

## CPI Leaders Continue Their Slanders Against CPC

Of late the leaders of CPI and CPI(M) are presenting themselves as a united force having differences on some issues. Now that the leaders of the CPI(M) have established party-to-party relations with CPC (Communist Party of China), those of the CPI have something to say by way of expressing their differing point of view. Instead of commenting on what the leaders of CPI(M) said in this regard, they are attacking CPC by way of continuing the slander which they indulged in all these years. Since all this is going on in the name of Marxism-Leninism, it is necessary to clarify what is correct and what is wrong and slanderous.

### 1. A baseless attack against CPC

Indradeep Sinha, a top leader of CPI, writes in *New Age* of June 5, 1983:

*".....the omission of Marxism-Leninism and proletarian internationalism from the list of principles governing the restoration of fraternal relationship between the CPC and the CPI(M) must certainly be due to the fact that one of these parties does not accept them as its governing ideology. It is well-known that the CPI(M) does accept Marxism-Leninism and proletarian internationalism as its governing ideology. Hence it must be the CPC which does not do so".*

We do not know what the leaders of CPI(M) have to say on this point. It is a fact that the basis of the relations between CPC and CPI(M) is four principles (independence, equality, mutual respect, and non-interference). There is no mention of Marxism-Leninism and proletarian internationalism as the basis, either in the joint communique or the statement issued by the leaders of CPI(M). But the conclusion he draws about CPC has no basis whatsoever.

We do not know the source from which the author has come to know that CPC does not accept Marxism-Leninism. Time and again the leaders of CPC have asserted, and are asserting, that they

are Marxist-Leninists. Their practice proves that it is so. There is no reason why one should accept the author's contention which is slander, pure and simple.

CPC maintains relations with Communist Party of Romania on the basis of Marxism-Leninism and proletarian internationalism. Hu Yaobang, General Secretary of CPC, has affirmed it by saying, "No force on earth could break or disrupt Sino-Romanian friendship based on Marxism and proletarian internationalism." (*Beijing Review*, May 16)

This is a conclusive evidence that there are parties with whom CPC has relations on the basis of Marxism-Leninism and proletarian internationalism. Of course, they observe the four principles as well in their relations. Therefore the CPI leader has no ground to say that CPC is not guided by Marxism-Leninism.

It is another matter that the CPI leader certifies the leaders of CPI(M) that they are guided by Marxism-Leninism etc.. For a long time, they were at logger-heads. It is only recently that they are united while keeping their separate identities as parties. Before their unification, CPI(M) leaders were branding CPI as revisionist. Now that they are united, it has ceased to be revisionist so far as CPI (M) is concerned. The CPI, in turn, treats it as being guided by Marxism-Leninism etc. The opposition of CPI to Mrs. Gandhi's government is more symbolic than real. This is the only change, if any, in the policy of CPI, which does not warrant a change in its characterisation of being revisionist.

The fact of the matter is that both the CPI and CPI(M) have embraced their respective varieties of revisionism. That is why they could unite while maintaining differences on this or that issue. That they certify each other as being Marxist-Leninist makes no difference because no party of revisionism admits that it is so. Parliamentary path, social chauvinism, class-collaboration etc. are common to both the parties which transformed them as revisionist. Their role is similar to the parties of Second International which were the embodiment of all these departures from Marxism-Leninism.

### 2. Mao Zedong Thought Accords with Marxism-Leninism:

The author says;

*"Needless to add that a communist party that has substituted Marxism-Leninism by "Mao Zedong's Thoughts" as its guiding*

*ideology is bound to relapse into bourgeois nationalism which finds repeated expression in great power chauvinism etc". (The same article).*

It is well known that both the CPI and CPI(M) leaders are opposed to Mao Zedong's Thought. That is no reason why the author should stoop to tell a blatant lie. Chinese communists never renounced Marxism-Leninism and substituted Mao Zedong's Thought for it. They treat it as an application to the practice of Chinese revolution. Such an application is quite in accordance with Marxism-Leninism. This is what it means according to Lenin:

"We do not regard Marx's theory as something completed and inviolable; on the contrary we are convinced that it has only laid the foundation stone of the science which the socialists must develop in all directions if they wish to keep pace with life. We think that an independent elaboration of Marx's theory is especially essential for Russian socialists; for, this theory provides only general guiding principles, which in particular are applied in England differently than in France, in France differently than in Germany and in Germany differently than in Russia.....(Lenin. **Collected Works**. Vol.4. pp.211-212).

We have to mention those lines again and again so that Indian communist revolutionary movement may emancipate itself from dogmatic approach to Marxism-Leninism-Mao Zedong Thought. What Lenin said about Marxism applies to Leninism as well as Mao Zedong Thought. The very fact that the Chinese communists led by Mao could lead Chinese Revolution to success, provides sufficient ground for coming into existence of Mao Zedong's Thought. Mao's application of Marxism-Leninism was independent as was the case with Lenin, who applied Marxism independently as is stated in the above quotation. Thus Mao followed Lenin's teachings in developing the theory and practice of New Democratic Revolution, whose correctness is proved beyond doubt by the successful revolution in that country. It is undoubtedly a new contribution to the arsenal of Marxism-Leninism. Obviously the CPI leadership does not accept this position. If it thinks that the success of the revolution is due to some accident or some deviation (chauvinism), it is due to its ignorance of Marxism-Leninism and nothing else.

Both the leaders of CPI and CPI (M) were expecting, just as the sections of the ruling circles in many countries, including ours,

that Chinese communists (CPC) would renounce Mao Zedong Thought and fall in line with Russian hegemonists. But to their disappointment, they found that the CPC adhered to Mao Zedong Thought as usual, while at the same time it corrected the mistakes committed by Mao, in his later part of the life (Cultural Revolution). What was done by the CPC in this respect was also quite in accordance with Marxism-Leninism.

Mao Zedong Thought was not a product either of nationalism or national chauvinism, as the CPI leaders want our people to believe. Contrary is the fact. The leadership of CPC alone and others need not accept it. It should be known that CPC accepted it as its guiding ideology long back in 1945, in its 7th Congress. Neither CPI of that time nor anyone else raised an objection to it. How then can the leadership be charged as chauvinists? It is slanderous to levy such a charge against it.

It is well-known that the present-day ruling classes are opposed to the influence of Chinese revolution on the people of our country. Counter-revolutionary as they are, their attitude can not be otherwise. But the leaders of CPI and CPI (M) claim to be Marxist-Leninists while at the same time oppose CPC's continued adherence to Mao Zedong Thought. They oppose CPC and Chinese government's policies, and support those of the ruling classes as represented by Mrs.Gandhi. Thus there is a common ground between the two, i.e., Mrs. Gandhi on one side, and the leaders of CPI and CPI(M) on the other, in opposing Chinese government and its policies so far as India is concerned. They extended the opposition into the realm of ideology. This is a characteristic of revisionism and social chauvinism. Had Mao and Chinese communists contented themselves with claiming to be Marxist-Leninists, without further developing it into Mao Zedong Thought, there would have been no successful Chinese revolution and no new China as we see it today. But the leaders of CPI and CPI(M) did quite the opposite. We, communist revolutionaries think that to make Indian Revolution a success, we have to develop Marxism-Leninism-Mao Zedong Thought further so that we can integrate it with our revolutionary practice. What we are doing is the same.

### **3. Unity and Split in the Indian Communist Movement**

It is wrong to say, as the author of the article says, that it is the leaders of CPC who were responsible for splits in the Indian

communist movement. It is not a fact. The split had come into the open during Telangana armed struggle itself. A section of leadership set up a rival centre at Bombay, started a journal *OPEN FORUM*, cyclostyled copies of which were circulated through length and breadth of India. The contents of the major part of the journal were open condemnation of Telangana armed struggle. Besides *OPEN FORUM*, they published pamphlets slandering it. All the anti-armed struggle forces were mobilised behind it. Most of these forces are, or were, in the present-day CPI.

The leaders who came into the top in 1951, and were at the helm of the affairs ever since, never cared to condemn this treachery. Instead, they were allowed to hold important leading positions at all levels. It is this section who acted as storm-troopers for class-collaborationist policies as long as the party was formally united till 1964. Thus there was a *de facto* split in the united CPI ever since 1950, which was formalised in 1964. Everyone who knows something about international communist movement can understand that the CPI leadership had nothing to do with either Telangana armed struggle or the *de facto* split which developed inside the CPI ever since 1950.

Late Ajoy Ghosh, who was the Secretary of CPI from 1951 till his death, had his own role in forcing a break with CPC long before India's war with China in 1962. Dange was hand in glove with him while he was alive and continued his role as a disruptor, after Ajoy Ghosh's death. These leaders, together with some more, were in close contact with the leaders of the Nehru Government at top-most level, briefing them about the developments inside the Central Committee. This is how the split was engineered by the class-collaborationist forces inside the united CPI. They constitute the present-day CPI leadership at almost all levels.

This does not mean that the leaders of the CPI(M) had nothing to do with the split. They had their own role.

While dealing with the phenomenon of splits, the CPI leaders are throwing stones from their glass houses. In spite of their unflinching loyalty to the CPSU, CPI has been a divided-house all through. Recently there was split leading to formation of another communist party led by Mr. Dange. The CPI(M) is in no better position. It has been splitting horizontally at various levels down below.

All this goes to show that it is a slander to say that the leaders

of the CPC engineered a split in the Indian communist movement or the united CPI. It is the class collaborationist policies of CPI leaders and their subservience to CPSU which were responsible for the split so far as united CPI was concerned.

There was some interference from the side of the leaders of CPC so far as CPI(M) was concerned for a brief period between 1967-70, during the period of Cultural Revolution in China, which had a decisive impact on the split that took place in CPI(M). It was the revolutionary movement which suffered heavily due to these splits. The CPI(M) also did suffer in the sense that it could not retain considerable number of the revolutionary ranks behind it to serve its parliamentary path. It had become another variety of CPI.

Communist revolutionaries are getting united inspite of the obstacles they are facing. This unity is on the basis of independent application of Marxism-Leninism to the practice of Indian revolution. Such a unity is developing for the first time in the communist movement, though there were attempts earlier.

#### 4. The Documents of 1956 and 1960 are not Sacrosanct.

The author quotes from the statement of 12 communist parties (1956), and the declaration of 81 communist and workers' parties (1960) and from Togliatti (1935) to prove his contention. There was an attempt to assess the post-Second World War situation in the first two documents, by the concerned parties. They were highly defective and compromised with fundamentals in many respects, inspite of the affirmation of many Marxist-Leninist principles in words. They showed a green signal to parliamentary path to communist parties, more so of the parties of the Third World countries, when the need of the hour was to follow a revolutionary path. They affirmed the "leading" role of CPSU while the need of the hour was the struggle against subservience to it and an independent application of Marxism-Leninism. The very fact that they failed to unite the international communist movement as well as the movement of our country clearly shows that the formulations they contained were far away from the reality obtaining in the movement.

There was no common understanding on these documents among the CPI leaders themselves. Every section had interpreted them in its own way resulting in consolidation of groups and factions inside the party. While a section (present CPI) advocated the path of class collaboration openly, the other [present CPI(M)] deceived

the revolutionary ranks and mobilised them in the name of opposing it and fighting its revisionism. Both advocated two varieties of a single path of class collaboration, the difference being skin-deep.

Therefore the two documents mentioned in the article are neither basic nor authentic. They could not stand the test of revolutionary practice of international communist movement.

The class collaborationist policy pursued by CPI during the anti-fascist war of 1941-45 clearly shows that the leadership of CPI of those days did not understand the revolutionary significance of united front tactics, and failed to apply them independently keeping the specific situation obtaining in our country. Today, for CPI, proletarian internationalism means serving the interests of Russian hegemonism and renouncing the interests of the revolution in our country in toto, and once for all. This understanding and practice has nothing to do with Marxism-Leninism, whose independent application and interpretation should mean that revolution in India is advanced. Anything which goes counter to it is wrong and should be repudiated. Serving the Russian interests means renouncing revolution itself, because Russia is opposed to Indian revolution.

### **Conclusion**

To conclude: The leaders of both CPI and CPI(M) are united and stopped calling each other revisionists, splitters etc. They are parading this as the unity of Indian communist movement. The differences, if any, are not so serious as their unity-in-action indicates. Given this background, how is it that the CPSU has refrained from establishing relations with equally loyal CPI(M), and created a situation in which it was forced to go to CPC, with whom CPI(M) does not see eye to eye? Everyone knows that CPI(M) was after "recognition" from CPSU, and preferred to be in the waiting-list all these years. Instead of explaining this aspect of the situation, the author of the article tried in vain to prove that CPC is not a party of Marxism-Leninism. This clearly shows that the leaders of CPI are in the fore-front of anti-China band-wagon only to serve Russian hegemonic interests as against those of Indian revolution, which they have discarded long back. (14-6-1983)