

**INTERNATIONAL SITUATION**  
and Problems of World Communist Movement

*Adopted by*  
**EIGHTH CONGRESS  
OF THE  
COMMUNIST PARTY  
OF INDIA**

*Karyanandnagar  
Patna, 7-15 February 1968*

COMMUNIST PARTY PUBLICATION

INTERNATIONAL SITUATION AND PROBLEMS  
OF WORLD COMMUNIST MOVEMENT

INTRODUCTION

THE SEVENTH CONGRESS of our party held in December 1964 reviewed developments in the international situation and the problems of the world communist movement. It adopted a comprehensive resolution on the questions under discussion and put forward certain suggestions for restoring the unity of the communist movement which had already been seriously impaired by the ideological positions and disruptive activities of the leadership of the Chinese Communist Party.

The period which has since elapsed has been one of severe tests and trials not only for communist and workers' parties, but for all anti-imperialist forces fighting for national independence, social liberation, peace and democracy.

Valuable advance has been made during the period, most of all by the Soviet Union and other socialist countries. A number of newly-independent countries have progressed further along the path leading to socialism. The valiant and indomitable people of Vietnam have written a new chapter in the world revolutionary movement by their exemplary heroism and sacrifice. Repeatedly imperialism has failed to dictate its terms in international affairs and its military aggression has been held at bay.

At the same time, we have before us the criminal and sanguinary assaults of imperialist and internal reaction in Indonesia, Ghana and Greece. Backed by the Anglo-Americans, Israel has brazenly invaded and occupied substantial parts of Arab territory. American marines landed in the Dominican Republic as though it was their private property. The drive towards establishing military dictatorial regimes,

as in Brazil and Argentine, is growing in Latin America. In a number of newly-independent Afro-Asian countries, including our own, the forces of internal reaction, aided, financed and supported by imperialism, are becoming a menace to national independence and democracy. Revanchism is raising its head in West Germany. Aggression against Vietnam is being escalated. US imperialists have started new provocative activities against the Korean People's Democratic Republic.

The arrogance and belligerency of the American warlords and their main accomplice, the West German revanchists, have grown in recent years. Considering the situation as a whole, the danger of imperialism precipitating a world conflagration has clearly increased.

These dangerous and retrograde developments can no longer be ignored. It is imperatively necessary for the international communist movement seriously to examine their causes, discover their solutions, and work out ways and means for the effective implementation of agreed solutions.

Reverses and setbacks are by no means an unknown experience for communist parties and the world revolutionary movement. History never advances in a straight and smooth course. Zig-zags, partial defeats, temporary retreats and so on have always been an inseparable feature of the world revolutionary process. It is precisely in such situations that communists hold firmly to their evaluation of the basic direction of international developments and pursue their course with patience, perseverance and conviction regarding the final outcome of events.

However, reverses do create an atmosphere of confusion, doubts and misgivings leading to an undermining of the will to fight and to tendencies of pessimism or of resorting to some kind of blind and desperate action. For this reason also the questions raised in such a situation have to be frankly posed, analysed and dealt with.

Besides, the grave concern that is currently felt by communists and progressive elements all over the world does not arise mainly from the recent reverses and setbacks.

Anxiety and concern arise from the realisation that the growing bellicosity of imperialism and reaction in the recent period is not due to any enhancement in the strength of imperialism as against the world forces of socialism, national independence and democracy. Imperialism has been emboldened in its attacks mainly due to the differences in the world communist movement and their injurious effect on the unity and striking power of all patriotic, progressive, anti-imperialist forces. Democratic and peace-loving people in all countries are fully conscious of the strength they receive from a united world communist movement. It is the division in our ranks that is the main cause of concern.

It is necessary, the more so because of the difficult period through which we are passing, to emphasise that not all the new problems with which we are confronted arise from unhealthy tendencies in the international communist movement.

In fact, many of the complicated problems are rooted in the very advance made by the world revolutionary movement after the Second World War. It is often very inadequately realised that success and progress also create new contradictions and problems that could not and did not exist in the earlier stage of the movement.

The advance of socialism from one country to a system extending over a large number of countries is one of the greatest of popular victories in the entire history of the struggle for human emancipation. And only next to it in significance is the disintegration of the world colonial system and the achievement of national independence by the overwhelming majority of nations which were formerly under imperialist rule of domination.

Both these historic achievements have given birth to new problems and complications which were obviously non-existent before.

The international communist movement, the guide and unifier of all forces fighting against imperialism and reaction, has to constantly keep abreast of its responsibilities by overcoming its internal weaknesses, by eradicating from

its fold unhealthy tendencies that emerge from time to time, by an objective assessment both of progressive and retrograde developments in the international situation, by nailing down the key tasks of every period and by uniting the forces of world communism for the execution of the common tasks of the movement.

This is an extremely arduous and complicated obligation to fulfil. It offers no easy solutions and often no historical parallels from which one could seek guidance in a new situation. No communist party can shoulder it singlehanded. Its discharge necessarily calls for a free and frank exchange of views and experience between all fraternal parties, as also for serious, sincere and collective efforts by all contingents of the world communist movement.

As part of our common international duty, the Communist Party of India has to evaluate new developments, work out solutions to new problems and strengthen the party on this basis. We in India have to make the effort in order to clarify the doubts and strengthen the confidence of our own ranks, for the purpose of unifying the communist movement in our country, for strengthening the unity of our left and democratic forces, and as our contribution to the international dialogue between fraternal parties dedicated to the cause of our common struggle against imperialism and for the achievement of socialism.

## I. BASIC FORCES ASSERT THEMSELVES

QUESTIONS HAVE BEEN raised as to whether the recent reverses and the division in the world communist movement indicate a shift in the balance of world forces in favour of imperialism, whether it is correct to claim that the world socialist system is becoming the decisive factor in the development of society, whether the socialist system and the forces fighting against imperialism are really determining the main content, the main trend and the main features of the contemporary epoch of historical development, and so on.

The first thing that has to be borne in mind in dealing

with these questions is that while the correlation of world forces can never be a fixed magnitude and is constantly in flux, the basic character of an epoch and its laws are not determined or altered by the incidental twists and turns of social development. Neither a few sectoral victories nor certain sectoral setbacks of the world revolutionary movement change the essential character of a given epoch which is determined, not by local and transitory factors, but by the relationship between global forces.

The characterisation of the present epoch and of its laws of development made by the world communist movement in its Declaration of 1957 and Statement of 1960 is based on the evaluation of the relationship of world forces as it emerged from the Second World War and during subsequent years. Socialism spread from one country to a number of countries representing one-third of the human population and thus became a world system. The colonial system disintegrated as the result of the mighty blows of the national-liberation movement. The revolutionary working-class movement and communist parties developed into a powerful force in innumerable capitalist countries. The peace movement became an international force. Imperialism entered the third stage of its general crisis.

All these factors are as real today as they were a few years ago. And it is they that determine the nature of the present epoch and the direction of its future development.

However, there is yet another question which is also raised. The recent reverses have taken place in a period extending over quite a few years and in far-flung countries and continents. Do they not, perhaps, indicate a halting of the process of revolutionary advance and the beginning of a reversal in favour of imperialism?

There is no need to burk this question either. It can be frankly posed and answered. But in order to do so, it is clearly necessary, first of all, to fix the criterion of judgement. More concretely, while it would be wrong not to make a proper assessment of retrograde development in the situation, it would be impermissible to isolate them from the posi-

tive developments of the period. Proper conclusions and lessons have to be drawn from the reverses and setbacks suffered in the recent period. Any judgement of the situation based only on its negative features would clearly be lopsided and wrong.

In assessing international developments of the recent period, in striking its balancesheet, it is necessary to take stock of developments *as a whole*, with due regard to the *relative magnitude of all the relevant features, favourable or otherwise*. This alone can be the correct yardstick for arriving at an objective judgement of the changing situation.

Judged by this criterion, what are the most outstanding and decisive developments of the recent period? Which are the developments which, by their nature and magnitude, reveal the vital character of the present epoch and the laws of its development?

By this test, the developments that stand out in the bold-est relief are, *firstly*, the continued, phenomenal and all-round advance of the Soviet Union and other socialist countries; *secondly*, the deepening economic and political crisis of world imperialism, most of all of US imperialism; *thirdly*, the total failure of the mightiest imperialist power in the world, the USA, to settle the issue of Vietnam by force of arms; *fourthly*, the growing strength of the movements for national independence and against imperialism, and colonialism in Asia, Africa and Latin America; *fifthly*, the rising tide of the working-class and democratic movements in the imperialist countries; and *sixthly*, the remarkable broadening and deepening of the world peace movement and the growing cooperation among the organisations working for peace and national independence.

The setbacks of the recent period bear no comparison with these factors in the matter of determining the shift in the balance of world forces and in assessing whether imperialism or socialism is becoming the decisive factor of contemporary social development.

The industrial and economic development of the Soviet

Union and other socialist countries continues at record rates varying between 9 to 11 per cent per year. The industrial production of socialist countries now accounts for 40 per cent of the world industrial production. Problems of economic management arising from the rapid development of productive forces in the socialist countries, from their immensely increased capacity for satisfying all kinds of sophisticated consumer needs, from the application of new scientific discoveries and inventions to industrial technology, have mostly been solved or are in the process of successful solution. The teething troubles of the new economic management are over. And all this has been achieved precisely in the period when the rates of economic development of the advanced capitalist countries, most of all in Europe, have declined to between three to four per cent per annum.

Sober bourgeois economists have begun to admit that the economic miracle claimed for West Germany is, in reality, taking place in the German Democratic Republic.

After the recent soft-landing of a Soviet spacecraft on the Venus and the docking of two unmanned spaceships in outer space, both US and British scientists have admitted that the Soviet Union is at least 8 years ahead of the USA in space science. This includes the most advanced branches of modern science, such as nuclear physics, electronics, rocketry and others.

Socialist countries have no intention of using their scientific superiority over imperialist countries for the purpose of aggression. But the military experts of the latter have not failed to take note of the fact that Soviet scientific development puts Soviet defence potential far in advance of the imperialist forces. Both qualitatively and quantitatively, Soviet military might is now admittedly invincible. No imperialist spokesman speaks any longer of 'rolling back the tide of communism' which was the common talk till a few years ago.

The cultural and educational advance of socialist countries continues its rapid strides when, in contrast, bourgeois 'culture' in the United States and Europe has reached

a new low in the spheres of racism, revanchism, sadistic criminalism, the use of narcotic drugs and so on. Sex degeneracy masquerading as occultism, and wild orgies born out of utter purposelessness and alienation have become the dominant feature of the cultural life of 'free society'.

The basic factor determining the balance of forces of the present epoch is the industrial, scientific, military and moral superiority of the Soviet Union and socialist countries in relation to imperialism. That correlation has certainly shifted further in favour of the socialist countries.

Meanwhile, the economic crisis and contradictions of imperialism have not only deepened but specifically in respect of the USA, the leading imperialist power of the world, the economic crisis has already grown over into a political crisis, such as has never been experienced by the United States in its entire history.

In recent years all the advanced capitalist countries have been faced with a declining rate of production (which, in the USA, has been kept up by gearing the economy of the country to the war against Vietnam) as also with inflation, rising prices, a rising cost of living, growing unemployment and foreign exchange difficulties arising from an adverse balance of trade.

Growing competition for markets has very seriously aggravated the contradictions between the USA and European countries, between England and the ECM countries, and between West Germany, France and Italy within the ECM bloc. In desperation, England has been driven to devalue the pound. The French and Italian economies have become almost stagnant. The crisis of the British economy has erupted in the shape of the devaluation of the pound.

The shakiness of the imperialist military pacts has grown. France has created a veritable crisis in the NATO alliance. The SEATO has developed sharp internal strains and fissures. The sharpening of interimperialist contradictions has thus been a marked feature of the present period. This weakens the imperialist system as a whole and is a manifestation of its deep crisis.

The most significant developments, of course, have taken place in the USA, the citadel and gendarme of world imperialism.

War and the production of armaments mean monopoly profits. But even in the case of the USA, with all its claims to limitless industrial power, the pursuit of war beyond a point necessarily precipitates, as has actually happened, a profound economic crisis.

During the last year and a half, US expenditure on the war against Vietnam has rapidly shot up to two and a half billion dollars per month. In result, the price-level in the USA is spiralling and the almighty dollar, the hardest currency in the world, is threatened with devaluation. The dream of the 'Great Society' has gone up in smoke, foreign 'aid' has been slashed, and the entire national economy has been seriously distorted.

The cumulative effect of the disgraceful, dirty, brigand war against Vietnam and the accompanying strain on US economy have been the unleashing of mass movements against war, for the defence of civil liberties and the assertion of equal rights for the Negroes, for better housing, education and other social amenities, and for higher wages and full employment.

Even taken separately the volume, expanse and militancy of each of these movements is something unprecedented in US history.

And what is of far greater historic significance, all these popular struggles are already uniting into a single mass torrent against war, against racial discrimination, for genuine equality and democracy, and for full employment and decent living standards. Never before have the US monopolists and their state power been confronted by such a mighty, nationwide, and united popular offensive.

The majority of students, youth and teachers in the universities from the East Coast to the West, are already lost to the US rulers on the issue of the war against Vietnam. Draft for conscription are being burnt in tens of thousands.

The Negroes are in open revolt for equal rights in politics, in the national economy, in education and every sphere of social and urban life. War resistance among women has assumed mass proportions. And each section of the populace is fraternising with the rest because of the growing realisation that the common enemy of all, the common cause of the various problems which confront different sections of American society, is the warlords of US monopoly capital.

Batons, bullets, imprisonment, murder, arson, vilification, all the weapons in the armoury of imperialism, have failed to arrest the popular avalanche in the US. Rallies and demonstrations are swelling in size and number. The marches are becoming bigger and longer. Washington is being invaded repeatedly by hundreds of thousands of people from all walks of life. For the first time in American history, the Pentagon has had to be literally defended by American soldiers from a massive offensive of American citizens themselves.

And now, the American working class is beginning to join the battle. Once again its old militant traditions are being revived. The steel and automobile workers are organising countrywide strikes. For the first time, again, over 500 delegates of American workers including prominent trade-union leaders have held a conference to protest against war and demand the withdrawal of US troops from Vietnam.

Bourgeois papers and newsagencies, both American and Indian, no longer deny the immensity and wide sweep of the mass upsurge in the USA. All the same, they systematically cover up and whitewash the fact that the new militant and democratic awakening has not only smashed the terror of McCarthyism in the USA (and anticommunism was the essence of McCarthyism) but has tremendously eliminated mass anticommunist prejudice in the country.

This is also due to the very vigorous intervention and active connections between the CPUSA and the new mass struggles. The party is in the very thick of the students, peace and Negro mass movements. It has a very important role in them which is never publicised by the bourgeois

press agencies. Everywhere the students, youth, peace and antiwar demonstrators, Negro gatherings, etc. invite US party leaders to address their gatherings. The party's position in some very important trade unions has improved to an extent where party members have become prominent leaders and functionaries of such trade unions. The legal ban against party members holding elective positions in trade unions and against trade unions electing communists to elective positions has been broken through in practice as also by a Supreme Court judgement.

The membership of the CPUSA (which was practically illegal till 1957) has risen to 14,000 and is growing fast. The sale of innumerable party journals and party literature has grown with remarkable rapidity. Millions of copies of the writings of Marx, Engels and Lenin have been sold in the recent years mainly among youth, students, workers, professors and among the Negroes.

No student of contemporary history, of the world revolutionary movement, can afford to miss the historic significance of the new popular upsurge in the USA.

The situation has reached such a serious stage that sections of the US monopoly bourgeoisie have been alarmed by the disastrous consequences of Johnson's reckless adventure in Vietnam.

A large number of senators, army generals, very prominent journalists, etc.—all spokesmen of big bourgeois American interests—and sections of the clergy are now openly opposing the war against Vietnam. For the *New York Times* to expose the criminal and adventurist activities of the CIA and the Pentagon is clearly indicative of a serious crisis within the ruling circles of the USA.

The great majority of members of the UN now favour a stoppage of bombing in Vietnam and a negotiated, peaceful settlement. This includes a number of advanced capitalist countries in Europe, besides France, such as Denmark and Norway.

The annual conference of the British Trade Unions Con-

gress and the British Labour Party have voted decidedly against the continuation of the war in Vietnam.

Gallop polls in the USA on the issue of popular support to Johnson clearly demonstrate his rapidly dwindling popularity. In some cases the majority vote has gone against him. A recent gallop poll in widely separated countries of the world revealed that in seven of the eleven countries covered by the poll between 70 to 80 per cent of those who recorded their opinion want a withdrawal of US troops from Vietnam. Notable among these seven were West Germany, Brazil and Argentine.

Such is the allround crisis, isolation and resistance with which the US rulers have been enveloped during the last 3 years. Clearly the growing aggressiveness of US imperialism is not a sign of its increased strength and confidence, but of its weakness and desperation.

The highest credit and honour for bringing US imperialism to such a pass goes to the heroic and unvanquishable people of Vietnam. The vaunted industrial and military pride of those who consider themselves the masters of the globe is today in mud. Such is the glorious achievement of the 'little country' called Vietnam. And now has come the recent thrilling and inspiring offensive of the National Liberation Front of South Vietnam which has struck terror into the hearts of the US imperialists.

Every decent man under the sun is full of admiration for the Vietnamese people. Every decent man has been roused to anger and detestation against the US brigands shamelessly murdering innocent women and children and laying a whole country waste with napalm and incendiary bombs. There is universal concern and sympathy for the superhuman suffering and the fiery ordeal through which the Vietnamese are passing.

Beneath these natural sentiments, however, one often discovers a failure to realise the significance of the titanic battle that is going on in Vietnam. US troops in Vietnam now number over half a million. In addition there are more than half a million puppet troops of the South Vietnamese

government. This, again, leaves out Australian, South Korean, Filipino and other troops on the scene. The South-East Asian American naval fleet is concentrated against Vietnam. American war planes from the entire Pacific and S-E Asian region based on land and aircraft carriers, are carrying out dozens of bombing raids against North and South Vietnam every day.

All the military forces in and around Vietnam, i.e. the army, the navy and the air force are equipped with the most modern and most destructive weapons and firepower which are actually being used to the point of saturation. The USA has already poured more explosives on Vietnam than it did over the whole of Europe in the Second World War. Over 200 lb of explosives have been dropped in Vietnam per head of the population.

And yet this vast destructive machine has been totally blunted by the Vietnamese people and armed forces. The US has suffered a military humiliation and crisis in Vietnam such as its armed forces have never met within their history.

It has to be realised that North Vietnam is not at war with the US in South Vietnam where the battle is being waged by the guerrilla troops of the National Liberation Front. And it is a matter of public knowledge that with all the valuable military aid being given by the Soviet Union and other socialist countries to Vietnam, the obstructionist policies of the Maoist leadership put very serious limitations to such aid reaching its final destination. The refusal of the Mao group in China to agree to repeated requests for concerted action to aid Vietnam, despite differences on other issues, has impeded the progress of the valiant battle of the people of Vietnam.

Despite all these handicaps, despite the fact that Maoist obstructionism prevents the Soviet Union and other socialist countries from going all out in aid of Vietnam we are witnessing the unbelievable spectacle of a small country, with a population of less than fifty million, divided into two parts, one under socialist rule and the other under the jackboots



of a foreign invader, reducing the might of American arms to utter demoralisation, frustration and helplessness.

Eighty per cent of the land area of South Vietnam is under occupation of National Liberation Front. In recent months, the North Vietnamese have been shooting down as many US war planes every day as can be manufactured in the USA in the same period of time.

If such is the plight to which Vietnam can bring the USA, what greater demonstration can there be of the invincible power of the national-liberation movement acting in alliance with the socialist camp and world democratic movement against imperialism.

How about the West Asian crisis? Undoubtedly the Arab countries and the Arab freedom movement have suffered a severe setback as a result of the imperialist-backed Israeli aggression. But no one with a knowledge of present-day world politics can believe that the real purpose of the military offensive launched by Israel and its masters was to grab big chunks of desert territory belonging to Egypt, Jordan and Syria.

The dominant and barely concealed object of the attack was to overthrow the militant, anti-imperialist regimes of Egypt and Syria to divide, demoralise and crush the resurgent forces of Arab independence and social liberation; to establish complete Anglo-American domination over Arab oil and the Suez canal; in brief, to reestablish Anglo-American economic, political and military domination over the Middle East by removing from the scene the 'menacing' challenge of the Arab freedom movement.

This is not to underplay the gravity of the setback which the Arab countries have received. Their forces, backed by the Soviet Union and other socialist countries, will have to compel Israel to disgorge the territory forcibly occupied by it. But that should not prevent us from seeing that, considering the key objective which they sought to gain through the Israeli attack, the Anglo-Americans actually met with failure in their West Asian adventure.

And the decisive factor which brought the Israeli armies

to a standstill, when they were poised for an attack on Cairo and Damascus, was the ultimatum given by the Soviet Union and the Warsaw Pact countries. The moment the rulers of Israel were warned that any further advance of their armies would bring in direct military intervention by the Soviet Union and other socialist countries, that moment their imperialist masters ordered them to halt.

The movements for national liberation are growing in strength and striking power. In Southern Africa, armed struggles have begun against the hated colonialist and racist regimes. In Latin America, despite naked US intervention (at times even military intervention as recently in Bolivia), the mass movements of the people against US imperialism for national sovereignty and economic independence are assuming different forms, in accordance with the different conditions in each country; in certain Latin American countries, armed struggles are being waged against the tyranny of US imperialism and the reactionary juntas, in others mass actions of the working people are taking place and the broad democratic fronts of anti-imperialist forces are being built.

The democratic and working-class movements all over the world have grown stronger. Of particular significance for our own people have been the heroic struggles of the people of East Pakistan against the Ayub regime, for autonomy and friendship with India.

New organisations and groups working for peace, embracing widely different sections of opinion, have come into existence, particularly in North America and Western Europe. In West Germany, the protest movement against the Bonn government's revanchist and militarist policies have assumed large dimensions. A special feature of the recent period has been the coordination of the actions of these various bodies with those of the World Peace Council and other democratic mass organisations and movements.

The imperialists are in no doubt regarding which way the balance of world forces is tilted. That should be more than sufficient proof for those who doubt it.

## II. TWO LINES — TWO RESULTS

THE ADVERSE DEVELOPMENTS in the international situation are vitally connected with the dominant conflict in the international communist movement, viz. the conflict between the policies being pursued by the Mao group of the Chinese Communist Party, and the line of the overwhelming majority of communist and workers' parties that have abided by the Moscow Declaration of 1957 and Moscow Statement of 1960.

As such, an examination of the new problems and complications that now call for solution has to begin with which of the two main contending lines has truly served the cause of peace, democracy, national independence and socialism and which has proved harmful to the cause.

Since the conflict has now a history of over six years, a clear verdict must be given dominantly on the basis of actual experience, on the basis of the concrete results of the two contending lines.

A few years ago it was customary to refer to the differences between the two lines as ideological. That they were, and still are. But from the very beginning, they were fraught with the most serious practical implications for the world revolutionary movement. In fact, their gravity lay precisely in the dangerous consequences of the Maoist line, not only for the socialist, but for the entire anti-imperialist world revolutionary movement.

Phrasemongering, reducing real differences to a battle of quotations, formulations and abusive epithets, shirking the test of life and practical experience—all these are old and incurable diseases of dogmatism. One has only to tune in the Peking Radio to listen to the same shrill harangue one heard six months ago. 'The Draft for Ideological Discussion' recently adopted by the Central Committee of the CP (Marxist) follows the same pattern in content, form and style. It is necessary to turn from such utter barrenness and sterility to the living lessons of history.

Firstly, in recent years, the policies of the Mao group have moved leagues 'ahead' of what could be characterised as a sectarian and dogmatist distortion of the common international line of the 81-partes' Statement.

As has been proved time and again, in the history of the world communist movement, the obstinate and egoistic pursuit of left-sectarian policies ends up with the worst forms of opportunism and adventurism and a complete negation of Marxism itself. In the case of the Mao group it has taken the forms of great-nation chauvinism and hegemonism.

The Maoist leadership has now formally dissolved the All-China Trade Union Federation and the Young Communist League. The organs of the so-called Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution have replaced, and in many places physically disbanded the party organs at all levels, right up to the Central Committee of the CPC. Frenzied bands of young boys and girls, barely in their teens, have been let loose in town and country to invade factories, farms and residential areas, to enter private houses for humiliating and physically molesting anybody and everybody whom they consider to be guilty of 'revisionism' and 'taking to the capitalist road'. Judged even by articles in the Chinese press, mass hysteria has led to hooliganism and anarchism in a large number of places. Respected and veteran leaders and heroes of the Communist Party of China have been publicly humiliated and on occasions even physically liquidated. In reality there is little to distinguish it from misanthropy and sadism.

For years, almost a decade, the Chinese leadership has published no statistics regarding the state of the national economy. By available accounts and reports, production has not made much advance beyond the level in 1958 when the policy of Great Leap Forward was adopted. The 'cultural revolution' has still further disorganised production, leading to a lowering of popular living standards. Foreign trade with the socialist countries has been disrupted, while the Maoist leaders are establishing closer trade relations even with South Africa and the Federal Republic of Germany.

Great-power chauvinism and hegemonism in relation to the newly-independent countries and the national-liberation movement have resulted in serious damage to the Afro-Asian and Latin-American liberation movements and are now recoiling against the dominant group in China.

The bellicose ultimatums and provocations of the Mao group during the Indo-Pak war and its hostile campaign against the Tashkent agreement exposed its true character.

While claiming to be the only real friend and champion of colonial liberation and the consistent enemy of imperialism, the Maoist leadership has thoroughly alienated itself from India, Nepal, Burma, Ceylon, the UAR and innumerable other newly-independent countries.

In Burma, Egypt, Cuba and a large number of Afro-Asian countries, the Maoist leaders have organised subversive activities against governments that have been resolutely fighting imperialism and introducing radical social reforms within their countries.

In South Africa and Southern Rhodesia the Maoist leadership is supporting political organisations of a shady character which are opposed to the political parties conducting armed struggle in these countries for national liberation. While ceaselessly calling for armed struggle, irrespective of time and place, it disrupts genuinely popular armed struggles wherever they are justified and must be defended.

The chauvinistic and bellicose attitude of the Mao group towards the newly-independent countries, their constant denunciation of bourgeois national leaders as stooges of American imperialism, while ignoring the real, diehard, pro-imperialist groupings in such countries, has invariably given a handle to such reactionary elements to whip up anti-Chinese, anticommunist hysteria, and to disrupt and attack the democratic forces within the country. That is a backhand service to imperialism, while appearing to denounce it.

The disruptive activities of the Mao group in the WFTU and other international democratic organisations have reached the limit of what patience and endurance can stand.

Barring Albania, the Mao group has now alienated themselves from practically every communist party in the world.

The policies and practical actions of the leadership of the Indonesian Communist Party, which helped to provide the opportunity for the brutal imperialist offensive against all revolutionary and democratic forces in the country, were to a considerable extent inspired by the Mao group. The butchery of lakhs of Indonesian communists and democrats by the imperialists and reactionaries could take place in a country which had the biggest communist party in the capitalist world, precisely because the Indonesian communist leaders trailed behind bourgeois nationalists on the one hand and became involved in an adventurist coup on the other, disarming and disrupting the popular forces, thus preventing from withstanding and beating back the reactionary offensive.

And yet the gravest charge that history will place at the doors of the Mao Group is that it has attempted its worst to disrupt the international communist and working-class movement and the national-liberation struggle precisely at a time when their unity can guarantee a decisive counteroffensive against imperialist aggression and domination, safeguard world peace and take humanity forward to genuine national independence and socialism.

The policies of the Maoist leadership are by far the most powerful factor contributing to the weakening of the world struggle against imperialism.

Further by their actions, the Mao group, while claiming to be Marxist, have in reality only acted to repel millions of people from the lofty ideas and ideals of Marxism-Leninism.

The concrete meaning of the 'ultra-revolutionary', 'supremely Marxist-Leninist' line of the Mao group is thus clear beyond doubt. 'By their fruits ye shall know them!' Anti-Sovietism and discrediting the ideas of communism under the pretext of fighting the 'spearhead and fountain-head of world revisionism'; disruption of the national-libera-

tion movement in the name of its revolutionary championship; great-power chauvinism and hegemonism under the garb of spreading the gospel of the Thoughts of Mao Tse-tung; placing great strains and stresses upon the country's economy in the name of the 'great leap forward'; poisoning the minds of youth and abandoning the leadership of the working class and its party in the name of the 'proletarian cultural revolution'; and in all, a gratuitous aid to imperialism in the very name of fighting it to a finish—such is the essence in flesh and blood of the ideological and political line of the Maoist leadership.

By any standard, all this amounts to a clear renunciation of Marxism, no longer a grave deviation from it.

Clearly the line is no less damaging, in fact more, for the interests of the Chinese people themselves than for the world revolutionary movement. And that is precisely why the Mao group now finds itself isolated, not only from the world revolutionary movement but growingly from the Chinese people themselves. There could be no greater and more eloquent verdict on the policies of the Maoist leadership than the massive resistance to it which is growing, not only among the national minorities in the Chinese People's Republic, but among vast sections of the working class, members of the CPC, and the Chinese Red Army. This is the one heartening feature of the otherwise dark picture that is China today.

In sharp contrast stands the record of the communist and workers' parties that have stood by the line of the Moscow Declaration and Statement and have made serious efforts to implement it. In Chinese evaluation, all these parties are now revisionist agents and accomplices of world imperialism, and more particularly, of American imperialism.

### III. TWO LINES AND THE CPM

THE 'DRAFT FOR IDEOLOGICAL DISCUSSION' adopted by the CC of the CPM also characterises the policies pursued by the supporters of the Moscow Declaration and Statement as

'the trio that works out a full-fledged line of class collaboration'. The contemptuous reference to the 'trio' is, of course, the CPM way of referring to the concepts of 'peaceful co-existence, peaceful economic competition and peaceful transition'. In fact, the draft, while referring to the policies of the leadership of the CPSU, characterises them as 'more and more a line of conciliation, compromise and collaboration between the two great powers, the USSR and the USA'. So, let us examine the actual record of those who are accused of revisionism and collaboration.

There is no need to speak once again of the rapid industrial and economic development of the Soviet Union and other socialist countries which have pursued the path of combining material incentives with the further development of socialist emulation among their people. Since this course assures a rapid rise in popular living standards, it appears to the perverted and inverted vision of the Chinese leaders as the 'restoration of capitalism in the USSR' and 'the bourgeoisification of its working class'.

The foreign policy of the Soviet Union and other socialist countries is denounced by the Mao group and the CPM as 'collaboration between the USSR and USA'.

And yet the newly-independent countries, on whose behalf the Chinese leaders claim to make this charge, are the very countries which acknowledge that the Soviet Union and other socialist countries are their main and most powerful support against imperialist aggression and intervention, and internal subversion backed by one or another imperialist power.

All the newly-independent Afro-Asian countries that are struggling to strengthen their economic and political independence have drawn closer to the Soviet Union, economically and politically, in the very period in which the Chinese leaders have been warning them not to trust the Soviet Union, 'the ally of US imperialism'.

The Democratic Republic of Vietnam and the National Liberation Front of South Vietnam have repeatedly declared that they have received from the Soviet Union and

other socialist countries every military and other assistance sought by them. Cuba recognises the Soviet Union as its main international support against the constant threat of US aggression. On the other hand, China has openly rejected the appeal of the Soviet Union and other socialist countries for concerted economic and military aid to Vietnam by all the socialist countries together.

In the recent West Asian crisis, China denounced the Soviet Union for betraying the Arab countries. The official journal of the CPM, *People's Democracy*, scathingly attacked the Soviet Union and accused it of downright treachery towards the Arab countries.

And yet 'strangely' enough, the entire Arab world, all the leaders and rulers of Arab countries attacked by Israel, paid tributes to the Soviet Union as their reliable and most powerful friend in distress. Subsequent to the West Asian crisis, the relations of the Arab countries with the Soviet Union, including military relations, have become even closer than before, not less.

If this is not conclusive proof of the consistent, anti-imperialist policy of the Soviet Union, its consistent and full support to every country threatened with or subjected to imperialist aggression, no better proof can be adduced. It is impossible to convince those who claim to be better and more patriotic Vietnamese than the Vietnamese themselves, better and more patriotic Arabs than the Arabs themselves.

It is often suggested even by those who consider the Maoist foreign policy to be provocative and adventurist, that Soviet foreign policy is not bold enough. More specifically, it is suggested that Soviet military intervention in Vietnam ought to be more direct and vigorous and that in the West Asian crisis also the Soviet Union and the East European socialist countries evaded a bolder intervention.

Sometimes, it is suggested that the peace policy of the Soviet Union and other socialist countries amounts to shirking the risk of a world war under any circumstances, that this attitude is being utilised by the imperialist power to

push ahead with their aggression against one country after another, and that, in effect, this means a policy of retreat which, in the final analysis will actually embolden the imperialists to launch a major world war after they have swallowed the ill-gotten fruits of a number of local wars.

When those who raise these questions are asked what exactly and concretely they expect the Soviet Union to do in Vietnam or what it should have done during the West Asian crisis, they generally say that they are not military experts. They can only say that Soviet intervention ought to be more effective. It is for the Soviet leaders to work out the specific ways and means.

The issue involved in all these doubts and misgivings is so serious that it is necessary to take very clear and firm positions on it.

It is not at all a question of military expertise; nor is it a question of being or not being prepared to take risks and face grave danger. It is a question of whether counterescalation can be an effective and useful policy to defeat the imperialist policy of cold war and military escalation, or whether the policy of peace, peaceful coexistence and rebuffing imperialist aggression, as it is understood by the world communist movement, is the really effective answer to the imperialist drive towards war.

As has been explained time and again, the policy of the world communist movement and the socialist countries is a composite, manysided policy. Far from being a policy of avoiding risks, it is a policy of constant struggle, a policy of constant and running risks and danger. The Soviet Union would not strain itself to the maximum to keep ahead of the American military potential if it wanted to avoid a world war under any and all circumstances. Every moment it is preparing itself more and more to face such a contingency if, despite all efforts, finally it does become unavoidable.

All this, however, is really beside the point and should need no repetition, but for the fact that the issue is being raised in context of recent reverses.

The real point is that once we accept the position, and that is not being questioned, that it is possible in the present epoch to avoid a world war and yet achieve the destruction of imperialism, what is the policy that the world communist movement and the socialist countries should tenaciously follow in order to achieve their goal?

It is only by posing the question in this manner that one can see the sharp distinction between a policy of counter-escalation to defeat imperialist military aggression and the policy which is being pursued by the world communist movement.

The policy of the communist movement certainly includes armed military resistance to imperialist aggression, with the full military support of the socialist countries, which has always been given without hesitation and without stint.

But a vital part of the policy is the mobilisation of powerful mass opinion within each country against imperialist aggression no matter in which corner of the world it takes place. It involves the utter isolation of the warmongers, and also involves driving a wedge between the imperialist powers themselves on the issue of every given local war. Imperialist military pacts like the NATO and SEATO have to be disrupted and broken, thereby isolating the Americans even from their other imperialist allies. The policy involves the working up of powerful mass pressure in the nonaligned countries to make them take firmer anti-imperialist positions and come out boldly in support of any country attacked by one or another imperialist power and the development of the world peace movement.

Clearly this implies the broadening and intensification of the national-liberation movement, the strengthening of the democratic movement in the developing countries and the working-class movement in all capitalist countries.

In brief, it is a policy of confronting imperialism with the united strength of all the peaceloving, democratic national-liberationist and socialist forces of the world. Military, armed confrontation is a necessary part of this counter-offensive. But it is inseparable from the political and eco-

conomic aspects of the counteroffensive, it is inseparable from diverse forms of struggle and innumerable other means and methods of countering the imperialist offensive.

Imperialist aggression is by no means purely military. It is also political, ideological, economic. The popular counteroffensive has also to employ all the weapons in its armoury.

Once again, it may be repeated that this is neither a straight nor an easy course. It is certainly not a course expected to give quick results. There are going to be setbacks and defeats on the way to victory.

But there is no shortcut to victory in the age of atomic weapons, in the age when imperialism has become desperate and nihilistic precisely because it knows that the forces pitted against it have become stronger and that it is nearing its doom.

We want to save human civilisation and also carry humanity forward to complete social liberation and happiness. Imperialism has never recognised or accepted either of these responsibilities. The worst among the imperialists surely think along the line that if in any case their system cannot be saved, they would rather destroy human civilisation than sink alone.

One should be frank on this issue. The outlook of wanting to settle accounts with imperialism with the military strength of the Soviet Union, is really (though not always consciously) the outlook of escaping one's own responsibility of building a powerful, united militant mass movement against imperialist aggression and in furtherance of the cause of democracy and socialism in one's own country. It is an outlook of shifting one's own responsibility on to the shoulders of the Soviet Union and the Soviet people. Twice in the lifetime of a single generation they have fought, with superhuman courage and sacrifice, for themselves and for the whole world. They continue to carry their burden even today. But are we shouldering our share of the responsibility?

Imperialist threats of aggression against Cuba, and far more

so, the American war against Vietnam and the Israeli attack on the Arab countries are directly connected with the growing offensive of Indian reaction, fully supported by the Americans, against Indian democracy and independence. And yet, how much have we done to rouse our country against the American butchery in Vietnam and the fascist Israeli barbarities in the occupied Arab territories? How much have we done to compel the Indian government to take a consistent anti-imperialist stand on Vietnam? The voice of India is today one of the major factors in world politics which determine the future of war and peace. It is this voice that we have to shift decisively in favour of peace and colonial liberation. That is the path of rebuffing imperialist aggression, so far as our part of the task is concerned. Counterescalation by the Soviet Union is no solution of the problem. To expect or suggest any such course is a counsel of defeatism and desperation.

It is a repeated charge of the Maoist leadership and several leaders of the CPM that Soviet and other socialist economic aid to the newly-independent countries strengthens, not their internal anti-imperialist forces, but the monopoly bourgeoisie in such countries.

Here again, if one is to go by facts and actual evidence, it can be demonstrated that in every single instance of a newly-independent country, its economic and political advance has been determined by the measure in which it has reduced its inherited dependence on the imperialists and developed economic cooperation with the Soviet Union and other socialist countries.

No independent country can advance without dominantly relying on its own internal economic and human resources. But given this basic premise, it is precisely the countries which have strengthened their economic ties with the Soviet Union and other socialist countries and rejected imperialist 'aid' with strings, that have advanced farthest on the road of internal socio-economic reforms and weakened the power of internal feudal and big bourgeois interests.

UAR, Burma, Syria, Algeria, Guinea, Mali—all are

testimony to this truth. Everywhere Soviet and other socialist aid has helped to weaken the positions of imperialism and internal vested interests in the economies of these countries. It has not strengthened reaction.

In the case of our own country it was Soviet and socialist aid which enabled us to break through the imperialist blockade against the building of basic industries in the country. It was socialist aid in the sphere of steel, heavy engineering, oil and similar industries that enabled us to lay the basis of economic independence.

Big business in India has never appreciated the emphasis on basic industries in national planning and has generally opposed their being built in the public sector which is precisely what the socialist countries have enabled us to do. Socialist aid for building heavy and key industries in the public sector would play a powerful antimonopoly role provided the left and democratic forces in the country were to unite and bring the necessary pressure on the government.

In this connection, it must be stated explicitly that the task of Soviet and socialist economic aid is to create conditions and opportunities for the struggle against reaction in the newly-independent countries. This is the responsibility of socialist countries. This is what they can be expected to do. But the struggle has to be waged by the people themselves. That responsibility clearly devolves on the people of the countries concerned and cannot be passed on to the Soviet Union and other socialist countries.

The test of socialist aid to developing countries is whether it strengthens the economic and political independence of the country in question against imperialism. Where it stands this test, it has to be welcomed. The Soviet Union and other socialist countries are themselves very particular to maintain only such economic relations with the countries of the 'third world' as conform to this test. No economic relations are maintained which would violate that condition.

Peaceful coexistence and peaceful economic competition are not, and have not been, instruments of collaboration with

imperialism in the hands of the leadership of the Soviet Union and other socialist countries. They have been instruments of struggle against imperialism, instruments of strengthening the economies and military defence of the newly-independent countries, instruments of resisting imperialist aggression, instruments of weakening and undermining the imperialist stranglehold over the countries of the 'third world'.

Representatives of 90 communist, socialist and national-democratic parties assembled in Moscow on the occasion of the 50th anniversary of the Great October Revolution. They included representatives of democratic parties from the Arab and other African countries. One and all, they declared that an indispensable condition of the success of their anti-imperialist struggle, of their advance to socialism, was the support they had received from the Soviet Union and other socialist countries. They asserted that unity with the socialist countries was the guarantee of their future victory.

A number of communist parties in the advanced capitalist countries, which have been loyally adhering to the 81-parties' Statement, have also registered a great advance in this period.

Mention must be made most prominently of the Communist Party of France and the Communist Party of Italy, which, through their consistent policy of building an anti-war, antimonopoly front, have achieved admirable success in building broader working-class unity, in organising powerful and militant working-class struggle and in substantially improving their position in various local elective bodies and in parliaments. The working-class and socialist movement in Japan has made immense strides by concentrating its attack against Japan's involvement in US aggressive policies in the Far East.

The Chinese leadership and the CPM deride the slogan of national democracy and the noncapitalist path of development for the newly-independent countries. It is argued that the slogan of national democracy is a slogan of class collaboration, a slogan of the surrender of working-class

hegemony to the bourgeoisie in the national-democratic revolution and the advance to socialism.

The basic outlook behind this argument is very old and not at all new for our party. What it fails, or more correctly, refuses to see is that working-class leadership is not established just by declaring it from the housetops. The forging of working-class leadership in the national-liberation movement, in other words, dislodging the national bourgeoisie from its position of leadership, involves a very complicated, arduous and generally very prolonged struggle, extending over years. The real question, therefore, is not one of accepting or rejecting the principle of proletarian hegemony but of the struggle to achieve it.

The slogan of national democracy and the noncapitalist path of development is meant for the countries where the working class is numerically weak, or for other reasons, has not succeeded in achieving the leadership of the national-democratic revolutionary struggle, and yet where a fighting alliance of revolutionary-democratic forces can achieve power or actually does achieve power. In such a situation, what are the working class and communist parties to do? Are they to support the state power of such an alliance or to oppose it? Are they to participate vigorously in building such an alliance or to keep aloof from it, waiting for the day when proletarian hegemony 'droppeth, as the gentle rain from heaven, upon the place beneath'?

After the experience of the last decade no one can say that this is a hypothetical question. On the contrary, what the experience of the national anti-imperialist struggles of the formerly dependent Afro-Asian countries clearly points out is that this is precisely the most likely perspective before all national-freedom movements struggling to move forward to social liberation.

The national-democratic state is a most complicated type of state. Firstly, because socio-economic conditions and the correlation of the various anti-imperialist classes in the countries concerned are characterised by great variations; secondly, because it is a state within which class relations



have to undergo a rapid change in favour of the working class. No two national-democratic states are going to be identically of the same pattern.

Once this is clear, it cannot be denied that the experience of Egypt, Syria, Algeria, Burma and a number of other Afro-Asian countries points to national democracy as the path for the newly-independent countries for completing the anti-imperialist, antifeudal, national-democratic revolution and advancing towards socialism.

There may be, can be, and in fact, there are reverses and temporary defeats on the way. Indonesian democracy received a violent setback before it had reached the stage of national democracy. Reaction won in Ghana. But that does not alter the situation in which once again, the road and perspective of advance remains national democracy.

Experience also proves that the immediate economic reforms introduced by national-democratic states are yet far removed from socialism. They are measures for the complete eradication of imperialist, semifeudal and monopoly interests in the country and for restricting the development of internal capitalism. That is their noncapitalist path of advance towards socialism.

It has to be emphasised that the noncapitalist path of development through national democracy, i.e. a revolutionary-democratic state in which the working class has not yet achieved leadership but is struggling to achieve it, has become possible basically because of the allround support which such states can receive in the present epoch from the powerful world socialist system. It has also become possible because of the immense radicalisation of nonproletarian, anti-imperialist elements in the backward countries resulting from the profound crisis of the world colonial system.

National democracy and the noncapitalist path are in no sense a surrender of the national-revolutionary struggle and the principle of working-class leadership to the compromising interests of the national bourgeoisie. They are the path of national-democratic revolutionary advance in the epoch in which the world socialist system, the international work-

ing-class movement and the revolutionary colonial-liberation movement have become powerful enough to give the final death blow to imperialism.

The struggle between the two lines has been going on within our country also. It is covered elaborately in the National Council report on the activities of our party since the Seventh Congress. Here it would suffice to refer briefly to certain vital points of difference on which a good deal of practical experience has already been accumulated in recent years.

The vital distinction between the policies of the CPI and the CPM has been and continues to be related to the question of the class alliance that is demanded by the conditions in our country for completing the anti-imperialist, antifeudal, antimonopoly national-democratic revolution and carrying the country forward to socialism.

Our Programme adopted at the Seventh Congress, which is consistent with the understanding of the 81-parties' Statement insists that what the country needs is a very broad front, undoubtedly based on a worker-peasant alliance, but also encompassing all other democratic elements, including the 'patriotic sections of the bourgeoisie. While a sustained struggle against vacillating and compromising bourgeois elements within the alliance has to be consistently pursued, the focus of attack has to be against foreign and internal reaction. It is this class strategy that is anathema to the CPM and is reviled by it as revisionism, class collaboration, trailing behind the bourgeoisie, and what not. CPM claims to be 'irreconcilably opposed to any collaboration'; it claims to be a sworn enemy of 'revisionism'.

What are the results of the actual implementation of the CPM's ideas of fighting class collaboration and revisionism? The result has been a vicious, disruptive role in the growing left and democratic front in the country against the forces of right reaction and the monopoly rule of the Congress. The result has been a disruptive role in the working-class and peasant movements, in the trade unions and the kisan sabha.

In Bengal, during the general election, the CPM made the formation of a united left and democratic front against the Congress impossible in the name of fighting the 'revisionism' of the CPI, and the Bangla Congress, which was characterised as nothing but a variant of the India National Congress. In result, instead of one solid front facing the Congress, two fronts confronted each other, as also the Congress. There is not the remotest doubt that it was the trifurcation of the votes thus brought about that prevented the popular forces in Bengal from totally routing the Congress in the election in that state. During the election CPM also opposed our slogan of replacing the congress government by a government of left and democratic unity. It advanced the slogan of a polarisation of bourgeois and 'revisionist' forces on one side and 'the revolutionary' forces on the other.

All the same, our restraint in not falling prey to the provocative and disruptive tactics of the CPM, combined with the good sense of the people, secured a majority for both the popular fronts taken together and the united coalition ministry was formed precisely on the lines we had advocated during the election.

What did the CPM leadership do subsequently? Even after joining the ministry, it did not work for preserving and strengthening the unity of the united front for a number of months.

It pursued such a policy even though, at the same time, Indian and foreign monopoly capital, the landed interests in Bengal, the big bourgeois press, the communalists, the bureaucracy and the central government were joining hands in a powerful and sinister conspiracy to subvert the Bengal ministry by hook or by crook.

The parties and elements in a united popular front have surely the right and even the responsibility of criticising one another in a manner that strengthens the front against the common enemy. But there is nothing in common between such fraternal criticism and attacking one another in a manner that brings grist to the mill of the common enemy.

It is a welcome development that since the threat of central intervention became imminent and much more so after the dismissal of the Bengal ministry, the CPM leadership in Bengal has displayed a growing realisation of the necessity of strengthening the unity of the popular front and that a powerful unity of the masses in action has grown in Bengal in the struggle against the central government for the restoration of the illegally dismissed ministry.

The experience of Kerala is not identical with that of Bengal but there also the realisation of the need of unity has been displayed by the CPM after considerable bitter experience.

The CPM's disruptive policies in the AIRUC and the All-India Kisan Sabha are also now a matter of prolonged experience. It continues to disrupt the existing trade unions affiliated to the AIRUC and also to start rival paper unions in order to secure a dominant position in the AIRUC.

Its amazing and unabashed demand for scuttling the membership of state kisan sabhas under our leadership so that the CPM may appear as the overwhelmingly powerful force in the AIKS has precipitated a complete split in the AIKS for the first time in its history.

Such are the fruits of the CPM's struggle against 'revisionism' and against what it calls class collaboration with the bourgeoisie.

We have also differed with the CPM on the question of the relation between forms of mass struggle and the objective conditions under which one or another form of struggle becomes advisable from the point of view of building the mass movement.

It has been the consistent CPM position that our line is one of avoidance of mass struggles and, in particular, of militant mass struggles. What is the actual experience in this sphere of mass activity?

Our party has been in the thick of all major mass struggles in the various states after the CPM elements broke away from the CPI, as before. There is no instance in which the CPM can claim to have organised a more militant mass

action than those in which we have participated, either as one of the constituents or the leading constituent.

It is the habit of the CPM leadership after a particular mass struggle is over to propagandise that it could have been raised to a higher form or that a better settlement could have been brought about than what was actually done. And in all such cases, without the remotest regard for facts, it is also the practice of the CPM to foist the supposed failure on us.

Had there been any truth in this constant slander campaign, the CPM leaders should be able to point out at least one instance in which they succeeded in raising a mass struggle to a more militant form despite our resistance or failed to do so because of our opposition. This, of course, they never do, for the simple reason that no such instance is there.

On the contrary, the only instance in which the cadres of the CPM attempted to organise 'higher form' of struggle on their own, viz. the Naxalbari armed action, was repudiated by the CPM leaders themselves as adventurist and disruptionist.

Both in regard to the class composition of the united front demanded by the conditions in the country and in the sphere of mass struggles, therefore, it is the positions and policy of our party that have proved right and the positions and policy of the CPM that have proved wrong.

The united front ministry of Bengal, including as it did the Bangla Congress, was a ministry of left and democratic forces, inclusive of progressive, democratic elements of the national bourgeoisie. *Basically*, the Naxalbari armed action was wrong, not because it took to arms, but because actually it was directed even against middle and poor peasants, who were not prepared to resort to armed action in the given situation. *Tactically*, it was wrong because it is impermissible to resort to arms without the necessary mass support, which only gives a handle to reactionary forces to isolate such a struggle and come down on it with a heavy hand. In the specific situation in Bengal, it also gave a handle for reaction:

to raise a howl against the united front ministry and demand its dismissal.

It must be explicitly stated that the CPM decision to join the Bengal ministry, though a correct decision, was patently in conflict with the strategical line embodied in its programme, and the tactical line pursued by it during the elections. And its repudiation of the Naxalbari action, though again correct, was equally in conflict with the mass-struggle line it had itself preached for years and enjoined its ranks to put into practice.

The ultra-lefts in the CPM and those who have now been expelled from that party are clearly correct in putting their finger on this glaring contradiction between the precept and the practice of the CPM leadership.

The CPM leadership has recently demarcated itself from the Mao group on the question of the feasibility of armed struggle in India in extant conditions and on the evaluation of the character of the Indian government. It is taking a better attitude on the question of joint mass action with the CPI. These are helpful developments.

At the same time, it has to be noted that the emergence of the Naxalbari group within the CPM is an inevitable development of its own earlier policies and the contradiction between its declarations and practice.

How serious is the division in the CPM can be a matter of opinion. But the concrete implications and consequences of the CPM line are already a proved reality, already beyond dispute.

Such are the two results, internationally and nationally, of the two main contending lines in the international communist movement.

After the dismissal of the Bengal ministry and the drive of the congress leadership to dislodge other noncongress democratic ministries, the question about the peaceful and nonpeaceful path of transition is again raising its head.

The Peking Radio has started broadcasting that the Bengal developments have thoroughly exposed all illusions:

about peaceful transition and proved that the Indian revolutionary movement has no choice except that of armed struggle. As was to be expected, the idea has been picked up by the Naxalbari group.

Here, once again, the adventurists are completely confusing the real issue, as they always do.

The question is definitely not of debarring nonpeaceful methods under any and all conditions. That has been explained times without number.

The real question in India today is whether, under the given conditions, the path to the maximum development of the revolutionary potential of the Indian people lies through forging a broader, firmer and clearer unity of the left and democratic forces and advancing towards nationwide, mass, militant actions, or through the resort to arms by one or another sections of the popular front. That is the crux of the question which no revolutionary and no democrat has the right to evade or can be permitted to escape.

The vital lesson which developments in Bengal and the experience of other noncongress democratic ministries has taught all the left and democratic parties is that foreign and internal reaction in India is now out to suppress all left and democratic forces that defend the interests of the working class, the middle classes and the mass of the peasantry. In this the congress leadership, the Swatantra party and the Jana Sangh are united.

The Bengal ministry was dismissed precisely because it stood by the working-class and middle-class struggles (ghe-raos, etc.) in defence of popular living standards; because it stood by the peasantry in their struggle to reoccupy land from which they had been ejected; because it was determined to procure grain by a levy from the rich peasants and landlords, while exempting the poor peasants from the levy; because it attempted to punish hoarders and profiteers fattening themselves through the blackmarket.

This is a fact which the CPM, with all its obsession to concentrate fire against 'revisionism', has begun to see. This

is a fact which the SSP, with all its anticommunist prejudices, has begun to realise. This is an experience which has been driven home to large elements in the Bangla Congress and similar elements.

In fact, even the experience of the functioning of the ministries in UP and Bihar is opening the eyes of large sections of the SSP. Blind anticongressism, the theory of uniting all anticongress elements, from the extreme right to the left, is being rapidly exposed.

The position which we have consistently held, viz. that all left and democratic forces, all such parties and groups must unite against all the reactionary forces outside and inside the Congress is fast becoming the actual experience of the CPM, SSP, elements among the PSP, other left parties, and progressives in such organisations as the Bharatiya Kranti Dal, etc. Progressive congressmen will also learn the same lesson through life itself.

This is why the need and also the golden opportunity of the hour is to make the most strenuous efforts for forging a stable unity of left and democratic forces and parties, based on a clear, minimum democratic programme, for the purpose of unleashing countrywide mass actions in defence of popular living standards, in defence of parliamentary democracy and for an allout offensive against the antipeople policies of the congress rulers which are now openly supported by the Jana Sangh and Swatantra.

Active efforts to bring about such a polarisation of Indian politics in terms of organisation, a democratic programme and mass militant action is the call of the hour.

An attempt by any section of the democratic forces, in the present circumstances, to settle the issue by arms can only be provocative and disruptive and play into the hands of reaction to confuse the real issues that face our people and to suppress the democratic forces, one after another.

There is every possibility in India today, given a militant unity of left and democratic forces, based on a clear programme, to compel the congress rulers to retreat and restore

the parliamentary democratic rights and liberties of the people.

That alone is the real line of advance.

#### IV. PROBLEMS AND THE LINE OF ADVANCE

THE FACT THAT THE basic world revolutionary forces continue to assert themselves and that the fraternal parties which have abided by the common line of the Moscow Declaration and Statement have recorded notable advance gives us guiding lines for the future and the confidence that the problems ahead of us can be faced and tackled.

This, of course, does not detract from the gravity of the present world situation or the seriousness of the differences that have emerged within the communist movement after the world conference of 1960. These differences are undoubtedly the most vital factor which has exercised a negative influence on the balance of world forces.

Looking back over the developments of the last decade it has to be accepted that there was a tendency in the international communist movement, particularly after the conference of 1960, to present the future perspective of the world revolutionary movement as one of a continuous and smooth advance. While the emphasis on the shift in the balance of world forces, as also on the new opportunities and paths opened out by such a shift was correct, the contradictions and complications of the new period were either not clearly seen or were not sufficiently emphasised.

Glossing over the new difficulties, though many of them, as stated earlier, arose from the very advance of the revolutionary movement, implied that we were not forewarned of the pitfalls ahead and hence were not sufficiently prepared to meet them as they came. This explains, in part, the severity of some of the reverses as also the confusion and loss of confidence created by them.

After the attainment of national independence a number of Afro-Asian countries swept forward to the adoption of radical social reforms. This was an expression of the depth

of the revolutionary crisis in the colonial and dependent countries and the new aspirations of the oppressed peoples.

But in all these countries the earlier bureaucratic apparatus of the state either continued as before or was only partially reformed. The social composition of the defence apparatus, and specially the officer class in the armed forces, was not radically altered. Various reactionary, vested, social elements were still left intact with their traditional links with the state machinery. A corrupt, novo-rich class grew rapidly both in the bureaucracy and outside. Above all, the leading political parties and organisations in these countries were characterised by a mixed class composition and lacked the necessary clarity and experience for carrying out the new revolutionary reforms adopted by their governments.

It was inevitable that the imperialists should take advantage of such a situation, and not only of the stupendous economic difficulties with which the newly-developing countries were faced because of their inherited backwardness. It is these factors that have mainly enabled the imperialists to push forward their subversive conspiracies in these countries, to export counter-revolution.

The task of building a truly revolutionary-democratic leadership in these countries, with an organised and active mass base in the working class, the peasantry and the middle classes, and of thoroughly democratising the class composition of the state apparatus, needed more vigilance and attention than what was anticipated. The only guarantee of the successful execution of radical socio-economic reforms is a truly revolutionary, mass party and genuinely democratic state organs.

The overwhelming majority of communist parties in the world have now clearly expressed their disagreement with the policies of the Maoist leadership. But the fact remains that this demarcation has taken a long and costly period of time. It has come about only after the Maoist leadership inflicted an immense damage on the world revolutionary movement. Moreover, far from returning to the correct path, the Maoist leadership continues to move further and further

along the disastrous course it has pursued over a number of years.

This has raised a number of questions calling for serious thought, study and examination by all communist parties. The question as to why the leadership of such a great and experienced communist party, a party that was an object of unique admiration and respect all over the world, should go so wrong, still remains to be fully answered. A number of reasons and, most of all, the peasant composition of the party, have been adduced as causes. But fuller explanations are needed in the interest of the future development of the communist movement as a whole.

Above all, Chinese experience calls for a thorough examination of the causes and factors that lead to the emergence of personality cult and nationalistic and hegemonistic tendencies within the communist movement. It calls for working out norms and forms of the application of the principle of democratic centralism to the functioning of communist parties under the new conditions. The new norms, while safeguarding party unity and discipline, have to provide for maximum democratic intervention in party functioning, so that tendencies of authoritarianism and arbitrariness are rectified in time, before they cause serious harm to the aims and ideals of the movement.

A great amount of experience has been gathered in recent years on the question of combining various forms of struggle, peaceful and nonpeaceful, parliamentary and extra-parliamentary. There is a new militancy abroad among youth and various nonproletarian, middle-class elements. This is noticed not only in the countries of the 'third world', but also in advanced capitalist countries. In India new experience has been gained by the bandh movement and also in combining mass actions with parliamentary activity. At the same time, the problem of a dogmatic approach towards armed struggle continues, and has raised new complications, as in Latin America. A combination of different forms that will unleash the full revolutionary power of the new mass militancy (based on the new and more recent experiences),

while avoiding recourse to sectarian and adventurist methods, is clearly called for.

It is quite clear that, while in some countries the possibility exists of a peaceful transition to socialism, avoiding a civil war, in other countries the only way of advance is through armed struggle of one kind or another. The CPI wholeheartedly supports the heroic armed struggles being waged, apart from glorious Vietnam, in the southern areas of Africa, in many Latin-American countries as well as in parts of Asia.

The greatest lesson which emerges from the developments which have taken place after the world conference of 1960 is that however favourable the objective factors may be, revolutionary advance is not an automatic process.

Such advance necessarily calls for a firm unity of the international communist movement. It calls for constant, conscious and persistent efforts to overcome disruptive trends as soon as they appear on the scene. While every communist party is equal and independent, and is primarily responsible to the people of its own country, it has also to carry out its obligations towards the commonly accepted line of the international communist movement in the joint struggle against world imperialism, the common enemy of all. Such a responsible position by every contingent of the world communist movement alone can assure that the striking power of the movement becomes fully operative and effective. Every fissure in the world communist movement means so much more suffering and sacrifice for the toiling people in their struggle for ultimate victory.

In the epoch through which we are passing, not only the unity of the world communist movement but its solidarity with the national-liberation struggle of the peoples of Asia, Africa and Latin America is a vital condition for the abolition of imperialism and the achievement of the world revolution.

Innumerable bilateral and multilateral talks have taken place in recent years between various communist parties.

Joint conferences have been held which have adopted common statements and declarations as, for instance, the recent conference of European fraternal parties at Karlovy Vary. Such talks and agreements have been of great value. But quite a number of problems affecting the communist movement on which exchange of views and experience is necessary and would be valuable, have remained outside the scope of these conferences.

Our party has stressed the need of a world communist conference for a number of years. We adopted a formal resolution on the question at our last Party Congress and pressed our viewpoint at the consultative meeting of nineteen brother parties held in Moscow early in 1965. Our position has been, and we stand by it, that many new developments have taken place and much experience has been gained in the period that has elapsed since the Moscow conference of 1960 and that it is necessary that these are properly assessed and conclusions drawn for the further advance of the world communist movement.

Not all the problems that have emerged may be accepted for consideration on the agenda of the world conference. A number of them may be discussed among different parties participating in the conference. Even such an exchange of opinions and experience would help the drawing of conclusions which could be highly useful to the movement as a whole.

While bearing this position in view, it is clear that highest priority has to be given to the most decisive tasks of the hour, viz., reforging the unity of the international communist movement for defeating the growing aggressive activities of US imperialism and for defending world peace and the independence of nations that now stand in dire peril. Compelling the US imperialists to withdraw their aggression against Vietnam and leave the people of North and South Vietnam free to decide their own future, is the vital task to which the future of the world politics is now hinged. No other differences or problems in the world communist movement can be allowed to stand in the way of the effort

to unite all its forces for defeating the growing menace of US imperialism.

Over seventy communist and workers' parties have now gone on record that a world communist conference is urgently needed for strengthening the unity of the communist movement and rallying all socialist and democratic forces in the struggle against imperialism and for the defence of national independence and world peace.

Eighteen fraternal parties have recently come out with a joint appeal proposing the convening of a consultative meeting of brother parties at Budapest in February 1968. We are a signatory to this appeal and fully support it.

All fraternal parties should be invited to the Budapest conference. Those of them who agree to meet together for mutual consultation for strengthening the unity of the communist movement and for rallying all socialist and democratic forces in the common struggle against imperialism should meet in conference and chalk out the further line of advance.

The consultative meeting at Budapest will consider various questions pertaining to the convening of a world conference, such as its scope and agenda, the preparation of the necessary documents, procedural matters, venue, date, and so on.

The purpose of the Budapest meeting should be to secure the cooperation of all fraternal parties who stand for united action by the international communist movement in the struggle against imperialism, for peace, democracy, national liberation and socialism. All efforts have to be made for strengthening the bonds between the world socialist movement and all other forces fighting for national independence and democracy. Our party will strive its utmost to make such a conference a success.

Among the new problems relating to developments in recent years there is one concerning the newly-independent countries which affects us very intimately and on which collective deliberation by parties working in similar conditions would be of immense value for us.

In a very comprehensive way it can be referred to as the problem of completing the unfinished national-democratic revolution, the problem of the transition from national independence to socialism through the noncapitalist path of development. Certain complications of this problem have been referred to earlier. It also involves a close study of the role of various strata and sections of the national bourgeoisie in the period of transition and the flexible tactics which the party of the working class has to adopt towards these different elements during the transition.

But that is not all. The picture in such countries is complicated by a number of other features. These are countries in which the working class is numerically weak, or for other reasons has not attained the stature of the national leadership. History has not given them a prolonged duration of time for completing the anti-imperialist, antifeudal, anti-monopoly, national-democratic revolution. It has confronted them with the objective necessity of rapidly advancing from the democratic to the socialist revolution under conditions in which the first revolution itself is only partially completed.

Coming still closer to reality we find that the newly-developing countries have inherited an extremely complex social structure in which differences based on religion, race, tribe, caste, language and so on still exert a very powerful influence on mass politics. Medieval feudal loyalties and illusions also persist among vast sections of the people. This means that many social conflicts—economic, political and ideological—inherited from precapitalist social conditions, which are substantially resolved by bourgeois-democratic revolutions have to be solved by the revolutionary movement in these countries when the decisive condition of its success is an advance from the democratic to the socialist revolution.

Such social affinities and divisions, on the one hand, make the task of forging the unity of the working class and the peasantry, as *classes*, very difficult. And the forging of a broader democratic unity of all anti-imperialist classes and social strata becomes a still more complicated problem.

On the other hand, such a social composition offers the most fertile soil for various reactionary elements in the country to build up their mass influence, to inflame communal, chauvinistic, obscurantist and other disruptive and fratricidal passions among the common people and hold up the economic and political advance of the country.

As is to be expected, imperialism finds in such reactionary elements its most willing tools in its neocolonialist and subversive offensive against the newly-independent and underdeveloped countries. The imperialist offensive is not only military. A most powerful weapon of attack is economic, political and ideological penetration, all calculated, in the final analysis, to subvert the recently-achieved independence of such countries. This is precisely the danger most of them are facing today.

We, in India, are struggling to work out the democratic solutions of these complicated social problems so as to strengthen the unity of the popular masses against the opportunist and antipeople policies of the ruling bourgeoisie and the provocative and inflammatory policies of the reactionary forces.

All these and similar problems, which are correctly characterised as problems of national integration, have become an inseparable part of the basic struggle for strengthening and deepening Indian democracy and advancing towards the noncapitalist path of development.

The task of forging the unity of the working class, the peasantry and all other democratic forces against the forces of imperialism and the internal vested interests, the task of unleashing mighty and militant mass struggles, of moving forward from national independence to social liberation, and even of defending national independence from the subversive activities of the imperialists—the successful execution of all such tasks is intimately interwoven with the solution of the complicated social problems mentioned above. Every kind of communal, chauvinistic and reactionary influence which disrupts the class and democratic unity of the people



has to be thoroughly exposed and isolated if our march to national democracy and the noncapitalist path is to be saved from the danger of disruption and defeat.

As stated earlier, this is not only an Indian problem. Many newly-independent countries are also faced with similar problems. Collective efforts by all communist parties that have to grapple with the question would be of immense help to all.

It should be restated at the end that all these problems will need immense labour, patience, time and collective efforts to solve. The purpose in stating them here is not to suggest that we have their solutions which obviously we alone cannot and do not have. The purpose is to pose them so that ways and means for solving them collectively are found. These are in no sense abstract, doctrinaire or distant questions. They are problems for which theoretical and practical solutions have to be found in the interest of the further development of the communist movement. They are problems which are weighing on the minds of thousands of party activists who are in the thick of struggle and who are asking for their solutions in order to strengthen their confidence and conviction so that they may fight so much the better for the cause of communism.

It has also to be stated that the struggle for unity on the immediate and most burning historical task of the day, the task of uniting the communist and all other anti-imperialist forces of the world to defeat the growing aggressive activities of imperialism, US imperialism in particular, cannot wait for the solution of those problems. The solution of that task is, in today's situation, the key to the solution of all other problems.

The international communist movement and the world democratic forces have all the necessary resources and strength to defend world peace, defeat imperialist aggression and move forward to complete national liberation, democracy and socialism.

The world communist movement has always risen to the

occasion in the discharge of its historic responsibilities. It will not fail in the decisive period that now lies ahead. Our party has to shoulder its part of the common obligation. On the fulfilment of that task, all our energies have to be concentrated. Let us strengthen our resolve to prove worthy of the cause and the traditions of international communism.