

Externally, the same process of revisionism is leading the Soviet leadership to compromise with American imperialism in the name of peace. In reality it is surrender to imperialist blackmail; it is an attempt to purchase temporary peace by stifling revolutionary struggles; an attempt to freeze the status quo by appeasing imperialism.

This is the line of the revisionists in socialist society who betray their proletarian responsibilities and who want to have a protected existence at the expense of the world revolutionary movement. □

## VIII

# Lack of Understanding of Lenin's Teachings

IF WE TAKE ALL THE ARGUMENTS OF OUR CRITICS, what do they amount to? They amount to a total repudiation of the understanding of the epoch. They suggest that a counter-revolution has succeeded in all countries of socialism, except China and a couple of other countries; that the major fight of the peoples and nations of the world, of the world working class is not against American imperialism, but against the Soviet and American imperialisms, against the Soviet-American axis—a parallel of the Hitler-Mussolini axis—and that it is permissible to seek agreements with other imperialists against this axis, against the Soviet Union. The fight against the revisionism of the leaders of the Soviet Union is replaced by the fight against the imperialism of the Soviet state, the imperialism attributed to it.

The critics repudiate the importance of the socialist camp, and assign the decisive role in world revolution to national liberation movements. They say that in this new epoch of final collapse of imperialism and the final triumph of worldwide vic-

tory of socialism, the national liberation struggles have become the decisive force for the final destruction of imperialism. Thus, in the present era, the national liberation movements have got overall and decisive importance in deciding the course of the world socialist revolution. They criticize that the Central Committee's formulations do not bring out the "decisive role of the National Liberation Movements in advancing the course of the World Socialist Revolution". No Marxist-Leninist Party has made such strange formulations, assigning the decisive role to national liberation movements in determining the course of world socialist revolution.

This announces the rupture of the critics with a Marxist-Leninist understanding of the present epoch and the content of the present-day revolutions. They reduce the present era to an era of national liberation revolutions and divorce them from the socialist revolutions, fail to regard the former as a component of the socialist revolutions. In fact, they indirectly eliminate the socialist revolution as the main task of the present period. The vital importance which all Marxist-Leninists attach to the liberation movements is caricatured by the critics when they make this strange formulation, making these movements the decisive force. It is the revisionists who charge the Marxist-Leninists with the distorted outlook, and our critics are just serving ammunition to the revisionists. All Marxist-Leninists must accept that in our time the world socialist system is becoming the decisive factor in the development of society—and that the revisionists are sabotaging this role of the system.

Obsessed by this reactionary outlook, espousing an outlook of liquidating the camp of socialism, our critics object to our formulation that to mobilize the forces of revolution of the present era involves a revolutionary combination of socialist diplomacy with the use of the armed might of the socialist camp against reactionary forces who try to drown the national liberation movement in blood. They say that this means underestimation of the national liberation movement. In reality, it is nothing but the revisionist plea to deny armed help of the socialist camp to the national liberation movement (our critics say at one place that such help should be given, but they attack the Central Committee for advocating it). It strikes at the alliance

of the socialist countries with oppressed nations under the pretext of suggesting that the national liberation movements are the decisive force of our time. A wrong formulation leads to revisionist conclusions.

Our critics object to the formulation—peaceful coexistence is, of course, an essential part of the Leninist foreign policy obligatory to every socialist country—and thereby lapse into Trotskyism. The reasons they advance show that they are victims of revisionist propaganda, that they are unable to meet it having strayed away from the Leninist path. They think that to admit peaceful coexistence as an essential part of the foreign policy of a socialist country is to deny the alliance of the socialist state with the revolutionary liberation movements. They thus miss the central idea of peaceful coexistence which applies only to relations between states belonging to different social systems and has nothing to do with the policy of the socialist state towards the revolutionary movements. It is revisionist distortion which extends peaceful coexistence to class struggle in each country, and the struggles of oppressed nations. Instead of fighting this anti-Leninist distortion, the critics succumb to it and want to throw out peaceful coexistence as an essential element of the foreign policy of a socialist state—thus helping the imperialist propaganda that socialist states seek war to export revolution.

Sometimes our critics make themselves thoroughly ridiculous by insisting that the Soviet revisionists are only pursuing the interests of American imperialism. They have no interests of their own to guard. They involve themselves or do not involve themselves in the Viet Nam conflict according to the needs of American imperialism; they follow a foreign policy to protect American interests; they decide everything in consultation with American imperialism. Here is a new contribution to Marxism-Leninism. In Lenin's time the revisionists betrayed the working class to protect the interests of their own bourgeoisie, imperialists of their own country; but the modern revisionists protect the interests of foreign imperialists—they are not supposed to have any separate identity or interests from that of the American imperialists. Wonderful Marxism, no doubt.

Our critics object to the Central Committee formulation that

despite the revisionist betrayal, the Soviet Union cannot be considered to be an ally of American imperialism and working in alliance for world domination. The Central Committee Draft exposes the revisionist collaboration with the USA and unmasks its treacherous character. Yet it says that Soviet Union cannot be considered to be an ally of American imperialism striving for world domination. Our critics, by saying that the revisionist leaders are collaborating for world domination, seek to indicate that the Soviet Union is interested in securing world domination.

The implication of this statement, which our critics make no effort to press, is that the Soviet Union is not a socialist country, that capitalism has not only been restored in the Soviet Union, but that it has become an imperialist country hunting for colonial conquests. Applying the same logic to all the other socialist countries who follow the Soviet Union, it means that they also have ceased to be socialist and are the client states of the imperialist Soviet Union.

If they really mean this, then they must give up all talk of a socialist camp and say that a socialist camp no longer exists. According to them, there is hardly any socialist country left now except China and perhaps North Viet Nam. This means capitalism has succeeded in organizing one of the biggest counter-revolutions in history. Therefore, the formulation about the epoch, about the socialist camp becoming the decisive factor, must be replaced by a new analysis with world revolution on the retreat. It is no longer a question of fight against revisionism but against a successful counter-revolution organized by it.

But our critics dare not accept the consequences of their formulation and demand that the entire conception of a socialist camp should be given up.

On the other hand, they themselves argue that restoration of capitalism in the Soviet Union will not take place. They say that the cycle of restoration of capitalism is not complete and that the efforts of the CPSU leadership in this direction are not going to succeed—the great Soviet people will see through the vile attempts of the revisionists and succeed in preserving socialism. Thus they make hopelessly contradictory statements. Thus they are afraid to face the logical consequences of the reckless

and reactionary formulations which liquidate the socialist camp.

Lacking minimum Leninist discipline they do not stop to think the class implications of their formulations. They talk a lot about the rise of capitalist elements, privileged strata, etc. in the Soviet Union. By all that they mean the rise of elements, degenerates, bureaucrats, persons occupying high-salaried and important posts who are in a position to advance their individual self-interests, and blackmarketeers. And the farcical claim is made that it is degenerate elements, the corrupt, the blackmarketeers, etc. whose interests demand sharing out of the world with American imperialism. This of course is a new contribution to Lenin's theory of imperialism. Lenin failed to associate the policy for colonies and world domination with degenerates, blackmarketeers and bureaucrats. It is by such arguments that the critics attack the Central Committee Draft.

The critics fail to see the real class roots of revisionism in the Soviet Union. The rise of bourgeois influence internally and surrender to imperialism externally are the basic causes of revisionist policies. The former arises because of capitalist elements remaining in the economic life of the country, capitalist encirclement together with the survival of capitalist ideology in the minds of the people; the latter because of loss of international outlook and hence fear to accept imperialist challenge. Both in the end are to be traced to the survivals of capitalist elements in the economic life of the country and capitalist encirclement. When the revisionist trend seizes hold of the Party, depriving the people of effective weapon to fight capitalist survivals—the prolonged battle for socialism for which dictatorship of the proletariat is necessary—all the evils and betrayals of revisionism multiply many fold and create a danger of capitalist restoration if revisionism is not defeated in the meanwhile. Capitalist elements and outlook get strengthened. That is what is happening today. The present day collaboration policies in foreign policy are born out of this development which leads to a surrendering position before imperialist blackmail. Our critics want us to accept that the Soviet people have allowed capitalism to be restored without a word of protest.

The utter bankruptcy of our critics is seen in their opposition to the proposal for united action and the confused, contradictory

and the anti-Leninist arguments they advance on this issue. The Central Committee Draft says that it is wrong to reject in principle the slogan of united action on the ground that it advocates such unity of action between revisionist leaders of the CPSU and the Marxist-Leninist leaders of the CPC. The slogan is discussed only in relation to Viet Nam. The Central Committee throws the entire blame for the present state of affairs, for lack of unity in socialist camp, for the failure of common action in Viet Nam on the revisionists. It also exposes the treacherous role of the revisionist policies in relation to Viet Nam. It is aware of the fact that common action here means common military action which requires a minimum degree of confidence between the parties undertaking it. It also says that the Soviet leaders, if they are serious about such action, must abandon their facile notion of maintaining world peace in collaboration with American imperialism. At the same time, it says, united action cannot be refused on the plea that it advocates such action between the revisionists and Marxist-Leninists. Whether the revisionist leaders show any formal change or not, the validity of the proposal stands.

It is against this that the most unprincipled, confused, contradictory arguments are directed by our critics. In the first place, our critics commit the most elementary error when they confuse unity of action with unity of parties or ideological unity. No doubt, some such fake proposal for unity of the movement was made by the revisionist leaders and they were correctly rebuffed. But one who confuses ideological unity, unity between parties, with proposal for united action on a specific issue, has no right to be considered a Marxist-Leninist.

This is exactly what our critics do. They go on quoting from Lenin when Lenin was fighting for the purity of the Party; when he was stating that the revisionists could never be accommodated in a single party with the Marxists. To flaunt these quotations when the unity of action is being discussed, only betrays an amazing lack of understanding of Lenin's writings.

Secondly, the critics say that the revisionists are coming forward with the slogan of united action because they are isolated and that their intentions are not honest. Again they forget the Leninist approach. A Marxist-Leninist party adopts a particular

tactic if it is necessary for carrying forward the class struggle. The intentions of this or that group have nothing to do with it. Nothing prevents the Marxist-Leninists from taking initiative and making genuine proposals for common action. If the revisionists are already forced to talk of common action because of their growing isolation, it means that if a serious movement for such action takes place, they will be completely exposed as they will have to come out in their true colours.

The real argument of our critics against the proposal for common action for Viet Nam is that the Soviet Union is an ally of American imperialism out for sharing world domination, i.e., the Soviet state is an imperialist Power. They are not prepared to face the logical meaning of this statement—the elimination of the socialist camp. They only repeat this to oppose any proposal for united action. In effect, they play the role of the revisionist leaders who have been sabotaging this common front.

In the name of fighting the revisionist leaders, our critics want to leave the Soviet and other peoples of the socialist countries into the hands of the revisionists. They are not prepared to distinguish between the leaders and the rank and file of the parties, between the leaders and the mass of people whose interests are being betrayed by the revisionists. Thus they announce their complete breach with Leninist methods of fighting revisionism and reformism which ask condemnation of the leaders while call for patience and persuasion towards the people. United action is a specific form of carrying on the fight for the isolation of revisionism. Thus, in spite of their vaunted boasts to fight revisionism, our critics want to leave the masses into the hands of the revisionists and act as their accomplices in keeping the latter's hold over the people.

Their opposition to united action under the pretext of principled fight against revisionism violates another Leninist norm. The fight against revisionism cannot be carried on in isolation from the actual revolutionary struggle, the struggle against imperialism. Peoples' common struggle against their common foe cannot wait till our pseudo-anti-revisionists are satisfied that by their verbal sallies they have razed revisionism to the ground. The theoretical struggle against revisionism must be combined with practical common struggle drawing masses

under revisionist influence into it. Then alone revisionism is routed. But our critics want to confine themselves to pure propaganda, and are afraid of taking steps to move the masses. This struggle will not succeed beyond raising a few groups here and there.

Yet another argument of our critics is that united front is not possible because the revisionists of the present day as distinguished from those whom Lenin had to deal with, are in control of socialist states. The argument is worthy of the ignorance of our critics. The fact that the modern revisionists are today leaders of parties which have played their historic vanguard role in leading the socialist revolution, that they are leading the socialist state which achieved marvels of socialist construction, removed exploitation and achieved colossal progress in science and well-being—only means that the illusions about them among the people must be very strong; the halo of past achievements surrounds them; their ties with the people are stronger than those of the former revisionists; hence quick and effective steps have to be taken to have access to the people before the revisionist policies succeed in their reactionary objectives. The struggle is more difficult than in the former days because the revisionists control all means of propaganda. The danger is greater than before because what is in jeopardy is the entire revolutionary achievement of the working class. That is why mere verbal propaganda is not enough. The common bond of anti-imperialism and socialism between the peoples of the socialist camp must be stressed on the basis of proposal for united action and the Marxist-Leninists must burst into the prohibited camp of the revisionist following.

Our critics forget that the necessity for united action directly arises today out of the grim struggle in Viet Nam and that the harm done by the revisionist policies is still not fully realized by vast sections because of the failure of the Marxist-Leninists to pursue united action with firmness and confidence. It is the minimum duty of the Marxist-Leninists to try to rouse all people for common action against American imperialism in this vital struggle of Viet Nam. Abandonment of this attempt is on par with the revisionist betrayal of Viet Nam and our critics are guilty of it. Besides, our critics fail to understand that the more the

people become aware of the disruption in the socialist camp and of the world Communist movement, the urge for unity grows. This is an honest urge among the people which must be utilized as a lever to rebuild the common movement and fight revisionist disruption. Marxist-Leninists must measure their success against revisionism today by their capacity to secure united action of the socialist camp against American imperialism and for Viet Nam.

Reducing the struggle against revisionism to a mere factional conflict, our critics seek to let down the fighting Viet Nam. To oppose common action they advance arguments which really amount to slander of Viet Nam and its leaders. According to them, united action for Viet Nam is not possible, for the Soviet leaders are only acting as agents of American imperialists in Viet Nam. Their involvement and non-involvement both are at the behest of the Americans and are intended to help the imperialists. The help given to Viet Nam is only a preparation to secure a position to betray the Viet Nam struggle.

They do not stop to think what the leaders of the Vietnamese people, who ought to know more about their struggle, think about it. What they are demanding of the international movement? They deliberately suppress what Ho Chi Minh and other leaders are saying, they suppress the fact that these leaders have praised both the Chinese and Soviet help and are in need of more such help. Their criticism indirectly holds the Vietnamese leaders as opportunists and gullible, calling for help from an open agent of American imperialism. This is what their stand on united action for Viet Nam amounts to.

And finally, when all these outpourings are put together, we get the picture not of American imperialism as the main enemy of the peoples of the world, but of the Soviet Union and America as the two imperialist Powers that are the common enemies of the world; normally even among imperialist Powers there are contradictions but, according to our critics, there are no contradictions between the Soviet Union and the USA; it is a complete Soviet-American axis—more homogeneous and monolithic than the Hitler-Mussolini axis; the socialist camp disappears—only China remains; the socialist camp as the deciding factor, as the base of world revolution, disappears—only China is the

centre of the world revolution; triumph of counter-revolution in the Soviet Union and complete set-back in all the socialist countries except two or three—thus a new epoch in which what Hitler could not achieve by open invasion has been achieved.

The picture they present, the arguments they advance, the positions they take have nothing to do with Marxism-Leninism. It is an essay of frustrated individuals who do not have a serious attitude towards Leninism, who do not apply their minds to any concrete situation and who are prepared to take any contradictory position that may suit the moment. □

