

"Our Programme expresses its concern over the fact that in recent years India has been losing its position in Asian and African countries." (P.Sundarayya et al.: "Reply from Prison"; Calcutta; 1965; p.15)

and in the fact that, in regard to the aggression of the Indian capitalist government against the People's Republic of China (held by the leaders of the Communist Party of India (Marxist) to be "a socialist state"), they could not bring themselves to characterise the war as unjust on the side of India and just on the part of the People's Republic of China:

"While there is no question of our 'toeing the Chinese line', ...

We were not and are not prepared to give up our view that the responsibility for the Chinese offensive of October 1962 should be shared also by the Indian ruling classes." (E.M.S.Namboodiripad: "The Programme Explained"; Calcutta; 1966; p.107-8).

The essentially "centrist" stand of the revisionist leadership of the Communist Party of India (Marxist) in 1964-5 may be seen from the following:

"The decision of the Tenali Convention of our Party, held in July 1964, to exclude the discussion on the questions of international debate when we met in the all-India Party Congress came in for a good deal of criticism. ...

More than two years have passed since the Calcutta Congress of our Party... adopted a special resolution postponing the discussion on the questions concerning the international Communist movement. ...

We have not taken our stand either in support of, or in opposition to, the ideological-theoretical stand of the Chinese Communist Party. ...

The essence of the Committee's approach thus was that the open polemics within the international Communist movement.. should be stopped. ...

The crux of the difference between our Party and the Dangeites (i.e., the Communist Party of India - PB, MLOB) on the problem of Communist unity, therefore, amounts to a difference between partisanship on the one hand and earnest attempts at resolving the differences on the other." (E.M.S.Namboodiripad: "The Programme Explained"; Calcutta; 1966; p.1,4,5,6).

BELGIAN REVISIONISM

a) In the service of the alliance between Belgian monopoly capital and US monopoly capital

According to the revisionists in the leadership of the (old) Communist Party of Belgium, the state in imperialist Belgium is, in principle, the machinery of rule of the Belgium people as a whole:

"It is therefore normal to put forward the demand that the State should show itself useful in directing the economy which in fact it finances. It is normal that the country should fight in order that this State, by modifying itself democratically, should reflect in its activities the aspirations of the Belgians and the interests of the country." (E.Burnelle: Report to National Conference of the Communist Party of Belgium, December 1961, cited in: J. Grippa: "Marxisme-Leninisme et Revisionnisme"; Brussels; 1963; p 120).

However, this principle has been distorted by the influence of the big monopolies, who have been able to convert the state into, in effect,

"the dictatorship of the monopolies". (J.Blume: "Forthcoming Congress of the Communist Party of Belgium", in: "World Marxist Review", April 1960; p.62).

However, say the Belgian revisionists, measures of nationalisation (within the framework of a capitalist society) represent

"stages in the transformation of capitalist society into socialist society." (Draft Constitution of the Communist Party of Belgium, Article 1; cited in: J. Grippa: "Marxisme-Leninisme et Revisionnisme"; Brussels; 1963; p.88).

Thus, the development of state monopoly capitalism in Belgium does not represent (as Marxist-Leninists maintain) an increase in the control of the state machine by the monopolies, but is a reflection of

"the superiority demonstrated by the socialist system" (Draft Theses for the 14th Congress of the CPB, Thesis 64; cited in: J.Grippa: *ibid.*; p.88).

and of

"the growing power of the working class movement". (Draft Theses for the 14th Congress of the CPB, Thesis 3; cited in: J.Grippa: *ibid.*; p. 87).

According to the revisionists of the (old) Communist Party of Belgium therefore, Imperialist Belgium is in "a transitional stage between capitalist society and socialist society" - represented by state monopoly capitalism! Further progress towards socialism (that is, towards further measures of nationalisation) is being impeded by the influence of the monopolies, so that the Party must strive to organise a united front of all social forces whose interests are opposed to those of the big monopolies (including, that is, non-monopoly capitalists):

"The Communist Party believes that the conditions for the formation of an anti-monopolist front, combining together all the forces threatened by the power of the monopolies. It considers one of its essential tasks to be the formation of this front." (Draft Constitution of the Communist Party of Belgium, Article 1; cited in: J.Grippa; *ibid.*; p.144).

The principal aim of this united front will be

"to modify the relation of forces in the interior of the state, to modify the structures of power and transform them into means of the control of the monopolies and the reduction of their power.

This implies mass pressure continually exerted on the State and its organs." (Draft Theses for the 14th Congress of the CPB, Thesis 53; cited in: J.Grippa; *ibid.*; p.121),

in particular by means of mass lobbying of Members of Parliament,

"the method which can bring Parliament back to life" ("Drapeau Rouge", July 28th, 1962; cited in: J.Grippa; *ibid.*; p.108).

and which will bring about

"the liquidation of the divorce between Parliament and the working masses of

Belgium." (Draft Theses for the 14th Congress of the CPB, Thesis 39; cited in: J.Grippa; *ibid.*; p.109).

By these means, say the Belgian revisionists, the Belgian working class can advance to socialism peacefully, by means of "democratic structural reforms" of the political system:

"The advance to socialism...implies the realisation of a series of structural reforms which will constitute a broadening of democracy and will mark stages on the road of the transformation of capitalist society into socialist society." (Draft Constitution of the Communist Party of Belgium, Article 1; cited in: J.Grippa: *ibid.*; p.144).

"The Communist Party is working for a peaceful transition to socialism, for a revolution unaccompanied by the horrors of civil war." (E.Burnelle: "Forthcoming Congress of the Communist Party of Belgium", in: "World Marxist Review", April 1960; p.62).

In accordance with its role of servicing the interests of that section of Belgian monopoly capital which wishes to maintain collaboration with and dependence on United States imperialism, the revisionist leadership of the (old) Communist Party of Belgium presented the leaders of US imperialism as "men of peace" who should be supported and collaborated with, and opposed the campaign for the withdrawal of Belgium from NATO.

According to the revisionist leaders of the (old) Communist Party of Belgium in 1962-3,

"Kennedy represents one of the principal factors in the struggle for peace" (J.Terfve: Article in "Drapeau Rouge", September 7th, 1962, cited in: J. Grippa: "Marxisme-Leninisme et Revisionnisme"; Brussels: 1963; p.18),

so that the party had to do everything possible

"to strengthen the position of Kennedy" (J.Terfve: Article in "Drapeau Rouge", February 4-5th, 1963; cited in: J.Grippa: *ibid.*; p.19).

The Draft Theses of the Central Committee for the 14th Congress of the (old) Communist Party of Belgium in 1963 did not once denounce US imperialism even in words, while Thesis 37 declared:

"The Communist Party does not consider it yet possible to bring about the withdrawal of Belgium from NATO." (Draft Theses of the CC of the CPB, Thesis 37, cited in: J.Grippa; *ibid.*; p.19).

and a resolution of solidarity with Cuba passed by the Brussels Federal Bureau of the party on November 6th, 1962 was denounced by the Central Committee as

"contrary to the Party line." (Cited by: J.Grippa: *ibid.*; p.33-34).

b) In the service of Belgian "national" monopoly capital

Some months after the reorganisation of the Communist Party of Belgium on an "anti-revisionist" basis in December 1963, the party began to put forward the policy of building a "People's United Front", a cardinal point in the programme of which should be "the struggle for the national independence of Belgium."

This policy is not put forward in the book by Jacques Grippa, the secretary of the Central Committee of the reorganised Communist Party of Belgium, in which the struggle against the revisionist leadership of the (old) Communist Party of Belgium is described. Nor does it appear in the "Programme of Action" adopted by the reorganisation conference of the Communist Party of Belgium itself, as summarized in "Peking Review" of January 17th, 1964.

By the late spring of 1964, however, the Communist Party of Belgium had adopted the "national independence" policy, as was stated by Grippa in his speech at the Higher Party School of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of China in June 1964.

In this speech Grippa emphasises the contradictions between the imperialists of the countries dominated by US imperialism on the one hand and the US imperialists on the other:

"One of the principal aspects of the contradictions among the imperialists today is the contradiction between the different capitalist countries and US imperialism. US imperialism is still pursuing its plan of world domination which includes the political, economic and military control of other capitalist countries.

Under such conditions it is inevitable that these contradictions should surge up and grow bigger." (J.Grippa: Speech at Higher Party School of the CC of the CPC, in "Peking Review", June 26th, 1964; p.17).

He says correctly that

"it is necessary to make use of the contradictions among the imperialists within the framework of realising our own strategic aims," (J.Grippa: *ibid.*; p.17).

He goes on to say that these inter-imperialist contradictions - that is, the conflict between the need of the West European imperialists to pursue an independent course in their own interests and the opposite need of the US imperialists to control the policies of the West European imperialists in their interests - are already manifesting themselves in a struggle on the part of the West European imperialists for "national independence", for "liberation from the US yoke." In other words, he declares that the "struggle for liberation from the US yoke," is a policy which serves the interests of the West European imperialists:

"We can note that these contradictions in action are already taking on the aspect of a struggle for national independence and for liberation from the US yoke." (J.Grippa: *ibid.*; p.17).

He then goes on to say that the leadership of the reorganised Communist Party of Belgium consider that the party should, in effect, be placed at the disposal of the Belgian "national" imperialists, i.e., of that section of Belgian monopoly capital which is striving for liberation from the US yoke, and that the party should urge the working class to form an alliance with this section of Belgian monopoly capital:

"We consider that our course of action should be one of struggle for national independence, ... by forming the widest possible alliances, including even alliances with certain capitalist strata whose interests are opposed to US imperialism." (J.Grippa: *ibid.*; p.17).

Thus, within a few months of the reorganisation of the Communist Party of Belgium on an "anti-revisionist" basis, the leadership had set the party on a new revisionist course. In opposition to the revisionist leadership of the (old) Communist Party of Belgium, which had placed the party at the disposal of that section of the Belgian imperialists which favoured continued collaboration with and subservience to US imperialism, the leadership of the reorganised party had placed it at the disposal of that section of the Belgian imperialists which favoured the liberation of imperialist Belgium from the yoke of US monopoly capital.

Faced with the objections of Marxist-Leninists that this course of striving to persuade the working class to ally itself with a section of its exploiting ruling class amounted to class collaboration and social-chauvinism, the leadership of the reorganised party modified the formulation put forward by Grippa in Peking. Under this new formulation, which has been maintained since, the "Belgian" imperialists (the adjective came to be written in inverted commas) disappeared from the scene except as mere agents and puppets of US imperialism:

"The 'Belgian' financial oligarchy...had deliberately chosen...to become a bourgeoisie of banking and sub-contractors, putting its capital at the disposal of yankee finance capital and literally selling out the country to it.

Its policy of national treason manifests itself by political servitude, economic colonisation and the military occupation of the country by American imperialism." ("Balance Sheet and Perspectives of the Workers' Struggle", in: "La Voix du Peuple", May 1st 1969; p.2).

Despite the mysterious "disappearance of the "capitalist strata whose interests are opposed to US imperialism", to which Grippa referred in his 1964 speech in Peking, the leadership of the (reorganised) Communist Party of Belgium continued to speak of "the increasing contradictions between the West European imperialists and the US imperialists":

"Stalin in 'The Economic Problems of Socialism in the USSR' (1952) had already drawn attention to the importance of the sharpening of inter-imperialist contradictions, especially between the USA and the countries of Western Europe." (Letter from J.Grippa, Secretary of the CC of the CPB, to the Marxist-Leninist Organisation of Britain, June 7th, 1969).

In a memorandum to the Communist Party of Belgium dated June 17th 1969 (sent in circumstances to be recounted later in this Report), the Political Bureau of the Central Committee of the Marxist-Leninist Organisation of Britain stated:

"An essential principle of Marxism-Leninism is that the world is not static, but in process of continual change. A Marxist-Leninist analysis of the world situation must therefore not only see the world in its development, but must from time to time be brought into line with the changes that are occurring. In our view the conception you put forward of the West European imperialists as subordinate accomplices of United States imperialism is generally true for the period 1945 to c.1958. At the same time, we feel that it needs to be made clear that the policy of 'national treason' pursued by the West European imperialists during this period was in no way due to any desire on their part to liquidate their imperialist exploitation in favour of American monopoly capital, but was dictated by the post-war situation in which the weakness of the developed capitalist states of Western Europe made it necessary for their ruling classes to adopt - in defence of their own interests as imperialists - a position of dependence upon Washington.

There can, of course, be no doubt that the US imperialists have been taking advantage of this situation to penetrate the economies of Western Europe with goods and capital, and to wrest certain spheres of influence from the West European imperialists. These factors have led to the development of increasing contradictions between US imperialism and the imperialist states of Western Europe, as you say in para 1 of your proposed amendment. These increasing contradictions reflect an increasing conflict of interest between the US and West European imperialists.

But if there is an increasing conflict of interest between US imperialism and the West European imperialist states, if the interests of the West European imperialists are suffering as a result of their subordination to US imperialism, it is inevitable that they will wish to break free from this subordination in their own imperialist interests. It is also inevitable that they will endeavour to put this wish into effect; that they will endeavour to break free from US domination when favourable circumstances permit.

It seems to us, with respect, that your proposed amendment is illogical in stating that there are increasing inter-imperialist contradictions between the US imperialists and those of Western Europe (that is to say, that there is an increasing conflict of interest between them) and that the interests of the West European imperialists are suffering as a result of US domination, and yet denying by implication that the West European imperialists must therefore wish to break free from US domination and must endeavour to do so when favourable circumstances permit.

In this connection we ask you to allow us to raise a fraternal criticism of your slogan calling for 'national independence' for Belgium. In our view this slogan cannot be correct for an imperialist country such as Belgium, in conditions where this country is under the domination of another imperialist state - in this case the United States.

We realise that this slogan is presented as directed against the Belgian imperialists, in that these are described as functioning as mere managers for the US imperialists, as 'national traitors' with no interests apart from those of serving US imperialism. But we believe it is not correct to speak of the imperialists of the Western European states in this way. Such a description is, we feel, irreconcilable with the statement in para. 1 of your proposed amendment which speaks of increasing contradictions (that is to say, an increasing conflict of interest) between the US imperialists and those of Western Europe, for if the latter were mere managers for the US imperialists, with no interests apart from those of serving US imperialism, there would be no such increasing conflict of interest.

But since there is such a conflict of interest between the US imperialists and those of Western Europe, a conflict of interest which the West European imperialists cannot but try to solve by pursuing an independent course in their own imperialist interests, must it not be said that for Marxist-Leninists in a West European imperialist country to adopt the slogan of 'national independence' for that country is, in effect, to support the imperialists of that country in their contradictions with those of the US? Is not the slogan of 'national independence' in a situation where one's own imperialist country is involved in inter-imperialist contradictions with another equivalent to the slogan 'defence of the fatherland' in a more violent inter-imperialist conflict? ...

We must say, with respect but sincerely, that we believe that the slogan calling for 'national independence', while correct for a non-imperialist

country under the domination of an imperialist power, is incorrect for an imperialist country under the domination of another imperialist power, in that it has the effect not of mobilising one's working people against imperialism but of mobilising them to the support of 'one's own' imperialists in their inter-imperialist contradictions with foreign imperialists." (Memorandum of PB of CC of the MLOB to the Communist Party of Belgium June 17th, 1969).

Although pursuing this revisionist policy from 1964 to the present time, the leadership of the (reorganised) Communist Party of Belgium may be said to have entered the international camp of "centrist" revisionism only in 1967-8, when the party began to publish broadly correct analyses of Chinese "left" revisionism leading gradually to an exposure of the counter-revolutionary character of the so-called "cultural revolution" in China. By this time international "centrist" revisionism had entered the second phase of its development, so that the political positions of the CPB after 1967-8 will be discussed in the next part of the Report, which deals with this second phase of "centrist" revisionism.

REVISIONIST TENDENCIES IN THE LEADERSHIP OF THE COMMUNIST PARTY OF CHINA 1959-1966

Having established the fact that the basic policies of such parties as the Communist Party of Japan and the (reorganised) Communist Party of Belgium were revisionist and served the interest of "national" monopoly capital in the countries concerned, it is necessary to ask how these policies came to be publicly accepted as "Marxist-Leninist" by the leadership of the Communist Party of China:

"Peng Chen in his speech hailed the Japanese Communist Party as a glorious Marxist-Leninist Party, as the defender of the interests of the Japanese working class and the Japanese people. He said:

'Holding aloft the banner of opposition to US imperialism and striving for national independence, holding aloft the banner of revolution, the great and heroic Communist Party of Japan...is worthy of the name of a firm and highly militant vanguard of the proletariat.'" ("Rousing Welcome for Japanese Communist Party Delegation", in: "Peking Review", April 1st, 1966; p.7-8).

In the Report of the Central Committee of the MLOB on the Situation in the People's Republic of China of January 1968, we said that during the period 1959-1966 the leadership of the Communist Party of China was one

"with the Marxist-Leninists in the ascendancy." (Report of the Central Committee of the MLOB on the Situation in the People's Republic of China, in: "Red Front", January 1968; p.9).

We cannot know at present the details of the internal political struggles within the leadership of the Communist Party of China, but from the evidence available it would appear that it was in the late 1950s that certain leading comrades

"were forced to realise by these developments that before effective action could be taken in the direction of ousting the representatives of the capitalist class from the new-democratic state and so opening the way to socialism in China, they were compelled to wage an inner-party struggle against the revisionist faction headed by Mao tse-Tung." (ibid.; p.9).