and the inheritor and continuer of the finest traditions of the working-class movement, cannot fulfil its great role unless it fights constantly and persistently against bourgeois ideology. In carrying out this task, the Party possesses a vital and indispensable weapon in the branch newspaper or bulletin. The bulletin greatly extends the Party's contact with the masses, wins new supporters for the Party and our national newspaper, the People's Voice, and helps to train and equip new forces for the Party.

The bulletin is a LOCAL propagandist, agitator, educator and organiser. It further develops policy, working-class politics, the theory of scientific Socialism, Marxism-Leninism, in a concrete and particular form. It is working-class politics related to a particular industry or locality.

A clear understanding of our aims is necessary if we wish to do effective work with branch bulletins. They should include the following basic points:

- (1) To defend the working people against the attacks of their main enemy, the monopolies and imperialism, particularly U.S. imperialism, and to fight at all times to promote their interests.
- (2) To stimulate and organise mass activity, realising that the working people will build their unity and strength through their own experience in the class struggle.
- (3) To strengthen the Party's links with and influence among the people, primarily among the industrial workers, on the basis of the principle of the mass-line method.
- (4) To build the Party numerically and qualitatively as

part of the process of building the mass movement for Socialism.

### **Bulletin's Specific Character**

It will be evident that a bulletin will not be a good propagandist, educator and organiser unless its particular, local and specific character is observed. A good bulletin will not be a junior edition of the People's Voice. If the bulletin contains only generalised material, editorial or feature-type articles and nothing of local interest, then it is not fulfilling its purpose. Excluding the "special," in which usually only one article of urgent importance is printed, we have indeed seen on occasions bulletins of this type.

Because of limited space, it is imperative that articles be short and sharp and boiled down to essentials. We cannot afford the luxury of essay-style writing where all the t's are crossed and the i's dotted. Furthermore, our style should be shaped to influence the working people, the industrial workers primarily, and, consequently, sentences and articles should be short and to the point. True, this is no simple task. It is easier to give many facts about an issue than just those few vital ones which will be remembered.

The important thing, therefore, is not just to tell a story, however well written, **but to reply to the main capitalist press lies, myths and distortions with our own policy in a language which is readily understood by working people.**

This may appear an obvious point. Nevertheless, we still do see bulletins which contain much tedious repetition and, what is worse, a condescending, arrogant, "this-is-the-story," "we're-telling-you" attitude. Take this sentence in a recent Auckland bulletin (the article dealt with the increase in the price of beer flagons and 12oz. glasses) and concludes on this note: "If it teaches the workers the need for more united and stronger trade unions to fight monopoly, the beer increase is not a dead loss altogether." Is this the way to strengthen our influence among industrial workers? Will this statement help us to combat the capitalist press lie that Communists are something alien to the working class?

Marxism-Leninism teaches us to perceive and understand the inter-connection of phenomena in the era of imperialism, the last stage of Capitalism. Our bulletin writers need to develop their ability to portray such inter-connections and relationships in the form of forceful com-

parisons and parallels. For instance, recent bulletins did a good job in revealing the link between racialism in Alabama and imperialist aggression in Vietnam—two aspects of the face of imperialism. But what about combining the general with the particular in the New Zealand situation? As B.G. pointed out in the October, 1964, Communist Review: "We must constantly show in all our propaganda, in as great a detail as possible, the link between the general role of imperialism, particularly U.S. imperialism, on a world scale with the particular role of imperialism (overseas monopoly) in New Zealand." And he points out that we must bring right home to the housewife the inter-connection between the packet of Griffins biscuits she buys and the role of U.S. imperialism in South Vietnam.

**It would not be claimed that this point is generally overlooked and some bulletins do well in linking economic and political aspects in a given situation. But our propaganda could be a lot more effective if we studied more closely our own economic realities and were, consequently, in a position to speak with the necessary detailed knowledge.**

### **The Bulletin as an Organiser**

The birth of a bulletin is usually a resolution in a branch or branch executive. If a branch resolves to get out a bulletin—that is a good resolution. But if a branch (as recommended by the executive) resolves to get out a bulletin on such-and-such a date—that is even better. If, furthermore, a number of comrades have agreed to do the necessary jobs associated with producing the bulletin—writing articles, typing and duplicating, etc.—that is better still. The next job is to check to ensure that all contributions are in by the due date and that the copy is checked by the executive, or at least a leading branch member, before it goes into print.

A good bulletin will involve a number of Party members or Party supporters in the work of producing and distributing it. The "one-man band" job, in which one comrade is contributor, editor, printer and distributor (as has occurred within the writer's experience) is not a good bulletin from its aspect as an organiser.

The task of producing a bulletin is facilitated if three points are stabilised:

- (a) The mechanical side, such as typing and duplicating, is permanently arranged.
- (b) An editor is appointed who sees that copy is in on

- time and sub-edits it.  
(c) Your bulletin is included in the branch plan.

### **The Area or Locality Bulletin**

What should we write about in our area or locality bulletin? There is an abundance of material, for, in every area, no matter how well developed, there are problems and issues of interest and concern to the working people. It may be the lack of community amenities, parks and playgrounds, swimming pools, a footpath or pedestrian crossing. There are also the increasing burden of rates and charges of various kinds, housing costs, transport, etc. If the branch takes an active interest in the problems of its area, it will have material for the bulletin. Failure to develop local activity and strong roots in the area will result in over-generalised bulletins—or no bulletins!

What is the problem which most concerns the worker and his wife in your area? Clearly this is something which the branch has to find out.

### **Industry Bulletins**

Industry bulletins, which it is recognised play an invaluable and a primary role in extending our influence among industrial workers, have their own special difficulties and problems. The two main ones, it is suggested, are ensuring a correct policy and class standpoint and improved organisation in production and distribution.

Errors of both a left and right nature occasionally appear in industry bulletins. They reflect weaknesses in the work of fractions and of the District in the trade union field and ever-present economist tendencies, especially among leading activists in the trade union movement. What do you think of this statement in an industry bulletin? "When the Communist Party of New Zealand is accepted as the Workers' Party, and is elected as the government of the country, one of the first steps it will take will be to socialise the freezing industry."

The articles in our industry bulletins on political issues and on the international situation are usually very good. There is room, however, for improvement in some cases in approach and presentation. In addition, more attention needs to be given to studying more effective ways of linking political and economic aspects. We need to show **in a concrete and particular way** that politics and economics are not divorced but are closely connected and that the solution of economic problems depend on the solution of political problems.



Better work here would help to break down the anti-pathology to politics on the jobs and in the unions. It would not be denied that some attempt is made to integrate and compare both economic and political aspects. But how fresh and stimulating are our examples based on a sound knowledge of the local situation?

### **Job and Area Distribution**

For area bulletins, where obviously a complete coverage is out of the question, we have to decide where to put them out. It must be clear that it is necessary to have an object in view and this would be, first of all, People's Voice canvasses.

However, area bulletins can also be given out at the factory gate, and an excellent example of good work in this respect is Auckland City Branch's distribution of its bulletin to workers fighting for the 6 per cent. on the ruling rate, which prepared the way for People's Voice sales.

To get through to workers directly on the job is our most important task. Perhaps some comrades are discouraged by the difficulties experienced. They make one or two spectacular efforts and then fall back to the old-time method of the letter-box. Perhaps in an important industry the workers enter and leave the grounds by car and bus.

An athlete in training increases his strength and ability by small degrees. Each day he runs a little farther. It may well be that the position in some cases is not to attempt to 'break through' in the most important industries, but to make a start on a smaller scale where there are better possibilities of maintaining a consistent effort. To make even a modest start may be the key that opens the door to an improved emphasis and development in branch work.

We are well aware, of course, that many or some proportion of our People's Voice readers work in industry. What industry do they work in? What are their particular problems? Would they be prepared to take leaflets and bulletins for posting up or for distribution? If there is already an industry bulletin issued in their industry, do they receive one?

STUDY the problem more closely, more minutely. Would one be far out in suggesting that better progress would be made if this were done?

Another aspect of the problem of increasing our influence among industrial workers is the interest (or lack of

it) which area branches take in fraction work. There is no doubt that there is insufficient interest, too little reporting, not enough help. Some organisational measures could be taken by branch executives to improve the situation, such as, for example, that there is always some time on the agenda for a trade union or fraction report. But mechanical methods have a tendency to fall into disuse unless backed up by political conviction.

The problem calls for renewed attention and study by all comrades, but especially trade union members and industrial workers. "First Steps," the many excellent articles in the Communist Review by our leading comrades, V. Wilcox, M. Williams and W. McAra, and Conference resolutions should be re-read and discussed. What are fractions, what is their role, how are they related to area branch work? These questions also require review and further discussion. An improvement in our ideological and political level will assist towards the change in emphasis, as pointed out in the National Committee Report.

Two practical points which could be given immediate attention are as follow:

- (1) What fraction or industry bulletins need distributors and where?
- (2) What comrades and non-Party supporters would be able and willing to help distribute them?

### **The Bulletin and the Mass Line**

As pointed out at the beginning, one of the Party's aims is to strengthen our ties with the working people, primarily the industrial workers, on the basis of the mass-line method.

How can the bulletin specifically be employed in this direction? Is what we say in our bulletins striking a chord in the hearts of the workers or are we to use Comrade Mao's expression, like the "raven cawing to the masses"? In other words, how do we know what the workers think? What is their response to our viewpoint?

Good propaganda must also be agitational—it should inspire and stimulate movement. If, then, people are prepared to act in some way and to some extent as a result of what we say, then our propaganda has effect and is good. (In practice, of course, our propaganda may do no more than assist to create a climate favourable for action.)

However, much of what is put into bulletins is informative and educational. We need to know what readers

think of such material. It must be our job to find out. It is possible that there will be no disagreement with our viewpoint on some subject, but it so happens that it is not the problem that is worrying them. We are off the beam. We will not automatically receive commendation or criticism. Criticism, opinions and personal experiences should be sought out and listened to carefully. We rely on the level of consciousness of people and their voluntary action. In order to give correct guidance, this level must be understood and then raised by finding those forms of activity which the people are prepared to take. We follow the well-known principle of "coming from the masses and going back to the masses."

In many of our articles in our bulletins we conclude with calls for action, and it is correct that we should suggest suitable forms of action which the people are prepared to take.

**However, such calls for action, which seem to be based on the level of consciousness as we understand it, will, in reality, be mechanical and academic unless the branch itself moves into action, mobilising interest and support along the lines of the directions and suggestions given.**

So, therefore, we need to ask: What are WE doing about the matter. Are WE, for example, writing letters to the papers or to the Prime Minister, as well as getting supporters to do likewise and making known the fact that the branch is in action on the issue.

The people make their own history. In the long and bitter struggle for their emancipation, for Socialism, the people will certainly win to victory, guided by the vanguard of the working class, the Communist Party.

"Heroes" standing above the masses who ignore the collective, or sit on the sidelines and attack the Party leadership, are not needed and only obstruct the onward march of the people. They will be swept aside.

In this great struggle of the working people for their future, the Party branch newspaper, the bulletin, is playing, and will continue to play, an indispensable role as an extension of the Party's press. Our task is to struggle for its improvement in both form and content so that it becomes a still better weapon of influence in the two vital spheres of our work—industry and the residential areas.

# CPSU 20th Congress --- Root of All Evils of Khrushchov Revisionists

(Reprinted from Peking Review)

The fifth volume of the collection of "Statements by Khrushchov" in Chinese translation has come off the press and is now on sale throughout China.

Compiled and published by the "Shijie Zhishi" (World Culture) Press, the volume contains 24 speeches, reports and interviews by Khrushchov that were made public in 1956, including the full text of the general report made by Khrushchov at the 20th Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union in February, 1956. The volume comes to some 230,000 Chinese characters.

A publisher's note prefaces the volume. It reads in full as follows:

**B**EGINNING with volume five, the collection of "Statements by Khrushchov" will carry public statements made by Khrushchov from 1956 onward.

In volume five, the general report made by Khrushchov at the 20th Congress of the C.P.S.U. in February, 1956, merits particular attention. It is a typical product of modern revisionism and is greatly treasured by all Khrushchov revisionists. It is indispensable reading for those who wish to understand and study the history of the development of Khrushchov revisionism.

What did the 20th Congress of the C.P.S.U., held under Khrushchov's auspices, do? What sort of a congress was it?

History has given an adequate answer.

That congress made a frenzied attack on the great Marxist-Leninist, Stalin; essentially it defamed the party of the proletariat and its leader, defamed the dictatorship of the proletariat and the socialist system, attacked Marxism-Leninism and attacked the Soviet Union, Communism and the people.

The congress postulated so-called peaceful transition to Socialism "by parliamentary means"; essentially it negated the road of the October Revolution, opposed proletarian revolution and national-democratic revolution

and opposed every kind of revolutionary armed struggle.

The congress postulated so-called peaceful co-existence as the "general line" of the foreign policy of socialist countries; essentially it advocated class collaboration on an international scale, capitulationism and the betrayal of proletarian internationalism; they themselves did not want revolution and forbade it for others; they themselves did not support revolution and forbade others to support it.

The congress postulated so-called "friendly cooperation" between the Soviet Union and the United States, and it prettified U.S. imperialism and its chieftain; essentially it propagated the notion that the nature of U.S. imperialism had changed and that two great powers, the Soviet Union and the United States, should dictate to the whole world.

The congress postulated "combatting the personality cult"; essentially this was intended as an attack on the Marxist-Leninists of all countries, so that buffoons of the Khrushchov variety "who speak at random and talk sheer nonsense" could become the "new leaders," and as a catch-word for purposes of subverting and controlling fraternal Parties and fraternal countries and thus paving the way for the introduction of Khrushchov revisionism.

The 20th Congress of the C.P.S.U. was the most significant sign of the emergence of Khrushchov revisionism. It was at that congress that Khrushchov first put forward the Khrushchov revisionist line in opposition to Marxism-Leninism. In the article, "The Origin and Development of the Differences Between the Leadership of the C.P.S.U. and Ourselves," we pointed out that "the 20th Congress of the C.P.S.U. was the first step along the road of revisionism taken by the leadership of the C.P.S.U. From the 20th Congress to the present, the revisionist line of the leadership of the C.P.S.U. has gone through the process of emergence, formation, growth and systematisation. And by a gradual process, too, people have come to understand more and more deeply the revisionist line of the C.P.S.U. leadership."

The 20th Congress of the C.P.S.U. is the root from which stems all the evils done by the Khrushchov revisionists. In that Congress we can find the origin of all such things as the 22nd Congress of the C.P.S.U., the Programme of the C.P.S.U., the "three peacefuls" and "two entires" ("peaceful co-existence," "peaceful competition" and "peaceful transition," and "the state of the entire people" and "the party of the entire people"), and the

“four alignments with and four against” (alignment with imperialism against Socialism, alignment with the United States against China and other revolutionary countries, alignment with the reactionaries everywhere against the national-liberation movements and the peoples’ revolutions, and alignment with the Tito clique and renegades of all descriptions against all the fraternal Marxist-Leninist Parties and all revolutionaries fighting imperialism).

The 20th Congress of the C.P.S.U. is the origin of the split in the international Communist movement. From the moment it took place, confusion arose within the international Communist movement and within the ranks of many Communist Parties. In the final analysis, all the current differences in the international Communist movement stem from that Congress. And they are becoming deeper with each passing day because the C.P.S.U. leadership persists in pursuing and developing the revisionist line of that Congress and insistently seeks to impose it on the fraternal Parties of other countries.

The 20th Congress of the C.P.S.U. has greatly helped imperialism and the reactionaries of all countries by providing them with weapons against revolution, against Communism and against the socialist camp. After the Congress, the imperialists and reactionaries seized the opportunity to stir up great waves of opposition to the Soviet Union, to Communism and to the people, most prominent among which was the counter-revolutionary rioting in Hungary. Those enemies of Communism, the Trotskyites, also seized the opportunity to move into action. In the past nine years, imperialism and its stooges have consistently made use of the revisionist line, formulated at this Congress and later developed and systematised, in order to undermine the international Communist movement and to disintegrate the revolutionary cause of the people of all countries.

What Khrushchov and company did during and after the 20th Congress of the C.P.S.U. has shown that they have thoroughly betrayed the international proletariat and the revolutionary peoples of the world, and have degenerated so far as to collude with imperialism and world reaction and work from within in collaboration with the outside enemy to oppose the revolutionary struggle of the peoples of all countries.

No matter how the Khrushchov revisionists try to justify the 20th Congress of the C.P.S.U., it will go down in the history of the international Communist movement

as an anti-Marxist-Leninist Congress which proclaimed the birth of Khrushchov revisionism; a Congress that betrayed the proletarian world revolution and served imperialism and world reaction; a Congress that split the international Communist movement and undermined the great unity of the revolutionary peoples of the whole world; a Congress that denigrated the C.P.S.U. which Lenin founded, and put it on the path of degeneration from a proletarian political party to one going in the direction of a bourgeois political party; a Congress that defamed the great Soviet state and put it on the path of degeneration from a state of the dictatorship of the proletariat to one going in the direction of a dictatorship of the bourgeoisie. The 20th Congress of the C.P.S.U. will go down in the annals of history as one that will leave a stench for all time.

From the very beginning, the Chinese Communist Party had a different estimate of the 20th Congress of the C.P.S.U. from that of the Khrushchov revisionists. At the time, we repeatedly conveyed our views to the leadership of the C.P.S.U. through inner channels and advanced principled criticism of their errors on the question of Stalin and on the question of so-called peaceful transition. We also openly published the two articles, "On the Historical Experience of the Dictatorship of the Proletariat" and "More on the Historical Experience of the Dictatorship of the Proletariat," in which we expounded our views in a positive way. At that time, of course, it was still impossible to see the essence of Khrushchov revisionism as clearly as we did later, because Khrushchov revisionism was then only beginning to take shape.

According to Marxist-Leninist dialectics, the essence of a thing manifests itself through phenomena, and phenomena unfold gradually. It is only after a process has gone on for a certain time and the contradictions are fully revealed that it becomes possible for people to comprehend the essence of the thing and arrive at correct judgments on the basis of a large number of phenomena and, in particular, the test of practice. Khrushchov revisionism has gone through a process of development. It was camouflaged under layer after layer of "Marxism-Leninism" and its true features revealed themselves step by step. One's comprehension of it has of necessity to undergo a process. However, it is not too difficult to distinguish between the pretensions and the real intentions found in the statements and actions of the Khrushchov revisionists if a Marxist-Leninist class analysis of the numerous objective facts is made and the essence of

Khrushchov revisionism is grasped.

This is the way to deal with Khrushchov and, of course, it must be the way to deal with Khrushchov's successors. The experience gained in coping with Khrushchov makes it easier for people to see the essence of Khrushchov's successors and prevents them from being confused by superficial, transient and spurious phenomena.

Very clearly, then, the problem of one's approach to the 20th and 22nd Congresses and to the Programme of the C.P.S.U. is the most important, the essential question in the struggle between Marxist-Leninists and Khrushchov revisionists. Whether one thoroughly exposes and criticises the revisionist line of the 20th and 22nd Congresses of the C.P.S.U. and of the Programme of the C.P.S.U. or whether one persists in it and propagates it energetically—here rests the most fundamental difference between Marxist-Leninists and Khrushchov revisionists.

In-as-much as they are persisting in the line of the 20th and 22nd Congresses of the C.P.S.U. and of the Programme of the C.P.S.U., Khrushchov's successors have shown that they have not in the least changed their revisionist, splittist and great-nation chauvinist nature, no matter how many fine words they utter. Their flowery talk about anti-imperialism, revolution and unity is only protective colouring designed to deceive people. Their most important, revealing words, their soul, their true essence, are to be found in their avowals of adherence to the line of the 20th and 22nd Congresses and the Programme of the C.P.S.U.

It has become increasingly clear that Khrushchov's successors are really following in his footsteps. They are really placing themselves in opposition to the more than 90 per cent. of the people of the world (including the people of the Soviet Union). Their class position conditions them to place the noose left by Khrushchov around their own necks.

The so-called general line of foreign policy which the new leadership of the C.P.S.U. has vowed to uphold, consisting of "peaceful co-existence" and "U.S.-Soviet collaboration for the solution of the problems of the world," has gone bankrupt in actual practice. To-day the U.S. imperialists' wild aggression in Vietnam once again shows up the absurdity of this revisionist general line. Johnson, ring-leader of U.S. imperialism, like Truman, Eisenhower and Kennedy before him, is no "sober" or "sensible" person, as Khrushchov and his successors have alleged, but a hatchet man who does not scruple to commit every



imaginable crime. Subjected to aggression, the Vietnamese people, in dealing with the utterly vicious U.S. aggressors, have no alternative but to resist to the end, to resist until they have completely defeated them, and there can be no question whatever of "peaceful co-existence" with them. Collaboration between the Soviet Union and the United States to dominate the world did not work in the past, does not work now and will not work in the future. However much they collaborate, the Soviet Union and the United States can never stamp out the just struggles of the great Vietnamese people and the revolutionary peoples of the world against U.S. imperialism; this simply reveals more and more fully how Khrushchov's successors are still transposing their relationships with friend and foe, aligning themselves with the chief enemy of the people of the whole world while directing the spearhead against the revolutionary peoples.

Now that volume five of "Statements by Khrushchov" has come off the press, we make a point of recommending to our readers Khrushchov's report of nine years ago. We suggest that they use the method of comparison to see what Khrushchov paid lip-service to and what he actually did at the time, how his works compare with those of his successors, and how he tampered with Marxism-Leninism and what criticisms Marxist-Leninists have made of him. By reviewing the history of the past nine years and making such contrasts, one can better analyse and compare and arrive at correct conclusions.

Khrushchov is finished. Khrushchov revisionism, too, is bankrupt. Yet to this very moment, Khrushchov's successors are still clinging to the shattered hulk of Khrushchov revisionism. How can this help them? Battered by the storm of the revolution, this lone craft is falling to pieces; how, then, can they hope to save it from destruction by patching it up with a few planks?

"A thousand sails skim past the shipwreck; a forest thrives beside the withered tree." These two lines of poetry superbly describe the present situation of revolution in the world. In the process of triumphing in the struggle against Khrushchov revisionism, revolutionary theory and the revolutionary ranks of Marxism-Leninism are ceaselessly developing and gaining strength. In the struggles against U.S. imperialism and its lackeys and the reactionaries of all countries, the revolutionary people of the whole world are breaking through all the obstacles erected by modern revisionism, one after another, and are advancing like a great fleet of ships riding the waves in

full sail. Like forests of trees burgeoning in spring, the great cause of proletarian world revolution is thriving, while, like a sinking ship, like a withering tree, imperialism, reaction and modern revisionism are nearing their end and life gets more difficult for them day by day.

***For the news and views  
the dailies don't print -***

**People's Voice**

(Weekly—25/- a year posted)

and

**Communist Review**

(Monthly—18/- a year posted)

**Combined Subscription for the two Publications:  
£2/2/- a year posted.**

From the

**Manager, Box 2197, Auckland**

1845  
The first of the  
series of the  
series of the  
series of the

series of the  
series of the  
series of the  
series of the

