

lism, the ruling party is steadily drifting. From "no aid" to "aid without strings" and then to "plain aid" can in the long run effect a qualitative change in the political situation in

Bangladesh. But would that be in the interest of her people? At the moment it is for the Awami League to answer this 125-million-dollar question.

## Socialist Diplomacy And The CPI(M)

MONI GUHA

**T**HE Communist Party of India (Marxist) in its Ninth Congress at Madurai has accused China and the CPC, putting China in the same bracket with the Soviet Union. It said in its "Political Resolution": "In pursuance of the short-term needs of their foreign policy they (China and the Soviet Union) seek to impose upon the workers and the communist parties such policies as virtually make them obedient adjuncts of the respective bourgeois regimes."

It is wellknown, at least to the students of politics, that one of the basic differences between the CPC and the CPSU is over the attempt of the CPSU to tie the communist parties of the capitalist world with the foreign policies and practices of the Soviet Union. The CPC, in 1963, in its historic "Proposal Concerning the General line of the International Communist Movement", which is more known as "14th July letter" or "Peking line", said: "Necessary compromises between the socialist countries and imperialist countries do not require the oppressed peoples and nations to follow suit and compromise with imperialism and its lackeys. No one should demand in the name of peaceful co-existence that the oppressed peoples and nations should give up their revolutionary struggle." The CPC advised the fraternal parties, more than once, to regard party statements as authoritative and, if necessary, government statements may be ignored.

There is nothing surprising or new in it. This is the normal practice of the communist movement. In the heyday of revolution, when a severe famine and isolation from interna-

tional trade were about to defeat the very purpose of the revolution, Lenin himself separated the party and State relations and party and State apparatus and functions in 1920 and made compromise with the capitalist world. "In July [1920]... Britain submitted the complete text of an agreement which said: you must declare as a matter of principle that you will not carry on official propaganda and do nothing opposed to British interests in the East. That will be elaborated at a subsequent political conference, but at present we conclude such and such trade agreement, would you like to sign it? We replied that we would... That is more important for us than anything... The line we followed in the Central Committee is one of maximum concession to Britain. And if these gentlemen think they are going to catch us breaking some promise, we declare that our Government will carry on no official propaganda and that we have no intention of infringing on any of Britain's interests in the East." (Lenin, *Report on Concessions*, Vol. 31). It is at this time that Lenin asked the Soviet Government and the Party to separate the functions and apparatus of the Party and State, so that official propaganda on behalf of the Soviet Government was not done against Britain. It is at this time that the Peoples' Commissariat of Foreign Affairs (Narkomindel) was set up. This is an unavoidable limitation of socialist diplomacy, as simultaneous revolutions cannot occur where unequal development is the absolute law of capitalist imperialism. As usual the 'purist' Trotsky wailed at this, like our CPM Central Commit-

tee. The task of the socialist State is to skilfully and effectively bypass and overcome the diplomatic limitations by other means. Recognition of the Soviet Union by the United States came only in November 1933, in return for a Soviet promise to abstain from revolutionary propaganda in that country. So a socialist State never binds any fraternal party to its diplomatic policy and practice.

The CPC also did not bind any fraternal party to "follow suit" so far as its diplomacy was concerned. A few years before the Chinese revolution, and immediately after the termination of the Second World War, when there was a possibility of a series of pacts between the capitalist countries and the Soviet Union, Mao Tse-tung in his "Some points of appraisal of the present situation" said, inter alia, "Such compromises do not require the people in the countries of the capitalist world to follow suit and make compromises at home. The people in these countries will continue to wage different struggle in accordance with their different conditions" (Vol IV). In "Long live Leninism", published and circulated during the Lenin Centenary, we find: "Modern revisionists seek to confuse the peaceful foreign policy of the socialist countries with the domestic policies of the proletariat in capitalist countries. Peaceful co-existence between nations and people's revolution in various countries are by nature two different things, not the same thing; two different concepts, not one; two different kinds of questions, not the same kind of question." In "More on the differences between Comrade Togliatti and us" and in several other booklets and pamphlets the CPC advocated the same thing. Nowhere and at no time did the CPC tie its own hands or of the hands of the communist parties of the capitalist world to the foreign policy of People's China. The CPC not only advocated this theory, but also practised it without whining a whit like our philistine "independent" and "impartial" CPM regarding the foreign po-

licies of the Soviet Union and China.

Let us recall the history of the Chinese revolution and the Soviet diplomacy in China.

The Soviet Government found two governments in China, in the twenties, one in Peking which was known as the Republic of China, governed by warlords, and the other in Canton, a revolutionary government led by the Kuomintang Nationalists under the leadership of Sun Yat-sen. The People's Commissariat of Foreign Affairs (Narkomindel) established diplomatic relation with the Chinese Republic of Peking led by the warlords, as it was then the "legally constituted government". Did it hinder the Chinese communists or the Kuomintang from forming the Kuomintang-Communist United Front or developing most friendly relations with the Kuomintang and the Soviet Union? Not in the least. While the Soviet Government had diplomatic relations with the Government of Peking, the Comintern had its relation with Canton. In 1924 a treaty with the Kuomintang Government was signed; it ruptured in 1928. Diplomatic relations with the Soviet Union were re-established by the Chiang Kai-shek Government again during the Second World War in 1942 and continued up to 1949. That did not hinder the CPC from fighting and waging war against the Chiang regime. Roosevelt and Stalin proposed a Communist-Kuomintang coalition government in China headed by Chiang Kai-shek, but that did not bind the Chinese communists to become "obedient adjuncts" either of Soviet diplomacy or of the Chiang regime. On the contrary the CPC placed an alternative proposal for a coalition government headed by Mao Tse-tung. The negotiations failed in spite of Soviet efforts, the Communist-Kuomintang United Front broke down, another period of bitter civil war began but the diplomatic relations of the Soviet Union with the Chiang regime continued uninterrupted. Did that hinder or deter the CPC from marching forward and encircling city after city against the

Chiang regime? Did that upset, in any way, the fraternal relations between the CPSU and the CPC? Not in the least. When the Chinese communists besieged Nanking, the capital seat of Chiang, the Soviet ambassador accompanied Chiang to Canton with bag and baggage; he did not stay behind to help the Chinese communists officially. That did not strain, in any way, the relations between the Soviet Union and the Chinese communists.

These are the history, theory and facts. Is it not, then, a rather brazen lie to put the CPC and the CPSU in the same bracket and say that China "seek(s) to impose upon the workers and communist parties such policies as virtually make them obedient adjuncts of the respective bourgeois regimes"? The CPM (undivided CPI included) leaders had thought that working wholeheartedly for the foreign policies of the socialist countries is true proletarian internationalism, which will automatically bring the revolution in India. Now being "disillusioned" and becoming "independent" and "impartial" the CPM Central Committee thinks that opposing wholeheartedly

the foreign policies of the socialist country would bring the revolution round the corner. Like a pendulum it swings from one pole to the other. It has conveniently managed to forget that "there is one and only one, kind of internationalism in deeds: working wholeheartedly for the development of the revolutionary movement and the revolutionary struggle in one's own country and supporting (by propaganda, sympathy and material aid) such a struggle, such and only such a line in every country, without exception. Everything else is deception and Manilovism." (Lenin, "The task of the proletariat in our revolution", Vol. 24). In fact it is a dirty trick of the CPM leaders, who abandoning the path of revolution against the government, are trying to shift their responsibility for their failure to the CPC, in the name of honeyed petty bourgeois phrase of proletarian internationalism, to save their skin from the just anger and resentment of their cadres and followers. Let these misleaders say whatever they like. "People are judged not by what they think of themselves, but by their political conduct" (Lenin).

## What About Cuba ?

FROM A CORRESPONDENT

IT seems unlikely, though it may be just a coincidence. Two distinguished newspapers, *Christian Science Monitor* and *Los Angeles Times* have published respectively an editorial and an editorial page story favouring better relations between Cuba and the United States. In this age of diplomatic surprises, Cuba, as far as Americans are concerned, still remains the odd person out and the logic for this attitude is hard to understand.

*Christian Science Monitor*, a Boston-based newspaper, published an editorial on July 28, questioning the wisdom of the U.S. attitude. "There was a time when Washington believ-

ed that its policy towards Cuba would hasten the downfall of the Castro government. But today, 13 years after he came to power, Fidel Castro appears as entrenched as ever with support from a sizable segment of his people..." Camouflaged in the finesse of the editorial style are the reasons why the U.S. should alter its present policy. "Washington need not alter its disapproval of many Cuban policies, including the oncestrong Cuban support for guerrilla movements in Latin America." Why? Because "Castro for his part seems to have embraced the Soviet idea that diplomatic and trade ties with Latin American nations are more