

## **October And Chinese Revolutions Show The Path Of Revolutions To The People Of The World**

Every revolution has its own significance. But the October Revolution (November 7, 1917) in Russia and the successful revolution in China (1949) have a unique significance in that they have directed the destiny of mankind towards socialism. The October Revolution in Russia was socialist, whereas the Chinese revolution was people's democratic which, after its completion, had developed into socialist revolution. Some more countries have joined the stream after the Second World War. Abolition of exploitation of man by another man and oppression of one nation by another nation is possible only under socialist system. This has been conclusively proved and practised by these revolutions.

Building of socialism and passing over to communism is not a one day's job. Nor can it be achieved by legislations and rules. A prolonged struggle of the proletariat against world imperialism, capitalism and reactionaries in their respective countries is going on to win final victory. Such a struggle is armed and otherwise with success and defeats. The same is the case with individual countries. The experience of the two revolutions has amply proved this. It was possible to build socialism in Soviet Union of Lenin and Stalin in the same way. A socialist camp had emerged after the Second World War. It was a case of success of building socialism in one country and its extension beyond its border. The same has become an experience of defeats with the transformation of Soviet Union into a social imperialist super power.

The Chinese Revolution too had to traverse zig zag course. It was a protracted war of about three decades before it was finally victorious. Then it had to consolidate itself and start building socialism under conditions of imperialist encirclement. Guided by Marxism-Leninism-Mao Tsetung Thought, the Chinese leadership could carry on a successful struggle against internal and external enemies, broke the encirclement and are on way to isolate Soviet social imperialism, which has become the main enemy and a threat

to the countries of the world in general and China in particular.

Now that the two countries are having different social systems, the problems they are facing are fundamentally different. Soviet Union, as a social imperialist power, is facing the opposition and resistance of people and countries to her drive for hegemony over the world. In addition to this, the revolutionary proletariat of Soviet Union is still facing the task of completing the socialist revolution again. In China, preparations for facing a war together with building socialism are going on simultaneously. True to her proletarian internationalism, she is supporting the struggles for national independence, the national liberation movements, people's revolutions and the struggles for proletarian revolutions. Of course, the people of the two countries have no contradictory interests. On the other hand, they are faced with the common task of fighting imperialism, including Soviet social imperialism. While there is no contradiction between Chinese leadership and the people in relation to struggle against imperialism, there is one, more so a fundamental one, between the Soviet leadership and her people. Opportunists of all hues refuse to recognise this objective reality. While a section of them equate the present Soviet Union with that of Lenin and Stalin, the others are trying to dig out opportunism in the leadership of CPC before and after the death of Mao.

It is not necessary that with the death of an outstanding leader of the socialist country, its socialist path must undergo a reversal. Though it happened in the case of Stalin's death, it was not so after Lenin. It is not necessary that China must undergo the same change after Mao Marxist-Leninist forces are strong enough to defeat counter-revolutionary forces in China. Whereas the reverse was the case in Soviet Union after Stalin.

China is the biggest country of the world in relation to the population. She was one of the most backward countries when she was liberated (1949). The problems facing Chinese socialism have a direct bearing with them apart from the role of imperialism and social imperialism such as ideological and political influences of imperialism, bourgeoisie, and petty bourgeoisie which are trying to make inroads into the socialist society. Soviet Union's military encirclement and the threat of war created these problems. The party and the people are better prepared to face them more than ever. It is the result of relentless struggle the party carried on in defence of Marxism-Leninism-Mao-Zedong Thought.

We people in India have to learn from China because both our countries were victims of imperialist aggression for a prolonged period. While India was two years (1947) ahead of China in having transfer of power from British imperialists, while the latter had completed people's democratic revolution by 1949, they had different paths of development. India is having imperialist path of development all along. China is having a socialist path. She had Soviet Union's help when the latter was a socialist power. Eversince she is having a self-reliant and independent economy althrough. This is the fundamental difference between the two paths.

There are some who embellish the imperialist path of development, who claim that Indian technology is more developed than that of China. There is no valid reason for such a claim. China is not only self-reliant but also self sufficient with no unemployment and poverty etc. The Four Modernisations which are going on are not to overcome starvation and semi-starvation etc, which are already things of past. They are meant to build a modern and a powerful China with a high standard of living for the people and with a higher level of defence capability which can meet the requirements of the country against possible attacks of imperialism in general and Soviet Union in particular. Same is not the case with india. It is true that certain amount of development has taken place in various fields. It is also possible that India is more developed than China in a few sectors, which is being embellished day in and day out. But when we go deep into the affair, it becomes clear that in China the development which took place and is taking place is of an independent nature, whose fruits are reaching all the people. Whereas in India it is the topmost strata which is enjoying it leaving 90 per cent and more of the population in dire poverty, want etc. Even the official spokesmen admit this though they differ regarding percentages. Moreover, the development that is taking place in India belongs to foreign capital in which Indian capital has no say, not to speak of people. It has control only over outdated technology and development.

The same persons and some others say that China too is having foreign 'Aid' by abandoning the policy of self-reliance. The recent agreements signed between China and Western countries and those still being negotiated are quoted as instances in support of their contention. A closer analysis shows that there are fundamental differences in this respect also. The role of foreign capital in China

is not the same as that of India because the state in India is controlled by comprador bourgeoisie and landlords who are serving the interests of imperialism. As a result, the foreign aid agreements between India and western countries are unequal in nature. They are leading India to be more dependent on western countries. Foreign loans and more foreign loans are the slogans of the day for the ruling classes. Their insolvency can be seen in that the debt-servicing is being done by incurring additional foreign loans. It is happening because there is plunder and more plunder by foreign capital. The same is not the case with China. Of late she has signed trade agreements with western countries including US in connection with her Four Modernisations. Such a policy is correct and justified because 1) Treaties are on equal footing. 2) The imported foreign capital in all its forms is controlled by the dictatorship of the proletariat and not vice versa. 3) Such a policy is a mere concession to foreign capital, which is necessary in a given situation and is correct according to Marxism-Leninism-Mao-Zedong Thought.\* Bourgeois economists, revisionists and neo-revisionists do not recognise that India's economy is semi-colonial, semi-feudal and the regimes which are emerging, tied to imperialism as they are, are incapable of building independent economy.

A new feature in the Indian situation is the growing strength of communist revolutionaries and their organisation and a democratic movement, a new type of democratic movement at that, headed by the proletariat. The path of the development of this movement is the same as that of October Revolution (November 7) and the Chinese Revolution. The revolutionary proletariat of India, headed by communist revolutionaries, are advancing on the same path. Therefore the lessons of these revolutions are more important today than ever.

**Long Live October Revolution (November 7).**

**Long Live Chinese Socialist Revolution.**

**Long Live Marxism-Leninism-Mao-Zedong Thought.**

(15-10-1979)

---

\* See Lenin *On Concessions* in the Appendix.