

October And November Revolutions: Some Problems Facing International Communist Movement.

There have been revolutions in Europe in 18th and 19th centuries which culminated in establishing the rule of bourgeoisie as against feudalism. But the first half of Twentieth Century witnessed two revolutions, one in Russia and the other in China, which have changed the face of the respective countries by putting an end to capitalism and feudalism and by building socialism. That Soviet Union has changed into a social-imperialist power, and some mistakes were committed during the course of Socialist construction in China, do not minimise the unique significance of these revolutions.

The revolutions have given an impetus to the proletarian revolutionary movements in the West and national liberation movements in the East. Formation and development of Third Communist International has provided the leadership to all these movements. As a result, a stage had arrived in the world revolutionary movement, wherein a world organisation was no more necessary to guide it from one centre. Every party had become sovereign in its respective country leading revolutions and revolutionary movements. Differences over strategy and tactics of the revolution in a given country were expected to be resolved by the parties concerned. At the sametime the parties were provided necessary help, when asked for, by the international leadership, which was headed by CPSU headed by Stalin and CPC headed by Mao, because these were the most mature parties who led the revolutions in their respective countries successfully, and who were capable of extending their help.

But the experience has proved that the help extended by them had their own limits and in some cases they proved to be incorrect also. More often the receiving parties were so immature, that they could not utilise the correct aspect of the help and reject the wrong aspect. Thus the short-comings belonged to both the sides, though the main responsibility lies with the leading party, so far as its

wrong advice, help and guidance is concerned. CPC headed by Mao had adopted this policy and led the revolution to a success. On the contrary, CPI and its leadership could not have a correct understanding and practice of Marxism-Leninism throughout its life, barring a few exceptions. That it could build a mass revolutionary movement and participated in the national movement is due to its revolutionary programme. But it could not establish the hegemony of the proletariat because of its wrong understanding and practice including wrong strategy and tactics.

Theory of Infallibility is Wrong

From among the leaders of the World Communist Movement, Stalin and Mao have come up for criticism for their role as leaders of the parties and States of Soviet Union and China and the International Communist Movement. There are enemies of Marxism-Leninism and those who have departed from it. Bourgeois ideologues, Trotskyites and some others belong to this category. Theirs is denunciation and not criticism though they may concede some of their achievements. But there are those who take a critical attitude from Marxist stand-point. For them, it is not difficult to accept that they have committed mistakes of a serious nature, though all may not be unanimous on this score. Therefore, the experience has proved that even the greatest leaders of the calibre of Stalin and Mao are not infallible. So also the parties in general. This is a valuable lesson that we have learnt and a harsh lesson at that.

There are some who defend Stalin ardently as if he had been infallible. They are the upholders of theory of infallibility of Stalin, though they may denounce others. If the leaders of Albania (PLA) uphold the infallibility of Stalin, they denounce Mao and CPC. There are those who treat both Stalin and Mao as infallible. As a result, they defend rights as well as wrongs of these leaders.

The mistakes committed by the leadership are connected with the consolidation of the dictatorship of the proletariat and building socialism in Soviet Union and China. The experiences were first of its kind for Soviet Union and Stalin. Even then they are mistakes, sometimes serious in nature. Therefore, the theory that outstanding leaders are infallible is wrong. The same is the case with Mao. His contribution as the leader of the CPC and the Chinese revolution is unique in all fields, i.e., ideological, political, military, organisational and practical. His ideas in this respect are known

as Mao Zedong Thought. They continue to be alive and Mao Zedong Thought has come to stay. This does not mean that he was free from short-comings either in thinking or in practice, especially in the last part of his life. They must be assessed criticised and correct lessons should be drawn. The CPC leadership is seized of the matter. It has expressed its opinions on most of the subjects. More details are being awaited, which are likely to be available soon. Notwithstanding this, we can conclude that mistakes of serious nature were committed during this period which goes to show that even outstanding leaders of international communist movement are fallible.

Cultural Revolution:

We have been upholding the Cultural Revolution in China, which has been initiated and guided by Mao, from 1966 onwards. The present Chinese leadership thinks that Mao's assessment of the situation was wrong and there was no need for a Cultural Revolution, which brought disaster to China, and impeded its development. We think that the problem has two aspects theory and practice. As far as the theory is concerned, we are one with Mao who said as following long back in 1940:

"A cultural revolution is the ideological reflection of the political and economic revolution and is in their service."

He says further:

".....The cultural revolution ushered in by the May 4th Movement was uncompromising in its fight against feudal culture: there had never been such great and thoroughgoing cultural revolution since the dawn of Chinese history. Both in ideology and in the matter of cadres the May 4th Movement paved the way for the founding of the Chinese Communist Party in 1921 and for the May 30th movement in 1925 and the Northern expedition....." (On New Democracy)

Quite in accordance with Marxism-Leninism, Mao has summed up the experience of May 4th movement and said that Cultural Revolution was necessary for the success of New Democratic Revolution. At the same time, its role is characterised as one of serving political and economic revolution. It is necessary during New Democratic as well as Socialist revolution. We support this theory. We are firmly of opinion that India needs cultural revolution

more than any country because of predominance of imperialist culture which is in its decaying stage. To some extent, it is sophisticated and decadent to a greater extent. Feudal and semi-feudal culture is appearing, not only in its crudest forms. They are deep-rooted among top strata, have influenced and continue to influence even today. They are an impediment to the development of the revolution.

It is not necessary that cultural revolution should always be the harbinger of political and economic revolutions. People of a given country decide their own course of revolution. But the essential feature of it is that it is a part of New Democratic and Socialist revolutions.

In China there was a cultural revolutionary movement even before establishing dictatorship of people's democracy. It facilitated the revolution to consummate as early as possible. But the Cultural Revolution which was started during the stage of Socialist revolution was not of this character. Of course, it was guided and led by the CPC and the dictatorship of proletariat. It has borne the features of political revolution in setting aside constitutional authority and running the administration by the "revolutionary" committees. Party committees were reorganised and considerable part of the leadership at various levels was removed and replaced by new leadership. While the former were called Capitalist Roaders, the latter were embellished as genuine revolutionaries. There were some serious mistakes of a serious nature, on economic front, which retarded the development of the country. Thus, it has, instead of serving the interests of Socialist revolution, retarded it.

In this connection, we should not ignore the conditions existing when the Cultural Revolution was started. The Modern Revisionism led by CPSU had gripped the major part of world communist movement, extending its influence even to some of the parties which were following basically a correct Marxist-Leninist line. CPC could not be free from such influences. Secondly there was a threat of war of aggression from Soviet Union. China had to prepare herself to meet all eventualities including the need to defend the country. These conditions have hastened the leadership to start cultural revolution. But they are no excuses for it because it is the correct assessment of the situation that decides the need, the form and the content of cultural revolution. According to the CPC leadership the assessment was wrong and there was no need for cultural revolution. Hence it was possible for resolving the differences within

the frame-work of party and State Constitution.

Every revolution destroys the old set up and creates new. It spreads chaos in the length and breadth of the country. Besides this, when the cultural revolution was terminated by the present leadership, and the situation was brought to normal by arresting the "Gang of Four", the change was smooth though there have been disturbances here and there. It shows that people had fully supported the change-over.

We support the theory that cultural revolution is a part of new Democratic and Socialist revolution and serves the political and economic revolutions in the two stages. We are applying it to the practice of Indian revolution. At the sametime its form and content has to be decided by us. If we commit mistakes it is we who are responsible and nobody else. It was CPC headed by Mao which had decided to start the cultural revolution and the present leadership has decided to terminate it. Thus the people and CPC together with its leadership proved to be better judges than ourselves to decide what is correct and what is wrong.

There is an international aspect of the cultural revolution of China. That it has influenced the communist movements in other countries is indisputable. Our country is no exception. Late Charu Majumdar's clique was emboldened by Lin Biao and the Gang of Four, by its ultra "left" line and carried on its activities over the length and breadth of the country which led to the disruption of revolutionary movement and organisation. Therefore it can safely be said that the serious mistakes committed by the parties more so those who are in power, have their international impact. The same is the case with the mistakes of the CPC leadership during the cultural revolution. It must be noted that we have never followed Charu's line and braved his opposition till his clique was crumbled to pieces.

What is the difference between those who opposed cultural revolution and ourselves? Those who are opposed to Marxism-Leninism-Mao Zedong Thought are opposed to cultural revolution as such. Apart from this the difference is: they are opposed to Mao Zedong Thought whereas we accept and apply it to the practice of our revolution. Some may accept in words the need for cultural revolution. But they don't realise the need for people's participation all-through. They think that cultural revolution comes about by party decisions and party's internal discussions. In short, they don't

realise its mass revolutionary character. They are also open parliament parties who have no revolutionary movement behind them. Or there can be none because of their opportunism. On the contrary we are for a mass revolutionary cultural movement during the period when we prepare the people for peoples democratic revolution or the socialist revolution as the case may be. When the peoples democratic dictatorship of the proletariat is established, there will be a cultural revolution or a revolutionary movement, whose form and content will be decided according to the given situation. These are the fundamental differences and there is no common point between the two.

The Question of Rehabilitation.

To rehabilitate a comrade or comrades, who are either wrongly degraded, or who corrected their short-comings and mistakes, is a correct principle of party organisation which must be observed by all parties. CPC has been adhering to it all-through. Deng was rehabilitated when Mao was alive. It was a starting point for all those who were deserving. (It is quite possible that some were rehabilitated even before Deng). The present leadership has expedited this process. The termination of cultural revolution has facilitated it.

We Communist revolutionaries are careful in this respect. We are firmly of the opinion that none should be punished without any substantial reason whatsoever and victims, if any, should have ways and means to get rehabilitated. We should have necessary provisions for this purpose. Correct way of rehabilitation will go a long way in developing, improving and unifying the party.

Party-to-Party Relations.

We are working in a new situation when there is no international organisation for world communist movement. Every party, group and organisation is independent with its own line. All claim to be Marxist-Leninists and some add Mao Zedong Thought. They have their alignments on local, national and international level. Therefore certain amount of mutual relations have already been established between them.

Revisionsim and opportunist internationalism has been the basis of the relations between some of them. CPSU and its associates belong to this category. PLA (Albania) is attempting to rally some

groups on the basis of denunciation of Mao Zedong Thought and opposition to the present leadership of CPC.

There are some who are independent in the real sense of this term. (Rumania, North Korea etc). They have condemned Soviet aggression against Afghanistan and Vietnamese aggression against Kampuchea either directly or indirectly. A party like CPI (M) which claims to be one belonging to such category but supported CPSU and Vietnam openly, cannot be included in this category.

The present situation demands that all anti-hegemonistic forces should be mobilised and united so that the onward march of hegemonism of Soviet Union is halted and defeated. Among them there are those who treat Soviet Union as a social imperialist power. There are those who treat Soviet Union as a socialist power. But oppose some aspects of its policies, more so, the drive for hegemonism. In spite of their limitations, they are anti-hegemonistic forces to reckon with. In isolating Soviet Union and Vietnam, these forces had an important role to play. The leadership of the CPC is unifying these forces by having relations with them. For this purpose, it is strengthening such relations which were already existing, and restoring some, which were broken earlier. The measures taken by the leadership in this direction, during the last four years are standing examples. Such attempts are likely to continue.

But this does not solve our problem. Because the question of Marxism-Leninism of these parties comes up for discussion. Who is to decide about the genuineness of Marxism-Leninism of a given party? It is the party of the country which can decide about it. Others can have their own opinions. The parties are sovereign and therefore there should be no outside interference. There can be a criticism from a fraternal party or parties which should be discussed on the party to party basis. When the mistakes of the party cross beyond certain limits leading to departure from Marxism-Leninism and embracing revisionism, a party has the right to criticise it openly and it cannot be called interference in internal relations of other party.

Where to draw a line between sovereignty and interference is a subject for further discussion and clarification. Suffice it to say that every party has the right to apply Marxism-Leninism to the practice of its country's revolution. It is likely to commit mistakes. But it should learn by its own experiences and correct itself. When

there are more than one party or group it is they who will settle accounts with each other resulting in emergence of a party of Marxism-Leninism.

A party's correct attitude towards proletarian internationalism arises out of its correct application of Marxism-Leninism. Mistakes may be committed by it in this respect. That does not amount to renouncing proletarian internationalism because they can be corrected. If they are not corrected in time leading to departure from Marxism-Leninism, they are bound to renounce proletarian internationalism as well.

Proletarian internationalists, as we are, we should denounce every war of aggression and act of aggression. Conversely, those who do not denounce them are opportunists and do not deserve to be called Marxists-Leninists. There are some who denounce naked aggressions like Soviet Union's war against Afghanistan, but take a neutral stand or ignore the issues like Soviet Union and Vietnams border clashes with China. They cannot be called proletarian internationalists. If they have reservations about such issues which are part and parcel of war and peace, we have the right to have the reservations about their proletarian internationalism. It so happens that the parties, groups, organisations, and individuals take their own time to realise hegemonist and aggressive character of a party leadership and the government. They realise only when it commits aggression. Vietnam is a case as an example. Some had illusions about its peace intentions because of the past. But when it committed aggression against Kampuchea they have opened their eyes, saw its real face in all its naked form, and then characterised it as a naked aggression. Therefore, while keeping the doors open for their becoming real internationalists, we will have our reservations till they join our ranks in this respect.

Therefore, the relations based on anti-hegemonism can not be equated to those based on proletarian internationalism. The former can be a part of the whole but not the whole.

Building of socialism in a country and the question of restoration of capitalism.

Every country will build socialism according to the specific features of its own while the basic principles of socialism are applicable to one and all countries. Basing on these specific features and advancing world revolution, these countries will add new

experiences in building socialism, communist parties, guided by Marxism-Leninism, can alone sum up these experiences and draw correct lessons to advance further. China is advancing in this direction in spite of the ups and downs it had to face in the past. Soviet Union had taken a different path, the path of Modern Revisionism and social imperialism. It was not difficult to realise this because of its aggressive wars against Czechoslovakia (1968) and Afghanistan (1979-80) together with its global strategy and connected activities. But it is difficult to understand the restoration of capitalism in small states, from which the information is scanty. We should have sufficient and correct information before we come to a conclusion that capitalism has been restored in a given country. More often, acting as a party or state on the dictates of Soviet Union becomes a reliable basis for such characterisation.

Therefore, while upholding the principle that every country has the right to choose its path of socialism, restoration of capitalism in any form should be opposed. Opposition to hegemonism, and proletarian internationalism should be guiding lines for its relations with other parties and states.

Attitude towards National Liberation Movements.

In spite of the Soviet Union's betrayal and counter-revolutionary role, national movements all over the world are advancing. Formerly, they were directed against imperialism in general and US or a specific power (France) in particular. Now another super power, Soviet Union, has appeared on the scene. Liberation movements are going on. Its aggression against and colonisation of Afghanistan is more naked than ever. In the name of supporting liberation movements it is extending its "sphere of influence", and control over the countries. Vietnam, Angola, Ethiopia were countries where Soviet Union has entered as a supporter of national liberation movements and is staying there as a master.

Apart from struggles led by Communist parties of Burma, Malaysia and Thailand, there are others which are led by non-communist forces as is happening in Afghanistan. Besides this, even the States and governments are fighting for independence especially from the two super powers. Iran, after completing its revolution against US imperialism is fighting against its restoration. It is now fighting Iraqi aggression backed by Soviet Union. Afraid of the consequences of direct intervention, Soviet Union is penetrating into Iran through

Iraq. Therefore, Iran's struggle for independence and liberation is not only directed against Iraq but also against Soviet social imperialism and US imperialism.

US, weakened by chronic economic crisis, regional and local wars, is losing its control over the countries on whom it was a big boss earlier. Therefore it is becoming easier though not smooth sailing for these countries to free themselves from the shackles of US imperialism. Thus they are having independence which varies in degrees for each country. They are threatened by Soviet Union and theirs is a life and death struggle against it. At the same time, they are showing a remarkable tenacity in upholding their independence from Soviet Union with a measure of success. That it is an invincible power is exploded and proved to be a myth in Afghanistan. Struggle for independence in Soviet-controlled countries is going on and communist revolutionaries are coming to the forefront in this struggle.

The struggle for independence by non-communist revolutionary forces is a present-day feature which has to be taken into account by all communist revolutionaries. The Three Worlds Theory, as advocated by Mao, proved to be correct by the developments that are taking place. The present Chinese leadership is correctly applying this theory.

Conclusion

That the Chinese Revolution is a continuation of the Great October Revolution (1917) is indisputable. Soviet Union has become a social imperialist power. China is advancing towards building and consolidating socialism. We in India have so many parties, groups etc., who claim to be Marxist-Leninists. They are confusing the people and revolutionary ranks by advocating wrong and opportunist theories, slander against CPC being part of it. Though some of the theories and practices are yet to be clarified the line that CPC is adopting is basically correct and is in the interests of Chinese socialism and world revolution. Of course, there are ups and downs and a zig-zag path which is quite natural and inherent in the situation. The strength of Marxism-Leninism-Mao Zedong Thought is such that they can be overcome. We take this opportunity to greet the people of Soviet Union who are fighting against the social imperialism. We greet the Chinese people, CPC, and its leadership for their successful march towards socialism.

Long Live Marxism-Leninism-Mao Zedong Thought!

Long Live October and November Revolutions!

(26-10-1980)