

ON THE MEETING
CONVENED IN MOSCOW
FROM MARCH 1
BY THE
CPSU LEADERSHIP

Articles in AKAHATA,
Organ of the Communist Party of Japan

FOREIGN LANGUAGES PRESS
PEKING

ON THE MEETING
CONVENED IN MOSCOW
FROM MARCH 1
BY THE
CPSU LEADERSHIP

Articles in AKAHATA,
Organ of the Communist Party of Japan

FOREIGN LANGUAGES PRESS
PEKING 1965

PUBLISHER'S NOTE

Collected in this pamphlet are two commentaries originally published on April 13 and May 7, 1965 in AKAHATA, the official daily newspaper of the Communist Party of Japan. The commentaries deal with the schismatic meeting held at Moscow in March, 1965 by the leadership of the CPSU. The translations are from the April and May, 1965 issues of the *Bulletin*, an English-language monthly published by the Japanese Communist Party.

Printed in the People's Republic of China

CONTENTS

ON THE MEETING CONVENED IN MOSCOW FROM MARCH 1 BY THE CPSU LEADERSHIP	1
IN REPLY TO THE CPSU LEADER'S GROUNDLESS CHARGES	
—Once Again on the Meeting Held in Moscow from March 1	43

**ON
THE MEETING CONVENED IN MOSCOW FROM
MARCH 1 BY THE CPSU LEADERSHIP**

AKAHATA, April 13, 1965

U.S. imperialism's aggression against the Vietnamese people is being carried on in a more ferocious way. Needless to say that in such a situation, the strengthening of unity and cohesion of the international Communist movement and the strengthening of the united struggle of Communist and Workers' Parties have become an ever more pressing task. For unity and cohesion of the international Communist movement as well as for carrying out the united struggle against U.S. imperialism's aggression in Viet Nam, it is especially necessary to fully examine what significance the meeting had which was convened by the CPSU leadership in Moscow on March 1 and to give a clear assessment of it.

**1. WHEREABOUTS OF THE "DRAFTING COMMISSION" OF
THE CPSU LEADERSHIP CENTERED ON N. S. KHRUSHCHOV**

It was announced in the name of the "consultative meeting" (according to the commercial press, "conference") that a meeting of a part of Communist and Workers' Parties unilaterally convened by the CPSU leadership was held in Moscow from March 1 to 5. The meeting is one which disguised the so-called "drafting

commission" by patching up its failure although the CPSU leadership was going to unilaterally convene it.

Last summer, while N. S. Khrushchov still held the post of first secretary, the CPSU leadership intended to hold a new international meeting of Communist and Workers' Parties during next July and attempted to unilaterally convene a meeting of the "drafting commission" for that purpose on December 15, 1964.

Our Party's Central Committee received a letter dated July 30, 1964 from the CPSU Central Committee concerning the convocation of the "drafting commission", but sent a reply dated September 30, 1964 and reasoned with them to criticize the error of the plan.

In the reply, our Party minutely pointed out and criticized the following points: —

(1) In principle, our Party is in favour of holding a meeting of representatives of Communist and Workers' Parties to eliminate differences of opinion within the international Communist movement and to strengthen its unity.

(2) But the condition necessary to prepare an international meeting is to be based on the revolutionary principles and norms regarding relations between fraternal Parties, defined by the 1957 Declaration and 1960 Statement.

(3) The CPSU leadership assumes as if the Communist Party of the Soviet Union has been entrusted with authority to convene an international meeting, but this is contrary to the truth and has no justifiable ground.

(4) The CPSU leadership has unilaterally decided the date and composition of the "drafting commission" and claims that it is a matter of course to compose the "drafting commission" with the 26 Parties which pre-

pared the 1960 international meeting. This is a unilateral claim with no justifiable ground. The date and composition of a preparatory commission should be newly decided through consultations among fraternal Parties.

(5) Moreover, on the pretext of an "absolute majority of Parties" supporting its proposal and without holding necessary consultations with our Party and other Parties concerned, the CPSU leadership insists that "even if some of the 26 Parties do not send their representatives by the above date", the "drafting commission" "should start its activity" to prepare drafts of the basic documents of the international meeting. It abandons the effort to eliminate, through consultations, the existing differences of opinion among fraternal Parties in connection with the way of preparation for an international meeting and unilaterally decides and enforces the date, composition and agenda of a preparatory meeting. This, in the final analysis, is bound to create a decisive split.

And while insisting that the convocation of a unilateral and groundless "international meeting" which might lead the international Communist movement to a decisive split be stopped, our Party maintained that in view of the present state of affairs of the international Communist movement, even though the controversy on the question of principles did not reach a final solution, it was precisely necessary for the advance of unity to strive to hold an international meeting in order to consult about concrete united actions for the joint struggle against the aggression, which was now being carried on by the peoples' common enemy clearly defined in the 1957 Declaration and the 1960 Statement, and extensively proposed to fraternal Parties to correctly make preparation for such an international meeting.

The unilateral plan of the CPSU leadership centered on N. S. Khrushchov to openly split the international Communist movement organizationally was subjected to strong criticism and opposition not only by our Party but also by a series of fraternal Parties which firmly uphold the principles of Marxism-Leninism. In addition, since the plan was of big-power chauvinist and divisionist nature, it met either opposition or reservation even from those Parties which so far had supported the opinion of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, and thus, the "drafting commission" had been driven to the state that its meeting could hardly be held.

But after N. S. Khrushchov's fall from power, the CPSU leadership succeeded the already clearly broken down divisionist plan handed down from N. S. Khrushchov and attempted to forcibly convene a meeting of the same "drafting commission" with no justifiable ground on March 1 of this year only by postponing its date by two and half months. It is quite natural that the unilateral plan met far stronger opposition and reservation than last time.

The CPSU Central Committee did not reply to aforementioned letter of our Party for more than two months and on December 3, 1964 (that is, directly before December 15, for which the "drafting commission" was scheduled), it suddenly informed us of the drafting commission to be postponed till March 1. Our Party at once sent a simple reply on December 10, 1964 to the effect that our Party never agrees to "the proposal which basically persists in the wrong, divisive proposal based on procedure with no justifiable ground, but only postpones the date of the convocation of the drafting commission

until March 1" and in addition, sent a detailed reply on January 16, 1965.

In this reply, our Party again refuted the wrong grounds for the convocation of a unilateral "international meeting" and the convocation of the "drafting commission" and insisted on the following points:—

(1) The CPSU leadership states in PRAVDA that "based on the mutual consultations held among fraternal Parties" the "drafting commission" has been postponed until March 1, but our Party opposes the very convocation of the unilateral and groundless "drafting commission" and all the more, has never approved of its mere postponement.

(2) The CPSU leadership states as though it had begun to give careful consideration to unity, saying that the "drafting commission" holds preliminary consultations and later on all the Parties including those fraternal Parties which do not take part in the commission, can hold consultations, but if it really considers unity, such a unilateral plan should be stopped altogether.

(3) The CPSU leadership has so far regarded drawing-up of drafts of the new "basic documents" to replace the 1960 Statement as the major task of the "drafting commission", but the subject of the polemics within the international Communist movement is, above all, the question of whether or not to adhere to the revolutionary principles of the 1957 Declaration and the 1960 Statement.

(4) At the same time, the CPSU leadership has partly and piecemeal adopted our Party's proposal regarding the content of an international meeting and has begun to claim that it is in favour of deciding concrete united actions against imperialism headed by the United States,

but the fundamental standpoint of our Party's proposal is completely incompatible with the idea of the divisionist "drafting commission" and "international meeting". It is demanded that after the plan of the unilateral, groundless "international meeting" is once and for all discarded, prior exhaustive consultations be held with the Parties concerned and for the present, a concrete agreement be worked out on a joint struggle against imperialism which is headed by the United States.

Even the CPSU leadership's proposal to convene the "drafting commission" which was postponed until March 1 was strongly opposed not only by our Party, but also a series of fraternal Parties including five Parties of Socialist countries and in addition, even among Parties which approved of the "drafting commission" planned by N. S. Khrushchov there came out a series of Parties, one after another, which newly opposed, reserved or attached conditions.

Faced with such a situation, the CPSU leadership, unable to enforce the "drafting commission" as it was, was forced to suddenly change its plan just before the meeting.

Without giving even a single reply to the points of issue raised by our Party's letter, the CPSU leadership verbally informed our Party on February 26 (that is, three days before the meeting) that it would be held not as a meeting of the "drafting commission", but as a "consultative meeting". But this information was literally a unilateral one and was not intended to hold a new consultation with our Party.

Thus, the so-called "drafting commission" had both its name and content changed and was barely held in the name of "consultative meeting". In this way, the CPSU

leadership has got into the difficulty by proving that its past claim regarding the "drafting commission" had no grounds.

In the editorial of PRAVDA of August 10, 1964 the CPSU leadership emphasized that "sufficient time has been set aside for the preparation for commencement of the drafting commission's work", but according to the announcement in PRAVDA of December 12, 1964, it postponed the "drafting commission" on the pretext of "for better preparation"; that is, because of insufficient time for preparation. Nevertheless, far from being better prepared by postponement, the "drafting commission" itself was eventually dropped off.

At that time, the CPSU leadership arbitrarily decided that the drafting commission be composed of the 26 Parties, unilaterally sent invitations and, besides, asserted in the same PRAVDA editorial that "even if some Parties do not send their representatives by the designated date" "it will not hamper the commencement of the commission's work". In fact, however, needless to say that a series of Parties which had opposed the divisionist plan did not attend the meeting, it ended in the result that a number of Parties attended it only on condition that the meeting was no longer that of the "drafting commission" and the draft commission's work was anything but being started.

In the PRAVDA editorial of August 10, 1964, the CPSU leadership stated regarding the "collective preparatory work" for an international meeting that "it will be appropriate to convene a drafting commission, which will be able to prepare drafts of basic documents of a new meeting and proposals and recommendations on the general questions related with holding a meeting, fol-

lowing the example of the preparation for the 1960 meeting". Now, this time, it has turned out that drafts of basic documents as well as the drafting commission itself are no longer necessary. The commentary of Radio Moscow for Japan on March 13 entitled "For Strengthening of Unity of the World Communist Movement" states that "in accordance with the situation, the method in which to prepare a new meeting will also change itself" and adds that at the "consultative meeting" "it was clarified that a new meeting can be prepared without a drafting commission" and "a joint arrangement was made that the delegations which attended the meeting would not undertake the function of a drafting commission, would not take charge of drawing up drafts of documents of a future international meeting and would not decide a deadline of the convocation of an international meeting". (by the Soviet News)

The development of those events revealed various contradictions and confusion in the CPSU leadership's plan, such as the arbitrary and unilateral decision of date, composition, character and procedure of convocation of the "drafting commission" which prepares an international meeting, its imposition upon other fraternal Parties, the arbitrary and unilateral postponement of its date or the abandonment of the idea of the "drafting commission" just before the postponed date, and proved it clearly to any one's eyes that the big-power chauvinist and divisionist way of doing things had failed disastrously. Nevertheless, the CPSU leadership could not completely liquidate the big-power chauvinist and divisionist plan which had essentially failed, but yet tried to justify it by forcibly holding the March 1 meeting as

a "consultative meeting" with a number of changes in its name and arrangement.

If N. S. Khrushchov's fall from power revealed to everybody the political bankruptcy of the revisionist, big-power chauvinist and divisionist line of modern revisionism, the failure of the unilateral "drafting commission" organized by the CPSU leadership to hold an international meeting for the purpose of split and to lead the present state of disunity further to a decisive split by asserting that "time has come to openly take a collective measure", has become, following N. S. Khrushchov's fall from power, the second bankruptcy of the current of modern revisionism within the international Communist movement, in particular, of its big-power chauvinist organizational line.

So far our Party not only has made its views clear by sending our replies to the CPSU Central Committee, but also has openly published its views by printing the Presidium's Statement of June 20, 1964, "The International Meeting of Representatives of Communist and Workers' Parties Be Held Not for a Split, but for Genuine Unity", the AKAHATA editorial of October 5, 1964, "The International Meeting of Communist and Workers' Parties Should Be Held Not for a Split, but in Favour of Unity", and the AKAHATA editorial of January 21, 1965, "Once Again on the Problem of International Meeting of Communist and Workers' Parties", in connection with open propaganda of the divisionist "international meeting". The historical development of this question proved with facts that the idea of the "drafting commission" which the CPSU leadership had strongly insisted upon for a year and half and critics of which it has attacked, resorting to every means, is completely unjustifiable in its

procedure and content and harmful to the unity of the international Communist movement and criticisms of those points made by Parties which firmly uphold the principles of Marxism-Leninism had firm grounds for argument.

The failure of the divisive "drafting commission" has been a serious blow to all anti-Party elements who had wished "success" of N. S. Khrushchov's divisionist plan; that is, the "Voice of Japan" group of Shiga, Kamiyama, Suzuki, Nakano and others, the Naito group and the Kasuga group. From the very beginning, they blindly praised the CPSU leadership's convocation of the "drafting commission" and slandered and attacked our Party. Last July Shiga and Suzuki published the statement to the effect that "the world meeting of Communist and Workers' Parties should be quickly held" and last September, Naito and the like issued a special statement entitled "World Meeting of Representatives of Communist and Workers' Parties and Our Attitude" and fully supported the proposition of "world meeting" and the proposal of the "drafting commission" by the Communist Party of the Soviet Union. The reason why they eagerly supported the unilateral plan for a split is that they hoped that their "delegate rights" will be somehow recognized at this sort of meeting which the Communist Party of Japan opposes and tried to catch a chance for emerging from obscurity even if only a little bit. For that purpose, Shiga and others repeatedly emphasized that "We are on the side of the main current of the international Communist movement" and basely call themselves "the Communist Party of Japan (Voice of Japan)". Naito and others have claimed that it is clear that "the present CPJ leadership cannot correctly represent the

Communist movement in our country" and it is necessary "to set up normal solidarity relations between the Communist movement in Japan and the international Communist movement".

In the "Voice of Japan" of January 1, 1965, Shiga openly expressed his expectation as follows: —

From March 1, the preparatory meeting for an international Communist meeting will be held. When Yoyogi group announces its attitude toward this meeting, it will reveal the true colour of "self-reliance and independence" — an international faction. In the new situation, the general line of the international Communist movement will make further correct development.

Thus, Shiga and the like set a gleam of hope on a situation that the international Communist movement would "develop" into a decisive split by the "international meeting" and through it they would be officially recognized. Here is revealed the most ugly divisionist nature of the anti-Party elements who earnestly expect not unity and cohesion of the international Communist movement, but only the "development" of its split.

But their earnest expectation has been completely betrayed by N. S. Khrushchov's fall from power and the present failure of the "drafting commission". This is an inevitable destiny of the traitorous elements who have neither slightest principledness nor slightest self-reliance.

2. WHAT IS THE BASIC CHARACTER OF THE MARCH 1 MEETING CONVENED BY THE CPSU LEADERSHIP

Even though the divisionist aim to be achieved by the so-called "drafting commission" has been delivered a

serious blow, the "consultative meeting" convened by the CPSU leadership recently is, in view of the process of its formation, essentially nothing other than a factional meeting against the unity of the international Communist movement. It is our Party's duty and responsibility as a Marxist-Leninist Party to make the above point clear.

That the "drafting commission" planned by the CPSU leadership centered on N. S. Khrushchov was nothing but what would really lead the international Communist movement to a decisive split, leaves no room for doubt in view of the CPSU leadership's intention to forcibly hold the "drafting commission" no matter whichever Party might oppose it, and, in addition, their openly insisting that "refusal of participation in the meeting is namely to give a 'fixed shape' to a split" (The PRAVDA Editorial of August 10, 1964) for the purpose of forcing the responsibility of split on those Parties which opposed the meeting. Even if the latest "consultative meeting" has a name and form different from the "drafting commission" scheduled at the beginning, its factional nature has not changed at all.

The CPSU leadership arbitrarily convened this meeting by groundlessly exercising the would-be "right to convene" and getting together a section of the 26 Parties. The latest meeting was centered on those Parties which had fully supported N. S. Khrushchov's divisionist proposal on the "drafting commission" and was also attended by those Parties which did not fully express the opposition attitude toward it but approved with conditions attached or with reservations.

It names itself as the "Consultative Meeting of Representatives of Communist and Workers' Parties" which gives an impression as though it were a normal interna-

tional meeting attended by representatives of Communist and Workers' Parties. But it is clearly a false name in view of the divisionist course of the meeting. This meeting is absolutely not a normal meeting of representatives of Communist and Workers' Parties based on norms of the international Communist movement, but is, so to speak, a factional meeting of part of Parties centered on those Parties which had supported the unilateral convocation of the "drafting commission" by the CPSU leadership.

Nor can it be "a meeting of Communist and Workers' Parties broader" than two Party talks which the 1957 Declaration announced to be held as "occasion demands". Because this meeting is not one for unity which is to be attended by fraternal Parties for the purpose "to discuss urgent questions" and "to adjust joint struggles" and with the proper range of convocation for the above purpose. It is a factional meeting attended by and centered on those Parties which fully responded to the CPSU leadership's unjustifiable appeal on the 26 Parties "drafting commission", taking up the question of international meeting which concerns the whole international Communist movement. Whatever appearance it may take, in view of the whole course of its development, it is not a meeting of fraternal Parties held in accordance with the norms of the Declaration and Statement.

The Communique announced by the March 1 meeting states that the meeting "was imbued with the spirit of active struggle for the cohesion of the Communist movement in the name of its great historic tasks". But with whatever beautiful words it may be embellished, it cannot be concealed that the meeting was one that assuming the title of unjustifiable, groundless "right to convene",

the CPSU leadership openly and unprincipledly rallied only a section of the Parties. It is literally a modification of the meeting "to give a 'fixed shape' to split" and in this sense, it is the meeting which made the split of the international Communist movement come up to the surface and of factionalist, divisionist nature. Of course we do not place all Parties, which attended the meeting, in the same rank as the CPSU leadership. Of the Parties which attended the meeting, we know, there is a Party which courageously fights against U.S. imperialism and did not side with N. S. Khrushchov's unprincipled following in the wake of U.S. imperialism. There may be some Parties which, within a certain limit, criticized N. S. Khrushchov's big-power chauvinist, divisionist idea of the "drafting commission" and took the attitude of not siding with it. We do not confuse those Parties with those all-out and uncritical followers of N. S. Khrushchov's plan. Nevertheless, for the sake of truth, for the sake of the genuine, principled unity of the international Communist movement, we can not help speaking without reserve as follows: — Even if a section of the Parties took part in the meeting and signed the Communiqué, subjectively with the wholehearted desire for unity and cohesion of the international Communist movement, or even if others thought that, should it become not the "drafting commission", then it would not be a divisionist meeting though it was the March 1 meeting convened by the CPSU leadership or that one should attend it precisely not to make it a divisionist meeting, their good intention cannot alter the objective nature of the meeting. The basic character of the meeting cannot be decided by the general emphasis of unity in the Communiqué. It is because the whole course of the unilateral holding of the

"consultative meeting" determines by itself the factionalist, divisionist nature of the meeting.

At the time when those Parties, including our Party, which firmly uphold the principles of Marxism-Leninism repeatedly pointed out the error of the way of doing things of the CPSU leadership headed by N. S. Khrushchov and emphasized that such a plan would mean an open split, the CPSU leadership not only did not lend an ear to it, but, on the contrary, closed the path of unity by attacking it with all sorts of slander and abuse such as fellows who do not consider the unity of the international Communist movement, divisionists and others. Besides, the CPSU leadership attempted to enforce the plan centering around the Parties which supported the convocation of the "meeting" by even postponing the date and even when it was finally compelled to partly abandon its idea of the "drafting commission", it, as can be seen from its oral notice given to our Party just before March 1, did not try to hold consultations with various Parties which opposed the convocation of the "drafting commission" by beginning all over again, but stubbornly persisted to the last in the convocation by the CPSU leadership of the March 1 meeting. And thereby, it has created a serious obstacle to the unity with a series of Parties which opposed the unilateral convocation of the March 1 meeting — among them are included the five Socialist countries which have a majority of the world Socialist population and the biggest Party in capitalist countries. In other words, it virtually unjustly forced a split upon the Parties which opposed the convocation of the drafting commission and forcibly held by itself the unilateral meeting which "gives a 'fixed shape' to a split".

Inasmuch as it did not completely abandon the plan of the wrong, groundless "drafting commission" put forward by N. S. Khrushchov, but forcibly held the meeting which was not in accord with the norms of the Declaration and Statement but only centered around the Parties that supported the plan, on March 1, the day which is inseparably connected with the plan, whatever the Communiqué of the meeting may state, it could not help, as the development of facts shows, becoming the meeting which forced the state of split upon the international Communist movement. All the more, so far as the meeting is given the false name of "the Consultative Meeting of the Nineteen Communist and Workers' Parties" as if it had an internationally legal representation and has created a new obstacle to the unity of the international Communist movement by emphasizing the legality and role of the meeting, as can be typically found in the CPSU leadership, it is an inevitable, necessary task for genuine Marxist-Leninist Parties to openly and explicitly point out the factionalist nature of the meeting.

3. ON THE PROPOSAL OF "A PRELIMINARY CONSULTATIVE CONFERENCE OF REPRESENTATIVES OF THE 81 PARTIES"

With regard to arrangements for convocation of an international meeting the latest meeting convened by the CPSU leadership has now advocated a "preliminary consultative conference of representatives of the 81 Parties" as desirable in place of the "drafting commission of the 26 Parties". The CPSU leadership, beautifying the meeting as a whole, is already trying to virtually unilaterally force the proposal.

In the Communiqué of the meeting are found the following words:—

. . . In the opinion of the participants, active and all-sided preparations for a new international meeting, to be held at a suitable date, fully conform to the interest of the world Communist movement.

To convene the new meeting and to secure its success, it is necessary to prepare it both as to its content and as to organization, actively to create by joint efforts favourable conditions for all fraternal Parties to participate in its preparation, and to work tirelessly for an improvement of the atmosphere in the world Communist movement.

The participants expressed the opinion that it is desirable to hold a preliminary consultative conference of representatives of the 81 Parties that gathered at the 1960 meeting in order to discuss the question of a new international meeting. It is necessary to hold consultations with all these Parties to decide the question of convening this preliminary conference.

Here, at least, as far as is expressed in the sentence, "a preliminary consultative conference of representatives of the 81 Parties" has been presented as a "desirable" proposal and also as a proposal which, together with its yes or no, is left to "consultations with all these Parties". As a matter of course, there are many questions in the proposal itself. This proposal contains such points of issue as among the signatory Parties of the Communiqué, there has come out a Party which already gives negative reflection on the idea of the preliminary conference of representatives of the 81 Parties. But what is most important at this point is that there has already emerged a

dangerous indication of turning the proposal which was made by the meeting into a new weapon for big-power chauvinism and divisionism.

Radio Moscow for Japan on March 20 claimed as follows:—

The path proposed by the meeting participants to convene a new meeting and to prepare conditions for its execution is the most democratic path. The path expects it to make all the Parties which took part in the 1960 meeting, participate in the work to prepare and hold a new meeting without any exception. No one will be able to propose a more democratic form than this. Those who cannot support it are they who desire the existing differences of opinion in the world revolutionary movement to be maintained and who have no relations with the interests of the movement.

Needless to quote the facts of the CPSU leadership's big-power chauvinist and divisionist intervention in our Party as well as in our democratic movements, such an attitude gives justification to our judgement that the CPSU leadership has not yet changed from its usual wrong big-power chauvinist and divisionist line.

In criticizing the CPSU leadership's plan of the "drafting commission of the 26 Parties", our Party held that necessary and sufficient preparations should be made, and in "The International Meeting of Communist and Workers' Parties Should Be Held Not for a Split but in Favour of Unity — Proposal of the Communist Party of Japan" (The AKAHATA Editorial of October 5, 1964), it is pointed out:

We consider it desirable as well as necessary to start due negotiations right now among the Parties con-

cerned, with the aim to reach a mutual agreement at least among those Parties which took part in the Meeting of the Representatives of the 81 Communist and Workers' Parties in 1960.

In our present opinion, the necessary preparations can be advanced by strengthening collaboration of the international Communist movement and of the international democratic movements for immediate earnest struggle tasks; by striving to execute, as occasion demands, the right to openly answer and criticize the Party, which first made an unjustifiable attack, so long as it does not openly recognize its own error, and thereby to eliminate obstacles to unity by holding bilateral and multilateral, principled meetings, that is, not factional as the "consultative meeting" and as a whole by promoting the tasks to overcome principledly and concretely the root-source of the disunity of the present-day international Communist movement and international democratic movements.

The CPSU leadership's tone of argument as appeared in Radio Moscow for Japan virtually completely disregards the concrete preparations necessary for unity, makes only the "preliminary consultative conference of representatives of the 81 Parties" a decisive question, moreover even makes an extreme argument that those who cannot support it are they who have no relations with the interests of the world revolutionary movements and places stress upon unilaterally enforcing it and attacking its critics. The Communiqué reads that "it is necessary to hold consultations with all these Parties . . .", but, in fact, the CPSU leadership forces on others the plan for the way of preparation for an inter-

national meeting, a plan which was unilaterally decided at the factional meeting of part of the Parties.

In addition, as is clear to any person, if "a preliminary consultative meeting of representatives of the 81 Parties" is immediately held without making necessary preparation to make the immediate unity of all Parties possible, it—even if called "preliminary meeting", will actually result in holding a general meeting or something similar to it and the split will be compelled to come to the fore on a whole-world scale. The full possibility of the danger is clear from the development that the CPSU leadership, the convener of the meeting which published the Communiqué, has so far made no response to the criticisms and views put forward by a series of Parties that, based on the endorsed norms at the 81 Party meeting of 1960, an international meeting be held on unanimity system for the sake of unity, but has rather talked glibly about its having the support of an "absolute majority of the Parties".

In spite of numerous words for unity used in the Communiqué of the meeting, the convocation of the meeting, including the course of drafting the Communiqué, is itself precisely against unity of the international Communist movement and moreover, the proposal of "a preliminary consultative meeting of representatives of the 81 Parties" has already begun to be itself used as a weapon of big-power chauvinism and divisionism.

If comrades of the CPSU leadership really think, as stated by the Communiqué, that "it is necessary to prepare it both as to its content and as to organization" and "it is necessary to hold consultations with all these Parties" in order to correctly take part in preparations for an international meeting, such "drafting commission"

should have not been convened. Moreover, it would not render the slightest service to the consolidation of unity of the international Communist movement no matter how much it repeats the words calling for unity and cohesion on the basis of the consultations at the meeting after having forcibly held and justified such an essentially factional, divisionist meeting in the name of "consultative meeting".

If the CPSU leadership which forcibly held the meeting, really recognizes that "divergences in the Communist movement weaken its unity and thereby do damage to the cause of the world liberation movement and the Communist cause" and believes that "the Communist Parties must exert collective efforts to improve relations between them and to strengthen the unity of the world Communist movement with the observance of the democratic principles of the independence and equality of all the brother Parties, then the path to be taken is only one. That is to strive for collaboration not in words but in deeds, and on the basis of it to participate in preparing an international meeting, stop every scheme to hold an "international meeting" on the basis of the unilateral "drafting commission" and "consultative meeting", free oneself from every factionalist, divisionist restriction given by this sort of past meetings and base oneself on the new basis of aiming at unanimity through consultations with all the fraternal Parties from a clean slate standpoint. It is absolutely impossible to win the unity and cohesion of the international Communist movement through the divisive path of calling for the "unity and cohesion" in words, while still accumulating divisionist fait accompli in deeds and of holding an international meeting on the basis of them.

4. OPEN POLEMICS AND THE QUESTION OF INTERVENTION IN OTHER PARTIES' INTERNAL AFFAIRS

The Communiqué of the March 1 meeting convened by the CPSU leadership states on the open polemics as follows:—

The Parties represented at this meeting have declared themselves in favour of discontinuing open polemics, which are in character unfriendly and degrading to the fraternal Parties. At the same time, they consider it useful to continue, in a comradely form and without mutual attacks, an exchange of opinions of the important contemporary issues of mutual interest.

These comrades raise the question of discontinuing open polemics. Now that they call for it, they would not have been able to avoid the question of who really started the open polemics, particularly, the open polemics "degrading" to the fraternal Parties.

It was N. S. Khrushchov who unilaterally attacked the Albanian Party of Labour at the CPSU 22nd Congress and the CPSU leadership headed by him that first conducted the open polemics, which "are in character unfriendly and degrading", violating the norms of relations between fraternal Parties defined in the 1960 Statement.

It was the "Open Letter of the CPSU Central Committee Addressed to the Whole Party Organizations and Whole Membership of the Soviet Union" of July 14, 1963, which unilaterally attacked the Communist Party of China that expanded the open polemics in the international Communist movement to the present extent. The CPSU leadership bears the entire responsibility. With regard to the open polemics with our Party, it was the "Voice of Hiroshima" (Y. Zhukov), an article published

in the CPSU central organ, PRAVDA of August 25, 1963 and subsequently, the unilateral publication of the CPSU leadership's long letter which denounced, attacked and slandered our Party, that first started the open polemics. The content of the letter and the method of its publication were extremely vicious, aiming at overthrowing our Party leadership. Moreover, its content concerned the content of the two-Party talks which had been previously agreed not to make public. One year after Y. Zhukov's article, after PRAVDA and Radio Moscow for Japan openly supported anti-Party elements Yoshio Shiga and others who were expelled from our Party, for the first time, our Party was forced to make open replies.

It is obvious that the CPSU leadership bears full responsibility for such a state of affairs. Our Party's refutation was not only based on our due right, but also necessary for concretely inquiring into the harm of big-power chauvinism, divisionism and opportunism in the international Communist movement and for achieving genuine theoretical and organizational unity of the international Communist movement. Those people at home and abroad, who have seen and heard the CPSU leadership's unilateral slanders and abuses, are now able to know, through the whole development of the polemics, where the question and truth lie.

To start and justify open polemics when one thinks that things are favourable for him and to propose the discontinuation of the open polemics after things have become unfavourable for him is really a big-power chauvinist attitude which should not be taken by the Communist. Had the Communist Party of the Soviet Union not started the open polemics in that manner since its Twenty-Second Party Congress, had it not extended dif-

ferences of opinion to relations between Socialist States or to its intervention in other Parties' internal affairs, surely the course of events would have proceeded in a different direction even though there had arisen grave differences of opinion and the disunity of the international Communist movement would not have become so serious as today. But the Communist Party of the Soviet Union has already started the open polemics which are full of abuses and slanders against other fraternal Parties and the issues have already been openly presented and openly discussed before the whole world's peoples. Besides, in the course of the development, revisionism which was pointed out as the main danger in the 1957 Declaration and 1960 Statement has brought up its theory from one concerning individual theses to the systematic one covering every field of Marxism-Leninism. Under such conditions, only to demand the discontinuation of the open polemics without making clear the responsibility for them and without making clear the relative merits of the content of the polemics on the questions of principles not only does not stand to reason, but also does not serve to adhere to the principles of Marxism-Leninism and to win genuine unity of the international Communist movement based on Marxism-Leninism.

In order to continue an exchange of opinion "in a comradely form and without mutual attacks" as stated by the Communique, it is necessary for the CPSU leadership, at least first of all to clearly admit its own mistake that it was the first one which openly, unjustifiably and unlawfully attacked other Parties and denounced and attacked to the maximum those Parties which did not follow it; what exists now is not something like "mutual attack", responsibility for which is not clear, but the

"unilateral attacks" for which the CPSU leadership centered on N. S. Khrushchov should bear full responsibility, and the just refutations of them. Without necessary inquiry into the "unilateral attacks" made by the CPSU leadership and some of the Parties which follow in the wake of it and the state of affairs caused by them, the question of the "open polemics" cannot be correctly solved. Naturally the CPSU leadership should reflect upon the attacks and interventions which it unilaterally made against our Party and other fraternal Parties and which were against the norms of relations between fraternal Parties and should positively express at least its full self-criticism of its own unjustifiable unilateral attacks which it directed at those Parties. Clearly without it, the call for the discontinuation of the open polemics can never be any fair one.

And directly mentioning our Party's name the leaderships of the Communist Party of France and some other Parties also laid slanderous charges against our Party. Our Party has not yet answered to them. If these Parties desire the open polemics to be stopped, naturally they should admit their errors to our Party and express their self-criticisms. So long as they don't openly admit their errors, our Party reserves its right to refute them.

The Communique of the meeting states as though all the participants of the meeting unanimously adhere to the norms of relations between fraternal Parties defined by the Declaration and Statement and desire genuine unity and cohesion of the international Communist movement in the following way:—

The participants declare themselves in favour of the rigorous observance of the standard governing relations between Parties as defined by the 1957 and 1960

meetings, and against the interference by any Party in the internal affairs of other Parties.

At least, as far as comrades of the CPSU leadership are concerned, those words are completely contrary to what actually they have recently done and are now doing.

The PRAVDA editorial of March 12, praising up the Communique, stated as follows:—

As is well-known, the 1960 Statement reads that the interests of the Communist movement demand Communist Parties to observe, in the spirit of solidarity, the assessment and conclusion regarding the common tasks of the struggles against imperialism and for peace, democracy and socialism which fraternal Parties jointly worked out at the meetings and to allow no activity which may disturb the unity of Communists of any country.

In view of the whole course of events which have aggravated relations between the Communist Party of Japan and the Communist Party of the Soviet Union and moreover, in view of the situation that even today the CPSU leadership still continues its interference in our Party in various ways, we strictly point out that the open declaration made by comrades of the CPSU leadership against interference by any Party in the internal affairs of other Parties is in complete discordance between words and actions as a Communist.

Even after the dismissal of N. S. Khrushchov from his post, the CPSU leadership has openly continued to support and help the subversive activities against our Party by Yoshio Shiga, Ichizo Suzuki, Shigeo Kamiyama, Shigeharu Nakano and other anti-Party elements who have been expelled from our Party formally on

the basis of the Party Constitution. The central organ of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union and the Moscow Radio for Japan have openly extolled their anti-Party organization, "the Communist Party of Japan (Voice of Japan)". Last November, even the Institute of Marxism-Leninism of the CPSU Central Committee invited Yoshio Shiga. At present, Shiga, Kamiyama, Naito, Kasuga and the like have jointly made Shigeo Kamiyama run for the House of Councilors in the Tokyo Local Constituency with the sole view to attacking our Party and preventing Comrade Sanzo Nosaka, Chairman of the Central Committee, from being returned. Comrades of the CPSU leadership join hands with such fellows and continue to help their subversive activities against our Party. Were such most open subversive activities and disruptive activities not "interference in the internal affairs of other Parties", then, there could be nothing like "interference in the internal affairs of other Parties" in this world. The CPSU leadership not only continues to help the Shiga group. As was stated by the Observer's article entitled "On a Series of New Attacks against Our Party by Mr. Plokhov and Others" printed in the AKAHATA of December 28, 1964, various attacks against our Party by the CPSU leadership are still being made.

The PRAVDA editorial of March 12 states that "in order to create a favourable atmosphere for adjusting opinions, Soviet publications have not taken part in the open polemics for more than five months". But the article "Great Strength of Proletarian Solidarity" by Plokhov, Secretary of the All-Union Central Council of Trade Unions which was refuted by our Party was printed in "TRUD", the central organ of the All-Union

Central Council of Trade Unions of October 30, 1964, after the dismissal of N. S. Khrushchov from his post. In his article Secretary Plokhovov, purposely quoting the article which the anti-Party Shiga-Kamiyama group wrote to attack our Party, makes a grave attack upon our Party that the position of the Communist Party of Japan "is against the fundamental interests of the Japanese working class and is virtually in accord with that of Japanese monopoly capital" and that "the CPJ leadership was in the same camp as those who suppress and exploit the Japanese working class". In addition to this, it is well-known that the Soviet Union has issued, in a great number, publications attacking other fraternal Parties for the last five months. The words of the PRAVDA editorial "the Soviet publications have not taken part in the open polemics for more than five months" are only a false claim which shuts its eyes to the mentioned facts. Moreover, Plokhovov's article is an impermissible slander against our Party rather than the "open polemics".

As for the CPSU leadership's attacks and disruptive activities against our Party, we can give more facts including various measures against our Party members staying in the Soviet Union. A comrade who was working at the Moscow Broadcasting Station at the request of the Soviet Union, not only was recently dismissed from the Station, but also sent back to Japan, being immediately ordered out of the Soviet Union for the reason that he refused to broadcast the article attacking our Party, that is, he took the proper actions as a CPJ member. Soviet comrades are also continuing their unjust interferences and manoeuvres in the movement against A and H bombs and other fields of the

democratic movements of our country. In respect to the Japan-Soviet Society, leaders of the Soviet-Japan Society openly help formation of splittist organizations and carry out vicious obstruction against genuine friendship between both the Japanese and Soviet peoples. It is impermissible for them to cover up their own divisive activities with the words of the Communiqué that "what unites the Communist Parties greatly outweighs that which at the present time disunites them", while at the same time carrying on divisive activities which destroy unity of the international Communist movement. Even if the CPSU leadership keeps silent about their own actions, at the same time, sign the Communiqué that is "against interference by any Party in the internal affairs of other Parties" and publishes the afore-mentioned PRAVDA editorial, we naturally entertain basic distrust in the truth of its words, above all, in the light of reality. We know that there are some Parties which signed the Communiqué, wholeheartedly wishing the unity of the international Communist movement. But if those comrades not only just generally desire unity, but also desire to overcome the cause which actually hampers unity and to actually strengthen unity and cohesion of the international Communist movement, then, they will be able to understand that our above indication is only a minimum one.

Should the CPSU leadership wish to adhere to the standards of relations between fraternal Parties defined by the Declaration and Statement and the will to be faithful to Marxism-Leninism and the principles of proletarian internationalism, it should immediately stop its support for the anti-Party elements who are attacking our Party, completely cease its subversive activities

and disruptive activities against our Party and create the minimum precondition for improving relations between both the Communist Parties of Japan and the Soviet Union.

We do not raise this question only as the question of bilateral relations between our Party and the Communist Party of the Soviet Union. Today, U.S. imperialism, in cooperation with Japanese monopoly capital, is frantically undermining the anti-imperialist struggle in Japan which is its powerful stronghold in order to push forward its criminal actions in Asia, including its ferocious aggression against Viet Nam. U.S. Ambassador Reischauer and others openly state that its most important means is the weakening of our Party which is consistently fighting against its war and aggression policy and for Anti-Imperialist, Anti-Monopoly United National Democratic Front and its victory. The consolidation of our Party, and strengthening of unity and cohesion of all the democratic forces including the resumption of the "National Council against the Security Treaty and for Peace and Democracy" are what is most feared by the U.S. and Japanese ruling circles who experienced the bitter lesson of the struggle against the Security Treaty and that is why they resort to every means to strengthen their attacks on our Party, and destruction of unity of the democratic forces and splitting manoeuvres against them. The Japanese anti-Party elements' shameless slanders and subversive activities against our Party and their splitting manoeuvres in the movement against A and H bombs, etc., from the above point of view, virtually play a role to help the intention of the U.S. and Japanese ruling circles. And it is also clear that the method of the CPSU leadership

which openly supports those anti-Party elements through the CPSU members staying in Japan and continues its very unjustifiable disturbance of and interference in our Party overtly and covertly by various methods, will, after all, end in making U.S. imperialism profit and helping its war and aggression policy. Even if one strongly pays lip service to "the struggle against imperialism", inasmuch as such disruptive and subversive actions which make the enemy profit are actually continued, it cannot be a real struggle against U.S. imperialism. It will not be an extreme argument even if one asserts that without any sincere reflection on this point the CPSU leadership will not be qualified to talk of unity and cohesion of the international Communist movement.

5. ON GENUINE UNITY OF THE INTERNATIONAL COMMUNIST MOVEMENT AND THE IMMEDIATE URGENT TASKS

Today, the barbarous expansion of the aggressive Viet Nam war by U.S. imperialism has given rise to the danger of an aggressive war all over Asia. Such a grave situation strongly demands international united actions from the international working class and the world's peace and democratic forces against war and aggression of imperialism headed by U.S. imperialism. Above all, it makes the strengthening of the united struggle of the international Communist movement the most urgent task.

Already, in the AKAHATA editorial of October 5, 1964, "The International Meeting of Communist and Workers' Parties Should Be Held Not for a Split, but in Favour of

Unity — A Proposal of the Communist Party of Japan”, our Party states as follows: —

Genuine unity of the international Communist movement and of the Socialist camp must certainly be based on the Marxist-Leninist principles and proletarian internationalism. It is because without being firmly united on the basis of the Marxist-Leninist principles and proletarian internationalism, the international Communist movement can neither accomplish the great cause to transform the world nor can it meet correctly the earnest demands of the working class, the oppressed peoples and the oppressed nations throughout the world.

We should gain such genuine unity as soon as possible. Nevertheless, judging from the present circumstances, have the conditions matured to solve all the questions of principles once and for all? To our regret, we think, such conditions have not yet matured. (Bulletin, November 1964, p. 24)

Then can we not achieve any unity of action before conditions to reach agreement on the matters of principle mature? As we already proposed in the Statement of the Presidium of the CPJ Central Committee of June 20, 1964 and in the speech delivered by Secretary-General K. Miyamoto on the occasion of the 42nd anniversary of the founding of the Communist Party of Japan, we think it necessary that, even though the open polemics on the question of principle are not finally settled on the basis of the Declaration and the Statement, all the Communist Parties should strive to gain unity through immediate actions in order to fight against actual manifestations of the aggression and

war policy of the international reactionary forces headed by U.S. imperialism. (Ibid, p. 25)

We think that while seeking for truth through polemics, efforts should also be made to gain unity of action for the purpose of fighting against the common enemy of all peoples so that the imperialist forces may not be allowed to sow discord in the Socialist camp and contrive machinations against the international Communist movement. This is indeed a realistic way to advance toward a genuine unity based on the Marxist-Leninist principles and proletarian internationalism. (Ibid, p. 25)

As consistently proposed by our Party, it is of extreme importance in the present state of affairs to immediately realize an effective joint action to fight against U.S. imperialism's aggression while searching for truth through necessary and appropriate polemics on the question of principles. Without serious efforts to do this, it is impossible to meet the heavy responsibility placed upon the international Communist movement and international democratic movements. Today, correctness of our Party's proposal has been ever more clearly proved.

It should be noted that the Communique of the consultative meeting could not completely avoid the question illustrated by the present grave situation.

As is well-known, when our Party, in opposition to the proposal of the divisionist “drafting commission”, stressed the importance of a joint action to fight against the war and aggression forces headed by U.S. imperialism, and proposed to hold an international meeting to win an agreement for that purpose, the attitude taken by the CPSU leadership at the beginning was either to dis-

regard it or to take it lightly. The anti-Party revisionists of our country who followed in the wake of it, also attacked our Party's proposal, saying that our Party's proposal confounds the question of unity of the international Communist movement with unity of action in the international democratic movements.

Yet, the Communique of the "consultative meeting" has been forced to take up the appeal to strengthen the struggle and international solidarity against the aggressive actions of imperialism, in particular, U.S. imperialism and moreover, emphasizes "concerted action in the fight for these common goals".

In this way, since the convener of the meeting is the CPSU leadership, it is, still more, very characteristic that the Communique of the meeting, together with its statement on the Viet Nam situation, emphasized the struggle against imperialism, denounced U.S. imperialism's aggression and thereby was forced to touch upon the question of unity of immediate actions. It is because, as is well-known, the unprincipled compromise with U.S. imperialism of the CPSU leadership headed by N. S. Khrushchov including N. S. Khrushchov's beautification of U.S. imperialist leaders, the question of inspection of Cuba, and the conclusion of the Partial Nuclear Test Ban Treaty, is indeed one of the greatest errors which have spread the disunity of the international Communist movement and international democratic movement, and in its letter of April 18, 1964 addressed to our Party Central Committee, the CPSU leadership made assertions which were against Marxism-Leninism as well as against facts, such as the imperialists "have lost the material basis for conducting their position of strength policy", and "are compelled to agree to peace-

ful co-existence among states". Here it is shown that with the Viet Nam war, which lays bare the ferocious aggressive nature of U.S. imperialism before their eyes, it is already becoming impossible even for the CPSU leadership to openly maintain such an irresponsible theory of beautification of imperialism in the usual form. Here too, it is shown that the CPSU leadership is now unable to force its too openly divisionist plan as it is, and contrary to its former attitude, is also unable to display its attitude of desiring unity of the international Communist movement without partly and piecemeal taking up the claim on the importance of the task to win unity of immediate actions.

Then, do those assertions which the CPSU leadership has begun to make mean that the obstacles to realization of unity of actions which have been advocated by our Party have actually been eliminated? And do they also mean that the danger of modern revisionism has become less?

No, on the contrary, various facts at home and abroad make it clear that the international current of modern revisionism still remains the main danger in the peoples' struggle against imperialism and in strengthening their unity.

It is now a well-known fact that the unprincipled policy of compromise with U.S. imperialism including the theory of beautification of U.S. imperialism and the Partial Nuclear Test Ban Treaty, all of which the CPSU leadership has developed since N. S. Khrushchov rose to power, has played the role to make U.S. imperialism avail itself of the disunity of the international Communist movement, to encourage its war and aggression which are at present mostly centered on Asia and to weaken the peo-

ples' struggle against it. And the illusion of the revisionists who beautify J. F. Kennedy and L. B. Johnson as the "reasonable group" has been delivered a blow, but the actual damages caused by revisionism which beautifies U.S. imperialism and avoids the struggle against it, remain deep-rootedly. It is a notorious fact that at the bottom of U.S. imperialism now shamelessly carrying on the criminal aggressive war in Viet Nam, there still exist the utilization of the disunity of the international Communist movement and the expectation from unprincipled "U.S.-Soviet collaboration" policy of modern revisionism. In view of some of the latest events including the example of "the Tonkin Gulf incident" of last year, which N. S. Khrushchov supported bringing into the United Nations, such an expectation of U.S. imperialism even now has a certain ground.

If the CPSU leadership really desires strengthening of "joint actions" in the struggle against imperialism, in particular, against U.S. imperialism as stated by the Communiqué, such a divisionist meeting on March 1, should not have been held during such a grave situation when U.S. imperialism was more ferociously spreading its aggressive war. One day after the meeting was held, that is, on March 2, U.S. imperialism after 20-day lull, resumed its new large-scale bombing of the Democratic Republic of Viet Nam. This was not an accident, we believe. To have held the "consultative meeting" which intended to bring a split to the surface and to give the split a "fixed shape" obviously has resulted in encouraging U.S. imperialism.

The actual damage caused by revisionism which forced support for the U.S., British and Soviet tripartite Partial Nuclear Test Ban Treaty upon the world peace move-

ment and split the peace movement by asking the meeting whether to be for or against the Treaty still broadly and deeply remains and still hampers a united action against the present aggression by U.S. imperialism. For instance, of late the CPSU leadership has consistently joined hands with the divisionist forces of our country which are trying to convert the Japanese movement against A and H bombs into a movement that will not fight against the aggression and war policy of imperialism. At the Tenth World Conference Against A & H Bombs of last year, the Soviet Delegation withdrew from the World Conference Against A & H Bombs and took part in the splittist conference under the auspices of the "Tripartite Prefectural Liaison Council". Those who are concerned with the Soviet peace organizations subsequently took part in divisive manoeuvres against the Japanese peace movement by the leadership of "the National Council Against A & H Bombs". In this way, even if it calls for strengthening the anti-imperialist struggle, while joining hands with the divisionist forces and continuing the action to prevent the Japanese movement against A and H bombs from advancing in the direction of unity and cohesion, anti-imperialism and peace, it will never be able to gain the trust of the militant Japanese people. We again point out herein that the CPSU leadership continues to join hands with the right-wing elements who are playing the role to split and disturb the anti-imperialist struggle of the Japanese people who are gallantly and resolutely fighting against U.S. imperialism's aggression and war.

Of late, the CPSU leadership repeatedly states that the Soviet Government is rendering assistance to the Democratic Republic of Viet Nam. Needless to say, it is

the proper duty for a member of the Socialist camp to render assistance to another Socialist country which is subjected to military aggression of imperialism. We greatly welcome such assistance if it is positively given without any selfish motive. But it cannot be said that only because of this one can avoid a series of appraisals to be drawn out of the question of the March 1 meeting and the CPSU leadership's unjustifiable intervention and splitting activities which are subsequently carried out — the question that those divisionist activities encourage U.S. imperialism and its war and aggression policy.

Naturally such a state of affairs gives rise to the following questions: — Does the CPSU leadership really and seriously attach importance to unity and cohesion in the struggle against U.S. imperialism? Or does it still attach more importance to succession to the Khrushchov line and its own big-power chauvinist face than to unity and cohesion? Or does it utilize the call for unity and cohesion for a mere “cloak”, just as it did to hide the divisionist plan which it still continues to pursue against our Party?

Today, it is clear that what hampers in various forms joint actions to fight against imperialism is still nothing other than modern revisionism at home and abroad and therefore, if unity of immediate actions of the international Communist movement and international democratic movements which fight against U.S. imperialism's aggression and war policy is to be seriously won, the resolute and consistent struggle against modern revisionism should be strengthened by all means.

As was already stated, our Party has conducted the uncompromising and principled struggle against modern revisionism at home and abroad, has consistently opposed

the CPSU leadership's big-power chauvinist and divisionist proposal to convene an international meeting and at the same time has proposed to hold an international meeting to consult unity of immediate actions. The AKAHATA editorial of October 5, 1964 states as follows: —

As an “international meeting” has not yet been held that will lead the international Communist movement to a decisive split, it is not too late now. We propose to all the fraternal Parties to stop the convocation of the “international meeting” based on the unilateral and groundless proposals and procedures — that is an “international meeting” which, in fact, is inevitably harmful to unity, and to make preparations for an international meeting which will conduct consultations on concrete common actions to fight jointly against the acts of aggression being actually carried out by the common enemy of all peoples, as clearly set forth in the 1957 Declaration and the 1960 Statement. (Ibid. p. 25)

Under the present condition that it is impossible to solve the questions at issue fundamentally and to win the complete unity of the international Communist movement at one stroke, it is still of importance as maintained by our Party to strengthen immediate unity to fight against the war and aggressive forces headed by U.S. imperialism and to hold an international meeting for that purpose and the latest situation makes its urgency ever greater. And at least, if necessary preparation to recover unity is correctly and fully made on the basis of all the fraternal Parties strictly adhering to the norms of relations between fraternal Parties de-

defined in the 1960 Statement, it is possible to hold such an international meeting to strengthen immediate unity against the common enemy even though the questions at issue have not reached complete solution.

Furthermore, from the same basic standpoint, our Party specially emphasizes that, whether or not such an international meeting is held, efforts should be made to immediately realize the joint struggle against the aggressive war against Viet Nam by U.S. imperialism which tramples the peace of the world and Asia for the purpose of strangling the national-liberation struggle in Asia.

In advancing the cause of such unity and cohesion of the international Communist movement as a whole from unity of immediate actions to genuine unity, what should be attached importance to in view of the past development, is as follows: —

First is, in the light of the course of events, to completely clarify how unprincipled is the unilateral plan for the divisionist “international meeting” and the “drafting commission” for that purpose which was mapped out by the CPSU leadership centered on N. S. Khrushchov, how it trampled the norms of relations between fraternal Parties and what serious damages it has caused to the international Communist movement, to draw correct lessons from them and to bring such a plan for a split to complete end. Inasmuch as some comrades attempt to continue this sort of essentially divisive plan to the last for various reasons, it is impossible to correctly solve the question of disunity of the international Communist movement.

Second is, as was already stated, that the CPSU leadership admits the error of every unjustifiable, unilateral attacks which it made in the past against our Party as

well as other fraternal Parties when N. S. Khrushchov was at the head and immediately stops its subversive activity against our Party and its every unjustifiable interference in other fraternal Parties. Moreover, that those Parties which made unjustifiable unilateral attacks upon the Albanian Party of Labour and the Communist Party of China make clear their responsibilities together with the CPSU leadership is of very important significance for creating an atmosphere which facilitates necessary talks between two Parties and for correctly solving the question of disunity within the international Communist movement.

From the consistent standpoint which our Party has firmly held for unity of the international Communist movement, our Party once again emphasizes the question of unity of actions of the Communist Parties to defend the earnest interests of the peoples of various countries as the urgent task of the international Communist movement.

Lastly, we make the following appeal to all Communist and Workers' Parties, which desire unity of the international Communist movement and the united struggle of the international working class and peace and democratic forces against the war and aggression forces headed by U.S. imperialism: —

That in opposition to the aggression against Viet Nam by U.S. imperialism which aims at strangling the national-liberation struggle in Asia and violates peace of the world and Asia, Communist and Workers' Parties immediately rise to a concerted struggle to support the Vietnamese people's just struggle, to oppose the aggressive war of U.S. imperialism and to demand the immediate withdrawal of U.S. forces.

In the international democratic movement, too, to strive jointly to develop joint actions against U.S. imperialism's aggressive war.

Furthermore, in order to promote the above joint actions of the international Communist movement more effectively as a whole, necessary measures and necessary consultations should be conducted on the basis of the norms of relations between fraternal Parties set forth in the Declaration and Statement in preparing an international meeting which "works out common views through consultations and co-ordinates joint actions in the struggle for common goals". (The Moscow Statement)

At the same time, our Party calls on all Communist and Workers' Parties which desire to observe the revolutionary position of Marxism-Leninism to strengthen further the struggle against modern revisionism which is the main danger and is the root that has given rise to and has spread disunity in the international Communist movement.

Our Party herewith states that in future, too, the whole Party will continue persistent efforts to fly ever higher the banner of Marxism-Leninism and proletarian internationalism, to observe the revolutionary principles of the 1957 Declaration and the 1960 Statement, and to win genuine unity of the international united front and international Communist movement against imperialism headed by U.S. imperialism.

IN REPLY TO THE CPSU LEADER'S GROUNDLESS CHARGES

— Once Again on the Meeting Held in Moscow from March 1 —

AKAHATA, May 7, 1965

TASS News reports that in his report delivered on April 22 at the meeting in Moscow devoted to the 95th anniversary of the day of Lenin's birth, Pyotr Demichev, Alternate Member of the Presidium and Secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, on the question of the meeting which the CPSU leadership unilaterally convened in Moscow from March 1, stated as follows:—

The Consultative Meeting held in Moscow this March was an important step along the road to rallying the world Communist movement.

It is true that in some fraternal Parties there are comrades who criticized the Consultative Meeting. But it is indicative that not one of them has made any concrete proposal aimed at rallying our movement. This is an additional proof of the weakness of their positions and shows unwillingness to strengthen the unity of the Communist movement. But he who prevents our cohesion assumes serious responsibility before history, before his people, before the Communists of the whole world.

The report made by the Alternate Member of the CPSU Presidium, P. Demichev, contains an important

content which cannot be tacitly overlooked by the Communists who desire genuine unity of the international Communist movement and make efforts for that purpose.

Herein, the reporter makes an attack upon "some fraternal Parties" which criticized the "Consultative Meeting" unilaterally convened by the CPSU leadership. It is clear that among "some fraternal Parties" attacked by him, included is our Party which published on AKAHATA of April 13 the unsigned article "On the Meeting Convened by the CPSU Leadership in Moscow from March 1" and criticized the divisionist and factionalist nature of the Meeting.

What does this mean? As is well-known, the Communiqué of the Meeting from March 1 repeatedly emphasized in its wording "strengthening of the unity of the international Communist movement". However, in less than 40 days since the Communiqué was published, a member of the CPSU leadership who was the convener of the Meeting demands the unconditional and uncritical obedience to the "Consultative Meeting" and its so-called "decision" from the whole international Communist movement, charges all the fraternal Parties which criticized the divisionist and factionalist nature of the Meeting, as those who "are unwilling to strengthen the unity of the Communist movement" and as those who prevent the cohesion of the international Communist movement, and demands of them their "serious responsibility" to history, their peoples, and the Communists of the world. This itself proves that as expected, the meeting which was forcibly held by the CPSU leadership from March 1, is essentially a divisionist and factionalist meeting which is not in the least a help to the unity of the international Communist movement, although the

Communiqué issued by the Meeting speaks about unity, and that our Party's criticism that the CPSU leadership "has created a new obstacle to the unity of the international Communist movement" by forcibly holding the Meeting from March 1 was really correct.

In laying new grave blame on a series of fraternal Parties including our Party, the report gives the opinion that "none" of the "comrades who criticized the Consultative Meeting" "has made any concrete proposal aimed at rallying our movement", as the sole basis of its argument.

As for the opinion, first of all, it must be pointed out that the reporter carries out complete secret substitution of the question. The core of the question concerning the Meeting from March 1 is that the meeting was a factional meeting which betrayed the unity of the international Communist movement. Our Party as well as a number of fraternal Parties which criticized the Meeting, precisely criticized this point. In the unsigned article of AKAHATA of April 13, our Party made clear in detail on the basis of facts and reason the following points:— that although its name and procedure were somewhat changed, basically the Meeting from March 1 had the same factionalist and divisionist nature as the "drafting commission" which was planned when N. S. Khrushchov was the first secretary of the CPSU leadership; that even if among the Parties which attended the Meeting, there were included some Parties which had subjectively the good intention to desire unity, in view of the development of its formation as well as the composition of the Meeting, it is not a regular meeting which is in accord with the norms of the international Communist movement, but only a factional meeting of a section of the

Parties, centered on the Parties which fully responded to the unjustifiable and unilateral call of the CPSU leadership; and that in respect to its actual content and role, it was a divisionist meeting which forced a state of a split upon the international Communist movement. The reporter, however, does not try to answer a single word to those criticisms which were raised, but only calls in question whether or not the "comrades who criticized" made "concrete proposal" for unity. This is an incorrect logic which is deceiving and appears to answer to the critics, by avoiding to touch upon the core of the criticized question and substituting the question for another.

In addition, as for the accusation that none of the "comrades who criticized" made a "concrete proposal" for unity, this is completely groundless and is something that cannot but help to be expressed as a false charge for the sake of an ax to grind. It is too clear for those who know the content of our Party's argument.

With regard to the divisionist and big-power chauvinist plan of the CPSU leadership centering around N. S. Khrushchov, who attempted to unilaterally convene an "international meeting" which has no justifiable ground and lead the international Communist movement to a decisive split, our Party took a consistent opposition attitude from the very beginning and repeatedly demanded that they call it off. And while actively making strenuous efforts for genuine unity of the international Communist movement based on Marxism-Leninism and proletarian internationalism, our Party has constantly pointed out that even on its way for achievement of genuine unity, it is necessary to realize unity of immediate actions of Communist and Workers' Parties in the pres-

ent conditions and has repeatedly made a concrete proposal for that purpose.

Our Party made this proposal in our reply of September 30, 1964 to the CPSU Central Committee's letter of July 30, 1964 concerning the convocation of the "drafting commission" and also in our reply of January 15, 1965 to the CPSU Central Committee's letter of December 3, 1964 and openly advocated the proposal in AKAHATA editorial of October 5, 1964 and in editorial of January 21, 1965.

When the CPSU leadership, disregarding objections raised by a series of Marxist-Leninist Parties including our Party, enforced its divisionist plan and held a meeting of a section of the Communist and Workers' Parties (March 1-5) in Moscow, our Party, as had been already stated, published the article "On the Meeting Convened by the CPSU Leadership in Moscow from March 1" and criticized it. In this article, our Party again made clear its concrete proposal for immediate unity of the international Communist movement and called on Communist and Workers' Parties to render positive efforts for this purpose.

As was already stated, this article of our Party minutely explains and criticizes that the Meeting from March 1 is a factionalist and divisionist meeting and makes the following concrete proposal as the pressing tasks to achieve the immediate unity of the international Communist movement and to advance toward genuine unity:—

- (1) Against U.S. imperialism's aggression in Viet Nam aiming at the strangling of the national-liberation movement in Asia and trampling the peace of Asia and the world, Communist and Workers' Parties immediately rise

to the struggle in unity for supporting the just struggle of the Vietnamese people, against U.S. imperialism's aggressive war and for immediate withdrawal of U.S. troops.

(2) Effort be jointly made to develop joint actions in the international democratic movements in the direction of opposing U.S. imperialism's aggressive war.

(3) In order to more effectively promote such joint actions of the international Communist movement as a whole, necessary procedures and necessary consultations be fully made regarding the preparations for an international meeting which "works out common views through consultations and co-ordinates joint actions in the struggle for common goals" on the basis of the norms between fraternal Parties defined in the Declaration and Statement.

In addition, in view of the development of past events, our Party emphasized that importance should be attached to the following two points in order to advance the cause of unity and cohesion of the international Communist movement from unity of immediate actions to genuine cohesion: —

1) To completely clarify the error of the unilateral plan of the divisionist "international meeting" and its "drafting commission", both of which were planned by the CPSU leadership centered on N. S. Khrushchov, in the light of the course of events thereafter, to draw correct lessons therefrom and to completely put an end to such a plan for a split.

2) That the CPSU leadership admit every past unjustifiable interference in our Party as well as in other fraternal Parties and stop at once its subversive activities

against our Party and every unjustifiable interference in other fraternal Parties.

Together with the CPSU leadership, those Parties which made unjustifiable attacks upon the Albanian Party of Labour and the Communist Party of China make clear their own responsibility.

Our Party's above three proposals and two emphases are a quite concrete proposal and stand to reason. It is far from showing the "weakness of our Party's stand", but on the contrary, shows the consistency of our Party's arguments and again proves correctness of its stand. Whoever tries to strive for the unity of the international Communist movement in deeds, instead of merely playing with the world of "unity", surely at least can never reject to sincerely examine those proposals.

The report made by P. Demichev, Alternate Member of the Presidium, does not dare to concretely refute our Party's criticism of the divisionist and factionalist nature of the Meeting in Moscow. Besides, with regard to our Party's concrete proposal for the purpose of immediate unity of the international Communist movement, the report denies even the unquestionable fact that it has been proposed and lays blame that "comrades who criticize the consultative meeting made no concrete proposal for rallying the international Communist movement" — this is completely contrary to the fact. On top of it, the report unilaterally makes a groundless slander stating "comrades who criticize the consultative meeting obstruct the unity of the international Communist movement".

Well, then, let's ask the reporter! Doesn't the reporter understand that, for instance, our Party's demand for the CPSU leadership to immediately stop its subversive activities against our Party, stop assisting and utilizing

anti-Party elements like Shiga, Kamiyama, etc. and stop its unjustifiable interferences in other fraternal Parties is a very "concrete proposal" for the improvement of relations between the Communist Parties of Japan and the Soviet Union and the unity of the international Communist movement? It cannot be possible that the reporter doesn't understand it. Nevertheless, he takes the attitude of ignoring the concrete proposal. Doesn't this mean that he is not pleased with the proposal, in other words, that contrary to his lip service he himself has no sincere intention to really strive for the unity of the international Communist movement, far from it, — that he has not abandoned his intention to pursue the policy in the future to also continue his assistance to Shiga, Kamiyama and other traitorous elements and to also continue his disruptive and subversive activities against our Party and thereby all the more to accelerate a split of the international Communist movement?

And couldn't the reporter understand that our Party's opinion regarding an international meeting for unity and preparations necessary for the meeting — that such unilateral plan as a divisionist "international meeting" and a "drafting commission" be completely discarded and that in order to prepare an international meeting for unity and to make consultations on joint actions against imperialism, necessary procedure and necessary consultations be fully made to recover unity on the basis of all the fraternal Parties strictly adhering at least to the norms of relations between fraternal Parties defined in the Moscow Statement — is a "concrete proposal for rallying our movement"? It cannot be possible that the reporter cannot understand this. Nevertheless, he ignores the concrete proposal. Doesn't this tell that he has no

intention to observe the norms of unity of the international Communist movement but is trying to actually force the divisionist and big-power chauvinist plan of the CPSU leadership, to the last, upon fraternal Parties?

After all, that the report tries to hide to the last our Party's proposal for unity from people's eyes and to make "comrades who criticize the consultative meeting" divisionists by openly falsifying the fact, exposes the true attitude of the CPSU leadership toward the question of unity of the international Communist movement and is "proof of the weakness of their positions".

In other words, firstly, this reveals that while, in words, speaking of its support for "joint struggles for common goals" and pretending as if it strives for the immediate unity of the international Communist movement, the CPSU leadership actually has no intention to sincerely examine the concrete measures for unity proposed by our Party — joint actions of the international Communist movement and the international democratic movements against the aggression in Viet Nam; holding of an international meeting for joint actions through full preparations based on the just norms; complete abandonment of the plan of a unilateral "international meeting" for a split; immediate suspension of subversive activities against and unjust interferences in fraternal Parties; and self-criticism of past actions.

Secondly, this illustrates that the CPSU leadership is not striving to radically rectify its past big-power chauvinist and divisionist line which continues to push forward such subversive activities against the unity of the international Communist movement as its subversive activities against our Party and legalization of the divisionist March 1 Meeting, and that at the same time it

demands the entire international Communist movement to uncritically follow in the wake of the unilateral plan of the CPSU leadership and blames those who take a critical attitude toward the plan, for "obstructing unity".

Such attitude of the CPSU leadership's should be regarded as harming the unity of the international Communist movement at the moment when U.S. imperialism's aggression in Viet Nam and challenge to the cause of national liberation and world peace are making united actions of Communist and Workers' Parties ever more important.

Should the CPSU leadership want to keep its words regarding the unity of the international Communist movement, it should not have taken such groundless and hasty attitude toward the serious question concerning a split of the international Communist movement as is shown by Alternate Member of the Presidium, P. Demichev's report, but should seriously examine our Party's criticism of the March 1 Meeting and concrete proposal and emphasized points to recover and strengthen unity and reply with sincerity like the Communist that he is. This is precisely the "serious responsibility" which the CPSU leadership assumes before history, before the Communists of the whole world.

評蘇共領導從三月一日起在莫斯科

召開的會議

日共《赤旗報》文章

*

外文出版社出版（北京）

1965年第一版

編號：（英）3050—1316

00033

3—E—698P

PAMPHLETS TO READ

LETTERS OF THE CENTRAL COMMITTEE OF THE COMMUNIST PARTY OF JAPAN IN REPLY TO THE CENTRAL COMMITTEE OF THE COMMUNIST PARTY OF THE SOVIET UNION

ON THE INTRINSIC NATURE OF N. S. KHRUSHCHOV'S PEACEFUL CO-EXISTENCE LINE

An Article by Observer in AKAHATA, Organ of
the Communist Party of Japan

ON INTERVENTIONS IN AND SUBVERSIVE ACTIVITIES AGAINST THE DEMOCRATIC MOVEMENTS OF OUR COUNTRY AND OUR PARTY BY THE CPSU LEADERSHIP AND THE INSTITUTIONS AND ORGANIZA- TIONS UNDER ITS GUIDANCE

An Article in AKAHATA, Organ of the
Communist Party of Japan

Published by

FOREIGN LANGUAGES PRESS

Peking (37), China

Available from

GUOZI SHUDIAN

China Publications Centre
P.O. Box 399, Peking, China