

48-357

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**

評苏共領導从三月一日起在莫斯科  
召开的會議

日共《赤旗報》文章

\*

外文出版社出版（北京）

1965年第一版

編号：（英）3050—1316

00033

3—E—698P

## 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-