

WHAT DO THEY
WANT TO ACHIEVE
BY THIS
'CULTURAL REVOLUTION'
IN CHINA

By
G. ADHIKARI

COMMUNIST PARTY PUBLICATION

WHAT DO THEY WANT TO ACHIEVE BY THIS 'CULTURAL REVOLUTION' IN CHINA

series CC 10043

By

G. ADHIKARI

COMMUNIST PARTY PUBLICATION

WHAT DO THEY WANT TO
ACHIEVE BY THIS
CULTURAL REVOLUTION
IN CHINA

Price : 50 paise

Printed by D.P. Sinha, at New Age Printing Press,
Rani Jhansi Road, New Delhi, and published by him
for Communist Party of India, 4/7 Asaf Ali Road,
New Delhi 1

PREFACE

This long article on "What They Are Trying to Achieve by the Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution in China" was serialised in the *New Age* (weekly) in October 1966. To it has been added the resolution on the subject adopted by the National Council of the Communist Party of India on 29 November 1966.

The author has attempted to base his analysis and conclusions on the published and authoritative material of the Chinese Communist Party and on the Hsinhua, the news agency of the People's Republic of China. Only other source used are the eyewitness reports of the correspondents of the socialist countries reporting from China.

It may be useful here to give a list of the most essential material on the subject, used by the author:

1. *The Great Socialist Cultural Revolution in China*, Pamphlets 1 to 4, published by Foreign Language Press, Peking, containing reprints from authoritative articles from *Hongqui*, *People's Daily*, etc. (April to June 1966)
2. Full text of the decision of the CC, CPC, concerning the Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution adopted on 8 August 1966 at the 8th plenary session of the CC of the CPC held in Peking, 1-12 August 1966 (*Peking Review*, No. 33, 12 August 1966)
3. Communique of the 11th plenary session of the 8th Central Committee of the CPC (*Peking Review*, No. 34, 19 August 1966)
4. "In Praise of the Red Guards" (*Peking Review*, No. 39, 23 September 1966)
5. "Some Sidelights on Peking's Red Guards" (11 October 1966) (*News from China* issued by Embassy of PRC in New Delhi.)

6. From the report of Com. Guenter Mittag to the CC of Socialist Unity Party of Germany (*Neues Deutschland*, 18 September 1966)
7. Editorial in *Muondo Obero*, organ of the CP of Spain (*Information & Documents on Spain*, No. 186, Prague, 21 September 1966)

G. ADHIKARI

New Delhi,
7 December 1966

I

The developments that have been taking place in China in the context of the 'cultural revolution' in the last two-three months have evoked a reaction of shock and astonishment from the overwhelming majority of the communist and workers' parties of the world. Most of these developments, it may be said, are connected with internal affairs of China and should be in the main China's own affair.

But if in a great Asian country which has distinguished itself by the magnificent and historic victory of the democratic and socialist revolution and has achieved significant successes in socialist construction, a campaign of juvenile frenzy in the name of 'cultural revolution' is worked up against great works of cultural heritage, then surely it is a matter of concern to democrats and communists all over the world, because such behaviour discredits the name and cause of communism.

Besides there have been developments directly in the field of China's relations with fraternal socialist countries, when, in the course of the same cultural revolution, organised mass demonstrations of youth besieged the embassies of the Soviet Union and other socialist countries for three days, uttering all kinds of insults and physically manhandling the personnel of those embassies in the streets.

This means that the campaign of slander and vilification which the Chinese leaders had been conducting against the Soviet Union and other socialist countries alleging that they have betrayed socialism, that they are restoring capitalism at home and collaborating with US imperialism and reactionaries abroad, is now reaching a new stage—that of openly provoking a break of diplomatic relations.

And this is naturally a matter of great concern not only to the Soviet Union and other socialist countries but to communists

and democrats the world over, for it threatens a serious breach in the worldwide anti-imperialist united front and action against aggression and war.

That is exactly the reason why these ominous developments connected with the cultural revolution in China have evoked such prompt public reaction from almost all communist and workers' parties. Our party, too, has made known its reaction through *New Age* two weeks ago.

The organ of the Hungarian Socialist Workers' Party, *Nepszabadsag* in its editorial said, for instance, that it was obligatory for revolutionary parties, for all communist parties, 'to struggle against revisionist and bourgeois ideologies; but to destroy the Greek, Roman and Chinese treasures of the Peking museum, to demand a ban on the works of Beethoven, Mozart, Tchaikovsky and Bartok, and to destroy records, books and paintings—this is neither vigilance nor struggle against bourgeois and revisionist ideological influence; these are actions alien to the ideas of communism and Marxism-Leninism.'

The editorial further stated: 'Nothing can justify the activities of those who ransack flats, who beat up helpless elderly people and put them in stocks, no matter what fine phrases they use. This is opposite of what is called revolutionary in the international working-class movement.'

BIG PURGE

Granma, the organ of the Communist Party of Cuba, in its article entitled 'Great Cultural Proletarian Revolution and the Ideas of Chairman Mao' focusses attention on other aspects of these developments. For instance, the great purge that is taking place in China simultaneously:

'Among the people removed were those who for more than twenty years were members of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of China, members of the Polit Bureau, Vice-Chairman of the government, many other party leaders, rectors of universities, heads of youth organisations, ministers, deputy ministers and top military leaders. Reports on the removal from posts were always accompanied by the charge of "resistance to the application of Mao Tse-tung's ideas."'

The article cites examples from *Hsinhua* (New China News Agency) material to show how propaganda is made about application of Mao's philosophical ideas to literally all fields of human activity including such diverse things as 'playing table tennis, treating burns, making electric bulbs, selling melons, and in haircutting.'

'Eulogising of Mao Tse-tung's ideas and their role in party and state, scientific, sport, trade, agricultural and other fields of activity has exceeded all bounds and cannot be compared with anything.'

The article stresses that all this information does not come from imperialist sources but from the *Hsinhua* news agency itself and concludes: 'Unfortunately imperialism uses this type of information in its attempt to ridicule not only Chinese leaders but also the ideas of communism. It is to be regretted that the People's Republic of China has given the enemies of socialism a pretext for ridicule and mockery.'

The majority of the communist and workers' parties or their newspapers have come out sharply against these developments in China, in the main because these are accompanied by an unprecedented escalation of attacks on fraternal socialist countries, especially against the Soviet Union, which gravely damages the united action of all anti-imperialist forces against US aggression in Vietnam.

ISOLATION

Support to China in regard to these events has come only from the communist parties of Albania and New Zealand. Parties of North Vietnam, North Korea, Rumania and Japan have not expressed themselves either in support or in opposition to these events.

In this context, it is significant that the Communist Party (Marxist) has taken the position officially supporting and defending the cultural revolution in China. As reported in *The Times of India* (14 September 1966) P. Sundarayya, general secretary of that party, in a press conference held after the Polit Bureau meeting of their party said the following on the 'cultural revolution' in China:

'Communists all over the world should get inspiration from what was being attempted by the Chinese Communist Party to keep up the revolutionary tradition of the movement.

'He thought such a movement was necessary to fight the temptation of revisionism, which might develop in the wake of socialist gains.

'Capitalist and imperialist news agencies from Hongkong were giving distorted versions of the cultural revolution.'

Their organ *People's Democracy* in its 11 September issue published the full text of the decision of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of China on 'The Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution' adopted on 8 August 1966, by its 11th Plenary Session.

Their purpose in publishing the same, they stated editorially, was 'to acquaint the reader with the official view of the Communist Party of China', while the Hongkong news agencies were giving distorted versions.

But the official view of the Communist Party of China on this question is not completely stated unless it is also made clear that the present 'cultural revolution' in China, which is a struggle against 'the rightists and modern revisionists' who have wormed their way into high places in the party is accompanied by the most rabid escalation of attacks against the fraternal communist parties, especially the Communist Party of the Soviet Union.

This is most clearly stated in the communique of the 11th Plenum of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of China and also seen in the shameful happenings in the streets of Peking, but the *People's Democracy* and the CP (Marxist) leaders have not a word to say about this.

Now, a leftwing weekly from Calcutta which seems to stand close to the CP(M), has in its characteristic bantering style defended the vagaries of the cultural revolution, but it has also kept quiet on this other aspect of the same.

We would entirely agree with our contemporaries if it was their endeavour to study recent developments in China which are said to be for the defence and consolidation of socialist revolution, directly from Chinese sources and not from the Western news agencies.

Our friends of the CP (Marxist) often take the pose that they are not taking sides in the great ideological controversy in the world communist movement between the Chinese and Albanian parties on the one hand and the Communist Party of the Soviet Union and the rest of the communist and workers' parties on the other. But on individual issues such as nuclear test-ban treaty, Chinese aggression on our borders, and socialist aid to underdeveloped countries, they have taken a position analogous to that of the Chinese.

They have every right to hold their views. But how long are they going to keep silent on the basic issue of this ideological controversy, viz., unity in the world communist movement and in the socialist camp or split and disruption? How long are they going to keep silent on the atrocious and disruptive slander campaign which the Chinese leaders are conducting against the leadership of the CPSU that it is restoring capitalism in the Soviet Union and colluding with US imperialism?

In the present case, they are posing to take an objective view of the 'cultural revolution' in China and putting it forward as a model for India. But why are they silent on the other aspect of the same campaign—the vicious vilification of fraternal parties and of the CPSU and the attacks on the diplomatic personnel of the embassies of the socialist countries in Peking by the 'Red Guards'? Did not the communique of the 11th Plenum of the CC of the Communist Party of China, which adopted the resolution on the cultural revolution, also proclaim that:

'A clear line of demarcation must be drawn in dealing with the modern revisionist groups with the leadership of the CPSU as the centre and it is imperative resolutely to expose their true features as scabs. It is impossible to have "united action" with them.'

Have they nothing to say about this? Almost every one of the articles in the Chinese press in the course of the present campaign stresses that the 'cultural revolution' is meant to prevent what happened in Russia, when 'Khrushchov revisionists seized power "to restore capitalism".' Will it strengthen proletarian international unity or undermine it? Have they nothing to say about it?

OBJECTIVE SITUATION AND CHINESE ACHIEVEMENTS

All this only emphasises the need to make an objective appraisal of the 'cultural revolution' taking place in China at present, basing ourselves on the resolutions, articles and literature of the Chinese Communist Party on the same. It is necessary to see under what specific conditions the present cultural revolution started in China; where its perplexing features stem from; what is the method behind this temporary frenzy of madness; what the leaders of the Chinese party are seeking to achieve by this mass campaign and what are the perspectives and what questions this raises.

Cultural revolution taking place in a country which has made its socialist revolution is indeed a source of inspiration to people living under the yoke of capitalism and imperialism.

Thus, the achievements of the cultural revolution in the Soviet Union after the victory of the October Socialist Revolution, the rapid eradication of illiteracy, the spread of education among the working masses, the creation of a working-class intelligentsia, trained in science, technique, literature and arts, marvellous advance of science and technology—all this inspired our people and did a lot to win them over to socialism.

The achievements of the cultural revolution in China in the early years after the victory of the revolution have also been inspiring.

How did Lenin define the cultural revolution in those early days after the October Socialist Revolution? Speaking of organising the entire peasantry in cooperatives, he said, 'that presupposes a standard of culture among the peasants (precisely among the peasants as the overwhelming mass) that cannot in fact, be achieved without a cultural revolution.'

Stating that in Russia 'the political and social revolution preceded the cultural revolution,' he said, 'That very cultural revolution now confronts us. This cultural revolution would now suffice to make our country a completely socialist country; but it presents immense difficulties of a purely cultural (for we are illiterate) and material (for to be cultured we must

achieve a certain development of the material means, must have a certain material base) character.'

LENIN'S WORDS

Here Lenin emphasises that cultural revolution means, first and foremost, the creation of social conditions in which the achievements of culture will be really within the reach of all the people. In this sense cultural revolution is inseparable from the development of productive forces and the rapid improvement of the living standards of the masses for which the path is opened by the socialist revolution.

Then along with the assimilation of the best and noblest achieved in the past, the task of the cultural revolution is to create new values, to create new socialist consciousness, the scientific materialistic world outlook among the masses, which, as Lenin says, is the only 'correct expression of interests, point of view and culture of the revolutionary working class.'

The Chinese Communist Party in its 8th Congress held in September 1956 defined 'Cultural Revolution' along the same lines. In the resolution adopted by the congress, in section III dealing with cultural and educational tasks, it is stated:

'To carry out our cultural revolution, we must make a very great effort to wipe out illiteracy and to introduce universal compulsory primary education in a systematic and steady way....

'We must continue to criticise the feudal and capitalist ideologies, but we must inherit and assimilate all useful knowledge, whether it is a legacy from the old China or has been introduced from abroad. Furthermore, we must reassess our splendid cultural heritage in the light of modern science and culture, and work hard to create a new socialist national culture.' (*People's China*, Supplement to No. 22, November 1956).

In May 1958 when the second session of the 8th Party Congress was convened, Liu Shao-chi in his political report again defined the cultural revolution along the same lines. It was defined as one of the basic points of the general line thus:

'To carry out the technical revolution and cultural revolution step by step while completing the socialist revolution on the

economic, political and ideological fronts.' (*Peking Review*, Vol. I, No. 14, 3 June 1958).

Main tasks of the cultural revolution were redefined. Apart from the task of wiping out illiteracy, and other tasks in the field of primary, higher education, research, etc., the report mentioned such tasks as devising written languages for national minorities and reforming the written language of the Han people (i.e. the Chinese). An important addition was the following:

"To train new intellectuals and remould the old intellectuals in order to establish a gigantic force of tens of millions of working class intellectuals, consisting of technicians who will account for the greatest number, professors, teachers, scientists, journalists, writers, artists and Marxist theoreticians." (*ibid*)

We have quoted this at some length in order to show how the leadership of the Chinese Communist Party visualised the tasks and the scope of the 'cultural revolution' in 1956 and 1958. The question of criticising and eradicating bourgeois and feudal ideologies, of correcting rightist and bourgeois tendencies and deviation was also there. This was tackled then by running a rectification campaign both inside the Party and among the people.

In the field of culture and academic studies, the Chinese Communist Party had put forward the policy: 'Let hundred flowers blossom.' This was defined in the resolution of the 8th Party Congress, in the section on culture, in the following words:

"In order to ensure the full flowering of sciences and art, we must steadfastly give effect to the policy of "letting flowers of many kind blossom and diverse schools of thought contend." It is wrong to impose restrictions and arbitrary measures on science and art through administrative channels."

In 1958, the policy was modified and sharpened in the light of Mao Tse-tung's speech of February 1957 'On the Correct Handling of the Contradictions among the People'. While the policy of 'hundred flowers blossom', etc., was proclaimed as 'a scientific Marxist method of promoting constant progress and advance in sciences and art', and 'a method of resolving contradictions among the people', it was not applicable to utter-

ances and activities of those who aim to undermine socialism and restore capitalism. When such 'poisonous weeds' grow up and confront the people, they are to be sharply criticised and uprooted.

In any case, this is how the cultural revolution was visualised and carried out in 1956 and even in 1958 and the struggle against the reactionaries and the rightists was carried out through the rectification campaign conducted under the leadership of the CPC itself.

III

VEERING AWAY FROM THE CORRECT PATH

How did this sober Marxist-Leninist programme of cultural revolution, coupled with a mass rectification campaign, to democratically and step by step fight back and eliminate the obstruction and sabotage by reactionary and bourgeois rightist elements, get transformed into the present campaign of mass frenzy with its alarming and disastrous features?

For this, it is necessary to piece together the main developments in People's China since the 8th Congress of the Communist Party of China which took place in September 1956. This historic party congress, the first after liberation and meeting at a time when the first five-year plan of socialist construction was being completed, correctly stated that the main victory of socialist revolution was achieved and that the chief task now was of 'transforming China as quickly as possible from a backward agricultural country into an advanced socialist industrial one.'

This congress worked out the correct general line for carrying out this chief task. The foundation of socialist industrialisation was laid with 140 projects built with the fraternal assistance of the Soviet Union being completed in the first five-year plan.

The task was to push ahead steadily with socialist industrialisation, building heavy industry side by side with consumer industries and modernising agriculture, while giving priority to heavy industry.

Agrarian reforms were completed and 90 per cent of peasant households were organised in production cooperatives. The task now was to consolidate and extend the cooperatives while preparing for mechanisation and modernisation of agriculture as and when the means for the same became available from the expanding industry.

Democratic reforms and socialist transformation were to take place in the national minorities' area in an unhurried way, in consultation with the people of those areas and in a peaceful manner. The national bourgeoisie, whose enterprises were already integrated with state enterprises, into joint enterprises, was to be steadily remoulded so that it is prepared for the next step of socialisation and of ceasing to be an exploiter class.

The programme of cultural revolution and of rectification campaign described above fitted into this perspective of a scientifically planned step by step development.

DEPARTURE

From 1958, the Chinese party leadership began departing from this policy and perspective, perhaps under the impact of such developments as the Hungarian counter-revolution, the stepping up of US aggression in the West and South-East Asia. Already in May 1958 when the second session of the 8th Congress of the Communist Party of China met, a new turn was made.

In the political report at this session, the thesis was put forward that China had entered a 'period of development by leaps and bounds'. The idea of forcing the pace of industrialisation was concretised in the slogan, in 15 years from 1958 China must catch up with and surpass Britain in industrial production. Peasant cooperative movement was not only to be consolidated but raised to a higher level without waiting for the means of mechanisation and modernisation but to solve that very question in a new way.

Soon afterwards, in August 1958, the Central Committee came out with the directive to set up people's communes.

Simultaneously the Central Committee came out with the slogan of double the steel output in one year (August 1958).

'The battle for steel' was waged on a massive scale by the campaign for building small steel smelting furnaces everywhere.

The year 1958 resounded all over China with the slogans and enthusiasm for the 'big leap forward' in every field of work. It is not possible here to go into the criticism and shortcomings of the economic policies of the 'great leap' on the industrial and agricultural front. But the fact remains that the people's communes did not fulfil the exaggerated expectations attributed to them.

Prematurely seeing in them 'first shoots of communist principles' or describing them as future 'basic units of communist society' led the local cadre to negate the socialist principle of 'to each according to his work' and thus violate the principle of material incentive. This was criticised by the Central Committee itself (September 1958 resolution). This led to complications and setback in production. The campaign, too, did not produce the desired result.

SETBACKS

As a result of these shortcomings and setbacks, coupled with three successive years of drought, 'China suffered temporary, economic difficulties from 1958 to 1962' as admitted by the Chinese press itself. Targets of industrial and agricultural production were not fulfilled. China had to import grain. The second five-year plan, which was to be completed in 1962 had to be prolonged. The communique of the recent 11th Plenum announces that, 'the third five-year plan started this year'.

The Chinese leadership, of course, does not attribute these economic setbacks to any shortcomings or mistakes in its general line of the 'great leap'. On the other hand, they say that these were the 'result of sabotage by Soviet revisionists and three successive years of heavy natural calamities.' But this is not the view of some fraternal socialist countries which have had ample opportunity of closely studying the economic development in China.

For instance, the Polit Bureau report of the Socialist Unity Party of Germany, delivered by Gunter Mittag, Polit Bureau

member, to the 13th session of the SED Central Committee, Berlin, while reviewing the developments of the cultural revolution in China, said the following:

When the policy of "great leap forward" failed completely, a complicated economic and political situation arose in China which was further worsened as a result of heavy natural calamities. The People's Republic of China was thrown back by many years in its economic, political and cultural development. These setbacks forced China to make certain corrections in its domestic and economic policies without officially changing the general line.

In the process of the so-called regulative measures, the people's communes were reorganised, the maladjustments in economy were corrected and the principle of material incentive was again taken into account in a certain measure. As a result of these corrections, a certain stabilisation of the economic situation was achieved in 1963.' (Translated from *Neues Deutschland*, 18 September 1966)

IV

CONTRADICTIONS SHARPEN WITHIN CPC LEADERSHIP

We have focussed the light on the economic difficulties and setbacks in the socialist development in the People's Republic of China during the years 1959 to 1962, because it is these and the policies they stem from seem to have become the subject of sharp differences inside the Chinese Communist Party, from its city and regional levels to its topmost level. The 'cultural revolution' in its present form seems to have been unleashed to steamroller these differences. The present cultural revolution campaign is not for fighting the temptation of 'revisionism', which is 'developing in the wake of socialist gains', as P. Sundarayya thinks.

The Foreign Languages Press, Peking, has published a series of four pamphlets entitled *The Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution in China*. In these four pamphlets are put together a

number of articles which were published in *Liberation Daily* (organ of the PLA), the *Hongqui, People's Daily* and other papers, exposing the alleged anti-party activities of Teng To, the Peking party committee secretary who was in-charge of propaganda; Wu Han, a historian and vice-mayor of Peking; Lu Peng, president of the Peking University and the secretary of the university party committee, which culminated in June 1966 in their dismissal and the dissolution and reorganisation of these key party committees in the capital.

These articles appeared between April and June 1966. The dissolution of these two party committees by a decision of the Central Committee was the starting point of the present campaign of the 'cultural revolution' in Peking and other centres.

It was given political sanction and organisational form by the 16-point resolution adopted by the 11th Central Committee Plenum of the CPC on 8 August. The campaign itself was formally inaugurated at the 10-lakh rally in Peking on 18 August by Chairman Mao Tse-tung, Lin Piao, Chou En-lai and others.

The *Liberation Army Daily* in an article dated 8 May 1966, on how the attack of 'right opportunists' inside the party started as early as 1959 and how it continued between 1959 and 1962 says:

'As the socialist revolution deepened, the right opportunists within the party, catering to the needs of imperialism and modern revisionism and of the landlords, rich peasants, counter-revolutionaries, bad elements and rightists at home launched a ferocious attack on the party at its Lushan meeting in 1959. Under the brilliant leadership of the Central Committee of the party and Chairman Mao, the meeting dealt a resolute counterblow at the right opportunists, disarmed them, dismissed them from office, completely smashing their anti-party scheme.'

ATTACK BEGINS

It appears that in the Lushan meeting of the Central Committee some top leaders of the party and the army were removed. The article says further:

'Later, between 1959 and 1962, our country encountered temporary economic difficulties owing to serious natural calamities

in successive years and to the sabotage of the Khrushchov modern revisionists. Gloating over our difficulties, the class enemies at home and abroad quickly raised their ugly heads and the right opportunists inside the party launched a new attack on the party in coordination with them. It was in these circumstances that Teng To and his gang "broke through the door and dashed out in a great hurry." (*The Great Socialist Cultural Revolution in China*—Pamphlet No. 1, p. 2)

What was the nature of the anti-party activities of 'Teng To and his gang'? For instance, Wu Han, a historian and the vice-mayor of Peking and an important party member in Peking, published in January 1961 a drama called *Hai Jui Dismissed from Office*.

It was a historical drama based on the incident of a good and upright prime minister being wrongfully dismissed by the emperor. There was no reference to any question of current politics in it.

Still, when the drama was 'exposed' and openly criticised in November 1965, it was stated that 'it directed its spearhead precisely against the Lushan meeting and against the Central Committee of the party headed by Mao Tse-tung, with a view to reversing the decision of the meeting.'

The message of the drama was said to be that the dismissal of the 'upright official Hai Jui', in other words right opportunists, was 'unfair' etc. (*The Great Socialist Cultural Revolution in China*, Pamphlet No. 2, p. 34)

In his preface to the drama Wu Han had written: 'This drama lays stress on the uprightness and tenacity of Hai Jui who was undaunted by force, undismayed by failure.' This was taken to mean that he—Wu Han—actively incited and supported the right opportunists who had been 'dismissed from office'. (*ibid.*, p. 36).

Later, in March 1961, Teng To started a column called 'Evening Chats at Yen Shan' in *Peking Evening News*. It continued up to 2 September 1962. Notes from 'Three Family Village' written by the trio—Wu Han, Teng To and Liau Meshu, began to appear later in 1961 in *Peking Daily* and *Frontline* and continued up to 1964.

DOUBLE TALK?

These columns were bright pieces of writing which, using historical anecdotes and fables under the guise of giving knowledge made sly political comments and innuendoes on current situation.

The exposure of these columns came after the exposure of Wu Han's drama in November 1965, after which both Wu Han and Teng To published articles making self-criticism of their writing saying that they betrayed a certain relaxation of class struggle.

Later in April and May 1966, *Hongqui* (Red Flag) as well as *Liberation Daily* came out with quotations from those columns and proved that they were 'a lot of double-talk against the party and socialism.' They 'slandered the party' and the 'great leap forward'.

Their attacks were said 'to chime in with the attacks of the Khrushchov revisionists'. *Hongqui* in its article said, 'The time has come for *Frontline*, *Peking Daily* and *Peking Evening News* to undergo a thorough revolution.'

On 3 June 1966, the Central Committee of the CPC took the decision to dissolve the Peking municipal committee and reorganise it. The new Peking party committee appointed a new team for a cultural revolution in the Peking university which functioned as the Peking university party committee in place of the one which was dissolved.

Editorial Boards of *Peking Daily* and *Peking Evening News* were dismissed and new editorial boards were appointed. Editorial board of *Frontline* was dismissed and the journal was temporarily suspended.

It is indeed a sad commentary on the conditions in the People's Republic of China and in its great Communist Party that top party leaders and party intellectuals in the capital city have to resort to historical drama, allegories, anecdotes and fables and other subterfuges to express their criticism of the current party line and its implementation and administration.

Why did this happen in a party which had put forward the dictum of 'Let hundred flowers blossom and a hundred systems of thought contend' to solve the 'contradictions among the people' and to achieve unity on a higher basis through rectification campaigns?

That, Liu Shao-chi had said, 'was a noble communist way of doing things' and had made the proud claim:

'Never before has there been a political party like our party of the proletariat... that firmly trusts the majority of the masses and is bold enough to practise democracy on such an extensive scale.' (Political Report, 2nd session of the 8th Congress of the CPC, *Peking Review*, 3 June 1958)

But this is not the view which the Chinese party leadership now takes of the Peking group. In an editorial in *Hongqui* published soon after the above mentioned CC decision, it was stated that 'in these few years of economic difficulties (1959-1962) one monster after another had come out of its hiding place. The offensive of the reactionary bourgeoisie against the party and socialism reached a pitch of utmost fury.' (*The Great Socialist Cultural Revolution in China*, Pamphlet No. 4, p. 8)

This offensive began, it stated there, in all fields—in the field of philosophical studies, in the field of literature and art, in education and journalism. It was started by the 'so-called authorities representing the bourgeoisie who had wormed their way into the party.' The Peking anti-party group was 'the most reactionary and fanatical element in this adverse current.'

According to this article, this Peking group, whose 'roots lay nowhere else than in the former Peking municipality party committee' was quite influential. 'They had many bases—newspapers, magazines, forums, publishing organisations. Their long arms reached out to all corners of the cultural field in which they usurped some positions of leadership.' 'Peking university was a most stubborn bulwark under its control.'

What did they use these positions for?

'Under direction, in an organised way, acting according to a plan and with a set purpose, they prepared public opinion for

the restoration of capitalism and the overthrow of the dictatorship of the proletariat.' (*ibid.*)

It is difficult to see how this group, which was sponsoring historical dramas, or putting out columns making indirect criticism through anecdotes and fables, could by these involved and indirect methods prepare the public opinion for the restoration of capitalism.

Whatever that may be, one thing is clear from these articles and that is that this group was linked with key persons in various fields of cultural activity who were being accused of opposing Mao Tse-tung's thought and putting forward 'modern revisionist' ideas.

For instance, in the field of education, there were people who 'opposed the educational policy advanced by Chairman Mao' and were propagating 'the educational theories and system of Soviet revisionism'.

Lu Peng, the dismissed president of the Peking university and the secretary of the party committee of the university was accused of 'leading the students astray on to the road of revisionism and train them as successors of the bourgeoisie.'

In the field of economic studies there were people who 'put forward a whole set of revisionist fallacies, opposed putting Mao Tse-tung's thoughts and politics in command and wanted to put profit and money in command.' (This may be reference to ideas of economic reform in current in other socialist countries.)

CULT OF MAO

In the field of historical studies, there were people who opposed putting Mao Tse-tung's thought in command and spread the notion that historical data was everything. In the field of literature and art, Chairman Mao's line was opposed by some who put forward theories of 'truthful writing' and 'broad path of realism.'

But the main point to grasp is that the leadership of the Chinese Communist Party headed by Mao Tse-tung and Lin Piao has come to the conclusion that these purveyors of 'modern revisionist' ideas who are in key positions in the party and in the cultural field, cannot be fought by methods of party recti-

fication campaign, by methods of 'solving contradictions among the people' but have to be fought as enemies of the revolution, of socialism and of the dictatorship of the proletariat.

They were declared 'anti-communist and anti-popular counter-revolutionaries'. They were declared as 'schemers and careerists who plan to capture our bastion from within and stage in China the ugly drama of Khrushchov's usurpation of party, army and state power' (*People's Daily* editorial of 5 June 1966).

The call was given 'to set the great proletarian cultural revolution in dynamic motion' firstly among the students and teachers of Peking university.

Directed by the 'working group for cultural revolution', which was set up by the CC to replace Peking university party committee headed by the dismissed President Lu Peng, and by rousing the students against 'Lu Peng and bourgeois royalists' who were said 'to intensely hate students of worker and peasant origin', who 'had sabotaged socialist education movement' and had taken disciplinary actions against many revolutionary students and teachers, the cultural revolution movement started with the Peking university students in the vanguard and was soon joined by the vast student mass from all the schools and colleges and educational institutes of the capital.

This is how the present 'cultural revolution' started, manned in the main by the young students and youth. It gathered force in the months of June and July and in the first week of August 10-lakh students and youth with red bands on their left arms and a red book of Mao Tse-tung's quotations in their right-hand, assembled in Peking, where the 11th Plenum of the CC of the Communist Party of China was meeting, which issued the 16-point directive to officially launch the great movement.

V

PROLETARIAN POLITICS AND CHINESE THOUGHT

If the 16-point decision of the CC of the Communist Party of China on the 'great proletarian cultural revolution' the formulation of which, it is emphasised, was presided over by Mao

Tse-tung himself, is analysed carefully, it will itself give the clue to the amazing excesses and enormities that have followed in its wake.

The 16-point decision, the communique of the 11th Plenum of the CC of the Communist Party of China and the editorials in *Hongqui* and the *People's Daily* on the same subject, form the basic authoritative material to understand the great upheaval and the aims of its sponsors.

The 'cultural revolution' is defined by the CPC leadership as a new stage in the development of the socialist revolution which aims at transforming education, literature, art and other parts of the superstructure that do not correspond to the socialist economic base so as facilitate the development of the socialist system.

But its 'present objective' is to 'struggle against and crush those persons in authority who are taking the capitalist road and to criticise and repudiate reactionary bourgeois academic authorities'. By 'those in authority' are meant 'in authority inside the party'. It is just these who 'are putting an unprecedentedly strong resistance' to the cultural revolution. This is the main target.

Though 'the main force in this cultural revolution' is said to be 'the masses of workers, peasants, soldiers, revolutionary intellectuals', those who are praised as 'courageous and daring path-breakers' and described as 'launching resolute attacks on the open and hidden representatives of the bourgeoisie' are 'the large numbers of revolutionary young people previously unknown'. So the main force, in short, is the young students and teenage youths!

SITUATIONS

Though the movement is initiated and it proceeds under the general leadership of the Central Committee, it is significant that the leadership does not expect the party organisations at all levels to come forward to rouse the masses for it equally enthusiastically.

The document states that four different types of situations exist in the party committees. While one group of party com-

mittees has leadership which will boldly rouse the masses for the movement, there are two more groups where the leadership would be more or less afraid to do so and would lag behind and even be an obstacle to the movement.

In the fourth group, the leadership is of those who have taken the capitalist road, they will even attack the movement.

SHAKE-UP

Thus, instead of party organisations at all levels leading the movement, the movement is to give a shake-up to the party organisations, so that the loyal leadership is strengthened, the vacillating ones are brought to heel and the disloyal ones are crushed.

It is a movement of young students and teenage youths, who are to rouse the masses 'against old ideas, culture, customs and habits left over from all the exploiting classes over thousands of years'; they are to rouse the masses against 'bourgeois rightists', 'counter-revolutionary revisionists' 'who are against Mao Tse-tung's thought'.

They are asked to take to the streets, criticise, argue, hold debates, use big-letter posters. As for the anti-socialist rightists in authority in the party, they are 'to be fully exposed, hit hard, pulled down, and completely discredited'.

Warning, of course, is given that contradictions among the people themselves are to be solved in a different way than those between the people and the enemy. In the case of the former, one has to debate and reason and not use coercion or force.

All the same, instructions are given 'to be good at making revolution' i.e., act freely. Revolution cannot be gentle or refined. It is visualised that there would be clashes between this movement and other sections of the masses who are not joining it. Warning is given to avert this. At the same time it is stated: 'No measures should be taken against students at universities, colleges, middle schools, and primary schools, because of problems that arise in the movement.'

The cultural revolutionary groups and committees, with the formation of which the movement began in schools and colleges,

are declared as 'new forms of organisation whereby... the masses educate themselves.' They are declared 'organs of power of the proletarian cultural revolution' (!). These groups and committees are to elect delegates to revolutionary cultural congresses and to be made into permanent organisations.

Two central guiding slogans of the movement are 'Hold High the Banner of Mao Tse-tung's Thought' and 'Put Proletarian Politics in Command'. Party committees and students are asked 'to study and apply Chairman Mao's works... consciously and in a creative way.'

What is the proletarian politics that is put in command? We get the answer in the communique of the 11th Plenum.

In the field of domestic politics, it is stated therein that in China 'a situation for a new leap forward is emerging.' A great cultural revolution is sweeping China. Mao Tse-tung's instructions for the same 'constitute an important development of Marxism-Leninism'.

During the last four years, Mao Tse-tung has raised questions of socialist revolution and socialist construction which are of far-reaching significance for consolidating the dictatorship of the proletariat and socialist system in China, for preventing revisionist usurpation of the party and state leadership and for preventing restoration of capitalism... for ensuring China's gradual transition to communism in the future.

In the field of international politics, it is stated that 'communism, the people, revolution and China' are faced with the 'holy alliance' of three evil forces.

They are, (1) 'the leading group of the CPSU which is safeguarding imperialist and colonial domination in the capitalist world and restoring capitalism in the socialist world'; (2) the US led imperialism; (3) the reactionaries of various countries.

WEAPONS

The 1957 Moscow Declaration and the 1960 Moscow Statement are not mentioned at all. Instead, the programmatic document put forward by the Communist Party of China on 14 June 1963, and the comments on the Open Letter of the CPSU (1963) published in *Hongqui* and *People's Daily* foully sland-

ering the brother parties, are declared as 'powerful ideological weapons against imperialism and modern revisionism.'

The Soviet Union is accused of 'betrayal on the question of Vietnam's resistance to US aggression' and it is declared that 'it is impossible to have any united action with them.'

This is the 'proletarian politics put in command'. This is narrow nationalism, a gross betrayal of anti-imperialist united action, intensification of disruption of the socialist camp and deepening of the split in the ranks of the world communist movement.

The actual course of events of the 'cultural revolution' in the last two months or so and especially after its official inauguration in the beginning of August is well-known through reports of the *Hsinhua* agency itself, as well as through reports of eye-witness correspondents from socialist countries.

It is necessary here only to summate the main features of these events and to attempt to answer the question as to where they are leading.

The movement is claimed to eradicate the bourgeois and feudal culture and to rouse the masses to adopt the proletarian socialist culture. Eliminate the four 'old's and establish the four 'new's is the slogan; by which is meant root out old ideas, culture, old customs and habits and replace them by new ones.

When the student and youth volunteers of the 'cultural revolution' named 'Red Guards' took to streets, they began a campaign against bourgeois influence in such things as shop and street signs, hair-dress, shoes and clothings, and gramophone records. Costly furniture and jewellery from houses of well-to-do citizens were pulled out and put on exhibition.

UNMARXIST

Some of these things can be understood though not elevated to the stature of acts of cultural revolution. But when it came to throwing out and even burning old classics from bookshops and replacing them by Mao's works; when it came to damaging old monuments, removing pictures from around the statue of 'reclining Buddha'; when it came to denouncing Beethoven as

representing reactionary classes, etc.—all this had nothing to do with the Marxist conception of a cultural revolution.

But this is what happened in the beginning and this is how teenagers with ill-digested Mao Tse-tung's thought began establishing the supremacy of proletarian culture over bourgeois culture.

Secondly, it is described as a struggle against counter-revolutionary revisionists and bourgeois rightists who have sneaked into the party and are in positions of authority and taking the capitalist road. How is this struggle carried out in the fields of domestic policy and that of international affairs?

In the field of domestic policy this struggle against the persons in authority in the party who are taking the capitalist road is carried out by raising to absurd lengths the cult of Mao Tse-tung's thought and of the personality of Mao itself.

The Red Guard who are campaigning with the red book of Mao's quotations are told by *Hongqui*:

'Any one who does not act according to Mao Tse-tung's thought and opposes Mao Tse-tung's thought... must be resolutely struggled against even to the extent of depriving him of his past and dismissing from office, no matter how high his past, how longstanding his qualification' (*Peking Review*, 26 August 1966).

In the latest *Hongqui* article of 17 September the matter is put more colourfully:

'So soon as we use the monster detector of Mao Tse-tung's thought on them their true features will be exposed and they will be encircled by the masses who ardently love the party and Chairman Mao.'

The 'cultural revolution' uses the cult of Mao Tse-tung's thought to fight the danger of revisionist usurpation and to bulldoze down all opposition and all criticism which arose in the ranks of the party in the context of the economic difficulties and setbacks.

Mao Tse-tung's thought is declared to give final and ultimate solution of all problems in all walks of life. The communique of the 11th Plenum itself declares 'Mao Tse-tung the greatest Marxist-Leninist of our era—who has raised Marxism-Leninism

to a completely new stage—Mao Tse-tung's thought is Marxism-Leninism of the tra in which imperialism is heading for a total collapse and socialism is advancing to a worldwide victory.

It is significant to note that neither the 8th Congress of the Communist Party of China in 1956 nor its second session in 1958 made any such formulation. Granting the outstanding achievements of Mao Tse-tung in the field of theory and practice, their absolute universalisation in this way is anti-Marxist.

In the field of international relations, the 'cultural revolution' allegedly fights revisionism by extreme escalation of its disruptive activities against the unity of the socialist camp and against the world communist movement, which found expression in the unseemly and provocative demonstration on the street where the Soviet embassy is situated and which was renamed insultingly as 'Anti-Revisionist Street'. And this 'cultural revolution' which incites the masses of its own people against the socialist camp, against the world communist movement is called 'great' and 'proletarian'!

It is amazing that the leaders of such a 'cultural revolution' are now brazen-facedly stating that in the Soviet Union 'bourgeois ideology' was rife even from the days of Lenin and Stalin! In the *Hongqui* article (June 1966) 'Long Live the Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution', it is stated:

'After the establishment of socialist relations of production, the Soviet Union failed to carry out a proletarian cultural revolution in earnest. Bourgeois ideology ran rife corrupting the minds of the people and almost imperceptibly undermining the socialist relations of production. After the death of Stalin, there was a more blatant counter-revolutionary moulding of public opinion by the Khrushchov revisionist group.' (*Great Socialist Cultural Revolution in China*, Pamphlet No. 4, p. 4.)

It has been again and again stated both in the 16-point document and in *Hongqui* articles, that a new organisation of great historic significance has arisen in the course of the 'cultural revolution'. They are the cultural revolutionary groups, committees and the organisations of 'Red Guards'. They are said to be 'created by the masses themselves in the course of the cultural revolutionary movement' (*Hongqui*, August 1966).

When the movement was started, the Central Committee leadership was not sure whether the party organisations at various levels would come forward to lead it. That is why it was stated in the 16-point document that 'the outcome of this great cultural revolution will be determined by whether the party leadership does or does not dare boldly to arouse the masses.'

That is why it described the four types of situations which we referred to earlier. In actual fact, it is the 'revolutionary cultural committees' and Red Guards who are leading the movement. Not everywhere they have received the support of the party committees and in many places they have come in conflict with the party organisations. For instance, the *People's Daily* editorial dated 23 August 1966 said:

'If the party organisation of any locality or unit goes counter to the correct leadership of the party's Central Committee headed by Comrade Mao Tse-tung... why should it not be criticised?....'

'The Red Guards, Red Flag fighting teams and other revolutionary organisations formed by the revolutionary students are lawful organisations under the proletarian dictatorship. Their actions are revolutionary actions, lawful actions. Anyone who opposes the revolutionary actions of the students directly contravenes the teachings of Chairman Mao and the decision of the party's Central Committee.' (*Peking Review*, 26 August 1966).

Pravda correspondent reported from Peking on 15 September:

'A characteristic feature of the present activities of the Hungweipings (Red Guards) is the ever sharper attacks on committees of the Chinese Communist Party at factories, educational establishments, cities and provinces and also on party functionaries and government officials. The "Red Guards" directly called for "shaking up" and purging all party committees.' (*Pravda*, 16 September)

NEW ELEMENT

The same correspondent reports attacks on many party functionaries in various towns by Red Guards, including beating up of some. The most amazing fact in this connection is this that

in this extensive movement in which students and young people are participating on a vast scale, the "Young Communist League of China" whose membership was reported to be 20 million at the 8th Party Congress (1956) is nowhere in the picture.

The *Pravda* correspondent reports that the Red Guards do not consider the YCL any longer a militant revolutionary organisation. The newspaper of the YCL has stopped publication since 19 August.

This confrontation of the Red Guards and the revolutionary cultural committees with party committees and the YCL is also emphasised by Franco Bertone writing in *Rinascita*, the Italian Communist Party's weekly. (TASS report from Rome, 19 September)

Gunter Mittag in the Polit Bureau report which he presented to the 13th session of the Central Committee of the Socialist Unity Party of Germany, put the matter thus:

'It is significant that the Chinese leaders failed to put through their line with the help of the party organisations. On the contrary, the reprisals are obviously first of all directed against the honest cadres of the party devoted to the cause of socialism. The adventurous course is directed entirely against the party and its leading role.

'Under the leadership of the army therefore so-called "Mao-brigades"—the committees of the cultural revolution—were created as shock-troops which are misused for all kinds of excesses, for brutal terror particularly against functionaries, against workers and peasants and for a regular iconoclastic campaign.' (*Neues Deutschland*, 18 September 1966)

Such then are the main features of the so-called cultural revolution that is raging through the streets of the cities and towns of People's China. What are they seeking to achieve by this cultural revolution?

They are proclaiming that they are eradicating old bourgeois and feudal ideologies and cultures, imbuing the masses with the new culture and ideology of the proletariat and of socialism which is scientific, revolutionary, international and humanistic.

THE CLAIM

They are claiming: they are changing the superstructure which no longer corresponds to socialism and are creating conditions to carry out socialist construction and production all the more speedily and efficiently.

If this is really so then why is the cultural revolution accompanied by shameful acts of vandalism against the great values of Chinese and world culture?

Why does it proceed under the banner of the cult of Mao Tse-tung and his thought raised to absurd limits?

Why is it inseparably connected with the most rabid anti-Soviet slander campaign, with the escalation of the disruptive and splitting activities against the socialist camp and the world communist movement?

Why is it proceeding amidst clashes with party committees, and with mass reprisals against the party cadre, and without the participation of the working class and the YCL?

This turbulent campaign of the Red Guards and cultural revolutionary committees, which is shaking the People's Republic of China at present and which is based on young students and teenage youths 'previously unknown' i.e., previously not organised either in the 20-million-strong YCL or in any other youth organisation, is master-minded by the leading group of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of China headed by Mao Tse-tung and Lin Piao.

The aim of this campaign, i.e., what the so-called 'cultural revolution' is trying to achieve at present, is the removal from office and thorough discrediting of all those in position of power and authority in the party and in the state, who were critical of the policies initiated since 1958, mainly under the initiative of Chairman Mao Tse-tung, in the field of domestic affairs, in the field of foreign policy and in the field of military affairs.

Those who were expressing this criticism were suspected to be influenced by the general line of the majority of the communist and workers' parties embodied in the 1960 Moscow Statement, and by the line of socialist construction and joint collaboration for the same as pursued by the majority of the socialist camp headed by the Soviet Union. That is why they

are being in general condemned as 'counter-revolutionary revisionists' and as seeking restoration of capitalism.

It is significant that these inter-party differences were not sought to be solved by the usual method of unity-criticism-unity on a higher basis, by the method of rectification campaign in the party. The fact that a mass campaign of this type is used for the purpose shows that the resistance was fairly strong—a fact also emphasised in the 16-point document. Even before the start of the cultural revolution movement, these differences had led to a number of dismissals even at high places in the party.

The Polit Bureau report to the CC of the Socialist Unity Party of Germany presented by Gunter Mittag quoted earlier has given the following facts:

'The heavy setbacks in the sphere of foreign and domestic policy of the country have inevitably led to a deep discontent among the Chinese population and to differences inside the party right up to the central leadership.

'Chinese leaders took measures in the years 1964 and 1965 to smash the growing opposition.'

He states further that these differences first burst out inside the army. There were sharp criticisms of the recent military policy of Mao Tse-tung and Lin Piao, especially of the 'People's War' thesis of the latter, in a meeting of political workers in the army held in the beginning of 1966.

After these critics were publicly reprimanded, the leadership of the army with the Defence Minister and Polit Bureau member Lin Piao at the head, took over the role of initiating the cultural revolution. It is well-known that it is the *Liberation Army Daily* which published the first articles attacking the Peking group of Wu Han and Teng To and calling for a cultural revolution.

Mittag then states:

'There were mass reprisals which affected numerous leading functionaries, among them were also members of the party leadership; dozens of party committees in provinces, towns, universities and institutions were dissolved. A great number of party functionaries, editors of newspapers, leading intellectuals etc., were dismissed, slandered and denigrated. Only after these pre-

paratory actions was the 11th Plenary Session of the Central Committee of the Chinese Communist Party convened, where the most extremist forces obviously prevailed.' (*Neues Deutschland*, 18 September 1966).

It appears that it was in the course of this preliminary purge that Polit Bureau members Peng Te-hwai and later Peng Chen were removed. The present course of the 'cultural revolution' is preparing the ground for further purges directed against the critics. But the main question to answer is: what trends will thus be strengthened in the policies of the People's Republic of China?

In the field of domestic policy, the trend that will be strengthened will be the one which in the name of 'great leap forward' neglects the socialist principle of material incentive and tries to skip over necessary stages of socialist construction. This is the trend which in the name of self-reliance repudiates the principle of fraternal economic collaboration between socialist states, which is the only guarantee of achieving the superiority of the socialist system over capitalism and the speedy socialist development in each state of the socialist camp.

In the field of foreign policy, it would mean further escalation of slanderous attacks on the Soviet Union and other socialist countries, intensification of splitting activities vis-a-vis the socialist camp and in the world communist movement, persistent repudiation of any united action with the Soviet Union and other socialist states against US aggression in Vietnam. All these can only bring grist to the mill of US imperialist aggressors and its war provocations.

In the field of military affairs, what would be strengthened is a policy based on nationalistic ambitions and adventurism and a repudiation of the principle of coordinating the forces and resources of the socialist states in this sphere so as to create a preventive guarantee against imperialist aggression and for maintaining world peace.

In the past this led to such actions as the repudiation of the partial test-ban treaty, escalating the India-China border dispute into an aggressive clash, abetting the adventurist tactics in Indonesia leading to a disaster, pouring oil on the fire of

Indo-Pak conflict over Kashmir, and it may in the future lead to other adventures, as well.

That is just the reason why the overwhelming majority of the communist and workers' parties look upon the course of 'cultural revolution' in China with concern and alarm. The developments will create greater difficulties for the world communist movement, will weaken the ranks of the anti-imperialist front, temporarily discredit socialism in the eyes of the peoples of the capitalist world, and help the game of the imperialist aggressors.

VI

LENIN'S TEACHINGS FORGOTTEN BY CHINESE LEADERS

On 1 October, in Peking and all over the People's Republic of China, the 17th anniversary of the victory of the great Chinese revolution was celebrated. The 'Red Guards' had been asked not to display their big letter posters in public places on that day—especially those dealing with international politics. They had been asked to lobby the foreign guests and explain to them the meaning of the 'cultural revolution'.

Communists and democrats all over the world greeted the anniversary of this historic event. On that day 17 years back, the 700 million people of China, having achieved their national-democratic revolution, joined the great socialist Soviet Union, which had become a powerful socialist industrialised state and was joined by a number of people's democracies after the former's historic victory over fascism. On that day the powerful socialist camp embracing one-third of the world's population came into existence and decisively changed the balance of forces in the world in favour of socialism.

On this anniversary, celebrated against the background of the regrettable events and course of the 'cultural revolution', our thoughts go back to the prophetic statement that Lenin made 43 years ago.

Writing in 1923, less than a year before his death, Lenin said that 'the final outcome of the world struggle... will in the last analysis be determined by the fact that Russia, India, China etc., account for the overwhelming majority of the population of the globe...' which 'during the past few years has been drawn into the struggle for emancipation with extraordinary rapidity.' In this sense, he said, the complete victory of socialism was fully and absolutely assured.

At that time when these prophetic words were written, the Soviet Union was just beginning its march towards socialist construction and India and China were both rising against colonial domination that chained the creative power of their millions.

After the victory of the Chinese revolution, and in the period of its first five-year plan, when People's China, with the fraternal assistance of the Soviet Union, embarked on the road to socialist construction, and creative energy of its millions, under the leadership of the great Chinese Communist Party began to achieve rapid progress in technical and cultural revolution, communists and democrats all over the world and especially in India looked forward to the perspectives of Lenin's prophesy being realised.

Close collaboration in economic, political and military fields between the socialist Soviet Union, with its advanced industrial and technical power on the one hand and the People's Republic of China with the creative revolutionary energy of its 700 million strong people liberated and advancing in socialist construction on the other, was bound to immensely strengthen the socialist system and accelerate the pace of socialist development in China itself.

TRAGIC IRONY

That was bound to influence favourably the struggle for national liberation and for democracy and socialism in the remaining colonial and the newly-independent countries, as was our experience in India itself.

But after 1959-60 and particularly after 1962-63, the leadership of China began to extend its political and ideological

differences with the CPSU and with the paternal communist parties to the state plane, a break occurred in that collaboration. The present 'cultural revolution' has raised this break to the level of a disastrous confrontation.

It is a tragic irony that Mao Tse-tung's thought which once was a brilliant application of Marxism-Leninism to the concrete experience of the Chinese revolution and scored significant achievements in the early years, has now become the theoretical justification of this disastrous confrontation.

This makes a mockery of Lenin's prophesy and it is just at this time that Mao Tse-tung's thought is being proclaimed as the summit of Marxism-Leninism, by its cult-makers!

Imperialism and reactionaries all over the world, including the reactionaries in India rub their hands in glee at this confrontation because they are enemies of socialism and progress. But communists and democrats in India, as elsewhere, are determined to fight for the unity of the world communist movement, for the unity of the socialist camp, for the unity of all anti-imperialist forces in the world and against policies that disrupt these, in the firm belief that this confrontation must end if the world struggle for socialism and democracy and peace is to advance and be victorious.