

This brings us to a particularly vicious aspect of Maoism which is also doing grave harm to the minds of the Naxalites in India. And this is its sickening anti-Sovietism. The Maoist leadership in Peking, having broken with Marxism-Leninism and surrendered to chauvinism and hegemonism, knows that its ambition to establish satellite parties in different countries cannot possibly succeed unless the minds of those whom it wants to use as its instruments are warped by anti-Sovietism. Otherwise the simple question would be asked by any communist or anybody wishing to become a communist—how can there be any advance of, let alone an offensive by, the world revolutionary forces without and in opposition to the land of the November revolution and the party of Lenin? So the argument is produced by the Maoists that a capitalist restoration has taken place in the Soviet Union and rampant revisionism has paved the way to power of “social imperialists” who have established a “fascist dictatorship” in that country. And this “fascist dictatorship” is coming to terms with the other superpower in the world—US imperialism—in order to divide up the world and subjugate all other nations.

What is the evidence provided to bolster up this perverse and preposterous line of reasoning? Some thieves have been caught in the Soviet Union and some gang of blackmarketeers unearthed and punished! Not a single shred of evidence is given to show that a single factory or a single collective farm has ceased to be social property and become the property of some private individual. And if thieves are caught and blackmarketeers punished how is this a sign of capitalist restoration?

To give some plausibility to their theories, to cover up their own failure to build a prosperous socialist country and to arouse envy among the suffering and downtrodden, the Maoists state that capitalism has been restored in the Soviet Union because standards of life are rising there and because material incentives are playing an important role. According to the twisted logic of Maoists the Soviet Union would be a revolutionary country if its people were all poor! What kind of socialism

would it be and its attractive force if after fifty-four years of working class power the people there were still poor! Besides how could the Soviet Union help the peoples and states struggling against imperialism materially, including military help, if its economy was floundering and its own people on the borderline of poverty? In order to help the world revolution and exert maximum influence on the world situation the Soviet Union has, above all, to win the economic race with the most powerful of imperialist countries, has to win the competition in the production of material values and the development of productive forces. And all Marxists-Leninists know, or should know, that the most important of all productive forces is man himself, the producer of all wealth. And it is quite impossible to achieve economic progress at a rapid pace alongside an impoverished population.

As for material incentives, it is typical of the Maoists that they hide the fact that in the Soviet Union material incentives are harmoniously and inextricably tied up with moral incentives. They hide the fact that in the Soviet Union social consumption—housing, education, transport, health—plays an enormously important role in preventing too great a spread of disparity. They hide the fact that precisely in the period when “capitalist restoration” is said to have taken place, the wages of the lower paid categories have been raised, pensions increased and the incomes of the farmers enhanced. There is greater equality today in the Soviet Union than at any period of its history. At the same time material incentives do play a most important role as Marx and Engels and Lenin had pointed out they would in the entire period up to the second phase of communism. During this entire period the slogan would be—from each according to his capacity, to each according to his work. Only when universal abundance would be reached and when labour would be life’s prime need only then would society inscribe on its banner the watchword of communism—from each according to his capacity, to each according to his need. The Soviet Union today is engaged in constructing the material-technical base of communism and, therefore, cannot as yet switch to the communist mode of payment. Skipping of stages is as disastrous

after the winning of power as prior to it—the Chinese should know this well positively from their experience of winning power and negatively from their experience of the great leap and people's communes!

At this point, the Maoists try another line. They ask where is the cultural revolution in the Soviet Union and without the cultural revolution how can the bureaucracy be fought and proletarian ideology establish its sway? As a matter of fact, Lenin had dealt with the question long ago. In his view the socialist revolution could not possibly advance without a cultural revolution. But what did he mean by a cultural revolution? He meant the eradication of illiteracy, the removal of inhuman conditions of life and work which have debased and crushed the overwhelming majority of the toiling people. He meant the rapid acquisition of knowledge, especially science, by the toiling people so that from the thick of the workers and other toilers would emerge their own intelligentsia. In his wonderful speech to the Third All-Russia Congress of the Russian Young Communist League in which he sharply criticised the old type of school with its cramming and barren useless knowledge "which clogged the brain and transformed the younger generation into bureaucrats regimented according to one single pattern. But you would be committing a great mistake if you attempted to draw the conclusion that one can become a communist without acquiring what has been accumulated by human knowledge. It would be a mistake to think that it is enough to learn communist slogans, the conclusions of communist science, without acquiring the sum of knowledge of which communism itself is a result. Marxism is an example of how communism arose out of the sum of human knowledge.

"...And if you were to ask why the teachings of Marx were able to capture the hearts of millions and tens of millions of the most revolutionary class, you would receive only one answer: it was because Marx based his work on the firm foundation of the human knowledge acquired under capitalism... He critically reshaped everything that had been created by human society, not ignoring a single point. Everything that had been created by human thought he reshaped,

criticised, tested on the working-class movement, drew conclusions which people restricted by bourgeois limits or bound by bourgeois prejudices could not draw.

"...Proletarian culture is not something that has sprung nobody knows whence, it is not an invention of people who call themselves experts in proletarian culture. That is all nonsense. Proletarian culture must be the result of the natural development of the stores of knowledge which mankind has accumulated under the yoke of capitalist society, landowner society, bureaucratic society...

"...we must take what was good from the old school. We must not take from the old school the system of loading young people's minds with an immense amount of knowledge, nine-tenths of which was useless and one-tenth distorted. But this does not mean that we can confine ourselves to communist conclusions and learn only communist slogans. You will not create communism that way. You can become a communist only when you enrich your mind with the knowledge of all the treasures created by mankind" (*Selected Works*, Vol. 3, Moscow, 1964, pp. 505-7).

It is the application of this approach that has produced a true cultural revolution in the Soviet Union where, for the first time in history, the oppressed and the exploited have become masters not only of the economy and the state but of culture as well. All is certainly not ideal in the Soviet Union. Mistakes, distortions and deviations have taken, and do take, place but the general line is the Leninist line.

The struggle against bureaucracy has been a constant struggle in the Soviet Union ever since Lenin drew attention to it as early as in the 1920s. Bureaucracy cannot be driven out by incantations, slogan-mongering and physical assaults. The most important and essential antidote to bureaucracy is rapid economic development, the constant raising of the level of consciousness and knowledge of the working class and toiling people, their ever greater participation in the running of the economy and of the state. The development of proletarian, socialist democracy, on this basis, is the jumping off ground for a purposeful offensive against bureaucracy. This is how Lenin

posed the problem and this is how the struggle against bureaucracy is being conducted.

The "cultural revolution" in China had nothing to do with all this. It was officially described in Peking as being, in essence, a political struggle to reestablish the dictatorship of the proletariat, to remove from power all those persons in authority who are taking the capitalist road. It turned out to be a struggle of Mao Tse-tung and a small clique against the majority of the Polit Bureau and the Central Committee of the Communist Party of China. It turned out to be a struggle in which Mao used the army and the vast hordes of inexperienced youth (the infamous red guards) to destroy all the mass organisations and to disband the party itself. Neither the army nor the young hoodlums organised as red guards had anything to do with the elevation of the consciousness of the toiling people and making them ever more firmly masters of their own destiny. The organised beating up and insulting of stalwart veterans of the revolution; spitting on professors, writers, vice-chancellors and torturing many of them to death; shooting down of workers who tried to protect their colleagues; raising of the cult of Mao Tse-tung to insane heights; replacement of a study of Marxism-Leninism by mass recitals of isolated texts of Mao, resembling the worst features of religious revivalism; holding of a so-called party congress in 1969 without proper election of delegates and with not even the semblance of a review report of the period since the last congress held in 1956; insertion in the party constitution itself of a clause nominating Lin Piao as the successor of Mao; whipping up of anti-Sovietism on a vast scale—all this demonstrates that the cultural revolution and its aftermath are nothing else but the break of the Maoists with Marxism-Leninism and proletarian internationalism. It means that in China a military-bureaucratic dictatorship has replaced the dictatorship of the proletariat and a most serious crisis situation has developed in that country whose socialist base is clearly at odds with this new super-structure. The latest troubled days of renewed conflict in the Maoist leadership bear further witness to this fact.

Despite all this, some of the Naxalites would argue, the Mao-

ists have proved to be internationalists, world revolutionaries, while the Soviet Union has been converted into a superpower anxious to maintain the status quo. In the recent period many of the Naxalites in India must be having some doubts on this score after China's open support to Yahya Khan's war of genocide against Bangladesh! Some others must be having more doubts following the now open "ping-pong diplomacy" between Peking and Washington. We would request our Naxalite friends to seriously ask themselves whether they ever imagined that "their" chairman and his party and government would ever behave in this manner. We would request them to do some serious thinking about how this "aberration" has come about. Has it, we would ask them to consider, nothing to do with chauvinism, with hegemonism, with seeking to "control" popular movements and when this fails dropping them like hot potatoes?

But we are not going to leave this question of internationalism by simply criticising the Maoists and pointing to their most recent deeds which tears off their pseudo-revolutionary mask. It is equally important to discuss the question of the so-called conversion of the Soviet Union into a status-quo power colluding with imperialism.

Even the Naxalites would agree that Vietnam is in the very front ranks of the fight against imperialism and that its heroic and immortal struggle is playing a most decisive role in changing the status quo in favour of world revolution. Here is what Le Duan, First Secretary of the Working People's Party of Vietnam, declared as long ago as in April 1966 from the rostrum of the 23rd CPSU Congress: "Under the leadership of the glorious party of Lenin, the Soviet people are unceasingly displaying revolutionary heroism and proletarian internationalism in the building of the new society and contributing immensely to the liberation of the working class and all working and oppressed peoples. We take this opportunity to express our profound gratitude to the Communist Party, the government and the great Soviet people for their immense and many-sided assistance to the struggle of our Vietnamese people. For us Vietnamese communists there are two homelands: Vietnam and the Soviet Union, the first country where socialism triumphed... The

Soviet people are helping us today in the same way that they have been helping us ever since the founding of our party and ever since the years of the war of resistance. It can be said that there are drops of blood of the men of the Red Army in each of our victories." He repeated those sentiments at the 24th CPSU Congress held in April 1971. We have preferred to give the earlier quotation so that the leaders would appreciate the consistency of the Soviet stand and the utter falseness of the Maoist slander.

Take another frontline fighter against imperialism, Fidel Castro of Cuba whose revolutionary and anti-status-quo credentials even the Naxalites would find it difficult to challenge. Here is what he said in April 1970: "Today there are, as we know, theoretical super revolutionaries, super leftists, veritable 'super men', if you will, who can destroy imperialism in a jiffy with their tongues. There are many super revolutionaries lacking all notion of reality, and the problem and difficulties of a revolution. They are prompted by sentiments carefully fostered by imperialism and are full of fierce hatred. It is as if they refused to forgive the Soviet Union its existence and this from 'left'-wing positions. They would like a Soviet Union shaped according to their strange model, according to their ridiculous ideals... They... regard the existence of the Soviet Union as almost a crime, and this from 'left'-wing positions, which is an act of absolute dishonesty.

"They forget the problems of Cuba, of Vietnam, of the Arab world. They forget that wherever imperialism is striking its blows it comes up against a country which sends the people the arms they need to defend themselves.

"We recall Playa Giron these days. We well remember the anti-aircraft artillery, the tanks and guns and mortars and other weapons that enabled us to smash the mercenaries.

"This means that the existence of the Soviet state is objectively one of the most extraordinary privileges of the revolutionary movement."

We can confidently issue a challenge to the Naxalites to ask any African, Asian, Latin American revolutionary anti-imperialist fighter as to who has supplied his movement with the arms,

the training and the other assistance required to conduct their armed struggle? We are sure that every time the Soviet Union would figure first and foremost in their list.

But the Naxalites are certainly in for disappointment if they expect the Soviet Union to carry out the revolution for all the peoples of the world, if they expect it to export revolution, if they expect it to provide a detailed blue-print for the revolutionaries of each country. The CPSU is a Marxist-Leninist party and is consumed neither by chauvinism nor hegemonism. It holds to the Marxist-Leninist viewpoint that the peoples of different countries should emancipate themselves by making their own revolutions. Help, yes! Preventing the export of counter-revolutions, yes! Substitution and domination, no! They are poor revolutionaries, indeed, who want others to do their thinking and their work for them!

Finally, the Naxalites make the point that the Soviet Union has let down the Indian revolution by establishing friendly relations with the capitalist (or, rather, neocolonialist) government and has even gone to the extent of jointly exploiting India along with US imperialism. We have to take up this argument.

When it comes to establishing friendly relations with non-communist governments, particularly India, due credit should be given to Mao Tse-tung and Chou En-lai. After all, the famous Panch Shila agreement was signed in 1954 by Chou En-lai and Nehru. Together they went and fought imperialism at Bandung in 1955. India was not then a communist country. Indeed, according to latter-day Maoism it was even then a neocolony. How is it, then, to be explained? And, what about China sending aid to Nepal ruled by a king? And countries like Tanzania and Algeria receive Chinese aid—what is the principle used here? And what can be said about accepting UN membership, once denounced as an instrument of US imperialism?

The point is that Maoists now have no principle left in dealing with other countries except opportunism elevated to the level of a principle. But the Soviet Union does have a principle and acts consistently upon it—with the newly independent non-communist countries not only peaceful coexistence but also friendship, aid and even alliance on the basis of a struggle for

world peace, anti-colonialism and anti-imperialism. There is no question of Soviet interference in the internal affairs and politics of the newly independent countries. These are matters exclusively the affair of the people concerned.

Such an attitude strengthens the anti-imperialist forces in the newly independent countries; helps them to move towards economic independence; helps the shedding of anti-communist prejudices on the part of non-communist anti-imperialists; helps the growth of the working class and modern, progressive intelligentsia; helps to popularise the achievements of the countries of victorious socialism and increases the attractive force of the ideas of scientific socialism.

The left and democratic, as also the communist, movement in India has had its own experience of which attitude helps in the struggle against imperialism, landlordism and Indian monopoly capitalism—that of the CPSU or that of the Maoists. They also have the experience that when the People's Republic of China based its relations with the Republic of India on the principles of peaceful coexistence and friendship how helpful this was to them and how harmful the efforts were of the unfriendly attitude since 1958, especially the Chinese aggression in 1962.

The completion of the national democratic revolution in India is the inescapable duty of the communists and other national democratic revolutionary forces. In the fulfilment of this duty they would be helped if all socialist countries acted towards India as does the Soviet Union with its policy of friendship, aid and non-interference in internal affairs.