

## RESOLUTION SUBMITTED BY KOLLA VENKAYYA TO THE ANDHRA PLENUM

[Jan, 1968]

1. The Dange clique, with the aid and abetment of the leaders of the CPSU, who are preaching and implementing modern revisionism, betrayed Marxism-Leninism and the Indian Communist movement. Basing on the writings of CPC, which is fighting modern revisionism and applying Marxism-Leninism to the conditions of the New Epoch, the Marxist-Leninists in India united and held their 7<sup>th</sup> Party Congress in Calcutta and declared to be the real heirs of the Communist Party of India (CPI). In the absence of favourable conditions for a full-fledged discussion on the ideological questions, the 7<sup>th</sup> Congress in its Declaration appealed to the Party members and sympathisers to "continue their efforts to achieve unity in the CPI by applying Marxism-Leninism in a correct way." In another resolution, the 7<sup>th</sup> Congress directed the CC to organise a fullfledged discussion on the ideological questions, and to conduct the discussions in a dispassionate manner.

The Dange group betrayed the Communist movement which has been fighting the repression and oppression of the Government. While uniting and advancing against this Dange group, the 7<sup>th</sup> Congress adopted a Programme and some other resolutions regarding tactics. After the General Elections, the CC passed "New Situation and Party's Tasks". This resolution went a step beyond the Party Programme and stipulated a political line for the Party. Either in the 7<sup>th</sup> Congress or after, the leadership of the CC did not place the ideological issues implied in the Party Programme and tactical decisions for a separate discussion. Our Party as a whole had no occasion to discuss these issues in the light of the views expressed by fraternal parties. Now the CC has prepared a draft on ideological questions and released it for inner party discussions.

2. Proletarian theory of Marxism-Leninism is the basis for the unity of the party of the working class. This is a complete and integral theory with international character. The future of the Communist Movement in our country depends on our discussions which have to be carried on, keeping in view the theories and practices and thus coming to a correct understanding. Revolutionary theory is a guide to action; practice not based on correct theoretical understanding is blind. Theory that has no relation to practice is dogma. For a very long time, we have been

discussing only some issues of controversy with the Dange group and some other national questions. We have not discussed these ideological questions which shook the entire world communist movement. Only by having a full-fledged discussion and arriving at correct understanding on these questions, will we be able to understand the correctness or otherwise of our Party Programme, our tactics and our practice. Then only our Party can get consolidated as a contingent of the international Communist movement.

3. The CC has described the draft as one of explaining “Modern revisionism as the main danger to the International movement at present” (Page 52). The CC, in the draft has openly criticised the CPC for saying that tactics of unity in action with the leaders of the Soviet Party are wrong and for its rejection in practice. In this draft the CC has described the Party Programme and the tactical line it is pursuing, as “the bedrock” of party’s Political unity and that they are unquestionable (Page.3). It describes CPC’s open criticism of these after General Elections as interference in fraternal affairs and appeals to party members to guard against any such outside interference and “jealously defend its independence and its independent political line” (Page 52). The CC in its draft declares that sectarian and dogmatic tendencies manifesting in the form of demanding rediscussion of Party Programme and political line are arising and that conducting merciless fight against these tendencies is the elementary duty of every Communist (Page.53). The CC has made these exhortations in the name of “Internationalism” and “Democratic Centralism”. But these do not create a conducive atmosphere for proper discussions.

4. The CC in its draft explains only its difference and some differing aspects with modern revisionism on ideological questions and that, too, in its own way. A great debate was conducted against modern revisionism on New Epoch and ideological matters relating to it. The CC draft accepts that “*the Chinese Communist Party has rendered yeoman service to the world working class movement and Communist movement in fighting against this menace of modern revisionism and in defence of Marxism-Leninism*” (Page.35). But along with the modern revisionist arguments on ideological questions, the CC did not straightly place the arguments of that Party which had done “yeoman service” before the Party members while discussing various other arguments. Only while making “unity in action” as a “serious point of dispute” in the ideological debate the argument of CPC was presented by the CC, that too, in its own way. This does not help ideological discussion. The arguments of modern revisionists and invaluable views of Marxist-Leninists on the ideological issues that shook the Communist movement and the views of CC on these two points must be placed before the Party members clearly and unequivocally and in such a way that the Party members can understand them all easily. Then only the Party members will be able to play their role in the ideological discussions. The CC draft does not aim at it. This is not useful for that purpose.

The task of all the Party members including the CC is to thoroughly discuss and understand the important issues connected with the working class theory

which is the basis for the unity and internationalism of the working class party and thus correct the present state of affairs; the discussion and consolidation has to be done through a Party Congress.

The CC draft is not only not useful for the purpose but also the understanding expressed in the draft on issues like Communist movement and our tasks, New Epoch and the tasks of Marxist-Leninists, fundamental contradiction, unity in action, relations among fraternal parties, is wrong and harmful. We cannot but say that the understanding expressed in the draft is close to that of the Soviet leadership and that it is confusing Party members. An analysis of the various issues will make it, clear.

### **PRESENT DAY INTERNATIONAL COMMUNIST MOVEMENT—TASKS**

With the victory of the Chinese Revolution under the leadership of the proletariat and the establishment of Peoples' Government the national liberation struggles and peoples' struggles began to surge forward like waves. The world imperialists, headed by the US imperialists, began to wage criminal last-ditch battles. Exactly at this critical juncture modern revisionism raised its ugly head in the international communist movement. The leadership of the CPSU which played an important role in the world communist movement began to propagate and implement revisionist theories. This line expressed itself in all the national liberation struggles such as Congo, Algeria, Angola, Dominican Republic, South Vietnam and Laos. It expressed itself clearly in its actions against China and Albania and their Parties and in its economic policies towards socialist countries. Marxist-Leninists are combating Soviet leaders' propaganda of war being not fatalistically inevitable and their denouncing of national liberation movements. The revisionists in capitalist countries are carrying in line of the Soviet leaders and supporting their collaboration with the US imperialists and their unity with reactionaries and all such things openly. Consequently the communist movement has to face many difficulties. Unless the Marxist-Leninists fight the treacherous theories and betrayal of the Soviet leadership, they cannot advance even a single step forward. The Communist Party of China under the leadership of Com. Mao Tse-tung prepared a General Line concerning the world Communist Movement and placed it before the CPSU and the international Communist movement on June 14, 1963. The CPC in its General Line warned against making no distinction between enemies, friends and ourselves and leaving the fate of humanity to collaboration with the US imperialists. They made it clear in the General Line that those who denounce the national liberation movements are fully defending the monopoly capital and that the World Socialist Revolution depends on the outcome of national liberation struggles. They further clarified that the attitude towards these struggles "is an important criterion for differentiating those who want revolution from those who do not, and those who are truly defending world peace from those who are abetting the forces of aggression and war." The preparation of this document is a historic event in the world Communist movement. It is a call for the international Communist movement to discharge its historic

responsibility towards the national liberation struggles and for principled unity in the international Communist movement. The Communists rose to the call. The Soviet leadership in its open letter rejected it as a "slander" and as an easy way of winning popularity among the people of Asia, Africa and Latin America. Continuing these controversies the Soviet leadership began to split and disrupt the anti-Imperialist struggles, socialist camp, movement and the Communist Parties.

Marxist-Leninists of all countries under the leadership of the CPC surmounting the difficulties, are united by combating the class collaborationist theories, policies and betrayal of the leadership of the CPSU and began to discharge their historic responsibilities towards national liberation movements and people's movements. Wherever the Marxist-Leninists were united and waged struggle against modern revisionism, in those countries they achieved spectacular victories. Among national liberation struggles that are overcoming the revisionist betrayal and advancing forward, the Vietnam struggle is a turning point. The daily expanding national liberation struggles and people's struggles in Asia, Africa, and Latin America are creating terror among the American imperialists and reactionaries who were already horrified with the Vietnamese struggle. Modern revisionism is in a hopeless position to save them. This is a heartening and encouraging situation for all the Marxist-Leninists in the world.

So far the leadership of the CC has made no effort to make our Party a partner in the great international ideological struggle of the world Marxist-Leninists against modern revisionism and make our Party join its hands with the national liberation movements. The leadership of the CC did not give importance to the ideological issues which are shaking the international Communist movement.

What is it that the leadership of the CC and their draft tell about the favourable conditions created by the struggle against modern revisionism conducted by the world Marxist-Leninists? The central leadership and the Central Committee are not happy over the present favourable situation.

The CC in its draft says that "*the world Communist Movement is sharply divided, its unity disrupted and it is plunged into a serious crisis.*" The CC did not refer to the date and time of the crisis they imagine. When compared to the situation existing before the 1964 Calcutta Congress did the Indian Communist movement go forward or backward? When compared to the situation existing before the CPC's proposal concerning the general line of June 14, 1963, did the international Communist movement achieve unity and development of the Marxist-Leninists or not?

Whether the unity of that day has got distracted; is in a crisis? And is it going backward? It is not proper to confuse the Party, taking into consideration only the propaganda launched by the reactionaries and revisionists and the presents day difficulties. The document of the CC hides the fact that the present situation is far better than that of past four years or even ten years. In spite of revisionist betrayal Vietnam is advancing, three fourths of Laos and 60 per cent of Burma

are already liberated. The national liberation struggles are expanding throughout all the backward countries. They have spread to Thailand, Malaysia, Phillippines, Bolivia and such other countries. The national liberation forces in Indonesia have overcome the fascist terror and are advancing inspite of the propaganda regarding its total collapse. In this connection the initiative shown by the Marxist-Leninists in mobilising the national liberation forces is commendable. The CC's presentation of this situation as a "sad state of affairs," whatever the reasons may be, is not true to the reality. The CC's presentation of the present situation as "*a crisis that has virtually paralysed the initiative of the world Communist forces in successfully resisting and rebuffing the offensive let loose by the world imperialists,*" (P.9) is nothing but denying the unity and victories achieved so far by the Marxist-Leninists and the national liberation struggles all over the world under the leadership of the CPC. The CC in its draft, while believing that "*modern revisionism had been and does still remain the main danger to the World Communist movement*" also emphasises that "*there have been certain dogmatic manifestations in individual parties and on individual propositions, precepts and actions*" (p.9).

The draft clearly says that the modern revisionist theories as advocated and practised by the leadership of the CPSU are "*the main cause for this sad state of affairs.*" But what are the dogmatic manifestations in individual parties and on individual propositions and precepts and actions? How and in which parties do they express themselves? Are they the causes for the "sad state of affairs" though secondarily? How far do they contribute to present conditions? Is there any difference between those modern revisionist theories which are the "main cause" for the "present situation" and the modern revisionism represented by the Soviet leadership? The CC draft does not answer these questions in a straight forward way. The CC makes it clear that "*the consolidation and further rapid advance of the world Communist movement is inconceivable without waging a principled and determined fight against this menace of revisionism in all its manifestations and conducting sustained struggle in defence of Marxism-Leninism and the principled unity of the International Communist Movement*" (P.9)

The principled struggle against modern revisionism is meant by the CC only as a theoretical struggle against modern revisionism. By "principle unity" in the international communist movement is meant only the unity achieved in the theoretical struggle against modern revisionism. Modern revisionism, and its representatives, Soviet leadership, beginning with the ideological betrayal went to the extent of betrayal in practice, beginning with the political betrayal went to the extent of betrayal in organisational matters and travelled further and further along this line. The CC draft insists that only an ideological struggle has to be conducted against this line and that only is the 'principled' line. But, whatever the reasons, may be, the CC's insistence is not recognising the danger of modern revisionism at the present stage. This method of struggle will be one of hiding the danger and betrayal of modern revisionism. That is why Marxist-Leninists

under the leadership of CPC declared that the struggle for fulfilling the tasks in the New Epoch and struggle against modern revisionism should be conducted through to the end.

The modern revisionists are continuing their conspiracies to split and disrupt the world communist movement and the Soviet camp. Marxist-Leninists are uniting against this and discharging their historical responsibilities. The effect of this struggle is seen on the Party members and people in the countries under influence of Soviet revisionist leadership. They are coming forward as against the Soviet revisionist leadership and other revisionist leading cliques. In the present circumstances, in the name of 'principled struggle' to limit struggle against modern revisionism only to a theoretical one does not help either national liberation struggles or the Parties and the people in the socialist countries under the leadership of Soviet revisionists, but only harms them. In the name of 'principle unity' to make the Marxist-Leninists confine only to theoretical struggle does not help the parties and the people in the socialist countries under the leadership of the Soviet revisionists to come out of the revisionists' grip, but only hinders this process.

It should not be forgotten that the majority of the people and the Party members in the socialist countries under the influence of the Soviet leadership, believe in Marxism-Leninism. Modern revisionism is the main obstacle for their coming forward. Modern revisionism will use all in its capacity to see that they do not come out of it. In the name of 'principled unity', reducing the struggle against revisionism only to an ideological struggle, establishing contacts with the revisionist leaders in the socialist countries will harm the interests of not only the people and the parties of those countries, but also the interests of the world communist movement, national liberation struggles and other revolutionary struggles. This makes no distinction between the Marxist-Leninist Parties and the revisionist parties.

"Principled ideological struggle" against modern revisionism and principled "struggle for unity" with modern revisionism- this is the line the CC Draft expresses. By virtue of the position the modern revisionists occupy in the Socialist camp, the line of the CC boils down to ideological struggle against and unity in practice with the modern revisionists, i.e., the line of struggle and unity regarding modern revisionism.

Whatever high-sounding words like "determined fight" against modern revisionism "in all its manifestations" the draft may express, such a line will make the struggle against revisionism nominal and unity with it real. This line will lead to making no distinction between revisionists and Communists and confuse the fighting people.

This line is against the teachings of great Marxist-Leninists that the contradiction between Marxism-Leninism and modern revisionism is an antagonistic one and by waging struggle against modern revisionism, Communists are discharging their historical responsibilities.

## NEW EPOCH: TASKS OF MARXIST-LENINISTS

In the face of distortion of the New Epoch by the Soviet leadership, their policy of confusing the world communist movement and national liberation struggles and pursuing the policy of class collaboration, the CPC with its invaluable experience came forward to resist the line. The CPC prepared the general line and placed it before the CPSU and the world communist movement on June 14<sup>th</sup>, 1963. Various parties discussed this general line.

Rejecting the CPC's proposal concerning the General Line, the CPSU expressed certain ideas in its open letter. The Soviet leadership expressed in its open letter that the changes brought all over the world in the New Epoch, "*changes in the balance of forces, new opportunities for the movement.*" (p.18) brought to fore, the "*problems of strategy and tactics of the world working class movement and national liberation movement*". It also declared that its own general line was the solution for all these problems.

The C.C. draft does not clearly express its opinion on the "*new opportunities*" preached by the modern revisionists. It does not explain their concrete manifestations. Rejecting the CPC's arguments, the Soviet leaders in their open letter said that it was meaningless to reject completely the method of negotiations and agreements as a solution for problems arising inevitably out of the relations among countries. They also said that if this method of solution was rejected, then wars would never come to an end (P.30). The C.C. does not clinch whether this is the way of avoiding wars between the two systems. The C.C. only says that the "*co-operation and collaboration aspect is being thrust to the forefront by the Soviet leadership*" (p.33). The Soviet leadership in its open letter expressed that it is a matter of the C.P.C.'s belief, not to believe imperialists in any affair and that they would certainly deceive but, it was a "matter of reasonable estimations" (p.30). Only according to this, the open letter said, that the "U.S. stick to its word in Cuba" and that they were "fulfilling their promises". In this open letter, the Soviet leadership talked of "new opportunities." But what is the understanding of our CC on these "new opportunities"? What does the draft explain? The C.C. draft warns that if "one were to proceed on several possibilities of averting war and establishing durable peace, and on that basis weave out theories and workout tactics, one is bound to end in grief" (P.17). The draft says that "*there were powerful imperialist forces with economic political and military resources*" and that the Marxist-Leninists should base themselves on these "realities" (p.17). But the C.C. does not specify the "several opportunities" which are imagined by it.

The C.P.C. explained that the New Epoch created opportunities for the national liberation movements and peoples' struggles. The C.C. draft does not say where it differs from the C.P.C.'s argument. The draft does not explain why the Soviet leadership, which "came to reasonable estimations was keeping its promises to the W.S" and whether what the C.P.C. said was only a matter of its own belief? Or is it a theory based on relations of the New Epoch and which is necessary for the present stage? The C.C. draft refuses to say this. If the C.P.C. is not able to see

the "new opportunities" which the C.C. imagines, atleast that should have been clearly stated. The C.C. does not express its opinion regarding the responsibilities of Marxist-Leninists towards the national liberation struggles which play a special role as against the war schemes of imperialists and for the advance of the world socialist movement at the present stage.

#### DEFINITION OF NEW EPOCH

The C.C. draft says that *"the definition of the New Epoch should not be based on utopian formulae, subjectively drawn"* (p.8). According to their own definition of the new Epoch, the CC draft defines the *"forces of revolution"* as *"the countries that have already come under the socialist system, the proletarian revolutionary movements in the advanced capitalist countries, the national liberation movements, and forces in the newly liberated and colonial countries, of the widespread popular movements against war and in defence of world peace"* at present (p.8). The C.C. draft does not clearly say whether the Indian Government is one among the forces in the newly liberated countries. The Soviet leadership places the Indian Government in the anti-imperialist peace zone and is propagating it. The leadership of our Party is preaching that the Indian Government did not join its hands with imperialism. Whatever may be the difference between both the estimations, the C.C. draft does not say whether the Indian Government is one in the list of these "forces of revolution". The C.C. does not clarify whether the Soviet leadership, representing modern revisionism, is one among the forces of revolution. It only says that imperialism can be defeated if these forces of revolution could stand united.

Modern revisionists reject the special role of national liberation struggles in the New Epoch and in the present stage in thwarting the war schemes of imperialists and in accomplishment of Socialist revolution. Marxist-Leninists chalk out their tasks by having this special role in their view. This is precisely the difference between the Marxist-Leninists and modern revisionists. It is precisely from here that the modern revisionists, betrayal and splitting activities start. The C.C. draft sidetracks this. The C.C. draft preaches *"a revolutionary combination of socialist diplomacy, calculated to isolate the most reactionary imperialist groups with the use of the armed might of the socialist camp,"* when the imperialists resort to aggression and bloodshed (p.9). The socialist countries under the influence of the Soviet revisionist leadership are using their diplomatic relations for improving friendly relations with U.S. imperialism, which has become the main enemy of the people of the world, and with those reactionary groups in those countries where the national liberation movements are advancing. This is clear to every student of politics. The leadership of the C.C. is not unaware of the Soviet propaganda that the C.P.C. is attempting to force the Soviet and U.S. into a war, that the U.S. imperialists had shifted their military concentration from Europe to Asia and their conspiracies of encirclement of Chinese People's Republic and that the Soviet revisionist leadership is provoking border clashes with China mobilising their armies to the Chinese borders. What does it mean when the C.C.



Draft hides these facts and preaches the revolutionary combination of socialist diplomacy with the armed might of the socialist camp? The C.C. Draft says that the unity of the revolutionary forces should be one that can defeat the imperialists and that "unity in which the ruling parties of the socialist countries render all forms of aid" against imperialist aggression and intervention (p.9). But it is well known that the obstacle to this unity is modern revisionism and the Soviet leadership which represents it.

The Soviet leadership joining hands with the enemies of the world people, U.S. imperialists and all reactionaries, and utilising the U.N. for diplomatic relations betrayed the people of Congo, Dominican Republic, Vietnam and Arab countries. The history of present day struggles has proved that the struggles conducted in alliance with modern revisionists could not strike and defeat imperialists. What does it mean, when the C.C. draft preaches for such unity in which the parties under the influence of Soviet revisionist leadership also could give all forms of aid?

The Soviet revisionist leadership also expressed the same thing, of course, in different words. The Soviet revisionist leadership rejecting the C.P.C.'s proposal concerning the General Line said in its open letter as follows: "*Today, the world revolution advances in the form of consolidation of the socialist camp, proletarian revolutionary struggles against capitalist countries, continued national liberation struggles, strengthening of economic and political independence of newly liberated countries in Asia, Africa and Latin America in opposition to aggressive schemes, people's struggles against monopoly capitalists etc. One should not be counterposed against the other. All should be directed towards a single aim-elimination of imperialist rule*". The open letter criticised the CPC for its alleged counterposing of national liberation struggles to others. It also criticised the CPC for believing in national liberation struggles as the decisive force in the New Epoch. The open letter theorised that, among the anti-imperialist revolutionary forces, it is the international working class and its creation, the world socialist camp, that could play the decisive role (p.53). The meaning is very clear; they want to subject and subordinate the national liberation struggles to their strategy and tactics. This is precisely the controversy in the world communist movement. The open letter of the CPSU saying that "*it is the struggle for averting nuclear war which is crucial among the tasks facing the anti-imperialist forces,*" counterposed this to others and revealed its plan for unity with reactionaries and collaboration with the U.S. They have regarded the Indian Government as a "revolutionary force" fighting imperialism and tried to pit it against the Chinese People's Republic. It is helping by all means and befriending the reactionaries in backward countries. This is precisely the controversy regarding the New Epoch. Then, which is anti-imperialist and which is not? In the name of "averting nuclear war" and directing all struggles as against imperialism, is it correct to subordinate the national liberation struggles and thus water them down? Or is it correct by surmounting all obstacles to continue national liberation struggles which play a decisively role in thwarting imperialist

war machinations and in advancing the world socialist revolution? The C.C. has thought it irk-some to express its opinion clearly in the draft over this controversial issue. The C.C. Draft stands away from this controversy. The Soviet leadership in its open letter explained away the national liberation struggle according to their own strategy.

It said: *"Marxist-Leninists always emphasise this great significance of national liberation movements and its feature. If it wants to achieve proper victories, it should have firm friendship and cooperation with the world socialist system which is the main force in the anti-imperialist struggle"* (p.56).

In his report of 15<sup>th</sup> February, 1964, on *"struggle for solidarity of the world communist movement,"* Suslov said, *"unity of the revolutionary forces is the basis for victory in the anti-imperialist struggle"* (p.37)

He proposed that in order to combat imperialist aggression, socialist countries extend their political and diplomatic aid in their full capacity, to the newly liberated countries (Ibid P.38).

There is no difference between the Soviet leaders' proposal of "firm friendship" and the C.C.'s draft explanation of the "unity of revolutionary forces". There is no difference between the "political and diplomatic aid", preached and implemented by Suslov and "Combination of socialist diplomacy with the use of armed might." The difference is only in words. The C.C. draft refuses to raise the question, whether the national liberation struggles have any special role to play in defeating the imperialist war plans.

Marxist-Leninists note that in the New Epoch and at the present stage the national liberation struggles have got a special role to play in thwarting the imperialist war plans, in defeating their strategy and in achieving the world socialist revolution. Only the modern revisionists reject this. What does it mean when the CC draft bypasses these struggles which have special significance and preaches such unity to defeat the imperialists? The CC is counterposing the "revolutionary forces" which it imagines and their "unity" to the national liberation struggles which have special significance at the present stage. This is nothing but rejecting the role played by the Korean war, Vietnam struggle and other national liberation struggles in defeating the imperialist war plans. The draft intends indirectly to tell that the national liberation struggles against U.S. imperialism have no special significance and they cannot achieve victories till such "unity" is achieved through skilful methods preached by them. The father of modern revisionism, Khrushchov, vainly attempted threaten about the fate of the Vietnamese struggle if he gave it up. His heirs tried to force a compromise with the U.S. imperialists by showing the difficulties which might arise if they would not combine their forces with it. The leadership of the CC and the CC draft do not have such confidence in the national liberation struggles as in the military might and diplomatic strength of modern revisionists.

The draft has more confidence in the unity in which the parties under the revisionist leadership could render all help against imperialism rather than anti-

imperialist struggles. The draft formulated that the struggle *"for unity against imperialism is inseparable from the struggle against modern revisionism"* (p.9) The meaning is very clear. The CC thinks that the struggle against modern revisionism should be such in which the ruling parties in the socialist camp could render all forms of practical aid, including direct military, intervention to the anti-imperialist struggles. The CC's idea is that during Marxist-Leninists struggle against modern revisionism and the revisionist leadership of the ruling parties in the socialist camp, it should be seen that those parties would not withhold their help to the anti-imperialist struggles. The CC rejects to note that the very struggle against revisionism would help the parties to overcome these respective revisionist leaderships and help to discharge their respective duties and achieve unity.

Modern revisionism and the Soviet revisionist leadership stand at the helm of the socialist countries and parties under its leadership. Thus it also becomes part of the "forces of revolution", defined by the draft. The Soviet leadership is tied up with Indian Government and such other reactionary forces. What does it mean when the CC draft links the struggle for unity "in which the Soviet leadership and the parties in the socialist countries under its leadership would not withhold practical and military aid to the anti-imperialist struggles" with the struggle against modern revisionism? Is it not conducting the struggle against modern revisionism in a way subjected to and subordinated to the acceptance of the Soviet leadership, so that it may not withhold its help to these struggles? Is it not subjecting and subordinating the struggle against revisionism to the acceptance of the Soviet leadership which rejects the special role of the national liberation struggles, and vainly tries to disrupt them by all means? This is nothing but subordinating the struggle against revisionism to the whims and fancies of modern revisionists in the name of unity. The CC may think that this "unity" is possible if the struggle against revisionism is carried out as a "principled" ideological struggle. It may also think that it is a revolutionary skill." But all this leads to unity with revisionism and the betrayal of national liberation struggles.

In this connection it is necessary to remember some of Lenin's formulations. He warned us in his book *"Imperialism, the Highest Stage of Capitalism"* as follows: *"If the struggle against imperialism is not made inseparable from that against opportunism it is bogus and humbug. They are the most dangerous who refuse to understand this."*

The great Lenin's warning is invaluable; precisely by having this warning in their views, Marxist-Leninists are carrying the national liberation struggles by linking them with struggle against modern revisionism, and achieved great victories. The Soviet leadership called its attempt for unity with the reactionary forces and such other heterogeneous forces as a struggle for unity. What is meant by struggle for unity? The CC draft decides to combine the struggle for unity with the struggle against revisionism. This is against the great Lenin's method and makes the anti-revisionist struggle nominal and waters down the national liberation struggles.

If we notice the CC draft's criticism of modern revisionism in the context of the New Epoch, we can understand what sort of struggle it preaches. The draft's understanding of modern revisionism is that it underplays certain salient features of the Epoch, while exaggerating certain other aspects and paints a period of more or less peaceful transition to socialism has set in (p.7). The CC thinks that it is due to erroneous ideas that the revisionists hide the fact that the rule of monopoly capital is still continuing in the advanced capitalist countries, that militarisation is growing in those countries, that "modern revisionism builds a dreamland in which imperialism has ceased to be one which has to be annihilated?" And the C.C. concludes that with these dreams modern revisionism is disrupting unity and undermining the national liberation struggles. Such are the mistakes of revisionism according to the C.C. So it can be clearly said that the understanding of the draft regarding the New Epoch and the responsibilities of Marxist-Leninists in this Epoch is not only mistaken but is close to the understanding of the Soviet revisionists.

### MODERN REVISIONISM: C.C'S ESTIMATION

The revisionist theories of "peaceful co-existence", "peaceful economic competition", and "peaceful transition" started by the Soviet leadership in the 20<sup>th</sup> Congress were developed and are being implemented as a political and organisational line. What does the CC draft tell us about this? It describes that the trio "with every passing day are being rendered in to a fully worked out line of class conciliation and collaboration on a global plane" (p.33). This is what the C.C. tells about international and class collaboration policies of Soviet revisionist leadership. The draft may delight itself that it has satisfied the Party members by saying that it has described the Soviet revisionist policy as being rendered into a fully worked out class collaborationist party. But it is not "by each passing day", that it becomes "fully worked out line of class conciliation and collaboration on a global scale". It would have been good if the CC explained how many days should be passed for it to become a fully worked out line? This is not the straight and unequivocal method of expressing its opinions to party members by the CC.

By hiding things it may have some temporary advantages, but it does harm to the movement rather than contributing to it. The CC tells in a roundabout way that the class collaborationist policy of the Soviet leadership which represents modern revisionism is only being rendered into a fully worked out line with every passing day and that it is not a fully worked out line as yet. These are against realities. It is impossible to hide the fact that the Soviet leadership is conniving with the US imperialists and helping them at every step in their conspiracies regarding Congo, Vietnam, West Asia, monopoly of nuclear arms, isolating China and all other international issues. The CC only intends to create an opinion that the policy of the Soviet leadership which represents modern revisionism is not a fully worked out line of class collaboration as yet.

In this connection one more important aspect must be studied. The CC Draft says that "the Soviet leadership is seeking to relegate the struggle against the

imperialists to a secondary position,” and thrusting cooperation with the US imperialists to the forefront (p.33). The CC describes their line as a bankrupt revisionist line. “Cooperation and collaboration” with the imperialists, particularly the US imperialists, the main enemy of the world, is unthinkable for the communist world even as a secondary one. Negotiations over controversial issues and compromises that are useful for the revolutionary movement are different things. It is impossible to hide the fact that the Soviet revisionist leadership has become a complete ally of US imperialism. This is the understanding of the Marxist-Leninists. To reject this the CC Draft adopts another roundabout way. It tells us that according to its criticism, the Soviet Union has not become an ally of US imperialism. The CC Draft is utilising the name of the Soviet Union to help the betrayal of the leadership in the same way as the Soviet leadership tries to cover up its betrayal by utilising the name of the Soviet Union. The imperialists in their pursuit for world domination are trying to isolate the Chinese Peoples’ Republic which stands in their way, are building up military encirclement around China, trying to suppress the national liberation struggles and disrupt the Socialist world. The Soviet leadership also is conniving with the US imperialists and other reactionaries and has concentrated against China. What else is this if not for sharing the domination of the world? And the CC Draft clearly tells that their criticism does in no way imply that the Soviet Union is working for sharing world hegemony with US imperialism. And thus the CC’s Draft rejects to accept the betrayal of the Soviet leadership and obstructs those who fight it. The draft propagates that the acceptance of this is tantamount to placing the Soviet Union outside the Socialist camp. This is clearly giving a place to the Soviet leadership in a roundabout way. The Soviet leadership is conniving with U.S. imperialism for sharing world hegemony on the one side and is taking quick steps to restore capitalism on the other, in order to strengthen its own base. Thus the Soviet leaders are trying to remove the Soviet Union from out of the Socialist camp. The world Marxist-Leninists are discharging their international responsibilities by exposing this before the Soviet people and the Soviet Party. The leadership of our Party and the CC Draft are standing in their way by trying to cover up the betrayal. For this they are using the name of the Soviet Union. There can be no worse anti-internationalism than this.

Only with this understanding the CC Draft tells us that the policies of the Soviet leadership are “right opportunist policies”, that the aggressive activities of the imperialists will grow in future and that peoples’ movements will be damaged. It means, according to the draft, that the policy of the Soviet leadership has not yet become a fully worked out class collaborationist policy, that they are only poisonous ideas and that these revisionist ideas cause serious damage to the world communist movement. Thus it bypasses the real issues, while stating that they accept the role played by the CPC in the struggle for the advancement of the working class and the communist movement. The Draft hides the fact that it has rejected the essence of the CPC’s line. The CC might have

thought that since the struggle chalked out by the Draft is confined only to the ideological struggle, it automatically becomes a criticism against the Chinese Party. Now let us analyse the various aspects.

### ON THE ISSUE OF FUNDAMENTAL CONTRADICTIONS

It has to be said that the CC has erred in its analysis of this issue. The general line of the international communist movement should be based on the sum total of the actual conditions and on the analysis of the fundamental contradictions in the contemporary world. Otherwise, besides being of no help to the world Socialist revolution and the world Communist movement it will harm them. It is here that Marxism-Leninism and alien ideologies struggle and this is not just a difference in words.

Is the general line preached by the Soviet leadership based on the analysis of the fundamental contradictions or not? Are the ideas propagated in this context correct or not? What is their end result? What is the Marxist-Leninist understanding? Presently these are the important issues in debate. The General Line proposed by the CPC has examined all these issues and shown the way.

The CC Draft has said that the Soviet leadership accepts the fundamental contradictions; but accepting the fundamental contradiction in words is not enough. They have to be understood from the class point of view. Whether the Soviet leadership is doing it this way or not is the real issue. The CC Draft has not intended to clearly state its stand on this issue. It has reduced the dispute to be one of a minor issue. It gives out that in treating the contradiction between the socialist camp and the imperialist camp as "almost the only contradiction," by the advocacy of "pet methods" for the solution of all the fundamental contradictions (p.10), modern revisionists are covering up the class essence of the contradiction between the camps of imperialism and socialism. They refuse that there is no difference between this contradiction and the one between socialist and imperialist Governments. This is an important issue under dispute. The CC has not at all touched upon this.

The CPC from a class analysis of the fundamental contradictions has given the slogan of broad UF with the Socialist countries and the international working class as its core against imperialism and reactionaries headed by US imperialism. At a time when the US imperialists are subjecting the intermediate zone between the Socialist camp and US imperialism to aggression and grabbing, the CPC had made it clear that the international working class should utilise inter-imperialist contradictions for "uniting all forces that can be united." It laid down that cooperation and collaboration with US imperialism is wrong. The General Line proposed by the CPC explained the contradictions and pointed that these national liberation struggles play a decisive role in the present stage in blowing up the war plans of imperialism and in achieving world socialism.

The Soviet leadership has rejected all these points. The Soviet leadership, while cooperating with US imperialism, ridiculed the Chinese Government for its relations with France and with Pakistan, which were maintained with a view

to utilising the inter-imperialist contradictions. It argued that to ask them, not to maintain relations with the US is ill-intended. In the name of "anti-imperialist peace front", the Soviet leadership, enlisting Indian Government and such other reactionary forces in it, has been giving all sorts of aid to them as against national liberation movements. It reveals its real face, when besides lending aid to the Suharto regime, the Soviet Ambassador lavishes praises on it. The Soviet leadership paints the national liberation movements as of regional significance. The C.C Draft has refused to state its opinions either on these disputed aspects or on the class content of contradictions, on the question of which is its principal aspect, and on the related intermediate zone and the attitude towards the national liberation movements. The CC Draft is not prepared to go deep into these important points of dispute.

The CC Draft has said that Marxist-Leninists understand that the contradiction between imperialism and oppressed nations has got accentuated and assumed the acutest form culminating in the outburst of national liberation movements and that it is "influencing the course of all other contradictions" and that it has become "the focus of all contradictions" (P.9). This may be their understanding, but not the understanding of the Marxist-Leninists. Marxist-Leninists understand that the contradiction between imperialism and oppressed nations is the principal contradiction for this entire stage that the various types of contradictions in the contemporary world are concentrated in the vast areas of Asia, Africa and Latin America that this principal contradiction leads to a surge of national liberation struggles. When they are unable to dispute this, it is incorrect to attribute their understanding to Marxist-Leninists. To understand well what the C.C thinks about the fundamental contradiction, one has to examine the CC resolution on "New Situation and Party's Tasks." Narrating the national liberation struggles in the period primarily before 1950, it included Vietnam with them, saying that a "glance at the continents of Asia, Africa and Latin America would convince anybody how powerful national liberation struggles have become a pronounced feature of our time" (p.10). The CC resolution then concluded that this contradiction got intensified, surmounting the dangled imperialist economic aid (P.11-12). The CC resolution has described that "a concrete study of international developments during this decade would more clearly reveal" that this contradiction "has assumed a particularly acute and sharp character" (p.13). The CC resolution has concluded that "at the present stage of international developments, Vietnam has become such a focal point of all world contradictions: (p.13). This means that Vietnam has become the focal point of world contradictions, while the principal contradiction has got accentuated. This is not how the Marxist-Leninists all over the world understand. They understand that the vast areas of Asia, Africa and Latin America constitute the focal point of all the contradictions. It is true that Vietnam has become a crucial one in the national liberation struggles. Its specific significance lies precisely in the fact that it withstood the betrayal of modern revisionism.

The method which the CC has adopted to study the fundamental contradictions is not the correct one. It is not studying the real situation. It is only the interpretation of their view, in terms of class contradictions. This would be more clear if we see one more aspect. The April resolution has said that "*the central theatre where all the fundamental contradictions and conflicts are sharply focussed, has now shifted from Europe, where they were concentrated in the first post-war decade, to Asia today*" (p.14). While saying that it has led to the change in the theatre of military activities, the CC Draft explained at length- the Chinese revolution and national liberation struggles and in addition to these "*the Soviet Union has proved itself to be more than a match to the US in the defence and military sphere*", "*the European People's Democracies had put their states fairly on the road to Socialism and Communism*", and "*the NATO military alliance countered by the Warsaw Defence Pact under the Soviet leadership*"- all these as reasons for the change. Will American imperialism leave Europe to forces which have surpassed its own military strength and shift its military target to Asia just because China has become a hard nut to them? Is this the reality? This simple doubt of a layman did not strike the CC. The CC is not bothered about as to which contradiction led American imperialism to shift its target. Do they mean to say that American has shifted its target only in accordance with the principal contradiction and that the Soviet leadership in the world and the Chinese Government in Asia have become hurdles to American imperialism? The way that the CC studies the fundamental contradictions itself is wrong. The study of the fundamental contradictions should be as to decide a general line and policy but not to defend our own understanding in their name. This erroneous understanding does manifest in the CC Draft. The soviet leadership has spread certain wrong ideas in support of its policies. They have begun to remove the class content of the contradiction between imperialism and the Socialist camp and to differentiate this with the contradiction between the imperialist Governments and the Socialist Governments to reject the other fundamental contradictions and propagate that the contradiction between different social systems will get resolved through "*peaceful economic competition, and that the contradiction between the proletariat and the capitalists and that the contradiction between the oppressed nations and imperialists will get resolved without revolution*". The CPC in its General line has warned that these erroneous ideas would inevitably lead to wrong and dangerous policies (p.9).

The CC Draft says, "this totally undialectical understanding, study and assessment of the contradictions has landed the revisionists in opportunist mistakes". This is nothing but interpreting the deeds of the modern revisionists in an inverted way. The Soviet leadership did not formulate its general line with a class understanding of the fundamental contradictions. They have formulated it from their own thinking. And now to defend it, they have been circulating certain wrong notions about contradictions. The history of the Communist movement has proved that erroneous ideas lead to dangerous policies. The revisionist



mistakes pointed out by the CC Draft are only some of the wrong ideas that they are propagating. The C.C. Draft does not mention in all these the key point, which discards the class content of the contradiction between different social systems. Did the "mistakes" pointed out by the draft lead to the dangerous policies, or not? How will the undialectical understanding lead to "mistakes"? The CC does not answer these questions. This would mean supporting the general line of the Soviet leadership, while saying that it is wrong "in principle" on the question of contradictions. Its attitude in the study of contradictions is clear from its evasion to touch upon the intermediate zone and the responsibilities to be discharged towards the national liberation movements.

This will be more clear if we examine the understanding of the CC regarding the class contradictions in India.

India is a backward country. It remained under the direct rule of the imperialists till 1947. The big bourgeoisie compromised with imperialism and since 1947 is wielding state power. This situation would not eliminate the contradiction between imperialism and the Indian nation as a whole and between imperialism and the national bourgeoisie, as well. It is accepted by one and all that as the crisis deepens, this contradiction is getting intensified.

The CC which said that the economic crisis in the country has been projecting itself into a political crisis and that the contradiction between the Government and the people gets accentuated in its resolution on "*The New Situation and the Party's Tasks*" of April 1967, also stated as follows:

*"At the same time, fissures and conflicts between the big bourgeoisie and the imperialists are not only ruled out, in fact they do also grow and find expression"* (p.56). There is no relation between the Programme and what the CC is now telling in this resolution. It did not stop there. In the same resolution, the CC has shown how the contradiction between the Indian Government and imperialism is getting accentuated in this way:

*"Did we not find that during the last two or three years there arose serious differences and conflicts between the Indian Government and US imperialism, on a number of questions such as the Indo-Pak War, the fertilizer deal, Indo-US educational foundation, terms and conditions for food aid, the rupee devaluation and the tightening of US and other foreign credits, etc?"* This explanation is contrary to the facts. It gave full opportunities for American intervention in our educational sector. The Indian Government stopped its trade with Cuba and Vietnam, faithfully carrying out the US directives. To show these examples asserting the developing contradiction between the Government of India and imperialism only gladdens those none other than the Government of India. This resolution also said that *"as the US offensive increases such conflicts are bound to increase"*. The CC intends to assert that the contradiction between the big bourgeoisie and imperialism and that between the Government of India and imperialists gets accentuated while the general crisis of capitalism is in the third stage and when the country is facing an economic and political crisis!

The CC explained in the following manner as to how the contradiction between imperialism and the democratic movement influences the class contradictions within India and the significance of its utilisation by the big bourgeoisie.

*"This tendency of utilising the contradiction between the Socialist and imperialist camps at least in the immediate future, may even acquire added vigour because of their efforts to defend themselves against increasing US measures and their eagerness to stave off the economic crisis. Big socialist investments, particularly from the Soviet Union, the offers of still larger aid, and other trade and economic relations developed between the Soviet Union and the Indian bourgeoisie are important factors to reckon with."*

*"It would be wrong to satisfy ourselves and rest content with the idea" that "what proves strong and real is the collaboration of the big bourgeoisie with foreign monopoly capital and not the friendly ties with the Socialist states, since the big bourgeoisie is capable of severing the latter at any hour it chooses. This is an over simplification par excellence" (p.57-58).*

What it means is clear. It is the view of the CC that in the near future our big bourgeoisie will more and more utilise Soviet economic aid against American imperialism, that it is wrong to think that the big bourgeoisie can break at its will the relations that are established in this process and that we should maintain our relations with the Indian Government keeping in our view the Soviet economic aid and the relations that are established.

This is not the way to study the fundamental contradictions from the class point of view. This cannot help in our study of the fundamental contradictions in our country and formulate our line and tasks. The CC is circulating certain wrong ideas to support its arguments.

It cannot but be said that the method adopted by the CC in the study of the fundamental contradictions in the national and international spheres and the explanations it has offered are wrong.

#### WAR AND PEACE

The CC Draft criticises modern revisionism for formulating that war is not inevitable, that the laws of social development are changed due to technological progress and advance of nuclear weapons and criticises it as giving up Marxism-Leninism. The CC Draft attempts to convince us that modern revisionism commits this mistake as they fail to understand the real nature of the imperialists and as they "proceed on several possibilities of averting war and establishing durable peace" and on that basis the Soviet leadership and modern revisionists "weave out their theories" and that they did not have any other motive (p.17). This is nothing but propagating the love for an enduring peace of the Soviet revisionist leadership in the name of criticising their theories.

The CC Draft preaches that "*new possibilities have certainly arisen*" for averting a new world war and establishing an enduring peace, and that "*these possibilities can be translated into realities*" by uniting and strengthening all the

forces of peace and democracy that can be united”, “*and that they do not fall victims to either pacifist illusions....or the class collaborationist utopias.*” This is nothing but supporting the Soviet leadership in the name of peace unity with reactionaries in backward countries. The importance of the NLMs did not strike the CC and it is not recognising that these are shattering the imperialist war plans. In the name of criticism, this is to propagate the good intentions of the Soviet leadership, sidetracking the real issue, and defending their general line.

The CC Draft criticises the Soviet leadership for concluding a treaty with the American imperialists to maintain their monopoly of nuclear arms as an outlook that emanates from a “*non-class and right-opportunist understanding*” (p.20). Modern revisionism is not without its class basis. It is an agent of the reactionary capitalist class. This is nothing but an attempt by the CC to cover up the class nature of the Soviet revisionist leadership.

It is manifest in the CC Draft that while being a sovereign nation, it is wrong to take protection from a fraternal state against imperialist nuclear weapons (p.20). This is a wrong argument.

The CC Draft teaches that the attitude of the Soviet leaders regarding China on the issue of nuclear weapons “*is based on an unwarranted premise*” that “*their collaboration with the Anglo American imperialists is a greater guarantee or the preservation of peace for the outlawing of the use of atomic weapons, and for averting a thermonuclear war*” (p.20). Whether the attitude of the Soviet leaders is based on “unwarranted premise” or not is one thing. But, to speak the truth, whatever the CC might tell in the name of criticism, none else can make better propaganda for the Soviet leadership than the CC Draft. American imperialists and all reactionaries are making preparations for a military encirclement of China. When the Soviet leadership is joining hands with them, should the Marxist-Leninists lay it bare or propose to propagate the good intentions of the modern revisionists? This is the problem. It is the betrayal of their responsibilities if Marxist-Leninists cover up the modern revisionists betrayal in any form.

The Chinese Party is making it clear that while making efforts to avert world war and establish peace on the one hand, the revolutionary forces on the other should muster all their energies and prepare to repulse if the imperialists force a world war. The CC Draft has completely left out this point.

Likewise we also know that the Soviet leadership and the CC Of CPC are expressing completely divergent views on what happens if the world war comes. The Soviet leadership writes that if a world war breaks out, it develops into a nuclear war, that nuclear weapons do not distinguish between Socialism and imperialism, that the entire humanity will be annihilated and that this land will turn into a graveyard. Instead of developing hatred among people against world war, they intend to create fear and scare them. Contrary to this the Chinese Party asserts that it is imperialism, and not the Communists who start a world war. It said: Socialist revolutions were victorious in the Soviet Union after the first world

war and in many other countries after the second world war. Similarly if a third world war occurs, imperialism and capitalism will be rooted out and it is wrong to say that humanity will be annihilated. It said that world war is not an inevitable necessity for the success of Socialist revolutions but the revolutions will certainly be victorious if world war occurs. It said in such a war one third of humanity might be lost, but on the ruins of capitalism, humanity would build a very great new society, and thus the CPC gave confidence to the people. The CC Draft has completely skipped off to give its opinion on the bankrupt formula of Soviet leadership, which scares the people and leads to compromise with imperialism and on the formula of the Chinese Party which imbues the people with confidence in the future and prepares them to fight imperialism.

#### PEACEFUL COEXISTENCE

Modern revisionists and the Soviet leadership are covering up and encouraging the aggressive acts and the interventions of American imperialists in the name of peaceful coexistence. Socialist foreign policy is opposed to imperialist aggression and supports national liberation movements and proletarian revolutions. In the respite between the Socialist and imperialist camps, the Socialist world should utilise peaceful coexistence to strengthen the national liberation movements. Peaceful coexistence should be subordinated to the needs of the Socialist camp and the national liberation movements.

The CC Draft while criticising that the modern revisionists are making peaceful coexistence the general line of Socialist foreign policy, covers up the above point and makes peaceful coexistence the important component of Socialist foreign policy (p.23). The Soviet revisionist leadership joined hands with aggressive imperialism and reactionaries and betrayed the Socialist camp. They are joining hands with evil forces to isolate China, which criticised their policy as betrayal. Covering up all this, the CC says that the Soviet revisionist leaders are laying exclusive emphasis only on some aspects of the policy of peaceful coexistence and that they are following opportunist methods to put up with the blatant aggressive acts of imperialism (p.23). The draft depicts that these happened, because the Soviet revisionist leaders think that real peaceful coexistence is possible with US imperialist rulers (p.24). This is nothing but propagating the good intentions of the modern revisionists. The CC preaches that "*peaceful coexistence is obligatory to Socialist states*", even when the imperialists are committing acts of aggression and intervention (p.24). Rejecting the idea that peaceful coexistence should be subordinated to the resistance against the imperialist aggression, the CC tells that they should be "combined". There is no difference between this and what the Soviet leadership is practicing, except in words. This is one way of condemning the help being rendered by the Chinese Party to national liberation struggles.

#### FORMS OF TRANSITION TO SOCIALISM

The Soviet revisionist leadership and modern revisionists began betraying the revolutions under the slogan of peaceful transition.

The CC Draft which has intended to make a scientific analysis of the forms of transition, stressed the need and the desire of the Communists to utilise the opportunities for peaceful transition. In the course of its explanation, the CC, Draft quotes from what Lenin has said in his analysis: "that the only programme of international social democracy must be recognition of civil war, though violence is, of course, alien to our ideals" (p.27)

What is the intention of the CC in stressing the "possibilities" while on the one hand and admitting that "the capitalist states have come to build and expand a thousand times more monstrous military apparatuses" (p.28) In reply to the General Line of the CPC the Soviet leadership has said in its open letter that it "is in keeping with the interests of the working class and all people" to realise the possibilities "to carry out Socialist revolutions in a peaceful way without civil war" and that "if the exploiting class resorts to violence against the people, the working class will be forced to use non-peaceful means of seizing power" (p.34). The CC Draft did not give its categorical opinion regarding these "possibilities" preached by the Soviet leadership. The CC Draft has only said that what the Soviet leadership has been saying is wrong for the reason that the military apparatus of the exploiting class had expanded. That is not the real issue. It is obvious from the editorial of the COMMUNIST (No.11, 1963), that the Soviet leadership does not see these possibilities from that stand point (News and Views from Soviet Union, 5-9-63, Vol.No.64).

The editorial wrote that the letter of the CPC concerning the general line ignored the new factors in the strategy and tactics of Communist Parties in the capitalist countries. The editorial said as follows:

*"The letter of the CC of the CPC even makes no mention of the new stage of the general crisis of capitalism, of such a process of modern capitalist society as the development of the state monopoly capitalism, the mounting role of the mass general-democratic movements in the struggle against the monopolies, or the importance of nationalisation and other political demands in the present day anti-monopolist class struggle. This is no accidental omission.*

*"The Communist Parties acting in the capitalist countries proceed from the fact that new, more favourable possibilities of class struggle of the proletariat and of the anti-monopolist struggle of the masses open up in the present day situation. Under the conditions of peace and peaceful coexistence of states with different socio-political systems the possibilities for the imperialist export of counter-revolutions are restricted considerably; monopolist bourgeoisie finds it increasingly difficult under such conditions to foment jingoism, chauvinistic sentiments among the masses..."* It further said.

*"Under the conditions of the aggravation of the international tension, of war hysteria, the influence of military, reactionary forces is growing while the successes of the policy of peaceful coexistence furnish more favourable conditions for winning over the masses to the side of socialism and for the development of the world revolutionary movement. By neglecting this point the Chinese*

*theoreticians reveal their ignorance of modern imperialism and the specific conditions and problems of the Communist Parties of the developed capitalist countries" (page.22. News and views Vol.XXII No.64.)*

The reasons for quoting this long passage here are, that it happened to be the editorial article of the Soviet theoretical journal and that specific ideas regarding the development of capitalism in our country are prevalent. To what extent does our CC's draft accept the "new factors" in the strategy and tactics preached by the theoretical journal of the Soviet leadership? To what extent does it accept the "new possibilities", they preach? And to what extent does it reject? This precisely is the central issue-what is the understanding of our CC about "the mounting role of the mass general democratic movements in the struggle against the monopolies", in the process of contemporary development? What is the CC's opinion on the "more favourable conditions for winning over the masses to the side of socialism and for the development of the world revolutionary movement" and on "the conditions of peace and peaceful coexistence of states with different socio-political systems" under which the imperialists find themselves "restricted considerably?"

Our Party should not rest content by merely saying that "*the positions taken by the leadership of the CPSU on all the fundamental questions connected with the Indian Communist movement completely coincide with those of the Dangeite revisionist*" (page.4). These tendencies are manifesting in the understanding of the Central Committee, in one form or another.

Mainly from 1956, our Party propagated that parliamentary and extra-parliamentary struggles should be combined and carried together. What is the role of the parliamentary struggle? What is its importance? What is the importance and role of the struggle against monopoly capital in the people's struggle? What is the role of the peasant struggles? How important are they? What is the relation between these struggles and the anti-imperialist struggles? Our Party never discussed these issues concretely. In Asia, Africa and Latin America, peasant struggles and liberation movements have come to the fore. The CC Draft does not make its opinions clear about these and their influence and does not draw the lessons. But recently the Central Committee has revealed certain ideas regarding the parliamentary struggles.

In its resolution after the 1967 general elections, the Central Committee has said that the "immediate political future" of our Party "in no small way depends on how it plays its worthy part in running the state governments of Kerala and West Bengal" (N.S. & P.T. Page 67) and has shown the way to "open the prospects of realising the slogan of a non-Congress democratic government at the centre" (Page.79). This is nothing but peaching peaceful transition. This is a step forward on what has been said about parliamentary democracy in the Party Programme. Since 1956 our party has been giving call for breaking the monopoly power of the ruling Congress party. In any country, state power lies in the hands of the ruling classes. In the countries in which the parliamentary system works, there

will be no significant change in the power of the ruling classes due to change in the parties in power. In 1957, the Kerala Government being the only non-Congress Government under the leadership of our Party, was very useful as an instrument of propaganda. Illusions of seizing state power through parliamentary democracy have also set in. The idea of breaking the monopoly of power, to give vent to the dissatisfaction of the people towards the Congress Government is manifest in our Programme. Our Party did not think that a basis would be laid for a change in the present economic system by either the formation of non-Congress Government in the states or the formation of a non-Congress Government at the centre which includes reactionaries. But now the Central Committee says:

*"It is this struggle of the democratic parties and groups in different legislatures and among the people, in parliament and states with non-Congress democratic Governments, that alone can pave the way for consolidating and widening the unity achieved by the democratic forces and open prospects of realising the slogan of a non-Congress democratic government at the centre"* (page.79).

This is nothing but preaching the peaceful parliamentary path. It must be said that between this and the understanding of the Soviet leadership there is almost no difference.

India got independence after the second world war. Yet, no fundamental social changes occurred after independence. As one of the two biggest countries in the Asian, African and Latin American countries, the peasant struggles have got special significance here. In the circumstances when the ruling classes attempt to suppress every struggle through repression and violence, revolutionary forces should be prepared to meet the situation by all means. But in this context the attitude of the Central Committee is different.

The attitude taken by the central leadership towards the Naxalbari struggle is not only different from the tactical line of 1951, but it is an attitude that should not be adopted to any people's struggle. This is quite evident from the attitude taken towards those who led the struggle, whatever may be the difference with them and the help rendered to the state Government in the name of controlling the struggle.

### NON-CAPITALIST PATH-NATIONAL DEMOCRACY

Accepting that the Soviet leadership is rendering economic and other aid to "the capitalists" of the underdeveloped countries "to develop capitalism" (Page 32), the Central Committee's Draft denies that this aid is for non-capitalist development. In fact that aid is not rendered to develop capitalism in those countries. It is not given to the national bourgeoisie. The Soviet aid is given to the big bourgeoisie and the big bourgeoisie-big landlord Government having close links with imperialism. It is not being used for national development. The aid rendered to the bourgeoisie which has no links with imperialism will help the development of the backward countries to some extent. But the major portion of the Soviet aid has been useful to the home and foreign monopoly capitalists, big landlords and reactionary Governments in these countries. The CC in its

resolution on the "New Situation and the Party's Tasks" has said that the Soviet aid would help the big bourgeoisie in their struggle against US imperialism, and that the relations the Soviet might develop in this process were "factors to reckon with" (Page.57). This is not telling the real situation. The fact is, the big bourgeoisie maintaining close relations with the imperialists is utilising this aid. The CC's explanation is different from the Party Programme also.

Since 1956, discussions have taken place in our Party on the issue, whether the line pursued by the Congress Government was a progressive one or reactionary one. We argued that their professions of building Socialism were bogus, and that they "attempt at capitalist development" in the only sense that they attempt at reactionary capitalist development." It is not our Party's understanding that it is progressive. We have been saying that the illusions they foster will not live longer in the period of the general crisis of capitalism. But some arguments have been raised that the party of the ruling class aspires progress, but that in this period of crisis it will not be successful. National capitalist development in underdeveloped countries is progressive; but the path pursued by the Indian Government is reactionary and this is not anti-imperialism.

The CC Draft has only said that it is correct to reject the theories of joint hegemony of the workers and the capitalists but did not even touch upon the betrayal of modern revisionism under the cloak of this class collaborationist line. In this way, it covers up the treachery of revisionism. This is to indirectly support the Soviet understanding.

#### **ON THE ISSUE OF PEOPLE'S STATE AND PEOPLE'S PARTY IN SOVIET UNION- MATERIAL INCENTIVES**

The CC Draft in its explanation expresses that the Soviet revisionist leadership is talking of "state of the whole people" and "party of the whole people" with "non-class revisionist concept" (page 38). Revisionism is not a non-class concept. It started in defence of the capitalist system. This is what all Marxist-Leninists say about it. To describe revisionism as non-class is anti-Marxist. To say that the Soviet revisionist leadership has transformed the working class parties and the proletarian states into parties of the whole people and states of the whole people respectively with such concepts, is only covering up their treachery. For, the Soviet leadership represents the people with reactionary class ideas, the bureaucrats in the Party and the Government and the people with huge incomes. It is difficult to give prominence to the interests of such people and restore capitalism when the principled ideas of the working class party and proletarian state prevail. They adopted these methods to liquidate them. This draft does not at all take into account the efforts of the Soviet leadership for the restoration of capitalist relations in the name of Communism. The CC has only said that the undue emphasis laid on material incentives by the Soviet leadership at this stage is wrong, but it does not express its opinions on their treacherous attempt to restore capitalist relations.



The thesis of the Soviet leadership on material incentives in socialist countries has inaugurated the restoration of capitalist relations. The incentives given in this way can be brought from nowhere else except from the fruits of the workers' labour. Hiding this fact with their propaganda, they preached the proletariat to keep its self-interests above everything and is kept in darkness regarding the specific need for building socialist economy through their own labour. Thus the Soviet leadership is anxious to see that nothing stands in their way for the restoration of capitalism. In contradiction to this the cultural revolution under the leadership of the CPC is resisting capitalist ideas and restoration of capitalism and is successfully advancing towards building the Socialist system. Refusing to recognise this fact, the CC Draft is indirectly supporting the Soviet leadership under the cover of the criticism that it is unduly emphasising material incentives.

#### ON THE QUESTION OF STALIN

The C.C. Draft which has at length criticised Khrushchov's report on Stalin, refuses to state that Comrade Stalin was a great Marxist-Leninist; his achievements greatly overweighed his lapses. Telling on the one hand that the Soviet leadership should have consulted important fraternal parties on this issue, the CC Draft on the other expresses that the Soviet leadership was entitled to think over the matter for themselves and discuss it. The CC Draft could not expressly state that the criticism of great Marxist-Leninists should be made only after discussions with the fraternal parties.

#### ON YUGOSLAVIA

Preaching revisionist theories, the Tito clique had removed their country from out of the Socialist camp catering to the needs of the US imperialists and capitalism is being rapidly restored in that country. The Tito clique has betrayed the victories won by the Yugoslav people. Hiding this fact, to say that they have "exposed the Yugoslav people to the danger of losing the revolutionary gains achieved through heroic struggle" (page 42) is not to depict the real situation. The CC Draft hides the open change in the attitude of the Soviet leadership towards the Tito clique and the fact that it has taken over the mantle of modern revisionism from the Tito clique, and instead, has by passed the entire thing by merely saying that "it is not for nothing that the Soviet leadership has gone back" (page.42). The real controversy is precisely here. The Soviet leadership upholds that even today, Socialism is being built in Yugoslavia and that even though certain ideological differences exist they should be resolved through discussions-speaking thus, it has taken the heritage of Yugoslav revisionism. For having held this as wrong, the revisionist leaders indicted openly the CPC in the East German, Italian and other Party Congresses, they have ridiculed and insulted the Chinese delegates at the East German Party Congress. It is not correct to end as the C.C. has done by saying, all this happened "not for nothing."

#### UNITY IN ACTION

The Vietnamese people's struggle is a turning point in the national liberation struggles. Modern revisionists and their representatives, the Soviet leadership,

have done everything to emasculate the national liberation struggles. Khrushchov, the father of modern revisionism and his heirs, the Kosygin-Braznev clique also failed in their treachery towards the Vietnamese peoples' struggles. Their efforts in March, 1965 to split the Communist movement did not bear fruit. They have come out with new slogans to make way again into the anti-imperialist front by any means, to make way again into the anti-imperialist front by any means, to gain respite to intensify their efforts for the restoration of capitalism and carry on their splitting activities, to serve the imperialists better. They came out with the slogans of "unity in action" on the basis of "common ideology" and "common programme", unity in action against the "common enemy" and the proposal for the meeting of the leaders of the Soviet, Chinese and Vietnamese parties. Shouting about American aggression on the one hand, they began talking of the American government's "wisdom" and that it "could take steps" to ease tension. With this, they were forced to explain the contradictions in their own words.

It is the Soviet leadership which abandoned the revolutionary programme, formulated in the 1957 and 1960 conferences of the world Communist Parties and allied with the American imperialists and reactionaries. It is they who abandoned Marxism-Leninism and preached the thesis of class collaboration with reactionary exploiting classes. How can the Marxist-Leninists have "common programme" with them? The Soviet revisionist leaders, in collaboration with American imperialism, the sworn enemy of the oppressed peoples of the world, and with all reactionaries are undermining the Socialist camp, the Communist Movement and revolutionary struggles and are encircling People's China, the base of national liberation struggles and people's movement. Who is the common enemy for these and the Marxist-Leninists? How can there be "defence of Vietnam" in alliance with those who even after the fall of Khrushchov till today are conniving with US imperialists in Glassborow and in every conference, and with those who are betraying the Vietnamese struggle? It is because of this that the world Marxist-Leninists have rejected their fake slogans for "unity in action" and laid bare their conspiracies. The first primary condition for anyone joining the anti-imperialist people's united front is that he must be an anti-imperialist. That is the important principle for the united front. When the Soviet leaders are acting in collaboration with imperialism regarding national liberation movements, unity with them is not a principled one as per the principles of united front. The Communist movement and the Socialist camp should act as the centre of the anti-imperialist front. The contradiction between the Communist movement and modern revisionism is antagonistic but not non-antagonistic. It is wrong in principle and dangerous in practice for Marxist-Leninists to function as the centre in alliance with modern revisionists. The CPC has made all these points clear to the fraternal Parties and rejected the slogan of the Soviet leaders and their proposal for joint conference. Marxist-Leninists of the world acclaimed the principled stand of the CPC. The revisionist leadership of the Japanese Party in its efforts to restore relations with the Soviet revisionist leadership in one way or the other, launched a campaign against the CPC. They visited many countries; leaders of some other

Parties raised doubts. Our CC Draft is saying that "a serious debate is on in the world Communist movement as to the correctness or otherwise of the stand taken by the C.P.C" (Pages 43-44). This is not the real situation. Since the leadership of the Japanese Party has been supporting the Soviet slogans inspite of the treachery of the Soviet revisionist leadership, it is true that doubts raised by them are under study. But it is incorrect to say that it has become a serious point of debate in the international communist movement.

What is the understanding of the CC on this issue? The CC says that it does not entertain "illusions that such united action can materialise" (page 48). It says that Vietnam is fighting alone against US aggression (page 45). It wishes us to await for the moment when "the bleeding Vietnamese people might in their just war of national liberation together with the states of the Socialist camp, rout the armies of imperialist intervention" (page 48). The C.C. Draft supports the call of the Soviet leaders for united action even though it found them to be not "immediately realisable."

It is accepted by one and all that the Vietnamese people carrying on their heroic fight have every right, to urge for help from the Socialist countries. The Chinese People's Government rendered every help and offered its territory as a rear without regard for boundaries, and declared its readiness to face the consequences arising therefrom. The Vietnamese Party leadership did not accept the proposal of the Soviet leadership to send its volunteers. It declared with revolutionary ardour its readiness to fight for years to end American aggression. It stood as a great exemplary inspiration for the national liberation movement in Asia. It inspired the oppressed peoples in Asia, Africa and Latin America. It caused great stir among the American people, the American military and the world peoples against American aggression. People's war got intensified in many countries like Burma, Laos, Malaya, Indonesia, Phillippines and Thailand. What the Marxist-Leninists meant in saying that the contradiction between the imperialists and the oppressed nations is the principal contradiction is being proved in practice. The American imperialists have fallen into a quagmire. The hot-line has come to function. Under these circumstances it is incorrect to say that Vietnam is alone. It is the American imperialists and their agents who are isolated. The Vietnamese Workers' Party stood up with unstinted confidence in the national liberation struggles; the Vietnamese people are winning great victories by shedding their blood. The Parties of the oppressed countries inspired by this struggle are advancing by drawing lessons from it. Our CC Draft does not think in that direction. Though entertaining no such "illusions" about united action, it has placed in the forefront the slogans given by the Soviet revisionist leadership and entered into controversy with the CPC. The world has learned that in Cuba, the Soviet revisionist leadership did not respect even the sovereignty of that country. They knew that the development of disputes and collisions among socialist countries during discussions in the conference and in the actual struggle will cause more damage, rather than inspiring the people. The leadership of the Vietnamese Workers' Party which has long years of experience in protracted

struggle did not think it "prudent" to support either the proposals or the slogans of the Soviet leadership. Also it is absolutely wrong if anyone imagines that the Vietnamese Government has this position in view of its difficulties. The new leaders have changed Khrushchov's policy of non-involvement in the Vietnamese struggle, to that of involvement. While the Soviet leaders intend the same either by involvement or by non-involvement the draft brought an erroneous argument to support it. What they intend to do is to help the American imperialists to get out of their predicament. To portray this as a change is meaningless. But our CC in its draft places these slogans and proposals in the forefront and sets itself to "eagerly work" for their materialisation (Page.48). This is of no use except for causing harm in practice to the Vietnamese struggle and make room for the Soviet leadership, which is getting isolated from the Communist movement and the national liberation movements.

The arguments brought by the CC Draft in this context are erroneous and harmful. It portrays this as a timely and correct slogan given by the Soviet revisionist leadership. Marxist-Leninists view this as a slogan given by the Soviet leadership to continue their treachery in a new way, after having failed to emasculate and disrupt the Vietnamese struggle and split the Communist movement. The draft describes the abetment of the US war of escalation by Soviet leaders as being "guided by the thesis regarding the danger of leading local wars to a world war." This is not true. The Soviet revisionist leadership proceeding from ideological betrayal to organisational sabotage and collaborating with American imperialists has put forward this thesis to scare the Soviet people when they are opening their eyes to the realities, when the Soviet leaders want to gain respite to sabotage the Socialist system and when they want to sneak into the advancing Vietnamese struggle. Our CC Draft describes such slogans as a call given by the Soviet leaders to "work out a plan of united action against US aggression" (Page. 43). The Soviet leadership cannot get a better conduct certificate from those who profess to criticise their revisionism.

The CC has listed "a chain of events that have embittered Sino-Soviet relations to the point of a serious split between the two" saying that "united military action demands minimum mutual confidence" and that nobody in his senses can imagine that such minimum mutual confidence exists between the Soviet and Chinese leaders (page 45-46). In this chain of events it did not strike to the CC that the Soviet leadership is pursuing its class collaborationist policy, that it is betraying the world peoples and has allied with American imperialists. The CC is well aware that if it admits this, then their slogan of united action against American aggression in Vietnam with the revisionist clique will be questionable. This is an issue facing the oppressed peoples of the world and the world Communist movement. This is not just a split between China and Russia. Neither a "mass" has been created between Russia and China on the one hand and the Soviet people, Soviet Communists, the world people and world Communists on the other, nor is it a "facile notion" of maintaining world peace in collaboration with the most aggressive US imperialists (page 46). To view this as a Sino-Soviet dispute is

narrow thinking. The draft portrayed that the Soviet leadership with this "facile notion" is collaborating with US imperialism "by passing People's China", instead of saying that it is collaborating with US imperialism in opposition to the national liberation movements. It is nothing but fostering illusions about the Soviet leadership and distorting facts. The proposal to the Soviet leadership that they will have to abandon "facile notions" and that they "will have to resort to bilateral talks with the Chinese leaders in order to clear up the mess that has been created" (P.46) is nothing but telling them to start afresh in a new cloak. The CC draft attempts to make us swallow the bitter pill of "unity in action" of the Soviet leadership, with the fake criticism that the slogan cannot be materialised immediately. It brought another argument in its support. It said that united action should not be rejected simply because the leadership is revisionist, that the tactics of united action should be adopted to unite with the Soviet people and that otherwise, it "Objectively tantamounts to make a present of that state and its people to the revisionists" (Page 48). It is unprincipled to call for a united front with such men who are in favour of American imperialism instead of calling for a united front of all people fighting against US imperialism. It is because of this that the CPC had adopted a principled stand. The draft's criticism of the principled stand taken by the CPC shows that the CC Draft is more concerned about unity with revisionism than about the principled stand. The C.C.'s attitude of demanding C.P.C. to sit and enter into discussions with revisionist leadership and provoking controversy with C.P.C. will not help anything, except to confuse the Communists and the Soviet people and thus help the Soviet leaders to continue their betrayal. The Vietnamese Party is adopting such methods and such united front tactics as to get help from the Soviet people, which leaving no room for betrayal of the Vietnamese struggle. The Chinese Party also encouraged this. The CC's criticism in the draft that this is not uniting all people that can be united, is nothing but harming the Vietnamese struggle which plays a key role in the national liberation movements and subjecting the Soviet people to the betrayal of the Soviet revisionist leadership. In this present period when the revisionist clique representing the privileged stratum of the Soviet people is intensifying its efforts for the restoration of capitalism and, when the Communists had to help the Soviet people realise this through their experience, our C.C. takes an attitude which harms itself. By preaching this attitude to others it helps nothing but disruption.

It should be said that the attitude of the CC and its arguments on this issue are a specimen to the sum-total of its ideas of the whole ideological issue. However much the CC Draft may say of its differences with the Soviet revisionist leadership, it is clear that they are not serious differences of strategy, tactics and practice in the New Epoch. What the draft has said on the united action makes it clear that they propose, only slight and limited changes in the line of the Soviet leadership.

#### **RELATIONS BETWEEN FRATERNAL PARTIES**

Our C.C. Draft which has taken up the slogan of "united action" given by the Soviet leadership representing modern revisionism, raised a controversy over the

principled stand taken by CPC, and charges the CPC that it is interfering in our Party's internal affairs violating the sound proletarian principle of internationalism guiding the relations between fraternal Parties. It has also launched upon a public propaganda against the Chinese Party on this issue. But what is the truth? Who is interfering in the internal affairs of the CPI? Since 1955-56, it is the Soviet leadership headed by Khrushchov in league with our leaders who provoked controversy in our Party, regarding the character of the Government of India and its role in the international affairs. Since the border dispute in 1959, it is they who propagated the Nehru Government's policy of peace. The leaders of the CPI got a resolution supporting the Nehru Government passed in the National Council and attended with this resolution in hand, the Moscow Conference of the Communist Parties in 1960. After the Conference, the leadership of the CPSU has taken up a fullfledged class collaborationist policy and allied itself with the Indian Government and such other reactionary Governments, characterising them as anti-imperialist forces, started collaborating with the American imperialists on all the major issues of the day. Only after conferring with and getting direct advice from the Soviet leaders, the Dange clique has adopted a class collaborationist policy regarding the class nature of the Indian Government, its policies and on every other issue, confused the party members and began disrupting the party. The attitude to be taken towards the Nehru Government, which was friendly both to the Soviet revisionist leadership and American imperialism, has become a point of controversy in the national and international Communist movement. In these circumstances, the Chinese Party has said that the India Government is a big bourgeois-big landlord government which has compromised with imperialism, mainly US imperialism, and that this big bourgeoisie is of the compradore, bureaucrat nature. Compradore character consists mainly in its trading nature in addition to the industrial aspect. Bureaucratic nature consists in its growth, mainly with the help of the state machine. On this count, to charge the CPC that it is showing a "tendency to subordinate the internal class policy of a Party without power to that to the needs of its foreign policy" (Page 50) is nothing but narrow-mindedness which bars fraternal Parties from studying Indian conditions. To say that the CPC asks the fraternal Parties to subordinate their internal class policy to its needs of foreign policy relations, will only help in practice the propaganda of arch-reactionaries. Whatever may be its reservations, the Chinese Party would not have given its opinion unless asked for, even after our draft programme has been prepared. The CPC would not adopt the method of the Soviet revisionists, who push forward their ideas through individual contacts. The central leadership did not place for discussion in any form the advice of the fraternal parties on the draft programme at least in the CC or in other higher committees, take opinions of the Party members and utilise them in the finalisation of the party programme. It is ridiculous for the draft to charge the CPC that it did not observe what itself had said, that every Party should "use its brains to think for itself". The CPC did not publicly come out with its differing opinions for two

and half years. even though our Programme was finalised without taking the opinion of a fraternal Party to the notice of the higher committees and without observing minimum courtesy.

The Soviet revisionist leadership is continuing its efforts to create confusion in our Party ranks on the ideological issues through maintaining contacts with individuals in the central leadership of our Party. It certainly has its influence on the central leadership and on the CC Draft. The Chinese Party is not one to resort to such acts. It acts in a principled way.

In its resolution on the "New Situation and Party's Tasks" the CC has surpassed the limits laid by the Party Programme, has almost taken up the line of peaceful transition and created a new situation. It recalls that the Party Programme "does take cognisance of the contradictions and conflicts that do exist between the Indian bourgeoisie including the big bourgeoisie and foreign imperialists", and that "in the background of the daily intensifying general crisis of world capitalism, the different contradictions obtaining in the national and international spheres are bound to get intensified" (para 108, Party Programme). The CC's resolution explaining this, went a step further and said that the "Government of India is surrendering step by step to the imperialists, notably to the US imperialists" (Page 55) and that "each step of surrender", "should not be equated with the final surrender" (Page 56). It formulated that "the fissures, conflicts and contradictions between the big bourgeoisie and imperialists are not only not ruled out, but in fact they also grow and find expression" (Page 56). The resolution observed that the contradiction between the Indian Government and imperialism has intensified. The resolution also said that the aid it gets from the Soviet Union and the relations it has with the Soviet Union are of anti-imperialist nature and that they can be utilised. It surpassed the bounds laid by the Party Programme and said that the contradiction between imperialism and the Indian Government is of importance "at least in the immediate future". The C.C resolution said that the "immediate political future" and "the fortune of the entire party" depends on how it plays its part in running the two state Governments of Kerala and West Bengal and decided to "open the prospects of realising the slogan of non-Congress democratic government at the centre" (Page 79). It is undoubtedly true that this led the Party closer to the modern revisionists. Under the circumstances, the CPC made its criticism in a comment on May 7<sup>th</sup> without mentioning our Party. It is clear that our Party leadership is not prepared to reconsider its erroneous stand whatever might have happened during consultations and discussions. It is incorrect to refuse to take the content of the criticism of the CPC because of the sharpness of the words used. Only friends offer sharp and clear criticism, while only the deceitful resort to methods of flattery. It is very important that our Party discusses our Programme and the resolutions in the light of the criticism made by the fraternal Marxist-Leninist Parties and set right the present situation. Our CC Draft expresses that we must be "modest enough to learn from....all other fraternal parties of the world" (Page 52). Making efforts to establish relations with

revisionist groups and the revisionist leadership that split away from the Communist movement will help only to create confusion in the Communist movement and helps the modern revisionists.

#### **FIGHT AGAINST REVISIONISM THROUGH TO THE END**

Though our Party broke away with the revisionist Dange group, our Party and the central leadership have not come out of the revisionist tendencies persisting for long in the ideological, political and practical fields because of the influence of the Soviet leadership and due to certain internal causes. As a contingent of the world Communist movement, it can play its due role in the national liberation movements, only if it can sharpen the critical outlook of the Party members, conduct discussions in a democratic manner, examine the lapses regarding the ideological issues, Party Programme, tactics, and policy and rectify them. From among the working class and peasantry, those who stand in the front ranks of struggles become conscious, and come into our Party. In the present stage of our movement when the correct tactical line has to take its shape, it is highly objectionable and harmful on the part of the CC to treat the criticism of our Programme and tactical decisions as a manifestation of sectarian, dogmatist and adventurist tendencies and to state that the Party remains under the threat of being swayed into extremes because of the petty-bourgeois origin of the Party membership. The CC Draft has simply forgotten that these are the very Party members who preserved Marxism-Leninism and the Party from the betrayal of the Dange clique. During the last 12 years of inner-party struggle, the membership gained invaluable experiences. The vigilance they show, is commendable.

#### **CONCLUSION**

This draft cannot serve as a weapon in the hands of Marxist-Leninists and help to discharge, the revolutionary tasks concerning the New Epoch and fight against modern revisionism, which is watering down, splitting and disrupting the Communist and the national liberation movements and revolutionary struggle through its sham theories and conspiracies. This draft on the one hand characterises modern revisionism as defective Marxist understanding, and equating Marxist-Leninist Parties with revisionist Parties, preaches opportunist unity between them; on the other, this draft comes out with heavy criticism of those real Marxist parties, who rejected opportunist unity and stood for principled unity. It cannot but be said that this draft is not such as to be useful, to conduct discussions in a dispassionate manner on all the ideological issues, connected with the New Epoch, national and international situation -keeping in view the experiences of the international Communist movement, and thus, to arrive at a unified understanding which only can help us in analysing the Party Programme and tactical line adopted and being implemented out of necessity and to consolidate our Party as a contingent of the international Communist movement.

In this context, one more important point has got to be made clear. Bracketing the fraternal Chinese Party with the Soviet revisionist leadership and depicting their criticism as orders and rejecting them, the CC Draft expresses that such



criticism would give scope to the propaganda of being led by the leadership of foreign Parties. Reactionaries always subject real Marxist-Leninist Parties to such scandals. This is not something new. To bring in such arguments in the context of ideological discussions is to encourage the blind rejection of the arguments of the fraternal Parties and the refusal to learn from them. In addition to its failure in explaining the CPC's opinions on various ideological issues, the draft's warning to Party members against enemy propaganda will only help to deprive the Party and side track them. This pointing out, is only to help the enemy. Thus the draft has taken up a wrong attitude.

Even before the completion of the inner-Party discussions on this draft, the CC made it a policy declaration. Basing on this, the central leadership of our Party continues to conduct slander campaign against the CPC on the one hand and, in the name of attempting to "learn from all fraternal parties", began on the other hand to improve relations with the leaderships of some revisionist parties and also started openly urging for the recognition of Soviet revisionist leadership. The CC leadership rejected to place differing opinions on various ideological issues straightly before the Party members; it did not prepare and place this draft before the party in such a way that the party members can express their opinions freely. In this connection the CC imposed such harmful restrictions as, that members of higher committee could not express their opinions in the lower committees, though they are members of both committees.

In addition to this, the CC passed a resolution on the CPC and on the "sectarian" trends in the Party without inner-Party discussions. These are all violations of proletarian internationalism on the one side and violation of democratic centralism on the other. This situation causes harm to the unity of our Party and that of the international Communist movement. This gladdens only the reactionary forces, both national and international, and modern revisionists who act as their agents. The leadership of the Central Committee is mainly responsible for this situation.

The understanding of the central leadership regarding the danger of modern revisionism and the relations they maintain with the revisionist leaders in various countries on one pretext or other, are responsible for this situation.

So it cannot but be said that the CC Draft is very much unsatisfactory and that it stands on wrong ideological and political basis. The harm caused by this draft is visible during the short period of its enforcement as a policy. So, the Central Plenum has to discuss this by keeping the above things in view. The Andhra Pradesh Plenum urges that a correct draft be prepared in a proper manner and make arrangements for discussions throughout the whole Party.

