

NEW STAGE OF DIFFERENCES

Differences in the international communist movement have reached a new and extremely acute stage. The threat of dogmatism and disruption offered by the leadership of the Communist Party of China to the communist and workers' parties of the world has created the danger of a complete and formal split in the movement. It jeopardises the internal unity of certain communist parties, including our own. In the case of a few, disruptive groups have already broken off from their parent organisations.

The threat is both political and organisational.

The CPC characterises the Communist Party of India as: the Dange clique (which) has embarked on the road of national chauvinism and class capitulationism with the intention to turn the Indian Communist Party into an appendage of the Indian big bourgeoisie and big landlords, and a lackey of the Nehru government (which) is repressing the Indian people and hiring itself to imperialism at the cost of national independence. (*A Mirror for Revisionists*, March 9, 1963, pp. 1 & 5.)

Similar epithets and descriptions can be quoted from other Chinese writings.

The CPSU, vanguard of the international communist movement and the initiator of the new policies of the movement at its historic Twentieth Congress held in 1956, is denounced by the CPC in the following words:

The leadership of the CPSU has allied itself with US imperialism, the Indian reactionaries and the renegade Tito clique against socialist China and against all Marxist-Leninist parties in open betrayal of Marxism-

“Leninism and proletarian internationalism.” (*Hongqi* and *People's Daily* editorials, September 6, 1963, pp. 1 & 2).

The same editorials continue,

“The facts of the past seven years have amply proved that the road taken by the leadership of the CPSU is the course of allying with imperialism against socialism, allying with the United States against China, allying with the reactionaries of all countries against the people of the world. (p. 52.)

Specifically on the India-China border conflict, the *People's Daily* of November 2, 1963, says

“Together with the US imperialists the Soviet leaders are helping the Indian reactionaries against socialist China and against the Indian people too. They have betrayed the Indian people as well as the socialist camp. (p. 22.)

Similar charges of betraying the socialist movement in their own countries and the national liberation movement of the oppressed and dependent countries, have been levelled against the communist parties of France, Italy, the USA and others.

Such is the CPC leadership's estimate of the political policies being pursued by the communist parties with whom it disagrees and which, it concedes, constitute the majority of fraternal parties.

D. N. Aidit, Chairman of the Communist Party of Indonesia, put forward the viewpoint of the CPC leadership regarding our Party and its leadership, even more crudely and insultingly in his speech delivered at Jakarta on September 29, 1963. The official version of the speech was published by the Secretariat of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Indonesia itself.

In his speech, Aidit attacked our Party as “the Dange clique that already acts as spies of Nehru.” He spoke of

“Dange-Nehru prisons.” He characterises our Party as “fully controlled by revisionists from which genuine Marxist-Leninists have been expelled.” He stated that the Communist Party of Indonesia would “give a good reception to the genuine Marxist-Leninists so expelled.”

Aidit's speech was repudiated by a resolution of our CEC, just as earlier attacks by the CPC leadership on our Party, its policy and leadership had been repudiated by resolutions of the CEC and the National Council.

With regard to the organisational solidarity of the international communist movement as also the unity of each national party taken separately, the *Hongqi* editorial of February 4, 1964 puts forward a fully worked out theory for splitting the world movement as also the parties with which it disagrees. In fact, it has issued an undisguised call for a formal split. Following are the relevant passages of the article:

Unity, struggle or *even splits*, and a new unity on a new basis—such is the dialectics of the development of the international working class movement.

The history of the international communist movement demonstrates that *in every period* the struggle between the defenders of unity and the creators of splits is in essence *one between Marxism-Leninism and opportunism revisionism*.

If the CPSU leaders insist on marking off the “majority” from the “minority”, then we would like to tell them quite frankly that *we do not recognise their majority*. The majority you bank on is a false one. The genuine majority is not on your side. . . . *The real majority are the revolutionary Marxist-Leninist parties and the Marxist-Leninists* who represent the fundamental interests of the people, and not the handful of revisionists who have betrayed these interests.

The CPSU makes the slanderous charge that “the CPC

LEADERSHIP organises and supports various anti-party groups of defectors, which oppose the communist parties of the United States, Brazil, Italy, Belgium, Australia and *India*.

What are the facts? In essence, the struggle within these communist parties turns on *whether to follow the Marxist-Leninist line* or the revisionist line, and whether to make the communist party a genuine vanguard of the proletariat and a genuine revolutionary proletarian party *or to convert it into a servant of the bourgeoisie* and a variant of the Social Democratic Party.

The leaders of the CPSU present a distorted picture of the struggles within the communist parties of the USA, Brazil, Italy, Belgium, Australia and *India*. They vilify in the most malicious language those *Marxist-Leninists who have been attacked and ostracized by the revisionist groups in their own parties*.

A Marxist-Leninist party should as a matter of course give *firm support* to revolutionaries and *to communists who oppose revisionism*.

The Chinese Communist Party has never concealed its position. *We support all revolutionary comrades* who adhere to Marxism-Leninism. In the international communist movement we have contacts with revisionists; *why then can we not have contacts with Marxist-Leninists?*

The leaders of the CPSU describe our support for Marxist-Leninists in other countries as a divisive act. In our opinion, it is simply a proletarian internationalist obligation which it is our duty to discharge. (All emphasis ours)

The instigation to organisational defection is clear and categorical. In fact, it is trumpeted as a proud revolutionary duty for which there can be no question of apology.

Clearly, there can be no meeting ground between the CPC and the communist parties so attacked, unless the

former abandons all these slanderous charges as also its call for "splittism", to use its own terminology.

The *Hongqi* editorial of February 4, 1964 traces the history of the communists' struggle against opportunism and revisionism since the days of Marx, Engels and Lenin. Without going into the strict objectivity of the picture as presented by *Hongqi*, the conclusion drawn by it still remains unsubstantiated. That conclusion is that *"in every period* the struggle between the defenders of unity and the creators of splits is *in essence one between Marxism-Leninism and opportunism-revisionism."*

By what stretch of imagination does *Hongqi* draw this conclusion?

If such a conclusion were true, why was it that at the time of the Brest-Litovsk treaty (early in 1918) Lenin had to mercilessly expose the petty-bourgeois revolutionism and adventurism of the Trotskyite factionalists and splitters?

Why did he have to write his famous classic *Left-wing Communism, An Infantile Disorder* in 1920?

Why did the CPSU and the Communist International have to wage a dogged struggle against Trotskyite "Leftism" and factionalism after Lenin's death?

Why did Com. Dimitrov have to concentrate the fire of his criticism against sectarians and dogmatists at the Seventh Congress of the Communist International in 1935?

After all this, to claim that in the history of Marxism-Leninism the threat of factionalism and splittism has *in every period* come from revisionists is an amazing blindness towards history.

Besides, the 81 Parties' Statement itself says:

Dogmatism and sectarianism in theory and practice can also become the main danger at some stage of development of individual parties, unless combated unrelentingly. They rob revolutionary parties of the ability to develop Marxism-Leninism through scientific analysis and apply it creatively according to the specific conditions; they

isolate communists from the broad masses of the working people, doom them to passive expectation or Leftist, adventurist actions in the revolutionary struggle, prevent them from making a timely and correct estimate of the changing situation and of new experience, using all opportunities to bring about the victory of the working class and all democratic forces in the struggle against imperialism, reaction and war danger, and thereby prevent the peoples from achieving victory in their just struggle.

The Chinese leaders never refer to this passage in the Moscow Statement even once.

Among one of the statements of Engels quoted by *Hongqi* itself (February 4, 1963) is the following:

The movement of the proletariat necessarily passes through different stages of development; at every stage part of the people get stuck and do not join in the further advance.

Obviously, the editors of *Hongqi* have not given serious thought to this warning given by Engels, though they quote it.

The eighth editorial of *Hongqi* and the *People's Daily* categorically declares that "violent revolution is the universal law of proletarian revolution." It declares that "to insist on revolutionary armed struggle is of primary importance not only to the proletarian revolution but also to the national-democratic revolution of the oppressed nations."

Lenin's own reference, quoted in this very article, speaks of a bourgeois state being superseded by a proletarian state, "as a general rule, only through a violent revolution." (Emphasis ours.) *Hongqi* and *People's Daily* have no compunction in turning a general rule into a universal law.

Even more. This very article openly calls for "amending the formulation" of the 81 Parties' Statement on this question.

And with all this, it calls the supporters of the 81 Parties' Statement as revisionist splitters, and justifies its own call

for splitting the world communist movement by referring to Lenin's breaking away from the Second International and founding the Communist International. Is it possible to misinterpret and distort history further?

The disruptive call and activities of the CPC are not directed only against the brother parties. They extend to international democratic organisations like the WFTU, the World Peace Movement, the Afro-Asian Solidarity Conference, the World Federation of Democratic Youth, the Women's International Democratic Federation, and so on.

Even more dangerous are the adventurist, chauvinistic and opportunist state policies engendered by the arrogant dogmatism of the Chinese leadership. For they relate to vital world problems of war and peace (the Caribbean crisis and the Partial Test Ban Treaty); the unity of the socialist camp (paralysing economic and trade relations with socialist countries in the name of self-reliance while establishing relations with imperialist countries for industrial and technical aid); the principle of peaceful coexistence; the unity of the peace camp and Afro-Asian unity (aggression against India, the opportunist support to Pakistan's demand for a plebiscite in Kashmir and the defence of its membership of Seato). The Chinese leaders take strong objections to Soviet aid to India, even in the sphere of industry:

With the increase in Soviet aid, the Indian reactionaries have become more and more frantic in their exploitation and suppression of the Indian people. (*People's Daily*, November 2, 1963, p. 27.)

The focal point of the controversy may be indicated at the outset. The defeat of the fascist powers in the Second World War and the formation of the world socialist system led to a still further deepening of the general crisis of capitalism. More specifically, it led to an intensification of all the contradictions of imperialism (between imperialism and

socialism, imperialism and the colonial liberation movement, the contradictions among the imperialist powers themselves and among various sections of the bourgeoisie in each imperialist country, and so on). On the other hand, the strength of the socialist countries, the colonial liberation movement and the working-class movement in the capitalist countries increased immensely.

Considered from the standpoint of the struggle and tactics of the world communist movement, what are the new advantages and opportunities that arise from this development?

The key advantage is that the working class, which is the most fighting champion of peace, democracy, national independence and socialism, is now in a position to divide the forces of imperialism and reaction, of the capitalist system as a whole, far more than in the pre-Second World War period. To put it positively, *the working class can now secure more allies than before* for realising the four key objectives of peace, democracy, national independence and socialism. For the same reason, the prospects of achieving these objectives at the cost of far less violence and bloodshed than before, have also improved.

This is the central point that the Chinese leaders refuse to see, and hence the focal point of the entire controversy.

Naturally the Chinese leadership disagrees with the world communist movement all along the line, on the strategy and tactics of the peace movement, the national liberation movement and the struggle for democracy and socialism. Their disagreement arises not merely in the sphere of international problems and policies, but also in the sphere of the policies to be pursued within each country whether the key task in the country concerned is the struggle for national independence and democracy, or the struggle for socialism. What we thus get are two conflicting lines of strategy and tactics in the solution of all the major international and national problems of the day.

The opinions and policies of the CPC leadership are thus a threat, not only to the international communist movement. They are a cause for the gravest concern to all lovers of peace, national independence, democracy and socialism all over the world. They directly affect the interests of the Indian people. No Indian can remain indifferent to them on the plea that they are conflicts within the communist hierarchy or conflicts of interests between two communist giants of the world, USSR and China, each guided by its own national interests under the mask of a pedantic doctrinaire controversy.

It is in this spirit that the National Council of the CPI poses all the problems and issues involved, and seeks to clarify them.