

ISSUE NO. 49

DECEMBER 1987

STRUGGLE

For the study and application of
Marxism-Leninism-Mao Zedong
Thought In New Zealand

Debate on Marxist principles should not stop united action

Those who aspire to the name of Communist must inevitably have one claim in common, no matter what title they adopt to describe their organisation. That common factor is the claim to uphold, and to be guided by, the theories of Marxism.

They may call it Marxism-Leninism, in tribute to the painstaking work of Lenin in developing Marxist theory in the era of imperialism and of proletarian revolution. Others add to this the name of Mao Zedong, the great Chinese revolutionary who creatively applied Marxism-Leninism to the question of proletarian revolutions in the Third World countries, where the vast majority of the population are poverty-stricken peasants and the percentage of the population that are proletarians is very small.

There is in the realm of theory, therefore, this one point of agreement. All say they adhere faithfully to Marxism. But in New Zealand at the present time

— as well as in most parts of the capitalist world, there is wide disagreement as to what are today the basic principles of Marxism and on how they should be integrated with the New Zealand scene, anyway.

In their time, whatever mistakes they made in their assessments and in their work, it cannot be denied that Marx and Engels did lay down the basic principles of Marxism and that Lenin, Stalin and Mao Zedong were outstanding in their defence of those principles and in their application to their time and place.

However, for us in New Zealand, what we know of their theoretical work is what we have been able to read in their pub-

lished works. And, in those publications, it is inevitable that there will be expressed not only the basic principles of Marxism but also the various authors' views on matters of the day and also mostly of the country in which they lived — and so therefore, on what they considered was the correct course of action at those times and in those places.

How to sort out which of the things one reads in their books is basic principle which does not change, and which is only an application of basic principles, which may have been correct in that time and place but has no relevance to this time and place is a crucial task for Communists of whatever stripe.

How they define basic Marxist principles, which must not be juggled with or revised, is really the fundamental criterion of whether they really are Marxists.

This has always been a crucial question from right back in Marx's and Engels' own time. There were, of course, those who said they were wrong and who put forward alternative theories for the working class movement. But what we are dealing with here are those who say they adhere to Marxism but want to change some Marxist propositions that have generally been considered by most Marxists to be basic principles.

Hence the struggle within the Marxist movement is fiercest over what is and what is not a basic principle, unchangeable at least within this stage of the social revolution. And, in this category, first and foremost is the Marxist theory of the state — from which stems the theory (and practical activity) in relation to how capitalism is to be ended and socialism ushered in.

Further allied with this is the

question of the nature of imperialism — and whether it has in any way changed in the post-war period.

Since the ultimate goal of Marxists is to lead the working class and its allies to achieve socialism in each country, it is a vital matter to them as to whether the capitalist class will just give up when an overwhelming majority want socialism or whether the capitalist state must still be overthrown by armed revolution. In other words, will the capitalist state today permit the legal existence of any Marxist (or even mildly socialist) organisation right up to the voting of capitalism out of existence?

Or whether, since it will not, the Marxist organisation must be fully prepared by its present method of organisation and style of work to maintain its existence even under the most undemocratic conditions?

In Marx's time, in Lenin's time and for over thirty years after that it seemed that all Marxists had the same answer to this question. There was agreement that the capitalist state was in essence the dictatorship of the capitalist class, no matter how democratic the outward form. There was, consequently, agreement that capitalism could not be ended nor socialism begun without the forcible destruction of that state. There was agreement that the capitalist state must be replaced by a working class state which, no matter what its outward form, must essentially be a dictatorship of the proletariat (a phrase first coined by Marx

It was also generally accepted that imperialism was the cause of war in the twentieth century. So long as imperialism existed, it was the commonly held belief the curse of war could not be lifted from the human race.

All the above may seem boringly obvious. Nevertheless, the fate of those once commonly held basic principles of Marxism has wracked the world Marxist movement for over thirty years.

The debate on these questions no longer holds the centre stage as it did when it first broke out in the early 1960's. But it has been raised again in a major way in *'Socialist Politics'*, the

theoretical organ of the Socialist Unity Party of New Zealand. Issue No. 86/4 of that journal carries eight articles dealing with the foundation, growth and splitting up of the Communist Party of New Zealand, from its formation in 1921 to the present day. (It is well worth reading. It is obtainable from Box 1987, Auckland, for \$2 — no doubt plus postage.) But the ultimate conclusions about questions of basic Marxist theory and who did what twenty five and thirty years ago certainly need to be contested.

The journal's line in its presentation of the history of the Communist movement in New Zealand is twofold:

Firstly, it says that the Communist Party of New Zealand, as it existed in the early 1960's, took an ideological and theoretical stand that was allegedly anti-Marxist. That stand was wrong, it implies, because only a minority of the Communist Parties ultimately took the same stand. And, it is further alleged, the CPNZ as then constituted and the other parties of the same outlook were, consequently, responsible for splitting the Communist movement in the world and in New Zealand.

Secondly, as a consequence of that, it is alleged, the SUP was formed as the true inheritors of the best that had gone before in the Communist movement in New Zealand. And the SUP was the true guardian of correct Marxism by the fact, it is implied, that the SUP stands with the majority of the world's Communist Parties.

Many harsh words have flown around the world and in New Zealand over that split. It is not our intention to repeat them today. Rather, in this article it is our intention to examine the contending views and to put forward a sober and reasoned argument to the effect that it was, quite incredibly when it first broke on the world, the leadership of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union that caused the split. It is also our opinion that the facts show the CPSU "won over" to its new views a majority of Communist Parties because of two very solid reasons which were in no way connected with the correctness of the views themselves. A. The CPSU had great prestige as the party of Lenin that had led the first

successful proletarian revolution; and B. The CPSU held quite some economic power within the world Communist movement.

It could well be added to those two points that the views the CPSU put forward for the first time in 1956 were, if a correct application of Marxism to the postwar world, very, very attractive. Indeed, if they were true, they made the road to peace and socialism a very pleasant pushover.

The new theoretical propositions in question were first put forward at the Twentieth Congress of the CPSU in 1956. Three years earlier, Stalin had died. In the twenty nine years Stalin had been the leader of the CPSU, socialism had made huge strides under the policies the CPSU had elaborated to move along the previously untrodden path of socialist construction. These gains, and their most graphic demonstration when, in the words of Churchill, "the Red Army tore the guts out of the German Wehrmacht (army)", were indissolubly linked with the name and fame of Stalin. And the world was further impressed when the terrible physical damage of war was overcome more rapidly in the socialist Soviet Union than in any of the capitalist countries.

It is not fashionable today to estimate Stalin highly. But people did then — and they were right. Stalin was a very great revolutionary and Marxist theoretician. However, even geniuses are human and make mistakes. Stalin was not exempt from making mistakes. Especially, the country's experiences in the mid-1930's of imperialist-inspired industrial sabotage and assassinations made him overly suspicious of those around him who disagreed with him. And there is no doubt that this over-suspicion led to some very unjust treatment of quite innocent people.

Overall, however, Stalin's positive achievements by far exceeded his errors.

With Stalin having died since the Nineteenth Congress, there had been a considerable shuffle in the top leadership by the time of the Twentieth. It was Khrushchov who was now the General Secretary. He made two reports to the

Congress, one of which was to stun the outside world. Yet it was really the stage setting for a main report that was, in the long run, even more devastating to the world Communist movement.

Khrushchov's report that had the most sensational immediate effect was his so-called "secret" report on Stalin. It was made to a closed session of the Congress. That is, the press and the delegates from other Communist Parties were excluded. But there the "secrecy" ended. For an even more astounding thing about the "secret" report was that a copy of it had been provided in advance to the United States!

It was a real secret as far as the rest of the Communist Parties of the world were concerned. So, when they read it as released in the American press, they somewhat naturally did not believe the Americans were telling the truth. They thought it was a forgery.

Would that it had been. Alas, it was only too accurate.

That "secret" report lashed Stalin as the greatest villain since Judas. It also portrayed him as utterly incapable, so that the great achievements of the Soviet Union in peace and war were allegedly achieved in spite of Stalin. And, not unsurprisingly, a good deal of credit, including for the victory in the epic and world-war decisive victory at Stalingrad, was to be attributed to no less than Khrushchov himself.

The attack on Stalin was wildly unbalanced. Nevertheless, with the all-out gleeful aid of the highly competent propaganda machines of the world's imperialisms, it inevitably had the effect of numbing the world's Communists with instant shock — and driving the most weak-willed of them out of the movement altogether.

But there was, from Khrushchov's point of view, very good reason for presenting such a distorted statement. By denigrating Stalin, the "secret" report denigrated almost everything that had been done, and the way it had been done, in building up so successfully the world's first socialist state.

That left the way open for making the

necessary "corrections".

The "corrections" were in the open report. There were five of them. Two of them were concerned with the nature of the state and of the Communist Party in the Soviet Union — and hence, in the long run, in all socialist countries. They are important to the theories of Marxism but we shall not concentrate on them. Rather we will deal with the other three which have the most direct bearing on the theory and work of every Communist and Communist Party throughout the world. These three were new theories on peaceful transition from capitalism to socialism, peaceful co-existence with and friendly co-operation with the imperialist powers, and especially with the United States, and ideological defeat of world capitalism as a result of peaceful competition in the world between it and socialism.

Let us start with the question of peaceful transition. By this is meant the way being clear for the working class in a capitalist country to win a change to socialism without having to resort to armed revolution. Khrushchov claimed that the post-war existence of a powerful group of socialist countries had tipped the balance against the capitalists of the various capitalist countries and the very real possibility now existed for the workers to attain real political power by winning a majority in a parliamentary election. In other words, he was saying that what Marx had said, and Lenin had later defended, about the need for armed revolution was now out of date.

This was, of course, some years before the disaster in Chile, not to mention the political lesson of Fiji that even the smallest threat of reforms can see the real armed power of capitalism come out of hiding behind the parliamentary facade.

Then let us look at Khrushchov's new presentation of the theory of peaceful co-existence. He said that such was the power in the post-war world of the socialist camp and such the destructive nature of modern nuclear weapons that not only was peaceful co-existence possible with the imperialists, but that notable leaders of the imperialist side were "men of peace" who thoroughly

approved the idea. Conversely, he put forward the idea that armed revolutions then developing in the Third World were bad and dangerous because they could be the spark that brought about a world war.

This was put forward very shortly before the U2 incident in which an American spy 'plane was shot down over the Soviet Union — and the US Government was unwise enough to try to deny it.

To go with those two was the third "peaceful" — peaceful competition. In this regard, Khrushchov said that the future of the world would be determined not only by the cooperation of the Soviet Union and the United States to maintain peace, but also by the economic competition between socialism and capitalism. So startling, he said, would be the economic successes of the Soviet Union that the peoples of the world would throw up their hands and say "socialism is for me". And that, allegedly, would spell the end of capitalism.

We have so far set out somewhat simply the essence of what the CPSU put forward at the Twentieth Congress as new Leninist formulations of theory in keeping with what it said was the new objective position of world politics. We do not intend to weary the reader by interlarding a quotation at every point, that is, for the purpose of proving we are telling it right. But, for any who doubt this, we are printing relevant quotations as an appendix at the end of this article.

At any rate, if what the CPSU was now putting forward was really correct Marxism for the modern era, it would certainly be cheering information. It would, of course, be sad about Stalin. But it would have been remarkably good news that America and the Soviet Union would work together to protect peace. And it would be marvellous news that the successes of socialism would make the work of the Communist Parties in the capitalist countries the merest child's play, ensured of the desired results. Splendid, too, would have been the news that there would be an end to the suffering of the rebellious working people at the hands of the capitalist courts, prisons, police and armed services.

In fact, almost Playway Communism!

As we said, for a while there was a stunned numbness in the ranks of Communism around the world owing to the incredible report on Stalin. The imperialists, on the other hand, were naturally cockahoop. They could hardly believe their equally incredible good luck.

But gradually in some places and faster in others, sections of the Marxists began to have serious doubts. And these doubts led very quickly to a world meeting of Communist Parties at the end of 1957.

This world meeting was to issue its view on the integration of Marxism with the current world reality. For it, then, the CPSU prepared the first draft of such a resolution. This was brought before a drafting committee of the major Communist Parties. Naturally, the Soviet pre-draft contained each of the three "peacefuls". And the drafting committee wouldn't wear them! The rest of the delegates waited in their hotels while heated discussions, of which they knew nothing, went on in that committee.

With the majority of that committee overwhelmingly against it, the CPSU had to give way.

The CPSU's pre-draft was changed. The draft that was then brought before the full meeting was basically in line with the classic Marxist theories. The delegates approved it unanimously.

It went out to the world as the 1957 Declaration of the World Communist and Workers' Parties. It was, to repeat, a unanimous decision. All agreed to it at that meeting.

All? Events were very soon indeed to show that the leaders of the CPSU had retreated only to organise a stronger spring forward. The Soviet Party proceeded to make statements and to carry on acts entirely in accord with its new Twentieth Congress theories — and entirely in contravention of the letter and spirit of the 1957 Declaration.

This reached a point where, at the 1960 Congress of the Communist Party

of Rumania, Khrushchov launched a surprise attack on the Communist Party of China — which had been firm in defence of the long-accepted basic principles of Marxism — and tried to cajole the representatives of other Communist Parties present as guests of the Rumanians to join in the attack.

There was a delegate from the Communist Party of New Zealand at that Rumanian Congress. If the CPNZ delegate at the 1957 World Conference had been unaware of what was going on, this one could not miss it. His totally correct response to the CPSU demand was that he had no authority from his Party to make any statement on the issue, but that he would report back to the leading committee of the CPNZ what had transpired.

After his trip home through China, he had a great deal more to report. He was in China long enough to see the CPSU carry its ideological and theoretical differences with the Communist Party of China into the realm of state relations. Soviet experts had for some years been employed under contract in China to help in the setting up of new industrial complexes the Chinese had bought from the Soviet Union. Overnight, the Soviet leaders tore up the contracts and ordered all the experts home. The CPNZ saw many of them leaving for home in tears.

So spiteful were the Soviet leaders, that they also had the experts take home all the blueprints with them!

This departure of the Soviet experts was another sensation in the capitalist press. It was the first undeniable sign that there were deep differences within the previously solid (the press loved to call it monolithic, which means made of a single stone) camp.

Once again efforts were made to save the situation with another world meeting of Communist Parties at the end of that year (1960). Once again, the CPSU tried to write its new theories into the draft of a statement to be put before the new conference. Once again, the Drafting Committee rejected these new theories. Once again, the Drafting Committee produced, and the full meeting unanimously

approved, a Statement along exactly the same lines as the 1957 Declaration.

In fact, the 1960 Statement was even stronger in rejecting the CPSU line that peaceful coexistence and peaceful competition were the general direction of the foreign policies of the socialist countries; in rejecting its line that there were growing possibilities of peaceful transition; and in rejecting the idea that peaceful coexistence and peaceful competition had brought about a new stage in the general crisis of capitalism.

Instead, the Statement spoke of the unchanged nature of imperialism; of US imperialism as the enemy of the world's people; of the consequent need to build the widest possible international united front against US imperialism; of the national liberation struggles as being an important factor in preventing world war; of the principle of Communist Parties ironing out their differences through consultation with each other; and of the chief ideological danger to Marxism coming from revisionism — that is, from any attempts to revise basic Marxist principles.

Today, the CPSU and its supporters like to make a lot of mileage out of their assertion that the split in the world Communist movement was the doing of a minority of parties. Facts prove the opposite. At the meetings that approved as world Communist policy the 1957 Declaration and the 1960 Statement, the leaders of the CPSU had started in the minority but had apparently been moved by the majority to come to an apparent position of unanimity with the others. If they were still actually "of the same (minority) opinion still", they kept it carefully concealed at the meetings.

Not so after the meetings. The truth is that, hardly was the ink dry on the 1957 Declaration, and later on the 1960 Statement, than they were hard at it once again, publicly pushing their rejected lines and behind the scenes working flat out to turn their minority into a majority by other means than theoretical persuasion.

The year following the 1960 Statement saw the Soviet leaders really take the bit between their teeth. For US imperialism (the enemy of the world's

people! Remember?) it was not a united front against but sweet messages of a desire for "US-Soviet cooperation" and a wish to "set about building durable bridges of confidence, mutual understanding and friendship". (Message from Brezhnev and Khrushchov to President Kennedy on July 4, 1961 — the anniversary of the success of the American Revolution!)

Behaviour of this sort, in total contempt for the Declaration and the Statement, set the scene for the Twenty Second Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union. It opened with a further vicious attack on Stalin, to be followed after the Congress by the removal of his embalmed body from Lenin's tomb in the Red Square and the changing of the name of the world-famous heroic city of Stalingrad.

For, as Khrushchov reported, the Soviet leaders were now taking a "road different from that of Stalin". (And, he could have said, different from the road laid down in the Declaration and the Statement.) When the leaders of the CPSU started on that new road in 1956, said Khrushchov, the CPSU needed the support of brother parties and "the voice of the Chinese Communist Party was then of great significance to us", but "things are different now" and "we shall go our own way".

As an ism, that would seem to be a great deal nearer to cynicism than to Marxism.

The Twenty Second Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union produced a new Party Programme. In it were enshrined in advanced form all the theories of "peaceful" this and that which had been so firmly rejected for their second time only a year before in the 1960 Statement. A younger Andropov was to claim that the new programme was "a whole set of Leninist policies of the international Communist movement of recent years". Khrushchov spoke of it as "the common programme of the Communist and Workers' Parties and of the people of countries of the socialist community". For, of the socialist community, only China and Albania had held fast to the principles of the 1957 Declaration and the 1960 Statement in spite of

the enormous economic sanctions that this brought down upon them from the Soviet Union.

As the SUP journal points out, the CPNZ was one of the few parties, but not the only one, that stood solid with the basic principles of Marxism as expounded in the two documents. But, of course, in the long run the only test of all theories is whether they stand up to the test of practice. Has imperialism in the least changed its spots as exhibited in the US aggression in Indo-China, the French behaviour over New Caledonia (not to mention the 'Rainbow Warrior' affair), the US funding of counter-revolution in Nicaragua — to name a few visible acts over the last quarter of a century since the Twenty Second Congress of the CPSU?

Has peaceful competition brought the downfall any nearer? Has the capitalist state drawn back from violent armed suppression in Indonesia, Chile, South Korea or Fiji?

What, however, was the reaction of those parties which still opposed the new theories postulated by the leaders of the CPSU? Were they hell-bent on a split in the Communist movement in the world and in their own country? Not in the least. True, the Communist Party of Australia, as then constituted, had been at one with the CPNZ, yet suddenly did an about face in 1961. But the parties of Viet Nam (yes, Viet Nam at that time), Indonesia and New Zealand all called for still another world meeting while there was still time to strive for an agreement between the different factions. The CP of China also put forward a list of key points on which it suggested a discussion could fruitfully be held.

But now the leaders of the CPSU did not need any such agreement. It had said "we shall go our own way" — and it was determined to do just that.

By August 1962, the Soviet Union was ready to strike an agreement with the US to prevent "nuclear proliferation". In other words, it was telling US imperialism (the enemy of the peoples of the whole world according to the Declaration and the Statement) that it would not be honouring its agreement to provide China with the scientific knowhow to make

atomic weapons. At the same time that it was pally with US imperialism, the Soviet leadership was launching one vitriolic attack after another against the Chinese Government and Communist Party. It used the congresses of the Bulgarian, Hungarian, Czechoslovakian, Italian and East German parties to keep up these public attacks.

Was the Communist Party of China thereby guilty of "splitting" the world Communist movement by being forced to make replies which gave its real position, different entirely from what was being said about it in those attacks?

In the light of the above facts which simply cannot be denied, the present-day reader should make an objective decision.

And still those parties in sharpest disagreement with the leaders of the CPSU and strongest in their support for the Declaration and the Statement did not give up from trying to heal the breach in the very way set down in the latter document.

The Chinese CP sent a delegation to Moscow to have consultative discussions in July, 1963. Yet, while those talks were actually in progress and it was the eve of Soviet-US-British talks that were to follow them, the CPSU leaders opened another blistering attack on the Chinese. It sent an "Open Letter" directed at the Communist Party of China to all the Soviet Party's organisations and even individual members.

What about the CPNZ as then constituted? Did it work for split? On the contrary. It made all the documents of both sides available to all members and encouraged thereby an informed debate. The majority of the then CPNZ members opposed the new Soviet theories and strongly supported the two world documents.

That, too, is an undeniable fact.

Moreover, in September 1963, the CPNZ sent its Chairman, General Secretary, two members of its Political Committee and a delegation secretary to the Soviet Union for discussions as to how the breach could still be healed. (And it should be remembered that at its National Conference at Easter that year the CPNZ had invited fraternal delegates

from Communist Parties on both sides of the differences.)

But the reception of the CPNZ delegation in Moscow was far from fraternal. Efforts were made to take advantage of the unfortunate drunken behaviour of one of the New Zealand delegates so as to divide the delegation against itself. The delegation secretary's room was searched in her absence, presumably to try to find any CPNZ documents relating to the discussions. (They didn't find them. She was politically far too advanced to leave confidential Party documents unattended.) Then attempts were made to seduce her. (That was unsuccessful too.)

On the ideological front, corresponding statements were made. The acknowledged theoretician of the Soviet Party, Suslov, was called in to reply to the New Zealand contribution when the original Soviet delegation head seemed to feel himself out of his depth. Suslov proceeded to distinguish himself by dubbing the CPNZ delegation "small nation chauvinists". Worse was to come. "Why, Comrade Wilcox," he asked the CPNZ General Secretary, "do you follow China? You're white."

Did the CPNZ really follow China at that time? Why would it do that when since 1917 the CPSU had been the world's most prestigious Communist Party and Communists around the world had, probably to too great an extent, hung on every word that came from it? Why now cease to support the viewpoint supported by the CPSU and prefer to support the viewpoint supported by the CPC?

There could be only one answer to that question as far as any unbiased observer was concerned. The CPNZ thought that the view supported by the CPSU was a departure from Marxism; and it was delighted to find that what it considered was correct Marxism was also seen in that light by the CPC.

If the CPC had taken the same stand as the CPSU, the CPNZ as then constituted would have opposed it too!

Equally, it is not true to say that the CPNZ wanted a split any more in 1964 than it had before. In fact, in the middle of 1964 there took place celebrations to mark the 25th Anniversary

of the CPNZ paper, the 'People's Voice'. And, again, the CPNZ invited fraternal delegates from the papers of other Communists on both sides of the arguments — including from the CPSU.

So much, then, for the general international scene regarding the world Communist movement and the CPNZ's part in it. Within the CPNZ itself, it was inevitable that there should be a minority to support the new theories put forward by the CPSU. As we said, these views were attractive, promising an easier, less painful road to socialism. And they bore the prestigious imprint of the party of Lenin.

One member of the CPNZ's top Political Committee's eight members, and three of the 21-member highest-between-conferences National Committee, opposed the majority stand against the CPSU views and for the Declaration and the Statement. That minority among the leadership of the CPNZ also, inevitably, had some minority support among the membership. At the end of January, 1966, six dissenting members made a surprise public announcement that they had withdrawn from the CPNZ and had formed a new party, the Socialist Unity Party of New Zealand.

They had, of course, a perfect right to do that.

But, in view of the facts set out above, do they have the right to say that the CPNZ was responsible, "ideologically and organisationally", for an "international split" away from "the agreed lines of the international meetings"? (*Socialist Politics*, Issue No. 86/4, Page 3.)

Certainly the SUP journal refers to an international meeting of Communist Parties held in 1969, as well as to those in 1957 and 1960. But the 1969 meeting was held **AFTER** the SUP was formed, after such splits as it had made had taken place all over the world. It was a meeting this time to **confirm** the split, not, as in 1957 and 1960, to try to **heal** the split.

It has been necessary to go into this rather long look at historical facts only because the matter has been raised in the open again by the SUP's theoretical

journal.

The Preparatory Committee unequivocally maintains what it holds to be the correct Marxist position in support of the general line of the 1957 Declaration and the 1960 Statement. It continues to view the CPSU's presentation of its theories concerning peaceful transition, peaceful coexistence and peaceful competition as being a revision of basic Marxism applicable throughout the whole period of the existence of capitalism in most of the world.

However, the PC is fully aware that the views it considers quite wrong are genuinely believed by not a few good, sincere battlers. The PC sees nothing happening since 1956 to prove the correctness of the "three peacefuls". The keenest supporters of those views have, for their part, not been convinced they are wrong. Nor do the latter find anything wrong in the Soviet Union sending troops into Afghanistan and forking out millions upon millions of roubles to finance Viet Nam's war of aggression against Kampuchea.

On such matters, there is still disagreement among the various sections of those who claim the title of Marxists. Their differences on matters of the validity of the basic principles of Marxism as they apply in the second half of the twentieth century have not been solved over the last thirty years. And, since such matters are solved in the long run by the experience of the working people, they may take quite a long time yet.

But, whether in the SUP, the PC, the CPNZ, the Workers' Communist League, the Red Flag Group and the Socialist Action League (and there are other small groups), all have one thing in common:

THEY ARE OPPOSED TO THE ALL-OUT ATTACKS ON THE WORKING PEOPLE OF NEW ZEALAND — MASTER MINDED BY THE MULTI-NATIONALS AND PUT INTO LAW AS "ROGERNOMICS".

Consequently, the PC has consistently called attention to an urgent need of the working class movement in New Zealand

today. That is, the need for an agreement among the various Marxist groups and parties, while reserving their right to their separate theoretical views, to get behind a common immediate programme of measures and demands of the working class to resist the attacks on them.

Hence, the PC sees that polemics over Marxist principles and their current application can certainly be waged. But, in the wider interests of the working class, they should be tempered in tone by the realisation by all Marxists that the divisions have created a weakness in the working class movement that ought to be as far as possible minimised.

Overall, the need to heal the differences is very great. But the time needed to come to complete theoretical and ideological agreement is obviously not going to be short.

So does that mean the New Zealand working class has to wait for the maximum of Marxist leadership until the Marxists settle their differences? What sort of opinion will that give them of the Marxists? And of Marxism?

Moreover, not only is such common support for an agreed programme of immediate popular demands vital for the working people as a whole.

DEVELOPING A COMMON IMMEDIATE PROGRAMME AS A BASIS FOR A UNITED FRONT OF MARXISTS IN ACTION IS ALSO THE FIRST STEP ON THE SHORTEST ROAD TO ULTIMATE IDEOLOGICAL AND THEORETICAL AGREEMENT — TO WHAT THE NEW ZEALAND WORKING CLASS NEEDS MOST. ONE SINGLE UNITED COMMUNIST PARTY.

AND THEY ARE ALL, IN ONE WAY OR ANOTHER, PREPARED TO FIGHT AND ARE FIGHTING AGAINST THOSE ATTACKS.

After all, is there a Marxist who would deny that practice is the only test of theory?