

## THE ROAD TO UNITY

We have been very frank in this report. We have very clearly stated our understanding of the 81 Parties' Statement as a whole and its various sections. We have stated what it means and should mean in the sphere of practical politics. We have also stated clearly where the understanding and practice of the CPC leadership depart from and come into conflict with the correct understanding and policies laid down by the Moscow Statement.

It is necessary to explain why we have had to deal with the whole question openly and with such utter frankness.

But before coming to that, it would be better to dispose of the question as to how the whole controversy arose in the international communist movement and who was responsible for bringing it into the open and for importing so much bitterness and acrimony into the whole debate.

The facts of the matter have been briefly and objectively stated in the Open Letter of the CC CPSU to the members of the CPSU dated July 14, 1963. We quote the necessary portion below. So far as our Party is concerned, we came out into the open only after our Party leadership had exhausted all possible avenues of conveying our views to the CPC leadership and after the development of the India-China dispute reached a point when it was impossible for us to maintain silence without abjuring our elementary obligation to the Indian people.

The main points of the CC CPSU open letter are given below:

In April 1960 the Chinese comrades openly revealed their disagreements with the world communist movement by publishing a collection of articles called *Long*

*Live Leninism!* The leaders of the CPC began imposing their views on all the fraternal parties. In June 1960, during the session of the General Council of the World Federation of Trade Unions, which took place in Peking, the Chinese leaders, without the knowledge of the leadership of fraternal parties, held a meeting of representatives of several parties who were then in Peking, and started openly criticising the positions of the CPSU and the other Marxist-Leninist parties, and the Declaration adopted by the Moscow Meeting in 1957. Furthermore, the Chinese comrades took their differences with the CPSU and the other fraternal parties to the open tribune of a non-party organisation.

These steps by the leadership of the CPC caused serious anxiety among the fraternal parties. In view of this, an attempt was made at the Bucharest meeting of communist parties in 1960 to discuss with the leaders of the CPC the differences that had arisen. Representatives of 50 communist and workers' parties subjected to comradely criticism the views and actions of the Chinese leaders and urged them to return to the road of unity and cooperation with the international communist movement in conformity with the principles of the Moscow Declaration. At the meeting of representatives of 81 communist and workers' parties which took place in November 1960 the absolute majority of the fraternal parties rejected the incorrect views and concepts of the CPC leadership. The Chinese delegation at this meeting stubbornly upheld its own particular views and signed the Statement only when the danger arose of its full isolation.

In its letters of February 22 and May 31, 1962, the CPSU Central Committee drew the attention of the CPC Central Committee to the dangerous consequences which the weakening of the unity of the communist movement could have for our common cause. We then suggested to



the Chinese comrades that steps should be taken to prevent the imperialists from having an opportunity to use in their interests the difficulties that had arisen in the Soviet-Chinese relations. The CPSU Central Committee also proposed that more effective measures should be taken on such matters as the exchange of internal political information and the coordination of the positions of fraternal parties in international democratic organisations and in other spheres.

However, these letters and the other practical steps aimed at improving relations with the CPC and the PRC on all lines, did not meet with any response in Peking.

Deepening their ideological differences with the fraternal parties the leaders of the CPC began carrying them into relations between states. The Chinese bodies began curtailing the economic and trade relations of the PRC with the Soviet Union and the other socialist countries. On the initiative of the PRC government, the volume of China's trade with the Soviet Union has been cut by almost 67 per cent in the past three years; the delivery of industrial plant has dropped by forty times. This reduction took place on the initiative of the Chinese leaders. We regret that the PRC leadership has embarked on such a course. We have always believed and still believe that it is necessary to go on developing Soviet-Chinese relations and to develop cooperation.

The Chinese leaders did not tell their people truthfully who caused these relations to be restricted. Widescale propaganda aimed at discrediting the foreign and domestic policy of the CPSU and at stirring up anti-Soviet feeling was started among the Chinese communists and even among the general population.

Since the end of 1961 the Chinese representatives at international democratic organisations began openly imposing their erroneous views. In December 1961, at the Stockholm session of the World Peace Council, the

Chinese delegation opposed the convocation of the World Congress for Peace and Disarmament. During 1962 the activity of the World Federation of Trade Unions, the World Movement of Peace Champions, the Afro-Asian Solidarity Movement, the World Federation of Democratic Youth, the Women's International Democratic Federation and many other organisations was endangered as a result of the splitting actions of the Chinese representatives. They came out against the participation of representatives of Afro-Asian Solidarity Committees of the European socialist countries in the 3rd Afro-Asian Solidarity Conference in Moshi. The leader of the Chinese delegation told the Soviet representatives that "white people have nothing to do here." At the journalists' conference in Jakarta the Chinese representatives tried to prevent Soviet journalists from participating as full delegates on the plea that the Soviet Union was not an Asian country.

It is strange and surprising that Chinese comrades accused the overwhelming majority of the recent World Congress of Women of splitting activities and erroneous political policy, while during the voting on the appeal to the women of all continents only two countries—China and Albania—out of 110 countries represented at the Congress voted against it. It seems the entire multi-million army of freedom-loving women is marching out of step, and only two are marching correctly, keeping in line! (pp. 6 to 9).

Comrade Suslov's Report to the CC CPSU dated February 14, 1964 brings the entire sad story up to date. It says:

Like other Marxist-Leninist parties, we have repeatedly proposed to the CPC leadership that the public polemics be stopped. Such a proposal, in particular, was made in N. S. Khrushchov's speeches on October 25 and November 7, 1963. At the close of November 1963 the Central Com-



mittee of the CPSU sent the Central Committee of the Communist Party of China a letter in which a number of concrete proposals were made for eliminating differences and strengthening scientific, technical and cultural cooperation between the USSR and the PRC. In that letter the CC CPSU once again proposed stopping the open polemics. You know, comrades, that during the past few months, acting in conformity with that proposal, the Soviet press has refrained from publishing any polemical material.

How did the Chinese leaders react to these steps? Blinded by nationalist arrogance, they paid no heed to the opinion and appeal of the fraternal parties. They rejected our initiative and took the road of open political struggle against the collectively worked out line of the Marxist-Leninist parties." (p. 6)

It is all these developments taken together that have led to our stating our viewpoint on the entire controversy fully and frankly.

At the same time, the last thing in our mind in resorting to this course is to offend or insult the CPC or its leadership. Though it is our view that the recent policies of the CPC leaders are doing immense harm to the world communist movement, we cannot forget the glorious achievements of the CPC and its leaders. Neither can we forget that however wrong the CPC leaders may have been in recent years, the division in the international communist movement does great damage to the people's struggle against imperialism and reaction and everything possible has to be done to restore the unity of the world communist movement.

The reasons for our frankness are altogether different.

The first reason is that the differences in the international communist movement are real and deep-rooted. They pertain to practical questions which are going to decide the fate of humanity in the years ahead. Such differences can

only be settled through free and frank discussion. Abusive and insulting language must be avoided, but the evasion of real issues for the sake of politeness or for giving the appearance of unity where it does not exist, will also not heal the breach which has been created by the Chinese leaders themselves.

Secondly, the real alternatives before us today are not polite silence or abusive controversy. The real alternatives are free and frank discussion with the aim of rectification and the restoration of unity, or ending up in confusion, disgust and anarchy. Already the bourgeois press is systematically putting across theories such as, the whole quarrel is over Chinese national self-interest and Russian national self-interest, it is over whether Mao or Khrushchov is to be the leader of the world communist movement, and so on. Such demoralising and disruptive theories lower the prestige and appeal of communism in the eyes of non-communists and can only be put an end to by a free and frank discussion of the real issues involved. Neither abuse nor polite silence can be the way out.

Somewhat similar attitude was reflected in the public utterances of some of the members of our National Council who were suspended from Party membership in April 1964, for their splitting activities. Even they have referred to the controversy as though it was a question between the CPSU and the CPC and stated that they have no intention of being guided by either side.

The third reason for our full and frank treatment of the subject is, therefore, to prove, not only in theory, but with reference to the actual issues at stake, that the conflict is between the CPC policies and the policies of communist and workers' parties all over the world. In fact, as mentioned in the report, it is a conflict between the policies of the Chinese leadership and the world struggle for peace, democracy, national independence and socialism. The



question of becoming a camp-follower, either of the CPSU or the CPC does not arise.

The fourth reason for such a treatment is that the dissident policies and splitting activities of most of the members of our National Council who were suspended by the National Council in April were related to the controversy in the international communist movement. Whether the views held by them are their own or whether they derive them from others is irrelevant to the issue under consideration. What is relevant is that many of their views are very similar to the views of the CPC leadership, and that their disruptive activities were intensified at the same time as the CPC leaders chose to attack our Party with growing venom.

Considering all these developments a frank discussion of the differences in the international communist movement, whether they pertain to political evaluations or actual policies, becomes incumbent for settling the differences among Indian communists themselves. We are deeply concerned with them not only as a national contingent of the world communist movement, but also because of the differences that divide us.

The question arises, what is our objective in a frank discussion of these differences? What is the spirit in which we seek to conduct the discussion? Do we conduct it with the object of dividing our ranks further and further, in a manner and spirit that will harden the differences?

The reply to these questions is an emphatic no. The purpose is not to divide further, to raise a Chinese wall between the contesting viewpoints. The purpose is to seek clarity and carry conviction on the basis of Marxist-Leninist theory and on the basis of analysing the actual experiences of the revolutionary movement in terms of Marxist-Leninist theory. The purpose is to reunite our Party ranks and the world communist movement through such a process.

At the same time, the task of unification, whether political, ideological or organisational needs a principled approach. If controversy degenerating into abuse is most damaging, unity based on the evasion of real differences and drawingroom politeness can also damage the basic character of the communist party, viz. the character of being an instrument of revolutionary action. Unity cannot mean turning the communist party into a faction-ridden debating society, paralysing its role of organising and leading the masses into action.

Such is the objective and spirit in which this report is being placed before the Party.

It is outside the scope of this report to narrate the efforts being made by our National Council and the Central Secretariat to resolve Party unity with the objective stated above. Party members are being constantly informed of the steps that have been and are being taken, in that direction.

It is also outside the scope of this report to narrate the suggestions made by our National Council for restoring the unity of the international communist movement. The resolutions of our National Council on the subject including the latest adopted by the last meeting of the National Council in June 1964 have been published in our Party journals.

Let us thresh out our differences in a principled manner and also strive for Party unity in a principled manner. The task is difficult. But it can and has to be accomplished. The unity of the forces of communism is the basic and indispensable requisite of the oppressed and toiling people all over the world in their arduous struggle for the overthrow of imperialism, reaction and capitalism, and for the achievement of socialism.