

the situation obtaining at any given time and no imagined or real world centre can call a revolution at its command; that internal contradictions will have to mature in each country before the final overthrow of the oppressor takes place. With all this, the socialist camp and the world working class have to play an active role in helping, guiding, promoting the revolutionary movement and, when necessary, rendering it direct armed help.

The role assigned to the socialist camp is well expressed in the following lines: "This general line is one of forming a broad united front, with the socialist camp and the international proletariat as its nucleus, to oppose the imperialists and reactionaries, headed by the United States; it is a line of boldly arousing the masses, expanding the revolutionary forces, winning over the middle forces, and isolating the reactionary forces. This general line is one of resolute revolutionary struggle by the people of all countries and of carrying the world proletarian revolution forward to the end." □

II

'Left'-Revisionists' Unashamed Volte-Face

The opportunist phrase-mongers seek to divide this united front, abandon the active and leading role of the socialist working class and leave the fighting people in each country to their fate.

What does recent experience show? Are the 'internal' contradictions of any country, or the non-socialist world allowed to be resolved without the armed intervention of imperialist powers in country after country? Isn't the struggle for socialism of different peoples and countries, the struggle for liberation, furiously attacked by the imperialists—the American imperialists—

who systematically attempt to export counter-revolution? The rise of several socialist states in Europe was rendered possible as a result of the titanic struggle of the USSR against fascism and by the armed help it later on rendered to the working class and the peoples of these countries.

The armed intervention of Chinese volunteers defeated American attempts to export counter-revolution to Korea and, in collaboration with the people and working class of North Korea, saved North Korea for democracy and socialism. The puppet Governments of South Viet Nam and a number of Latin American countries are part of this 'internal' contradiction; the half a million American troops in South Viet Nam are also part of this 'internal' contradiction.

Since all these are part of the imperialist world, according to them, the outcome of the struggle in South Viet Nam must be decided only as a result of the actions of these contradictions, i.e., only by the single-handed fight of the South Vietnamese people, at best with help from the capitalist world but none from the socialist world, against the world power of American imperialism. What else does this formulation mean when you emphasize that transition to socialism will take place only as a result of internal contradiction of the imperialist camp and describe the socialist world as an external contradiction? This dialectics is thus a plea for leaving the South Vietnamese people to their own fate.

Our document puts forth the role of the socialist camp correctly when it states: "However, the process of mobilizing and uniting these revolutionary forces is no simple task. It involves a revolutionary continuation of socialist diplomacy, calculated to isolate the most reactionary imperialist groups, with the use of the armed might of the socialist camp against such reactionary powers as resort to aggression on peace-loving countries or try to drown the national liberation movement in blood. This requires the ever-growing unity of the international Communist movement—a unity in which the ruling parties of the socialist countries render all forms of practical aid, including direct military intervention against imperialist aggression and intervention, to the revolutionary proletarian movement, in the capitalist countries as well as the national liberation movements

in underdeveloped countries. This struggle for unity against imperialism is inseparable from the struggle against modern revisionism."

Many years back Lenin estimated the role of a victorious socialist revolution as follows: "Uneven economic and political development is an absolute law of capitalism. Hence the victory of socialism is possible first in several or even in one capitalist country taken separately. The victorious proletariat of that country having expropriated the capitalists and organized socialist production, would stand up against the rest of the world, the capitalist world, attracting to its cause the oppressed classes of other countries raising revolts in these countries against the capitalists, and in the event of necessity coming out even with armed force against the exploiting classes and their states."

But our revisionists from the Left want everything to be left to the 'internal' contradictions of each state or of the capitalist world only, with imperialism having full freedom to strike at the revolutionary movement with the socialist world watching or "helping" from a distance.

This is nothing but the abandonment of the unity of the world revolutionary movement, of the idea that every revolutionary struggle in any country is a component of the world proletarian revolution whose outstanding successes are embodied in the socialist states.

No Communist Party in the world has made the formulation that the contradictions between the socialist system and imperialism is an external contradiction in relation to the world revolutionary movement as a whole. On the other hand, when contradictions of the contemporary world are mentioned, the first to be mentioned is always the contradiction between the imperialists and the socialist camp. All the contradictions are taken to be the contradictions of the world as a whole. Revisionists are attacked because they divest this contradiction of its revolutionary meaning, reduce it to peaceful competition, besides making it the sole contradiction, minimizing the importance of other contradictions.

Step by step, the revisionists from the Left come to the conclusion that the only contradiction is that between the oppressed nations and imperialism. Listen to their comment.

They quote the Madurai document: "Notwithstanding the fact that" the contradiction between the camp of socialism and the camp of imperialism remains as the central one among the fundamental contradictions of our time, "the one between the imperialists and the oppressed ones has got accentuated and assumed the acutest form...and the intensification of this contradiction is, of course, influencing the course of all other contradictions, their growth and development." And here is their profound comment: "It is the socialist system that is becoming the decisive factor determining the main content of the present epoch while the contradictions between the oppressed nations and imperialism, that is to say the role of the national liberation struggle, consists only in 'influencing' the growth and development of all other contradictions. In other words, the course of development of the content, the path of transition from capitalism to socialism, will be determined not by the maturing of the internal contradictions but by the external contradictions, namely, the role of the socialist camp." They have tied themselves in so many contradictions, external-internal, that they are unable to reason properly.

How does it follow that because the socialist camp is becoming a decisive factor, the other contradictions lose their force and cease to play a vital revolutionary role? Only amazingly ignorant fellows can reason in this way. And from where do they get the idea that the main content of the present period is only national liberation struggle? May we remind these gentlemen that all Marxist-Leninists regard the present era as the era of proletarian revolution, of the triumph of socialism, that the national liberation struggles are a component part of the world proletarian revolution?

Our document states the position correctly. While the socialist camp is becoming a decisive factor, the contradiction between imperialists and oppressed nations has become so acute, the national liberation struggles are so intense that they are intensifying all the contradictions of modern society, influencing them, thus tremendously helping forward the process of proletarian revolution. This does not underrate the importance of national liberation struggles, but estimates their present day role correctly. But all this is beyond the phrase-mongers.

After attacking our Party for saying that the world socialist camp is becoming a decisive factor, after denouncing it as revisionist heresy, the phrase-mongers suddenly discovered that the formulation is found in the 1960 document, and has to be reckoned with. Now, they haven't the guts to repudiate it, attack it, but they welcome it as a profound formulation. (This is done in the same article. Our phrase-mongers are ideological chameleons of no mean order. They very well know which way their bread is buttered.)

Listen now how have they described the same formulation. "How should we understand this profound concept? The contradiction between the two systems is one of the four fundamental contradictions which are working towards the collapse of the imperialist camp." (How nice that they have discovered it now!)

And then they perorate: "The world socialist system is a firm mainstay for the national liberation struggles and the working class movements in the capitalist countries."

They now admit that the socialist camp is a powerful international force and influences the course of the other contradictions, it also exerts a big influence towards the resolution of these contradictions. From their bankrupt opposition to the formulation about the socialist camp becoming a decisive factor, they have come to regard it as a profound formulation. From their bankrupt formulation that further world advance to liberation and socialism is to be the result *only* of the results of the internal contradictions, they have come to regard the socialist camp as exerting a big influence on the course of the development of contradictions.

At the same time, they remain entrapped in their faulty understating.

And as we have said, the socialist camp must discharge its responsibilities by rendering every material, moral and ideological aid and even direct armed aid whenever it is necessary.

The working class of the socialist countries represents the vanguard of the world working class. It must fulfil this role in every way possible. The revisionists betray this role and divest it of its historic mission. And the 'Left' phrase-mongers aid and abet them by offering excuses like external and internal contradictions appearing to rely on the revolutionary upsurge in

each country, but in reality isolating this upsurge from the victorious conquests of the world proletariat. That is why they do not mention by a word the necessity of armed help by the socialist camp or any other direct help. That is why they do not mention that united front with the working class of the socialist camp as the nucleus. Then, with unequalled untruthfulness they say that the Madurai document has totally failed to grasp that the vast areas of Asia, Africa and Latin America are the storm centres of the revolutionary movement. Consider the following from our document: "...do we not find that another contradiction, namely, the one between the imperialists and oppressed nations has got accentuated and assumed the acutest form culminating in the outburst of national liberation revolutions in a series of countries of Asia, Africa and Latin America, and the intensification of this contradictions is of course influencing the course of all other contradictions, their growth and development. This is exactly what is meant by the world Marxist-Leninists when they say that the contradiction between the oppressor states and oppressed countries, at this stage of development of world history. has become the focus of all the contradictions of our times." This, according to the phrase-mongers, amounts to total failure to grasp the issue. Can you beat this?

And again, as typical of all non-Marxists, the phrase-mongers, when they talk about these national liberation struggles, have not a word to say about its relation with the world proletarian revolution or the socialist camp. It is a Leninist principle to regard the modern liberation struggles as a component part of the world proletarian revolution. It involves fraternal cooperation with the world revolutionary movement for Socialism. But of this the phrase-mongers show no inkling, not even a distant awareness. Such is their internationalism, such is their vaunted claim to fight revisionism.

Contradicting themselves at each step, in the beginning of the article they denounce the very formulation about the socialist world becoming a decisive factor in the course of development of society, they attack us and consider it to be the essence of revisionism. Later on, they certify it to be a profound formulation which must be seriously understood. In attacking us they say that further transition from capitalism to socialism can take

place only as a result of the internal contradictions, the socialist camp being an external contradiction. Later on, they say that the socialist camp exercises a big influence on the solution of all the contradictions of the modern society. But at all stages they fail to understand the mighty significance of the socialist camp, which, as everyone accepts, is becoming a decisive factor. They fail to grasp that the socialist camp represents the common victory of the peoples of the world and, as such, must render every aid including armed aid when necessary to the national liberation struggles and struggle for Socialism in capitalist countries. Confused by the revisionist sabotage, they seek to liquidate the revolutionary role of the socialist states and isolate the national liberation movements. And all this is passed off as fight against revisionism.

Our phrase-mongers work themselves in a fit and frenzy when they attack our document on the question of possibility of peaceful transition.

What have we stated in our document? Having refuted every revisionist argument on the question of peaceful transition, on the basis of Marxism-Leninism, we categorically state that howsoever the working class might prefer to have a peaceful transition, it cannot forget that the ruling classes seek to bar the road at every turn by resorting to violence and terror, and hence the need to be ever vigilant and prepared to meet all such exigencies. The bourgeois states, which are in essence nothing but a special organization of force and violence for the suppression of the proletariat and the people, have perfected this engine of suppression to such a monstrous degree in the present period that even the smallest democratic and class struggle of the proletariat has to encounter brutal force—nay, the very existence and functioning of the revolutionary parties and organizations are confronted at every stage with terrific violence and repression at the hands of the huge police and the military machine of the state.

This state of affairs has today become a rule rather than an exception. The entire course of history in the post-second world war period confirms this truth, and no revolution in any of the continents of Asia, Africa, Latin America and Europe was allowed by the bourgeoisie to take to the peaceful path, and

lakhs of freedom-fighters and proletarian revolutionaries in several countries are being butchered by the bourgeois police and military.

This should make our stand clear to every one who is not bereft of common sense and a minimum degree of honesty. Oh, no, they say, this is all trickery. You believe in peaceful path. Then with great sense of discovery they quote to us that Marx wanted the state machine to be smashed, the armed power of the bourgeoisie to be destroyed, and so on. Having no point to answer, they quote Marx, Lenin, to fill their pages and create an impression that all the quotations go against us. But of course, at the same time, they expose themselves and their own foolishness.

The phrase-mongers build their entire charge of revisionism on the following quotation: ".....Our Party strives to achieve the establishment of People's Democracy and socialist transformation through peaceful means... However it needs to be borne in mind that the ruling classes never relinquish power voluntarily. It is, therefore, necessary for the revolutionary forces to be vigilant and so orientate their work that they can face up to all contingencies, to any twist and turn in the political life of the country."

On this their comment is: "So it is clear that if these people have any complaint to make about the revisionists, it is certainly not because the revisionists stand for a peaceful transition to socialism. Oh, no, these people themselves are striving for such a peaceful transition... These cunning agents of the reactionary ruling classes chide the revisionists for an entirely different reason. They say to the revisionists: why on earth do you have to present the theme of peaceful transition as a general rule; what prevents you from referring to the universal law of armed revolution and then go on canvassing the peaceful path?"

Only flippant persons can argue like this after studying our document. The entire document is a repudiation of the revisionist concept about peaceful path and assertion of the Marxist theory of state and revolution. These tricksters resort to very crude tricks. When we talk of state as the organized form of violence and refer to it as bourgeois violence, they turn round on us and argue you are not fighting against the state but only

bourgeois violence, i.e., you want to accommodate yourselves to the state; when we, in throwing the responsibility of violence on to our class enemy, say it is they who organize violence and flout the will of the people, these petty tricksters turn round and say that means you stand for bourgeois law and present them as fulfilling the needs of the people, that is sowing illusions about class collaboration. Whether this is mental deficiency to understand or downright dishonesty—it only shows that our phrase-mongers have to waste the pages of their journal with incoherent and nonsensical writings.

But, as usual, in their outpourings they reveal their own ignorance and expose that their outlook has nothing in common with Marxism-Leninism. Is it incorrect for any Marxist-Leninist party to state that it strives for peaceful transition but is aware that the ruling classes organize violence and therefore the party must be prepared for alternative situation, for any sudden twist and turn in the situation? Our opportunists denounce this as heresy, and thereby show their ignorance of Marxism-Leninism.

While fighting against the revisionist distortion of the possibility, the Communist Party of China states: "On the question of transition from capitalism to socialism, it would be more flexible to refer to the two possibilities, peaceful transition and non-peaceful transition, than to just one, and this would place us in a position where we can have the initiative politically at any time." So, gentlemen, reference to this possibility is not *ipso facto* attacked as revisionism, but it is demanded that both possibilities should be mentioned.

You attack us for putting the onus of violence on the bourgeoisie, consider it opportunism. Listen to what the CPC says: "Referring to the possibility of peaceful transition indicates that for us the use of violence is primarily a matter of self-defence. It enables the Communist Parties in capitalist countries to sidestep attacks on them on this issue and it is politically advantageous—advantageous for winning masses and also for depriving the bourgeoisie of its pretext for such attacks and isolating it." It is further stated: "If practical possibilities for peaceful transition were to arise, in individual countries in the future because of international and democratic circumstances, we could then make timely use of the opportunity to win the support of

the masses to solve the problem of state power by peaceful means." Oh, horror of horrors!

At the same time, a warning is given: "The bourgeoisie will not step down from the stage of history voluntarily. This is a law of class struggle." Is this all revisionism? To refer to the possibility of peaceful transition, while preparing for all eventualities—recognizing that the ruling classes never surrender voluntarily is the correct standpoint—and those who fulminate against it have no right to call themselves Marxist-Leninists.

Once again, while emphasizing that the proletarian party must base itself on the Marxist-Leninist teachings concerning the proletarian revolution and the dictatorship, the CPC states: "Communists *always* prefer to bring about the transition to socialism by peaceful means." Mark the word 'always'. Gentlemen, denounce this as revisionism if you dare, if you are not mercenaries. Having correctly stated that the Communists would like to bring about the transition by peaceful means, the statement draws a correct demarcation between the revolutionaries and the revisionists. It asks: "But can peaceful transition be made into a new worldwide strategic principle for the international communist movement? Absolutely not."

It then refers to the fundamental question of all revolutions—the question of state power—and says ruling classes never relinquish power voluntarily. In specific historical conditions, Marx and Lenin did raise the possibility that revolution may develop peacefully. But as Lenin pointed out, the peaceful development of revolution is an opportunity—"very seldom to be met with in the history of revolution. As a matter of fact, there is no historical precedent for peaceful transition from capitalism to socialism."

So the authority by which they swear, accepts that Communists would always prefer to bring about transition to socialism by peaceful means, but the ruling classes never surrender voluntarily. But they must attack us for saying the same thing. Thereby they announce their complete rupture not only with Marxism-Leninism but also with intellectual honesty. □