

## “Unity in Action” With Whom— Revolutionary People or the Revisionist Clique ?

—Partha Choudhury

“Disguised counter-revolutionaries”, said Mao Tse-tung, “conceal their true features by giving a false impression. But since they oppose the revolution, it is impossible for them to cover up their true features completely.” The desperate attempts Ranadive, Sundarayya, Namboodiripad, Jyoti Basu and Co. are making to conceal their true features remind us of these words of Comrade Mao Tse-tung. The CPI (M) *Central Committee's Draft for the Ideological Discussion* and the long series of articles in its defence represent a pitiful attempt on the part of their authors to conceal their true features by prostituting Marxism as they have ever been doing. This attempt to hoodwink Party comrades with Marxist catchwords is quite in keeping with their historic role as tools of the imperialist-feudal-comprador combine in opposing the tide of revolution that has set in.

The *Draft* seems to be an exercise in abstract theorising which, while criticising the revisionists' stand on ideological issues as a sort of mistake or deviation, lashes out at the great Communist Party of China for its alleged anti-Marxist stand on the issue of “Unity in action” and for its “interference” in the affairs of the Indian Party. The lengthy articles in defence of the *Draft* are even more rabid in their attacks against the CPC (though they carefully refrain from mentioning the CPC) and other Marxist-Leninist Parties and Groups, which oppose the revisionist slogan. It is not accidental that neither the *Draft* nor the seemingly endless articles do anywhere mention that the thought of Mao Tse-tung is the Marxism-Leninism of our era—the era when imperia-

lism is heading towards collapse and proletarian revolution is on the eve of its final victory—just as Leninism was the Marxism of the era of imperialism and proletarian revolutions. Nor do they anywhere acknowledge the leading role of Mao Tse-tung's Party in the World Communist movement of today. How can a bunch of opportunists declare unequivocally as Enver Hoxha did at the Fifth Congress of the Albanian Party of Labour in November, 1966 ?

“The PLA (Albanian Party of Labour) thinks that all the parties and Marxist-Leninist forces, as equal and independent, must closely unite with the Communist Party of China and the People's Republic of China to form an iron block against which our enemies would break their heads. We do not care at all for the slanders of the revisionists and their imperialists that by joining China we became her ‘satellite’ and lost ‘independence’.”

It will be our purpose to show by analysing the arguments of this miserable bunch of counter-revolutionaries—the arguments in defence of the revisionists' slogan of “unity in action”—that while pretending to accept Lenin's teachings in the abstract, they actually repudiate them in the concrete. Ranadive, Sundarayya, Namboodiripad, Basavapunniah and Co. have now joined in the world-wide revisionist chorus clamouring for “unity in action” between Marxist-Leninists and revisionists for the ostensible purpose of lending support to the heroic struggle of the Vietnamese people against U.S. imperialism.

What are the arguments these neo-revisionists put forward to justify the revisionist slogan of ‘unity in action’ ?

“The stark reality, today,” these “Marxists” lament, “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.” (Italics ours). Pointing out that the slogan of unity in action is not “*an immediate and practicable one*,” the *Draft* continues :

"But the freedom-lovers and proletarian revolutionaries of the whole world are extremely concerned and agitated over the brutal and 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". (Italics ours).

Then the *Draft* mentions the conditions that must be fulfilled if "unity in action" is to be forged. First, there must exist minimum mutual confidence between the Chinese and Soviet leaders as "the unity in action proposed in this concrete case is nothing short of military action with its own serious consequences." Second, the Soviet leaders "will have to abandon the facile notion of maintaining world peace in collaboration with the most aggressive U. S. imperialists." Both these conditions, the *Draft* notes, are absent at present. Yet, the C.C. of the CPI (M) "cannot subscribe to the view that the slogan of unity in action *in principle* is wrong, since it advocates unity in action between the revisionist leaders of the CPSU and the Marxist-Leninist leaders of the CPC, since the contradiction between revisionism and Marxism-Leninism is by nature antagonistic, and such united action is impermissible." (Italics ours)

Then follows a homily on how to build up a united front and how to avoid the mistake of not distinguishing between the Soviet leaders and the masses behind them. These "Marxist-Leninist" warriors battling against revisionism, on the one hand, and dogmatism and left sectarianism, on the other, point out that "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, at times."

About thirty columns of the precious pages of *People's Democracy* have been devoted to answering critics who oppose

this slogan. Most of the space has been taken up in elaborating the sermon on the united front and on the necessity of rescuing the Soviet people from the clutches of the revisionists by developing the class struggle and waging a *real*, not *verbal*, struggle against U.S. imperialism. Not only Comrade Lenin but Comrade Dimitrov also has been invoked to defend the slogan of "unity in action." Quite a lengthy extract from Comrade Dimitrov's report to the Seventh Congress of the Communist International has been given.

At the same time *sly* attempts have been made in an article in defence of the *Draft* to represent the Soviet Union as playing today a genuine anti-imperialist role in Vietnam. The article says: "It should also be noted that our critics' estimate of the role which the Soviet Union is playing in Vietnam at present in distinction from the past, does not tally with the estimate of the leaders of Vietnam." (*People's Democracy*), February 18, 1968. After quoting from a message of Comrade Ho Chi Minh and other Vietnamese leaders to the Soviet Party and Government on the occasion of the 50th Anniversary of the October Revolution to prove that the Soviet revisionist clique is rendering valuable assistance to Vietnam, it jumps to the conclusion: "they (the Vietnamese leaders) *clearly indicate* that a united action of the entire socialist camp will be of tremendous help to them." (Ibid) In the message itself there is not a single word about 'the socialist camp' or about 'united action.' This utterly dishonest conclusion which the Ranadives seek to force on unsuspecting comrades is part of the trickery they have played too long.

They have also invoked Kim Il Sung, who said: "Even those who once took to revisionism have found it hardly possible to hold out before the world public opinion without supporting the Vietnamese people. This is a good thing, by no means bad, ... There may be some who condemn the U.S. imperialist aggression and support Vietnamese people in order to make up for their past mistakes which they repent [who are those repentant sinners?], others may join in the anti-imperialist struggle, though reluctantly, under pressure from their own people and the peoples throughout the world, although their

fundamental position remains unchanged. But whatever their motives, it is necessary to enlist all these forces in the joint anti-imperialist struggle."

Does the "joint anti-imperialist struggle" proposed by Kim Il Sung mean joint "military action" which the *Draft* envisages. If so, what about the two minimum conditions which, according to the *Draft*, needed to be fulfilled before there was any practical possibility of such struggle—the minimum mutual confidence between the Chinese and the Soviet leaders, the basis of which, the *Draft* says, the Soviet leaders had destroyed, and the Soviet leaders' abandonment of the policy of collaboration with the U.S. imperialists? Did the Ranadives forget these conditions of theirs when they approvingly quoted Kim Il Sung?

But with 'deadly' sarcasm they wrote: "We hope our critics will not ascribe to the Korean leader a lack of desire to resist American imperialism or think that he has fallen victim to the cunning change of tactics of the revisionists."

In this connection we cannot but refer to the following formulation of Kim Il Sung's included in his report to the Korean Party in October, 1966:

"In our society (in North Korea) there exist no socio-economic and material sources for the emergence of outdated ideas...One may commit a leftist error if one emphasizes class struggle only...forgetting that the alliance of the working class, peasantry, and intellectuals constitutes the basis for social relations under socialism...this may cause unrest in society." It is an astounding statement from the leader of a country half of which is administered by stooges of U. S. imperialism and occupied by fifty thousand American troops and where the American way of life flourishes. "Consequently," *Progressive Labour* observed, "this point of view obliterates the dictatorship of the proletariat, and prevents class struggle against old and new bourgeois forces because of the fear of 'unrest'—a nice cozy estimate in which the stage is set for the restoration of capitalism." ("Road to Revolution—II", *Progressive Labour*, February-March, 1967).

We have digressed. Let us now return to Ranadive, Sundarayya, Namboodiripad, Basavapunniah and Co. In the *Draft* they admit that the slogan of "unity in action" is not "an immediate and practicable one" but they put up a brave fight for 'a true Marxist-Leninist principle' which the CPC and other Marxist-Leninist Parties and Groups are supposed to oppose. But in the articles, the ideal seems capable of realization now and they convey the impression that what prevents it is "the sectarian and disruptive outlook," "the extra-Left stand", the anti-Leninist policy, the ignorance of the ABC of Marxism and the factional motives of those who oppose the slogan.

Let us first take up the question of building up a united front against U. S. imperialism. Our "Marxist" warriors maintain that the Soviet leaders, though revisionist, should be welcomed as a member of the front. Profuse quotations from Lenin and Dimitrov are offered in support of their view. The principle that they state is unquestionable but what is pernicious is the manner in which this Leninist principle is prostituted in the interests of the revisionists. The working class and its party should build up a united front against a common enemy with classes and parties with which it has at least a temporary identity of interests. In the thirties, when fascism was emerging, there was such a basis for a partial and temporary unity between the working class and other classes including a large section of the bourgeoisie—the classes which were all threatened by the rise of fascism.

"During World War II", to quote from "Road to Revolution-II", *Progressive Labour* of February-March, 1967, "the Soviet Union was in alliance with the U. S. Both wanted the defeat of Hitler but each for a different reason. Since the defeat of Hitler was critical for mankind's progress to socialism, there was a basis for partial and temporary unity. And the result was that the socialist revolution did advance.

"But in the case of Vietnam, things are quite the opposite. Both the Soviet Union and the U. S. want the revolution crushed now! Therefore, there is no basis for partial and temporary unity with the revisionists."

In its letter of March 22, 1966, the Central Committee of the CPC wrote to the Central Committee of the CPSU :

"Despite the tricks you have been playing to deceive people, you are pursuing U. S.-Soviet collaboration for the domination of the world with your whole heart and soul. In mouthing a few words against U. S. imperialism and in making a show of supporting anti-imperialist struggles, you are conducting only minor attacks on U. S. imperialism while rendering it major help. ...Your clamour for 'united action,' especially on the Vietnam question, is nothing but a trap for the purpose of deceiving the Soviet people and the revolutionary people of the world. You have all along been acting in co-ordination with the United States in its plot for peace talks, vainly attempting to sell out the struggle of the Vietnamese people against U. S. aggression and for national salvation and to drag the Vietnam question into the orbit of Soviet-U. S. collaboration. You have worked hand in glove with the United States in a whole series of dirty deals inside and outside the United Nations. In close co-ordination with the counter-revolutionary 'global strategy', you are now actively trying to build a ring of encirclement around socialist China. Not only have you excluded yourselves from the international united front of all the peoples against U. S. imperialism and its lackeys, you have even aligned yourselves with U. S. imperialism, the main enemy of the people of the world, and the reactionaries of all countries in a vain attempt to establish a Holy Alliance against China, against the people, against the national liberation movement and against the Marxist-Leninists."

Today, revisionism is the main ally of imperialism. What are its main goals? "The main goals of revisionism," to quote from *Road to Revolution-II*, "are to crush existing revolutionary movements, to prevent the development of new revolutionary movements, and to subvert socialism and restore capitalism where the revolution has triumphed." Under cover of the slogan of "a state of the whole people" the revisionists have already restored capitalism in the Soviet Union and

several other East European states. To quote again from *Road to Revolution-II*, "The Soviet Union has changed from being a country whose means of production were owned by the working people to one controlled and owned by a new exploiting class whose origins are in the former managerial-technical-professional strata. Profit—the private appropriation of the society's economic surplus—has replaced planning the economy for the benefit of the workers. Profit has been brought to the fore in all aspects of the Soviet economy."

Though outwardly the means of production are still socially owned, the economic processes and relations that have recently been introduced are more and more dominated by capitalist characteristics and, as a result, social wealth is turning into its opposite. "Within the Soviet Union the essence of capitalism has been restored. Everything from Liberman's plan to the ability to will complete personal fortunes to heirs gives the game away." (*Road to Revolution-II*)

The Soviet state apparatus and the leadership of the Soviet Party have no doubt been usurped by the representatives of the new capitalist forces though, as Mao Tse-tung has said, these forces will surely be overthrown by the Soviet workers. While restoring capitalism to the Soviet Union, its new rulers are trying their best to practise counter-revolution abroad. "Like any other nation which is developing an economy based on private profit," *Road to Revolution-II* points out, "The Soviet Union needs areas to exploit." Under the guise of "International Socialist Division of Labour," they have sought to stifle the industrial development of other socialist countries and turn them into the appendage of their economy. By extending economic and military aid they try to establish their neo-colonial domination over countries like India and Indonesia. It is the objective needs of the new ruling classes of the Soviet Union that force them to practise counter-revolution both at home and abroad and play the role of the junior partner of U.S. imperialism. Its foreign policy is inevitably a projection of its internal policy. It has built up close political and economic

relations with all reactionary governments on earth including the Sato Government of Japan, the CIA-led military clique of Indonesia, the U.S. satellites of Latin America. To put out the flame of national liberation struggle in different countries it actively colludes with U.S. imperialism and the worst reactionary regimes in different countries—the Congo, Iraq, Indonesia, India etc.—whom, while mouthing the slogan of a world without arms and war, it arms to the teeth. It was Khrushchev who declared in 1960: "Any local war might spark off the conflagration of a world war." On this false plea Khrushchev and his heirs have tried their best to sabotage all national liberation struggles, while, at the same time, they have placed all kinds of military hardware, besides economic aid, at the disposal of the reactionary ruling classes seeking to strangle the revolutionaries. Their policy of active hostility towards China and of close collaboration with U.S. imperialism is quite well-known. The Soviet policy towards Vietnam is not isolated from but part of their global strategy. Until 1964, Khrushchev and his men openly refused to support the Vietnamese revolutionaries. In the early months of 1965, when the U.S.-puppet regime in South Vietnam was on the verge of collapse, the Soviet revisionists came out with offers of help to the Vietnamese people. Why do the Soviet leaders help Vietnam against U.S. aggression? Because they are forced to. They are caught in the meshes of an insoluble contradiction. Though accomplices of U.S. imperialism, they are obliged to preserve the facade of being anti-imperialists in order to maintain their own rule and to deceive millions of people at home and abroad.

Explaining the significance of the informal talks Kosygin had with Vice-President Hubert Humphrey and Secretary of State Dean Rusk in New Delhi in January, 1966, the U.S. President's Adviser McGeorge Bundy said in a television interview on January 16, 1966:

"The public position of the Soviet Union is one of strong support for the specific objectives, for the conditions set down by the government of North Vietnam.

"...It has been made clear to us over a long period of time that the Soviet Government hopes there can be a peaceful settlement."

In another telecast on the same day Hubert Humphrey told his audience:

"It is a fact that the Soviets are trying to build a containment wall around China. This was part of the reason for Tashkent and that was well done.

"Its (the U.S.S.R.'s) main concern is Communist China rather than anything the U.S. may be doing."

In an article which appeared in the *New York Post* and other U.S. papers on May 14, 1966, Washington columnist Jack Anderson wrote:

"This column has obtained a copy of the intelligence report summarizing Kosygin's views. It shows that Russia is extremely anxious to keep the Vietnam war from exploding and would welcome a peace conference. Kosygin even said that he understood the American predicament in Vietnam...

"In several recent interviews off the record", reports the secret intelligence dispatch, 'Kosygin said he understands the U. S. cannot cease its efforts in Viet Nam 'by itself' without 'other people doing something reciprocally'.

"He described his country's relations with the U. S. as good and said that the U.S.S.R. intends to continue its policy of no conflict with the U. S.'"

This policy of 'no conflict' and active collaboration with the U.S. imperialists has yielded a large number of agreements and treaties between the U. S. and Soviet rulers, the latest of which is the Draft Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty. While the revisionist leaders of the Soviet Union are offering much less aid to the revolutionary fighters of Vietnam than what they are pouring into India, they actively help the U.S. imperialists to shift thousands of soldiers and most of their guns from Europe to Vietnam.

What common interests, even temporary, form the basis of unity, even partial and unstable, between anti-imperialists and revolutionaries, on the one hand, and these counter-

revolutionaries of the basest type, on the other? It is by their policies and deeds that these counter-revolutionary rulers of the Soviet Union have excluded themselves from the Socialist camp and the international united front of revolutionary peoples fighting against U.S. imperialism.

No Marxist-Leninist confuses the Soviet leaders with the Soviet people, as our neo-revisionists accuse Marxist-Leninists of doing. At the Fifth Congress of the Albanian Party of Labour, Comrade Hoxha quoted the words of Lenin, "The struggle against imperialism, if not closely connected with the fight against opportunism becomes an empty talk and fraud", and declared :

"Our Party firmly rejects the idea that 'united actions' with the Khrushchevite revisionists against U. S. imperialism are a touchstone for a useful and effective struggle against revisionism. Actually, to co-operate with revisionists, to take united actions with them is to slip gradually into the revisionist positions, to accept their treacherous line."

Such unity with U. S. imperialism's ally will inevitably confuse the revolutionary peoples all the world over and disrupt their solidarity. The best way of unmasking the Soviet revisionists and isolating them from the people they confuse is to expose their policy of collaboration with U. S. imperialism and their policy of hostility towards China and the revolutionary movements everywhere.

Next, it is quite evident that the Madurai brand "Marxists" are deliberately subverting the principles of People's War and discarding Mao Tse-tung's strategy of defeating imperialism, the strategy Lin Piao explained in *Long Live the Victory of People's War*. To them 'unity of action' is "united military action" to defeat U. S. imperialism. "United military action" to hasten the downfall of U. S. imperialism can lead either to a surrender on the part of U. S. imperialism or to a world conflagration. As U. S. imperialism will certainly not willingly wither away, a world conflagration, a nuclear holocaust, will then be inevitable. Anybody who suggests this is an agent provocateur donning the garb of a Marxist.

Such a strategy is opposed to the principles of People's War which the Vietnamese people are waging victoriously today. The Vietnamese people have developed the art of People's War to unprecedentedly new heights and are raining smashing blows on the U. S. imperialists. More Vietnams are appearing in Asia, Africa, and Latin America; the grave of U. S. imperialism is being dug by the revolutionary peoples in Viet Nam, Burma, Thailand, the Congo, Angola, Mozambique, South Africa, etc. As Comrade Lin Piao said :

"Everything is divisible. And so is this colossus of U.S. imperialism. It can be split up and defeated. The peoples of Asia, Africa and Latin America and other regions can destroy it piece by piece, some striking at its head and others at its feet. That is why, the greatest fear of U.S. imperialism is that people's wars will be launched in different parts of the world, and particularly in Asia, Africa and Latin America, and why it regards people's wars as a mortal danger."

The brave peasantry of Naxalbari, Sreekakulam and other places in our country have kindled the spark of People's War in India. The arch revisionists who are serving as tools of domestic and foreign reactionaries to snuff it out are naturally betrayers of People's War everywhere and oppose their knavish strategy of "united military action" by the Socialist camp' to People's War.

In *The Collapse of the Second International*, Lenin said : "Socialist parties are not debating clubs, but organisations of the fighting proletariat; when a number of battalions have gone over to the enemy, they must be named and branded as traitors." (*Collected Works*, Vol. 21, p. 212). The CPC, the leader of the world communist movement, and Marxist-Leninists everywhere else have named and branded them as traitors: among them are the leaders of the CPSU and the Ranadive, Sundarayya, Namboodiripad, Basavapunniah and Co.