

## **Renouncing The Revolution At Home And Demanding Unity Of International Communist Movement Can Not Go Together**

Now-a-days there is some talk about international communist movement and its unification, more so from CPI quarters. Unless certain wrong understandings about the international communist movement and its relations with the communist movement of our country are removed, people are likely to be misled and get satisfied with what is going on, instead of concentrating their attention on the revolution, the revolutionary movement and related problems.

Normally, international communist movement includes the movement in a given country. In the present context, our own country. Therefore we can not think of one to the exclusion of other. In the same way, one should not over-state it and underplay the other. A genuine communist movement is a revolutionary movement whose immediate objective is people's democratic revolution in a country like ours, and socialist revolution in a capitalist country like England, France, USA etc. Let us know significance of the two movements when viewed with a correct perspective.

### **Present state of affairs in the international communist movement.**

It is obvious that the International Communist Movement is not homogeneous not only at present but it was so for the last three decades and more. After the dissolution of Comintern, communist parties in each country have become independent replaced by a new set of relations which were different from those laid down by Comintern. This situation puts new demands on the parties to think and act more independently though it was a must even when they were affiliated to Comintern. The revolution in China could succeed because CPC, headed by Mao, could interpret Marxism-Leninism independently and apply it to the practice of Chinese revolution.

Most of the communist parties could not orient to changed

situation after the dissolution of Comintern. If they were dependent on Comintern for its guidance while it was functioning, they continued the same after its dissolution and substituted CPSU for Comintern. It was easy for them for such a switch-over because CPSU was playing a leading role in Comintern all along. The dependence was so much that it was subservience to CPSU which was understood and practised as proletarian internationalism. After the death of Stalin, the new leadership of CPSU used this subservience to serve its interests. But the need of the hour was that the parties assert independence and more independence so as to advance the revolutions in their respective countries.

In order to carry on this stupendous and fundamental task, it was necessary that the parties have a correct Marxist-Leninist understanding on questions of war, peace and revolution. Obviously there was no such understanding in most of the parties. Differences of a fundamental nature have been existing for the last three decades and more. The leaders of the CPI(M) admit this fact in the following words.

*"..... today the international communist movement is badly divided and this division is not confined only to the CPC and CPSU. Divergent views are being expressed..... Just because of that these parties can not be written off." (People's Democracy-June 12, 1983).*

Previously, CPSU and CPC were singled out for the division or split in the international communist movement. Now, those leaders admit that there are other parties who hold "divergent views" on fundamentals of Marxism-Leninism, and they can not be written off simply because of this. It should be known that most of the problems, fundamental as they are, arose because of the policies of CPSU, which is the centre of controversy, and not CPC and its policies during Cultural Revolution. It should also be known that it is not CPC alone which is opposed to CPSU, on these fundamental questions; there are others who hold similar views to those of CPC for which it can not be blamed of either interference or of pressurising. CPI(M), for that matter CPI, is having relations with most of these parties, while at the same time it has differences with them on the above-mentioned issues. They are connected with the CPSU and are the result of its policies. The leaders of CPI(M) are not explicit on this point.

To say that Russia and Vietnam had sent their armies to

Afghanistan and Kampuchea and stationed them in those countries by way of "aid" is to deny a fact which is known to the people of the world. And the fact is naked aggression. That the leaders of CPI(M) support it does not alter its nature to one of "aid". These powers are forcing puppet governments of their choice not only on the respective peoples but are pressurising and threatening other countries also, to coexist with those governments. This is the type of "aid" they are extending.

#### **Sermonising about proletarian internationalism.**

The CPI(M) leaders, while mentioning some statement of their P.B., have to say the following:

*".....It is equally the duty of the ruling communist parties of socialist countries to follow a policy that would help the struggles of the working class and peoples of non-socialist countries against their own exploiters and oppressors. It is utterly wrong for the big parties of some of the socialist countries to pursue policies which subordinate the class struggle, in the countries with whose governments they have friendly relations, to the narrow immediate needs of the foreign policy of their Governments....." (The same article)*

These leaders are sermonising about proletarian internationalism for the last so many years. The author of the article admits that there are divergent opinions about Marxism-Leninism and proletarian internationalism itself. CPI(M)'s opinion about it is one of the so many. Its opinion is not based on objective reality. The article says some thing about "the big parties of some of the socialist countries". What are those parties? Which are those socialist countries? Do they think that their efforts for unity of international communist movement would end in failure if they came forward with names of those countries?

The "big parties" whom they are not ready to name are CPSU and CPC. We do not know whether they have in mind the Vietnamese party also. So far as CPC is concerned, the leaders admit that it is "correcting" the mistakes it has committed in the past. The fact of the matter is that the CPC has adopted policies for correcting its mistakes. It is taking steps in this direction. At the same time, the mistakes committed by the CPC have no comparison with those committed by CPSU and its leaders. But they are being equated by the interested sections including CPI(M) to the crimes committed

by the leaders of CPSU so that their enormity is minimised. Is this not shielding the CPSU leaders from the crimes they have committed?

That the CPI is pursuing policies "which subordinate the class struggle" to the narrow immediate needs of the foreign policy" of the Soviet government is indisputable. This is because Mrs. Gandhi and her government have "friendly relations" with Soviet Union. But what about CPI(M)? It is also doing the same in the name of proletarian internationalism. It is not only supporting the foreign policy of Soviet Union, but that of Mrs. Gandhi also. CPI(M)'s complaint is that Mrs. Gandhi is not dittoing Soviet Union's foreign policy. She is putting up a posture in words that she is not kowtowing Soviet Union. But in reality she is following its policies in deeds.

The CPI(M) might take pride that it is opposing Mrs. Gandhi in internal policies. If it is so, CPI can as well take credit for doing the same, because it also claims to be opposing Mrs. Gandhi in her internal policies. What then is the difference between the two? This is not the innovation of CPI (M) leaders. Late Ajay Ghosh, after he became the Secretary, had worked out a device which meant a liberal parliamentary opposition to certain aspects of internal policies like suppression of civil liberties, loans from US etc. It was a mere verbal opposition. Present CPI (M) leaders have been indulging in the same. There is no opposition to Mrs. Gandhi on any of the basic issues and there is no mass movement against the regime which alone can be characterised as opposition in deeds.

Therefore, CPI (M) is as much class collaborationist and is subordinating class struggle -- to the interests of Soviet Union as well as Mrs. Gandhi's regime -- as CPI.

What has happened in our country is that Nehru and his successors have utilised the basic weakness in the leaders of both CPI and CPI (M) and dislodged them from the idea of a revolution in our country, not to speak of a practice towards it. Their weaknesses are: loyalty towards Soviet Union to the denial of revolution, and aping western countries in adopting parliamentary path. Both have nothing in common with revolutionary content of Marxism-Leninism. By establishing friendly relations with Soviet Union, the leaders of the ruling classes could pose themselves as progressive anti-imperialists so that the leaders of CPI and CPI (M) ran after them

to support their regimes, which continues even today. By offering a symbolic parliamentary system, they have reduced them into parliamentary parties who have turned their faces away from revolution. Absence of independent interpretation of Marxism-Leninism and its concrete application to the practice of Indian revolution have landed them into this quagmire, from which they can not come out.

It must be known that Soviet Union's changed policies, after Stalin's death, have helped Nehru and his successors because it has ceased as world revolutionary force and became a hegemonic super power.

It must be known that they (Nehru etc) have no such relations with China, which have been hostile all along barring a few years in early fifties. This is because they did not derive any such advantage which they had from Soviet Union. This situation continues even today. Herein lies the fundamental difference between Russia and China.

**Advance and success of revolution in our country  
is in the interest of socialist countries.**

The question posed by CPI (M) leaders itself is wrong in that a socialist country, big as that (Soviet Union), wants the interests of the revolution in a country to be subordinated to the immediate interests of its foreign policy. A genuine socialist country never does it. It is possible only when it ceases to become a socialist country. It is not a deviation but a departure from Marxism-Leninism itself. Even if we presume that it was a deviation in the beginning, it will never last for two decades. It is bound to degenerate into departure. Granting that it is still a deviation, the interests of the country's revolution do not allow the revolutionaries to respect the deviation, by sacrificing the revolution.

The deviation in the CPSU, if it is really a deviation, does not mean that CPI or CPI (M) should inherit it, which they did. The continued immediate interests of CPSU spread over two decades become ultimate interests because, for revolution such a long period is most important so that it decides the success or failure of the revolution itself. Therefore, those who cherish the interests of revolution most, should discard Soviet Union and CPSU because it is opposed to revolution by nourishing a "deviation" which is renouncing Marxism-Leninism.

It is well known that Russia and Vietnam had supported the proclamation of Emergency in 1975 by Mrs. Gandhi. Is it not a counter-revolutionary step directed against democratic and revolutionary movement in our country? The leaders of CPI (M) criticise CPI for supporting emergency but are formal in their criticism about Russia and silent about Vietnam.

Advance and success of revolution in our country is a blow to imperialism in general and US in particular. CPSU need not fear it if it is genuinely Marxist-Leninist and Russia is genuinely socialist. If CPI (M) leaders are really Marxist-Leninist, and realise that CPSU is opposed to revolution in our country, they should discard and write it off. That they are not writing it off means that they are not serious about the revolution in our country. Rather they are opposed to it.

Ulyanovsky's latest article (*The Indian National Congress: Lessons of Revolution*) is a conclusive evidence that CPSU is totally against the revolution in our country. The sum and substance of the article is to support Mrs. Gandhi on matters of foreign affairs, on the part of CPI and CPI (M). It demands a total subservience to Mrs. Gandhi and her regime. CPSU knows that these parties have renounced revolution long back. What it wants them is to renounce their liberal parliamentary opposition, which is not real at all. That they do not accept that aspect of the article which is connected with internal policy of the government leads them nowhere as long as they eschew revolution directed against the ruling classes, though the parties may differ as to who they are.

The CPI (M) leaders have the following to say about the path they are pursuing:

*Each Communist Party should strive to bring about social transformation by peaceful methods. But how this transformation will be brought about does not depend upon the desire and striving to bring it about by peaceful means. It mainly depends on the behaviour of the ruling classes. Historical experience teaches that the exploiting ruling classes constituting the minority of the people do not respect the will of the majority and suppress it by use of terror and bestial violence. When their rule is threatened by the exploited majority, they do not hesitate to do away with the bourgeois parliamentary system and resort to naked dictatorship and rule by terror (from the same article)*

Communist parties are independent. As such they need not wait for sermons from CPI (M) leaders that they should "strive for social transformation by peaceful methods". What is necessary is to know as to what the CPI (M) leaders have to say about the same in our country as well.

If historical experience shows that ruling classes resort to bestial violence against people who constitute the majority, the question of peaceful social transformation does not arise. That is to say, that the desire of any communist party, more so of the dictum of CPI (M), to bring about peaceful social transformation does not fit in with the historical experience of the society.

It is a fact that the bourgeoisie as a ruling class did away with parliamentary system in certain capitalist countries during forties (Germany, Italy, Japan). After Second World War, countries of the third world have also resorted to such methods. Experience in our country is different. Parliamentary system and naked terror are co-existing. This being so, what is the solution?

The PB statement is silent over this as the above extract shows. The experience further shows that CPI(M) wants the present parliamentary system to continue so that it may be an instrument for achieving its slogan of the rule of Left and Democratic Front at the Centre. The experience again shows that such a Front in West Bengal, when in power, is serving the ruling classes and not the majority of the masses of the people. It is helping them to strengthen the illusions in the Constitution, and in the ruling classes it represents. Therefore, people are asked to choose the parliamentary path which the CPI (M) had chosen. As a result, they are kept away from revolutionary path. The silence over the path of revolution can only mean this. CPI (M)'s practice confirms this.

It must be known that when major part of CPI (M) leadership was detained in various jails towards the end of 1964, the Polit Bureau had come out with a memorandum in which it stated that there is no difference between the path chosen by CPI and CPI(M), and hence there was no need that they should be detained.

In fact the concerned paras were the gists taken from the statement of 81 parties in 1960 in a distorted form, though there is a mention of peaceful path for capitalist countries under certain conditions, which have nothing in common with those in our country.

The ruling classes as represented by Nehru and his successors have provided a parliamentary system which is symbolic in its nature to dislodge the communist movement from taking a revolutionary path. They have succeeded in their efforts so far as CPI and CPI (M) are concerned because of their right opportunism and revisionism. All this is going on in the name of Marxism-Leninism.

#### **Conclusion:**

CPI (M) claims that it is for the unity of international communist movement. There are two types of this movement, one being opportunist, and the other being revolutionary based on Marxism. The party, CPI (M), which is right opportunist and class collaborationist at home and supports social imperialism and hegemonism can not perform this task. That some parties including CPC are having relations with CPI (M) does not make it revolutionary and Marxist-Leninist because they did not take up the responsibility of judging it on that score. Guiding principles of party-to-party relations do not permit them to do so. Revolutionary communist movement will decide what is Marxism-Leninism and what is not, so far as our country is concerned.

Imperialism in general and the two super powers in particular are dominating our country. As a result our revolution is directed against the two super powers. We can not think of a successful revolution if it is directed against US only, because Russia has already stepped in its shoe. A party is judged whether it is Marxist-Leninist, or not, in relation to our revolution and not in relation to the desire in words for unity of international communist movement. A successful revolution in our country will go a long way in such unity efforts. Renouncing revolution at home and demanding unity of international communist movement cannot go together.

CPI (M) can not be Marxist-Leninist simply because it claims to be so. It can not be revolutionary simply because it happens to be in power in two states, with some numerical strength. A party of genuine Marxism-Leninism applies it to the practice of our revolution by interpreting it independently. The organisation of communist revolutionaries is performing this task, which alone is a guarantee to the success of revolution as well as unity of international communist movement. (21-6-1983)