

CONCLUSION

If we take all the arguments of the critics of the ideological document, what do they amount to? They amount to a total repudiation of the understanding of the epoch. They imply liquidation of the Socialist camp; they convey that capitalism has been restored in the USSR leading to imperialist policies; that the major fight of the working class of the world, of the peoples and nations of the world is not against American imperialism but against the Soviet and American imperialisms. The fight against

the revisionist leaders of the Soviet Union is replaced by the fight against the "imperialism" of the Soviet State.

(1) Our opponents repudiate the epoch, and the importance of the socialist camp when they blandly assert that the national liberation struggles and not the socialist camp are the decisive force of the present period, decisive for the final destruction of imperialism and for the cause of the world socialist revolution. No Marxist-Leninist party has made such a formulation.

(2) Obsessed by this outlook they oppose the formulation that to mobilize the forces of revolution of the present era involves a revolutionary combination of socialist diplomacy with the use of the armed might of the socialist camp against reactionary forces who try to drown the national liberation movement in blood, under the false plea that this means an underestimation of the liberation movement.

(3) They oppose the formulation that peaceful coexistence is an essential part of the foreign policy of a socialist country falsely counterposing it to the alliance of the socialist state with the revolutionary liberation movements. Thereby they unwittingly lapse into Trotskyism.

(4) They oppose the statement in the document that Soviet economic aid is utilised by the bourgeois government to build capitalism—they say Soviet aid is given to build a public sector subservient to American penetration thus reducing it to an American agency.

(5) They give up all pretence of fighting against revisionism when they object to any mention of illusions, undialectical ideas which the revisionists use to mislead the people. The Leninist understanding that revisionism purveys the ideology of the class enemy inside the working class movement, that it bases itself on illusions and prejudices inside the working class and that its class role has to be laid bare by patient exposure is rejected and it is equated with imperialism.

(6) The left critics are totally opposed to the statement in the document that the Soviet Union cannot be considered to be an ally of American imperialism and working for sharing world domination with it.

By implication they suggest that the Soviet Union is

not a socialist country, that capitalism has not only been restored in the Soviet Union but it has become an imperialist country. Thus the socialist camp and the new epoch both are liquidated and we come to a period of defeat or retreat of world revolution—a counter-revolutionary conclusion.

(7) But they are unable to face the logic of their formulations and are compelled to state that restoration of capitalism will not take place in the Soviet Union.

(8) When they make the formulation that the Soviet Union is working in alliance with the USA to share world domination, they do not in the least make any effort to explain the class basis for such striving for annexation, which comes only as a result of the rise of monopolies. All that they talk about is the rise of economic degenerates, speculators in the Soviet Union which according to them constitute the source of striving for world domination.

(9) They fail to see the real class roots of revisionism in the Soviet Union, existence and continuance of capitalist elements in the economic life, capitalist encirclement, bourgeois influences internally and surrender to imperialism externally. The revisionist policies arising out of these conditions have strengthened the capitalist elements and outlook. Loss of international outlook due to these has led to surrender before imperialism.

(10) In their blindness they fail to see the crisis and disruption of the socialist camp and its paralysis created by the revisionist betrayal. They oppose the statement in the document that there is a crisis and North Vietnam is fighting the battle virtually alone.

(11) They oppose united action on the question of Vietnam and betray that they are not in the least interested in working for the restoration of the unity of the socialist camp for joint action against the common enemy.

C.C. document holds the revisionists responsible for the crisis; it says joint action is difficult since it means military action. And yet it cannot be opposed on the ground that it involves joint action between revisionist leaders and Marxist-Leninists.

This is opposed by them.

(a) They confuse unity of action with unity of parties or the principled unity of the movement.

(b) They oppose it on the ground that revisionists are suggesting joint action because they are isolated; they forget that Marxist-Leninists support joint action because it arises out of the need of the class struggle and are not swayed by the intentions of the reformists and revisionists.

(c) Their real argument is that the revisionist leaders and the Soviet Union are allies of imperialism—that the front should be formed against the Soviet-American axis—that the Soviet Union has no place in an anti-imperialist front—that you can cooperate with imperialist France, or West Germany, but not with the Soviet Union.

(d) In the name of fighting the revisionist leaders of the Soviet Union they want to neglect the Soviet people, make no approaches to them for joint action and keep them under the influence of the revisionist leaders.

(e) By opposing joint action they seek to carry on the fight against revisionism in isolation from the struggle against imperialism and violate another Leninist norm.

(f) They argue united front is not possible because present-day revisionist leaders are leaders of socialist states. This fact makes it all the more necessary to make proposals to draw together the socialist states for common action. It also shows that the revisionist leaders continue to have influence over the people and unless quick steps are taken to make the people see them in their true colours, the gains of socialism and the strength of the socialist camp may be endangered.

(g) They forget that the necessity of united front arises out of the grim struggle in Vietnam. Also that joint action and unity of the socialist camp are desired by larger and larger numbers as they see through the reactionary character of the revisionist policies.

(h) To oppose common action they advance arguments which slander the people and leaders of Vietnam. According to them united action for Vietnam is not possible because the Soviet leaders are only acting as agents of America in Vietnam. This amounts to saying that the Vietnamese leaders are letting down their people when they take help

from the Soviet Union and praise the Soviet leaders for giving it.

(i) They do not stop to think what the Vietnamese leaders think about Soviet help; what they and their people today are asking of the world movement. They reduce the fight against revisionism to a factional struggle and are prepared to sacrifice the interests of the Vietnamese people for their factional ends.

We have attempted to meet all the basic questions of criticism levelled against the party line by the critics.

While closing our reply to these criticisms, we cannot but reiterate that these differences of our critics are neither confined to some minor issues nor to one or two basic questions which could be easily resolved or put in abeyance till some opportune time. To think so is to delude oneself and deceive others. The differences are fundamental, and they extend to every key question concerning the Indian communist movement, as well as the international communist movement. They cover every field—ideological, theoretical, programmatic, tactical and organisational.

What the critics say would convince everybody that the ideological-political views they expound and the tactical line they advocate are coming into head-on collision with our Party Programme and its general political-organisational line, while essentially coinciding with the line enunciated in the political platform of the Naxalbarites.

It is also no secret that this line has been deriving massive propaganda support from Radio Peking and the Chinese communist press during the last one year. We, of course, have no means to verify, and our efforts have not succeeded so far, whether this political line concerning the Indian revolution is based on the considered opinion and decision of the Central Committee of the CPC or whether a particular department of their C.C. in charge of Indian affairs, has been led to believe in the correctness of such a political and tactical line and is acting accordingly. In either case, the fact remains that our Party, its political line and its leadership are under constant and open attack by the Chinese radio and press.

The rival platform of the Naxalbarites with its noisy and clumsy attacks on the one hand, and open denuncia-

tions from the Chinese radio and press on the other, have created a complicated situation for our Party, leaving it with no alternative except to either liquidate its entire political line as wrong, accepting their criticism as correct, or join issues publicly and defend the Party and its line as basically correct and Marxist-Leninist. But, on the ground that such totally divergent views are echoed by some comrades or a section of our Party, we cannot any more keep things within the confines of inner-party discussion, as it would amount to outright abandonment of the open defence of our Party, its Programme and political line—the defence of which is the bounden duty of our C.C. and the entire Party.

We appeal to those comrades who find themselves in total opposition to the Party's political line, characterising it anti-Marxist-Leninist and revisionist, to seriously rethink and retrace their criticism and opposition, since it is totally wrong, sectarian and subjective. The communist movement in India is already disorganised and weakened due to right-reformist and revisionist disruption, and is unable to cope with the urgent and pressing tasks of the growing revolutionary movement today. Any further weakening or disorganising of the Party from a sectarian and left-opportunist deviation, we are of opinion, would only result in greater harm to the cause of the Indian revolution, and would come as a boon to the reactionary ruling classes.

We appeal to the party membership to unite and stand as one man in defence of the Party Programme and its political line and reject the alternative line advanced by our critics as completely wrong and totally deviating from Marxism-Leninism.