

ON THE SLOGAN OF UNITY IN ACTION

The slogan of unity in action emanates from the present-day objective situation, from the general line of the international Communist movement which is one of forming a broad united front with the socialist camp and the international proletariat as its nucleus to oppose imperialism and reactionaries headed by U. S. imperialism, a line of

boldly arousing the masses, expanding the revolutionary forces, winning over the middle forces and isolating the reactionary forces.

The Soviet leadership had been refusing to take united action against American imperialist aggression in Vietnam and had even talked of disengaging itself from its commitments in Southeast Asia. But the Communists and revolutionaries all over the world demanded united action and active defence of Vietnam.

Further, with the advancement of the liberation struggle of Vietnam which became the rallying point of progressive mankind against U. S. imperialism, the revisionist leadership of the Soviet Union itself came forward with the slogan of unity in action in its manoeuvre to avoid isolation from the currents of anti-imperialism.

To be more clear and precise, it is a call by the Soviet leaders to the Chinese Communist Party and government leaders, that the two big socialist states, the USSR and the People's Republic of China, should work out a plan of united action against American aggression on Vietnam, notwithstanding the sharp division on several ideological-political issues between them.

The Chinese Communist Party rejected this proposal on the following grounds: (a) that the attitude taken by the Soviet leaders to the U. S. aggression in Vietnam over a number of years in the past as well as the present is dubious; (b) that the Soviet leadership has been conspiring to impose a humiliating peace on Vietnam and thus betray the national liberation revolution of the Vietnamese people; (c) that the material help rendered by the Soviet Union to Vietnam is nominal and is not commensurate with the strength of the Soviet state; (d) that "in contemporary world opposition to or alliance with U. S. imperialism constitutes the hallmark for deciding whether or not a political force can be included in the united front against the U. S.", that "the new leaders of the CPSU have destroyed the basis for international proletarian unity, and they transpose enemies and friends and persist in the line of Soviet-U. S. collaboration for world domination" and hence it is not possible "for Marxist-Leninist parties to take united action with them on the question of Vietnam."

“On the question of handling our relations with the enemies and friends whether to oppose or unite with U. S. imperialism”; “and there are things that divide us and nothing that unites us, things that are antagonistic and nothing that is common” and as such the contradiction between the two is an antagonistic contradiction, and hence unity in action with them is ruled out.

A serious debate is on in the world Communist movement as to the correctness or otherwise of the stand taken by the Chinese Communist Party on this issue of united action.

A careful analysis of the developments of Vietnam's liberation war against the U. S. imperialists during the last several years clearly demonstrates the truth that the attitude adopted to it by the Soviet Union and the role it played is certainly disappointing and is not what is rightly expected of a leading and mighty socialist state, i.e., the Soviet Union. For a long time, there has been neither forthright condemnation of U. S. aggression nor was timely and effective intervention forthcoming. Things, at a stage, went so far as Khrushchov publicly announcing the intention of the Soviet Government to resign from the presidency of the 1954 Geneva Conference and ‘disentangling’ itself from the whole of Southeast Asia, thereby objectively encouraging the U. S. imperialists to proceed with their aggressive plans against Vietnam with impunity. Even after the acceptance of the five-point programme of the South Vietnam National Front for Liberation and the agreement with the North Vietnam Government for increased material assistance by the Soviet Union, a sort of “sitting on the fence” policy is pursued, and the statements issued, assistance rendered and the action proposed by Soviet statesmen are not so unequivocal as to serve a stern warning to the U. S. imperialists and to force the U. S. to desist from its aggression. An examination of the entire course of developments leading to the present escalation of the war against the Democratic Republic of Vietnam by the U.S. cannot but compel one to conclude that the Soviet Government is guided by the thesis of ‘local wars in danger of growing into a world war’ and consequently takes hesitant, halting and compromising steps, and makes repeat-

ed attempts at restoring some kind of peace in Vietnam in compliance with the U.S. aggressors—all of which has gone only to abet and encourage the American expansionists rather than in restoring real peace in Vietnam.

The stark reality, today, is that the small socialist republic of North Vietnam, together with its patriotic fighters in South Vietnam, is fighting alone against U. S. aggression and is making unheard of sacrifices, notwithstanding the fact that she is a member of the world socialist camp which has become a formidable force in the present era. Of course, it is true that it is getting enormous material assistance and moral support from the socialist camp, but not its direct and united intervention to drive out the aggressor.

The North Vietnamese Government and its ruling Workers' Party, taking into account the great ideological-political gulf that divides the two mighty socialist states of the world, the Soviet Union and People's China, do not think it prudent to raise the slogan of unity in action as an *immediate and practicable one* and, instead, is appealing to both the Soviet Union and China and all other socialist states to render independently maximum material and political assistance in the war of liberation against American imperialism. But the freedom-lovers and proletarian revolutionaries of the whole world are extremely concerned and agitated over the brutal, fascist war on the Vietnamese people and desire united action by the socialist states, particularly the Soviet Union and China, so that the aggressors might be speedily driven out and peace restored in Vietnam. Our Party cannot but share this legitimate urge of the people, all over the world, and eagerly look for such a heartening development as soon as possible.

While passionately desiring united action against imperialist aggression, it cannot but take serious note of the fact that the unity in action proposed in this concrete case is nothing short of military action with its own serious consequences, and such a united military action demands minimum mutual confidence between the states and parties which are participants in that united action. Nobody in his senses who is following the developments in the international Communist movement and Sino-Soviet relations

in particular can imagine that such minimum mutual confidence exists between the Soviet and Chinese leaders.

In this connection one cannot but recall to memory a chain of events that have embittered Sino-Soviet relations to the point of a serious split between the two. The high-handed manner in which the leadership of the CPSU revised a series of Marxist-Leninist propositions at the 20th Congress and sought to arbitrarily impose its understanding on fraternal parties, the open denunciation of the Chinese C. P. by Khrushchov at Bucharest in 1960 after it expressed its serious ideological differences with the CPSU, the blatant violations of fraternal socialist relations by the Soviet leaders through the stoppage of aid, annulling agreements mutually entered into, and sudden withdrawal of the Soviet technicians from China, the unashamed backing out from the Sino-Soviet agreement to share the technical know-how of atomic weapons, the test-ban treaty that was signed and the proposed treaty of non-proliferation to be signed by the Soviet leaders with the USA and Britain by-passing China and in the teeth of its opposition, the Soviet leaders' refusal to help China to acquire the latest military techniques and to develop its military capability to meet the American atomic and rocket menace, the most vicious international campaign organised by the Soviet Party and Government to isolate it and pressurise it into submission and a host of similar steps and actions deliberately perpetrated by them to damn the Chinese Communists as warmongers and traitors to the cause of socialism, cannot be wiped out with the stroke of a pen by issuing the slogan, "let us unite in action" against U. S. aggression.

The Soviet leaders, if they are really earnest and serious about Sino-Soviet united action against U. S. imperialism, will have to resort to bilateral talks with the Chinese leaders in order to clear up the mess that has been created, will have to abandon the facile notion of maintaining world peace in collaboration with the most aggressive U. S. imperialists, and will have to realise that their struggle for so-called peace, freedom and socialism in the world without socialist China is more unreal and absurd than the stupid U. S. concept of UNO and world politics by-passing People's China, a fourth of the world's population.

A series of initial steps are required to prepare the ground for such unity of the socialist camp and the international Communist movement. Without the preliminary necessary steps and preparations for unity in action, the slogan of united action, as advanced by the Soviet leaders as a slogan of immediate action, loses its meaning and significance and reduces itself to one of scoring points and deceiving the gullible.

Notwithstanding this, acceptance of the proposal for a meeting of representatives of North Vietnam, Soviet Union and China and participation in such a meeting would have helped the process of putting to test the Soviet proposals of joint action, to test the Soviet professions of helping Vietnam and served to enlighten the peoples of all countries.

However, our Party cannot subscribe to the view that the slogan of unity in action between the USSR and PRC is wrong in principle on the ground that the USSR is headed by a revisionist leadership. The very concepts of united front, united action, etc., advocated by Communists presuppose action against a common enemy, at a particular stage of development, together with several other classes and parties with whom the proletariat has its contradictions, including antagonistic contradictions, at times. Communists in pursuing the political line of united front and united action do not address themselves only to the leaders of political parties and organisations but principally to the masses behind them. It is wrong not to distinguish between the leaders and the masses following them, and to identify the views of the leaders with those of the classes and masses behind them. Hence to rule out in principle the slogan of unity in action with political parties or states on the ground that those parties or states in question are headed by revisionists restricts the scope of unity with all those with whom it is possible to unite, while singling out and isolating the most immediate and hated enemy.

In this particular case, i.e., the Soviet leaders whom we, too, consider as the advocates of modern revisionism, the question of unity in action is interwoven with the Soviet state and its people, as these leaders happen to head that state at present. The outright rejection of the slogan of united action as unprincipled, on the ground that such unity

in action implies unity between revisionists and Marxist-Leninists is, objectively, tantamount to making a present of that state and its people to the revisionists, instead of isolating the revisionists. While appreciating the innumerable obstacles that stand in the way at present, for the immediate realisation of the slogan of united action between the Soviet and Chinese governments, and while entertaining no such illusions that such united action can materialise if the struggle to realise it is carried on in the manner the Soviet leaders are at present carrying it on, we do cherish this concept and eagerly work for its materialisation, so that the bleeding Vietnamese people might in their just war of national liberation together with the states of the socialist camp rout the armies of imperialist intervention.