

## SOME QUESTIONS OF IDEOLOGICAL CONTROVERSY

### NEW EPOCH AND THE THIRD STAGE OF THE GENERAL CRISIS OF CAPITALISM

The author concludes his discussion of the conceptions non-capitalist path and national democracy, which according to him are erroneously applied to India by both the majority and minority drafts of our programme by the following remark :

Failure of both the drafts arises "out of the common failure to see the reality that the general crisis of capitalism has reached a new stage in which every country having capitalism as its social system has to face the consequence of an unstable economy and a politics and ideology which is in profound crisis." (p. 46)

As we have attempted to show, the author, having set himself the pre-conceived task of working out of an analysis and line equi-distant from the alleged revisionism of the majority and the Left-sectarianism of the minority, does not present us with an integrated understanding of the new epoch, the third stage of the general crisis of capitalism and new possibilities opened by the same to solve in a new way the radical problems of the day; nor does he apply the same to the concrete national and social problems which face our country at this moment.

He only picks one aspect of the new stage of the general crisis, that capitalism has become an unstable system—its economy, politics and ideology are in crisis, and says, that is why the non-capitalist path.

He does not show what new possibilities have arisen for the newly-developing countries to build their independent

national economies. He also does not and cannot explain why we now stand for national democracy instead of people's democracy.

His one-sided concept of the new world situation becomes more clear in the next sections where he deals with—(1) Our "one-sided" analysis of the general crisis, (2) three stages of the general crisis, and (3) nature of epoch and the question of allies.

### GENERAL CRISIS OF CAPITALISM—THREE STAGES

In reviewing the stages of the general crisis he correctly points out that "each stage is connected with a political development which changed the correlation of class forces on a world scale."

But this political development connected with each stage is primarily linked with the rising strength of victorious socialism and the change in the relation of class forces is primarily a change in relation of forces of socialism and capitalism.

Thus, the *first stage* is heralded by the victory of *socialism in one country—USSR*—the first breach in the fortress of imperialism. The first socialist country exists side by side with the capitalist world.

The *second stage* is heralded by the emergence of the *socialist system*, rise and consolidation of people's democracies in Europe and Asia on one-third part of the world. Balance of forces shifts in favour of socialism and against capitalism.

The *third stage*, as distinct from the first two stages which were connected with a world war, arises in the course of peaceful competition and struggle between two systems—and is marked by the fact that "the socialist system is becoming the decisive factor in the development of society."

Of course, each stage is connected with other features of the general crisis—sharpening of the contradictions of

capitalist system, rise and expansion of revolutionary working-class movement, victorious rise of national-liberation revolution in colonies of Asia, Africa and America, decline and break-up of the colonial system, sharpening of contradictions between capitalist countries.

But each stage is characterised by the rise of the strength of victorious socialism, which exerts decisive influence over other developments.

It is only in this way that we can understand the third stage of the general crisis and the NEW EPOCH. Only when we single out this factor in the succeeding stages of the general crisis of capitalism that we are able to see how its quantitative growth through the various stages leads at a particular point to a qualitative change in the world situation leading to a new epoch which is characterised by the socialist system becoming the decisive factor.

Through the successive stages of the general crisis of capitalism, contradictions of capitalism grew; though capitalism expanded, its economic crisis deepened, strength of victorious socialism grew; decline of colonial system began; revolutionary movements of workers in capitalist countries and the national-liberation revolutions in Asia, Africa and Latin America gained in strength and sweep.

But the growth of these factors and especially of the factor of the rise of the military, technical, economic and political might of the socialist system vis-a-vis capitalism in the third stage reaches a point at which a qualitatively new situation begins to take shape.

The correct *method* of understanding the succeeding stages of the general crisis and especially understanding the third stage and the new epoch is to focus the attention on the relative rise of the strength and influence of the forces of victorious socialism vis-a-vis the forces of capitalist world, of imperialism. This is the deciding factor, which influences, moulds and aids the revolutionary forces

in the world and creates conditions for them to take advantage of the deepening crisis of capitalism to forge ahead.

What has happened in this third stage and in the new epoch is that the economic, military, technological and political might of the socialist system vis-a-vis imperialism has become so great that it is now becoming the decisive element in the development in the world. This new situation creates new possibilities for the international communist movement, for the working-class movement in advanced capitalist countries, for the national-liberation movements fighting for independence and for newly-independent countries to solve the basic problems facing them in a new way.

This creates new possibilities of preventing war, of enforcing peaceful coexistence, of checking aggression by imperialism.

This creates new possibilities of advancing towards socialist revolution by building broadest fronts and movements for peace, democratisation and for the overthrow of the rule of monopoly.

This creates new possibilities for dependent countries for getting effective aid for their national-liberation revolution—possibilities open up for such countries to win liberation both by military, as well as by non-military means.

This creates new possibilities for newly-independent countries to consolidate independence, to build their independent national economy in the non-capitalist way, thus creating the pre-conditions for their advance to socialism.

This creates possibilities to make transition to socialism by winning majority in the Parliament, by converting Parliament into an instrument of people's will, provided, of course, a broad mass revolutionary movement to break the resistance of reactionaries is built.

All this had to be re-stated because the author, who sets about to give us a profound understanding of the third stage and the new epoch, who is conscious of the fact that

the "international movement is by no means agreed on the implication of such a characterisation of the epoch," as given in the 1960 Moscow Statement which he quotes, and who is anxious to demarcate himself from the dogmatic and sectarian stand of the Chinese and the Albanian Parties, does not present the analysis in this way at all. There is no word about the basic factor which is bringing about the change, no word about a qualitative change having taken place, no word about new possibilities and new tactical approach needed.

For, the author is not so much concerned with presenting an integrated, deep and objective picture of the new epoch and the third stage as given in the 1960 Statement which has become the common understanding of the international communist movement as a whole, as he is in showing that his understanding is neither dogmatic and sectarian like that of the Chinese nor is it revisionist.

#### THIRD STAGE OF THE GENERAL CRISIS OF CAPITALISM

The author in his own exposition of the general crisis of capitalism, of its three phases and especially of its third phase polemises against "the one-sided analysis of the general crisis." Of course, it is necessary to negate the sectarian and dogmatic understanding of the third stage of the general crisis of capitalism. But for this purpose the author, for some reason or other, picks out an article by Comrade B. T. Ranadive entitled "Marxism and the General Crisis of Capitalism" published in *The Communist* of 1947. Comrade Ranadive was attempting to formulate the *economic* aspect of the general crisis. Summing up his analysis he says: "In fact, underemployment of labour, overproduction and depression become chronic. Capitalism entered a period of general crisis." In this connection he refers to an old remark of Engels in which he expressed the surmise that the decennial cycle of stagnation, prosperity, overproduction and crisis may run its course and

be replaced by a permanent and chronic depression. In 1948-49, Marxist economists were closely studying the economic developments of the post-Second World War capitalist world and trying to figure out the shape the economic crisis would take in the context of the intensification of the general crisis of capitalism. Would there be a repetition of the 'great depression' of 1929-33? What would be the effects of the new technical revolution and of the economic militarisation on the cyclical crisis? Such were the questions asked. Comrade Eugene Varga's analysis of the post-war economic crisis in the capitalist world had appeared. Comrade Ranadive was giving expression to one of the views of the probable development of the economic crisis current in the international communist movement then. It is well known that those forecasts proved wrong. But it would be unfair to accuse Comrade Ranadive that he is equating the economic aspect of the general crisis of capitalism to the totality of the same, that he is negating the understanding that the general crisis of capitalism is the crisis of the capitalist system as a whole—of capitalism as a social system. This is an elementary formulation rammed home since the Programme of the Communist International adopted in its Sixth Congress in 1928, and none of the older comrades whether 'dogmatists' or 'revisionists' are likely to miss it.

#### ECONOMIC ASPECT

"The author is of course perfectly right in emphasising that the general crisis of capitalism, which began with the victory of the October socialist revolution in Russia, opened "a qualitatively new phase in the development of capitalism." He is again right in emphasising the formulation from the *Fundamentals of Marxism-Leninism* that

Capitalism experiences periodic economic crises which are organically inherent in the system. However the

general crisis differs from these in that it is an *all-embracing crisis of capitalism as a social system.*" (emphasis ours.)

This holds good for all the three stages of the general crisis of capitalism. But Comrade Ranadive's article which deals with the economic aspect of the general crisis of capitalism should not be taken to mean that he was "underestimating the depth and seriousness of the weaknesses which had gripped the system." But it does suffer from the weakness that it "overestimates the depth of the economic crisis" and that it postulates that "a permanent depression" has set in. But this weakness is common to the view held in the world communist movement in those years (1948-49).

In the course of the general crisis of capitalism and its various stages, the instability of its economy has been increasing, its vulnerability as a social system has been growing. This is an accepted fact. The point is to define concretely and sharply *the exact manner* in which the economy of capitalism has become more unstable and the exact way in which it has become more vulnerable as a social system. The author has correctly quoted two paragraphs from the 1960 Statement which give such a concrete definition of both these features. (pp. 52 & 54). This concrete description both of the increasing vulnerability of capitalism as a social system and of the increasing instability of its economy is not just a further development of the analysis of the new stage of the general crisis of capitalism given in the days of the 'Information Buro'—1947-49. It is in fact a negation of the sectarian understanding which was current in those years.

#### AUTHOR'S CRITERIA ANALYSED

It is necessary to grasp the rich content of this concrete analysis of the third stage of the general crisis of capitalism and of the new epoch. This rich analysis cannot be reduced

to the general truth that the capitalist system has become more unstable than ever, or that material pre-requisites are present in all advanced capitalist countries to make the transition to socialist society and in underdeveloped countries to develop their economies and cultural life along non-capitalist lines. The concrete analysis of the 1960 Statement goes deeper, lends flesh and blood to these general truths and points out how new opportunities open before the proletariat in the new epoch and in the period of the third stage—to solve the radical tasks of the day in a new way.

The author quotes the passage from the 1960 Moscow Statement giving the characterisation of the new epoch, and says "the international movement is by no means agreed on the implications of such a characterisation of the epoch." The "conflicting interpretations," he says are, "today in open clash." It is well known that the clash is between the Chinese and Albanian Parties on the one hand and the bulk of the other Communist and Workers' Parties including the CPSU on the other. He cites the example of the Caribbean crisis on which the Chinese and the Albanian Parties clashed openly with the CPSU—whom they charged with capitulating before American imperialism. The author refers to the Sino-Indian border conflict in which the CPI and the CPC accuse each other of violation of proletarian internationalism and surrendering to narrow nationalism.

The author does not specify what the disagreements on the understanding of the new epoch are, though he refers to the fact that our Party has expressed itself on the general questions involved in the controversy. But he formulates a method which according to him would enable us to avoid revisionist as well dogmatist deviations in understanding the new epoch and the third stage of the general crisis of capitalism. He says there are two ideas which are basic to this understanding. They are different from each other but interconnected. Their proper integration alone would enable us

to avoid both types of mistakes in the understanding of the new epoch and in applying that understanding to concrete problems of the international tasks.

These two ideas are as follows: (1) In the third stage the capitalist system is growing more and more unstable and the material pre-requisites are present in the advanced capitalist countries for a transition to socialism and in underdeveloped countries to pass over to development on non-capitalist lines. (2) Greater possibility than ever for winning allies for the working class on a world scale—(a) peace-loving people and even governments in some capitalist countries who are opposed to war and oppose warmongering policies of big imperialist powers; (b) ruling circles and even governments in many newly-independent countries whose direct material interests draw them towards non-alignment, peaceful coexistence and cooperation with socialist states.

Based on the 'proper integration' of these two ideas, the formula to avoid the two deviations seems to be as follows:

If in fighting for the socialist revolution and for the non-capitalist path respectively the proletariat fails to see the importance of unity with these two allies respectively, for maintaining peace and non-alignment, etc., then it would be committing a Left-sectarian mistake.

If on the other hand, while uniting with these two allies for that purpose, the proletariat fails to rebuff pro-capitalist and pro-imperialist tendencies in them, it would be committing a revisionist mistake.

The author applies this formula to the Chinese and Albanian Parties' attitude on the Caribbean crisis—when these Parties criticised the Soviet Union for placing the missiles in Cuba as adventurist and later for withdrawing them as capitulating to imperialism. Actually, says the author, the Soviet Union by doing this averted a nuclear war and won the support of millions of people throughout the world who were concerned at the prospect of such a

war breaking out on the question of US aggression against Cuba. The Chinese and Albanian Parties do not see the significance of winning these allies to prevent war and so their attitude is Left-sectarianism.

#### THE ALTERNATIVE GENERAL LINE

Is this sufficient and satisfactory explanation of the divergent view and attitude of the Chinese leaders on the Caribbean crisis? Does such a great and experienced Party as the Chinese not see the significance of winning broad allies among the peace-loving peoples to prevent war and maintain peace? Actually the different attitude and view of the Chinese Party stems from its different understanding of the following key features of the new epoch and the third stage as stressed in 1960 Moscow Statement:

That war is *not fatally inevitable* in the present epoch and in the third stage.

That joint action of the socialist states and of international working class with the broadest support of all the peace-loving forces can prevent aggressive actions of imperialism, promote peaceful coexistence and thus avert the danger of war.

Such actions successfully carried out create favourable atmosphere for the growing struggle for democracy, national liberation and socialism.

These three features are implied in the two paras about the third stage and the new epoch from 1960 Statement quoted by the author (pp. 52 & 54). They indicate the direction of the general line of the international communist movement. Do the Chinese leaders agree with the general line implied in these 3 features understood in an integrated manner? They do not; otherwise they would not have put forward an alternative general line in their letter of June 14, 1963.

When we say this we do not imply that the Chinese Party

does not accept that in the present period world war is not fatally inevitable. We grant that they accept it in a general way.

We also grant that the Chinese Party accepts that the socialist countries have to integrate the two tasks: (1) to use all means at their disposal to prevent the aggressive actions of imperialism and to avert the danger of a world war, and (2) to support by all means, the national-liberation struggles, and the struggles of newly-independent countries of Asia, Africa and Latin America as against imperialism and not to counterpose one against another.

When all this is agreed, the question which still remains is this: In integrating these two tasks what is the main line of foreign policy a socialist country, especially a leading one, has to follow? Shall not a socialist country in its foreign policy actions first and foremost concentrate on promoting peaceful coexistence, on checking the aggressive actions of the imperialists and thus on averting the danger of world war and thereby creating favourable climate for the national-liberation struggles, etc.

As soon as the problem is so posed the answer is self-evident. Promoting peaceful coexistence, imposing it on imperialism is the main line of the foreign policy of the socialist countries and it corresponds to the general line of the world communist movement laid down in the 1960 Moscow Statement.

It is true that in the third stage of the general crisis of capitalism, the capitalist system has become extremely unstable and conditions have matured in the advanced capitalist countries for transition to socialism and in newly-independent countries to development on non-capitalist lines.

It is also true that imperialist war preparations are growing and so is the war danger; and this world war would be a thermonuclear war which in the very first days of its start will wipe out one-third or more of humanity.

In the new epoch when the socialist system is becoming a decisive force, when peace forces have grown tremendously, the correct initiative and action of the socialist countries with the support of the international working class and the peace forces can promote peaceful coexistence, check aggressive actions of imperialism and arrest the danger of war.

The more such actions succeed and peace is maintained and peaceful coexistence enforced and strengthened, the more favourable becomes the climate for the growing struggle for democracy, national liberation and socialism.

Therefore the socialist countries who form the vanguard of the international working class must make peaceful coexistence the main basis of their foreign policy and must give priority to the struggle for peace and to the prevention of aggressive actions of imperialism and to the averting of war danger. This way alone they aid the contemporary revolutionary process.

The Chinese Party does not accept this reasoning and the general line it indicates, which is the general line of the world communist movement. For instance, it does not accept that peaceful coexistence should be the general line of the foreign policy of the socialist countries. This, and the priority to the struggle for peace, it says is one-sided emphasis on peaceful coexistence and peace which is betrayal of national-liberation struggle. It says that the intermediate zone of Asia, Africa and Latin America is the focus of all the contradictions of the present epoch, where the national liberation struggle against imperialism is raging; so the international communist movement and its vanguard must concentrate their actions on this zone. It opposes the popularisation of the facts about the devastating and destructive effects of thermonuclear war, as panicky propaganda, and does not see that the spread of such knowledge actually wins us broader support among the masses for peace.

What does this alternative line amount to? Refusal to see the new in the situation, the new opportunities which open up before the world proletariat and its vanguard, the countries of the socialist system, which we have outlined previously and to make use of them to solve the radical questions of the day in a new way. This is *dogmatism*.

By opposing the concrete initiative and actions of the Soviet Union and of the world proletariat, to promote peaceful coexistence and to check aggressive actions of imperialism, to avert war danger and instead proposing a line amounting to gambling with war danger it is taking a line which is *adventurist*.

Opposition to socialist countries making peaceful coexistence the general line of their foreign policy, opposition to socialist countries giving priority to actions for peace, for checking imperialist aggression while affording every aid to national-liberation struggles and movements, etc., amounts to depriving the movements of the support of the international working-class movement and the broad peace-loving forces. This is *Left sectarianism*.

All this was argued at length, to show that the two criteria worked out by the author to negate the Left-sectarian and reformist understanding of the new epoch and the third stage are not enough. If the author wants seriously to rebut the Left-sectarian stand of the Chinese Party in such individual cases like the Caribbean crisis and the India-China border question, then he must show how these flow from the complete alternative line which they propose for international communist movement. It is also necessary to show how this line is in contradiction with the accepted general line of the 1960 Moscow Statement.

#### THE CARIBBEAN CRISIS

We have pointed out in the foregoing pages how the author's criticism of the Chinese leaders' opposition to the

Soviet moves in the Caribbean crisis is inadequate. They say that the Soviet Union when it first put the missiles in Cuba to forestall the imminent US attack on Cuba, was acting in an adventurist manner; when the Soviet Union withdrew the missiles after getting assurance that there will be no direct attack on Cuba from the US, this action is branded as capitulation to imperialism. The author remarks that both these positions of Chinese leaders are self-contradictory. Apparently they appear self-contradictory, if we look at the matter superficially. But if we go deep into the matter we will see that the self-contradictory positions are both consistent with their alternative line.

Was the Soviet step in placing the missiles in Cuba adventurist as the Chinese leadership considers? Cuba fearing a direct aggression from the US asked the Soviet Union to aid its defence by supplying these missiles. Was Soviet Union to refuse this request? When the US imperialists spotted the missiles by their aerial survey they raised a hue and cry about "Cuba preparing an aggression against the US" and charged the Soviet Union of provoking a thermonuclear war. Are not those who condemn Soviet action as "adventurist" not bringing grist to the mill of this US imperialist slander? And what actually happened? Soviet strength as well as its initiative for peace forced the US to respond; the danger of a thermonuclear war was averted; the US opened negotiations and gave an assurance that they would not attack Cuba without provocation. Obviously the Chinese leaders underestimate how the world balance of forces has shifted in favour of the socialist camp and how elements among imperialists have to think thrice before they risk a thermonuclear war. While the Chinese leaders do not see the new in the situation, the Soviet Union sees it and makes full use of it to prevent aggression, avert war as well as to defend Cuba.

Then again, having placed the missiles there, was their withdrawal not a capitulation to the US? Was the US

assurance worth the paper on which it was written? This is the second part of the Chinese leaders' criticism. Actually the US assurance coming as it does after they have seen with their own eyes that the Soviet Union can go to the length of putting missiles in Cuba—has to be differently estimated. After the Caribbean crisis the US will think thrice before they launch a *direct* attack on Cuba. This means that even after the missiles were withdrawn the Soviet action has given the Cuban revolution comparative respite and time to consolidate itself. The Chinese leaders' position in both the cases arises from their refusal to give priority to actions to defend peace and avert war and from their tendency to take positions amounting to a gamble with war danger.

Thus the Chinese leaders' positions on the question of the Caribbean crisis cannot be properly nailed down unless we show how they flow from their proposed alternative general line for the world communist movement—which is a negation of the general line laid down in the 1960 Moscow Statement, and is a dogmatic and Left-sectarian distortion of the same.

If the author wants seriously to conduct a simultaneous struggle against the dogmatism and sectarianism of the Albanian and the Chinese leaders as well as the revisionism and Right-opportunism of the Yugoslav leaders, he has in the first place to nail down the alternative understanding of the Chinese Party on the main theses of the 1960 Statement and the alternative line for the world communist movement which they (Chinese leaders) derive from that differing understanding. The Hyderabad resolution of our NC, which the author says he accepts, had not done that job thoroughly. The document submitted by Comrade S. G. Sardesai at the National Council and which was not taken up for discussion by that session but just shelved had attempted that job and had successfully nailed down the dogmatism and sectarianism of the alternative understanding of the Chinese Party

on basis of quotations from their own documents. That the line of study adopted by Comrade Sardesai was a correct one, was proved by the fact the Chinese Party soon afterwards came forward with its completely alternative line for the world communist movement in their letter to the CC of the CPSU of June 14, 1963. Our NC reacted to this new situation in the world communist debate and in its October 1963 session took the draft resolution submitted by Comrade Bhupesh Gupta for discussion. This draft resolution took up the alternative line of the Chinese leaders as laid down in their June 14 letter and their attitude on the Caribbean crisis, etc., and subjected the same to a point by point refutation.

What was the position of the author, who wants a simultaneous struggle against the dogmatism and Left-sectarianism of the Chinese Party and the revisionism of the Yugoslav Party? The author did not want the NC either to discuss or adopt that draft resolution. Instead, he proposed a short 2-page statement in which he called upon the CPSU and the CPC to resume their bilateral talks and prepare for a world conference of the Communist and Workers' Parties to solve the differences. The statement also called upon the Party centre to organise an inner-Party discussion throughout the Party on these differences. The NC rejected the stand of the author and adopted the resolution but at the same time agreed to open the discussion on these questions.

Obviously the author who claims to conduct an equal and simultaneous struggle against Chinese and Albanian dogmatism on the one hand and against Yugoslav revisionism on the other, did not want to go on record criticising the alternative general line put forth by the Chinese Communist Party.

#### STRUGGLE AGAINST YUGOSLAV REVISIONISM

In the struggle against Yugoslav revisionism and Right-opportunism the author has mentioned one or two points—

their equating the peace policy of the socialist camp with the non-alignment policy of the neutral powers, their theory of "two blocs", and the "non-involvement with either bloc" His criticism is quite correct and it is necessary to guard against such revisionist trends penetrating inside our party. At the same time the author has rightly stated that the Yugoslavs have already made corrections in some important respects and to that extent the struggle against their mistakes has to be reduced. Also it is necessary to bear in mind that the struggle against Yugoslav revisionism must not go to the limit of saying that that country is no longer socialist and that capitalism is fast growing there and that Yugoslavia is in conspiracy with Western imperialism against the socialist camp. This was how Yugoslav revisionism was being fought in the days of the Cominform (1949). This was corrected by the CPSU after its 20th Congress and by the international communist movement. The Chinese and the Albanian Parties still continue to attack the Yugoslav Party in this way. Therefore, in talking of struggle against Yugoslav revisionism it is necessary to negate this type of 'struggle' also.

When the author wants to conduct simultaneous struggle against Yugoslav revisionism, he does not mean that we conduct a campaign here in India or even within our Party against the various revisionist mistakes Yugoslav Party has committed both in its internal policy of socialist construction and in its foreign policy as well as against the revisionist line in its programme. We take it that he does not want us to run a campaign against Yugoslav revisionism—as the classic example of modern revisionism as the Chinese Party, who consider that Yugoslavia is no longer a socialist country but a key link in the imperialist conspiracy against the socialist world.

We have briefly dealt with how Yugoslav revisionism has to be countered and how not. The Chinese Party leaders identify the understanding and implementation of

the Moscow Statement by the CPSU and by many other Parties like the Italian and French, with Yugoslav revisionism (modern revisionism). We reject this and we hope the author agrees with us.

#### SINO-INDIAN BORDER QUESTION

On the Sino-Indian border question, according to the author, the Indian Party and its National Council majority have taken a completely revisionist position, identified themselves with bourgeois nationalism and grossly betrayed proletarian internationalism. Of course, the author admits that Socialist China was wrong in using force to solve the border dispute in its own favour. He says:

Dogmatic assessment of the class character of the Nehru government as well as of the role which a socialist country should play in relation to a non-aligned country made the Communist Party of China resort to force rather than peaceful negotiation as the means of settling the border problems.

Can the mistake of Socialist China be reduced to merely a mistake of assessment of the class character of the Nehru government? Does not the Leninist principle of proletarian internationalism demand of a socialist country that it cannot use force to solve its border dispute with a neighbouring country whether aligned or non-aligned? Is not the internationalist consideration of winning the esteem of the people of the neighbouring country for socialism more important for a socialist country than the narrow nationalist consideration involved in gaining a border territory? Even supposing that Chinese claims in Ladakh were right was it as a socialist country justified in unilaterally pushing forward with its check-posts and occupation? And in that case was India not justified in pushing forward with its check-posts into what she considered her territory? When these moves and counter-moves led to dangerous situation of actual clashes—and

when proposals and counter-proposals of disengagement and peaceful negotiations are going on—was it not the duty of a socialist country to persistently and patiently pursue negotiations?

Instead Socialist China 'solves' the question by a massive armed attack in NEFA as well as in Ladakh, which transforms the political situation in India so radically that it turns against Socialist China, as well as against the progressive forces in India itself. Does this not show that for China narrow nationalist consideration of getting hold of some border territory which it claims as its own mattered more than the internationalist consideration of promoting peaceful coexistence with a great neighbour like India, of maintaining the love and esteem of the hundreds of millions of Indian people for the socialist system in China? Have not the breach of peaceful coexistence and the creation of warlike conditions between India and China given a set-back to progressive forces and added strength to reactionary forces? Does this not prove that China has acted against the thesis of the 1960 Moscow Statement which says promotion of peaceful coexistence creates favourable conditions for the growing struggle for democracy, national liberation and socialism?

The answers to all these questions are clear and obvious and they prove to the hilt the statement of our November resolution that Socialist China

has most grossly violated the common understanding of the 81 Parties' conference in 1960 in relation to peaceful coexistence and attitude to newly-liberated countries and the question of war and peace—and has fallen victim to narrow nationalistic considerations at the cost of the interests of world peace.

The author does not agree with this formulation and quotes in his support the editorial of *Pravda* of October 24,

1962. He complains that we rejected the warning of that editorial that reactionaries in India were raking up war-hysteria and wanted the progressive forces to counter it and strive for peaceful negotiations. But the article left many things unsaid. It had not a word to say against the disastrous Chinese invasion which in fact had created the soil for the reactionaries to sow war-hysteria. That is why our Party rightfully ignored it. We had no reason to regret it either. Subsequently, it was the CPSU which had to change and had to do the same open criticism of the Chinese Party which we did earlier.

Of course, the Party had to act to counter the war-hysteria whipped up by the reactionaries for the purpose of subverting non-alignment and attacking progressive forces and had to win support for the path of peaceful negotiations. But how was that to be done? The author accuses the NC of making a 'revisionist assessment of the character of the Nehru government.' Our assessment of the Nehru government for the purposes of this situation was based on sharply demarcating it from the war-mongering reactionaries who were itching to use the situation to subvert non-alignment and other progressive policies. Despite vacillations the Nehru government continued to stand for non-alignment, against war-hysteria and for peaceful negotiations. This differentiation had to be made the basis of our policy and this was not revisionist but a correct assessment.

The author accuses us of being blind to our duty as part of the international movement and 'abandoning the path of negotiations.' Could we have done our international duty by merely shouting 'negotiate', while doing nothing about national defence? By such an attitude we would have rendered ourselves ineffective to counter reaction and thus done disservice to the international movement. Only by vigorously participating in national defence could we make our voice for peaceful negotiations and against war-hysteria heard. Later, when Colombo proposals came, we supported

negotiations on the basis of those proposals—a stand which has now the support of the Soviet Union also.

The author accuses us of adopting 'the line of bellicose anti-China campaign.' It is gross slander to accuse us of mouthing bourgeois anti-China slogans. But we did conduct a vigorous campaign against Socialist China to show that its action vis-a-vis the border question was a violation of the line of the world communist movement—on the lines of the para from our November Resolution quoted above. This was necessary to combat the campaign of the reactionaries to use Chinese armed action to discredit communism and communist movement itself.

The author accuses us of welcoming imperialist 'aid' against Socialist China. This is again a deliberate distortion. In the face of massive invasion of China and the military debacle which it forced on India there was an urgent need for weapons. We certainly said: take weapons from any quarters but on commercial basis and without strings. We were the first to initiate a campaign against the imperialists foisting their 'aid' on India to subvert our non-alignment (American military mission, Air Umbrella—joint air exercises, etc.).

Actually the policy initiated by our November resolution, and developed further by later decisions and resolutions, was quite correct. It enabled the Party to face the extremely difficult situation in which the Chinese invasion had landed us and to develop initiative later to honourably discharge our national and international tasks. That is why out of that resolution our policy developed the following four features:

1. Support national defence effort while pressing for peaceful negotiations.
2. Campaign to show that Chinese action is in violation of policy and principles of world communist movement.
3. Campaign against imperialist efforts to take advantage

of this situation to subvert India's non-alignment and harm her independence.

4. Campaigns and struggles against reactionaries and monopolists and the government, seeking to take advantage of the emergency to put more and more economic burdens on the people and to subvert progressive policies—campaign for alternative measures to raise money for defence and development (bank nationalisation, etc., state trading in foodgrains, etc.).

The author makes much of the remark of Comrade Dange that as a result of the Chinese invasion, proletarian internationalism was a casualty on both sides of the McMahon line. It is good that by hailing this remark the author admits that proletarian internationalism has been violated on the Chinese side. Given this violation was there any other alternative for the Indian Party and the Indian proletariat except to join the defence of the country while striving for peaceful negotiation and simultaneously fighting against imperialist machination? *Formally*, national defence against a socialist country is a breach of proletarian internationalism. If the author considers it a *real* breach then he should have opposed defence and called for a struggle against the war-mongering Nehru government as the Chinese wanted us to do. But he was against Chinese armed action and for national defence. Then why does he gloat over this supposed 'admission' by Comrade Dange? Then again the author makes another contradictory remark: 'By no stretch of imagination can the comrades who opposed support to defence be accused of abandoning proletarian internationalism and of adopting bourgeois nationalist positions'! Could the CPI and the Indian proletariat in that difficult position perform its national and international duties by opposing support to defence? If that was the opinion of the author why did he not stand for opposing support to defence?

The author is obviously entangled in a peculiar contradic-

tion born of his zeal for simultaneous struggle against revisionism and dogmatism—mechanically pursued.

To sum up, the four-fold policy which the National Council adopted in its November 1962 resolution and developed through subsequent resolutions and practical decisions—was the only correct way of defending the national and international interests of the proletariat in our country. That way we were able to fight the chauvinistic and anti-communist drive of the pro-imperialist section, develop struggles against anti-democratic and anti-people policies of the national bourgeois government, while supporting defence, and also expose and fight against the conspiracies of the imperialists against non-alignment and sovereignty of our country.

If within the framework of this policy and practice, there were lags and shortcomings of a Right-opportunist character, they could surely be discussed and reviewed. But this is not the position of the author. He first attacks the correct positions taken by the National Council as revisionist and Right-opportunist and from that position criticises our correct criticism of the Left-sectarian position, who refused to see that full and wholehearted participation in national defence alone gave the Party, in the difficult position, the possibility and the chance of discharging its international tasks. What the author calls “full-scale political propaganda against Socialist China” was public criticism of our great neighbour that she had violated socialist principles and the 81 Parties’ Statement by its action against our country and this was an indispensable weapon in our fight against anti-communism and in our defence of international communist movement.