

## **CPI(M) Doesnot Cease to be Revisionist Simply Because It Could Establish Relations with CPC**

Of late contacts were developing between CPC (Comunist Party of China) and CPI (M), culminating in establishing relations between the two. Various interpretations are given to this event. Some are speculating that it may help in normalising the relations between our country and China, on the governments' level. The question is also being discussed in the context of relations between two communist parties belonging to two different countries, more so CPC and others.

### **I**

To understand the event, we have to explain the origin and development of international communist movement headed by Third Communist International (Comintern), and the developments which took place after its dissolution. We can not go into the details because of the limitations of this article. Suffice it to say that the relations between the Comintern and affiliates were not the same althrough.

It is a fact that formation of Comintern was a historical necessity and world communist movement has advanced considerably under its leadership. Communist parties have been formed in a capitalist as well as colonial and semi-colonial countries with revolutionary programmes. Proletarian revolutionary movements advanced under the leadership of the concerned parties. They had the advantage of guidance of such great leaders as Lenin and Stalin.

So far as India and China are concerned, guidance from Comintern was always available. CPC had utilised it in a different way than the CPI of Comintern period. The CPC headed by Mao relied on its own experience, corrected the mistakes committed by the leadership of the Comintern, and advanced the revolution. This was how it exercised its independence during that period. Different is the case with the leadership of CPI. It has never grasped its own programme nor implemented it. It did not rely on its

independence in correcting the basic shortcomings the then general line contained.

The Comintern was dissolved in 1943. A new situation arose wherein the parties have become independent and were expected to look after their own affairs. It was easier for CPC to adapt itself to such a situation because it was already pursuing its own independent line. The same was not the case with CPI whose dependence on Comintern was total. Though the party was formally independent, it continued to be dependent on "international guidance". In fact there were some comrades at various levels who were opposed to dissolution of Comintern, which meant that they wanted continued dependence.

## II

While the relations between CPI leadership and CPSU (Communist Party of Soviet Union) were always good, cordial and fraternal, CPI's relations with CPC met with ups and downs. The Polit Bureau (1948-50) headed by B. T. Ranadive condemned Mao as reformist simply because he worked out a correct strategy, tactics, course of revolution and led the New Democratic Revolution in China successfully. There were no party-to-party relations between CPI and CPC by that time. Therefore there was no question of their breaking up. But then it was a clear indication that there existed an anti-CPC trend by 1948 itself.

However, party-to-party relations between CPI and CPC were established during fifteen for a brief period. Thanks to anti-CPC activities indulged by late Ajoy Ghosh, the then secretary of CPI, the relations were broken again around 1960. They were again restored after the split and at the time of formation of CPI (M).

It should be noted that the relations between government of India and Chinese government had undergone substantial changes during the period. CPI's relations with CPC were always linked with its attitude towards Indian government as well as Soviet Union. Since both were hostile to China, the question of party-to-party relations between the two did not arise during this period. The same situation continues even today.

## III

Though party-to-party relations between CPI (M) and CPC were broken at the time of Naxalbari revolt and formation of Charu

Majumdar's CPI(ML), they were suspended by CPI(M) for all practical purposes after the formation of CPI(M), i.e., after the Party Congress held in Calcutta in 1964 for this purpose. The reason for this was: there were three lines of thinking among the leading sections who joined together to form CPI (M). One section was severe in its criticism about CPSU leadership while it was supporting CPC in the main in the ideological debate that started in the earlier part of the sixties. Such leaders were from a good number of states, the main contingent being from Andhra and West Bengal. There was another section which was critical both about CPSU and CPC. This was from Kerala. There was yet another section which was more critical about CPC and less about CPSU. This was from West Bengal.

When all these sections joined together to form the leadership of CPI(M), they became anti-CPC in the main. There was a historical background for this as the earlier developments in the CPI show.

Upto this time, the CPC did not intervene in the internal affairs either of CPI or of CPI(M) when the latter was being formed. The leadership of CPI(M) had never taken pains to inform its ranks about the suspension of relations with CPC not to speak of explaining it. Obviously, the leadership did not want to annoy CPSU leaders. Rather it wanted to get "recognised" by it by keeping itself away from CPC. The government of India's hostility towards China had its bearing on this attitude of CPI (M).

Thus there was a CPI linked with CPSU and "recognised" by it, while the CPI(M) was left out so far as CPSU was concerned. The parties of various countries, though formally independent, had their own party-to-party relations, some with CPSU, others with CPC, a few with both. So far as CPI(M) is concerned, it had to content itself with having relations with the parties like that of Romania which has relations with both the parties. So far as CPSU is concerned, it acted as a patriarch over some of the parties, which accepted its leadership, and dictated their policies.

## IV

The situation was anomalous for CPSU as well as CPI and CPI(M). CPI(M) was equally pro-Soviet, sometimes more than CPI. It was stronger, with Left Front governments in two (sometimes three) States. CPI(M) gradually backed out from its mildly critical stand about CPSU, and stopped calling CPI revisionist. They have

come together in a United Front, but could not merge. CPI was for a merger but CPI(M) did not oblige. The differences between the two parties were not so important as to prevent merger.

CPI(M) had tried its best to get a recognition from CPSU, through Romania, but it was of no avail. Obviously, the stumbling block was CPI. Otherwise CPI(M) was second to none in supporting CPSU in all respects.

The change in the leadership of the CPC was a god-send to CPI(M). It expected that it would denounce Mao Zedong Thought and repeat what Khrushchev had done to Stalin so that both may come together without any reservations. But the CPC had taken a different direction. While denouncing Cultural Revolution, it upheld Mao Zedong Thought as firmly as it should be.

It should be noted that CPI(ML) was renounced by CPC in 1970 when Mao was alive. If recognition of CPI(ML) was the real reason behind break in relations between CPC and CPI(M), it should have been possible to start efforts from both sides for establishing relations during earlier part of seventies itself. But there were no such efforts. This again makes it clear that CPI(M) was bent on getting recognition from CPSU by supporting its policies.

## V

There is much talk about CPC's interference in the internal affairs of CPI(M) etc. As we stated elsewhere, the relations between the two were already suspended; as such the question of intervention does not arise. The only difference was that CPC leadership, which was silent all the while, had come out openly against the CPI(M) leadership, with all its consequences. But we do hold that there was such intervention so far as revolutionary communist movement was concerned. It was by way of supporting Charu Majumdar and his formation of CPI(ML), Apparently it was directed against CPI(M) leadership. But it resulted in disintegrating and disrupting the entire revolutionary movement. The CPI (M) was no longer representing it by then because it adopted the 'Path of Bengal and Kerala' as its line, which is the parliamentary path in its naked form, by renouncing the path of revolution. Thus the harm done to Indian revolutionary movement was more than to CPI (M).

We are firmly of opinion that the question of Path of Indian revolution should be settled by the communist revolutionary

movement in India . It can be accomplished only when Marxism-Leninism is integrated with the revolutionary practice. No party outside our country can undertake this task. We, communist revolutionaries, already have undertaken this task with all the self-confidence at our disposal.

## VI

CPC leadership was adhering to the principle of equality with and non-interference in the internal affairs of the parties of other countries. But the earlier half of the decade starting with 1966(Cultural Revolution) saw a different picture in our country, when this principle was given a go-by. But it was restored in full when the present leadership was at the helm of affairs. It should be noted that it had party-to-party relations with Romania and North Korea during the period of Cultural Revolution, in spite of basic and important difference. The only criterion at the time was that they were independent of CPSU to a considerable extent.

The present CPC leadership extended the relations to almost all. It has established its relations with Italian party which was independent of CPSU although. More notable and oft-mentioned are the parties of France. It had established relations, long before, with French Socialist Party, which is now the ruling party. Then came the French Communist Party. It has been loyal to CPSU all along, though there are some differences between the two. Notwithstanding this, CPC had established party-to-party relations with it. The differences they had are not allowed to come in the way of having such relations. CPC has relations with Communist Party (Marxist-Leninist) of France. The *Beijing Review* (10.1.83) has reported about the visit of its delegation as following:

"The Chinese Communist Party is willing to establish and develop relations with the workers' parties and other French political parties", said Hu Yaobang, General Secretary of the CPC Central Committee, on December 31, 1982.

Hu made this remark to a delegation of the Central Committee of the Communist Party (Marxist-Leninist) of France.....

"In our relations with these parties, " Hu Yaobang said, "We follow the principles of independence, equality, mutual respect and non-interference in each other's internal affairs".

It is clear that CPC is establishing party-to-party relations not only with bigger parties like French Communist Party, but also a smaller one like Communist Party (M.L.) of France. Therefore the scope of such relations is wider than what is considered to be. Besides this, CPC is having relations with such parties as Somalia's Revolutionary Socialist Party which is the country's ruling party.

Answering a question connected with establishing party-to-party relations with French Communist Party -- "Does this mean that parties that maintain close relations with the Soviet Communist Party can develop relations with the Chinese Communist Party?" -- Hu Yaobang, General Secretary, CPC, said, "I think they can, because one of our principles is not to interfere in other parties' internal affairs. Any party, whether a workers' party, communist party or nationalist party, if it is willing to be friendly with us, we are willing to establish relations with it". (*Beijing Review* : 25.10.82) .

By this, it becomes clear that CPC is establishing relations with more than one communist party if such parties exist in a country and they desire to have relations with CPC.

It should be noted that in all countries, especially those of the Europe and the Third World, people including working class are realising the pinch of Russian hegemonism as that of USA. As such their genuine nationalism stands in opposition to Russia which is expressed in rising national feelings. The communist parties which once had total allegiance towards CPSU have to reckon with this fact. Though the leaderships of most of the parties do not accept the social-imperialist and hegemonic nature of Russia, they have to relax their allegiance to convince the people that they are national parties. French and Spanish parties can be shown as examples in this respect, though they too have their own differences.

The latest example which we have in our country is that of CPI. Everyone knows about its unquestionable loyalty and allegiance towards CPSU. But the leadership had to come out in the open dissociating itself from a policy article in the Russian press which asks CPI and all pro-Soviet forces to support Mrs. Indra Gandhi. The leadership also declared that CPI is an independent party having its own policy, without any dictates from Moscow. We need not take it on its face-value. But the fact of the matter is that it has to reckon with Indian nationalism, which is growing and is directed against Russian hegemonism in our country.

All this goes to show that some of the parties having allegiance to CPSU, and once rapidly anti-CPC, are coming forward to establish party-to-party relations with it. The policies of the new CPC leadership have facilitated this process more than any other factor.

The statements issued by the leaders of CPI(M), while they were at Beijing and after their return, make certain facts clear which we should take into consideration.

1. The relations established between the two parties are on the basis of four principles and not on the basis of Marxism-Leninism and proletarian internationalism. The four principles are: (1) independence (2) equality (3) mutual respect and (4) non-interference in each other's internal affairs. The parties of Marxism-Leninism and proletarian internationalism must adhere to these principles in their relations. At the same time, we can not call CPI (M) as a party of Marxism-Leninism and proletarian internationalism simply because it accepts these principles. Support to Indian ruling classes in all its basic policies, adherence to parliamentary path as against revolutionary path, support to the Russian and Vietnamese aggressions in Afghanistan and Kampuchea respectively etc. are open departures from it all along.

It also shows that it is a matter for communist revolutionaries in our country to settle accounts with these forces, and not for the CPC.

2. It is correct to say that there is no agreement between the two parties on any of the basic and important issues arising out of national and international situation; yet CPC could establish relations with them. At the same time, CPI(M) is in agreement with CPSU on all such issues. At the same time it is not "recognised" by it. There is no explanation for this from CPI(M).

3. CPI(M)'s opposition to CPC's policies is not of a critical nature. It has joined anti-China bandwagon in all respects excepting in that it has not characterised Chinese government as fascist military dictatorship. It has been saying that China is socialist only to equate it with social-imperialist Russia. It is silent over Russia's stationing one million troops along the entire Chinese border. Instead of condemning Vietnamese acts of aggression on China in 1979, it has condemned CPC for its counter-attack in self-defence. It has arrogated itself the right "to demand that the leaders of the CPC completely break with that disastrous line..."- which is nothing but

interference in the internal affairs of CPC (See CPM's organ *People's Democracy*, March 18 and April issues of 1979). Fact is that it has been loyal to the above four principles all along is untenable and preposterous.

4. In the Indian communist movement we have stated earlier there has been a strong trend of depending on help and guidance from international leadership. This attitude is continuing even to this day. CPI's dependence on CPSU is obvious in spite of its claim for independence. CPI(M)'s dependence can be seen in its support to CPSU in all its basic policies even though it was not "recognised" by it formally. To substitute this "recognition", it was in need of some relation with a party like CPC, in spite of having nothing in common with it.

CPI(M) has no revolutionary movement in our country to rely on. Its parliamentary strength is dwindling. Section after section is coming out from it every passing day. Faced with this disintegration, and no recognition from CPSU, it needs a straw to catch and survive, at least for the time being. It has it in having relations with CPC.

In the conditions prevailing today, this step creates some confusion among revolutionary ranks, which in turn reflects the survival of dependence. Communist revolutionaries as we are, we are seized of the problems facing our revolution and we are able to resolve them with the help of the revolutionary line we are pursuing. It is an internal matter of the movement and we are capable of settling accounts with all parties and groups that renounced Marxism-Leninism while claiming to be Marxist-Leninist.

5. The leader of the delegation is reported to have said that CPI(M)" has actively supported the Indian government's efforts to improve relations with China". In fact Mrs. Gandhi's government has become a stumbling block in improving relations with China. Instead of taking steps to normalise relations straight away, it has brought forth the border problem to be resolved first. It means that normalisation of the relations will be postponed indefinitely. CPI(M) leaders' support to the government in this respect means their support to the present state of affairs which has nothing in common with normalisation. "Improvement" in one degree or two is of no consequence in the context of the need of the hour.

6. The leaders of CPI(M) claim that their present step helps

in the unification of international communist movement. They should know that CPC established such relations with a number of parties belonging to the countries of Europe and the Third World. CPI (M) is one of the so many. Most of the other parties have atleast some common points to agree with CPC. But CPI(M) has none. It is known for its self-righteousness, having nothing to learn from others.

The essential division inside the international communist movement is not between CPC and CPSU, as it is made out by CPI(M) and others. It is divided into revolutionary Marxism-Leninism and that which is opposed to it. It is quite natural that there can be and there are differences in each section. A unity is possible on the basis of revolutionary Marxism-Leninism so far as communist revolutionary movement is concerned.

To conclude: In our country also the division in the communist movement is not between pro-Russian and pro-Chinese sections as it once appeared to be. The real division was and continues to be between the revolutionary communist movement and that which is opposed to it, which we characterised as revisionist. The path which CPI(M) is following has nothing in common with Indian realities. It is a parliamentary path practised by social democracy of Western Europe. Everyone knows that it is serving imperialism in war and peace, and not socialism. If this is the reality, how can a parliamentary path be an Indian path? Certainly not. It is a path of western social democracy now advocated by CPSU.

We Communist revolutionaries have no such paths imported from outside. Our path is Indian path arising out of revolutionary experiences of our own country. We learn from the revolutionary experience of other countries. We rely on those of ours, Herein lies the strength of ours.

We hold that revolutionary communist movement in our country and the world will be unified on granite foundations of Marxism-Leninism and proletarian internationalism. In the changed conditions, unity of communist revolutionary movement will adopt ever new forms, but its content continues to be the same. We can not visualise a situation wherein this content has to be changed. (23.5.83)