

WHO HAS DEPARTED FROM AGREED POSITIONS?

The differences between the CPC and the world communist movement were first made public by the famous pamphlet, *Long Live Leninism!*, published by the CPC in April 1960.

Beginning from that time, the CPC leadership has persisted in expanding the area of disagreement from the sphere of ideology to the sphere of practice; to the sphere of an alternative programme, strategy and tactics for the world communist movement; to the sphere of the relations between brother parties and the functioning of international democratic organisations; to the sphere of actual state relations and policies.

Of course, the CPC leaders deny this. They vehemently claim that it is they who are the genuine and loyal champions of the agreed documents of the international communist movement, while others have deserted them. It is they who are marching in step, while the majority brother parties have fallen out of step.

Hence it is necessary at the outset, to compare the positions of the Moscow Statement unanimously adopted by the Conference of 81 Communist and Workers' Parties, in December 1960, with the authoritative statements and pronouncements of the CPC. It is taxing to have to wade through so many quotations, but it has to be done since it is unavoidable. We shall attempt to restrict ourselves to such references as relate to vital questions. *In subsequent sections, we will deal with the actual policies and practices of the Chinese leadership emanating from its wrong positions.*

To begin with, the international communist movement has given a clear verdict that the 20th Congress of the CPSU, the Twelve Parties' Declaration of 1957 and the Eighty-one Parties' Statement of 1960 are a continuity. The 20th Congress of the CPSU gave us a blueprint of the character of the new epoch following on the defeat of the fascist forces in the Second World War; the new balance of world forces; the new stage of the imperialist crisis; the new possibilities and opportunities for preventing a world war, for a peaceful transition to socialism in certain advanced capitalist countries; the new stage of the colonial crisis and of the upsurge of the national liberation movements; the emergence of a camp of peace consisting of the socialist countries and the newly-liberated countries following a policy of non-alignment; the harmful consequences of the cult of personality and the necessity to fight them; and so on.

While elaborating and enriching the theses of the 20th Congress, the Moscow Declaration and the Moscow Statement paid tributes to the achievements of the 20th Congress, not only for the CPSU and the USSR, but for the world socialist system and communist movement.

In the words of the Eighty-one Parties' Statement, "The historic decisions of the 20th Congress of the CPSU are not only of great importance for the CPSU and communist construction in the USSR, but have initiated a new stage in the world communist movement, and have promoted its development on the basis of Marxism-Leninism." (p. 46.)

Years earlier, the 4th Congress of our Party held at Palghat in April 1956, hailed the 20th Congress of the CPSU as "an event of the greatest importance" and called upon all party members "to study its decisions seriously in

the light of the report of the general secretary of the Party", Comrade Ajoy Ghosh.

The Bombay Session of our National Council, on January 1, 1961, hailed the Moscow Statement as a "historic programmatic document of the world communist movement" and adopted a resolution "endorsing the work of the delegation of the Party to the Moscow Conference". The delegation itself had reported that great effort had to be made to persuade the CPC delegation to give due place to the international role of the 20th Congress in the Statement of the Moscow Conference.

The CPC's present evaluation of the 20th Congress is summed up by the *Hongqi* and *People's Daily* editorials of September 6, 1963 in the following words:

The 20th Congress of the CPSU was the first step along the road of revisionism taken by the leadership of the CPSU. (p. 6.)

The glaring contradiction between such an estimate and that given in the Moscow Statement is explained by the CPC leaders on the basis of an argument that they signed the Moscow Statement for the sake of unity and that they have always held that the 20th Congress "had both positive and negative aspects." (*People's Daily* editorial, February 27, 1963, *The Great Debate*, p. 167.)

But surely, for the sake of unity, no one could agree to characterise "the first step along the road of revisionism" as a historic decision "promoting the development of the world communist movement on the basis of Marxism-Leninism." Nor could the CPC leaders have agreed to such an estimate in 1960 if, in their opinion, what they then considered the negative aspects of the 20th Congress were weightier than its positive aspects. The tributes paid by comrades Mao Tse-tung and Liu Shao-chi to the 20th Congress at the Eighth Congress of the CPC in September 1956 are eloquent testimony to this contention, if any is needed.

There is no escape from the conclusion that the CPC leaders have made a right about turn in their evaluation of the 20th Congress after 1960. If what they say today about it was their opinion at the Moscow Conference, then the only explanation as to why they signed the Moscow Statement is that—they were afraid of isolation from the world's parties at that time.

(b) THE PROGRAMME OF THE CPSU

The new programme of the CPSU adopted by its 22nd Congress in 1961 has not been formally approved by an international communist conference. But no communist would quibble over this fact considering that the leading representatives of almost every communist party in the world were present at the 22nd Congress as fraternal delegates and paid glowing tributes to the new programme in their speeches of fraternal greetings to the Congress.

The National Council of our Party in its session at Hyderabad held in August 1962 hailed the CPSU Programme as

the greatest document of our age for the international working class movement and for all peoples fighting for peace, national independence, democracy and socialism.

What has the CPC to say about this Programme? That "it is an out-and-out revisionist Programme," that "it opposes revolution on the part of the people still living under the imperialist and capitalist system," and that "it is a Programme for preservation and restoration of capitalism" in the USSR (editorials of *Hongqi* and *People's Daily*, September 6, 1963, pp. 42 & 43).

What comments can be made on such shocking formulations!

The new programmatic document of the CPC Central Committee is the letter addressed by it to the CC CPSU on June 14, 1963, which is entitled *A Proposal Concerning the*

General Line of the International Communist Movement. Besides, the CC CPC has published other documents of its own covering the various issues dealt with by the Eighty-one Parties' Statement. We will have to draw on all these to bring out the contrast and conflict between the positions of the CPC and the Moscow Statement.

It has to be stated, as will be evidenced below, that the CPC's departure from the Moscow Statement is not limited to making statements in conflict with the positions of the latter. The departure very often takes the form of enunciating certain general and indisputable principles of Marxism while keeping mum over what is *new* in the Moscow Statement as compared with the positions of the international communist movement prior to the Second World War.

This is by no means surprising since the ideological dogmatism of the CPC leadership lies exactly in this that it attacks as revisionism precisely what is new in the Moscow Statement and Declaration, as also in the decisions of the 20th and 22nd Congresses of the CPSU. The overall new turn given by the 20th Congress of the CPSU to the international communist movement is precisely what the Chinese leaders call revisionism.

(c) CHARACTER OF THE NEW EPOCH

For working out the general line of the international communist movement, its strategy and tactics, it is vitally necessary to pin down the distinctive features of the world situation, i.e., the epoch, from which the general line emanates and to which it has to be applied. For, we Marxist-Leninists consider it axiomatic that while the basic principles of Marxism do not change, our policies, the strategy and tactics of our movement have to be related to the specific conditions in which we work, which naturally change from period to period. On an international scale, the crux of these changes lies in which class occupies the dominant position

in the given epoch. Within this context the communist party of each country works out its line in accordance with its particular national conditions.

Lenin said,

We can and do know *which class* occupies a central position in this or that epoch and determines its main content, the main direction of its development, the main characteristics of the historical situation in the given epoch, etc. Only on this basis, i.e., by taking into consideration first and foremost the fundamental distinctive features of different "epochs" (and not of individual episodes in the history of different countries) can we correctly work out our tactics.

The period of the development of monopoly capital leading to the First World War was described by Lenin as the epoch of imperialism, the highest stage of capitalism. With the victorious Russian Revolution and similar though unsuccessful working class revolutions in certain European countries, international communism defined the new epoch as one of imperialism and proletarian revolutions. In this epoch, the victory of socialism on an international scale was brought on the agenda.

All this is true. *Long Live Leninism!* and other Chinese writings repeatedly stress this and there is no quarrel over it.

But has something new, something more, happened after the defeat of the fascist powers in the Second World War in which the Soviet Union played the decisive role? Does the post-Second World War epoch exhibit certain very important and distinctive features which could not be said to be present earlier?

The Moscow Statement tells us that in this epoch "the superiority of the forces of socialism over those of imperialism, of the forces of peace over those of war, is becoming ever more marked in the world arena." (p. 2.)

Long Live Leninism! in a way agrees with this evaluation. It says,

the main characteristic (of the epoch we are facing) is that the forces of socialism have surpassed those of imperialism, that the forces of the awakening people of the world have surpassed those of reaction. (p. 8.)

It is possible to argue that both these statements have the same content, viz., that the forces of socialism, national independence, peace and democracy have now become superior to the forces of imperialism, war and reaction, and that their superiority is growing with the passage of time. The balance of world forces had definitely shifted in favour of socialism against imperialism. The complete triumph of socialism on a worldwide scale is certain.

So far so good. But even the recognition of this fact is not enough to get a full and comprehensive understanding of the nature of the new epoch, much less to grasp the new opportunities opened out by it for defeating imperialism and securing the victory of the forces of peace, democracy, national independence and socialism.

The Eighty-one Parties' Statement arrives at this evaluation of the altered correlation of the forces of imperialism and socialism on the basis of a concrete examination of all the manifestations and features of the new epoch in an organically interconnected, integrated manner. Hence, too, the Statement works out a new strategical and tactical line for the world communist movement.

The Chinese leadership on the other hand, looks at the change in the balance of world forces in a crude and mechanical fashion, from which it derives its line of a "head on" struggle with imperialism, "a blow for a blow and a spear for a spear," "tit for tat," etc. for the prevention of a world war, and the universal recipe of civil war in capitalist countries and armed struggle in dependent countries for achieving socialism and national independence.

Says the Moscow Statement, "There are now real opportunities of solving cardinal problems of modern times in a new way, in the interest of peace, democracy and socialism." (p. 16.)

In the torrent of words coming from Peking, from the press and the radio, one searches in vain for a single sentence, a single syllable, that can be considered as a faint echo of the confidence, the faith and the hope expressed in this inspiring judgement of the 81 Parties' Statement.

Let us see how the Moscow Statement amplified the evaluation of the superiority of the forces of socialism over those of imperialism.

The Statement says,

It is the principal characteristic of our times that the world socialist system is becoming the decisive factor in the development of society. (p. 2.)

Further,

Today it is the world socialist system and the forces fighting against imperialism, for a socialist transformation of society, that determine the main content, main trend and main features of the historical development of society. (p. 3.)

It is extremely pertinent and valuable here to make a reference to Lenin. In just two parenthetical remarks contained in his theses on the National and Colonial Questions adopted by the Second Congress of the Communist International, in 1920, Lenin's prophetic genius anticipated precisely what is stated above.

Lenin wrote,

The task of transforming the dictatorship of the proletariat from the national one (i.e., existing in one country and incapable of determining world politics) into an international one (i.e., a dictatorship of the proletariat covering at least several advanced countries and capable of exercising decisive influence upon the whole of world politics) becomes an actual question of the day.

What was Lenin's dream in 1920 has become the reality of our epoch!

However, to continue with the features of the new epoch, the Moscow Statement further elucidates that "the development of international relations in our day is determined by the struggle of the two social systems — the struggle of the forces of socialism, peace and democracy against the forces of imperialism, reaction and aggression — a struggle in which the superiority of forces of socialism, peace and democracy is becoming increasingly obvious. (p. 20.)

On this very point, the Twelve Parties' Declaration of 1957 says, "In our epoch world development is determined by the course and results of the competition between two diametrically opposed social systems." (p. 4.)

Still further elaboration has been given by the Statement as under

A new stage has begun in the development of the general crisis of capitalism. This stage is distinguished by the fact that it has set in not as a result of the world war, but in the conditions of competition and struggle between the two systems, an increasing change in the balance of forces in favour of socialism, and a marked aggravation of all the contradictions of imperialism. It has taken place at a time when a successful struggle by the peace loving forces to bring about and promote peaceful coexistence has prevented the imperialists from undermining world peace by their aggressive actions, and in an atmosphere of growing struggle by the broad masses of the people for democracy, national liberation and socialism. (p. 8.)

What light do the Chinese documents throw on these questions? None, whatsoever. They repeatedly declare that ours is the epoch of imperialism and proletarian revolutions (which has been true for over forty-five years); that socialism is now superior in strength to imperialism and that its victory is certain. But how does this superiority manifest

itself in newer forms and features of the crisis of imperialism; the success of the forces of peace in bridling imperialist aggression and yet preventing the outbreak of a world war; the new role of peaceful coexistence and peaceful competition between the two social systems for aiding the struggle for national liberation in dependent countries and for socialism in the capitalist countries; and in new paths of advance for the socialist and the national liberation movements?

In other words, how do the contradictions of imperialism get deepened in the new epoch enabling the international proletariat to isolate the worst elements of imperialism and reaction and secure new allies in the struggle for peace, democracy, national independence and socialism?

No Chinese document has anything to tell us on these questions. In fact, as we shall see, at their very mention the Chinese leadership sees the ghost of revisionism.

(d) WAR AND PEACE

Having stated the character and the main distinctive features of the new epoch, the first question posed by the Moscow Statement relates to the dangers of a world war and the necessity and possibility of its prevention. With regard to the danger of a thermo-nuclear holocaust, the Moscow Statement stresses in many different formulations and places that it would bring "unheard of destruction to entire countries and reduce key centres of world industry and culture to ruins," "that it would bring death and suffering to hundreds of millions of people," that "imperialism spells grave danger to the whole of mankind," that it would be "a global disaster," etc. (pp. 17 & 21.)

Both Soviet and American atomic experts have confirmed that the very first blow of a thermo-nuclear war would kill between seventy to eighty crores of people. Some countries will be simply wiped off the face of the earth. Untold

millions will suffer from the horrifying effects of radioactive elements. The survivors will envy the dead. One hydrogen bomb has more explosive power than all the explosives used in human history, including both the world wars. And there are thousands of such bombs now with the atomic powers.

The attitude of the Chinese leadership towards atomic devastation is shocking beyond words. They say, "the atom bomb is a paper tiger," and that "it is not terrible at all." (CC CPSU *Open Letter*, July 14, 1963, p. 13.)

As the Moscow Conference in 1957, Mao Tse-tung said, Can it be conjectured what number of lives can a future war carry away? Possibly it will be one-third out of 2,700 million of the population of the entire world, i.e., only 900 million persons. . . . I argued on this question with Nehru. . . . I told him that if half of mankind is destroyed, there will remain the other half, but imperialism will be completely destroyed. There will be only socialism in the entire world. And in half a century or in a whole century population will grow even more than by half. (*Kommunist*, No. 14, 1963, p. 22.)

The judgement of *Long Live Leninism!* has now gone round the world. It says,

On the debris of a dead imperialism, the victorious people would create very swiftly a civilisation thousands of times higher than the capitalist system and a truly beautiful future for themselves. (p. 22.)

With such an attitude towards the disastrous consequences of a world war, which is bound to be a thermo-nuclear war, it is hardly possible to argue that the Chinese leadership accepts the supreme necessity of preventing a world war in the sense in which the Moscow Statement stresses it. Under any and all circumstances, communists are opposed to the unleashing of world wars. That is not the point. The point is that "peaceful coexistence of countries with differ-

ent systems or destructive war—this is the alternative today." (p. 23.) This is the sharp contrast that the Moscow Statement places before us. That is why it says that "the democratic and peace forces today have no task more pressing than that of safeguarding humanity against a global thermo-nuclear disaster." (p. 21.) And further that "the communist parties regard the fight for peace as their prime task." (p. 22.)

Nowhere in the Chinese documents do we find such an emphasis on the necessity of preventing a world war and the responsibility of communists to strive for it.

On the question of the possibility of preventing a world war in the new epoch the position of the Moscow Statement is clear. It is stated that so long as imperialism exists, there will be soil for wars of aggression. The nature of imperialism has not changed. The war danger is real. At the same time, "war is not fatally inevitable. . . . the time is past when the imperialists could decide at will whether there should or should not be war. . . . Concerted and vigorous actions of all the forces of peace can safeguard the peace and prevent a new war." (pp. 19 & 21.)

The Chinese position on the question is also clear. *Long Live Leninism!* states its position in the following words: "Whether or not the imperialists will unleash a war is not determined by us. We are, after all, not chief-of-staff to the imperialists." (p. 21.) Further emphasis is added by asserting that "we believe in the absolute correctness of Lenin's thinking: War is an inevitable outcome of systems of exploitation." (p. 30.)

The June 14 letter of the CC CPC, referring to the question of the possibility of preventing war, attempts to blow hot and cold in the same breath.

Firstly, it tells us,

As Marxist-Leninists see it, war is the continuation of politics by other means and every war is inseparable

from the political system and the political struggle which give rise to it. (pp. 22 & 23.)

Since "every war" includes a world war as well, this clearly means that so long as imperialism exists, a world war is "inseparable" from it, and hence inevitable, whatever the change in the balance of world forces may be.

But on the next page we are told that "the people of the world universally demand the prevention of a new world war, and it is possible to prevent a new world war."

Then follows a homily that "world peace can be won only by the struggle of the peoples in all countries and not by begging the imperialists for it."

This is in the typical fashion of the CPC leadership, the fashion of begging the real issue by insinuating something against somebody else.

Whether somebody is really begging imperialism for peace or someone else is pursuing an adventurist, provocative and opportunist foreign policy is a question of facts that we shall consider later.

Here the simple point is that while the people of the world have always been opposed to a world war and the path to peace is the path of struggle against imperialist aggression, world peace now CAN be effectively defended, which could not be done earlier.

Either one accepts this position or one does not. You cannot say that a world war is inseparable from imperialism and at the same time maintain that the people can prevent it. Prevention becomes possible despite the inherent laws of imperialism precisely because the correlation of forces between it and the people of the world has now changed, because, not imperialism, but the forces of socialism now determine the main content, features, etc., of the historical development of society.

Another Chinese variant on the question of the possibility of preventing war is that both possibilities are there and should be equally borne in mind. But that is a clear

confounding of the issue. The Soviet Union and the socialist countries have undoubtedly the duty to be militarily prepared to face a world war and defeat imperialism in case it launches such an attack. And they have unswervingly carried out that duty. The Soviet Union, in fact, keeps abreast of the latest military technique and spends billions of roubles on its armed forces not just for itself but for the defence of all the socialist and peace-loving countries. The point is that a balancing of the two possibilities undermines consistent, sustained and patient efforts to use all channels, military preparedness as well as diplomatic negotiations, agreements, etc., for strengthening peace, for ending the cold war, for reducing tension and thus eliminating the danger of the outbreak of war.

(e) PEACEFUL COEXISTENCE AND PEACEFUL COMPETITION

The question of peaceful coexistence and peaceful economic competition is one on which the Chinese leadership is extremely touchy.

The Moscow Statement is crystal clear on the issue:

The foreign policy of the socialist countries rests on the firm foundation of the Leninist principle of peaceful coexistence and economic competition between the socialist and capitalist countries. In conditions of peace the socialist system increasingly reveals its advantages over the capitalist system. . . . the peace zone will expand. . . . the working class movement in the capitalist countries and the national liberation movement in the colonies and dependencies will achieve new victories. The disintegration of the colonial system will become completed. The superiority of the forces of socialism and peace will be absolute. (p. 23.)

In a world divided into two systems, the only correct and reasonable principle of international relations is the

principle of peaceful coexistence of states with different social systems. (p. 23.)

Further,

in conditions of peaceful coexistence favourable opportunities are provided for the development of the class struggle in the capitalist countries and the national liberation movement of the peoples of the colonial and dependent countries. (p. 24.)

Simultaneously, it is clearly stated that "the coexistence of states with different social systems is a form of class struggle between socialism and capitalism," and the warning is given that "peaceful coexistence of states does not mean the renunciation of class struggle or... the conciliation of the socialist and the bourgeois ideologies." (p. 24.)

When the whole position is so clearly stated, where is the need for the CPC leadership to make all kinds of alternative formulations about it? They want to accuse the CPSU and other brother parties of emasculating the principle of peaceful coexistence *in practice*. That is a different matter, which we shall deal with later. But that can be no justification for putting forward alternative formulations. The only meaning of such formulations is that the CPC wants to run down and belittle the positions of the Moscow Statement, and to deny the role of peaceful coexistence and economic competition for the struggle for national independence and socialism.

The CC CPC letter of June 14, 1963 says, if the general line of the foreign policy of the socialist countries is confined (*sic!*) to peaceful coexistence then it is impossible to handle correctly either the relations between socialist countries or between the socialist countries and the oppressed peoples and nations. Therefore it is wrong to make peaceful coexistence the general line of the foreign policy of the socialist countries. (p. 28.)

Such a jumble of confusion would be difficult to put down on paper.

First, peaceful coexistence deals with relations between the socialist and capitalist countries and not between the socialist countries themselves. The relations between the latter are those of fraternal unity and aid.

Second, in speaking of "confining" the foreign policy of socialist states to peaceful coexistence, the CPC leaders confess that they do not consider peaceful coexistence *itself* to be "a form of class struggle between socialism and capitalism." (See Moscow Statement quoted above.) That means that according to them peaceful coexistence means freezing the world into a socialist zone and an imperialist zone. And having taken such a strange position, they turn round and say that if peaceful coexistence is considered as the general line of the foreign policy of the socialist countries it would prevent them from assisting the oppressed peoples and nations in securing national independence.

The Moscow Statement states categorically that "all the socialist countries and the international working class and communist movement see it as their duty to render the fullest moral and material assistance to the peoples fighting to free themselves from imperialist and colonial tyranny." (p. 32.)

Where then is the conflict between such assistance and the policy of peaceful coexistence?

The *Hongqi* and *People's Daily* editorials of December 12, 1963 quote Lenin in evidence of their contention that the CPSU leaders are vulgarising and repudiating his understanding of the policy of peaceful coexistence. What are the quotations?

The existence of the Soviet Republic side by side with imperialist states for a long time is unthinkable. One or the other must triumph in the end. And before that end supervenes, a series of frightful collisions between the Soviet Republic and the bourgeois states will be inevitable.

existence. The significance and aims of this struggle are no longer limited to the exposure of the aggressive designs of the imperialists and their hypocritical talk of peace.

The Moscow Statement says:

The meeting considers that the implementation of the programme for general and complete disarmament put forward by the Soviet Union would be of historic importance for the destinies of mankind. To realise this programme means to eliminate the very possibility of waging wars between countries. It is not easy to realise owing to the stubborn resistance of the imperialists. Hence it is essential to wage an active and determined struggle against the imperialist forces with the aim of carrying this programme into practice. . . . It is necessary to strive perseveringly to achieve tangible results—the banning of the testing and manufacturing of nuclear weapons, the abolition of military blocs and war bases on foreign soil, and a substantial reduction of armed forces and armaments, all of which should pave the way to general disarmament. (p. 25, emphasis in original.)

As regards the possibility of bringing about such a result, the Statement says,

Through an active, determined struggle by the socialist and other peace loving countries, by the international working class and the broad masses in all countries, it is possible to isolate the aggressive circles, foil the arms race and war preparations, and force the imperialists into an agreement on disarmament. (p. 25.)

Regarding the social significance of disarmament, we have,

In each country, it is necessary to promote a broad mass movement for the use of the funds and resources to be released through disarmament for the needs of civilian production, housing, health, public education, social security, scientific research, etc. . . . By an active and

resolute struggle, the imperialists must be made to meet this demand of the peoples. (p. 26.)

The Moscow Statement leaves no room for a non-struggle, revisionist approach to the problem of disarmament. At the same time, it emphatically points out how, under the new conditions, a step by step advance towards disarmament can be made, achieving tangible results.

The Peace Manifesto issued by the Communist and Workers' Parties in 1957 demanded among other things, "the prohibition of the manufacture and use of atomic and hydrogen weapons, and, *as a first step, an immediate end to the testing of these weapons.*" (p. 24, Twelve Parties' Declaration, etc. Emphasis ours.)

But the CPC leadership is not satisfied. It accuses those who call for disarmament of harbouring illusions about imperialism. It insists that disarmament is only possible when all exploitation of man by man is abolished.

Here is what the June 14 Letter says:

Certain people now actually hold that it is possible to bring about 'a world without weapons, without armed forces and without wars' through 'general and complete disarmament' while the system of imperialism and of the exploitation of man by man still exists. This is sheer illusion. (p. 23.)

The *Hongqi* and *People's Daily* editorials of November 19, 1963 accuse the Soviet leadership of spreading the Kautskyian "fallacy that the money saved from disarmament can be used to assist backward countries." (p. 6.)

The CPC Letter further states, "We have always maintained that in order to expose and combat the imperialists' arms expansion and war preparations, it is necessary to put forward the proposal for general disarmament." (p. 24.)

Still further, "an elementary knowledge of Marxism-Leninism tells us that a so-called world without weapons and without armed forces can only be a world without states." (p. 24.)

Since a world without states can come into existence only with the complete victory of world communism, disarmament obviously has to wait till then. If this is not a repudiation of the Moscow Statement, what else is it?

And then we are told that "it is possible to compel imperialism to accept some kind of agreement on disarmament." (p. 24.) "Some kind!" What kind? That the CPC leaders do not tell us.

(g) PEACEFUL TRANSITION

On this question, as on others, the CPC vulgarises the positions of the Moscow Statement and then attacks them as revisionist and what not. The full position of the Moscow Statement on this issue is as under:

Today in a number of capitalist countries, the working class, headed by its vanguard, has the opportunity, given a united working class and popular front or other workable forms of agreement and political cooperation between the different parties and public organisations, to unite a majority of the people, win state power without civil war, and ensure the transfer of the basic means of production to the hands of the people. Relying on the majority of the people and resolutely rebuffing the opportunist elements incapable of relinquishing the policy of compromise with the capitalists and the landlords, the working class can defeat the reactionary, anti-popular forces, secure a firm majority in Parliament, transform Parliament from an instrument serving the class interests of the bourgeoisie into an instrument serving the people, launch an extra-parliamentary mass struggle, smash the resistance of the reactionary forces and create the necessary conditions for peaceful realisation of the socialist revolution. All this will be possible only by broad and ceaseless development of the class struggle of the workers, the peasant masses and the urban middle strata

against big monopoly capital, against reaction, for profound social reforms, for peace and socialism.

Further,

In the event of the exploiting classes resorting to violence against the people, the possibility of a non-peaceful transition to socialism should be borne in mind. Leninism teaches, and experience confirms, that the ruling classes never relinquish power voluntarily. (pp. 40-41.)

What is the position of the CPC leadership on this question? It submitted an outline of its views on it to the 12-Parties' Conference in Moscow in 1957 (printed as Appendix No. 1 to the *Hongqi* and *People's Daily* editorials of September 6, 1963 on pp. 58 and 59). The June 14 Letter of the CC CPC repeats the same positions again.

The outline says

In the present situation of the international communist movement, it is advantageous from the point of view of tactics to refer to the desire for peaceful transition. But it would be inappropriate to overemphasise the possibility of peaceful transition. The reasons are: (1) Possibility and reality, the desire and whether or not it can be fulfilled, are two different matters; (2) If too much stress is laid on the possibility of peaceful transition, and especially on the possibility of seizing state power by winning a majority in parliament, it is liable to weaken the revolutionary will of the proletariat... and (3) To the best of our knowledge, there is still not a single country where this possibility is of any practical significance. (pp. 58 and 59.)

The emphasis in the Moscow Statement on the possibility of peaceful transition is just correct, neither more nor less than what it should be. Besides, it is not only emphasised, but concretely explained, how the peaceful transition visualised is based on a grim struggle against reaction and not on any illusion that the ruling classes will relinquish power or accept peaceful transition voluntarily. The ques-

tion of ushering in socialism just on the basis of parliamentary majority is ruled out by the Moscow Statement itself. Then against whom is the CPC leadership polemising?

So, the real bone of contention is that, whereas the CPC leadership wants to refer to peaceful transition only as a desire, and that too, as a tactic, the Moscow Statement speaks of it as a practical proposition in a number of capitalist countries. The CPC leaders repudiate this perspective as not having "any practical significance." The two positions are clearly different.

How has the possibility of a peaceful transition, i.e., the possibility of advancing towards socialism without recourse to civil war and by transforming the character of existing parliaments, arisen in the developed capitalist countries? How does the opportunity concretely develop in the new conditions?

The grim experience of two world wars and the threatened and far greater horrors of a third one have made war the most universally feared and hated thing in these countries. Now, whether it is the USA, West Germany, France, England, Italy or Japan, or any of the other imperialist countries, it is the armament manufacturers, the oil and the steel barons, the biggest bankers, etc., who are at once the worst warmongers and the most powerful monopoly capitalists in the country. They are also the bitterest enemies of parliamentary democracy and the supporters of reactionary dictatorial regimes. They are, of course, the most vicious enemies of the trade-union movement and the working class. Military expenditure constitutes more than half of the budget expenditure of these states.

Considering all these factors, the struggle against war and for peace, the struggle for disarmament and getting out of military blocs, the struggle for getting rid of foreign military bases and creating nuclear-free zones, etc., gets directly linked up with the securing of resources for improving popular living standards and with the defence

and expansion of democratic liberties. It draws within its fold and sweep far broader sections of the people, including sections of capitalists, than any other single mass issue. It enables the working class and its vanguard, the communist parties, to forge the broadest anti-monopoly front not only for organising mass actions but also in the legislatures. It enables the working class to emerge as the political leader of all sections who stand for peace and democracy, and thus to advance towards socialism by the transformation of parliaments without recourse to civil war.

No one has suggested that this struggle is an alternative to or replaces mass working class and peasant struggles for their specific class demands. No one has said that it guarantees a peaceful transition to socialism. Most powerful working class struggles have been organised by the communist parties of France, Italy, etc., whom the CPC leadership has denounced as traitors to the working class taking cover behind glib talk of peaceful transition.

At the same time, the fact remains that in the new period, the struggle against war and for democracy gets directly interwoven with the struggle for socialism, becomes an integral part of that struggle, and opens out prospects for a peaceful transition that did not exist before.

The key to utilising the opportunities for peaceful transition, i.e., transforming Parliament into an instrument of the people's will lies in the maximum utilisation of the democratic rights and liberties provided by the parliamentary system and in a constant struggle for broadening and deepening democracy.

Clearly there must be no illusions about parliamentary democracy "gradually growing over" into a people's state, no more than about capitalism growing over into socialism. The turning of Parliament into an instrument of the people's will necessarily involves crises, zig-zags, clashes and even occasional set-backs.

The point is that in the past, we communists have held

that the utmost utility of parliaments was to serve as a forum for exposing the evils of the capitalist system and thereby help the unleashing of extra-parliamentary mass actions. Now we think in terms of transforming their class role.

This means, first of all, that the struggle for broadening democracy is not restricted to the highest legislature in the country. It has to be fought out right from the bottom upwards, from elected local bodies to Parliament. In Indian conditions, it means that we have to fight for the growing democratisation of the village panchayats, the municipal bodies, the zilla parishads, the state legislatures and Parliament.

Further, the fight has to be not merely for economic demands such as the wages of the employees of the state and local self-government bodies, the democratisation of the tax system, securing bigger grants from the central and state governments for the local bodies, etc., The fight has also to be secure more powers for the elected bodies and reducing the powers of the bureaucracy to the minimum. The fight has to be for cultural and other requirements of the people such as health, hospitals, water and sanitation, better and more education, the promotion and encouragement of popular arts, and so on.

We have also to fight for the fundamental rights of the people being made justiciable instead of being a pious declaration of good intentions as now. We have to fight for compensation for landed property and nationalised concerns being reduced to the minimum.

We have to fight for workers' representation in the management of industry, first and foremost, in the public sector. The peasantry has to have an effective voice in the actual implementation of enactments pertaining to land reforms. This cannot be left in the hands of the officials alone, as at present.

A crucial part of the struggle is the systematic break up

of the bureaucratic state structure. The power of the bourgeoisie does not lie in the Parliament alone. It lies in the state structure taken as a whole.

It is a vulgarisation of the concept of "transforming Parliament" to equate it with securing a majority in Parliament. The concept necessarily includes mass sanctions, a fight for broadening democracy in all spheres of social life and at every level of political authority, as also activity within the walls of the legislatures. It is hardly necessary to clarify that it includes the struggles of the working class, the peasantry, etc., for their class demands; mass sanctions in support of a foreign policy of peace and anti-colonialism and to oppose any deviations from it; sanctions for expelling foreign monopoly capital from the country, etc. Minus such an understanding, we miss the very essence of the struggle for peaceful transition.

The Constitution of the Communist Party of India, adopted by its Congress at Amritsar in April 1958, states:

The Communist Party of India strives to achieve full democracy and socialism by peaceful means. It considers that by developing a powerful mass movement, by winning a majority in parliament and by backing it with mass sanctions, the working class and its allies can overcome the resistance of the forces of reaction and ensure that parliament becomes an instrument of the people's will for effecting fundamental changes in the economic, social and state structure. (p. 3.)

It is impossible to brush aside such an explicit statement by talking about a "desire" or "tactic".

Apart from the libellous charge that the CPSU and other communist parties have allied themselves with US imperialism and reactionaries in all countries to oppose the struggles for national liberation and socialism, the running thread of the CPC criticism is that the majority of parties with whom it disagrees have reduced the line of the Moscow

Statement to "peaceful coexistence", "peaceful competition" and "peaceful transition." This criticism, is repeated at a number of places in the *Hongqi* and *People's Daily* articles.

The elaborate references given till now should suffice to bring out that, while the brother parties stand by the real revolutionary content of the Moscow Statement it is the CPC leadership which has given it a Trotskyite twist.

(h) CERTAIN OTHER ISSUES

The CPC documents are entirely silent on the question of the process of national liberation and its advance to socialism through the establishment of national democracy, as put across by the Moscow Statement. Hence this question will be dealt with later.

The denunciation of the Stalin personality cult at the 20th Congress of the CPSU was welcomed by the CPC leadership in 1956 and, in fact, in their article on the *Historical Experience of the Dictatorship of the Proletariat*, the Chinese leadership came out with a more comprehensive treatment of the subject than what had been done at the 20th Congress. This effort was appreciated in the international communist movement.

The CC CPC Letter of June 14 (p. 34) as also the *Hongqi* and *People's Daily* editorials of September 6, 1963 (p. 8), however, have nothing in common with the earlier writings and pronouncements of the CPC leaders.

The new evaluation now given is that the denunciation of the Stalin personality cult at the 20th Congress of the CPSU

defamed the dictatorship of the proletariat, defamed the socialist system, the great CPSU, the great Soviet Union and the international communist movement.

The results of the struggle against the cult of personality in the Soviet Union are no longer a matter of conjecture or

abstract debate. The great changes that the struggle has brought about in unleashing mass initiative in every sphere of Soviet life, e.g., party functioning, the functioning of the state, economic planning and its execution, the judiciary and the legal system, education and scientific research, etc., are now a world recognised fact.

To denounce the struggle now, eight years after its correctness has been proved in practice, is asking for a glorification and continuation of Stalinist methods and policies.

The National Council of our Party, at its Hyderabad session held in August 1962, stated in its resolution on the 22nd Congress of the CPSU that

the struggle against the personality cult started by the 20th Congress was an act of exceptional courage and significance on the part of the leadership of the CPSU in order to bring about a radical break with the past methods and theories which had become shackles on the advance of Soviet society towards the goal of communism.

It also stated that the struggle against the cult of personality and the elimination of all its consequences conform to the interests of the international communist movement.

Our National Council resolution also stated that in conducting the struggle against the Stalin cult, "it is necessary to keep in view the positive as well as the negative aspects of Stalin's character and role." Further, that "it is not necessary for us to endorse every statement made by the CPSU leaders in the course of exposing the harmful consequences of the cult of Stalin's personality."

The position of our Party is thus clear. While calling for the conduct of the struggle against the personality cult in "a balanced and objective manner," it recognises the courage and immense service rendered by the CPSU leadership to

the Soviet Union and the international communist movement in exposing the cult and restoring Leninist norms of state and party functioning in the USSR.

This has nothing in common with denouncing the struggle against the cult as a defamation of socialism and the dictatorship of the proletariat.