

Theoretical Problems

We have already stated that Marxism-Leninism-Mao Zedong Thought is our world outlook. We have also explained this. We still have this view. There is no change in it.

In the last decade, certain developments took place in the international communist movement. Cultural revolution was one such important development, which has become a controversy. Chinese Communist Party leadership has stopped it and broadly reviewed it and concluded it as wrong. (It is understood that they will take a final decision in the 12th Party Congress). We had categorically supported Cultural Revolution. Now the question arises whether there is any change in our attitude now. Though there is no change fundamentally, to some extent there is a change, we should say.

Before explaining this, it is necessary to recollect the relation between international communist movement and Indian communist movement and their traditions.

1. Indian Communist Party had supported all the decisions taken by the Soviet Communist Party headed by Stalin. As far as we know, those decisions were correct. Supporting them was also correct. But the mistakes which were committed due to lack of understanding were serious. For example: characterising the anti-fascist war during World War II as peoples war and formulating a class collaborationist policy in accordance with it. It has caused an irreparable loss to Indian revolutionary movement. It is clear that it is necessary to support or apply with a correct understanding and keeping facts in view.

2. In the course of Chinese revolution, certain important problems and experiences that were useful to colonial and semi-colonial countries came to the fore even by 1930s. For example, People's war path and comprador bourgeois class. The then leadership of the international communist movement (Comintern) confined these experiences to China. It did not apply them to India and other colonial and semi-colonial countries. In the writings of Stalin, there

are a number of points dealing with the armed struggle in China, united front, and the role of comprador bourgeoisie. But it is clear that they were not applied while explaining the problems of India. For example: without raising the question of comprador bourgeoisie, calling it as compromising big bourgeoisie. Keeping that aside, the leadership of the Indian communist movement did not try to understand the class nature of the comprador bourgeoisie and formulate policies by applying these experiences. Nor did it develop prolonged peasant struggles into armed struggles. If this effort was made in our country, international leadership would not have obstructed it. No such effort was made even after the international organisation (Comintern) was dissolved. If this had happened, it would have been easy to develop the peasant struggles, which had erupted between 1945 and 1951 into protracted armed struggles.

3. A considerable section of revolutionaries broke away from revisionism and neorevisionism and accepted Mao Zedong Thought. But the same trend appeared among them also. It was common for them to chant Mao's quotations the whole day, may be a hundred or thousand times. But they have not made any effort to apply Mao Zedong Thought to concrete conditions in India. Even if they have done, it was not along correct lines. We can understand the extent of degeneration in their understanding and practice when we see that there are still some among their ranks who support the annihilation of class enemy and 'actions' for money.

Communist revolutionaries did not follow this path. They applied Marxism-Leninism-Mao Zedong Thought to the concrete conditions in India, atleast to the extent of their understanding. They formulated a path. They set on to implement it while defending it from right and left trends.

4. Our experiences show that there are an abounding number of people who accepted our path in words, but did not practise it in deeds. As a result, it has become necessary to carry on a struggle for implementation of the line with a correct understanding.

When we examine all these things, it can be seen that the same obstacles which were there to translate Marxism-Leninism-Mao Zedong Thought into a motive force to the Indian revolution are still continuing. The only difference is that an organisation of communist revolutionaries fighting for a correct line both in words and deeds is formed and developing. This organisation had never

followed Marxism-Leninism-Mao Zedong Thought as a dogma. We have been following it as a living ideology ever developing. Our understanding and practice are also developing in line with that. Viewed in this angle, there is fundamentally no change in our attitude towards cultural revolution. We are considering it as theoretically correct. This theory applies both to China and India.

The Communist Party of China implemented cultural revolution as a part of the programme of new democratic revolution. And it had positive results. Even during the period of socialist revolution, a struggle against alien theories, ideas and traditions among working class and the people will be necessary. To that extent, it is necessary to implement the programme of cultural revolution. It has to go on ceaselessly. At times it may assume some additional importance. But whether cultural revolution should be started and carried on in an intense form and as a destructive force, even after the establishment of proletarian dictatorship has become a point of discussion in this decade, particularly after Mao's death (1976). There are some who opposed it previously (revisionists and neorevisionists). Their opposition is one thing. And opposing the CPC leadership even while claiming to be following Mao Zedong Thought is another thing. They are two different things. Those belonging to the first category are opposed to Mao Zedong Thought itself. But the leadership of CPC has always been following Mao Zedong Thought. They reviewed the experiences gained in Cultural Revolution and stated that it was wrong to have started it in 1966 and continued for a decade. Not only that; they are also publishing details about it. Such being the case, why should we reject their contention? Those who say that it was correct to have started the Cultural Revolution in China are only repeating the outworn phraseology but are unable to put up necessary arguments to support it. Moreover, they are unable to see the harmful and bad consequences caused by it to the revolution in our country. Or they are unable to answer the questions arising in that context.

We too had to face certain bad consequences because of Cultural Revolution. The activities carried on under its name did not help to advance the revolutionary movement. For example: the struggle to be carried on against imperialist, feudal and reactionary culture, which was and is being spread among people, was in no way strengthened or advanced by merely breaking a few statues. Moreover, it had helped only to create an aversion among intellectuals and

common people about cultural revolution. The same is the case with the "programme of annihilation of class enemy". People's revolution has to be won by the armed forces of the people defeating the armed forces of the government. And if any one says that this can be achieved by their "annihilation" programme, it would be a mockery of people's revolution.

The Tasks Being Fulfilled by the Leadership of the CPC -- Our Attitude

1. We are of the opinion that the CPC is adhering to Mao Zedong Thought. We are rejecting the theory of those who say that it has turned revisionist. The activities of such people are contrary to proletarian internationalism.

2. We are of the opinion that the policy being followed by the leadership is basically correct. Because of this reason, we are supporting it. It means that there may be differences on secondary issues. But it is not a must. Realising mistakes, short comings and correcting them is the internal matter of a party. If is following a correct line in carrying on socialist construction, by correcting the mistakes committed in the past and also in foreign policy. We are supporting it.

Though we had recognised that certain mistakes were committed by the time of writing this book, we did not propagate them, nor did we support them. They are:

1. In 9th Party Congress (China), Lin was declared as a successor to Mao in the Party Constitution itself. We did not accept it. We did not defend it.

2. Indian revolutionaries faced serious difficulties in uniting on the basis of a correct line and in consolidating into one party as a result of recognition of a 'left' adventurist group as a Marxist-Leninist group. The leadership recognised and corrected the mistake soon (during the life-time of Mao).

We don't know the circumstances in which these mistakes were committed. We do not consider it proper to make open criticism. But still we did not hesitate to follow Mao Zedong Thought and to formulate and implement a revolutionary line in accordance with it. The distinguishing feature was: here we have not formulated a programme in accordance with the Cultural Revolution. We have developed and are developing it as a part of mass movement. And

it is correct.

It is particularly necessary for Indian revolution to have a correct attitude towards China. Because Soviet Union has established itself as the main super power in our country, it is mobilising anti-China forces also along with forces favouring it. In this way, it is trying to strengthen itself in both ways. If the Soviet Union is strengthened, it is detrimental to the Indian revolution to that extent. Thus they are becoming detrimental to both Indian revolution and China.

It is a well-known fact that those of the ruling classes who are in power in India today are not only lackeys of Soviet Union, but are arch enemies of Indian revolution. They are doing their utmost to see that the experiences of Chinese revolution are not within the reach of the Indian people. Though some cosmetic trimming is seen in India-China relations, there is no basic change. This situation will continue to be so as long as India remains a part of Soviet global strategy. This is the main reason for non-improvement of relations between India and China in all fields. Even Chinese literature is not within the reach of the people. Except the information given by the bourgeois press, people have no way of knowing about the changes and developments taking place there. When we keep this in view, calling baselessly the present Chinese leadership as revisionist, and opposing it, would only be strengthening Soviet social imperialism and Indian ruling classes indirectly. Anti-China forces occupy an important place among those who oppose Indian revolution.

We have been thinking that the then Yugoslavian Party led by Tito was revisionist and that capitalism was restored by him in his country. But under his leadership, the party has been opposing Soviet hegemonism. There is no additional information about restoration of capitalism there. We have also come to know that the information basing on which we came to this conclusion was wrong. The additions and changes made in the course of socialist construction are only related to the specific conditions of that country. In this way, every country must have opportunity to carry on socialist construction in accordance with their specific conditions, within the limits of basic principles. None has said as to what extent it has gone beyond that scope.

The leadership of that country (Tito) had followed nonalignment. Though it has a limited anti-imperialist character, it is not one that

benefits a socialist country. In the same way, though they condemned the aggressions of Soviet Union and Vietnam, they have not condemned the Vietnamese attacks against China. Though that party has correctly opposed hegemonism, we have to conclude that is not based on proletarian internationalism. Even then the Yugoslavian party is opposed to the Soviet hegemonism.

Yugoslavia has brought to the fore the question that every country can and should carry on socialist construction according to their specific conditions, within the limits of certain basic principles Marx and Engels mentioned this point in their *Communist Manifesto*. Lenin has reiterated this in his writings. The question of Yugoslavia has to be reexamined in this light. As far as we know, the Chinese Communist Party has taken this attitude. And it is wrong to blame it.

The Theory of Three Worlds

By the time of writing this work, it had already come into vogue that Asia (except Japan), Africa and Latin America belong to the third world and that India is part of it. In this work, we too have referred to them in the same manner. Further, we have made it clear that Soviet social imperialism, even while contending with U.S. imperialism, was also colluding with it to encircle People's China. The fact of the matter was: by that time itself collusion had come to the minimum and contention was maximum. With the Shanghai Communique released at the time of 1972 (Nixon's China trip), China could break the encirclement around it. The US encirclement was no more and only Soviet encirclement remained. But Soviet Union was not content with the then existing encirclement; it had extended it to Afghanistan and Vietnam.

The developments in China have been a point of discussion since past 25 years. In our country, these discussions have started ever since 1948. Viewed in this way, improvement of relations with U. S. has become yet another point of discussion. Establishment of relations with some of the reactionary and fascist regimes belonging to the third world (Zaire, Chile) has also become a controversy. All these are different aspects of the Three Worlds' Theory. Any measure opposed by Soviet Union becomes a controversy in our country. It is not difficult to find the birth-place of these controversies. (It is a fact that there are doubts about some of the Chinese policies among China's supporters also).

By the time we were completing this work, Soviet Union had already become a social imperialist power (occupation of Czechoslovakia in 1968). Soviet Union played the main role in the 1971 war with Pakistan and in separating Bangladesh. But still there was a lot of confusion prevalent among freedom-lovers and democrats including the revolutionaries. Because of this we have concentrated on establishing how Soviet Union is a social imperialist power. By this, we feel, there is a clarity to a great extent among revolutionaries. But those in confusion still remain. At that time, Three Worlds Theory was not a point of discussion. The basic principles of this theory were explained by Mao in 1974. In 1976, the Albanian party leader, Enver Hoxha, had criticised it in the report to the 7th party congress. Mao died shortly after this criticism appeared; important changes were made in the policies of Chinese Communist Party.

With this, another uproar started all over the world. Small groups supporting the Albanian Party had raised their heads in other countries. Albanian literature flooded our country. It is still pouring in. After all, its influence will also be there to some extent. Certain groups have emerged, which "criticise" Chinese leadership as revisionist and say that China developed into a third super power. MASS LINE group belonging to Charu Mazumdar's and Punjab group of communist revolutionaries are important among them. Still others are opposing it in different degrees. Doubts and suspicions are quite common. The Theory of Three Worlds is also a part of it. Some oppose it. Some others are indirectly rejecting the theory by expressing suspicions and doubts on basic issues. Communist revolutionaries and others are in a considerable number among those who support it.

In the present national and international situation, this theory has a lot of political significance. It is in the light of this theory only that we can correctly understand the struggle waged against the hegemonism of the super powers and the aggressive wars carried on by Soviet Union and its stooges (Vietnam and Cuba). Our support to this theory needs no mention.

In this work, we had characterised Vietnam as a country struggling for liberation from US imperialism. To that extent, it is correct. But gradually it has become a stooge of Soviet Union by providing it all facilities to set up military bases. It has occupied Kampuchea and Laos by sending its troops into those countries. A struggle

for liberation is going on in Kampuchea under the leadership of the communists. Vietnam had openly betrayed its ideological and political degeneration by supporting the 'emergency' (1975 June) declared by Mrs. Gandhi. We need not be surprised at its emerging as an aggressive power by the end of 1977. Vietnam is carrying on aggressive attacks on Chinese borders.

Soviet aggression of Afghanistan is yet another serious development. With this, the Soviet Union lost the good-will it had in international affairs and became isolated by now. Freedom lovers and people all over the world are supporting the heroic struggle being waged by the Afghan rebels to liberate their country from Soviet Union. During the period of writing this book, there were a number of people supporting Soviet Union. The number of those who opposed was very small and we are one among them. Today those who oppose the policies of Soviet Union are in a considerable number. This opposition is taking the form of a mass movement. This is a welcome development.

Many such developments had taken place in the last decade. This is an evidence of the onward direction of the world revolution. During this period, Soviet Union had become a more aggressive power than US from the position of an equal contender with it. This is an important development. And it is a fundamental aspect of the Three Worlds Theory. Understanding this is essential to understand the struggles for independence as against super power hegemonism all over the world.

The decline of the Soviet Union has begun with its aggression on Afghanistan. This weakness was further exposed in Poland. We should note that it could not march its troops into Poland as it did in Czechoslovakia (1968). But it would be wrong to define it as a weakened super power like the US. Though US is attempting to recoup itself, it can not attain its old position. US will be still weaker, than now, so long as such countries as West Germany and France (the recent victory of social democrats) among Western European countries adopt an attitude of appeasement towards Soviet Union.

The Third World War did not break out during the last decade. But the reason for this was not the super powers' love for peace. Socialist China is prepared to fight back any war of aggression and to wage a protracted war if necessary. It is fortifying its defence

capability. Many states the world over are not prepared to get embroiled in war. If Soviet Union is forced into a protracted war even in such a backward country as Afghanistan, which country can it hope to conquer in the Third World War? Opposition to war has built up well during this period. If war could be prevented for some time, the anti-war force would very well gain in strength. If still war breaks out, the world people would be in a position to defeat the aggressor. (8-5-1981)

(This is an extract from Foreword to the (Second) Telugu Edition, 1981, of *People's Democratic Revolution in India -- An Explanation of the Programme* - Ed.)