

CPC - CPM RELATIONS

As an Opportunist Alliance

After more than one year preparations, in the last week of April 1983, the Communist Party of China (CPC) and Communist Party of India (Marxist) (CPM) have announced that they have decided to resume relations on a Party to Party basis. Party to Party relations can only mean relations based on Marxism-Leninism. They have announced that they have reached agreement on 'many points'.

It is significant to note that a joint statement, customary on such occasions, has not been issued containing their agreements and dis-agreements.

But on 30th April, according to the official Xinhua News Agency, Deng Xiaoping "has announced that differences between the two parties will not hamper expansion of their relations".

Having stressed agreement on 'many points', why now speak of "differences"?

The naked truth is that on many major issues of ideology, assessment of present international situation, on the assessment of the role of the Soviet Union in today's world affairs, on the burning issues of Kampuchea and Afghanistan or Pakistan, which have got a bearing on the security of China, the known positions of CPC & CPM are diametrically opposed. Based on their declared positions, there can be no agreement between these parties on those major issues.

Theoretical issues

Look at the issues on which both of them have taken completely opposite positions.

In spite of the unilateral withdrawal of the 9 Commentaries and the General Line, the CPC has been declaring :

"In dealing with the relations between CHINA and the Soviet Union between the two parties, the Soviet leaders headed by Khurshcov deviated further and further from Marxist-Leninist positions". (Peking Review-Sep 14, 1981).

Whatever be the diplomacy of the language, or the mildness of the criticism, the CPC holds that the CPSU leaders "have deviated from the principles of Marxism-Leninism".

But the CPM has been consistently upholding the "Marxism-Leninism" of the CPSU!

Even the present leadership of the CPC has been consistently upholding the Three World Theory. The CPC has never withdrawn its support to the theory of Three Worlds, propounded by Comrade Mao. Even the 12th Congress of the CPC has declared that "China belongs to the Third World" that "the emergence of the Third World on the international arena after World War II is a primary event of our time.

The CPM has been continuously condemning the Three World Theory as anti Marxist and anti-Leninist.

On the question of Maozedung Thought, whatever be its differences with Comrade Mao in the last days, the CPC has been consistently upholding Maozedung thought as it "has added much that is new to the treasure house of Marxism-Leninism", that it has "enriched and developed Marxism-Leninism", that his writings during the period of New Democratic Revolution and Socialist Transformation "are of universal significance and provide us with invaluable guidance now and will do so in the future"

But the CPM leadership has never accepted Maozedung Thought as a part of Marxism-Leninism, let alone enrichment of it.

Can there be agreement between CPC and CPM, without any agreement on these theoretical issues?

Present international situation

There is not only no agreement between these two parties on the most important theoretical questions of the day, but there is no agreement between the on the most basic principles and policies concerning the international situation today.

CPC has been characterising Soviet Union as a social imperialist country and has been praising Mao for having stood up against "the pressure of the social imperialists". Now a days, their official journals are writing Soviet Union as "self-styled socialist country" (Peking Review, Feb 7, 1983).

CPC has characterised the Soviet Union as a "Super power in contention with the other Super power — USA — for world hegemony". It has been condemning both the Super Powers, USA and Soviet Union, as pursuing a policy of "global domination", that they pose "a new threat to the people of the world", CPC has been consistently condemning both USA and Soviet Union "for all local wars of aggression which they instigate or back" (12th Congress of the CPC).

CPC holds "Soviet Union, as the rival of the United States in its bid for world hegemony and also the main threat to West European security" (Peking Review, March 21, 1983).

CPC condemns both USA and the Soviet Union for taking "advantage of the economic difficulties of some third world countries to weaken their economic strength", for attempting "to influence and change the domestic and foreign policies of third world countries", and for attempting, through economic penetration, "to find and foster proxies to subvert local govts".

It is very well known that the CPM is diametrically opposed to the positions of CPC on the role of the Soviet Union in today's world affairs.

Coming to the most recent events, CPC condemns the massing of Soviet troops on its borders as a hostile act. CPM has never opened its mouth on this question.

CPC has condemned Soviet backed Vietnamese aggression in Kampuchea and Soviet aggression in Afghanistan.

In India let us remember that it is only CPM and CPI who have shamelessly supported Vietnam and Soviet Union in these aggressions.

Finally, on the question of Pakistan, the CPC and CPM have been consistently holding diametrically opposed views.

On all occasions, when the ruling classes with the support of the Soviet Union, committed aggression against Pakistan, the CPC has supported Pakistan as a victim of aggression. The CPM has always been siding the Indian ruling classes and the schemes of social imperialists against Pakistan, exposing its own character of national chauvinism.

Even today, when Indira Gandhi tries to improve relations with Pakistan, it is CPM that is warning her about the dangers of Pakistan as a stooge

USA and it has openly condemned China for playing the American game Pakistan. Utilizing the issue of Pakistan, the CPM has been consistently using national chauvinism and hatred both against Pakistan and China.

All these are known facts. On all major theoretical issues of the day, and today's international issues, particularly about the role of the Soviet Union, CPC and CPM have taken diametrically opposed lines. On all these issues, CPM has been consistently opposing the positions of the CPC and has been consistently supporting aggression, hegemonism, and neo-colonialism of the Soviet Union.

On these questions their differences are antagonistic differences. Can there be relations between these two parties without agreement on these basic principles and policies?

That is why we say that the present relations between CPC and CPM are opportunist, for temporary gains or imaginary gains and advantages, sacrificing fundamental principles.

Why this opportunist alliance?

Having known fully well, that there still exist sharp, even antagonistic differences between CPC and CPM on issues of theory or on the role of the Soviet Union as a super power in today's world affairs, still both sides have decided for resuming their relations on a Party to Party basis. Their statement that their relations are based on Marxism-Leninism cannot hoodwink anybody. History will condemn it as nothing but opportunist.

What are the compelling reasons for both these parties that have helped them for this opportunist alliance?

The CPC in its history Resolution (June 27, 1981) has drawn the conclusion that Comrade Mao had deviated from Marxism-Leninism from 1956.

In line with this understanding they have also withdrawn the 9 commentaries and the General Line. Let us remember that the differences between CPC and Modern revisionists of the CPSU also started in 1956, with the 20th Congress of the CPSU.

From these two events, one can only conclude that the present leadership of the CPC wants to go back to 1956, and re-establish its relations with all the revisionist parties in the world.

In line with this they have already established their links with the communist parties of Italy, Spain and France. The present agreement with the CPM is one more in that line.

Perhaps, the CPC thinks, that these revisionist parties will bring pressure on the Soviet Union to come to agreements with China.

When the CPC re-established its relations with the communist parties of Italy and Spain, our party supported it, because these parties/have condemned the Soviet aggression in Afghanistan and Vietnamese aggression in Kampuchea.

The French revisionists and the CPM have openly supported Soviet actions on both these issues.

With the History resolution, (June 27, 1981), the CPC has been taking many contradictory positions.

Opposition to the Soviet Union as a Super power, dependence on pro-Soviet parties to bring pressure on the Soviet Union for agreement is a contradiction in itself. Opposition to the Soviet Union as a Super power but alliance with pro-Soviet revisionist parties is a contradiction in itself.

For the CPM also, this opportunist alliance has become a necessity.

Right from its break with the CPI in 1964, the CPM leadership has been desperately trying recognition from the CPSU. But the CPSU has so far not obliged. The CPM thinks that its present link with the CPC will help its bargaining power with the CPSU and for its international recognition.

Inspite of its left phrase-mongering, the parliamentary path pursued by the CPM leadership, its opportunist election alliances with various ruling class parties to gain a few parliamentary or assembly seats, its own performance in the provincial go vts. under its own leadership, all these have been increasingly exposing its own revisionism. More and more people have begun to see that CPM has become a party of the present establishment, a party of the status quo, in the country.

All their electoral victories and the ministries, they lead, have been confined to the traditional centres of communist movement in West Bengal, Tripura and Kerala. In other states, including Andhra and Punjab, they have miserably failed to gain anything new, inspite of becoming the tails to certain opposition ruling class parties.

Particularly, the CPM's dirty role in supporting Indira Gandhi's blood-bath against the Assam people, its shameless support to Indira Gandhi's bogus elections in Assam and the miserable results it has got there has become an eye-opener to many to understand the bogus opposition of the CPM to Indira Gandhi's authoritarianism. Having announced its support to the 'anti-imperialist' and "genuine non-aligned" policy of the Indira Govt. it has further exposed its real character.

Its performance in the various provincial govts. has proved that the CPM is only a party of reforms and not a party of revolution. That is why the ruling classes in India allow them to be in power in the ministries, since at present it suits their own interests by preventing the people of these states from taking the path of struggle.

With the long practice of Parliamentary path, its tactics of opportunist political alliances with all sorts of bourgeois opposition parties, its practice of economism, CPM has been continuously losing its mass base, in all other states, including those states under their rule. It has already heavily lost in the TU's among the students and even in the peasant pockets. In some areas, its social base itself has changed into Jotedar, rich peasant-landlord base.

This has been continuously leading to the dissatisfaction of its own ranks leading to the split into small groups in many states where it is working.

Faced with this situation, the CPM thinks that its present link with the CPC will help in preserving its "left" image for some more time to carry on its deception of the masses and its own ranks.

These are the considerations that have brought the re-establishment of the relations between CPC and CPM.

As long as CPC holds that the Soviet Union is a super Power with ambitions of world hegemony, the present relation is bound to be an uneasy alliance full of contradictions and disputes. Let us wait and see.

Our attitude to the CPC

Our attitude towards CPM is in no way dependent on the attitude of

the CPC towards CPM. We have broken away from the CPM on various programmatic, tactical and political principles. On all these questions we firmly believe that the CPM has taken a revisionist stand. We will continue our ideological and political struggle against the revisionism of the CPM, while uniting with their ranks and mass organisations on the immediate issues of the people on all possible occasions.

In spite of CPC's new relations with the CPM, our attitude to Socialist China and CPC will not change.

Our Political Resolution, "Intensify the people's Struggle" has declared :

"Socialist China, pursuing the path of socialism through modernisation, is supporting all National Liberation struggles, opposing the hegemonism of the two Super Powers and strengthening its own defence against any possible attack".

While continuing our support to China on all the issues mentioned above, against all attacks, the resolution has declared :

"Proletarian internationalism does not mean that we should blindly follow every line of our international friends. While supporting the general orientation of the working class movement, we will take our own positions on various issues both national and international and decide our own tactics of struggle".

Our Party has been consistently following this principle.

While holding CPC as Marxist-Leninist Party, we have demarcated ourselves from the CPC on its assessment of Mao's role, on the Cultural Revolution, on the question of Liu Shaochi or Tito.

When the CPC attacked the extremism of the so-called Gang of Four, we supported the CPC. At the same time we demarcated ourselves from their trial for 'criminal' offences or branding them as counter-revolutionaries.

When the CPC established links with the Communist Parties of Italy and Spain, we supported it because both these parties were opposed to the hegemonism of the Soviet Union. At the same time, we demarcated from the CPC's characterising Euro-communism as a new scientific experiment.

Long ago, we have said that the CPC being a ruling Party in China has got a right to make its own friends in India. At the same time, we have warned that such agreements and friendship with such elements should not harm the cause of the Indian Revolution.

Based on our own experience, we have fought both against 'leftism' and rightism and have succeeded largely in overcoming them. Having taken to the Path of Agrarian Revolution, we have tried to integrate the principles of Marxism-Leninism to the concrete situation in India, and through ups and downs, we have succeeded in preparing our own programme, Tactical Path, Lessons of 14 years, and our own Political line.

By pursuing the correct policies, our Party and the mass organisations under its leadership have registered important advances in majority of the states where we are working. We have emerged as a growing force in a fierce struggle both against left and right deviations.

During the last 14 years, our Party, our masses and its ranks have made innumerable sacrifices in the cause of Agrarian Revolution. What ever be the difficulties and sacrifices on this difficult road of Agrarian Revolution, we will continue our struggle.

The fate of Agrarian Revolution in India is not dependent on the mercies of anybody, but is dependent on the intensification of the contradictions in our society, correct political line of the communist revolutionaries and the people fighting for it. It is the people that will decide the issue.

With deep faith in our own people, with deep faith in the teachings of Comrade Mao, let us advance on the path of Agrarian Revolution.

March to Liberation (editorial)

May, June 83