

RESOLUTION SUBMITTED BY T.NAGI REDDY & C.PULLA REDDY TO THE ANDHRA PLENUM

[Held in Jan 1968]

The C.C. Draft for the Ideological Discussion has come at a great turning point in the struggle of the international communist movement against world imperialism headed by the U.S. imperialists and against Modern Revisionism represented and practised by the revisionist leadership of the CPSU.

At the time of the Seventh Congress of our Party, when the Party Programme was being adopted, we did not discuss the various fundamental issues involved in the great international ideological debate. Even when certain aspects of this international debate having a direct bearing on certain issues of our Programme were discussed, at least these and the conflicting views about these issues, were not separately formulated and discussed thoroughly to enable us to come to proper conclusions.

Beginning with the victory of the Great Chinese People's Revolution, a new epoch of all round peoples struggles against decaying imperialism has been unfolding throughout the world, heralding a new epoch of rapid decay and disintegration of the imperialist system, heralding the eve of the complete victory of World Socialist Revolution.

But world imperialism headed by American imperialism has been conducting ferocious last-ditch battles to drown the revolutionary struggles in blood and save imperialism from its inevitable doom.

Just at the time when imperialism is on the verge of complete collapse, when the world socialist forces are on the verge of complete success, when the forces of the international working class movement are conducting titanic class struggles against the dying forces of imperialism, Modern Revisionism, represented and practised by the present CPSU leadership, has raised its ugly head within the ranks of the World Communist Movement, with a host of revisionist theories and practices, to demoralise, disrupt and sabotage the international working class movement, to liquidate the revolutionary struggles of the oppressed peoples and nations and thus save the imperialist system from its inevitable doom.

Beginning with the 20th Congress of the CPSU, Modern Revisionism represented by the CPSU leadership has passed through various phases of development-its emergence, formation, growth and systematisation.

Now, Modern Revisionism, represented by the CPSU leadership, has been revealed as open betrayal of the revolutionary struggles, as open collaboration with U.S. imperialism for world domination.

Now, it is as clear as daylight that the Programme of the CPSU leadership is a Programme which opposes revolutions of the peoples still under the imperialism and the capitalist system, which opposes the carrying of revolution through to completion on the part of the people already on the Socialist Road. It is a revisionist Programme for the preservation and restoration of capitalism.

Marxist-Leninists throughout the world, especially the glorious CPC, had to conduct a merciless ideological battle against Modern Revisionism represented by the CPSU leadership. The forces of Marxist-Leninists regrouped themselves, both nationally and internationally, fought valiantly against this treachery and betrayal perpetrated by the CPSU leadership in the international working class movement, and the revolutionary struggles.

The revolutionary struggles of the oppressed peoples and nations, the revolutionary forces of the international working class movement, based on Marxism-Leninism had to withstand the repressive forces of imperialism and counter-revolution and, the deception and disruption practised by Modern Revisionism represented by the CPSU leadership, and inspite of certain defeats, made significant advances throughout the world.

In these struggles, Marxist-Leninists and the revolutionary forces of the world are getting consolidated, taking the initiative into their own hands, and are advancing in the struggle against imperialism and Modern Revisionism represented by the CPSU leadership.

Faced with the prospect of growing isolation from the ranks of the world revolutionary forces, from the ranks of the National Liberation forces, from the ranks of the Marxist-Leninists the revisionist leadership of the CPSU, has been parading a façade of "unity" slogans, to worm itself back into the ranks of the Marxist-Leninists, into the anti-imperialist front, for further disrupting this front, and thus to better serve the imperialists.

It is the duty of the Marxist-Leninists to ruthlessly expose the deceptive new slogans of the CPSU leadership, to rebuff their efforts to work themselves back into the ranks of the revolutionary struggles, in order to achieve victory in their struggle against imperialism and Modern Revisionism.

The consolidation and the further rapid advance of the World Communist Movement to accomplish the tasks of the new epoch is inconceivable without waging a principled and determined fight against this menace of Modern Revisionism, against the deceptive new slogans of "unity", given by the CPSU leadership.

It is at this stage of the struggle against imperialism and modern revisionism represented by the CPSU leadership, that our Party is discussing the various issues involved in the great international ideological debate.

We strongly feel that the C.C. Draft and the outlook expounded from time to time in various documents, particularly *'the New situation and Party's Tasks'*, will not and cannot serve as an instrument in the hands of the Party to fight against Modern Revisionism and reorientate itself to the rising struggles in the Country in the present international revolutionary situation.

1. The depth of the treachery and betrayal of Modern Revisionism represented by the CPSU leadership towards the international working class movement.

At this stage of the struggle of the international working class movement against the imperialists and the deceptive and disruptive tactics adopted by Modern Revisionism represented by the CPSU leadership, the duty of every Marxist-Leninist Party is, not merely to oppose the revisionist theories and propositions of the CPSU leadership, but also to ruthlessly expose the devastating results of this policy in practice, the depth of the treachery and betrayal of the CPSU leadership towards the international working class movement, the crass nature of Soviet Revisionism and the class roots of Soviet Revisionism.

This Plenum meeting strongly feels that the C.C. Draft has completely failed in discharging this task.

(a) The policies of the CPSU leadership on peace, Peaceful Co-existence, Peaceful Economic Competition and Peaceful Transition-which have resulted in a line of compromise, conciliation and collaboration with U.S. imperialism for world domination, have been based on its description of the new epoch as an epoch of peaceful transition.

This anti-Marxist-Leninist description of the New Epoch made by the CPSU leadership, in practice, was merely a mask to cover up the aggressive nature of U.S. imperialism, to create illusions in the revolutionary forces about achieving peaceful transition to Socialism without gigantic battles, without heavy sacrifices; illusions about achieving victories without a fight. Thus, it was an attempt on the part of the CPSU leadership to sap the fighting will of the fighting forces and facilitate the aggressive plans of U.S. imperialism.

It is a deceptive cover through which the CPSU leadership carries its betrayal of national liberation struggles, the betrayal of world revolutionary struggles.

Instead of ruthlessly exposing this deception of the CPSU leadership, the C.C. Draft explains away as though the CPSU Leadership's estimation of the New Epoch is due to an *"erroneous definition"*, *"over-simplified formulas subjectively drawn, presenting utopian and false perspectives"*, as though it is living in a *"dream world in which imperialism has ceased to be the monster which has to be annihilated"*.

For the C.C. Draft to say that the CPSU leadership wrongly evaluated the New Epoch as an epoch of peaceful transition to Socialism because it underestimated the strength of imperialism still to resist the advance of the popular

forces, is not exposing the deception of the CPSU leadership, but only inventing an explanation for this deception.

Not only that: In this New Epoch of final collapse of imperialism and the final triumph of world wide victory of Socialism, the national liberation struggles have become the decisive force for the final destruction of imperialism. It is the imperative duty of the international working class movement to give all its support to NLM. It is sacred duty of the Socialist countries to give every kind of support-ideological, political, economic and military-to help NLM to achieve complete success.

The C.C. Draft has failed to locate the NLM as playing the decisive role for the final destruction of imperialism.

Instead of this, the C.C. Draft has said that revolutionary combination of "Socialist diplomacy" and the "armed might of the Socialist Camp" as essential factors for the complete victory of National Liberation struggles.

This is akin to Suslov who said that *"the duty of the Socialist countries to give to these countries political and diplomatic support and when necessary, to curb the imperialist aggressors by using the whole might of the Socialist System"*. (Suslov Report- English P.38)

(b) The CPSU leadership has been dogmatically asserting that the basic contradiction between Socialism and Imperialism is almost the only contradiction which determines the course of world revolution, while the other contradictions play a minor role in the development of world history.

This so-called understanding of the CPSU leadership on the question of contradictions was only a means for its advocacy of peaceful solutions for all the fundamental contradictions of the present epoch.

It was only a means to cover up the growing contradiction between the oppressed nations and imperialism, to negate the decisive role of the NLM in deciding the success of the world revolution which practically served the interests of imperialism, the U.S. imperialism in particular.

Instead of unmasking these pernicious effects of the theory of the CPSU leadership on contradictions, the C.C. Draft describes the theory of the CPSU leadership on contradictions as merely *"wrong in theory and harmful in practice"* and that this wrong theory merely led to "serious opportunist mistakes".

Not only that. The C.C. Draft finds an explanation for this "wrong theory" of the CPSU leadership and declares that this is due to a *"totally erroneous and undialectical understanding, study and assessment of the contradictions"*.

In the recent period, the ever growing forces of NLM are seriously undermining the rear of the imperialist system, the U.S. imperialism with its 3,000 military bases throughout the world is concentrating its main military strength in the continents of Asia, Africa and Latin America to drown NLM in blood. Thus Asia, Africa and Latin America have become the main theatre of war between the world revolutionary forces and imperialism. The struggle between these two forces is of decisive importance for the cause of World Socialist Revolution.

To say that the CPSU leadership does not see this reality, that it merely underestimates the role of NLM, is merely a refusal to see the treachery of the CPSU leadership.

(c) Practice has revealed that the sole aim of the peace policies of the CPSU leadership has been to come to an agreement with the greatest enemy of the peoples of the whole world-U.S. Imperialism.

To achieve this purpose, it disrupted the socialist camp betrayed the revolutionary struggles of the oppressed peoples, disrupted the anti-imperialist front, disrupted the unity of the international working class movement, the only key weapons in the hands of the world peoples to defeat the war plans of the U.S. aggressors and preserve world peace.

Its nuclear agreements with the U.S. imperialists were merely intended to isolate China, to preserve the monopoly of USA and USSR over nuclear weapons.

Friendship with America-enmity with Socialist China- this in essence has become the peace policy of the Soviet Union.

Instead of exposing these pernicious manifestations of the policies of the revisionist leadership of the CPSU, the C.C. Draft explains that *"the attitude of the Soviet leaders on the entire issue is based on the unwarranted premise that their collaboration with the Anglo-American imperialists is a greater guarantee for the preservation of peace"*.

So, the betrayal of one revolutionary post after another by the CPSU leadership, to purchase peace with America, is the result of a more *"unwarranted premise"*.

(d) The essence of the policy of peaceful co-existence practiced by the revisionist leadership has been allround peace with the exploiting classes throughout the world- peace between the oppressed people and oppressor nations, peace between the proletariat and the capitalists', peace between the Socialist Camp and the Imperialist Camp even at the cost of revolution.

Thus, the policy of peaceful co-existence of the CPSU leadership is a negation of all revolutions throughout the world, and an allround cooperation and collaboration with the class enemy.

Its practice fully demonstrated that friendship with America is the heart and soul of the policy of peaceful co-existence of the CPSU leadership.

This great betrayal of all revolutionary struggles, and its global collaboration with U.S. imperialism is being painted by the C.C. Draft as though the CPSU leadership merely *"tends to shield the aggressor"*, *"seeks to conceal the constant imperialist aggression, to appease the aggressor"*.

Not only that. The C.C. says that *"peaceful co-existence is of course an essential part of the Leninist foreign policy obligatory to every Socialist State"*.

We think that this is not in consonance with Lenin, who said:

"Alliance with the revolutionaries of the advanced countries and with all the oppressed peoples against any and all the imperialists- such is the external policy of the Russian Revolution".

To say that peaceful co-existence policy of a socialist state is the “*essential part of the Leninist foreign policy*” is adding grist to the policies of the CPSU leadership on peaceful co-existence.

Instead of trying to analyse the class roots of the revisionist leadership of the CPSU, to understand its treachery and betrayal of the revolutionary struggles, to understand its collaborationist policy, the C.C. document tries to issue good conduct certificate to the CPSU leadership by saying that its “wrong” theories with “harmful effects” are merely due to “totally erroneous and undialectical understanding, study and assessment” of the new epoch and contradictions of the new epoch. This amounts to saying that the collaborationist policy of the CPSU leadership is not due to its betrayal of Marxism-Leninism, to its treachery and betrayal of the revolutionary struggles but merely to an undialectical understanding of the new epoch, as an epoch of peaceful transition.

But what is the reality? The revisionist leadership of the CPSU, exploiting the peace sentiments of the peoples of the world and the peace sentiments of the peoples of the S.U. in particular, introduces its treacherous policy of peace and peaceful co-existence to betray the revolutionary struggles and to serve the interests of the U.S. imperialists.

Lenin never tried to explain ‘peace’ policy of the revisionist leaders of the Second International as resulting from their wrong understanding of the situation. He said:

“The theory reduces itself to this and only to this, that Kautsky utilizes the hope for a new peaceful era of capitalism to justify the opportunists and the official Social Democratic parties who joined the bourgeoisie and repudiated the revolutionary, i.e. proletarian tactics during the present turbulent era not withstanding the solemn declarations of the Basle Resolution.” (Lenin - Collapse of the Second International.)

He declared:

“... the very thought of peacefully subordinating the capitalists to the will of the majority of the exploited, of the peaceful, reformist, transition to socialism is not only extreme philistine stupidity, but also downright deception of the workers, the embellishment of the capitalist wage slavery, concealment of the truth.”

II. National Liberation movements.

(a) The growing National Liberation Struggles are breaking the base of the imperialist system. Imperialist rule has been overthrown in many colonial and dependent countries, and, in others it has suffered heavy blows and is tottering. This inevitably weakens and shakes the rule of imperialism in the metropolitan countries themselves.

Thus the National Liberation Struggles have become a powerful force in thwarting the war plans of U.S. imperialism for world domination and in preserving world peace.

Thus, in the present era, the NLMs have got overall and decisive importance in deciding the course of the world socialist revolution.

Instead of seeing this, the C.C. Draft merely says that the intensification of the contradiction between the NLMs and imperialism "*influences the course of all other contradictions.*"

We feel this characterisation does not fully bring out the decisive role of NLM in advancing the course of the world Socialist Revolution.

We have to bring this fact here, because, the C.C. in "*New Situation and Party's Tasks*" has expounded certain wrong notions on this question.

(b) The C.C. Resolution says:

"The popular victories scored in a series of countries in Asia and the Middle East against the imperialists have become a cause of panic for the U.S. imperialists who began raising the pernicious slogan of 'power vacuum'." (Page.15)

What is it that the C.C wants to convey by this?

According to the C.C. Resolution, the NLMs in Asia, Africa and Latin America threaten the imperialist system in Asia and U.S. imperialism shifted its centre of attack against the NLM to dominate the East with its "*amended global strategy and tactics*" "*for its aggressive and expansionist aims in Asia.*" (Page 16)

So according to the C.C. Resolution, the NLM threatens the imperialist system in the East and the U.S. imperialists are attacking the NLM to achieve their domination in the East.

Is not this outlook similar to that of the CPSU leadership, who have been propagating the view that the NLM in Asia, Africa and Latin America have got only a geographical and regional significance?

But we firmly believe that what is at stake today in Asia, Africa and Latin America is not only the imperialist system in these parts but the very existence of the world capitalist system as a whole. The destruction or the preservation of the world capitalist system is today dependent upon the success or failure of the liberation struggles in these areas.

The U.S. imperialism rightly sees in NLM a threat to the whole world capitalist system, the biggest impediment to their plans of world domination, and are fighting their last ditch-battles against NLM in connivance with the revisionist leadership of the CPSU to preserve the fast crumbling world capitalist system, and to achieve their world domination.

Further the C.C. Resolution says that the military strength of the Soviet Union under the present CPSU leadership and the Warsaw Pact are an effective force in resisting the war plans of U.S. imperialism to dominate Europe. *The C.C. Resolution* says:

"In Europe, the Soviet Union has rebuilt its war-ravaged economy rapidly, broken the U.S. nuclear monopoly, outstripped the U.S. in the scientific and technological fields, manufactured atomic and hydrogen weapons including the ICBM and the anti missile-missiles, and proved itself to be more than a match to

the U.S. in the defence and military sphere. The East European peoples' Democracies had succeeded in consolidating their revolutionary victories and had put their states firmly on the road to socialism and communism. U.S. imperialism also found that its aggressive NATO military alliance was effectively countered by the Warsaw Pact under the Soviet leadership. At the same time it was being faced with the mounting tide of the NLM forces that was threatening to further undermine the imperialist system in Asia."

What an amazing statement! Leaving aside the question as to whether the East European Democracies have been placed firmly on the road to socialism and communism for future discussion, the C.C. Resolution wants the Party members to believe that the "U.S. imperialists then shifted their main centre of aggressive activities and sphere of expansion from Europe to Asia", because its plans for the domination of Europe were thwarted by the military strength of the Soviet Union and the East European Democracies.

To say the least, this is completely a travesty of truth.

The advocacy of peaceful transition to socialism by the CPSU leadership and Modern Revisionists of the European continent which sapped the will of the fighting sections of the proletariat. The active opposition of the revisionist leadership of the CPSU to all revolutionary struggles, the constant efforts of the CPSU leadership to come to an agreement with U.S. imperialism on all key issues of the day, even at the cost of revolution, its nuclear agreements with U.S. imperialism, its constant secret negotiations with U.S. imperialists in the corridors of UNO, gave confidence to the U.S. imperialists about the readiness to collaborate with U.S. imperialism in suppressing NLM, and it was this that enabled the U.S. imperialists to shift their military concentration from Europe to that of Asia, Africa and Latin America to successfully carry its aggressive wars against the oppressed nations.

Instead of showing up this treachery of the CPSU leadership towards the NLM, the C.C. Resolution merely tries to show it up as an effective force in rebuffing the U.S. efforts to dominate Europe.

(c) The C.C. Resolution has further tried to reduce the significance of the PRC as against the aggressive war plans of the U.S. imperialists, to one of geographical importance. *The C.C. Resolution says:*

"What, according to the U.S. strategists, stands as the biggest stumbling block to their Asian expansionism and domination?..... They now treat PRC as the chief force standing against their expansionist aims in Asia."

So according to this, the U.S. imperialists are fighting for expansionism in Asia, and PRC as an Asian power is fighting the expansionist aims in Asia.

But the truth of the matter is, the U.S. imperialists are fighting for world domination while the PRC carrying through the behests of Lenin and Stalin is doing its utmost to help NLM to success heroically championing the cause of world socialism and valiantly fighting the aggressive war plans of the

U.S. imperialists for world domination. Such is the world liberating mission that PRC is gloriously carrying on its shoulders.

Only prejudices can blind one not to see the world liberating mission of the PRC, that PRC, with its consistent struggle against U.S. imperialist plans for world domination, with its irreconcilable ideological battles against modern revisionism, with its self-less support to the revolutionary struggles throughout the world, is actually acting as the base of the world revolution.

(d) Soviet Economic Aid

The C.C. Draft describes Soviet economic aid to the backward countries in the name of the non-capitalist path, as aid to capitalists, to build capitalism in their respective countries.

This description is misleading, giving the impression as though Soviet Economic Aid to the backward countries plays an anti-imperialist role to resist imperialist pressures on those countries.

Practice has shown that Soviet Economic Aid has been used to build a so-called public-sector, subservient to the growth of monopoly capitalism, subservient to the penetration of American capitalism.

More and more Soviet economic aid is acquiring the character of aid to buttress reactionary governments as in Indonesia, Bolivia and India, as aid to create its own sphere of influence in the backward countries, as aid to gang up reactionary governments against PRC.

When this is becoming the growing character of Soviet Aid, to say that Soviet Aid is aid to build capitalism, is not to thoroughly expose the real features of CPSU leadership.

(e) Peoples War

Recent history has amply proved that NLMs faced with the armed intervention of the U.S. imperialists, faced with armed counter-revolution, are taking more and more to the path of people's war inspired by the experience of the Chinese Revolution.

When this is becoming the main form of struggle, such expressions as, *"the foremost thinkers, founders and leaders of Marxism-Leninism were always eager to find out ways and means to restrict, minimise and, if possible to avoid the bourgeois violence in the way of effecting the Socialist revolution, since peaceful transition is advantageous to the proletariat"*, or *"Marx, Engels, Lenin and the foremost leaders of the world proletariat did strive to achieve the socialist revolution by peaceful means wherever and whenever such an opportunity did open before them without allowing it to be missed"*, would only emphasise the possibilities of peaceful transition and create illusions among the fighting ranks about peaceful transition, as has been done in *"New Situation and Party's Tasks"*.

(f) Intermediate Zone

The C.C. Draft has not discussed the significance of the intermediate zone. It is not for nothing.

In between U.S. imperialism and the socialist camp, the intermediate zone and the inter-imperialist contradictions in this area have got a particular significance in isolating U.S. imperialism.

In this context alone, we can understand PRC's relations with France or Pakistan, which have yielded good results in isolating U.S. imperialism.

The revisionist leadership of the CPSU which opposed this line in the beginning, had to swallow its own words and try to develop its relations with France and Pakistan with its own ulterior motives.

The C.C. could not appreciate the attitude of PRC to Pakistan as it fails to understand the approach of PRC towards the intermediate zone.

Attitude towards the NLM has become an important line of demarcation between Marxist-Leninists and modern revisionists represented by the CPSU leadership.

And, it is on this question the revisionist leadership of CPSU has exhibited the worst features of betrayal of all revolutionary struggles.

True, sometimes the CPSU leadership pretends to be supporting the NLM and does give some limited help to them to justify themselves as communists in the eyes of the world public.

But, the essence of the policy of the CPSU leadership is total betrayal of the national liberation struggles one by one. Congo, Rhodesia, Dominican Republic, the Middle East- are all standing monuments to the great betrayal of the national liberation struggles by the CPSU leadership.

The C.C. Draft, instead of bringing out this through betrayal of the National Liberation struggles by the CPSU leadership, has dismissed its whole attitude on this question as one of neglect or underestimation of the national liberation struggles.

It is pertinent to remember that some of our C.C. leaders even as late as 1964 have been singing praises to "*disinterested, technical, industrial and economic aid liberally given by the Soviet Union..... to the underdeveloped and newly liberated countries.*"

III. CPSU Leadership's collaboration with U.S. Imperialism for world domination.

The C.C. Draft agrees that "*the bankrupt revisionist line of the Soviet leaders*" is being glaringly seen and understood by "*every intelligent student of politics in the world, let alone the Marxist-Leninists, as more and more a line of conciliation, compromise and collaboration between the two great powers the USSR and the USA, a line which objectively preserves and perpetuates the international status quo and as a line which summarily abandons the revolutionary class struggle of the proletariat.*"

But the C.C. Draft has rushed to add that this collaboration is not for "*sharing world hegemony with American imperialism and for the division of the spheres of influence in the world.*"

Then, why is this collaboration for?

According to the C.C. Draft, this collaboration is due to the CPSU leadership's "*facile notion of maintaining world peace in collaboration with the most aggressive U.S. imperialism.*"

U.S. imperialists are conducting ferocious wars of aggression against oppressed nations throughout the world. It is arming itself to the teeth with deadly weapons to achieve world domination. It has created a huge war machine.

To think that the CPSU leadership really believes that it could preserve world peace in collaboration with such a power, is nothing but blindness to see the depth of the treachery of the CPSU leadership.

The global strategy of U.S. imperialism has been to grab and dominate the intermediate zone lying between the U.S. and the socialist camp, put down revolutions of the oppressed peoples and nations, proceed to destroy the socialist countries and thus to dominate the whole world.

Is not the CPSU leadership collaborating with U.S. imperialism in the accomplishment of these aims?

The CPSU leadership with its theory that 'local wars lead to world conflagration' has been trying to demoralise, disrupt and sabotage the NLM thus facilitating the wars of aggression of U.S. imperialism against struggling nations.

It has been helping the U.S. imperialism to use UNO as an instrument of suppression of peoples struggles.

With its teachings of peaceful transition, it is trying to sap the fighting will of the proletariat and thus help U.S. imperialism in preserving the capitalist system and the capitalist world.

The CPSU leadership is trying for peaceful restoration of capitalism in the Soviet Union which has been the dream of imperialism.

Both USA and USSR have come to an agreement to maintain their monopoly of nuclear weapons to blackmail the weaker nations.

The CPSU leadership has disrupted the socialist camp and International Communist Movement which is the fond hope of U.S. imperialism.

The CPSU leadership is ganging up with all reactionary powers to malign and isolate China, to build the so-called containment wall against China, which is in the forefront of the struggle against U.S. plans for world domination.

If these acts of the CPSU leadership are not acts of collaboration with U.S. imperialism for world domination, what else is it?

Both imperialism and the CPSU leaders are shouting about their collaboration for world domination.

Willey Brandit of Western Germany recently declared:

"We are by now doubly assured by the Soviet collaboration with U.S., started in Cuban crisis, followed by the Middle East now."

"It is proved beyond any doubt that Soviet leadership will not dare clash with U.S. and the rest of the West. Now is the time to redivide the spheres of influence between U.S. and USSR in both Western Europe as well as Asia".

Gromyko declared in 1962:

".....If there is agreement between N.S. Khrushchov, the head of the Soviet Government and John Kennedy, the President of the United States, there will be a solution of international problems on which mankind's destinies depend."

The revisionist leadership of the CPSU uses deceptive peace slogans to deceive the peoples of the world, the Soviet people in particular, to cover up its dirty collaboration with U.S. imperialism for world domination.

The CPSU leadership resorts to all *"these subterfuges, sophistries and fraudulent falsifications"* only in order to disassociate themselves from revolutionary struggles, to *"conceal their desertion to the liberal policy i.e. to the bourgeoisie"* to cover up their dirty deals with U.S. imperialism for world domination.

We are sorry to note that the C.C. Draft has fallen a prey to the deception of the CPSU leadership.

To sustain its wrong arguments, the C.C. Draft declares that to speak of the CPSU leaders' collaboration with U.S. imperialism for world domination is *"tantamount to nothing short of placing the Soviet Union outside the socialist camp."*

Who is trying to place the Soviet Union outside the Socialist Camp?

It is the CPSU leadership, by its efforts to restore capitalism in the Soviet Union, by its efforts to transform P.D. (Proletarian Dictatorship) into a bourgeois state, by its efforts to transform CPSU from a party of the working class into a bourgeois party, by its class collaborationist policy, that is actually trying to take the Soviet Union out of the socialist camp.

A timely ruthless exposure of its betrayal alone will rouse the consciousness of the Soviet people and Soviet Communists and help their resistance to this betrayal of the CPSU leadership. The international communist movement owes this responsibility towards the Soviet people.

Any shielding of the betrayal of the CPSU leadership or any soft pedalling in the exposure of the betrayal of the CPSU leadership will be a violation of international duty of the world communist movement and the interests of the Soviet people.

The C.C. Draft by negating the naked fact that the CPSU leadership's collaborating with U.S. imperialism for world domination and by asserting that such a characterisation amounts to placing the Soviet Union outside the socialist camp, is only trying to negate all the criticism it has made about the policies of the CPSU leadership in the previous chapters, to bestow some good intentions on the CPSU leadership for its collaboration with U.S. imperialism and lay the basis for a united front with the CPSU leadership.

IV. Building communism in the Soviet Union -Transformation of P.D. into the so-called peoples state and the transformation of CPSU from a working class party into a party of the whole people

The C.C. Draft has characterised the decision of the present leadership of the CPSU to transform P.D. into a state of the whole people and the transformation

of the CPSU into a Party of the whole people as negation of Marxism-Leninism on the question of P.D. and the proletarian character of the Communist Party.

The C.C. Draft has also admitted that *"the resort to capitalist incentives and ideas of personal profit, in the final analysis, paves the way for the restoration of a new type of capitalism and harms the cause of socialism and communism."*

But the C.C. Draft concedes the claim of the CPSU leadership that it is building communism when it says that *"this danger is all the more so when the concept of material incentives is unduly emphasized in a socialist society at a stage which they claim to be full-scale construction of communism."*

So the C.C. Draft's complaint is that the CPSU leadership is unduly emphasizing the concept of material incentives at the stage of full scale construction of communism.

But, what is the reality?

As long as differences between town and country, between worker and peasant, between mental and physical labour remain, as long as a new man imbued with the spirit of selfless service to society is not created, as long as encirclement of the socialist state by the capitalist states remain, to think of building communism is an utopia. So the claim of the CPSU leadership that it is building communism in the Soviet Union is a hoax. The C.C. Draft fails to expose this hoax that the CPSU leadership is playing on the Soviet and world people.

Not only that. The practice of the Socialist states teaches us that the socialist society covers a very long historical period. Throughout this historical period, the class struggle between the bourgeoisie and the proletariat continues and the question of 'who will win' - the capitalist road or the socialist road remains. Thus till society enters the period of communism, the danger of restoration of capitalism persists.

But the present revisionist leadership of the CPSU, which has abandoned the principle of class struggle, both nationally and internationally, in the name of building communism is actually taking steps for the restoration of capitalism in the Soviet Union.

Their disbandment of machine and tractor stations and selling that property to the collective farms, their introduction of free market, their decentralisation of certain industries and particular sectors of industry, their investment of greater power to the local managers of industries, their introduction of material incentives, profit motive and bonus system, their introduction of competition, are all against the teachings of Lenin and Stalin on transition from socialism to communism. They are steps that will lead not to the building of communism, but will definitely lead to the restoration of capitalism in the Soviet Union.

And recently a very dangerous phenomenon has appeared in the East European States. Many of them are building joint industries with foreign Western collaboration. Even the Soviet Union is negotiating with the Japanese capitalists for the joint exploitation of Siberian mineral wealth.

It is pertinent to remember that all these measures of decentralisation, competition, profit motive, free market- were measures that Lenin and Stalin

adopted to use them to revive capitalist relations to a certain extent under the vigorous control of P.D. before going to the full scale construction of socialism.

But to-day these steps are being introduced by a revisionist leadership which has adopted bourgeois ideology and which is following a policy of collaboration on a global plane, and these steps have given rise to new type of capitalistic elements both in town and countryside.

It is pertinent to remember that the revisionist Tito clique in Yugoslavia adopted the very same measures long before the revisionist leadership of CPSU adopted them.

The new bourgeois elements, who have usurped the leadership of the party and the State step by step, have formed a privileged stratum in Soviet society.

This privileged stratum is the principal component of the bourgeoisie in the Soviet Union to-day, and the present revisionist leaders are the political representatives of the new bourgeois elements, particularly of the privileged stratum.

Thus we see that while shouting that it is building communism in the Soviet Union the CPSU leadership is actually taking steps to restore capitalism.

That is the reason why the bourgeois world, instead of being afraid of the construction of 'communism' in the Soviet Union are showering praises on the CPSU leadership for its new measure.

This should open the eyes of all the Marxist-Leninists as to the nature of communism' being built in the Soviet Union.

The C.C. Draft, instead of exposing the ugly fact that the CPSU leadership, under the guise of fake communism, is actually taking steps for the restoration of capitalism in the Soviet Union, that new capitalist elements have already appeared in the Soviet society, says that material incentives "*in the final analysis pave the way for the restoration of a new type of capitalism*", as though the danger is only in the distant future and not in the present.

STATE OF THE WHOLE PEOPLE AND PARTY OF THE WHOLE PEOPLE.

Keeping in line with its policy of restoration of capitalism in the Soviet Union, the revisionist leadership of the CPSU is taking steps to transform P.D. into a bourgeois state in the name of state of the whole people.

State can always only be a representative of a particular class and there cannot be a super class state. It is only the bourgeoisie who camouflage their state with the name 'People's State', to cover up their class rule. Engels said:

"free peoples state was a programme demand and a catchword current among the German Social Democrats in the seventies. This catch word is devoid of all political content except that it describes the concept of democracy in a pompous philistine fashion."

Exactly the present CPSU leadership is using the people's state to cover up the bourgeois state it is trying to build.

Similarly, the deceptive term '*Party of the whole people*' is a mask to cover up the efforts of the CPSU leadership to change the proletarian character of the CPSU into a bourgeois party.

The C.C. Draft while opposing the decisions of the CPSU leadership to change the proletarian character of P.D. and CPSU, it does not expose that the CPSU leadership, in the guise of '*State of the whole people*' and '*Party of the whole people*' is actually trying to convert the Soviet State into a bourgeois state and the Communist Party into a bourgeois party.

Because the present CPSU leadership is the privileged bourgeois stratum representing the new capitalist elements in the Soviet Union, it doggedly pursues its line of collaboration with U.S. imperialism for world domination.

The C.C. Draft refuses to see this ugly development.

Ofcourse this does not mean that the cycle of restoration of capitalism in the Soviet Union is already complete, or the efforts of the CPSU leadership in this direction are going to succeed.

The privileged bourgeois stratum in the Soviet Union, represented by the present revisionist clique, represents only the new capitalistic elements, constituting a small percentage of the Soviet population. It is diametrically opposed to the overwhelming majority of the Soviet people, to the great majority of the Soviet cadre and the Communists.

The contradiction between the Soviet people and this privileged bourgeois stratum is now the principal contradiction inside the Soviet Union and it is an irreconcilable and antagonistic class contradiction.

It is our firm conviction that the great Soviet people, the great Soviet Communists, who have long traditions of revolutionary struggles, will, before long see through the vile attempts of the revisionist leadership of the CPSU at restoration of capitalism in the Soviet Union, resist their attempts, discard their revisionist theories and practices and preserve socialism in the Soviet Union.

But confidence in the strength of the Soviet people to preserve socialism should not blind us to the ugly fact that the present revisionist leadership of the Party, which has temporarily usurped the leadership of the Party and the State, is attempting to restore capitalism in the Soviet Union.

It is the duty of the International Communist Movement towards the Soviet people to mercilessly expose this treachery of the present CPSU leadership.

The C.C. Draft, by refusing to take up this sacred task and by asserting that the CPSU leadership is not trying to restore capitalism in the Soviet Union, is only helping the present revisionist leadership of the CPSU to further deceive the Soviet people and the peoples of the world and successfully carry through their restoration of capitalism in the Soviet Union.

V. The class roots of revisionism in the CPSU leadership

Lenin always taught us that "*the inevitability of revisionism is determined by its class roots in modern society*".

Now the C.C. Draft has admitted that the CPSU leadership is following a revisionist line.

Then, what are the class roots of revisionism in the CPSU leadership?

As noted above, the old and new bourgeois elements, the old and new rich peasants and the degenerate elements of all sorts constitute the social basis for revisionism in the CPSU leadership. The existence of bourgeois influence is the internal source of revisionism and collaboration with imperialism is its external source.

But the C.C. Draft refuses to analyse the class roots of revisionism of the CPSU leadership.

Then the legitimate question arises as to how the C.C. leadership, has come to the conclusion that the leadership of the CPSU is revisionist without going into its class roots.

In the same breath they say that they do not accept the view that new capitalistic elements have grown up in the Soviet Union and that the present CPSU leadership represents these new capitalist elements.

Lenin said:

"Everybody agrees that opportunism is not an accidental thing, not a sin, not a slip, not the treachery of individual persons, but the social product of a whole historical epoch."

Revisionism either of the Soviet brand or of Yugoslavia brand or of the brand of the capitalist countries or revisionism of the revisionist leaders of the Second International—all of them are a prop of bourgeois ideology.

One cannot draw a distinction between the Tito clique and the present CPSU leadership.

The only difference is that while the Tito clique is working for these aims from outside the socialist camp, the Soviet revisionist clique is working for the same aims from inside the socialist camp. Their class roots and class nature are one and the same.

The CPSU leaders have been shouting from their house-tops that they and the Tito clique are 'not only class brothers' but 'brothers tied together-by the singleness of the aims confronting us' that they are 'reliable and faithful ally' of the Tito clique, that they and the Tito clique 'belong to one and the same idea and are guided by the same theory.'

The CPSU leaders are vociferously shouting about their identity with the Tito clique. It is really curious on the part of the C.C. leaders to draw a distinction between the Tito clique and the CPSU leadership.

Characterising the opportunism of the revisionist leaders of the Second International, Lenin said:

"Advocacy of class collaboration, abandonment of the idea of socialist revolution and revolutionary methods of struggle, adaptation to bourgeois nationalism, losing sight of the fact that the borders of nationality and country are historically transient, making a fetish of bourgeois legality, renunciation of the class viewpoint and the class struggle, for fear of repelling 'the broad masses' of population

(meaning the petty bourgeoisie)-such doubtlessly, are the ideological foundations of opportunism." (Lenin-COLLECTED WORKS-Vol.21,P.35)

Does not this description fully fit in with the opportunism and revisionism of the CPSU leadership?

Are the theories and practices of the CPSU leadership on War and Peace, Peaceful Co-existence, National Liberation Struggles and on Peaceful Transition to Socialism any way different from those of Kautsky and Co.?

Characterising the theories and practices of Kautsky, *Lenin* said:

"Kautsky takes from Marxism what is acceptable to the liberals, to the bourgeoisie- and discards, passes in silence, glosses over all that in Marxism which is unacceptable to the bourgeoisie (the revolutionary violence against the bourgeoisie for the latter's destruction). That is why Kautsky, by virtue of his objective position and irrespective of what his subjective convictions may be, inevitably proves to be a lackey of the bourgeoisie." (Proletarian Revolution and Renegade Kautsky.)

Does not *Lenin's* description of Kautsky exactly apply to the present revisionist leadership of the CPSU?

Have not the Soviet revisionist leadership with their class collaboration theories with their opposition to revolutionary struggles, with their efforts to restore capitalism in the Soviet Union sold themselves, body and soul to bourgeois ideology and are acting as the 'lackey's bourgeoisie'?

The C.C. leaders argue that the revisionist leadership of the CPSU should not be treated as an ally and agent of imperialism, because according to the C.C., the revisionist leadership of the CPSU is part and parcel of the socialist system, a part and parcel of the Soviet people.

With its policies of class collaboration, with its policies of undermining socialism, how are we to equate the CPSU leadership with the Soviet people who are genuinely interested in the preservation of socialism and destruction of imperialism?

Lenin has said:

"Actually the fact that the opportunists formally belong to workers' parties, does not by any means remove the fact that, objectively, they are a political detachment of the bourgeoisie, channels of its influence, its agents in the labour movements." (*Lenin -Against Revisionism-P.263*)

Does not this description apply to the CPSU leadership? Are not the CPSU leaders, with their line of class compromise, conciliation and collaboration on a global plane acting as the agents of the world bourgeoisie, as the agents of American imperialism in the socialist camp and the international working class movement?

Lenin said:

"The crisis that was created by the Great War has torn off the coverings, has swept away the conventions, has exposed the abscess, that has long been ripe, has revealed opportunism in its role of ally of the bourgeoisie". (Lenin-Against Revisionism-P.273)

The growing crisis of world capitalism, the raging national liberation struggles throughout the world, the gigantic class battles against imperialism, have all 'torn off the coverings' of the CPSU leaders, have torn off the mask of 'communism' which they have been donning so far and showed them up as nothing but allies of the bourgeoisie within the socialist camp.

Our love for the Soviet people, our solicitude for the Soviet people, should not hide the fact that Modern Revisionism represented by the CPSU leadership is today acting as the enemy of the socialist camp as a counter-revolutionary force inside the international working class movement.

It is the duty of all Marxist-Leninists to carry on an irreconcilable fight against the menace of this Modern Revisionism. It is only such a fight that will help the Soviet people to see through the treachery and betrayal of the CPSU leadership.

Modern Revisionism is occurring in the background of ever deepening crisis of world capitalism and growing class struggles. In the face of these class struggles, Modern Revisionism can not deceive the Soviet people for long.

The great ideological fight of the Marxist-Leninists against Modern Revisionism has already started yielding good results. The fall of Khrushchov is the first great victory against Modern Revisionism. It is the beginning of the end of it.

The continuation of this irreconcilable fight against Modern Revisionism represented by the CPSU leadership and its class collaborationist policies, alone will unite the socialist camp and international communist movement based on Marxism-Leninism.

We are sorry to note that the C.C. Draft, instead of helping in this irreconcilable ideological fight against the revisionism of the CPSU leadership is laying the basis for a united front with the CPSU leadership in the name of the unity of socialist camp.

VI. Irreconcilable battle against revisionism of the CPSU leadership or, united front with the CPSU leadership-Unity of Action in Vietnam.

We believe the central theme of this document is that inspite of ideological differences between Marxist-Leninists and the revisionist leadership of the CPSU, united front with the revisionist leadership of the CPSU, is the immediate task in order to achieve success in the struggle against imperialism.

To carry through this idea, the document puts forth even more wrong ideas before the Party. The C.C. Draft says:

"A look at the present world communist movement and the socialist camp would convince anybody that it is sharply divided, and it is plunged into a serious crisis – a crisis that have virtually paralysed the initiative of

the world communist forces in successfully resisting and rebuffing the offensive let loose by the world imperialists- chiefly the U.S."

So the C.C. Draft sees only crisis and paralysis in the socialist camp, an "unity in action against imperialism between different socialist states whose state and Party leaders have come to hold diametrically opposed views on a series of ideological-political issues of the day" becomes the immediate and imperative need.

This is the guiding principle in this document.

But '*crisis*' and '*paralysis*' in the camp of the international working class movement, in the camp of socialism- Is it true?

The International Communist Movement tried to correct the revisionist errors of the CPSU leadership through the 1957 and 1960 conferences.

The CPSU leadership, including Khrushchov, taking advantage of every concession given, seriously tried to create confusion in the ranks of the world communists and came out against all revolutionary principles of the militant revolutionary programme of the World Conferences of 1957 and 1960. They openly came out against all revolutionary struggles and ganged up with U.S. imperialists and all the reactionaries of the world against the great PRC, the base of the NLM, to isolate it from the fighting people and the socialist countries.

Marxist-Leninists, who understood the betrayal of Marxism-Leninism by the CPSU leadership, in spite of initial confusion, regrouped their ranks, both nationally and internationally and resolutely fought back the treachery, betrayal and splitting activities of the revisionist leadership of the CPSU.

In spite of the betrayal of the CPSU leadership, its sabotage, its open collaboration with U.S. imperialism, the national liberation struggles against imperialism have continued to advance. It is in this period that liberation struggles have spread in the continent of Latin America and they are taking more and more to the path of armed struggle. The national liberation struggles have made significant advances in South East Asia.

In particular, the people of Vietnam have scored spectacular successes in their national liberation struggle, in bogging down the American imperialism in a bottomless pit.

Peoples Republic of China has scored great victories in industrial and agricultural production, in its Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution, in achieving atomic weapons to match the American imperialists and these successes of PRC have gladdened the hearts of all freedom loving peoples.

The advancing national liberation struggles have sharpened the crisis of world capitalist system, have increased the crisis of American imperialism in particular. The American people themselves, especially the Negro people have begun to fight the policies of U.S. imperialism.

The advance of the national liberation struggles has not only thrown U.S. imperialism into a crisis, but also they have led to a crisis in revisionism of the CPSU leadership.

In actual life, in the fields of battle, the line of the CPSU leadership was being more and more exposed as a line of class collaboration, as a line of collaboration with U.S. imperialism for world domination.

Faced with the prospect of complete isolation from the ranks of revolutionary forces, from the ranks of the liberation struggles, from the ranks of Marxist-Leninists, the CPSU leadership had to throw out Khrushchov from power and a new set of leaders, the present leaders, had to be placed in power.

The present CPSU leaders following the same old Khrushchovist collaborationist policies had to invent new deceptive and honeyed slogans like 'unity of the socialist camp', 'Common Programme', 'common ideology', 'unity of action in Vietnam', 'unity against the common enemy' and etc.

The C.C. Draft fails to see the general advance of the revolutionary struggles, in spite of certain defeats in certain sectors, the growing crisis in the camp of revisionism. It sees only crisis and paralysis in the camp of socialism.

That is why the C.C. Draft readily catches the deceptive slogans of the CPSU leadership and puts forth the idea of united front with the CPSU leadership.

THE DECEPTIVE SLOGANS OF THE CPSU LEADERSHIP

As the forces of NLM and revolutionary forces advance, imperialism headed by U.S. imperialism has been carrying on a Death bed struggle for its existence and it badly needs the services of Modern Revisionism in its vain attempt to save itself from its final doom.

In their vain attempt to deck themselves as different from Khrushchov to do better service to U.S. imperialism, the new CPSU leaders have been raising a façade of 'unity' slogans in order to conceal the essence of their continued pursuance of Khrushchov's revisionist line. All moribund forces take to such progressive slogans for their own reactionary purposes.

The CPSU leaders shout for 'united action' on the basis of the so-called 'common programme' and 'common ideology'.

But it is the revisionist leadership of CPSU who have completely betrayed Marxism-

Leninism, the common ideology of all Marxist-Leninists, and the revolutionary principles of the common programme of the Communist Parties, unanimously agreed upon by the 1957 and 1960 Conferences.

The CPSU leaders, disregarding the common programme of the world Communist movement, have been telling time and again that the line of the class collaboration 'adopted at the 20th and 22nd Congresses of the CPSU "was, is and will be the only immutable line in the entire home and foreign policies of the Communist Party and the Soviet State"'.

The common ideology of all Marxist-Leninists is Marxism-Leninism, while the common ideology of Modern Revisionism is bourgeois ideology.

The common programme of the Marxist-Leninists is revolutionary struggle for the final destruction of imperialism, for the success of the world socialist revolution, while the common programme of modern revisionism represented by

the CPSU leaders is the preservation of the imperialist system and active opposition to world socialist revolution.

Therefore the antagonism between Marxism-Leninism and modern revisionism represented by the CPSU leadership is a class antagonism, between the proletariat and the bourgeoisie; it is the class antagonism between the socialist and the capitalist roads, between the line of opposing imperialism and the line of surrendering to it. It is an irreconcilable antagonism.

UNITED ACTION AGAINST 'THE COMMON ENEMY'.

The new leaders of the CPSU incessantly cry for 'united action' against 'the common enemy' in spite of ideological and political differences.

In the struggle against capitalism and imperialism and in the course of world socialist revolution, the international proletariat can defeat the enemy through uniting its own forces and uniting with all other forces that can be united.

In today's world situation, the U.S. imperialism is the common enemy of the whole world. United front against U.S. imperialism has the unity of the international proletariat as its core and unity between the international proletariat and the oppressed nations as its foundation. It means uniting closely with the masses of the people, who constitute over 90% of the world's population, uniting with all the political forces subject to U.S. aggression, control and interference or bullying, and making use of every possible contradiction, all for the purpose of isolating U.S. imperialism, the main enemy of the peoples of the whole world to the maximum extent and dealing it the hardest possible blows. This is the way to mobilise all the positive factors conducive to world revolution for the achievement of victory in the peoples' revolutionary struggles in every country.

In the contemporary world, opposition to or alliance with U.S. imperialism constitutes the hall-mark for deciding whether or not a political force can be included in the united front against the United States.

Can the CPSU leadership, judged by its actions, be included in the united front against U.S. imperialism?

While they sometimes criticise U.S. imperialism as 'aggressor' and 'war monger' in the same breath they praise the Johnson administration as 'sensible' and 'moderate', they declare that 'there are sufficiently broad areas for co-operation', and behind the scenes they are stepping up their secret diplomacy and their deals with the United States.

The programme of the CPSU leadership is alliance and collaboration with U.S. imperialism to dominate the world.

Sometimes they deceive the people with their verbal attacks on U.S. imperialism. These verbal attacks meet the needs of U.S. imperialists and the revisionists themselves. They have to give an appearance of opposing the U.S. imperialists to hoodwink the masses and sabotage revolution. Otherwise they could not play this deceptive role and that would not be to the advantage of U.S. imperialism. Minor attacks in words and major help in deeds—such is the way the new leaders of the CPSU serve U.S. imperialism.

Thus its call for unity of action is a clever camouflage for greater disunity, for greater disruption within the socialist camp and within the international working class movement.

Such being the case, can the CPSU revisionist leadership have a place in the united front against U.S. imperialism? Is U.S. imperialism the common enemy for both Marxist-Leninists and the Modern Revisionists represented by the CPSU leadership?

The CPC is absolutely right in refusing to fall into this trap of the CPSU, in refusing 'unity of action' on the basis of the so-called common programme. The CPC has rightly said, "*there are things that divide us and nothing that unites us, things that are antagonistic and nothing that is common.*"

It is wrong on the part of the C.C. Draft to find fault with the CPC's stand on this question.

UNITY OF ACTION ON THE QUESTION OF VIETNAM.

The very fact that the great CPC has repeatedly stated that they are ready to take united action with CPSU leaders, if they are really opposed to U.S. imperialism and did so by actual deeds, goes to show their urge for principled unity for anti-imperialist struggle.

The C.C. wrongly thinks that the slogan of 'unity of action' is given by the new CPSU leadership at a time when the socialist camp is seriously divided on several ideological political issues, that this slogan was given in connection with U.S. aggression in Vietnam, and that this slogan would bridge the gulf in the socialist camp, and to work out a joint plan of action with PRC against U.S. aggression in Vietnam.

But, this is not in consonance with facts.

When Khrushchov was in power, the revisionist leadership of the CPSU openly sided with U.S. imperialism and opposed and undermined the revolutionary struggle of the Vietnamese people. With their declaration, that any local war would lead to a world conflagration, they tried to frighten and intimidate all peoples engaged in revolutionary armed struggle; they openly refused to support and aid the Vietnamese people in their anti-U.S. struggle. When the struggle became acute, their policy was one of 'disengagement'. In July, 1964, they indicated the desire of the Soviet Government to resign from its post as one of the two Co-Chairmen of the Geneva Conference. Soon after -wards, when the U.S. imperialism engineered the Bac Bo gulf incident, Khrushchov went so far as to concoct the slander that the incident was provoked by China.

The liberation struggle in Vietnam continued and grew intensity in opposition to the policy of the CPSU leadership. World revolutionary forces magnificently rallied to the cause of Vietnam.

The liberation war in Vietnam is Victoriously progressing against U.S. imperialism inspite of the CPSU leadership's betrayal, with the full support of PRC and the world people. It has become a rallying point for all anti-imperialist forces and all Marxist-Leninists who are genuinely interested in a decisive defeat of U.S. imperialism in Vietnam. It has become a turning point in the

anti-imperialist struggles, after certain debacles as in Congo and Dominican Republic due to the betrayal of the CPSU leadership.

The CPSU leadership, which has so far done everything to disarm, to disrupt and sabotage the Vietnamese struggle, has now come forward with the slogan of 'united action', to cover up its own isolation from the struggling people and Marxist-Leninists of the world, and to worm itself back into the anti-imperialist front for further disruption.

'Involvement' or 'non-involvement' of the Soviet Union-both serve the interests of the U.S. imperialists.

The stand taken by the CPSU leadership on Vietnam, is inseparable from its general programme of collaboration with U.S. imperialism for world domination.

In 1965, the Soviet leaders directly transmitted to the North Vietnamese Government, the preposterous peace conditions of the U.S. imperialists demanding the North Vietnamese Government not to support the liberation struggle in the South and that the attacks on the cities in South Vietnam should be stopped.

At that time, they proposed to the CPSU to help the U.S. *"to find a way out of Vietnam."*

In February 1965, it forwarded Johnson's proposal for unconditional negotiations, and carried on diplomatic negotiations with France.

When the North Vietnamese Government refused to accept this proposal, they again proposed negotiations, if bombing of North Vietnam was stopped.

When these plots were failed, they began to collaborate with the Tito clique and Indian reactionaries, both brokers for U.S. imperialists' peace overtures.

While pretending to be supporting the Vietnamese struggle, they have been continuously conducting secret negotiations with U.S. imperialism about the Vietnamese issue.

They have been cooperating and collaborating with U.S. imperialism and coming to an agreement with them on every issue of the day.

They allowed the U.S. imperialists to use Moscow Radio to denounce Socialist China as standing in the way of peaceful settlement of the Vietnamese issue.

Its help to Vietnam is being used to malign Socialist China and to carry the most slanderous campaign against the cultural revolution of China.

The limited help that the CPSU leadership is peddling to Vietnam should not blind us as not to see the real aims of the CPSU leadership in Vietnam.

This limited help to Vietnam is not against the wishes and interests of the U.S. imperialists. They are openly declaring that *"eventually an agreement might be contrived involving the Soviet troops in North Vietnam.....while American troops remain in South Vietnam"* and that *"one of the paradoxical advantages of more direct Soviet military involvement should be the establishment of a direct American-Soviet bargaining relationship in this area."*

The actions of the Soviet leadership amply demonstrate that it is not interested in a decisive defeat of U.S. imperialism in Vietnam.

As a matter of fact, the strategical aims of Vietnam liberation war are diametrically opposed 'to those' of the CPSU leadership.

While the Vietnam war aims at a decisive defeat of U.S. imperialism, the sole of the CPSU leadership is to bring Vietnamese issue into the orbit of U.S. – Soviet collaboration.

WHY THESE DECEPTIVE SLOGANS

The class collaboration policy of the CPSU has been fully exposed.

To cover up their growing isolation, to cover up their collaboration with U.S. imperialism for world domination, it wants to worm itself back into the ranks of Marxist-Leninists to confuse, deceive, corrupt and disrupt them, to work itself into the ranks of the national liberation struggles for further disruption, to stop the open polemics which are relentlessly exposing their real class character, to deceive the Soviet people for some more time to complete the process of restoration of capitalism in the Soviet Union and lastly to bring the Vietnamese issue into the orbit of U.S. Soviet collaboration.

Taking into consideration these diabolical aims of the CPSU leadership, the CPC has rightly rejected any united action in principle with the CPSU leadership on the Vietnamese question.

To abandon the principled stand and take united action with the revisionist CPSU leadership will only white wash its collaboration policy, and help it in deceiving the Soviet and world people. It will be nothing but taking chances and making experiments with the glorious Vietnamese struggle which has advanced in opposition to the treachery and betrayal of the CPSU leadership.

The global strategy of U.S. imperialism is, the destruction of PRC and the socialist camp to be achieved after the suppression of the national liberation struggles, all for world domination. The CPSU leadership collaborates with U.S. imperialism in this global strategy for world domination. Only revisionism, representing the privileged bourgeoisie stratum can pursue such an aim.

The C.C. Draft fails to see the revisionist depths of the CPSU leadership, falls a prey to the deceptive slogans and proposals of the CPSU leadership.

The C.C. Draft, while noting that the line of the CPSU leadership in Vietnam *"is disappointing and is not what is rightly expected of a leading and mighty Socialist State"*, that the CPSU leadership *"takes hesitant, halting and compromising steps"* and *"makes repeated attempts at restoring some kind of peace in Vietnam in compliance with U.S. aggressors"*, that it has tried to isolate China and *"pressurise it into submission and a host of similar steps and actions deliberately perpetrated by them to damn the Chinese Communists as War-mongers and traitors to the cause of socialism"* still supports the call of the CPSU leadership for 'unity of action in Vietnam'.

The C.C. Draft holds the view that CPC should not have rejected a united front action with the CPSU leadership on principle. The Draft says that this is against the concept of united action and untied front.

What the C.C. Draft forgets is that these states and parties are not states and parties in general. They are Communist Parties and Socialist States, which have to serve as the constituents of the core of anti-imperialist front. Ideological and

political struggles and a kind of sorting between Marxist-Leninists and the revisionists is taking place in these parties and states. The condition for the united front is, the struggle against imperialism. If the people and Communists are allowed to be deceived and dulled in their vigilance against the revisionist leaders, it will only help in the disruption of the anti-imperialist struggle. Such slogans of 'united action' which help the disruption of the anti-imperialist struggle, are diametrically opposed to the very aims and principles of united front tactics.

Joint discussions between the CPSU leaders and the revolutionary leaders of CPC and Vietnam will not strengthen the core of the anti-imperialist front against U.S. imperialism in Vietnam and the failure of the meeting will be a handle in the hands of imperialists and revisionists to disrupt the Vietnam struggle itself.

To sustain their unprincipled support to the unity call of the CPSU leadership, the C.C. leaders are putting forth certain absurd arguments.

The Draft argues that "North Vietnam is fighting alone against U.S. aggression" and as such united front with the CPSU leadership is an imperative duty.

The liberation struggles being waged against U.S. imperialism throughout the world, the American peoples struggle against American intervention in Vietnam, the great solidarity campaign in support of the Vietnam struggle spreading throughout the world are powerful factors of support to the Vietnam liberation struggle.

The great PRC, short of direct intervention, has been giving every kind of help to the fighting forces in Vietnam. The CPC had declared time and again that they would directly intervene whenever North Vietnam demands it.

Recently North Vietnam comrades have declared that they have been allowed to use Chinese mainland as the rear for the Vietnam struggle.

It is true the Vietnam people are shouldering the main brunt of the struggle against U.S. imperialism in Vietnam. But it is not true to say that they are fighting alone.

Another argument that the C.C. leaders put up is that the CPC stand in Vietnam is against the experience of anti-fascist front in 1935.

Here the C.C. leaders forget three pertinent factors.

At that time Communist Parties had completely demarcated themselves ideologically, politically and organisationally from the Social Democratic Parties and as such united front between such parties could not confuse the masses about their aims and identity.

But now such a demarcation between Communists and Revisionists-ideologically, politically and organizationally is taking place and it is yet to be completed.

Struggle against Fascism was the pre-condition for any force to be included in the front. But when CPSU leadership is an ally of U.S. imperialism it cannot have a place in the united front against U.S. imperialism.

At that time the united front slogan had been given by the Communist Parties to build a genuine united front, and in the process of struggle to isolate the vacillators.

But now the unity call is given by the CPSU Leadership to deceive the Soviet people and world people to cover up its collaboration with U.S. imperialism for world domination.

Curiously enough, the C.C. leaders argue that judged by the experience of our united front tactics with regard to the Dangeite revisionists, the CPC stand on unity call is wrong.

How far our tactics are correct, is a subject matter to be seriously discussed. But to transplant our experience to the question of Vietnam, where military strategy between great powers is involved, is absurd.

To sustain their support to united front with the CPSU leadership, the C.C. Draft even bestows certain anti-imperialist character to the CPSU leadership. The Draft says:

"Thus, instead of an irreconcilable struggle-economic, political, ideological and military-as the main form and content of struggle between the two systems, a regular hunt for discovering areas of even wider cooperation and collaboration with the U.S. is on by the revisionist leadership of the Soviet Union. The fundamental aspect is to be relegated to the subordinate and secondary position while the cooperation and collaboration aspect is thrust to the forefront."

So the complaint of the C.C. Draft against the CPSU leadership is not that it has become the agency of imperialism but merely that its anti-imperialist role is occupying only a secondary position.

But how are we to reconcile this with Lenin's description of revisionism as *"the lackey of the bourgeoisie"*, as *"vehicle of bourgeois influence"*, as *"agency of imperialism"*?

No amount of solicitude for the Soviet people, for the Vietnamese people' will hide the ugly fact that the C.C. Draft seeks united front with the revisionist leadership of the CPSU in the so-called common struggle against 'the most hated and immediate enemy.

The C.C. Draft thinks that differences on ideological and political issues should not come in the way of united action with the revisionists.

But Lenin said that *"the fight against imperialism is inseparably bound up with the fight against opportunism."*

What is standing between CPC and CPSU leadership, between Marxist-Leninists and the Modern Revisionists represented by the CPSU leadership is neither a mess nor a facile notion (of maintaining world peace in collaboration with U.S. imperialism without China)- held by the CPSU leadership. What is standing in between is, Modern Revisionism of the CPSU leadership and its policy of collaboration with U.S. imperialism for world domination.

Unity of the socialist camp and unity of the international communist movement is the cherished goal of all Marxist-Leninists.

It is the revisionist leadership of the CPSU that has disrupted the unity of the socialist camp and the unity of the international working class movement.

The history of the international communist movement is one of struggle by Marxism against opportunism and revisionism, a history of struggle by Marxists to safeguard the international unity of the proletariat and to oppose attempts by opportunists and revisionists to divide it.

Marxism-Leninism teaches us that the international unity of the proletariat must be based on principle and its achievement demands resolute and unequivocal struggle against revisionism and opportunism.

Lenin said:

"Unity is a great thing and great slogan. But what the workers cause needs is, the unity of Marxists, not unity between Marxists and opponents and distorters of Marxism."

Unity of socialist camp, unity of the international communist movement will be achieved in bitter struggle against imperialism and modern revisionism represented by the CPSIJ leadership.

Unity of the socialist camp and unity of the international communist movement "is moving and will move", "is proceeding and will proceed" against the modern revisionism represented by the CPSU leadership and it will be a victory over them.

VII. The contribution and Role of CPC

The Chinese Revolution is a great epoch making event, ranking next only to that of the Great October Revolution. This is the first peoples revolution that took place, breaking the shackles of colonial and semi-colonial system. It has heralded the era of final collapse of imperialism and the victory of world socialist revolution.

The glorious CPC under the leadership of Comrade Mao, basing itself on the experience of the Great October Revolution creatively applied Marxism-Leninism to the Chinese conditions, and following the correct tactics of united front and prolonged armed struggle, first liberating the country-side and finally the towns, liberated 70 crores of Chinese population from age long slavery, established peoples democracy under the dictatorship of the proletariat and now through its great Proletarian Cultural Revolution, is strengthening the dictatorship of the proletariat, and struggling for the completion of the socialist revolution.

With this rich experience of revolutionary struggle, CPC tried to correct the revisionist mistakes of the CPSU leadership through friendly criticism. When the CPSU leadership spurned this friendly criticism, and openly took to a complete class collaboration line, the CPC began an open ideological fight against modern revisionism represented by the CPSU leadership to preserve the sacredness of Marxism-Leninism.

Its numerous articles exposing Modern Revisionism have greatly contributed to the enrichment of Marxism-Leninism in the present era.

People, Republic of China, adhering to the principles of Marxism-Leninism, if firmly fighting the aggressive expansionist war plans of U.S. imperialism. PRC is in the forefront of the struggle against the global strategy of U.S. for world domination.

PRC, faithfully implementing the behests of Lenin, is helping the national liberation struggles. the revolutionary struggles with all the means at its command-ideological, political, economic and military.

The PRC is acting as the base of the world revolution.

We are sorry to note that the C.C. Draft refuses to see these facts, facts of reality.

The whole historic role of CPC in the present era, has been reduced into one single sentence that "*CPC has rendered yeoman service to the world working class and communist movement in fighting against this menace of Modern Revisionism and in defence of Marxism.*"

In the same breath, the C.C. Draft adds that "*there have been certain dogmatic manifestations in individual parties and on individual propositions, precepts and actions,*" and that "*there also exist certain dogmatic and left-sectarian trends in some parties on certain issues connected with the revolutionary movement of the proletariat*"- all this keeping in view CPC and other parties that agree with its line.

But we firmly believe that CPC is acting as the beaconlight of the world communist movement.

Peoples Democracy, Peoples War, completion of the socialist revolution through the cultural revolution, an irreconcilable ideological battle against Modern Revisionism- this is the essence of the thought of Mao-Marxism-Leninism of the present epoch, upheld by Marxist-Leninists throughout the world.

Marx and Engles developed their theories of scientific socialism in a period of growing industrial capitalism.

Lenin further developed Marxism, as applicable to the period of imperialism.

Stalin developed Marxism-Leninism, while building socialism in a single country encircled by capitalist states and in his struggle for creating mass communist parties throughout the world.

The thought of Mao is a further development of Marxism-Leninism applicable to the present era, when imperialism is fast disintegrating and the national liberation struggles have come to occupy a central place for the completion of the world socialist revolution.

Already, recent world history has amply proved that wherever the people have assimilated the experience of the Chinese revolution and applied it to the concrete conditions of their countries, there the revolutionary movements have won complete victory, or have made significant advances. And, wherever the people have not assimilated the experience of Chinese revolution, there the revolutionary movements have failed to make any significant advance or even counter- revolutions have succeeded.

VIII. Consolidation of the International Communist Movement

Consolidation of all Marxist-Leninists throughout the world, is the urgent task facing the world communist movement to accomplish the tasks of the present epoch.

There must be a common programme based on Marxism-Leninism for the general direction of the world communist movement in the present period. Such a common programme alone will help in the consolidation of the international communist movement.

"A proposal concerning the general line of the International Communist Movement", proposed by the CPC lays the proper basis for such a common programme for the world communist movement.

Fraternal relations based on proletarian internationalism must be restored between the various constituents of the world communist movement.

These relations must be based on the principle of solidarity, principle of mutual support and mutual assistance, the principle of independence and equality and the principle of reaching unanimity through consultation.

It is the primary duty of the Communist Party in each country to acquire an accurate knowledge of the trends of the different classes in its own country through serious investigation and study and know how to apply the universal truth of Marxism-Leninism and integrate it with the concrete practice of its own country, evolve its own programme and tactical line based on Marxism-Leninism, to achieve victory in its revolution.

When the political line of a particular party goes completely wrong, and when the party rejects the friendly criticism of brother parties, fraternal parties will have no other option, except open criticism. This has been the practice of past history.

Marxist-Leninists are evolving in struggle against Modern Revisionism. CPC, the leading detachment of the world communist movement, with its rich experience of the revolutionary struggles, in its discharge of international tasks, is offering criticism of the activities of certain parties to help them correct their mistakes.

It is highly regrettable that relations between our Party and CPC have been greatly damaged recently.

It is not true to say that the CPC first started publicly criticising our Party Programme and Political Line through its press and radio.

We know that there were certain basic differences on our Programme, between our Party and CPC, even at the time of our Calcutta Party Congress.

But it was unfortunate that these differences were not properly formulated and thoroughly discussed inside our Party before the Party Programme was adopted at the Calcutta Congress.

But CPC did not attack our Party till 1967, till *"New Situation and Party's Tasks"* appeared.

From 1964 to 1967, on many occasions, some of our leading comrades of the P.B., have been criticising CPC sometimes publicly, sometimes inside our Party, on many issues affecting us and the CPC.

The differences between our Party and CPC relating to the Indian situation should be patiently discussed, try to come to correct conclusions, and thus bridge the gulf between our Party and CPC.

It is with this spirit, that we offer the following points for the consideration of the Party:

1. GROWING COMPRADOR NATURE OF THE MONOPOLY CAPITALISTS IN INDIA.

After 1958-59, the economic dependence of our country under the present Government is growing apace.

Majority of our industries, both in the Public and Private sectors, especially the industries of the collaborating big business are completely foreign oriented. They are dependent for their existence, on foreign imported machinery, spare parts, raw material, and technical know-how.

Of late, establishment of joint industries, with foreign imperialist investments is becoming the predominant feature of our industries wherein the western capitalists have come to dominate.

Because of the growing economic crisis, the rapid decline of the purchasing capacity of the overwhelming majority of our population, we see a rapid shrinkage of internal market due to which the Indian big business is forced to try for external market in collaboration with foreign imperialists.

Because of the above reasons, the collaborating big business, is acquiring a marked comprador nature depending more and more for maintaining its profits on imports and exports.

Instead of seeing this growing comprador nature of the big business, the C.C. Resolution on Differences with CPC, says that the comprador bourgeoisie occupies only a minor place in India, and that it is the "*industrial bourgeoisie which, to-day has emerged as a powerful force holding the leading position in the new state and Government, and not the comprador element*".

While at the time of the Seventh Congress, our Party Programme spoke of 'contradictions and conflicts that do exist between the Indian bourgeoisie including the big bourgeoisie and foreign imperialism' and that these conflicts should be utilised for practical purposes, in "New situation and New Tasks"- the C.C. Resolution speaks of growing contradictions between big business and the imperialists.

It says:

"The economic and political crisis that is enveloping the country, no doubt sharpens the basic contradiction between the big bourgeois-landlord alliance and rest of the democratic classes and masses. At the sametime the fissures, conflicts and contradictions between the big bourgeoisie and imperialists are not only not ruled out, but in fact they do also grow and find expression." (P.56)

We are not able to understand one point. When "*the economic crisis deepens and the pressure of the imperialists increases the danger of greater and greater concessions to the imperialists by the big bourgeois-led government, allowing the foreign monopolists to make still bigger inroads into our economy and political*

life, becomes more serious” as the same resolution says, how do the conflicts and contradictions between the “collaborating big bourgeoisie and foreign imperialists” grow and find expression?

Experience has proved beyond any doubt that, however the Indian big business may try to utilise the inter-imperialist contradictions, however much they try to counterpose Soviet aid to the Western aid, the Indian big business is rapidly going down on an inclined plane towards a more and more surrendering policy vis-à-vis the Western imperialists. Devaluation, liberalization of imports and exports policy in favour of the foreign imperialists-all go to show that the Indian big business is acquiring more and more a comprador nature.

But the C.C. Resolutions are showing the industrial base of the Indian big bourgeoisie as a powerful factor in its resistance to imperialist pressure.

What the C.C. forgets is that the big business in our country is big business of a colonial country. The big business in a colonial country, because of its close links with feudalism and its collaboration with foreign imperialists, cannot withstand foreign imperialist pressures unlike the industrial bourgeoisie of a developed capitalist country.

Forgetting this aspect, the C.C. in “*New Situation and Party’s Tasks*” says that “*every concession and each step of surrender*” should not be equated with “*final surrender*”. But do not continuous surrenders, after sometime, change the qualitative nature of surrenders?

To sustain its wrong evaluation about the strength of the Indian big business to resist foreign imperialist pressures, the C.C. in “*New Situation and Party’s Tasks*” speaks of “*big socialist investments, especially from the Soviet Union, the offers of still larger aid and the other trade and economic relations developed between the Soviet Union and the Indian big bourgeoisie*” as “*important factors to reckon with*” and that “*at least in the immediate future, may even acquire added vigour against increasing U.S. pressures and STAGE OF ECONOMIC CRISIS.*”

We completely disagree with this evaluation of the role of Soviet aid in Indian economy. Experience has proved that Soviet aid is aid to a public sector, subservient to monopoly interests, subservient to foreign imperialist penetration. It is becoming an instrument to cover up the abject surrender of the collaborating Indian bourgeoisie.

This is a departure from the understanding of the Programme.

The Programme says:

“Despite assistance of key importance from the socialist countries, despite the increase in trade with the socialist countries, despite the fact that the Indian capital has grown in volume, the most glaring fact of our economic life is that the country’s economy as a whole is in many respects precariously dependent on Western assistance and particularly U.S. assistance.” (Para.26)

We feel that in the face of the growing economic crisis in India, in the face of growing world capitalist crisis, in the face of the American pressures, the abject surrender of the collaborating big business is rapidly growing and the comprador nature of the collaborating big business is becoming the principal character.

2. FORMAL INDEPENDENCE

The whole economic policy that the present Congress Government has followed has resulted in the growing dependence of the Indian economy and the internal and external policies of the Indian Government on foreign imperialism especially U.S. imperialism.

Our Rupee is tied to the American dollar. Our imports and exports are dependent upon the wishes of the World Bank and the U.S. imperialists. Our Budget and Five-Year Plans are dependent upon loans from World Bank and U.S. imperialism. Our industries depend on foreign supplies of machinery, Spare parts, raw materials and technical know-how. Our military hardware is dependent on foreign imperialist supplies. Our rationing is dependent upon food supplies from America. Because of this dependence and its dependence for more and more loans from U.S. imperialists, the surrender of the Indian Government is rapidly growing.

The same surrender we can see in the foreign policy of the Indian Government, as seen in its policy towards American aggression in Vietnam, in its opposition to national liberation struggles in its stoppage of trade with Cuba and North Vietnam and in its pronounced anti-communist policies.

The so-called non-alignment policy of the Indian Government has become a big hoax and it is becoming a part of the global strategy of U.S. imperialism, an instrument to suppress national liberation struggles in the East and an instrument to build an anti-China axis in alliance with other reactionary powers subservient to U.S. imperialism.

In this connection we want to remind our C.C. that there was large opposition to characterising the foreign policy of the Indian Government "*to be within the broad framework of non-alignment and opposition to world war,*" in our programme adopted at the Seventh Congress.

Sometimes the Indian Government appears to take independent positions different from that of America. Such efforts are becoming more and more efforts to cover up its surrender to U.S. imperialism, as in the Middle East Crisis to keep up its image of independence, to deceive the Indian and world people, and thus better serve the U.S. imperialism. Surrender to U.S. imperialism is becoming more and more real, while independence of the country is getting more and more formal.

The C.C. Resolutions issued from time to time say that the revolutionary movement is weak, that the rule of this government is no threatened and, as such the Indian big business has no need to surrender to U.S. imperialism.

This is a very superficial view of things. The growing economic crisis, the crisis of the ruling party, the growing discontent of the masses, the growing world capitalist crisis, the growing crisis of the U.S. imperialism in particular, and resultant U.S. pressures, are acting as real causes for the growing surrender of the Indian Government to U.S. imperialism.

3. BREAKING MONOPOLY OF POWER OF THE CONGRESS

Our *Party Programme* has given the tactical slogan of participating in provincial ministries, "to bring into existence governments pledged to carry out a modest programme of giving immediate relief to the people."

The Party Programme visualised such non-Congress Governments at the provincial level as governments "which give immediate relief to the people and thus strengthen the mass movement."

Now in "New Situation and Party's Tasks" the C.C. describes the coming into existence of a number of non-Congress Governments as "breaking of the Congress monopoly of power at the hands of several opposition parties."

This is really a very astounding statement.

Parliament, central cabinet, provincial assemblies and ministries, Presidents and the central nominated Governors, the administration, the military, police, jail and judiciary, are all part and parcel of the bourgeois-landlord constitution pledged to the preservation of the bourgeois-landlord system of exploitation.

From our experience, we know that the provincial assemblies and the provincial ministries have no real power to effect any basic change affecting the life of our people. Every Act and Bill is to be assented by the President who is the nominee of the Congress. And today the bourgeois-landlord constitution is still administered by the Congress Central Cabinet.

When such is the case, how the non-Congress provincial governments, with no real power to affect any basic change, which are directly under the thumb of Congress nominated Governors, which are part and parcel of the bourgeois-landlord constitution under the Congress rule, are breaking the monopoly of Congress rule is beyond our comprehension. Is it not against the teachings of Lenin who said that bourgeois parliaments are mere talking shops, are brothel houses where fraternity, equality, and brother-hood are cheaply sold?

Nay, the formation of the non-Congress Governments is almost raised to the level of dual power in the country.

Look at the following evaluation in "*New Situation and Party's Tasks*."

"If it is a question of some sort of 'truce' that is being proposed between the central government and the non-Congress governments, one can understand it and decide one's attitude to it. It is so because the ruling party in power at the centre has ceased to be that strong, powerful and holding monopoly way as to frontally and immediately challenge the opposition parties and their non-Congress Governments in eight states; the opposition parties, too, have not acquired the requisite strength and necessary mass sanctions to frontally and immediately challenge the authority of the central Congress Government. Both mark time, avoid head-on conflicts for the present, and move cautiously and with circumspection in formulating and practicing the respective Governmental policies." (P.65)

How many atrocious statements in one sentence?

We are supposed to believe that the non-Congress Governments-the DMK in Madras, the Swatantra in Orissa, the Janasangh dominated Government in U.P.,

the landlord Government in Haryana or the Kerala and Bengal Governments where we are supposed to be playing the key role—are acquiring the ‘requisite strength’ to ‘frontally’ challenge the central authority.

It appears that the two warring camps—the Congress Central Government and the opposition non-Congress Governments at provincial level, are marking time and are in a period of truce.

Does not this mean that half of the country is under a form of dual power one at the Centre and another at the Provincial level?

4. CENTRE-STATE RELATIONS

After the general elections, with the establishment of the Congress Government at the Centre and the formation of non-Congress Governments in a number of states, it is true that the conflicts between the centre and the states on various issues have increased. We have to utilise these conflicts in the development of the democratic movement.

But in “New Situation and Party’s Tasks” the C.C. tries to exaggerate these conflicts between the centre and the states.

“*New Situation and Party’s Tasks*” says:

“The struggle these non-Congress Governments will have to carry on in defence of states’ autonomy and the rights of the people belonging to different nationalities is essentially democratic and progressive in content and will go a long way in influencing and strengthening the wider democratic movement with its ultimate object of replacing the big bourgeois-landlord set up by a People’s Democratic order. It would be a grievous mistake to under-rate it.” (P.40)

It further says:

“The second important manifestation of the developing political crisis, which has come to the front with the election results, is what is now-a-days frequently and commonly talked off as centre-state relations.” (P.47)

It further says:

“In other words, the crisis that has gripped the capitalist path of development in India has now projected itself into the political super-structure, namely the Federal Structure of the Indian Union. A stage is reached when the struggle from the economic sphere has passed into the political sphere.” (P.49)

The meaning of these statements is too clear. It tries to portray that the whole present political crisis is being reflected in the Centre-State relations. Such an over-emphasis of the Centre-State conflicts will only divert us from developing the struggles of the basic masses basing ourselves on the economic and political crisis.

5. THE ROLE OF KERALA AND BENGAL UNITED FRONT GOVERNMENTS IN THE PRESENT DAY SITUATION.

We joined these united front governments when the people voted down the Congress and voted for anti-Congress coalition.

Judged by the results, we have to make a painful reappraisal of the correctness of joining such governments in coalition with parties with a definitely reactionary class character, in spite of the popular verdict of the masses against the Congress.

Even if we joined such governments we should have no illusions of affecting any real basic change in the present structure.

As Communists, our work in the ministries while trying to give some immediate relief to the extent possible, should help the masses to see through the complete ineffectiveness of these Assemblies and Ministries, raise their consciousness and thus *'prepare them for an irreconcilable battle for the overthrow of the bourgeois-landlord system.'*

Have these two Governments been 'instruments' of struggle to mobilise the people on an All-India scale for an assault on the bourgeois-landlord government on the basis of an alternative programme?

To say the least, the experience of the past 10 months has proved that the achievements, their work, and their programme have not been able to make any appreciable impact on the All-India situation to mobilise the people on the basis of an alternative programme, even to the extent we could make with the Kerala Government in 1957.

Even in the concerned provinces, we have so far failed to place an alternate programme on the floor of the Assemblies, differentiating our Party from all other parties.

Any attempt on our part to bring forth basic alternative programme on any basic issue would have really shown the reactionary nature of our coalition partners, but we are afraid to bring forth any such programme because the hodge-podge coalitions would have broken to pieces considering the reactionary elements with whom we are sailing to-day.

Not only that. We have so far failed to unleash any big mass struggle on any basic issue.

Our whole work in these ministries is overwhelmed by agitation on food.

And even on the food issue, while there has been some attempt at internal procurement from the richer sections, our struggle against rising prices, and black-market has been at a very low ebb.

On the other hand, the whole campaign of the Party has been not to mobilise the people against the food policies of the Central Government, against hoarding and blackmarket, but to convince the people that we are not responsible for the existing distress of the masses, but the central Congress government.

Instead of rousing the masses for struggle against the food policies of the Central Government, the hoarder and black-marketeters, we give some calls, just stop them the moment a petty vague promise of a few bags of rice from the centre is made. The pity is we ourselves have begun to participate in hunger strike, even at the gates of Indira Gandhi- which have only helped to divert the attention of the masses from the real struggle.

We cannot hide the fact that the distress of the masses is growing, the dissatisfaction of the masses is growing, and we see the repressive machinery of the government and the police is being used against the struggling people inspite of our wishes and opposition.

Of course, our comrades in Bengal did try to make a demarcating line to some extent from the other parties and made some advances in the form of the gherao agitation of the workers, distribution of the banzar lands, taking over the management of the British Tramway Company- unlike our admitted failure in Kerala.

But taking the growing crisis, the growing distress, and the possibilities into account, our achievements fall short of the expectations of and hopes raised with the formation of the ministries.

Not only that. In Andhra, in the wake of the Telengana struggle, even though we were in the opposition, we could then mobilise the masses on many political and economic issues-issues like linguistic province, Nagarjunasagar project, banzar lands- could take them to the level of political struggle and force the government to bow before the will of the people.

But, because our Party had no clear-cut perspective of the path of the struggle and failed to reorientate our work to reach that perspective, the invasion of revisionism in the subsequent period could destroy many of those achievements and we lost our bearings and we are still struggling to regain the lost initiative.

We only wish that this experience should not repeat itself again in Kerala and Bengal, which are our strongest bases to-day.

To-day the Party as a whole is lacking a clear-cut perspective of the path of our revolution towards which all our struggles must be directed.

We feel that, instead of our governments being used to unleash big mass struggles, mass agitations are being subordinated to the existence and continuation of the ministries.

We doubt the sagacity of our continuance in the ministry after the dastardly plan of October 2nd conspired by Ajoy Mukherjee and his open denouncement accusing us as welcoming Chinese invasion, and our own inability to force the ministries to take drastic steps and bring the much needed relief to the suffering masses.

In this connection, we must remember the intensity of the peoples' struggles, the continuity of the struggles, their spread from province to province, drawing every class affected by the policies of the government, leading to open confrontation with the government forces, leading to bloody clashes, on the crest of which a verdict against the Congress could be obtained at the subsequent polls.

To-day, the crisis is deeper, the distress of the masses is deeper and wider, and the popular forces including our Party are in more advantageous positions both in the Assemblies, Provincial ministries and Parliament. But the mass struggles that have unfolded in the post-election period are nothing in a comparison with the pre-election battles.

Has the participation of the left forces in the so-called united front governments in partnership with known reactionary forces and the revisionists been a fillip to the mass struggles against the bourgeois-landlord government?

How true was *Lenin* when he said:

"The experience of alliances, agreements and blocks with the social reform liberals in the West and liberal reformists (Cadets) in the Russian Revolution, has convincingly shown that these agreements only blunt the consciousness of the masses, that they do not enhance but weaken the actual significance of their struggle by linking fighters with elements who are least capable of fighting and most vacillating and treacherous. Millarandism in France –the biggest experiment in applying revisionist political tactics on a wide really national scale– has provided a practical appraisal of revisionism that will never be forgotten by the proletariat all over the world."

(*Lenin-Against Revisionism*- P.116)

We feel, the Party has to seriously think whether our work in the united front ministries together with bourgeois sections and revisionists has not resulted in blunting the edge of the peoples struggles against the policies of the bourgeois-landlord government.

6. PATH OF OUR REVOLUTION

We are not only failing to unleash mass struggles on an extensive scale in the present period, we feel also, that the Party is working without a clear-cut perspective of the path of the Indian revolution.

We feel that, the rich experience of the Chinese revolution and the recent experience of the liberation struggles in the backward countries have shown that peoples war, prolonged agrarian armed revolution is the only path left open to all the backward countries for social emancipation. We feel that, the path of peoples war, taking our own particular objective conditions in our country into consideration, is the only path of our revolution.

The terrain of our country, the geographical conditions of our country, the areas suited to such forms of struggle, should be properly studied and selected, the whole party should be educated and reorientated to such forms of struggles.

The mass struggles of the basic agrarian classes should be conducted in various parts of the country, which will finally lead to the path of peoples war.

But we feel at present, our Party has not paid any thought to this question.

Various CC documents and recent B.T.Rs articles on Naxalbari reveal, a quiet different perspective of the path of our revolution.

These documents and articles are counter-posing, winning the majority of the people, building strong mass organisations, building a strong, well-organised, revolutionary Party to the tactics of armed struggle in those areas, where the course of struggle and the repression let loose by the reactionary forces bring it on the agenda for the further advance of the struggle.

The question is often posed in our press and resolutions, as between those of armed-struggle-walls, the ultra-revolutionaries, and those who want to mobilize the majority of the people behind the party before thinking of any armed struggle.

We categorically say, that in all backward countries, winning the majority of the people, building mass organisations and Party building is closely linked with the armed struggle.

Of course, we do not mean to say that such a struggle could be started tomorrow. The whole point is, the Party has no perspective of this and no conscious preparation towards this direction- political, organizational, ideological-is being under-taken.

Now, due to Naxalbari and Chinese criticism, the CC says that it stands by the 1951 tactical line. Having sit tight over that line, for the last 15 years, without any thorough discussion on the point at any level of our party till this time, the CC's statement on this question merely surprises us.

So far, we have no perspective of Peoples War. The whole perspective expounded in the hitherto CC documents is long legal and illegal work, parliamentary work coupled with mass agitation and mass struggles to a limited extent, and endlessly remain waiting for an insurrection taking place in our industrial centres, which will thence lead to the socio-political emancipation of the country. Repeated assertions about winning the people, building the mass organizations, building the Party-unrelated to armed resistance-gives us this impression and nothing else.

Is such a perspective possible in a backward country like India, even with its marked industrial growth compared with other backward countries? Certainly not. On the other hand if we wait for such a development to take place, we will only be faced suddenly, with the fate of the Indonesian Communist Party.

As we have said earlier, the CC does not have the perspective of a prolonged armed struggle as the strategic weapon of the Indian revolution. On the other hand, the CC is holding out that, the fate of our Party and the course of the struggle will decisively depend, on our work in the Kerala and Bengal united front governments.

"New Situation and Party's Tasks" says:

"Hence it is imperative that our Party realizes that its immediate future, in no small way depends on how it plays its worthy part in running the two state governments of Kerala and West Bengal." (P.67)

It further says:

"Since the fortunes of the entire Party, at the present stage of development, are closely linked with the successful running of these ministries and the role our Part throughout the country will have to be mobilised to back the agreed programmes of these two non-Congress ministries and see that they are earnestly implemented." (P.67)

And what is the aim of this successful running of these ministries?

"It is this struggle of the democratic parties and groups in different legislatures and among the people, in Parliament and in 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 the prospects, of realizing the slogan of a non-Congress democratic government at the centre.”(P.79)

All the above preachings give one meaning and only one, i.e., not the mass struggles of the basic agrarian masses, a prolonged armed struggle leading for a change of government at the centre, but Parliamentary struggles, especially, successful work of the non-Congress governments, is the key to the establishment of a non-Congress democratic government at the centre.

What a wishful thinking! UF governments of Bengal and Kerala leading to the establishment of a non-Congress democratic government at the centre. What will the Indian army in the hands of the central government, in the hands of the bourgeois-landlord government be doing? Sitting with folded hands, silently looking at this Melodrama of basic change of government at the centre.

Successful running of the Bengal and Kerala UF governments have come to occupy such a central place in the programme of the whole party, that the CC Resolution describes these two as instruments of struggle in the hands of the people. Nay, recently Com. E.M.S. as reported in the press has said “that they are instruments of future revolution”!

Lenin gave the general strike as a strategic weapon of the proletariat to achieve its socialist revolution in the industrially developed countries.

Mao gave peoples war as a strategic weapon of the peoples of the backward countries, to achieve their social and political emancipation.

Our CC is offering its creative contribution—the UF governments of Kerala and Bengal—as strategic weapons for the social and political emancipation of the Indian masses!

Look at the following sentence in “New Situation and Party’s Tasks”:

“In clear class terms, our party’s participation in such governments is one specific form of struggle to win more and more people and more and more allies for the proletariat and its allies in the struggle for the cause of Peoples Democracy and at a later stage for socialism..”(P.70)

UF governments of Bengal and Kerala—leading to Peoples Democracy and socialism—could anything beat this?

7. SELF -DETERMINATION

Our Party has not yet found time to decide its attitude to self-determination for the various nationalities inhabiting this country. At the Party Congress in 1964, the Party leadership promised to study this problem and soon take decision on the matter.

Meanwhile, Kashmir, Mizo, Naga, Sikkim, Bhutan—language issue and various border conflicts between states, all cry for immediate solution. The Party has no definite line on these questions, basing on self-determination. Events passing are over our heads without our effective intervention.

But it appears that the CC is yet to “take immediate steps to see that our Party studies the problem, formulates the question, takes initiative in the matter” to intervene in the situation effectively.

Three years are not sufficient for the CC to decide its attitude on this question!

But in the meantime, due to the compulsions of the international situation, CPC decides in favour of self-determination for Kashmir, a state lying on its next door, and we find fault with it for the same.

We don't decide our own attitude, and we don't want others also to take a definite stand!

8. UNITED FRONT WITH THE REVISIONISTS

We broke from the Dange revisionist clique when we found them acting as lackeys of the Indian bourgeoisie within the Indian Communist Movement.

The Seventh Congress of our Party at Calcutta was the beginning of the break with revisionism of Dang and Co.

But we are alarmed at the developments that are taking place in the post-election period.

There is no use now to compare our Calcutta Programme or our practice of the pre-election period with the Bombay Programme or the pre-election practice of the revisionists.

The Bombay Programme of the revisionists is dead and gone, and none could resurrect it.

During the election period itself, and after the elections the Dange revisionists have completely changed their Programmatic slogans and their practical line of action.

From their press, it is quite clear now, that the revisionists.

- Characterise this government as a government dominated by big business-landlords.
- that this is an independent government, increasingly subjected to American pressures, the independence being threatened by US imperialism.
- that the non-Congress governments are democratic and are instruments of struggle for national democracy.

On all these points, on Naxalbari and on the question of unity of action in Vietnam-our line is almost in line with that of the revisionists. And both of us are united in the governments of Kerala and Bengal.

Thus we see the demarcating line between us and the revisionists getting blurred.

Are not these tactics of united front with the revisionists helping them to reinstate themselves in the eyes of the public? Any how we feel that the battle against the revisionist theories and practices and unity with them in class organizations or on agitational issues are policies which are to be carefully selected and implemented.

Before the elections, the revisionists were rapidly getting isolated from the masses and were being more and more exposed as agents of the ruling Congress party.

But unity with the revisionists in the ministries is harming the cause of exposing them as the agents of the bourgeoisie among the working class and

helping the revisionists to get out of their isolation. We must make a distinction between, the issues on which we have to give an irreconcilable battle against the revisionists and the issues on which we could unite with them to our own advantage. This is all the more necessary when the revisionists are not yet completely exposed among the people as the agents of the bourgeoisie within the working class movement and when the demarcation between the revisionists and our Party is not yet complete before the public eye.

Instead of this, "*New Situation and Party's Tasks*" makes the sweeping statement, "*Our Party, while ready to have unity of action with the right communist party on all issues affecting our people, in all mass and class organisations, in the functioning of the non-Congress democratic state governments, and in its work in the different Legislatures and Parliament, will have to conduct a principled and uncompromising struggle against revisionism and all its manifestations in our country.*"

Shorn of all verbiage, this is nothing but paper struggle against revisionism and united front with them in practice, which works only to the advantage of the revisionists.

It is not correct to say that "there is not one single basic question connected with the Indian revolution on which we and the revisionists do not diametrically oppose each other" as the CC Draft claims. This is not the truth. On the other hand we have begun to move closer to them.

We think that the CPC is essentially correct on all these points and it has discharged its international duty in pointing out how the Party is slipping into wrong channels. We should not be carried away by the strong language used. We must take the essence of the criticism and self-critically examine our Programme and the present Political Line of the Party.

Of course, while fighting against revisionism, we should guard ourselves against left mistakes.

But the CC Draft has almost posed it as the immediate danger threatening the whole Party.

Not only that. Comrades who differ from this document are being looked with suspicion and a tendency is growing inside the Party to pounce on such comrades even for trivial matters, with disciplinary actions.

We must face the naked fact that there was no complete ideological and political unity inside the Party when our Party was formed. There were sharp differences even at that period. They were being expressed on various occasions in the subsequent period also. Now they have taken a serious turn. The CC must conduct a patient and dispassionate discussion on all the fundamental issues concerning our Programme and tactical line and present policy. This is the only course to unite the Party- politically and ideologically and take the movement forward.

Instead of adopting such a course, our CC assuming that there is already 'bed-rock ideological political-unity' inside the party is trying to settle political

-ideological differences inside the Party through organisational methods without patient discussions at various levels to achieve maximum unity.

We must recognise the fact that the issues of difference inside on Party- the death of the betrayal of the CPSU leadership, the class roots of revisionism inside the Soviet Union, the class nature of Soviet revisionism, acting as the agency of imperialism inside the socialist camp and the International Communist Movement, the dire necessity of an irreconcilable battle against Modern Revisionism represented by the CPSU leadership, the leading role of CPSU in the International Communist Movement at the present time, the thought of Mao-Marxism- Leninism of the present epoch, the method of peoples war as the only weapon in the handle of the people of the backward countries to achieve their emancipation- are issues that are being debated internationally and that this debate is going to continue for a long time to come.

When such is the position, for the CC to settle these issues through organisational methods, will only fan up discontent in the ranks and will only lead to further disruption of our Party.

Such methods, have already resulted in disruption in Naxalbari and U.P., which have only gladdened the hearts of the revisionists.

The Indian Government is going more and more into the grip of American imperialism and the revisionist leadership of CPSU. It is the CPC and PRC that are in the forefront of the struggle against U.S. imperialism and Modern Revisionism represented by the CPSU leadership.

Our Party must be an active partner in this powerful current against U.S. imperialism and Modern Revisionism.

We feel that the CC Draft, instead of helping this current will only take away our Party from the powerful current of struggle against US imperialism and Modern Revisionism and lead the Party eventually to united front with Modern Revisionism represented by the CPSU leadership, thus doing irreparable damage to our own cause and the cause of the International Communist Movement.

It is pertinent to remember at this time, that some of our CC leaders have been propagating the view that it was a "*welcome attempt and a great contribution by the leaders of the CPSU at its 20th Congress to reassess the mighty forces for peace and against war*" (*A contribution to Ideological Debate-P.38*), and that "*while not for a moment forgetting the responsibility in this regard of other communist parties, particularly parties like that of China, WE RIGHTLY EXCEPT THE LEAD FROM THE GREAT CPSU, WHICH ALONE CAN PLAY A DECISIVE ROLE IN THE REUNIFICATION OF THE INTERNATIONAL COMMUNIST MOVEMENT TO DISCHARGE ITS TASKS*". (P.9 Ibid)

We are sorry to note that the CC Draft has not yet completely broken from this understanding.

We feel the ways and the forms that the CC has adopted to conduct the discussions on the international ideological issues are entirely wrong.

Having given a draft to the Party members for discussion the CC has released the draft to the press. Before the Party members could discuss and give the final shape to the draft, the CC has declared that the draft would be the official line of the Party even during the period of discussion.

Calcutta Party Congress had enjoined the CC to conduct 'dispassionate discussions' on the international ideological issues. We feel the CC has taken these decisions contrary to the mandate of the Party Congress.

To add to this, our Provincial Committee, by a majority vote, has asked the right to place an alternative document to the CC Draft for the discussions of the Party members. But the CC has refused this request. The CC has refused to place the alternative document sent to the CC, with the specious argument that there is no requisite strength for the alternative document inside the CC to allow for such a procedure.

Even the request of our PC to allow comrades with dual membership to explain their view in both the Committees has been refused by the CC.

With such decisions, we feel the CC has tried to restrict the freedom of the Party comrades to freely discuss the draft and we feel that all these decisions are entirely wrong.

Taking all these developments into consideration, the issues concerning the international debate, Party Programme, our tactical line, the differences between our Party and CPC, should be thoroughly discussed at all levels inside the Party, alternative documents of the different comrades should be placed before the Party members for discussion. Our Plenum, wants the CC Plenum to take steps to call the Party Congress as soon as possible to take final decisions on all the above issues.

This Plenum strongly feels that only by such broad-based discussions dispassionately conducted and the calling of the Party Congress to take final decisions, full unity of the Party-ideological, political, organisational-could be restored inside the Party and thus take the movement forward.

