

NATIONAL LIBERATION MOVEMENT

These comrades make an erroneous and ill-informed criticism of the CC.. document on this point and commit mistakes in formulation and understanding, adopt a wrong attitude towards the role of the socialist camp in relation to the national liberation movement and in effect adopt a bourgeois-nationalist standpoint on this question. They think they are talking high revolutionary stuff; but in reality they wander into the morass of bourgeois-nationalism and liquidate the role of the socialist camp. In the bargain they make hopelessly contradictory statements. They state, "It is the imperative duty of the international working class movement to give all its support to the national liberation movement. It is the sacred duty of the socialist countries

to give every kind of support—ideological, political, economic and military—to help the NLM achieve complete success”. So far so good. Everyone will agree with them. But then they must find fault with the C.C. They say, “The C.C. has failed to locate the NLM as playing the decisive role for the final destruction of imperialism. Instead of this, the C.C. has made a revolutionary combination of ‘socialist diplomacy’ and the ‘armed might of the socialist camp’ essential factors for the complete victory of the national liberation struggles.” Is it your contention, comrades, that socialist diplomacy and armed might of the socialist camp are not essential for the complete victory of the national liberation struggles? Is this the meaning of your statement that the national liberation movement has become the decisive force? Does it mean therefore that it stands in no need of help from the socialist camp? If that is so why are you shouting against the revisionists for not helping the national liberation movement? And why do you then state that the socialist camp must render every help including military help to the national liberation movement? You forget that this is just what you have stated (quotation above) when you find fault with the C.C. However, if this is your position then it is a bourgeois-nationalist position according to which the national movement can achieve its objective in isolation from the socialist camp; it is not based on proletarian internationalism, it does not regard the national liberation movement as a component of the world proletarian revolution but only of a bourgeois-democratic movement.

To counterpose the importance of the national liberation movement, its vital role, to help from the socialist camp, to suggest that insistence on such help in any way minimises the importance of the national liberation movement is to be guilty of downright bourgeois-nationalism despite protestations of being unalloyed revolutionaries. Because the revisionists distort the conception of help and try to eliminate the role of the national liberation movement itself, that is no reason why Marxist-Leninists should throw it out, reject it and isolate the NLM from the socialist camp.

What is it that they are objecting to in the ideological document? The relevant passages run as follows: “No

Marxist would dispute the fact that imperialism, today, has been tremendously weakened on a world scale. Forces of revolution—the countries that have already come under the socialist system, the proletarian revolutionary movements in the advanced capitalist countries, the national liberation movements and forces in the newly liberated and colonial countries, the widespread popular movements against war and in defence of peace—are today so powerful that they can unitedly inflict defeat after defeat on imperialism and its allies. However, the process of mobilising and uniting these revolutionary forces is no simple task. It involves a revolutionary combination of socialist diplomacy, calculated to isolate the most reactionary imperialist groups, with the use of the armed might of the socialist camp against such reactionary powers as resort to aggression on peace-loving countries, or try to drown the national liberation movement in blood. This requires the ever-growing unity of the international communist movement—a unity in which the ruling parties of the socialist countries, render all forms of practical aid, including direct military intervention, to the revolutionary proletarian movement in the capitalist countries as well as the national liberation, movements in underdeveloped countries”.

Can any sane person object to these passages? Can any person calling himself Marxist-Leninist object to the demand on the socialist camp, on the communist movement that it must render all aid including armed aid to the revolutionary movements? How is it that our comrades are objecting to this, though they themselves at one place say that it is the duty of the socialist camp to render all aid?

The key lies in their wrong understanding of the role of the national liberation movement. It is not accidental that they think that the C.C. underestimates the importance of the liberation movements. They say, “In this new epoch of final collapse of imperialism and the final triumph of worldwide victory of socialism, the national liberation struggles have become the decisive force for the final destruction of imperialism”. Again they state, “The C.C. has failed to locate the NLM as playing the decisive role for the final destruction of imperialism”. And again they assert, “Thus, in the present era, the NLMs have got overall and decisive

importance in deciding the course of the world socialist revolution". "It was only a means to negate the decisive role of the NLM in deciding the success of the world revolution". Thus the national liberation struggles have become the decisive force for the final destruction of imperialism; they are decisive in deciding the course of the world socialist revolution also. No Marxist-Leninist Party has made this strange formulation. It is on the basis of this erroneous formulation that they criticise the C.C. as underestimating the role of the national liberation struggle. The C.C. states the position correctly when it says that "the contradiction between the camp of socialism and imperialism remains as the central one among the fundamental contradictions of our time". Notwithstanding the fact that it is so, do we not find that another contradiction, namely the one between the imperialists and oppressed nations, has got accentuated and assumed the acutest form, culminating in the outburst of national liberation revolutions in a series of countries of Asia, Africa and Latin America, and the intensification of this contradiction is, of course, influencing the course of all other contradictions, their growth and development. This is exactly what is meant...when they say that the contradiction between the oppressor states and oppressed countries, at this stage of development of world history, has become the focus of all the contradictions of our times". This states the position correctly in consonance with the Marxist-Leninist understanding of the epoch and the role of the national liberation movement. But the critics are not satisfied because they do not accept the common understanding of the epoch based on the revolutionary principles of the 1960 Statement which many Marxist-Leninist Parties regard as the common programme of the international communist movement. "The two documents point out the characteristics of our epoch and the common laws of socialist revolution and socialist construction and lay down the common line of all the Communist and Workers' Parties. They are the common programme of the international communist movement".

The 1960 Statement does not describe our time as only a time of national liberation revolutions. It says, "It is a time of struggle between the two opposing social systems, a time of socialist revolutions and national liberation revo-

lutions, a time of breakdown of imperialism, a time of transition of more peoples to the socialist path, of the triumph of socialism and communism on a world scale". "It is the principal characteristic of our time that the world socialist system is becoming the decisive factor in the development of society". Our critics want to turn the epoch topsy-turvy and announce that the content of the present epoch is not transition from capitalism to socialism but national liberation; and that it is not the socialist camp that is becoming the decisive factor in the development of society but the national liberation movement has become the decisive force.

There is no doubt that the revisionists not only berate the national liberation movements, but paralyse them by asking them to follow peaceful paths, by suggesting disbandment of the revolutionary struggles and asking them to trust in the peaceful competition between the socialist and imperialist worlds. All this has to be unmasked and fought.

But that is no reason why a correct relation between the socialist camp and the national liberation movement, between the proletarian revolutionary movement in capitalist countries and the national revolutionary struggles should be thrown overboard by the Marxist-Leninists. The national liberation movements of our times are a component part of the world proletarian revolution whose creation is the socialist camp.

The Communist Party of China after stating that "in a sense...the whole cause of international proletarian revolution hinges on the outcome of the revolutionary struggles of the people of these areas" does not conclude that these struggles have become the decisive force. After stressing their importance it says, "Therefore the anti-imperialist revolutionary struggle of the people in Asia, Africa and Latin America is definitely not a matter of regional importance but of overall importance for the whole course of proletarian world revolution". This of course is correct. But this has nothing to do with the strange formulation of our critics that the national liberation struggles have become the decisive force for the final destruction of imperialism.

This leaves no doubt that they liquidate the role of the socialist camp, the victorious socialist revolutions, and the

proletarian revolutionary movements. This exclusive emphasis on national liberation movement becomes an apologia for a bourgeois-nationalist outlook and loses all contact with proletarian internationalism. In practice, all this amounts to seeing only one contradiction. Like the revisionists our comrades also argue as if there is only one contradiction.

Our critics are not aware that the Soviet leaders had charged the C P C with advocating that the national liberation struggles had become the decisive force and that the C P C had repudiated the charge.

The open letter of the Central Committee of the CPSU of July 14, 1963, accused the Chinese Communist Party of putting forward a "new theory". It said: "according to the new theory the main contradiction of our time is, you see, contradiction not between socialism and imperialism, but between the national liberation movement and imperialism. The decisive force in the struggle against imperialism, the Chinese comrades hold, is not the world system of socialism, not struggle of the international working class, but again the national liberation movement".

The CPC replied that "this is a fabrication". It said that the allegation that it considered the national liberation struggles had become the decisive force, that it considered the main contradiction was only between the national liberation movement and imperialism, was a fabrication. It stated that the anti-imperialist revolutionary struggle of the peoples in Asia, Africa and Latin America was of overall importance for the whole course of the proletarian revolution. Will our critics now at least understand that their formulation is hopelessly wrong; that it cannot be accepted by any party which claims to be a Marxist-Leninist Party; and that their extreme revolutionism just lands them in extreme rightism, bourgeois-nationalism? Will they see the error of their ways?

At the 2nd Congress of the Communist International, Lenin had warned against viewing the liberation movement in isolation from the socialist state and the revolutionary movement for socialism. In his speech on the Report of the Commission on the National and the Colonial Question he elaborated the basic ideas contained in the Report: "First,

what is the cardinal idea underlying our theses? It is the distinction between the oppressor and oppressed nations. Unlike the Second International and bourgeois democracy, we emphasise this distinction." "The second basic idea in our theses is that, in the present world situation following the imperialist war, reciprocal relations between peoples and the world political system as a whole are determined by the struggle waged by a small group of imperialist nations against the Soviet movement and the Soviet states headed by Soviet Russia. Unless we bear that in mind, we shall not be able to pose a single national or colonial problem correctly, even if it concerns a most outlying part of the world. The Communist Parties, in civilised and backward countries alike, can pose and solve political problems correctly only if they make this postulate their starting point".

"Third, I should like especially to emphasise the question of the bourgeois democratic movement in backward countries". Lenin says: "As a result of our discussion, we have arrived at the unanimous decision to speak of the national revolutionary movement rather than of the 'bourgeois democratic' movement". At the same time he added: "It is beyond doubt that any national movement can only be a bourgeois-democratic movement, since the overwhelming mass of population in the backward countries consist of peasants who represent bourgeois capitalist relations." (*Collected Works*, Vol. 31, Pp. 240-241)

Anyone who forgets any of these propositions is bound to land himself into bourgeois-nationalism.

Carrying forward this thought, Mao Tse-tung wrote: "A change, however, occurred in China's bourgeois-democratic revolution after the outbreak of the first imperialist world war in 1914 and the founding of a socialist state on one-sixth of the globe as a result of the Russian October Revolution of 1917.

"Before these events, the Chinese bourgeois-democratic revolution came within the old category of the bourgeois-democratic world revolution, of which it was a part.

"Since these events, the Chinese bourgeois-democratic revolution has changed, it has come within the new category of bourgeois-democratic revolutions and, as far as

the alignment of revolutionary forces is concerned, forms part of the proletarian socialist world revolution." (Mao Tse-tung, *Selected Works*, Peking, Vol. II, Page 343)

Anyone who one-sidedly describes the national liberation struggles as the decisive force for world revolution, fails to understand the content of the epoch, divorces the liberation struggles from the world socialist revolution and the socialist camp and totally fails to see the content of the liberation struggles if it is divorced from the socialist revolutionary forces, virtually lands himself in bourgeois-nationalism.

It is wrong to declare that the national liberation movement has become the decisive force; this is a total underestimation of the whole epoch which is an epoch of proletarian revolution. The criticism made against the C.C. that it underestimates the role of the liberation struggles is made on the basis of wrong premises and is not justified; the criticism against the C.C. for stating that the socialist camp should help the liberation struggles with arms, etc., is unprincipled and anti-Leninist.

The criticism in the end amounts to opposition to proletarian alliance of socialist countries with national liberation movements, opposition to efforts for unity of the socialist camp, united efforts of the communist movement to help the revolutionary movement. It is an outlook which isolates the national revolutionary movements, berates the world socialist revolutionary movement and the socialist camp and brings grist to the mill of bourgeois-nationalism in the liberation movement. Instead of rousing the proletarian international consciousness of the freedom-fighters, instead of teaching them to regard the world proletarian movement and the socialist camp as a firm ally, it panders to bourgeois egoism and will only create the danger of disintegration of the liberation movement. The experience of the South Vietnam struggle itself shows that without the active help of socialist states the freedom struggle becomes very difficult entailing avoidable sacrifices; the experience of Korea shows that military help is often essential for the success of the struggle.

The correct formulation is that the national liberation movements and the world revolutionary proletarian move-

ments mutually support each other; the socialist camp, the creation of the world revolutionary movement, is becoming the decisive factor in the development of society; and at the present juncture the national liberation movements, embodying all the contradictions of the present era have become the storm-centres where the world proletarian movement must win its battle to march forward to the world revolution. One should not forget Lenin's words, "World imperialism shall fall when the revolutionary onslaught of the exploited and oppressed workers in each country, overcoming resistance from petty bourgeois elements and the influence of the small upper crust of labour aristocrats, merges with the revolutionary onslaught of hundreds of millions of people who have hitherto stood beyond the pale of history, and have been regarded merely as the object of history." (Report on International Situation to the 2nd Congress of the C.I., *Collected Works*, Vol. 31, Page 232)

In passing it should be noted that Marxist-Leninists fighting the battle of national liberation have also proletarian international duties, and that the national liberation struggle of our times cannot be carried on in isolation from the socialist camp or the world proletarian movement. It is the duty of the proletarian revolutionaries to create strong ties between the liberation movement and the world revolutionary movement and make the liberation movement realise that the latter is its firm ally, just as it is the duty of the socialist camp and world proletariat to lend every help so that its class mission in regard to such movements is fulfilled. While it is entirely correct to say that the main brunt of the struggle in any particular country must be borne by the people of that country, this cannot mean a fight in isolation, with the socialist camp as an observer. The slogan of reliance on oneself should not degenerate into bourgeois separatism from the world forces of revolution. One who talks only of the responsibility of the socialist camp for the national liberation movement, but keeps silent about the international duty of the proletarians in the national liberation struggles is just a bourgeois-nationalist. Stalin has warned, "Hence the necessity of fighting against the national insularity, narrowness and

aloofness of the socialists in the oppressed countries who do not want to rise above their national steeple and who do not understand the connections between the liberation movement in their various countries and the proletarian movement in the ruling countries. Without such a struggle it is inconceivable that the proletariat of the oppressed nations can maintain an independent policy and its class solidarity with the proletariat of the ruling countries in the fight for the overthrow of imperialism; without such a struggle internationalism would be impossible." (*Problems of Leninism*, Moscow, 1947, Page 66). On this point Stalin quotes Lenin, "But in all cases he (the Social Democrat of a small nation) must fight against small nation narrow-mindedness, insularity and aloofness, he must fight for the recognition of the whole and the general, for the subordination of the interests of the particular to the interests of the general".

The vital importance of the national liberation struggles should not make anyone ignore this warning of Lenin and Stalin. The betrayal by the revisionists should not make one take a position which divorces the national liberation movement from the world proletarian movement.