entire area of Lukamba was put to the torch and all inhabitants killed.

After the start of the Congolese people's armed struggle, an article in the British *Sunday Telegraph* on February 16 disclosed that 1,500 well-equipped Adoula troops were carrying out "a systematic clean-up" in the Kwilu region and a "kill and destroy indiscriminately" operation. However, all the terrorist acts of the Adoula regime certainly can only arouse the indignant Congolese people to determined action. The paper admitted that attempts by Adoula troops to wipe out the patriotic forces "are making little headway."

Washington Shaken Up

This recent march of events has inspired the Congolese people with greater confidence in their struggle against U.S. imperialism and for genuine national independence. It has caused alarm in Leopoldville and anxiety in Washington. On March 1, when he announced an indefinite postponement of the resumption of the Congolese parliament, U.S.-backed President Joseph Kasavubu said that allowing parliament to meet at that time seemed "ill-timed." The Adoula regime has declared a state of emergency throughout the Kwilu region, banning gatherings of five or more persons. UPI has warned of "the most critical" situation since 1961 in the Congo. The *New York Herald Tribune* (February 14) said that the Congolese guerrillas "send shivers of concern into Westerners." What is dangerous about the Congolese guerrilla operation, it added, "is that it has expanded successfully. Moreover, it is a definite pilot scheme to adapt revolution to local conditions."

U.S. imperialism is particularly fearful of the influence of the Congolese patriotic armed struggle. U.S. Ambassador to the Congo Edmund Gullion who visited the Kwilu region soon after the outbreak of the struggle said that "the danger came not from the military point of view, but from the effect it might have on other regions." Refusing to learn from the situation, Washington has decided to help strengthen Adoula's police force in an attempt to suppress the Congolese people, beginning with the police of the three major cities — Leopoldville, Stanleyville and Elisabethville.

One of the mottoes of the Congolese people is: "endurance and perseverance." No matter what efforts are made by U.S. imperialism in its attempts to hang on in the Congo, the people's armed forces will continue to fight on until they have won final victory.

— WANG LIN

International Communist Movement

V.G. Wilcox's Speech at Party School In Canton

V.G. Wilcox, General Secretary of the Communist Party of New Zealand, made a speech on February 18 at the Party School of the Kwangtung Provincial Committee of the Chinese Communist Party in Canton. The full text of his speech follows. Subheads are ours. — Ed.

Comrades,

It is a great pleasure and honour to speak to you today. An honour not only for myself personally but for the Communist Party of New Zealand of which I am General Secretary, a Party that in the capitalist world is endeavouring to the best of its ability to uphold the banners of Marxism-Leninism and prepare the way by correct policy and practice for the future advance to a socialist New Zealand. That we face many difficulties you will realize. We have made some gains and we have made some mistakes, the experience of which we have tried to study in order to eliminate them from our theory and practice in the future. In our own way, based on our own experiences and understanding, we have tried to apply the theories of Marxism to our country and its conditions. For any Marxist-Leninist party there is no other way because otherwise one takes the road of sectarianism, of dogmatism. Therefore our Party programme is based on New Zealand conditions while using the worldwide experience of our movement both before and since the Great October Revolution of 1917 led by Lenin.

Firm Support for 1957 Declaration and 1960 Statement

We have stood firm in support of the recent documents of our world movement — the 1957 Declaration and the 81 Parties' Statement of 1960. We have refused to follow the illusions advanced by the revisionists that so much has occurred since 1960 that without world collective consideration at the request of the leadership of the C.P.S.U. whole portions of the 1957 Declaration and the 81 Parties' Statement of 1960 should either be ignored or unilaterally altered. We have refused to accept the revisionist concept that the League of Yugoslavian Communists should be brought back into our Marxist-Leninist fold without retracting their revisionist views or activity in order, so say the revisionists, to save what so-called socialism still exists in their country. We have refused to accept the idea that so many things have changed since 1960 that dogmatism and not revisionism is now the main danger in our world Marxist-Leninist movement.

No! We stand firm, upholding, as we see them, the principles of Marxism-Leninism in our part of the capitalist world, in so doing we have made many enemies but we have found many friends, both in New Zealand and in other countries. In time we will gain more friends and the enemy will retreat and finally be overcome by the offensive of the correct principles of Marxism.

The N.Z. Party Fights for Marxism-Leninism

Comrades, as the 81 Parties' Statement put it, we are in the era of the decline of imperialism and the victory of socialism on a world scale. Today it is apparent that this situation has brought not only gains but also new problems. New difficulties have brought sharp contradictions, struggles within our world movement and within each individual Communist Party. This should not discourage any Marxist. Without difficulties, contradictions and struggle we do not advance. If we do not recognize this first stagnation sets in and then retreat. It is useless in such a situation to remain placid like a cow chewing its cud and hope that time will bring a solution without our help. No — we must fight, we must oppose all who want to emasculate Marxism-Leninism in such a way that ultimately it would survive as but a bourgeois theory. The Communist Party of New Zealand in its congress decision last year recognized this and we are fighting for the principles of Marxism-Leninism. Within our world Marxist-Leninist movement those who today take a stand will emerge victorious and modern revisionism will be defeated.

Today the idea has arisen that because of the strength of the socialist world the way forward has now become easy, that socialism can be won in the main through reliance on the socialist world and not on the organized fighting ability of the masses led by their own Communist Parties. Looking at it in this way the class struggle as the motive force for change in each individual country assumes less and less importance and class collaboration ideas grow, both in internal policy and international affairs. This is but an expression of revisionism, the same revisionism that Lenin fought, the basic idea being the same as that advanced by the Bernsteins and the Kautskys. The modern revisionists may express it in different language, they may try to cloak it by talking about the "new era" but in content it is the same old story.

Modern Revisionists Defend U.S. Imperialism

In the imperialist world new contradictions are arising, contradictions which all Marxists should welcome and use, but do the revisionists suggest doing this? No. They profess to see no new contradictions or else they ignore them. They see imperialism in decline as a monolithic whole, hence they attempt to deal with it as a whole. That imperialist France is, in a small but nevertheless significant way, throwing out challenges to the hegemony of United States imperialism is not, for the revisionists, something to be welcomed, something that will help our movement advance in its struggle against all imperialism. No! It is to them a bad thing against which a main blow must be delivered and they end up seeing French imperialism as the most reactionary force in the world, and advising us to concentrate our forces against it. What are they doing really when they advocate this? They are assisting the most reactionary force in the world, United States imperialism, to maintain unchallenged its present dominating position in the imperialist camp.

This issue, of growing divisions within imperialism, shows clearly what is the role of modern revisionism in practice. Because of a wrong theory, that of dealing with imperialism as a monolithic whole which to them in practice means dealing with United States imperialist leaders, they find themselves defending United States imperialism and its interests against other imperialisms. Is that not the explanation of our Czech comrades' attack on the Chinese for establishing, at this stage, diplomatic relations with France? Of course it is. Since when, we ask, did Marxist-Leninists act in this way? Did not Stalin after World War II point out that divisions of importance would again arise in the imperialist camp and that we should welcome them and use them to the advantage of the struggle against imperialism and for the victory of socialism on a world scale? Who was right, the revisionists who see imperialism as a whole and who in fact conciliate with it in the false belief that it will weaken and die peacefully, or Stalin? Of course it was Stalin. Stalin did make serious mistakes but they were small and unimportant in comparison with those of the revisionists of today. He, not they, has a history of standing firm against imperialism.

Comrades, I have spoken briefly of how the revisionists in our world movement are trying to revise Marxism-Leninism in such a way that it would become just a bourgeois theory with an outer coating of Marxist phrases. That they should continue to use Marxist language and for that matter continue occasionally to advance correct Marxist theory is not unexpected. A study of Kautsky shows that that is precisely what he did when he had passed from the Marxist camp to that of the bourgeoisie. Lenin exposed this cunning approach and we must do the same with the modern revisionists. They talk big in Marxist-Leninist language, if possible every third word refers to the great Lenin, but when their words have to be put into practice where are the revisionists? They are missing!

Revisionism in Action

Does this not apply to the national-liberation struggle? The revisionists speak as if the national-liberation struggle is nearly ended and as if we were now passing into a new period. This is just not correct. Hundred of millions of people still live under colonialism or under conditions where imperialism is still the dominating factor in deciding their living standards and their way of life. The revisionists refuse to see the growing danger of neo-colonialism because to do so will bring them into direct conflict with imperialism which they pretend to believe is gently fad-

ing away. Their solution is to compete peacefully with imperialism through "economic aid." This is what has been done in India. The leadership of the C.P.S.U. persists in regarding India not as a capitalist country, becoming more and more under the influence of United States imperialism, but as a country still in the process of a national-liberation struggle led by Nehru and the Congress. Today the Congress policy is reactionary — it aids imperialism, prevents real independence and leads to the further impoverishment of the masses of the people of India. But Khrushchov and his followers fawn over Nehru, give aid which is used directly against another socialist country, the People's Republic of China, and persist in the story that the Sino-Indian border dispute is the fault of China! This latter point they persist in, in spite of the fact that no other Asian or Southeast Asian country, socialist or non-socialist, is of their opinion. What is this in practice but assisting in the infiltration of United States imperialism into India, the strengthening of the most reactionary force in our modern world, the building up of the power that has huge stockpiles of atomic weapons and which remains a daily threat to world peace. The revisionists prattle about world peace, a world without arms and without war, but through their deeds they strengthen the forces that now and in the future, are the main danger, as far as world war is concerned and as far as local imperialist wars are concerned too. These local imperialist wars are waged to protect and advance U.S. imperialist interests and strengthen the U.S. imperialists in their backing of reactionary regimes by aid and armed force in Asia, Southeast Asia, Africa, and Latin America.

This is revisionism in action.

Again, where armed struggle is being conducted, in many cases under the leadership of the Communist Party, do they show their concern for the victory of the liberation forces? No, their main worry is to find a peaceful way in co-operation with the imperialists. Recent history proves this point.

How does this affect our Party in New Zealand?

You Can't Stand Aside From the Battle Against Revisionism

For a long time many comrades thought that we were not directly involved and that the policy decided by our national conferences, based on Marxism-Leninism as we saw it, would proceed unhindered by the overseas development of revisionism; that in fact this question could be settled by others so that while we might deplore what was occurring we could stand aside from the battle.

Obviously this was incorrect. Our proletarian duty meant that we had to battle not only internally but on the international front for Marxism-Leninism in our world movement. It soon became apparent too that the application of our Marxist-Leninist policy in New Zealand was hindered and made more difficult by growth of revisionism on a world scale.

I have spoken of the concept of dealing with imperialism as a monolithic whole while ignoring the growth of divisions within imperialism and I have stated how this lead some to think that People's China should not recognize imperialist France because France desires to challenge the United States monopoly of the nuclear weapon for its own imperialist purposes. Here, straight away, we have a difference in policy in N.Z. Not only do we welcome France's recognition of People's China but we do not consider that French imperialism, because it desires to test nuclear weapons in the Pacific thus ignoring the partial test ban agreement, immediately become the most reactionary force, against which the main blow against imperialism at this stage must be dealt, in countries bordering on the Pacific. Yet that is what some Parties with revisionist leadership are doing in that area. They are taking the heat off U.S. imperialism which is the most reactionary force in the world today. They demand protests against the French tests but they carry out no effective campaign for the total end to all testing, manufacture, and stockpiling of nuclear weapons and the destruction of existing stockpiles which is the only effective guarantee against nuclear war. These Parties call the Chinese Government's appeal for such action premature. It is apparent that they are beginning to accept the United States proposal that there be only two nuclear powers, the U.S. and the Soviet Union, and that they are going to pretend that that is a secure basis for world peace.

Our Party says, yes, we should protest against French tests in the Pacific right at our front door but we should also make plain that the main enemy is U.S. imperialism, which tested and perfected atomic weapons at the same front door.

While protesting against the French tests we should link such a protest with the demand that all nuclear tests be stopped and all stockpiles be destroyed. The revisionists do not agree, so at this stage unity in action, both in N.Z. and between Parties bordering the Pacific, is damaged by revisionism.

The Question of Malaysia

In the countries of the South Pacific and those bordering the Pacific, the question of Malaysia is of immediate concern. In New Zealand our Government, like that of Australia, is committed to aid the armed forces of the British imperialist puppet, Tunku Rahman, if called upon to do so. At any moment we are faced with the danger of being involved in war with our neighbour to the north, Indonesia. But do the revisionists recognize this danger as an urgent one? No, they are too concerned about concentrating their fire on French imperialism and they do not realize the fact that tied up in this issue is a revival of more open conflict between British imperialism and the present dominant imperialism, the U.S.A. The U.S.A. does not want effective British success in Malaysia, it wants its own imperialist influence to be the major factor there, hence its approach through R. Kennedy recently, the talks with Sukarno, etc. The United States moves are

not genuine moves designed to preserve peace in South-east Asia and the South Pacific but are intended to check the interests of British imperialism while of course they hope to extend their own. Fortunately the Indonesian Government realizes that such differences can be used to advantage but the revisionists cannot see any possibilities in such a situation.

What is the position now in New Zealand? Our Government is pledged to aid by armed force, if called upon, the newly created Malaysia but it is making it very plain that it does not want to be called upon to do so. The reason is obvious. The domination of British imperialism, as far as N.Z. foreign policy is concerned, no longer exists. The new factor, U.S. imperialist influence in our area, enters and the result is to some extent confusion and no decisive action. Our Party can of course use such differences arising in our ruling class to advantage. It can use this situation to ensure that no troops go to Malaysia by raising opposition not only from the working class but from sections of the bourgeoisie. Can the revisionists in the countries of the Pacific see this? No they cannot, because they only regard imperialism as a monolithic whole. To them, in the "new era" divisions within imperialism either do not exist or are unimportant.

Strategy and Tactics Towards Social Democracy

Where do the revisionists stand on what is for us in New Zealand the basic question of correct strategy and tactics towards social democracy? They confuse the mass working-class base of social democracy in countries such as ours with a mass working-class ideology. In fact they are starting to argue that if a Labour Party has an overwhelming majority of workers in its membership it must follow that it has a working-class outlook in policy, or at least that correct policy can be achieved without an ideological battle to win the workers to an understanding of the basic principles of Marxism-Leninism and of the necessity for a Communist Party. In fact, they persist in ignoring the historical fact that social democracy nowhere in the world has led the working people and their allies to the achievement of state power and the creation of a socialist society. It is only where a strong and decisive leadership has come from the Party of the working class, the Communist Party, has that been achieved. The modern revisionists, claiming that we are in a new era and that things are different to what they used to be, say that now we can work in a different way and somehow or other through parliamentary road with little additions here and there achieve a socialist society. In fact they say we can do it without the establishment of the dictatorship of the proletariat. Utter and complete nonsense! They expect to achieve socialism by a Labour Party, assisted by a few injections from the present membership of the Communist Party. This leads to the negation of the correct concept of the leading role of a Communist Party and in fact starts it on the road to liquidation. In the mid-1940s the Browder line, advanced for a time in the Communist Party of the U.S.A. suggested organizational steps towards the liquidation of effective communist organization based on Marxism-Leninism and many of the present revisionists opposed it then. Today they are taking the Browder road. At the best they treat the Labour Party as a two class Party, but all Marxists know that such a thing is an impossibility. They refuse to learn from Lenin who categorically declared that social democratic political parties, labour parties, are capitalist parties.

The Communist Party of New Zealand does not view social democracy in this revisionist way. We see the necessity to work and unite on immediate issues of struggle with all sections of the workers including those most strongly influenced by and supporting the Labour Party, we also see the need to conduct side by side with such united front work a continuing educational ideological battle to win the workers to Marxism-Leninism and to an understanding of why no social democratic party ever leads them to socialism but in fact merely strengthens the stranglehold of capitalism. We unite in action with these sections but we do not unite ideologically. On the contrary we bring out strongly the leading role of our Communist Party, the reasons why it must be strengthened and its influence widened if we are to effectively lead the struggle for a socialist New Zealand.

In other words, in dealing with social democracy we unite with but we also struggle against. When we do this the revisionists in the world movement say we are dogmatists, Left sectarians and that we do not understand the changed situation in the world. They say we do not realize that, as with the nature of imperialism in our present era, so also the nature of social democracy has changed. Lenin has thus become outdated! The revisionist leaders of the Second International, Kautsky in particular, when they passed from a correct Marxist approach to one of revising Marxism because they say that it was outdated and did not meet the new conditions of the strong imperialist world of those days quickly passed from revising Marxism to complete opposition to all aspects of Marxist theory and practice. They rapidly become social democrats as we understood it. In the years of about 1905 to 1915-16, most of them went overboard but were still hanging on to Marxism at the outbreak of World War I.

One can well say of the modern revisionists that unless they quickly return to the principles of Marxism-Leninism they too will cease to be revisionists of Marxism-Leninism and will become complete opponents of all aspects of Marxism-Leninism. They will become as ardent social democrats as leaders of our labour parties in the capitalist world.

And some Communist Parties of Europe today, the Communist Party of Italy in particular, are very much near that position. There is no middle road between Marxism-Leninism and social democracy for revisionists.

Viewing them in this way, what are our Communist Parties in the classic countries of social democracy in fact becoming? Nothing more than a Left wing of social democracy, a useful tool of the capitalist class

for preserving a little longer their privileged class position and their exploitation of the masses. In the era of the decline of imperialism and the victory of socialism on a world scale they are, in the strongholds of imperialism, helping imperialism to live a little longer.

The incorrect ideological approach to social democracy had immediate repercussions as far as policy and activity in the trade union movement (the movement that Lenin referred to as the mass organs of struggle of the workers) was concerned.

New Zealand is the country that Lenin described as the paradise of the Second International. The social democratic idea of a workers' capitalism, the so-called welfare state, was founded in our country away back in the 1890s by legislative action by the Liberal-Labour governments of that time. This was when the concept of class collaboration between the worker and the employer in the industrial field through government legislation arose. For the majority of the workers industrial conciliation and arbitration became the only way to advance claims for higher wages, better conditions, etc. The idea, spread successfully by the ruling class, is that the workers could rely on industrial issues in any dispute receiving impartial justice from an appointee of the capitalist state if agreement could not be reached between the workers and employers. Needless to say, the result has always been class justice — justice favouring the employing class.

Social democratic ideology has kept such illusions as "impartial justice from the capitalist state" strong in the minds of our workers and has up to now been accepted by the majority of trade unions. Recently however the deepening crisis of capitalism on a world scale has begun to affect the economy of New Zealand in a more direct way. Although our living standards remain possibly the highest in the capitalist world, the workers, small farmers and small businessmen have found that their living standards are down compared with ten or fifteen years ago and that they are still falling. The growing infiltration of international monopoly into New Zealand, together with the fact that our economy relies upon the price received from the export of farm products (a doubtful factor on the world market today), has meant that prices have risen, increasing the cost of living, but no increase in income has occurred. In the trade union movement this has given birth to a more militant policy, the beginning of a nationwide move to break from the stranglehold of class collaboration and the wider use of the strike weapon against the employing class. Last year more workers went on strike than for many a long year. Conditions for our Party to develop, inside the trade union movement, a clearer class understanding and more progressive working class politics have become more favourable.

However, if we accept the revisionist ideas we cannot utilize these favourable conditions. Collaboration with imperialism at the top, and waiting for it to be peacefully competed out of existence, leads inevitably to accepting the idea of class peace and not class struggle in our own internal affairs.

C.P.S.U. Leaders Turn Away From Revolution

And so leaving the question of social democracy it is no wonder these revisionists say that we are suggesting something outside of the general line of our world movement when we insist that today the storm centres of world revolution are in Asia, Southeast Asia, Africa and Latin America. Suslov told our delegation this when it was in Moscow for bilateral talks with the Central Committee of the C.P.S.U. Since when have Marxist-Leninists expected the next break-through, the next advance of socialism, to occur in the strongpoints of imperialism? In actual practice the further success of the revolutionary movements in the weak links of imperialism will greatly aid our struggle against imperialism and help to break the stranglehold of social democratic ideology on the minds of our workers.

In actual life, what Suslov, Khrushchov and other leaders of the C.C. of the C.P.S.U. are saying to us: look to the strongpoints of imperialism to break through. What does that mean? In fact they turn away from revolution. No wonder they turn to conciliation with imperialism.

Social Democracy — Servant of Imperialism

To return to social democracy. Lenin outlined the reasons for its rise in the ranks of the workers' movements and in Marxist parties many long years ago. He pointed out that with the development of imperialism the ruling class in imperialist countries were able by their excessive exploitation of their new colonial empires to buy off sections of the workers in their own countries by giving them slightly higher living standards, crumbs from the rich man's table. They were able to buy off workers leaders by flattery, by honours and knighthoods and by straight out bribery. This could be done without in any way affecting their own profits; in fact the dampening down of class struggle, the development of theories of class collaboration and class peace in the imperialist countries always showed a good dividend on any profit and loss balance sheet. Social democratic ideology and social democratic political parties were thus created among the working class in the capitalist world.

What becomes of social democratic ideology and its political expression among the workers in the period of imperialist decline? If Lenin was right, and we consider that he was, should we not expect a decline in this particular brand of bourgeois theory? We think so but the revisionists do not agree. In the era of the decline of imperialism they see social democracy remaining but changing like imperialism which they now say can be made through its weakness to accept a peace policy and die gracefully without struggle. In their opinion, social democracy, labour parties, will become parties with which not only can we unite and work on certain limited issues in the interests of the masses but with which we can unite in the struggle for socialism in our own countries.

What utter nonsense! As the struggle in the imperialist world grows social democracy becomes an ever more vicious servant of capitalism in each individual country. Its mass support must be won to a working-class outlook and to support of the Communist Party. It is obvious that the decline of imperialism produces naturally the opposite to what Lenin saw occur in the days of its rise and that the hold of social democratic ideology in the ranks of the working class diminishes. That is so in N.Z. today. No longer do the mass of the workers expect the Labour Party to provide a solution to their problems, much less lead them to socialism as they used to believe in former years, social democracy's hold on them is based on the thin hope that they may prove a little better than other bourgeois political parties. In many cases the hope has gone and many workers have supported other capitalist parties as may be proved by an analysis of the results of the last two general elections in N.Z.

Road to Victory

The task of a Communist Party is to win them away from all bourgeois theories to a working-class ideology, to support of Marxism-Leninism. This will not be achieved by the false call for unity in everything (including ideology) just because the workers still constitute the mass of the social democratic parties which is what the revisionists are doing. No! It will be achieved in a Marxist-Leninist way by unity only on immediate issues, in action, in struggles, which will lift the understanding of the workers. They will learn by experience that way that the capitalist today, as always, concedes nothing unless the workers fight for it and that no capitalist intends to hand over state power to the working people and their allies without a struggle. They will learn to think about the ideological outlook and policy advanced by the Communist Party, an outlook based on Marxism-Leninism.

This is the road to the strengthening of the Communist Parties in the capitalist world where social democracy still remains a major problem. It is the road to victory. The revisionist road is the road to the liquidation of the Communist Parties as far as playing any independent role, or giving decisive leadership is concerned.

When our delegation to the bilateral talks in Moscow raised this question, so important not only to us in N.Z. but to our whole world movement, because as yet a major break-through against social democracy has yet to be made in any of the countries where social democratic ideology has been dominant among the ranks of the workers, what did Suslov have to say on behalf of the C.C.C.P.S.U.?

He said: "Why blame us? This is your problem. You must solve it." What a Marxist-Leninist attitude to adopt! Should we adopt the attitude to the struggle for national liberation and socialism in Southeast Asia, of saying that is not our problem and therefore does not concern us? Of course not. Any Marxist must be concerned because collectively the correct policy on all these matters means that we will achieve what the 81 Parties' Statement said we would and that is the world victory of socialism.

You see these revisionists as was apparent in our discussion in Moscow, when they do not want to deal with a thing, say that is your problem. But, then as Suslov did on behalf of the C.C. of the C.P.S.U. in the conclusion of his talk to us, he had no hesitation in saying: you are wrong. We had hope that you might change. If you change, you will remain within the ranks of the fraternal world Parties of Marxism-Leninism. But if you do not change, then, of course, you will be outside and excluded.

In other words, social democracy is our problem, but they decide who is going to remain in the framework of fraternal Parties.

Leadership of C.P.S.U. Can't Dodge Responsibility

Then again, when we spoke of the fact that their actions in regard to policies to socialist Albania, to socialist China and to other Communist Parties throughout the world, had shown that they were adopting an attitude that we could only sum up as great-nation chauvinism. When we said that, they had no effective answer. When in discussion we said, as we see it, your concept is by exploiting the rest of the socialist world you are going to advance to communism. In other words, they are going to advance to communism on the backs of the socialist world and the people and Communist Parties of other countries. When we said that, no effective reply. But what was the answer that came after a little while: In effect it was, Comrade Wilcox, we are very perturbed at the position of the Communist Party of New Zealand and your position in leadership. You are little-nation chauvinists.

In any case the statement that the C.C.C.P.S.U. leadership has no concern and no responsibility in the formulation of communist policy for the eradication of social democratic ideology from the ranks of the workers in the capitalist world is false. Their general policy since the 20th Congress, because of their former special position in our world movement and because since the Great October Revolution of 1917 they have held a particular leading role, has meant that they have played a big part in aiding the revisionist confusion between tactics in work among the masses under social democratic influence and action to achieve the strategic aim of defeating social democratic ideology in the workers' ranks and replacing it by Marxism-Leninism. Like other revisionists they cannot dodge that responsibility.

I say once again that the struggle against revisionism is in N.Z. a struggle for the survival of our Communist Party as a Marxist-Leninist party and that this basic problem affects all aspects of our policy.

From my experience in Moscow and elsewhere, if they told me that black was black, I still have an idea that it might be white and have a very careful look, because they certainly lie very, very effectively about everything.

Strategical and Tactical Aim of Our World Movement

I have discussed the problem of strategy and tactics for overcoming social democracy. This raises the

question of what is the fundamental strategical and tactical aim of our world movement today.

The Communist Party of New Zealand considers that the strategical aim of our world movement is the elimination of monopoly, of imperialism, the achieving of state power by the working class and the building of socialism from that point; the main tactical concentration at this stage being on the prevention of imperialist world war, particularly nuclear war. That is how we expressed it at the bilateral talks in Moscow last September.

But in Moscow when I put this forward, how did Suslov reply on behalf of the C.C.C.P.S.U.? He said, "You know the problem of preventing thermonuclear war occupies an important place. The Declaration and Statement adopted by world Communists says: 'That Communists consider the struggle for peace their primary task.' Frankly, do you agree with this? It was far from your speech. You diminish the role of the struggle for peace, but the 81 Parties' Statement says that the problems of war and peace are the most urgent problems of our time, that we have great responsibility for preventing a world nuclear war, first of all on the world working class. The fight for peace is not just a tactical matter but one of the basis of strategy of the international communist movement."

Social Democratic Revisionism

Comrades, our approach is the classical Marxist one and in spite of the spate of words in Moscow last September we still consider it correct. Suslov's concept opens up loopholes for social democratic revisionism to enter. Our objective, our strategic aim, assumes less importance and other things take their place, not just as far as immediate tactics are concerned but from a strategical approach too. The next step will be to ask for peace at any price from imperialism, complete conciliation and finally capitulation.

In N.Z. this issue assumes immediate importance for our Party. In the struggle for world peace and the drawing of the N.Z. people into maximum effort in that direction and in the struggle to get a peace policy on the international field from our Government, what is involved? We have to decide whether we must fight against imperialism in all aspects of its activities and influence as the basis of the struggle for peace or whether we as a Communist Party restrict our activities to certain forms of the struggle for peace. If we do the latter we will find that we have handed the leadership in the struggle for peace to bourgeois pacifist leaders and have ourselves become pacifist in outlook. We will ignore the inherent nature of imperialism, the nature that is the cause of modern war. Before long we will start prattling about the peaceful intentions of some imperialist leaders, overestimating the importance of top-level negotiations and underestimating the role of the working class, the role of the masses in the struggle for world peace. In other words we would turn away from the strategic aim of our Party which is the overthrow of imperialism, and make peace at any price our objective. That is what the modern revisionists have actually done. Of course it leads not to peace but to war. The imperialists have no peaceful intentions, they are not indulgent. They welcome the revisionist approach as a sign of weakness in our world movement. At this stage we become easy victims, lambs for the slaughter. The imperialist lions will never lie down with the socialist lambs and allow them slowly and peacefully to economically compete imperialism out of existence. No, we must build bigger, stronger, fiercer lions ourselves. So says the Communist Party of New Zealand.

Question of Open Polemics

And now let me turn to the question of open polemics. The Communist Party of New Zealand called in the early stages for the dropping of open polemics as in our opinion at that time it was harmful. The leadership of the C.P.S.U., headed by Khrushchov, would not agree. We called for a world meeting to discuss, in an objective and dialectical manner, the issues in dispute. Other Parties including the Communist Party of China did the same. But what occurred? The revisionists in the leadership of the Central Committee of the C.P.S.U. persisted in open polemics. They have continued to do so. At the 22nd Congress of the C.P.S.U. a violent attack was made on the leadership of another fraternal Party, the Albanian Party of Labour. While cooing like doves around the imperialist leaders the C.P.S.U. told the world that the leadership of the Albanian Party of Labour were betrayers and traitors. Having publicly fired these heavy shots they for a time became a little quieter. Then at the end of 1962 and the beginning of 1963 a series of Party congresses in both the socialist and capitalist sectors of Europe took place. Again open attacks were launched, a disgraceful, uncomradely attitude was adopted towards the fraternal delegates of the Communist Party of China and others who stood firm on Marxism-Leninism, one which culminated in the diatribe of Khrushchov at the Congress of the Socialist Unity Party in East Germany and in the welcoming of the representatives of the Yugoslav revisionists.

A call then came for the stopping of polemics although they themselves carried them on openly and this call has been repeated. Let time solve the problem and prove who is right, they say.

It is our opinion that at this stage open polemics cannot be stopped. The issues involved are too fundamental, they affect the future not only of our Parties but of the whole socialist world, the future of humanity. The polemics can only be stopped now if the revisionists give up their revisionism both in words and deeds. If they do not we will suffer great losses. What kind of Marxism-Leninism is it to say "let time solve the problem?" The whole essence of Marxism implies active aid in the solving of problems. A whole new world is being born, we are in the era of the victory of socialism on a world scale, do we assist in its creation or do we stand aside as the revisionists are asking us to do?

Now, why do they at this stage want to stop open polemics? Such an approach is but a trick. Their

tactics are those of firing in a frenzied manner all possible shots, of poisoning people's minds everywhere against the defenders of Marxism-Leninism and then saying please don't you start using your heavy ammunition. We'll all stop now and let time solve it. The fact is they are not too happy about the way increasing numbers of members of all Communist Parties and supporters are beginning to see through their revisionism, to see that it will lead to defeat and not victory. They fear a reply. They fear the offensive of Marxist-Leninists throughout the world. They want to carry on revisionism while all remain silent and wait for time to solve the question. No, we cannot accept such a proposal. Our world movement must consider the questions in dispute. Marxist-Leninists everywhere must be given aid and support. Recently Ted Hill, former Member of the Secretariat of the Communist Party of Australia, a leading Marxist-Leninist, visited New Zealand. What were we supposed to do: Ignore him and only talk with the revisionists? No, we would talk with anybody in the interests of developing our Marxist-Leninist movement, on correct principled basis, in New Zealand and throughout the world. That is what we did, in spite of the fact that some revisionists apparently considered that they are protected by the 81 Parties' Statement which in their interpretation, we can talk to nobody but to them. Revisionist leaderships of some Communist Parties must be forced, by the offensive of those holding firm to Marxism-Leninism, to allow their membership to read and study not only what revisionism today has to say about Marxism-Leninism and about those who oppose revisionism but also what Marxist-Leninists have to say. In the Communist Party of New Zealand the leadership has consistently tried to provide its membership with all known facts and varying opinions. The views of our Party, as presented by our delegation to Moscow last September to discuss ideological issues in dispute bilaterally with the Central Committee of the C.P.S.U., have been given to every Party member to study but we did not act like the revisionist leaders, we did not stop with our own views. Every word of what Suslov, the leader of the Soviet delegation at the talks, said was also given to all members at the same time together with a report adopted by our National Committee after our delegation's return to N.Z. in which we explained why we cannot accept the views advanced by Suslov on behalf of the C.C.C.P.S.U. International documents expressing varying views have been widely distributed. We have encouraged the attempt to obtain material on ideology being issued by the legation of the U.S.S.R. in Wellington, New Zealand. We have placed no black ban on our members reading and studying what the revisionists have to say, why do not the revisionists in the leadership of Communist Parties act in the same way? Why do they not tell their membership the truth about the Bucharest meeting called by the C.P.S.U. leaders after the Rumanian Congress in 1960? Why do they not tell the truth about the issues that had to be debated at the 81 Parties' meeting in November 1960? The reason is obvious. They fear the widespread knowledge of the facts. Is this Marxism? When have Marxists ever ignored, misrepresented, or evaded facts? Every Marxist must consider and study all known facts. Widespread open discussion, after consideration of all opinions, will lead quickly to the victory of Marxism-Leninism, hence the present tactics of abuse and blackout.

Worldwide Ferment in Marxist Ranks

We must not be despondent because such a situation faces us. Certainly not. Today millions are studying Marxism-Leninism, are studying the problems that arise after the victory of socialism in a number of countries. They are losing their idealistic illusions that class struggle, contradictions, the clash of opposites, inevitably vanish as the motive force for progress after socialist victory. They are reaching the conclusion, too, that the nature of imperialism has not changed, that in the capitalist world class struggle not class collaboration is still the primary factor in the fight for socialism and the defeat of imperialism.

A worldwide ferment is taking place in Marxist ranks. A new blossoming of creative Marxism will emerge that will guarantee the victory of Marxism-Leninism on a world scale. Let the revisionists shout and rave, let them manoeuvre how they may. We stand firm, knowing that there will be no victory for socialism on a world scale, no final defeat for world imperialism, while revisionism is dominant in important sectors of our world movement.

You all heard of the cult of the individual. I have had a lot to say about this. It can explain failures in the countryside, lack of bread, problems in industry, bad literature, poor painting. It can explain everything. Of course, Comrade Stalin died in 1953 and Khrushchov had been around a long time since and they do not explain that one.

Comrades, may I conclude by paying tribute to the great Communist Party of China and its leader Mao Tse-tung in their firm Marxist-Leninist stand on this issue. It has given heart to countless thousands, encouraging them in the battle for Marxism-Leninism in every country of the world.

We know that the masses make history. We have lived and are living in a period that demonstrates the correctness of this Marxist approach, but in each time and age great thinkers and leaders do have their role. It has been always so in our world movement. We have the example of the creative thought and practical activity of Marx and Engels, then of Lenin and to a degree of Stalin. Now, in the era when we face the problems of keeping firm the class struggle base as the motive force for change in the capitalist world as well as the problem of how to deal with the conflicts and the class struggle still existing in socialist society again we find a great creative Marxist-Leninist leader — your leader, Comrade Mao Tse-tung. Proletarian history will record his achievements and those of your Party in letters of gold when the puny leaders of modern revisionism are in their right place — the dust bin of history.