

Our Party has made serious reservations on some points. ...

The Document is not presented as a 'programmatic charter' or a 'general line' for the Communist Parties. ...

At present unity can only be achieved on the terms of complete independence of the Parties in shaping their policy line. ...

We wish to stress with the best of intentions but also with the utmost frankness that...the world communist movement is not governed by the principle of democratic centralism. In our movement, fundamental problems cannot be solved by voting nor by a majority vote. ...

Our Party...is not prepared ever to be a minority." (S.Carrillo, General Secretary, Communist Party of Spain: "Speech at International Meeting of Communist and Workers' Parties: Moscow 1969"; Prague; 1969; p.365,366-67).

THE (REORGANISED) COMMUNIST PARTY OF BELGIUM ENTERS THE "CENTRIST" REVISIONIST CAMP

At the end of Part Three of this Report we said:

As an alternative to seeing their parties or groups degenerate in this way, some of the maoist leaderships may choose to repudiate Maoism and bring their parties or groups into the camp of "centrist" revisionism."

The recent history of the (reorganised) Communist Party of Belgium provided a significant example of this tendency.

Following its repudiation of Chinese "left" revisionism and its re-analysis of the "cultural revolution" as a counter-revolutionary attack on the Chinese working class, the Communist Party of Belgium was congratulated on its stand by the Political Bureau of the Marxist-Leninist Organisation of Britain. The Central Committee of the Communist Party of Belgium accepted the proposal of the Marxist-Leninist Organisation of Britain that talks should take place between representatives of the two Organisations. As a result a meeting was held between representatives of the two Central Committees in November 1968, and a further meeting between a representative of the Central Committee of the Marxist-Leninist Organisation of Britain and representatives of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Belgium in May 1969.

The Political Bureau of the Marxist-Leninist Organisation of Britain had been somewhat concerned at the fact that the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Belgium had apparently felt it unnecessary to issue any statement of explanation or self-criticism on the abrupt change of their line from full support of the Chinese "cultural revolution" to outright opposition.

We were also concerned at the fact that the Communist Party of Belgium continued to recognise the Communist Party of Cuba, the Workers' Party of Korea and the Workers' Party of Vietnam as "Marxist-Leninist Parties", and Cuba, the People's Democratic Republic of Korea and the Democratic Republic of Vietnam as "socialist states":

"The People's Democratic Republic of Korea, Cuba and the Democratic Republic of Vietnam continue to win victories in the building of socialism". (Editorial in: "La Voix du Peuple", March 21st, 1969; p.1).

We were even more concerned at the fact that the Communist Party of Belgium continued unchanged its policy of calling for "national independence" for Belgian imperialism:

"This struggle for national independence (in Belgium - PB, MLOB) forms an integral part of the class struggle." (Editorial in: "La Voix du Peuple", April 11th, 1969).

On the latter two issues, the Political Bureau of the Marxist-Leninist Organisation of Britain made known to the Communist Party of Belgium its disagreement with these policies.

Nevertheless, the leadership of the Communist Party of Belgium expressed its desire to cooperate in the building of an international Marxist-Leninist movement. In view of the urgency with which we regarded this task, we therefore proposed that, in order to establish the international nucleus of such a movement, a meeting should be held as soon as possible to which should be invited all parties and groups calling themselves Marxist-Leninist which had repudiated both Soviet right revisionism and Chinese "left" revisionism. At that time, such parties and groups known to us existed in the United States, Britain, Belgium, France and Italy. The American Communist Movement endorsed the principle of such a meeting and authorised the Marxist-Leninist Organisation of Britain to act as its proxy at the meeting.

The leadership of the Communist Party of Belgium wished that the meeting, with which it expressed agreement, should take place in Brussels, to which the Marxist-Leninist Organisation of Britain was pleased to agree, and asked that the Political Bureau of the MLOB should prepare the draft documents for the meeting.

The Political Bureau of the MLOB prepared these draft documents on the basis of issues on which, to the best of our knowledge, there was agreement among the organisations due to participate in the meeting, hoping that differences would be resolved in due course as a result of joint consultations and coordinated activity.

On July 3rd, 1969, however - some three weeks before the international meeting was due to take place - the Secretary of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Belgium, Jacques Grippa, wrote to the MLOB declaring that all the draft documents for the meeting, including the draft agenda, were unacceptable to them, that it was very doubtful whether the delegations of the French and Italian groups (with which the Communist Party of Belgium had been in touch for some time) would attend, and that it was the view of the CPB that the meeting should take the form of an informal, unpublicised discussion without any agenda. The letter, in fact, deprecated the whole conception of an international meeting of the character which had been agreed to, saying:

"We fear that it would produce an important misunderstanding as to the range and significance of this first meeting, which, we must be aware, is so limited in numbers of participants (and in the geographical area which it covers) that it cannot be truly regarded as representative of the Marxist-Leninist forces in the world. ...

In calling in some way for other Parties, organisations and/or persons to rally to a document put out by us, we could do more harm than good, making it more difficult for the Marxist-Leninist forces to show themselves in the world and to unite with us, in placing before them a fait accompli which could alienate them." (Letter of Secretary of CC of CPB to MLOB, July 3rd, 1969).

Taking this letter in conjunction with the discussions held with representatives of the Communist Party of Belgium, the Political Bureau of the MLOB drew the conclusion that the reference in the letter to "Marxist-Leninist forces in the world" not participating in the meeting was a reference to the "centrist" revisionist-led parties of Cuba, Korea and Vietnam, and that the leadership of the Communist Party of Belgium had broken with Chinese "left" revisionism not in order to take the path of Marxism-Leninism but, for purely opportunist reasons, to align the party with the "centrist" revisionist camp in the service of the Soviet revisionists.

This conclusion has been confirmed by later events.

In 1967, "La Voix du Peuple", organ of the Communist Party of Belgium, was stating correctly in large headlines:

"THE SOVIET REVISIONISTS HAVE ALREADY RESTORED CAPITALISM IN THE SOVIET UNION." ("La Voix du Peuple", March 24th, 1967; p.17; also: March 31st, 1967; p.19).

and was saying as recently as March 1969:

"The Khrushchovite and post Khrushchovite cliques have succeeded in usurping the leadership of the party and of power, proceeding in this great country to the restoration of capitalism." (Editorial in: "La Voix du Peuple", March 21st, 1969; p.1).

But by November 1969 "La Voix du Peuple" was saying:

"Since the fall of Khrushchov, which constituted victory for Marxism-Leninism, and in the context of accentuated class struggle, positive signs of revolutionary rectification have shown themselves...."

We proudly affirm our solidarity with the Soviet Union and the other socialist countries. ...

In the Soviet Union, the signs of revolutionary rectification go hand in hand with new socialist victories which we salute with joy." (Editorial in: "La Voix du Peuple", November 7th, 1969; p.1).

In March 1969 "La Voix du Peuple" was saying correctly:

"We witness the sharpening of the contradictions between leading groups of different countries under the revisionist yoke even to the point where they lead to the invasion of Czechoslovakia and to an armed confrontation on the Sino-Soviet border, with a nauseating emission of chauvinist propaganda on both sides. ..."

It is in this context that one must understand the present Sino-Soviet conflict. It is above all an inter-revisionist collision where each of the protagonists...presses degeneration to the point of great power chauvinism." (Editorial in: "La Voix du Peuple", March 21st, 1969; p.1).

But by August 1969 "La Voix du Peuple" was saying:

"The working class (of Czechoslovakia - PB, MLOB) has shown by its actions (on which the bourgeois press is silent) its will to defend its socialist conquests, its support for the present leaders of Czechoslovakia and its solidarity with the Soviet Union, whose aid contributed at the time to defeat the counter-revolution."

They (i.e., the Chinese 'left' revisionists - PB, MLOB) go so far as to compare to the Hitlerite occupation the aid of the Soviet Union and the other socialist countries to the peoples of Czechoslovakia to help fight the counter-revolution."

One must add that their (i.e., the Chinese 'left' revisionists - PB, MLOB) provocations on the river Amur and on the frontier of Soviet Kazakhstan, provocations which are a manifestation of their great power chauvinism, play the game of US imperialism". (Editorial in: "La Voix du Peuple", August 29th, 1969; p.1).

REUNIFYING THE SPLIT REVISIONIST-LED PARTIES

One aspect of the task of trying to bring about the reunification of the "international communist movement" is that of reunifying the split parties in countries such as India and Belgium, where "centrist" revisionist parties came into being in opposition to the older revisionist parties.

In India, where the (old) Communist Party of India reorientated its political line after 1964 in accordance with the new foreign policy of the Soviet revisionists, there is no fundamental political barrier to reunification, and the "centrist" revisionist-led Communist Party of India (Marxist) is, in fact, referred to by the Soviet revisionists as

"the parallel Communist Party". (P. Shastitko: "Political Struggles in India, in: "New Times", August 20th, 1969; p.5).

"The Party Congress (of February 1968 - PB, MLOB), therefore, gave the clarion call for unity in action with the CPI (Marxist), for persisting in patient efforts to restore the unity of the Communist movement in India." (M. Sen: "The Eighth Congress of the Communist Party of India", in: "World Marxist Review", May 1968; p.43).

"The three main points on which the split took place in the communist movement in our country in 1964 are to a large extent resolved by history....

In their recent document of May 1969, the statement of the CPI (M) Politbureau on the Ninth Congress of the Communist Party of China, they totally repudiate the ideological and political positions of the Maoist leadership as being anti-Marxist-Leninist." (R. Rao: "Political Perspectives in India" in: "Marxism Today", November 1969; p.345, 346).

It is clear that there are no major political barriers preventing the reunification of the right revisionist-led Communist Party of India and the "centrist" revisionist-led Communist Party of India (Marxist).

In Belgium, on the other hand, the leadership of the old right-revisionist Communist Party carries on in practice the ultra-revisionist pro-US imperialist policy of the Khrushchov period. While supporting the concept of a "European security scheme" it stands for a special "independent" and "neutral" role for Belgium within this scheme:

"On March 30th last the Central Committee of our Party passed a resolution... for seeking a status of active neutrality and security for the Belgian state.