

Cultural Revolution of China

Alarmed at its revolutionary significance, the capitalist-imperialists of different countries unleashed a spate of slander campaign against the Cultural Revolution in China, which created much confusion among the people in general and the communist circles in particular. This exhaustive analysis provided the Marxist-Leninist approach to evaluating the significance of this great event termed here as magnificent.

Comrades,

I shall place before you my reactions about the Cultural Revolution of China. The Central Committee of our party has not yet met to discuss and make an evaluation of it. Naturally, whatever I would place here should be considered only as my personal observation and, till it is accepted by the Central Committee, it will remain as the basis for further discussion — and nothing more. Because, it is quite likely that some changes may have to be incorporated here and there. The Central Committee may decide and I myself may think it necessary to make certain additions and alterations later on.¹ Based on whatever materials and information we could gather about the Cultural Revolution of China — I place my reactions about it as well as my viewpoint on how our party comrades should view this issue and by what approach they should be guided.

Confusions about Cultural Revolution

We find that wild speculations are going on in the bourgeois press all over the world about the Cultural

Revolution of China and they are dishing out motivated and deliberately distorted news on it. But what is most agonizing is that confusions prevail about this Cultural Revolution even among the communists of different countries, who are imbued with the noble ideology of Marxism-Leninism. Instead of following the conventional practice of purging through inner-party struggle those elements who are engaged, according to the leadership of the Communist Party of China, in anti-party activities, the CPC has set in motion an astounding event by involving the whole people openly in the struggle — drawing them into the vortex of such a gigantic polemical struggle which some communist parties, including the CPSU, consider to be alien to the fundamental principles of Marxism-Leninism. Not only that, the revisionist leadership of the CPSU and some of their supporters have even tried to insinuate that this Proletarian Cultural Revolution is a movement engineered by Mao Zedong with the sole design of establishing his absolute leadership and autocratic control over the party, destroying the CPC itself. Moreover, both the Soviet revisionist and the bourgeois press are carrying on malicious propaganda about the ‘excesses’, etc., committed by the Red Guards. As a result, different types of confusion have cropped up among many of the communist workers over these questions. Besides, many communists are getting misled by the bourgeois propaganda that the present difference between Mao Zedong and Liu Shaoqi is nothing but a power conflict and that what is being practised in China centring round Mao is nothing but personality cult. Whatever be the propaganda in the bourgeois press, communist workers will have to bear in mind that with such a superficial and oversimplified approach it is impossible to grasp the real significance of the Cultural Revolution of China. I hold that, viewed from the Marxist angularity, this Cultural Revolution has a sound scientific basis, and the way the CPC is conducting this Cultural Revolution is really magnificent and

full of great significance. Communists throughout the world who have really dedicated themselves to the revolutionary movement have a great deal to learn from it. There are some defects, shortcomings or even weaknesses in it — and it is not at all unnatural for these to crop up in such a gigantic affair — but these are not at all what the bourgeois and the revisionist press circles are trying to make out. We shall have to judge these considering the entire background of the Cultural Revolution.

Cultural Revolution

— a culmination of cultural movement

The present Cultural Revolution is the culmination of those very movements which the Communist Party of China had to conduct after the revolution embracing all spheres of cultural life of the society. The CPC had to conduct such movements in the sphere of culture even before the revolution — for revolutionary parties in all countries this is an indispensable task before the revolution. No revolutionary party can accomplish revolution by ignoring this very task. At the Tenth Plenary Session of the eighth Central Committee of the CPC, Comrade Mao Zedong said: “To overthrow political power it is always necessary, first of all, to create public opinion, to do work in the ideological sphere”. By this he had meant and emphasized the necessity of cultural revolution. This holds good for the revolutionary parties as well as for the counter-revolutionaries. Those who aspire to overthrow the opponent forces from state power through mass uprising would have to work in the ideological-cultural spheres to organize the masses on the basis of their own class politics, ideology and cultural outlook for the sake of mobilizing public opinion in order to bring about that mass uprising. And this struggle in the cultural sphere is to be conducted not only before the

revolution for its accomplishment but has got to be continued even after the revolution in order to protect, consolidate and advance the same. Because: 'The fundamental question of every revolution is not only to capture power, but to consolidate it.' What is meant by this consolidation are not simply the economic and political aspects, but the cultural aspects too. When Marx said that cultural revolution will continue, he meant precisely this. In China, too, this cultural movement was continuing uninterruptedly even after the revolution — at a pace at times slow, at times intense.

Even after the victory of revolution, many writings have been published in China on character-building of the cadres, on style of propaganda and against the infiltration of bourgeois and all sorts of counter-revolutionary ideas and culture among the party members and the people. Are not all these part of cultural revolution ? But today the form of this Cultural Revolution in China that we are witnessing, simply indicates a particular phase of cultural revolution, manifesting itself in this way at this particular juncture. Cultural revolution does not always take this form. In its course, cultural revolution at times takes such turns centring round certain events and developments. But it should be borne in mind that cultural revolution is a continuous process. By studying the developments in China and whatever information is available, it appears to me that the present intense phase of the Cultural Revolution would soon come to an end and a relatively stable phase would follow. The present intense wave of this Cultural Revolution would not be there. But what would that mean? It would mean that certain changes would have been brought about through this present phase of the Cultural Revolution. I think that when this present phase is over, the CPC would convene a party Congress where there would be many changes, including changes in the leadership. This is what they are going to do.

But the instruments of the cultural revolution would remain even then and would continue to operate. The cultural movement would continue, only the present form would not be there.

Why they started the Cultural Revolution at this juncture of international situation

Now, before we examine the questions which have cropped up centring round this Cultural Revolution, we shall have to understand one thing first. That is, why has China at this particular phase of international and national situation dragged the whole nation into the vortex of this Cultural Revolution? It may seem as if they have willingly invited an untoward situation, not an untoward situation of ordinary nature but one of far-reaching consequences, which may bring in its wake serious crises. And at what time have they undertaken this? To tell the truth, they are doing this at a time when in the face of continuous threat of attack and aggression by the US warmongers they stand virtually alone. And the possibility cannot be ruled out altogether that if such an eventuality does really arise, they may perhaps not get any help from the socialist camp. Moreover, the problem of China's own economic growth and augmentation of production is quite pressing today. At such a time the Chinese leaders, having felt the necessity of a cultural revolution, could easily have taken to the old traditional way as many people suggest, that is, they could have settled the question inside the party bodies first through inner-party struggle, resolved the differences among themselves and then imbued the people on the basis of the adopted decisions and the party-line. But instead of doing that they have launched a struggle creating an environment of open criticism and counter-criticism involving all sections of the people, even the army, which they knew would inevitably cause a lot of trouble and difficulties. This they did knowing

it well that it might create serious convulsions in the country. Before discussing whether this process adopted is right or wrong, I like to place before you my reading of the situation and my understanding about the reasons which compelled them to take such a grave risk in such a situation.

To fight reactionary ideologies and opportunism

First of all, in China there had been an anti-imperialist, anti-feudal people's democratic revolution. The revolution had to be accomplished by instilling in the mass mind the sense of indispensability of people's democratic revolution while conducting the revolutionary struggle based on that political line. Thus, people's democratic revolution was accomplished having developed anti-feudal, anti capitalist outlook and mentality in the ideological and cultural sphere to the extent necessary for seizure and consolidation of power. But this, however, could not free the cultural mindset of the people, or even the party members from all sorts of shortcomings and aberrations nor totally uproot the seeds of the outdated moral principles, ideology and culture, which they had inherited and carried along as hangover from the old social order. Moreover, the class which had been overthrown from power, did not, as a class, lose all its power of resistance, particularly in the socio-cultural life, as soon as it was overthrown. As a result, the cultural seeds of the old system remained – in whatever form and however subtle a way it might be — in all spheres of the social, economic, cultural and political life in the new environment of the society. And after the attainment of stability in the relative sense, following the seizure of power, these kept growing day by day, due to the relative low level of ideological-political consciousness of the party workers and even of some of the leading members. What is more, the transition to socialism in the Chinese society is taking place relatively peacefully; whatever might be the external

disturbance, the internal condition is, no doubt, relatively peaceful and with the party controlling the state power, a tendency of individualism and various shades of opportunism are growing among the party members and the people. And centring round all these, different types of bourgeois, petty bourgeois and even feudal ideas and norms of behaviour are penetrating into the party life. And all these are happening and at work within the party in the name of socialism and under cover of revolutionary verbiage and Marxist-Leninist scholasticism. That the Chinese leadership would feel worried over all this cannot be disbelieved on any reasonable ground if there is no bias involved. This is quite natural and can happen. Of course, there may be some exaggeration or underestimation in stating facts, but there is nothing unnatural about it. Only those who have no understanding about the magnitude of various activities going on through the complex process of contradiction, thesis, anti-thesis and synthesis, unity-struggle-unity entailed by revolution, can talk the nonsense that since revolution has been accomplished such things can never happen and that the party or the party comrades have at once been completely freed from the bourgeois process of thinking. In no country can revolution accomplish things in this way. Even after the victory of revolution, these tendencies persist for some time within the party and different layers of society. In China too these shortcomings and lapses are there.

Task of eradicating low level of thinking and culture

Secondly, the Russian experience has clearly shown that along with the tremendous growth and development of the economy, military science, technology and widespread development of various aspects of socialist reconstruction in a socialist country, if the cultural make-up of the society as a whole — starting from the philosophical understanding

and cultural-ethical standard of the collective to the minutest detail of the individual behaviour, habits and practices — cannot be elevated to keep pace with the need for all-round development of socialist economy, then the gap that will be created is bound to lead to a lowering of standard in the realm of thinking. And if the level of thinking and the cultural standard remain low, then it may give birth to revisionism-reformism at any moment, in a critical hour, under favourable conditions and may lead to counter-revolutionary upsurge, peaceful or violent, and thus endanger socialism by bringing about counter-revolutionary changes in the socio-political setup. If backwardness continues to persist in the fields of epistemology and culture, then the entire party and the working class may, being misled, tread the revisionist-reformist path and bring about restoration of capitalism while waving the banner of socialism and Marxism-Leninism.

Need for uninterrupted practice of proletarian culture

Thirdly, the present leadership of China has been highly perturbed over another serious matter. It is this: in the post-Second World War period, an excellent revolutionary situation developed internationally, when the whole world was in ferment with revolutionary movements — a surge of revolutionary movements was sweeping across the entire world and imperialism got cornered. But today in a complete reversal from this, we find, on the contrary, the revolutionary movements on the retreat, and the imperialists in an aggressive role resorting to counter-attacks, while forces of counter-revolution and subversion are on the offensive everywhere — and for all this, the main responsibility basically lies with Soviet revisionism, with the revisionist outlook and practices of the present Soviet leadership. Immeasurable damage to the world revolution has been

wrought by such a party which has the legacy of great Marxist leaders like Lenin and Stalin, the party which for the first time in the world made socialist revolution victorious, founded a socialist state, consolidated and developed socialist economy on a firm basis, and was considering and contemplating under the leadership of Comrade Stalin how quickly, in what way it could achieve the final victory of socialism, and step on to the 'first stage of communism'. There are references to all this in the Report to the 19th Congress of the CPSU which was held just before Stalin's death. How could such a disastrous situation develop, such a change be possible in the party of Lenin and Stalin — how could the revisionists all of a sudden usurp the leadership of the party and the state without any effective resistance from within? Certainly all this could not happen overnight. The Chinese leadership has been greatly perturbed over the gravity of such a situation.

Naturally, they have been seriously thinking that if they are to safeguard the Chinese Revolution, if they are to ensure its uninterrupted growth and advancement, if they are to achieve victories of socialism, one after another, both in the national and international spheres, they would have to, while holding aloft the banner of proletarian internationalism, carry on the struggle within the country for continuously uplifting the standard of proletarian politics and culture without which they cannot fulfil their obligation to revolution — this is the conclusion they have reached. This extremely important task of cultural revolution was neglected in the Soviet Union. Even a giant communist leader like Stalin committed some mistakes in this particular field for a somewhat complacent attitude. Stalin once said that the more the socialist system and the socialist economy will be strengthened and consolidated, the more sharpened will be the class struggles. But at the Eighteenth Congress Stalin himself had analysed the Soviet society in a way from which it might appear that

there was no more class division in the Soviet society — it was a classless society. He observed : “The Soviet citizens are a new type of citizens — they are socialist citizens. The Soviet society is free from internal class contradiction, that is, the antagonistic character of the internal class contradiction is no more there”. Surely it was wrong to put it this way. Because, antagonistic character of class contradiction still prevailed in the Soviet society, otherwise what was the state for ? To answer this question Stalin only referred to the external contradiction, that is, the existence of imperialism and its influence over the Soviet society. But, in my opinion, it should be borne in mind that here, too, the external contradiction can influence the internal contradiction of society only when a material condition favourable for such an influence to work is already existing within the society.

Naturally, when after the socialist revolution it was necessary to further intensify class struggle, when the proletarian cultural standard ought to have been further heightened, when it was indispensable to keep uninterrupted this practice and the process of struggle in order to uplift the standard of proletarian revolutionary character against the infiltration of the influence of bourgeois ideology and culture into the party and the social life, when it was necessary to hold aloft the banner of cultural revolution in order to raise the cultural and political standard of the people to conform to the needs of each and every change of the character of the socialist productive system, the fact that this struggle got slackened due to the self-complacent attitude of the Soviet leadership after attainment of some stability in the social system actually led to this inevitable fall of ideological, political and cultural standard and provided the breeding ground for revisionism. Whether the CPC explained all these points so elaborately and in a beautiful manner in support of their programme of the Cultural Revolution, is not the point we are discussing. But from whatever they have said or

indicated, I understand it like this. Not that they have said it in this manner, but observing what had happened in the Soviet communist party, this apprehension has worked in them.

**To develop unity between the Party and
the people in the sphere of ideology**

Fourthly, China apprehends that she may have to face a war any day although the forces of peace throughout the world and their power of resistance have gained such strength today that it is very difficult for the US imperialists to unleash a world war. It is true that in the end the imperialists may not be able to wage a world war — their war efforts would remain limited to local and partial wars only, and they will continue to blackmail the weaker nations posing before them the threat of a nuclear war — but so long as imperialism exists as a world force, the root-cause and real danger of war will also be there. Naturally, no revolutionary party can afford to underestimate or rule out this danger. Taking advantage of the internal conflict, disunity and lapses in the socialist camp, imperialist attack on China may come one day, particularly when the present out-and-out revisionist leadership of the CPSU is persistently carrying on a malicious propaganda against China and frantically striving to curb its growing influence on the anti-imperialist liberation struggles in different countries as well as on the newly independent countries of Asia and Africa. In such an eventuality, if the party and the people of China continue to suffer from the ideological shortcomings and defects which I have mentioned earlier, then they would not be able to stand as ‘one man’ and face the attack. Particularly, if an imperialist attack is launched against China, it can’t be said what situation this might bring on. In such a situation, China might get encircled from all sides, and all the capitalist-imperialist countries of the world may be involved in this encirclement of China. Even

many of the newly independent bourgeois countries may turn out to become agents of the imperialists, and there may develop a worst conflagration with disastrous consequences. From the trend of events taking place one after another in the newly independent countries, this apprehension gets further confirmed. India, who was a friend of China a few years back, is no longer so. Burma, who was China's friend even the other day, has now turned towards the USA. Indonesia is thoroughly changed. It is now in the grip of the reactionaries, the agents of the imperialists. As there are bright prospects of ultimate victory of revolutionary movement in some countries of South-East Asia, it does not mean that they are free from these dangers. Under the circumstances, when the policy of containment of China is an open and naked declaration of the US imperialists, and when the US warmongers may at the slightest opportunity, at an unguarded moment, mount a pre-emptive attack to suppress China — the possibility of which is very much there — then everyone of the Chinese society, if necessary, would have to fight till the last drop of blood under the leadership of the party to thwart the imperialist attack and save revolution. In that case, it is the firm political and ideological unity between the party and the people that would provide the lifeblood for this war. And herein lies the invincible strength of revolutionary China. Being empowered by this strength, it is throwing the challenge to the world: no power on earth can destroy China. Whoever comes to destroy it, will ultimately be destroyed. This strength of theirs, which makes possible such a bold declaration, lies precisely in the firm political and ideological unity of the people and the party. So, the remnants of reactionary ideas that still persist in the Chinese society and are growing anew and infiltrating it in new forms — if all these cannot be completely eradicated as fast as possible, then the evils which are almost imperceptible at

present and apparently quite insignificant, causing only, if at all, some disturbances in the economic, administrative and organizational fields might at such a critical hour rear their ugly heads through internal sabotage and even bring in its wake a civil war and create a great hurdle to uniting the whole nation as 'one man' by organizing a counter-revolution. So this is also another important aspect that warrants this Cultural Revolution right at this moment.

To build permanent organizations for cultural movement

Fifthly, in order to keep the Chinese revolution and Chinese society free from the pernicious influence of different varieties of revisionism, it is necessary to build up a permanent organization for conducting uninterrupted cultural movement within the country. It is necessary to conduct a combined struggle by the party and the people to combat the bourgeois ideas and thoughts, remnants of which still survive in party workers at different levels, among the people and in different activities in the society. Besides, it should be remembered that even after all these years of revolution, in Soviet Union as well as in China, the number of people adapted to Marxist-Leninist way of thinking is very few in comparison to the vast population. Another section of people have some idea about Marxism-Leninism — but with them, too, the influence of Marxism-Leninism has remained at a superficial level only. Again, the people — that means those within the party — who work and think in accordance with the Marxist-Leninist methodology and outlook have been found to suffer from bourgeois ideological confusions and are influenced by modern revisionism. Moreover, the Chinese leaders do also find that with the relative stability of the new social system and advancement of the society as well as with the increasing material benefits, individualism of a new variety is growing

in the mental make-up of the individuals in the society. This new trend of individualism manifests itself in a socialist system. Whether they have been able to correctly ascertain its real character or not is an altogether different question. But there is no denying the fact that they have been able to understand at least this much that such a trend of individualism is completely alien to revolutionary ideological consciousness, class emotion and dedication of the proletariat. So, to fight it out is a must.

To fight casual attitude

Sixthly, those who are the living soul and forces of the Chinese Revolution today, i.e., the communists and other cadres who are engaged throughout the country in different spheres of activities — military, cultural and different branches of production, are guided by the Central Committee and Mao Zedong, the concretized expression of their collective leadership. Most of the old and experienced members of the Central Committee, including Mao Zedong are already above seventy. They cannot shut their eyes to this stark reality, which is causing great anxiety, too, in them, that this most experienced batch of the leaders, all growing old, would pass away at close intervals of time. Because, so long as Mao Zedong and all these old, experienced and powerful leaders are there, the party may not face any acute crisis or serious danger. But the apprehension of a grave danger cropping up within the party in their absence should not be ruled out. We should remember that people very often work relying on their belief, reposing their faith and confidence in a leader. Just take the example of Soviet Union — the disastrous happenings there did surely not take place overnight. As the thoughts, ideas and cultural standard could not be raised continuously to higher level, keeping pace with the material development in the society, the standard of thinking and

culture remained at a relatively low and inadequate level; this is the main factor behind the gradual growth of revisionism. But you see, notwithstanding this relatively low level of consciousness of the party and the people of the Soviet Union, its poisonous consequence did not appear because of the impact of the towering personality, astounding level of thinking, highly disciplined and firm conduction of Stalin. As a result, the Communist Party of the Soviet Union could remain essentially the 'proletarian vanguard' despite some mistakes and blunders here and there so long as Stalin was living. But today, solely because of the absence of a great personality, how easily the whole party and the people have fallen victim to all sorts of rotten thinking and ideas. So you see, if proper precaution is not taken in time, such eventualities may very well arise. The Chinese leadership did not fail to take lessons from all this. What is worrying them very much is that if the ideological-cultural standard along with the political consciousness of the new members, who have joined the Communist Party in growing numbers after the revolution, and many of whom are already occupying responsible posts and positions in the party and the state, are not adequately uplifted and if a new wave of proletarian cultural movement is not created among the people, then, in absence of Mao Zedong and the present leadership, revisionism may grow in China too in the very same way it grew in the Soviet Union.

Besides all this, China is confronted today with serious and complex problems. As its various internal problems require immediate solution, so also it has to face the problems created by the activities of the external forces, and it has the problem to educate the whole nation to stand as 'one man' against the imperialist powers' policy of suppression of China. Moreover, in carrying out systematically the task of socialist reconstruction, let alone being helped by the Soviet Union, China rather has to fight

against various obstacles and economic blockades created by the Soviet revisionists. Hence, if China is to bring about the speedy development of its economy by further consolidating and strengthening that on a strong foundation, then China would have to build up a firm unity between the party and the people on the basis of correct political line and ideology and develop a sense of revolutionary dedication among the people. Otherwise, because of the relative stability that appears in society in the post-revolutionary period, a kind of casual attitude might develop among the workers and different sections of the people, in which case the speedy development of the Chinese economy would not be possible.

**To attain greater economic and military power
in the interest of revolutionary movement**

Seventhly, China is trying to prepare itself to be the nerve-centre of international proletarian revolution. Naturally, as China's standing up as one man on a stronger military, political, social and cultural footing and its continuous gaining in strength is a guarantee in favour of peace and against the threat of nuclear war, it is of utmost necessity as well for extending active help and co-operation to the revolutionary movements all over the world. Naturally, such a gigantic Cultural Revolution has not been prompted simply by its internal and economic necessities guided by national point of view. In the interest of effectively helping the anti-imperialist liberation struggles, which China wants to do, it is also necessary for it to strengthen the economic foundation and to acquire military power very speedily. And in this regard China's needs to attain a stage almost at par with the Soviet Union as fast as possible. Because, even if it sounds somewhat queer, the fact however remains that because of the revisionist role of the Soviet leadership, its supremacy in the economic and

military field is causing much harm today. If China can speedily cover the economic gap that exists between it and the Soviet Union, then it would be easier for China to overcome the present crisis in the international communist movement and it would be able to unite the other countries, more particularly the anti-imperialist forces and the leading forces of the socialist camp, in the anti-imperialist movement throughout the world. Because, China is not yet in a position, on account of its relative economic backwardness, to offer economic aid to the non-aligned countries that surpasses the economic help provided by the Soviet Union and to effectively draw them in the anti-imperialist struggle under its leadership. Since those less developed countries are to a very great extent dependent on Soviet economic aid, the influence of the revisionist Soviet leadership still persists. If China can very rapidly acquire almost equal economic and military strength and position then only it can influence those countries which still have got a genuine anti-imperialist role to play and thus can straightaway draw them to the side of anti-imperialist struggle by freeing them from the influence of revisionist leadership of the Soviet Union.

**To continue uninterrupted proletarian politics
within the army**

Eighthly, in a section of the Chinese army, a dangerous trend of putting undue emphasis on speedy modernization of the army and mechanization of equipment and weaponry to be on a par with the leading imperialist countries, was growing strongly. As a result, they almost made secondary the urgent necessity of continuous uplift of the political-cultural standard of the army through continuous practice of proletarian politics. This, too, has made the Chinese leaders very much anxious. Faced with persistent war threat from the imperialist countries the leaders of the Chinese Cultural Revolution are

neither ignoring nor belittling a whit the importance of speedy modernization of armament; on the contrary, their serious efforts in this field and the spectacular advances they made within such a short time have startled the world powers. But whatever may be the advancement in the field of modernization of armament, if the army of a socialist country is not imbued with the spirit of proletarian culture and revolution, then in culture and character it remains in no way different from the imperialist mercenary army in a bourgeois country. Because, only the urge for proletarian revolution and the practice of proletarian politics and culture can help the army of a socialist country acquire decisive and invincible strength which no bourgeois mercenary army even if equipped with all modern armament can face or contain. Naturally, if the tendency of putting greater emphasis on technological development of weaponry in place of practising the revolutionary politics and proletarian culture gains the upper hand, then the sense of dedication for revolution in the Chinese army may be lost in course of time, the symptoms of which are already there. So, to free the army from this dangerous trend and mindset by involving them, along with the people, in the movement, is also another vital object of the present Cultural Revolution.

To elevate ideological standard of intellectuals

Ninthly, the scientists, the intellectuals and the technocrats who have served the progress of the society and made valuable contributions in different ways to the cause of social progress have also not been excluded from the purview of the Cultural Revolution. For, because of their special position in society and also because of the influence they have on all sections of the people through their activities, they very easily turn out to be heroes in the eyes of the people. The influence of the scientists and other intellectuals is really tremendous on the society. Hence their

cultural and world outlook also needs to be changed. Their thoughts, ideas and cultural standard must also conform to the needs of socialist revolution, its progress and development. In the Chinese society those persons in power in the party and in the state who are discharging diverse responsibilities in the economic and administrative fields – the level of thinking that they are reflecting is not adequate and consistent with necessity. These incongruities and inadequacies have, therefore, to be removed and eradicated through struggle. All these factors taken together necessitated the present Cultural Revolution in China. This Cultural Revolution is the struggle to wipe out, both individually and collectively, all sorts of reactionary ideas from within the party, administration, style of work, educational system and even from the fields of science and epistemology.

Communists of all countries to learn from Cultural Revolution

Then again, the hitherto existing method was to initiate struggle first inside the party, to arrive at certain decisions in the party bodies and then to educate and imbue the people in accordance with those. That was the old methodology. But I should say that in this Cultural Revolution Mao Zedong has shown a magnificent and brilliant organizational courage. Communists all over the world have got a great deal to learn from it. Ideological struggle took place in the Soviet Union also. But there it remained confined within the party. In this way, the various types of apprehensions in the mass mind persist and cannot be touched; hence the people do not rally round the party as ‘one man’ on the basis of a clear and correct understanding. Even if they do so sometimes, they do it either under the overall impact of the leadership, or under duress or from a wrong notion, or not out of conscious but blind emotion for the party.

But if any doubt or apprehension prevails among the people regarding what is happening inside the party, then at the time of crisis, the reactionaries and the anti-party forces may create division among the people using it as a weapon and thereby endanger the party and the revolution. Naturally, nothing can save the revolution at a critical hour other than the firm unity of the party and the people in the ideological-political field, at least up to a certain level. So, to make the people active in favour of the basic principles of the party, to inspire them to work unitedly under the leadership of the party, it is necessary to raise the level of consciousness of the people to that required standard. And to do this the people would have to be involved continuously in the process of cultural movement and be given the opportunity to take active part in debates and discussions. But you see, a grave danger inheres in that. Only a very powerful communist party, a party which is in state power, which controls the army and the legal system, handles the state machine and has got a network of organizations as well in every field of activity of the people, can afford to take such a great risk. Only such a powerful party can shoulder the risk of such a gigantic programme, and the Communist Party of China has undertaken it. Despite the risk involved, they were not afraid of facing it. The entire people have been given the right to openly criticize even the leaders and the executives of the party and the state. The party which can grant the people such a right and can take such a risk is not an ordinary party. They are doing this knowing full well that certain kind of danger may arise out of this. The people who have been awakened and given the right for open discussion and criticism, if they develop some grudge they may even get involved in utterly wrong activities directed against the very leadership who had awakened them.

For that, all precautionary measures have been taken. Moreover, the leadership is quite aware of the fact that there

may be some excesses when the entire people have been brought into the vortex of such a gigantic Cultural Revolution. It would not be wise in any way either to stem the tide or discourage the people on the main object of the Cultural Revolution lest there might be excesses. The CPC Central Committee has pointedly declared that where excesses will lead to criminal offences, those responsible will be punished according to law. Law will take its own course against those who will commit criminal offences like arson, looting, killing and the like. But the main programme of the Cultural Revolution cannot be stopped or kept in abeyance on the plea of all this.

Leadership not to be frightened of criticism by the people

This movement, once started, may not spare the leaders even, not excluding those who are on the right track, from irresponsible criticisms of the people, for which they may feel embarrassed. But for this, they should neither feel embarrassed nor be distracted from the main objective. It is for this that the leaders have been urged again and again not to be frightened in the face of criticism in the Cultural Revolution. It is quite likely that the people may criticize rightly or even wrongly. By this, only those will be perturbed or afraid who are not really imbued with the proletarian outlook and culture. Revolutionaries are never afraid of criticism. They have nothing to hide from the people. It is only about the party and revolution that they may have something to keep secret. They cannot have anything personal which they feel necessary to keep secret from the people. There may be certain things which the party may decide to keep secret. But in the present case, it is the decision of the party to encourage open criticism by all. So, there is nothing here to take personally and no tangible reason to be afraid of. It is known that it is Mao

Zedong at whose inspiration this Cultural Revolution was initiated. The whole programme is the outcome of Mao Zedong's contemplation. But at a certain stage a hue and cry was raised even against Mao Zedong. Some people — maybe they belonged to the opposite camp — raised the slogan that Mao came of a rich peasant family, and hence was a bourgeois himself. But all this could not embarrass or perturb Mao Zedong a bit. Rather, he himself consented to the continuation of this type of criticism. Because, he knew it for certain that such questions, if suppressed would remain unresolved. But if these came out in the open; that would expose the wrong posing of the question, that is, what is the mistaken notion for which this type of question could arise at all, and thus it would provide a chance for its rectification. So, when the question is resolved, it provides a correct concept and clarity of thought. But if such things are suppressed or attempted to be impressed upon the people in a confused manner or in vague terms, then although the people may acquiesce in because of the overall impact of the situation, they would do it not with a clear mind, some doubts would still persist. This way of coming to an agreement indicates that blindness and mechanical thinking continue to persist. So, the revolutionary workers along with the active workers of the Cultural Revolution should remain with the masses actively participating in the Proletarian Cultural Revolution and help them correct their mistakes, and in this process the people would also help in correcting the mistakes of the party workers, if there be any. This way, the party would conduct the movement by making the people active and would thus be able to keep it within its control as well. It was not at all conceived at the outset that the army would have to be involved. But later at the Eleventh Plenary session it was decided that, if necessary, even the army would have to take part in this Cultural Revolution. Because, there are differences of opinion even

within the army. Moreover, if the movement takes a violent turn then it has got to be brought under control. So, this movement has to be conducted in a very disciplined way; if necessary, it has got to be restrained even, but under no circumstances can this feature of mass participation be allowed to die. That is the main essence.

Necessity of involving wider sections of people

Now the question is : why did the Communist Party of China take recourse to this path of involving actively the whole people in the Cultural Revolution ? Because, by this, right from the leaders to the party workers as well as the people, all would get an opportunity to correct their mistakes and shortcomings. The present Chinese leadership is contemplating to give a permanent shape to the existing organizations of the Cultural Revolution. Naturally, this struggle will continue. The specific problems against which the present Cultural Revolution is being conducted will no longer be there in future and so the content of the future movements will also change with the emergence of newer problems before it. But the process China has adopted to build the instruments of struggle by involving the masses actively in the movement would not be discouraged. This approach is no doubt new.

We hold that in whatever way this movement may be conducted if people are actively involved, chances of committing mistakes would be less. If people do not take active part in movements, then even if no mistakes are committed, unnecessary doubts and apprehensions would remain in the mass mind. Even if justified disciplinary action is taken against an individual, the people may harbour the apprehension that his was a conspiratorial move to remove that individual. And here, if the people are actively involved in it, what happens? Well, people may apprehend a conspiracy here, too; but in this case there is scope for

open discussion and debate. One section may come out to say openly that a conspiracy is there, and another section would assert that there is no such conspiracy. So, you see, a debate is going on and as a result a correct understanding is developing; many new ideas and reasoning are appearing. Many documents would be placed by the opponents as well as others.

For this the party has advised not to brand as enemies in an indiscriminate manner all those who are opponents during this Cultural Revolution. Again, at the same time, the party has warned against the danger that even the real enemies may go undetected, taking advantage of the notion: everybody opposing is not necessarily an enemy. That is why it is necessary to distinguish between the real enemy and those who are common people but are behaving like enemies under the influence of the bourgeois ideology or are being confused by the reactionary forces, and to isolate the enemies from the common people. So, after this turbulent phase ends when unity would ultimately be reached, free from the influence of all sorts of reactionary ideas and thoughts, it would be, even if relatively, a stronger unity of the majority based on a clearer understanding — a unity of the party and the people, of the leadership and the party cadres. So, in the present situation, under the given circumstances, this at least seems to be the only guarantee.

Now some may think that the party will have to face many difficulties if the whole of the masses are involved in it. What are those difficulties? Well, widespread chaos and disturbances. But even if it causes chaos and disturbances, it is a necessity if China has to solve her internal and external problems, if she has to remove all apprehensions from the mass mind and if she has to build up a firm unity of the party with the people on the basis of a higher political consciousness, culture and ethics. Otherwise, despite all propaganda and publicity, the necessary initiative of the

people would be lacking. In that case, people would not get the chance to plunge into struggle, to learn from this struggle and thereby grasp the truth. Maybe, they would listen and acquiesce, but they would do so blindly. Whereas here given the scope for debates and conflict of ideas, people would come out openly and speak frankly — they would not conceal the doubts and apprehensions in their minds. So we see that through this Cultural Revolution they are striving to bring about a unity, in their own language, of the ninetyfive per cent of the people with the party — a unity based on ideology. They are striving to achieve this unity dragging all points of differences and diversities into the vortex of struggle. Naturally, as a methodology, I feel it is very scientific. And the only question that may arise is whether it is at all possible to lead this Cultural Revolution to its logical culmination. Or, whether it will end up in a catastrophe ? The CPC has courageously taken it up. The way they have undertaken this risk to accomplish such a gigantic task is, I would repeat, simply magnificent. Communists all over the world who are in the midst of struggle have a great deal to learn from it.

A deviation does not mean turning into a completely opposite force

Questions have been raised centring round some mistakes and shortcomings of the Cultural Revolution of China. For example, a kind of mechanical way of thinking is manifest in their approach, in which, to a certain extent, lies the danger of slipping into subjectivism. If the leadership is not sufficiently careful in time about it, there is every possibility of slipping into subjectivism later on. I shall deal afterwards with what this mechanical approach means. Some persons think that since there is an influence of mechanical way of thinking in the approach of the Communist Party of China, it has already deviated from

Marxism. No, surely not. There is always a gap, a nodal point, between what might take place in future and what has already happened. For, a deviation does not necessarily mean that one turns into a completely opposite force. So, it is wrong to conclude that each and every deviation of a party makes it counter-revolutionary at once. In the course of continuously suffering from deviations when that reaches a particular point, the nodal point, it turns out to be counter-revolutionary. The present mechanical approach that you find is the outcome of low level of thinking in general and the wide gap that exists in the level of thinking between the top leadership and the rank and file, and between the party rank and file and the common people, in particular. So, if the CPC fails to get rid of this mechanical approach from which it suffers at present, then subjectivism, gaining ground, may one day cause a serious disaster. But if you suggest that they have already deviated fundamentally then you will have to substantiate it with facts. I do not hold that their thought process is wrong. But I say that correct thought process notwithstanding, they are reflecting somewhat low level of thinking. There is nothing unnatural about it. But in view of this low level of thinking, if it is generalized and presumed that this lowering of ideological standard is a common feature everywhere, then it would be a gross mistake.

Although this low level of ideological standard is sometimes leading them to some theoretical inconsistencies, still then it cannot be denied that in place of the old method of criticism and self-criticism prevalent so far in the communist movement, the method they have adopted to remove from the mass mind the various confusions, unfounded apprehensions and unnecessary suspicions, that is, the process of involving the people directly in this gigantic movement for making them collectively a politically conscious entity, is definitely a bold and new step

and in that sense it is really unique and magnificent.

Referring to the ideological controversy in the international communist movement and the method of struggle that should be adopted to resolve the same, as far back as 1963 we held in the article *An Appeal to the Leaders of the International Communist Movement* that this struggle concerning ideological questions of fundamental nature should involve not only the leaders but also the rank and file, the class and the masses. In that article of 1963 I made a detailed discussion about this issue. We are glad that in the Cultural Revolution of China, this principle finds its first concrete application in the history of the communist movement. Frankly speaking, to that extent I myself also did not have the expectation that the CPC would so promptly apply this principle in practice on such a massive scale. It is true that there are inadequacies in the ideological standard in some aspects of this Cultural Revolution — which I shall discuss later on — but there are, at the same time, many advanced and brilliant aspects of it from which all the communists have a lot to learn. There are many unique and creative things in it. Both aspects are there. To only look at the inadequacies and denounce the whole thing as subjective — that won't do.

Criticism to be just and proper

But I find that those who are criticizing the Cultural Revolution are manifesting a mentality of bravado in the manner they are doing it. Every communist has not only the right but also the bounden duty to express his opinion on the Cultural Revolution. Because, it is directly linked with the all-important question of the progress and advancement of the world communist movement. So, if there is any mistake in their approach, one should point that out. At the same time, if somebody can provide an enriched theory, that also should be pointed out. But if someone is able to do so, he

becomes superior to them in all respects or that they are therefore of no worth – this is not at all a correct attitude. It is true that compared to us they are much greater in many respects and maybe in that context we are insignificant compared to them. But still then in some spheres we may be capable of providing something, some theories which are more advanced than theirs and which may be useful even to them. As it is wrong to accept blindly whatever comes from them because they are great, at the same time to reject or underestimate even those magnificent and brilliant contributions of theirs since we could provide some useful new theories – with such an attitude we can learn nothing. Then one day, following this course complacency would consume us too, like the bourgeoisie. We would then, in the name of Marxism, reduce ourselves to the position of those fiendish bourgeois pundits whom they are decrying. This is why, even if there is something that needs to be criticized, it should not be done with such an attitude.

Revolutionary intellectualism *vis-a-vis* bourgeois scholasticism

Though not directly related to this particular issue, still then, I want to discuss one more point. You should always remember that there is a fundamental difference between bourgeois scholasticism and revolutionary intellectualism. The difference between revolutionary intellectualism and bourgeois scholasticism lies precisely in the fact that revolutionary intellectualism is purposive, creative, active and beneficial. That is why there is no false sense of pride and egotism in it. A revolutionary intellectual is never vainglorious, nor does he fear or fight shy of asserting his worth when necessary. He never projects himself to be superior to others. And as revolutionary intellectualism acts with a purpose, whatever it does becomes very powerful; it acts in a decisive manner. Its aim is not to belittle but to

help others. But bourgeois scholasticism is devoid of these objectives. So, when real communists would criticize the Chinese Communist Party they should give them the proper respect they deserve. What a tremendous risk they have undertaken! Even a little modesty suffices to make one understand that it was not just an infantile act on the part of the CPC. In fact, the programme of Cultural Revolution has a sound theoretical foundation and is backed by rich experience.

When every individual's consciousness gets raised to the level of social consciousness, the role of the individual as leader for inspiring people will wither away

Now, different circles, not excluding the communists, have raised certain points of criticism and expressed some reservations about the Cultural Revolution of China. First, many are of the opinion that what is going on in China in the name of Mao Zedong is nothing but the cult of personality. That is, during this Cultural Revolution and in the whole of the social life of China, the way in which Mao Zedong is being eulogized as a leader provides evidence, they say, of the cult of personality. Say, for example, when Mao Zedong attends a meeting, the party workers maintain some formalities to express their regard; thunderous slogans eulogizing him continue for a long time; the critics attribute these acts to the practice of the cult of personality. From all these formalities it may appear to be the cult of personality. But you would have to keep in mind one more important point in this connection. If you are to inspire and involve the masses of people in social movements, then so long as the active members of the party as well as the people do not acquire the highest standard of communist consciousness — not the highest standard of the past but as it should be at present — these would remain as the general form of paying respect. There are elements of mechanical approach in it, but

nevertheless there is a real necessity for it. Today, revolution cannot be brought about anywhere avoiding these formalities. Revolution will be free from this limitation only when the level of consciousness of every individual member of society will be raised to the level of social consciousness, when individual consciousness will become identified with social consciousness, when the party and the individual entity will become one and the same, that is, when society as a whole and the party will have become identified and the prevailing gap between the highest and the lowest levels of consciousness will be eliminated. Only then the historical role of individual as leader to inspire and imbue people to discharge their social responsibilities will cease to exist. But not before that. Although this method of inspiring and drawing people into movement carries the legacy of the old mechanical process, still then it is different from the bourgeois mechanical method. This also has to be realized. Where lies the difference? The difference lies precisely in the fact that in the communist movement a constant attempt is there to maintain a necessary minimum level of consciousness of the people. That is, a minimum level of theoretical understanding is considered indispensable here. First of all, no individual, not even the leader, is considered infallible; and secondly, any phenomenon, any entity, even thoughts and ideas, are not taken as absolute, rather they are considered changeable — they change along with the change of the material condition. These two are the bases on which the minimum level of consciousness of people should rest.

Blind allegiance to a leader gives birth to authoritarianism

Again, as this method of projecting an individual as a leader to inspire the party workers and people is indispensable, so also there is a danger inherent in it if it is

not based on a correct understanding. A genuine revolutionary party feels it necessary, no doubt, but knows the inherent danger as well. If this is not conducted correctly, it brings mechanical trend of thinking within the party and gives birth to authoritarianism. What is more, because of this mechanical trend, the low level of thinking persists, which in turn makes one incapable of comprehending the contemporary problems. As a result, those very people whose emancipation is the object of revolution and for which they are being inspired, fall prey to another preconception. Then they cannot be freed from it. For example, there is no denying the fact that in Soviet Russia the gigantic socialist construction was made projecting Stalin before the masses — no doubt this made all the spectacular achievements possible. The personality of Stalin and his leadership inspired the whole of the Soviet people anew. But again, following this very course came the backwardness in the theoretical standard. The mechanical trend that is inherent in this method of imbuing the people by projecting a leader before them could not be fought out ultimately because the low level of theoretical and cultural standard among the communists and the masses continued to persist. That is why Stalin's Soviet Union today is treading the revisionist path. Both these aspects are equally valid. The leading role of an individual was there in Russia and it is there in China too. It was there in China before the revolution, it is there today also and it will be there in the future, too, and will act as a decisive force so long as there will be the necessity of inspiring the people to work under the leadership of the party on the basis of unity of will. No revolution can be viewed without this. So, in all revolutions, this method is inseparably linked up with the question of involving the masses in action. The revolutionary party which does not practise this method, which has not been able to concretize and personify the collective leadership of

the party through an individual, has not been able to project the leader in the high esteem and imagination of the masses, but places all the leaders on a par, does not really mean revolution at all. No doubt, there exists a collective leadership but, over and above it, should emerge a leader as a symbolic expression of the unity of struggle. The objective necessity of organizing and leading revolution to victory in any country always calls for the emergence of such a leader of the leaders. Otherwise, while conducting revolution, the unity amongst the leaders and within the party cannot be preserved, nor can the unity of the people be maintained in confronting a dangerous situation before the nation, because no sense of authority works and ultra-democratic tendency grows. As a result, while conducting revolution or movements, at any moment the entire party runs the risk of being reduced to a debating society and losing its ability to act. Therefore, no revolutionary party considers the task of projecting the leader a useless task, but while doing it they always remain vigilant and alert.

Regarding conflict between Mao Zedong and Liu Shaoqi

Secondly, various sorts of speculations are going on centring round the question of the conflict over leadership between Mao Zedong and Liu Shaoqi. The communist cadres must have a clear understanding about this too. Leaving aside the propaganda in the bourgeois press, even the leadership of the Communist Party of China is pointing out that some persons in power like Liu Shaoqi have been gradually stepping towards capitalism, even if unknowingly, by opposing the proletarian revolutionary politics of the party. Moreover, a very careful examination of the contentions of these two opposite sides reveals that a trend of bureaucratic way of functioning, just like that of the bourgeois political leaders, was developing as a regular

practice among many of the leaders holding top posts both in the party and the state. Since the accomplishment of the Chinese Revolution, Mao Zedong has been raising the slogan: 'Let hundred flowers bloom and a hundred schools of thought contend'. But although he stressed it repeatedly, it was not put into practice in the party life. When he said, let hundreds of people think and contemplate, he knew that this would encourage open conflict and contradiction between different thoughts and opinions, but he, at the same time, asserted that there was nothing to be afraid of. Such conflicts and contradictions were not only unavoidable but necessary and beneficial as well. He reiterated this during the present Cultural Revolution, too. The revolutionary leadership of China maintains that through this process of struggle not only the leaders and the rank and file of the party, but even the entire people would unite into a single organic whole in different spheres of activities on the basis of a common understanding up to a certain level. Otherwise, it would be some kind of unity based on certain preconceptions that develops, unity to enjoy some benefit, or unity under pressure which cannot last long.

Therefore, unity achieved through the correct process of open conflicts and contradictions between different thoughts and ideas would be a stable unity. But in spite of all these exhortations, the leaders have been pursuing bureaucratic method, and in their day-to-day behaviour and activities a typical apolitical attitude is being manifested. In the manner of typical bureaucratic officers, these leaders follow the routine of attending office in office hours, clearing files, issuing orders, notices and circulars, attending meetings to deliver lectures — and that is all. But the revolutionary cadres are always told: 'Behave like political workers, impress upon the comrades the party instructions clearly — guide them concretely, if necessary with illustrations on how to put the party decisions into practice'.

But in spite of this, it has been observed that there is practically no reflection of it in the actual behaviour and conduct of the leaders. That it does not work in that way, we too experience that in our party. I have time and again criticized our leaders and cadres for being victim of bureaucratic style of work and what I meant by the term 'bureaucratic' was precisely this style of activity. Among the Chinese leaders, this trend of bureaucratic functioning was also growing in their day-to-day activities. Those communists who move like the official bureaucrats, if their identity as Marxist-Leninists is not made known, if their party cards are anyhow found missing from their pockets, then it is difficult to distinguish them from the bourgeois bureaucrats attending duties regularly, except when they open their mouths in characteristic verbiage. But the question is : why is there no reflection of revolutionary character in the working style; no reflection of revolutionary character in the relationship between the leaders and the cadres, and why is a mechanical and stereotyped attitude growing within the party life of the CPC? What is the root cause behind all these ? The reason is: the struggle, the open confrontation within the country is no more like the earlier one. Nobody is going to overthrow them from power, no more is the police forcibly taking them to prison. In short, the old form of class struggle is no more there today. The class struggle has assumed a new form, and has become more and more subtle. But with regard to the concept of struggle, the old idea still prevails in them. The reactionary ideas and thinking of the old society have not been thoroughly wiped out from the minds of the leaders, cadres and the people on the one hand; rather bourgeois ideas in the new conditions are infiltrating in newer forms and in subtler ways while, on the other, with the growing economic and political stability of the socialist system the tendency of reducing sense of individual freedom and individuality to a

sense of privilege is continuously growing. As a result, conducting class struggle has become all the more difficult today. The revolution which earlier was perceived to be very difficult, in today's condition it is still more difficult. Mao Zedong himself admitted this fact in his speeches and writings and said: It is much more difficult than the revolution Beijing has done previously. Because, the struggle had then been direct and straight and the enemy was in the open and known. They were then directly involved in the struggle. But here, the enemy infiltrates stealthily, the party falls victim to it unconsciously — today the struggle is against all this. It is a struggle against the tendencies that grow from within. Where the enemy is known, it does not pose so much danger since it is then easier to detect and conduct struggle against the enemy directly. But where the enemy is within and enters stealthily, the struggle becomes much more difficult. In the CPC, too, bureaucratic style of functioning was growing and the sense of individual freedom was tending to develop into a sense of privilege. That these tendencies had grown very strong within the CPSU is amply clear today. The organizers of the present Cultural Revolution of China hold that different types of counter-revolutionary trends and tendencies are growing within their party too and they charge that even some of the top ranking leaders are not free from the pernicious influence of all these. So, all-round criticism is going on in that country. Extensive debates are going on as to what should be the behaviour, conduct and the mode of life of the communists. They want to bring about a change in all respects. As a result, this Cultural Revolution would provide those who committed mistakes but are honest, who support socialism and are willing to move along the path of revolution with a chance to rectify themselves. And if the struggle is conducted in this way, then those who would try to hide their true colours and pose as innocent victims, and

hence not the real enemy of the people, would one day expose themselves when judged on the yardstick of partisanship. In this way it would be clear whether they are pretenders and enemies, or have committed mistakes from genuine confusions. This process, being correct and scientific, will help to eliminate anti-party and counter-revolutionary forces better. This is why the Chinese leadership did not adopt, from the very beginning, the policy of forcibly ousting the anti-party and counter-revolutionary forces by using the state machine. They wanted to do that by developing a countrywide unified understanding and approach involving people in this movement mainly for two reasons. First, this is necessary because this very method of involving the people in the struggle would minimize the possibility of committing mistakes and, even if mistakes are committed by some from genuine confusion, it would give them a chance for their rectification as well. And secondly, when on the basis of either unanimous or majority decision, unity would be achieved through wider participation of the people in a struggle in which conflicts and interaction of diverse thinking and ideas take place — it would be a far more stable unity than before and hence there would be no apprehension among the people despite any disciplinary actions ultimately taken against anti-party leaders and cadres.

And this is why, when there is no doubt about the fact — which even the bourgeois media is admitting — that Mao Zedong and the core group in charge of Cultural Revolution have been able to establish their supremacy and control over the entire party, we find Liu Shaoqi still at the helm of the state and enjoying all his power and position as the head of the government.²

If it was really a power conflict between Mao Zedong and Liu Shaoqi as the speculation goes in the bourgeois press, then Liu Shaoqi could have been very easily removed

from power through coercion. But they have not done so. And why? First, this is not a conflict over leadership at a personal level and obviously there is no doubt today that the conflict going on between Mao and Liu is one of political line and outlook. Secondly, the CPC is not thinking in terms of removing anybody by coercion. This leaves the ground for Liu Shaoqi to change his political line through persuasion by ideological struggle and join the mainstream. And if it so happens, then we shall find Liu Shaoqi's name in the first rank once more.

Cultural Revolution helps augment production

At one stage, difference of opinion between Mao Zedong and Zhou Enlai cropped up centring round certain aspects of the Cultural Revolution and it seemed that at the initial stage Zhou Enlai was opposed to extension of Cultural Revolution to the industrial field. And at that time a debate was conducted in the ideological field against this idea also. And in course of that ideological struggle, those who were opposed to carrying the Cultural Revolution to the industrial sector, lest it might hamper production – who in the beginning included Zhou Enlai — were ultimately proved to be wrong. Because, in order to augment production, there is the necessity for Cultural Revolution. Cultural Revolution does not hamper production. Rather, Cultural Revolution aims at completely removing the bourgeois trend of thinking from among the working class, freeing production totally from the influence of economism and casual attitude and freeing those who are at the helm of industrial production from the influence of such utterly confusing ideas and thoughts. So, the programme of Cultural Revolution should by no means be opposed. Zhou Enlai realized this afterwards and corrected himself — of course if it is not surmised, as some are doing, that he was made to change his views under duress. Again, many are

speculating that even though Zhou Enlai is acting as the next man to Mao Zedong during the course of the Cultural Revolution, but after Mao, he will assume the role of a turncoat like Khrushchev. Because, in their opinion, this change of Zhou Enlai is just a shrewd manoeuvre, a deception. Even if this happens in future, I do not consider it proper to indulge in such thinking. Because, to adopt such a method in analysing events means to sink into bourgeois speculation instead of following dialectical method of analysis. And if this method of thinking persists, there will remain the danger of sinking into speculations, one after another. Naturally, I consider it is a great mistake to think like this because it is subjective and imaginary and is absolutely divorced from reality. This can never be the correct methodology of analysing things. Everything must be judged by the yardstick of objective reality. Zhou Enlai has a glorious revolutionary record and at present he is strongly defending the cause of the Cultural Revolution. Once, the name of Zhou Enlai went down in the list of the bourgeois speculators. But again, they have brought his name up in the list. His name is again among the two next to Mao — one is Lin Biao, the other Zhou Enlai. In the bourgeois world there is a lot of speculation on the question of names of the leaders coming to the forefront, or going down to the bottom. But China is least concerned about all this. Naturally, it would not at all be surprising if Mao Zedong and Liu Shaoqi reach complete unanimity — about the possibility of which I have mentioned earlier. A conflict is going on, however much mechanical approach might have cast its influence on the struggle it cannot be denied that the conflict is real and genuine. That is why they do not want to give up the struggle. But neither from the government nor from the party are they allowing criticism against Liu Shaoqi by name, and even in the midst of the waves of Cultural Revolution, he has been provided with all protection and

security. So, from all these, what I feel is that the root cause of the present conflict between Mao Zedong and Liu Shaoqi lies in some genuine confusion of Liu over the outlook and method of implementation of the political line of the party.

Achieving unity — when possible ?

Now, this confusion may be of two types. Maybe, Liu Shaoqi does not differ on the fundamental political line and outlook of the party but he considers the way it is being implemented under the leadership of Mao Zedong to be wrong. And secondly, it may be that on the international questions, too, Liu Shaoqi has no ideological difference on questions over which the CPC is fighting against Soviet revisionism but he differs with Mao on just the style and approach. Perhaps that is why he is being named Khrushchev, modern Khrushchev — he is being accused of having a leaning towards revisionism. At least, from the articles and editorials appearing in the party journals guided by the thoughts of Mao Zedong and the way the party leadership is approaching the whole issue, it appears that maybe here lies, in the main, the real confusion. So, a struggle is going on. If this is the nature of conflict with Liu Shaoqi, there is nothing to worry. He is forwarding his arguments on this, so also the party is coming out with counter-arguments under Mao's leadership. If mechanical approach does not stand in the way and blur the main object and issues involved in the struggle then, no doubt, through this struggle there will be clarity, and unity will be achieved.

New type of economism in socialist system once again evokes bourgeois concept of individual right in the working class

But if the confusion is of a different nature, then it becomes very serious. That is, if the difference is over the base political line and outlook of the party as well as on the

fundamental line and approach pursued by the party in the ideological struggle going on in the international communist movement, then it is really of a fundamental nature. What is more, it seems that a basic difference has arisen centring round a new type of economism and the policy of 'material incentive' under conditions of socialism. In the period of socialist economic reconstruction there is a danger that a tendency of a new type of economism, of hankering for material incentive and benefit may grow among the common workers. In other words, to the general workers, socialism comes to mean simply greater benefit and amenities. As a result, behind the urge of a worker to produce more actually works his sense of privilege and material benefit as otherwise the talk of socialism or higher production has no meaning to him. In socialism the workers will automatically get its benefit more and more with the growth of production and there will be continuous uplift of the standard of living of the working people. But to relate the question of enhancement of production to personal benefit is to reflect a mentality which is absolutely incompatible with the basic aim and object of socialism. Such a mentality breeds a typical individualistic and opportunistic trend among the workers. So, the outlook and attitude of workers should be moulded in such a way that they sincerely feel the necessity to dedicate themselves to increasing the production in the very interest of advancement of their own country as well as of the world proletarian revolution. Because, no doubt, the unhampered development and progress of the country is inseparably linked with the growth and advancement of the international proletarian revolution, and on the question of attainment of these two depends, in the main, the spiritual and material progress of an individual. If this be the mode of thinking and the bent of mind of the working class while they take part in socialist construction, then only would a sense of complete dedication grow and prevail among them

and then only the workers would be able to fight out casual and apathetic attitude towards work and responsibility. It means that when the sense of dedication is absent, it breeds a kind of lackadaisical or casual attitude towards work, an attitude which brings in its trail an urge for individual privilege and a tendency to get more, even though unreasonable. If the workers are not imbued with the revolutionary consciousness that they themselves are the sole determinant force in a socialist society, then the old bourgeois concept of individual right would resurface again. It would again take deeper roots in society under cover of new slogans and ultimately the sense of freedom and individual liberty would be reduced to a sense of privilege.

Revisionist policy of material incentive endangers socialist system

Due to a superficial knowledge of socialism and also due to the influence of modern revisionism, a group of socialists think that the main object of socialism is to anyhow increase production. These so-called Marxists, in utter disregard of the inherent internal contradiction and the fundamental economic laws of socialist system, even advocate introduction of 'material incentive' to augment production, a policy prevalent in capitalist society. As a result, the rate of production may be boosted temporarily but in no time it may put the socialist economy at stake and endanger the socialist system by generating in all branches of production a speculative trend and by bringing about anarchy in production. As the aim of socialism is to ultimately create abundance in production, in the opinion of these so-called Marxists the working class wants to increase production for individual benefit, both material and cultural. What is more, according to them, socialism will have no meaning to the working class if it cannot provide them with more material benefits in comparison to the advanced

capitalist countries. Under cover of this queer explanation of socialism, the old sense of bourgeois individual freedom and right again reappears in a socialist society. It does not and can never bring proletarian revolutionary dedication among the working class.

Economism in socialist system creates hindrance for identification of individual interest with social interest

This economism that grows among the workers after revolution is different from the economism that prevailed among them before revolution. Distracting the working class from proletarian revolutionary politics, economism offers, before revolution, a scope to the bourgeois and petty bourgeois parties to create cleavage among the working class separating the fighting section from the rest, and thereby creates confusion among the people about the nobility of the revolutionary ideology. Neither does it help the revolutionary consciousness to grow among the workers, nor does it help the revolutionary politics to come to the forefront. The economism in the period after revolution obstructs the development of workers as dedicated cadres of international proletarian revolution in the true sense of the term. It obstructs the development of their sense of obligation to society, of their sense that one's individual freedom can grow and flourish only through complete dedication and spirit of sacrifice, and hinders the realization of its necessity and dampens the urge for it. If there is no serious blunder or shortcoming on the part of the leadership, socialist economy is sure to advance because of the very inherent objective law of the socialist system. But it will not generate, in that case, the cultural and political inspiration among the workers that is so vitally necessary to carry forward the advancement unhindered to its logical goal. As a result, this economism in a socialist system is a great obstacle in the way of identification of individual interest

with social interest. This economism, this hankering for individual benefit, for privilege in a socialist system, which I have already termed 'socialist individualism', fosters this mentality and approach among the workers. One of the main objects of the Cultural Revolution of China is to fight against this tendency as well. This is because, in order to further consolidate their economy they will have to step forward from organizing not only the peasants' commune but also the workers' commune.

And for that, this new type of individualism, a new type of opportunism, based on the individual worker families in the industrial field, will put a great obstacle to the formation of the workers' commune. So, in this phase of economic development of the Chinese society, this too, is a very important point.

Problem of individualism, if severe, will further complicate ideological struggle

Zhou Enlai's initial hesitant attitude to the question of extending the Cultural Revolution to the industrial sector is a clear indication that the influence of economism worked to some extent in him, even if indirectly. Be that as it may, Zhou Enlai was ultimately convinced that in the interest of ensuring uninterrupted advancement of production, extension of Cultural Revolution to the industrial field was an indispensable necessity. Herein lies the advantage of criticizing the defects of an individual without mentioning his name. But so far as Liu Shaoqi is concerned it is clear that no such ideological unity with him has yet been achieved. It may so happen that all attempts for unity may ultimately fail. Now, if in this struggle the political line of Mao Zedong becomes ultimately victorious, it will mean the fall of Liu Shaoqi. But if unity is achieved in the long run then Liu Shaoqi's name will again make it to the top of the list in the bourgeois press where it had been going up and

down. Then what would those people say, who are now painting this struggle as a power conflict between Mao and Liu and are making wild speculations on it ? They cannot find anything other than a power conflict in such a great historic struggle. In this struggle the conduct of both sides may suffer from mechanical approach, and in fact it does. So far as I feel, due to the low level of consciousness of the rank and file communists and the people, the standard which is required for conducting ideological struggle, free from all sorts of influences of individualism, is not there at present. There is no denying the fact that the seed of individualism is very much there in the movement. As a result, may be both Mao and Liu get influenced by this to some extent. What is important to realize is that leanings towards individualism and cult of personality quite unnecessarily creates complications in the course of conduction of this ideological struggle, and its result depends, to a very great extent on the intensity of these leanings towards individualism. If the phenomenon of individualism is very severe and acute in this conflict-contradiction, in this movement, the unity which could have been arrived at relatively early and easily would not only become delayed; what is more, it may even create a complete rupture in the much cherished unity. If the influence of individualism and egocentricism goes beyond limit, then nothing is impossible. But whatever may be the case, one thing is sure that it is not a power conflict. It is a struggle between two opposite lines, two methodological approaches. Perhaps the fact of Mao Zedong's emergence as a great 'hero' before the whole nation might have even hurt and stirred up the personal ego of some individuals. This is quite likely. Those who once accepted Mao as their leader, after having attained higher position, even among them the trend of individualism may manifest itself, and they might have started thinking, in what way are they inferior to Mao ? Under cover of their fight

against the cult of personality what they actually desire is, now let their name get projected a bit. If the mechanical attitude to the leadership persisting among the rank and file communists and the people is indulged, even if for the time being, then Mao Zedong himself may one day fall victim to the cult of personality. But here these are not the main points at issue. Remember, these factors can only help complicate matters — what could have been solved very easily may tend to defy solution. As a result, these may rupture relations between many. For example, many people at different levels have already left the party or been spared — a fate which Liu Shaoqi or some other groups may be awaiting. There may be another big purge in the party. Again, it may so happen that by persuading the majority and through a very negligible purge, the party would be able to solve such a great problem very easily and most successfully. If that happens — the probability being high — there is nothing to be astonished at. The probability lies in the very method adopted — that is the method of involving the whole people in the vortex of the Cultural Revolution.

Some shortcomings in mode of expression

Thirdly, some defects and shortcomings have been noticed in the approach in articles recently published in some Chinese papers and you also have some questions regarding these. It is true that there are certain defects in many of their writings. But here you will have to take another point into consideration. That is, all those who write these articles are not of the same political standard and calibre. It is but quite natural, since there is division of labour. As a result, what happens? One who is assigned the job of writing an article does it, no doubt, on the basis of the party line and thinking and he prepares it the way he has understood the party line. Now, it is quite possible that somebody else may detect certain fundamental deviations in

their expressions later on. But by that time the article has already been published. In such a case, the outsiders may take all that is there in the article as party thought. Does not such a thing happen? In our party, too, such things do happen sometimes. It happens when the comrades who write for party journals do not possess the minimum required standard. But here, too, we must remember another point — even those who possess this minimum required standard, do not have equally powerful pen. One writes very precisely and lucidly while another may be very clumsy and stiff in his writing. Although it may appear to be a little out of place here, still, for further clarification I like to give you one example. You see, when a polemic on some fundamental ideological questions was going on between Yugoslavia and China, I supported the views, the arguments and writings of the CPC countering the revisionist ideas and thoughts and political line of Tito's party. But I have observed that though it was thoroughly against the fundamentals of Marxism, still, how attractively the Communist League of Yugoslavia had presented their views while answering the CPC!

In my opinion, Kardelj is really the father of modern revisionism — Khrushchev is nothing but his shadow. This perverted theoretician has vulgarized and maligned Marxism-Leninism. But there is no denying the fact that he is highly equipped theoretically. That is why his art of placing his viewpoints was more powerful than that of the Chinese writers. Because, Kardelj himself wrote from the Yugoslavian side while from the Chinese side most probably someone from the editorial board wrote all these. All the members of the editorial board are not as highly theoretically equipped as Marx, Engels, Lenin, Stalin or Mao. This is naturally not possible. But, of course, there is a minimum standard of the Chinese writers and we can quite reasonably presume that their minimum standard is much higher than that we are having at present. But it would be

wrong to expect that there would be no mistakes in such type of writings. There may be defects in the mode of presentation and the approach may not always be precise and scientific. I like to place one more point in this connection. There is the problem of falling victim to certain temptations. As, for example, the tendency of bantering, using unnecessary invectives and harsh words and even odd characterization often try to creep into writings. These tendencies very often create a particular mood in the writers which they enjoy and relish. So, the fact remains that the writers very often fall victim to such temptations. Not always can they keep themselves free from it. As a result, it often happens that these writings centring round the cause of revolution and international situation, are not written keeping in view the mindset if not of their opponents' at least of their supporters and the very purpose of such writings. Hence, it causes much harm and in fact some harm has already been done. Only he can write such articles who has got a thorough control over his emotional factors and who knows when and where emphasis has to be given, when and where emotion is to be restrained and how to control emotions and pattern arguments in order to become meaningful and purposive. The members of the editorial board must all be of such a high standard or else all will be lost — it is not proper to think in this way. This, of course, is another aspect of the problem.

Some aspects of theoretical inadequacies of Cultural Revolution

Now, you see, there have been some theoretical weaknesses and inadequacies in the Cultural Revolution of China. I have some submissions — observations and criticisms, fraternal criticisms to make, which I shall elaborate.

In my opinion, a cause for apprehension would still be there unless these theoretical inadequacies as also the

influence of mechanical thinking and practice of the party are done away with in the near future. As you know, as real communists are aware, constant and continuous cult and practice of revisionism-reformism in a socialist country may lead one day to the restoration of capitalism. An expression that such a change can take place even through the process of evolution is found in the writings and literature of the CPC. The CPC holds that regression to capitalism from socialism in Soviet Russia is possible through evolutionary process. Such an expression, in my opinion, is wrong. One thing is sure that coming back to capitalism from socialism is also a fundamental change of society. That cannot take place only through the process of evolution. When restoration of capitalism actually takes place, it must be kept in mind that the change involves also a break, which signifies nothing but a fundamental change. But because the term 'revolution' is always associated with the concept of social progress and advancement and, particularly in social science, the term 'revolution' always connotes progress, the term 'revolutionary change' should not be used in this particular context of change from socialism to capitalism. But in the sense of a fundamental change it is definitely an abrupt change in the opposite direction, that means a counter-revolutionary change. There is a nodal point that marks this abrupt change. In case of such changes in society, the nodal point is not always so easily perceptible. But because it is not so easily perceptible, it cannot be construed from this that such changes involving qualitative transformation of one form of society into another can take place only through the process of evolution. Therefore, in the ultimate analysis, it is always a revolutionary change, an abrupt change, coming as the culmination of evolutionary changes. Now, in this particular context, since the term 'revolutionary change' is not at all appropriate, they could have easily called it a "counter-revolutionary change

following the process of evolution”. Then there would have been no scope for confusion over the term ‘evolution’. Clearly, in this regard there is no clarity of thought. Had not this kind of expression found place in the documents prepared by the highest body of the party leadership, I could have taken it as a lapse due to lack of necessary caution on the part of the writers. Another kind of confusion that might have contributed to such a faulty expression is that counter-revolutionary change also takes place through open confrontation, which is not always true. It may so happen that the revisionists after usurping the leadership of the party may corrupt the revolutionary essence of Marxism, communist outlook, code of conduct, behaviour and practice — slowly, surreptitiously, through subtle devices and polluting by degrees — and thereby degrade the society to such an extent that Marxism-Leninism will remain only in vocabulary, slogans and speeches — its soul having been corroded completely, leading for all practical purposes to substitution of capitalism for socialism. The entire working class may fail to detect and resist this danger in time due to their very low ideological, cultural and political standard. This cannot happen overnight. With the long and continuous practice of revisionism-reformism, this is not altogether impossible. But since this change has taken place — if it takes place at all — not through conflict and open confrontation, it will be definitely wrong to say that this is a sequel to evolutionary change only.

So, it needs to be realized that in this return of society from socialism to capitalism, both the processes — evolutionary and revolutionary, in this case counter-revolutionary, are at work indicating both continuity and break.

Mechanical concept of leadership still prevails

The emergence of Mao Zedong as the great leader of the Chinese Revolution is no doubt a historic event. History

has witnessed the emergence of great leaders to organize revolution in different countries even in the period of classical bourgeois democratic revolutions in the international arena. In the era of proletarian revolution, too, we are witnessing today the emergence of great leaders in those countries where revolution has been successful under the leadership of the working class. But it must be clearly understood that the historic necessity of the emergence of great leaders and their leading role are not one and the same in bourgeois democratic revolution and proletarian revolution; they are fundamentally and qualitatively different in character from each other. And you must understand this difference very clearly.

Since the aim and object of bourgeois democratic revolution was to establish individual and private ownership and control over the means of production, in one sense it was a revolution for the establishment of individual rights and development of individuals, and for that matter, notwithstanding the apparent bourgeois democratic model, that is to say, formal democratic character, it is the individual who constituted the leadership. As a result, individual leadership seemed to be something, providing leadership to the collective as if coming from above.

But since the aim and object of socialist revolution is to establish social ownership and control in place of private and individual ownership and control over the means of production by the people under the leadership of the working class, the concept of working class leadership being the reflection of social ownership over the means of production has developed as collective leadership.

So, collective leadership in the working class party emerges as the collective knowledge of all the members of the party through the process of conflict and interaction of their thoughts and ideas, and the best personification of this collective leadership through an individual leader constitutes

the distinctive feature of the role of leadership of an individual in the present era of proletarian revolution.

So, this is not at all a case of imposing Mao Zedong as the leader over other leaders and workers of the party and the people. But, strangely enough, most of the communist parties of the world, not excluding the CPC, have failed to grasp the significance of the personified expression of the collective leadership of the Chinese Revolution and naturally their concept of leadership, still today, bears testimony to mechanical thinking.

It is true that the common people may not clearly understand today the theoretical aspect of this question of concretized expression of collective leadership through an individual. Under the present circumstances in their activities and behaviour a tendency of blind emotion and mechanical approach to individual leadership is likely to be there. But the theoretical weakness of the Cultural Revolution of China lies in the fact that even those leaders who are accepting and propagating ‘Mao Zedong Thought’ as the gospel truth are not themselves clear as to why they are doing so, nor have they been able to provide the theoretical foundation of collective leadership as being the concretized and personified expression through an individual leader to the world at large.

Of late, whenever the Mao Zedong leadership has been charged with practising cult of personality, they have been heard saying : “As there can be no war without a General so there can be no struggle without a leader — where is the cult of personality in it ?” But through this argument the theoretical basis is not completely established.

The revolutionary splinter group inside the Soviet Union, opposed to the revisionist Soviet leadership, has remarked in their main political documents, first published from Paris, while answering this question : “Yes we accept Mao and Hoxha as our leaders. We are organized under the

leadership of these two Generals. Because, in wars we need Generals. We want to fight and there can be no fight without Generals. The bogey of ‘cult of personality’ or all that is a bourgeois propaganda”.

Collective leadership in a working class party is personified through an individual leader

If the matter is understood in such a simplistic way, then what will happen within the party is that it will weaken the collective leadership as well as the ideological movement. And if this remains the level of understanding then the Cultural Revolution which was organized with a view to continuously uplifting revolutionary consciousness and building up character – even after the immediate tasks of the Cultural Revolution are successfully completed, that level of understanding will again create newer problems and obstacles.

So, the most essential thing that the Chinese leadership ought to have done in this phase of Cultural Revolution before projecting Mao Zedong as a God like authority to the nation and the people, was to free at least the party from all sorts of erroneous conceptions about authority. They should have established on firm theoretical foundation the historic necessity as also the dialectical process of the emergence of collective leadership in the concretized and personified expression through an individual in a working class party, which is distinctly different from the conception of God in idealist philosophy, the conception of bourgeois individual leadership, different from individualism or any kind of blindness. The CPC has not yet been able to do it. It seems that their understanding is confined to the recognition of the practical necessity of projecting Mao Zedong as the leader before the nation. As a result, they are using the name of Mao Zedong quite mechanically. Their point of logic is like this : ‘So long as Mao Zedong is correct, what’s the harm in

it? He is providing us with correct leadership, so we are following him. After all, the leader is a necessity’.

But it is not proper to view this question simply in this way; it has other aspects too. I do also appreciate the need of projecting Mao Zedong as authority before the Chinese people. The name Mao Zedong has its electrifying effect on the Chinese masses. It is a very powerful instrument in the hands of the CPC to rouse the people. It cannot be dismissed. There may be difference in degree, but the necessity of projecting the authority in organizing revolution in different countries will appear in history time and again so long as the theoretical standard of each and every individual of society does not reach a certain higher level. But that the necessary and adequate ideological standard cannot always be maintained in a party at the time of revolution or after it, is quite evident. That has been observed in the Russian Revolution, and also in the Chinese Revolution. The available writings and literature of the CPC bear testimony to this fact.

Again, this method they have been adopting of projecting Mao as leader before the people has for the time being fulfilled the concrete necessity of imbuing the people – all these are very much true. But they have not yet succeeded in providing a scientific formulation on the basis of the dialectical science of logic, reasoning and historical facts regarding the correct concept of emergence of leadership.

It must be kept in mind that so long as the emergence of a leader as the concretized and personified expression of collective leadership does not take place, then no matter the tall claims of collective leadership — it would, in reality, mean nothing but formal democratic leadership. Scientifically speaking, a party is able to give birth to collective leadership only when the collective thinking and knowledge of all the members of the party is concretized

and personified in a most comprehensive, developed and finest way through a leader and this, in fact, is the true and concretized expression of collective leadership of that party.

Only at such a stage of development of collective leadership can a party eliminate the tendencies of ultra-democracy arising from the hidden influence of individualism that is very often found in a party and can give defeat to all such trends and tendencies of individualism appearing in the garb of different types of phrase mongering of democracy, which are alien to all principles of proletarian democracy. But the writings of the CPC reflect, still today, some commonplace understanding about collective leadership. They still cling to the idea, in tune with formal democratic understanding, that the majority decision of the Central Committee is the collective leadership of the party. They have not been able to develop the concept of collective leadership further than this. If the understanding about collective leadership remains at this stage in the background of historic emergence of Mao Zedong as the great leader, then, not to speak of ordinary workers, even the leaders would fall victim to blind and mechanical practices. If those leaders and active workers who are conducting the present struggle remain for long such victims of mechanical concept of leadership, then even after such a magnificent Cultural Revolution, all the evils arising from authoritarianism would rear their ugly heads, one after another, in the Chinese society and in the party. It is therefore essential to become alert about it right now.

Mechanical use of quotations

Recently, a craze has been discernible among the workers of the CPC and the Chinese people of using quotations in general, and those of Mao Zedong in particular. It is true, sometimes it becomes necessary to quote from authorities to make others grasp the truth.

Nobody can deny its necessity. But a lot of problems may be created and in fact are being created if quotations are used blindly and indiscriminately without thoroughly realizing the significance of the quotations, that is, why, under what circumstances, in the face of what problems the particular observation was made. As, for example, in the document of the Eleventh Plenary Session, those persons in authority who are opposing Cultural Revolution have been criticized for giving the directive — “All workers of Cultural Revolution must abide by the decision of the party body”. Criticizing this directive, it has been observed that : “It would add to the blindness and servile attitude of the general workers. Because, Mao Zedong has said that every communist should use his own head”. This way of arguing may, of course, satisfy the immediate object of their struggle against the leading personalities opposing the party, but it is dangerous to argue like this since it can one day bring about a disaster in the inner life of the party. All quotations must be used in their concrete context. But this quotation has been used out of context. Without caring to analyse the concrete context, in which sense and to uphold which truth, this observation has been made, this quotation has been used against such a directive of the party body to follow which is a must for any democratically centralized party in order to conduct its day-to-day activities. Since all these were not elaborately discussed — that is, what was the concrete situation created in the internal organization of the party bodies that necessitated the defiance of such a directive by the followers of the revolutionary line of Mao Zedong and that, through bold defiance was reflected the real consciousness, ethical standard and sense of discipline of the genuine communists — use of this quotation of Mao may encourage among the communist workers an unethical and ultra-democratic tendency in future. Indulgence in unprincipled and ultra-democratic behaviour for satisfying

an immediate interest in the name of fighting blind sense of discipline is surely alien to the principle of Marxist-Leninist sense of discipline and organization.

If, taking advantage of their party position, persons in the leadership use this principle of party discipline that all workers of Cultural Revolution must abide by the decision of the party body with the ulterior object of stifling the Cultural Revolution, organized on the basis of revolutionary political line of the party, then bold and courageous struggle must be conducted against them. The quotation of Mao Zedong has its significance if it is used in the context of a concrete situation with a view to developing a correct understanding about the sense of discipline and the question of allegiance to the party. Where the struggle against a particular party leadership is of fundamental character, and where the struggle has been initiated and permitted to continue by the highest leadership of the party, then if a section of the leaders, taking advantage of their party position, wants to stifle the very struggle under cover of the principle 'all must abide by the decision of party body' — they really aim at developing a kind of vested interest of leadership and sustaining blind allegiance and servility among the workers. If the quotation of Mao Zedong had been used making clear to the people this specific background, I would have nothing to object. But the manner in which it is being used surely suffers from mechanical approach — maybe, today it is going in their favour. But if it is understood mechanically, the same logic may be used by the opponents to incite the people against the leadership. Naturally, there is danger in it. What is the real object of this intense struggle unleashed against the opponents through Cultural Revolution? The main object of this struggle is to reach unity and develop uniformity of thinking among ninetyfive per cent of the party members and the people. This precisely means that they are aiming at re-establishing centralism and finally strengthening it further. It

is with this object of developing a higher form of centralism within the party and in the relationship between the party and the people that this unique, gigantic and complex struggle has been launched. It is, therefore, unwise to do anything only with an eye to the immediate interest. Let us take, for example, another observation of Mao : “The citizens should know and the soldiers should know and work”. It means, for the citizens it would suffice only to know. But only they are soldiers who know and work, who act. This point is not at all new, but what a beautiful expression ! The citizens, that is the common people should know, even if superficially, the theory of revolution and the revolutionary movement. All do not take active part in revolutionary movements. But as they come to know the theory of revolution superficially, they become, no doubt, passive supporters of revolution. They only know and understand superficially — they do not act. But since an inherent process is at work in their knowledge and superficial understanding, they become passive supporters of revolution. But others who take active part in the struggle — Mao Zedong has termed them as soldiers. They should know theories in such a way that they can really apply them in practice. Here, the term ‘to know’ has been used in the sense of real knowledge. The whole thing has been put so beautifully that the word ‘to know’ carries two different connotations representing two different levels of knowledge. One is superficial knowledge and the other the real knowledge. But due to the bad habit of using quotations blindly without knowing their import, many people think that it is possible to grasp theory even without taking active part in the struggle, because, Mao has said that the ‘citizens should know and the soldiers should know and work’. So, where lies the difficulty in knowing theory even without taking active part in the struggle or putting in any work ? Naturally, many will, in that case, consider themselves Marxist-Leninists, though not soldiers, without actively associating themselves with any

struggle. These gentlemen, knowing Marxism-Leninism without struggle, would assume the leadership over the real soldiers, that is, the party workers, and lord it over them. Naturally, what kind of trouble and disturbance it may cause if such a beautiful expression is not understood properly ! That is why nothing should be understood or quoted out of context. These expressions are quite logical and effective in the concrete conditions and if applied correctly and in the right place, they would yield good results. What reflects truth in a particular context and in a given condition does not necessarily reflect the objective truth in another context and in a different condition. This much for the time being regarding the misuse of quotations.

Failure to conduct theoretical struggle against new type of individualism in socialist system

Another serious shortcoming of the Cultural Revolution in the matter of conducting ideological-cultural struggle has come to our notice, and this is very important. If they cannot get over this weakness in the sphere of theoretical and ideological struggles, then the apprehension of the reappearance of the seeds of revisionism in future, which they are attempting to uproot from social life, will remain in spite of the attainment of some immediate objectives of the Cultural Revolution at present.

Through this Cultural Revolution they are seeking to hold aloft the victorious banner of proletarian revolutionary politics driving away the influence of thoughts and ideas of the old society, as well as bourgeois thinking and individualism. They are no doubt conducting struggles against the influence of bourgeois and old reactionary thoughts, ideas and culture which still prevail in the party and social life, but have not yet been able to present a clear and comprehensive outline as to the content and character of proletarian culture. They have not yet been able to provide any theoretical

formulation, borne out by history, as to the fundamental difference between the moral-ethical concepts and sense of values of bourgeois humanist culture and proletarian culture. True, they are speaking of proletarian humanism as against bourgeois humanism, but a careful study would reveal that their struggle is in the main directed against bourgeois humanist ideology and political thoughts, but not so much against bourgeois culture. In the realm of sense of values in life and concept of morality, they have not yet been able to establish the moral and ethical values of proletarian culture as against bourgeois humanist values. As a result, at this stage of development of the Chinese society, the theories and approach that they are presenting in conducting the ideological struggle are quite inadequate to free the society from the influence of individualism. The problems with which the Chinese society is confronted today have a new aspect. It is that simultaneously with the attainment of relative stability in the economic and political spheres in the socialist society, the tendency of reducing individual freedom, sense of individuality and emancipation of the individual to an individual privilege is growing, which I have already termed as 'socialist individualism', meaning a new type of privilege seeking in socialist society. Naturally, mere reiterations of the old theories, differing only in language, will not help eliminate its influence over the people. With the passing of this phase, the present phase of Cultural Revolution, stability will come. Again a wave of struggles followed by a period of stability will appear in succession. And during every such period of stability this new kind of individualism will be gathering in strength unnoticed and is sure to affect the party and the leadership. Remember, even today, the ideological appeals of the CPC that have been found effective in rousing and inspiring the people are essentially based on the spirit of self-sacrifice stemming from the bourgeois humanist values, that is to say, surrendering self-interest to the interest of

society and revolution and fulfilling social responsibilities. The principal tenor of this appeal is attuned to bourgeois humanism. They possess no other higher and more developed ideological weapon, higher ethical and moral concepts of proletarian culture for rousing and inspiring the people. They are still attempting to lead the masses with the same old sense of moral and ethical values and the earlier exhortations of Mao Zedong. The writings of Mao Zedong had proved quite adequate to face and tackle the complexities and problems of class struggle in the background of backwardness of the Chinese society that existed before the revolution and even for a certain period after the revolution.

So, the writings of Mao Zedong have been found inspiring to those who still today are fighting in the jungles of Vietnam or even to us, considering the present relatively backward stage of class struggle in our country. But much of the old teachings of Mao Zedong cannot have that exact bearing, significance and impact on those communists of the new generation who are and will be living at a relatively still higher stage of economic and industrial development in the socialist society. As a result, many of the old teachings of Mao Zedong have, in that sense, become obsolete and exhausted to some extent. So, in the present socialist society of China, it is incumbent on the leadership to present anew and clearly to the communists and the people at large what should be the essence of proletarian moral values and culture and what should be its content. In order to imbue the communists and the progressive individuals of those countries which have relative economic stability and those bourgeois democratic countries where the sense of individual freedom has already been reduced to individual privileges, it is essential to show the historical limitations of the bourgeois humanist values and wherein lies its reactionary role as well as what should be the newer concepts of proletarian moral values and culture.

Old standard of communist values inadequate in present complex situation

I have already pointed out that the consciousness that one needs to adjust one's individual necessity to social necessity, that one needs to surrender one's individual's interest to social interest — this consciousness basically reflects bourgeois humanist level of consciousness. Up till now, the highest standard of communist moral values was considered to have been reflected in this, and only they were considered to be the real communists who were able to surrender unconditionally the individual interest to social interest, place the cause of revolution and party above all and subordinate individual interest to the cause of revolution and party. And in *On Communist Education* by Kalinin, this was considered to be the highest standard of communist consciousness. Also in the book *How To Be A Good Communist* written by Liu Shaoqi — although of late this book is being severely criticized and discarded, but once it was approved by the Central Committee of the CPC and considered a highly acclaimed document — this has been regarded as the real communist standard. But in today's changed situation this cannot be regarded as a very high standard of communist consciousness so far as communist character is concerned. Because, it is found that living under the exploitative capitalist system, individual freedom and sense of individuality is being reduced to individual privileges on a wide scale and the individual's indifferent attitude to social problems is on the increase daily. After right of equality in the bourgeois sense has really been established in socialist society and individual freedom and sense of individuality has been completely freed from the bourgeois and feudal repression, an individual is enjoying more and more freedom, greater benefits and opportunities. But in a socialist society, since the state still exists the individual's struggle for emancipation has entered into a new historical phase. In this situation, what stands as the main

stumbling block in the way of the individual's emancipation today is that while enjoying more and more facilities and amenities in the socialist society, the sense of individual freedom and individuality in the communists would give birth to a new kind of sense of privilege if a correct theoretical concept and understanding corroborated by history cannot be provided. So, sufficient light must be thrown on the newer problems confronting man's struggle for emancipation in the socialist society.

Without freeing society from influence of socialist individualism, the state would not wither away

The contradiction that exists between the individual interest and the social interest is antagonistic in nature. So long as the antagonistic contradictions between the individual interest and social interest remain, the state will not wither away, i.e., it will not disappear even after the problems relating to production and other issues have been resolved. The state, even though it is a socialist state, is after all an instrument of coercion. A bourgeois state differs from a socialist state in the sense that while the former is a coercive instrument to curb the interest of ninety-nine per cent of the people of the country to protect the interest of one per cent, the latter is a coercive machinery that frustrates the counter-revolutionary attempts and reactionary activities of the one per cent to safeguard the interest of ninety-nine per cent of the society. And so long as the state exists as a reflection of this antagonistic contradiction, even in socialism the individual must have to submit to the social interest, and the trend of revolt against the repressive character of the socialist state would appear repeatedly in individuals and, for this, the social objective would suffer time and again. Time and again the individual would revolt and his indifferent attitude towards social problems would grow more and more. As a result, the appeal of the nobility

of communist ideology and the power of communist dedication would lose their attraction, or it would lead to the trend of liberalization. In other words, more and more demands for greater individual freedom and rights would be raised. And if this process continues, then this would give birth to revisionism and that would only help in the restoration of capitalism.

Therefore, the problem is to be viewed in the following way. It is to be understood that in socialism, right is not to be wrested from anyone, i.e., the question of achieving freedom or acquiring rights fighting against any ruling class no more arises in the socialist society. Because of the continuance of class struggle in the socialist society, the oppression by the state still remains necessary to some extent — mainly to curb the conspiratorial activities of the dispossessed bourgeoisie and the vile self-centred individualistic activities of certain individuals that stand in the path of development of the individual's real freedom and complete emancipation with the gradual development of the socialist social system. The problem is not that any exploiting class is oppressing the people to exploit them. The matter is not so at all. In the socialist society of today, it is the old bourgeois mindset or prejudiced idea of individual freedom that stands in the way of conducting a new form of struggle at this new stage for the individual's freedom and emancipation. And this old mental make-up is obstructing the individual necessity and individual interest from merging and becoming identified with the social necessity and social interest. At this new stage of social development, this stands as the main obstacle in the way of the individual's emancipation. And if this persists, class struggle would not cease completely even after the disappearance of class as an economic category, and because of the poisonous effect of individualism the state would not wither away. As a result, the individual would not be

completely free from coercion of the state. Because, so long as the state exists — it exists with its coercive character in whatever form it may be.

Only through identification of individual interest with social interest will individual attain real emancipation

So, while conducting the struggle for the complete victory of socialism, the main object of the struggle for the emancipation of the individual should be to transform the antagonistic nature of contradiction existing between the individual necessity and social necessity into a non-antagonistic one. It is only by achieving a complete success in this struggle through cultural revolution that a basic and qualitative transformation in the content and outlook of the individual's desire and its fulfillment would take place. After passing through successive stages of cultural revolution, when the socialist society reaches such an advanced stage, then and then only can the state wither away. Then only would the individual be free from all sorts of social coercion. *So, it is obvious that the individual's struggle for emancipation has reached a new and complex height and has assumed a new character in the socialist society, where to resolve this problem an arduous struggle is to be conducted for complete identification of the self-interest with the interest of society through unflagging dedication and constant endeavour.* Hence, it is a new standard of ethics-morality and sense of values that is completely different from the old level of bourgeois humanist values which so long have been applied in practice to inspire and attract the workers and cadres in the communist movement. So far, the standard of morality which worked in proletarian revolutionary politics was that the individual interest must be regarded as secondary to the greater cause of social interest. But if the standard of consciousness remains at the same level in the present new and completely changed situation of the socialist social

system, then it is impossible to achieve complete dedication and arrest the trend of individualism. If the standard of communist morality is allowed to remain static at this point, then the trend and tendency of individualism would certainly continue to remain within the society despite pious wishes and tall talks on proletarian cultural revolution or merely recognizing the necessity of continuously lifting proletarian politics towards its revolutionary transformation. The influence of ego and bourgeois individualism, in some form or other, would be at work in the society so long as the vanity and mental complex of self-sacrifice would be there. So, the mental complex of self-sacrifice should be lifted and transformed, yielding place to real recognition of social necessity.

So, from the discussions we have had so far, it would be clear how subtly, surreptitiously and under newer garbs, the old bourgeois thoughts and ideas are working within the socialist society. The Chinese leadership, in my opinion, while fighting individualism, has moved close to grasping the root cause of the problem. But till now, they have not succeeded in providing a clear and precise theoretical basis of the problem I have discussed so far.

Unless theoretical weakness can be removed danger of revisionism reappearing in future remains

First of all, the whole problem is to be grasped conceptually, giving it a firm theoretical basis. And thereafter, a countrywide powerful movement has got to be developed centring round this new concept of communist morality. But the Cultural Revolution of China has not yet been able to take up this problem in this light. The object of the Cultural Revolution in China is to fight and eradicate that very individualism for which some of the leaders and workers are taking to the capitalist road, falling victim to bourgeois ideology, behaving bureaucratically, reflecting in their

behaviour the trend of economism, pursuing revisionist outlook and path, and within the army are placing the importance of arms and weapons above unity on the basis of proletarian revolutionary consciousness. The object of this Cultural Revolution is, therefore, to create such a condition that the entire Chinese nation can stand as 'one man' against all adversaries and cope with all the problems confronting their society by eradicating and freeing the people from the influence of these evils. The immediate objective of the Cultural Revolution will be fulfilled, for the present, with the completion of these tasks. But the present programme of Cultural Revolution will not be able to free the party completely from the danger of reappearance of revisionism in future. That the individual's struggle for emancipation assumes a new and complex character in a socialist society — they have not been able to correctly grasp the nature of this particular phenomenon and give it a theoretical basis. Because of this, they have not yet been able to incorporate this theoretical understanding as the focal point of the cultural movement in the struggle to raise the standard of consciousness at least among the cadres and the rank and file of the party inspiring them with a higher sense of responsibility to the society. Only if a cultural movement throughout the length and breadth of the country can be released on the sound basis of the above theoretical understanding, this realization would dawn upon them and herein lies the real emancipation of the individual. This is one of the fundamental weaknesses of the present Cultural Revolution.

If this weakness persists, then although the present problems confronting the Cultural Revolution would no doubt be resolved, and the immediate tasks ahead achieved, but certain other issues as the offshoot of the Cultural Revolution would remain unresolved. For example, the mechanical concept about leadership would continue to exist and not be

fought out. Moreover, the reason as to why the tendency of individualism is gaining in strength still now they have not been able to comprehend that philosophically and theoretically, and regarding individualism, that is to say, the tendency of individualism in socialism — what is its character and how to eradicate it — they have not been able to pinpoint it in a fundamental formulation, nor released on its basis an all-out struggle embracing the leaders as well as the workers. As a result, even after the conclusion of such a magnificent Cultural Revolution, the new, the coming generation would fall into the clutches of this new type of individualism and hence become the victim of a new type of revisionism, unless the Communist Party of China is able to conceptually realize it or someone can bring it home to them and they can thus integrate this theoretical understanding with their programme of Cultural Revolution.

Speech delivered on October 27, 1967.

First published in a special issue of *Ganadabi* in January, 1968.

NOTES

1. Afterwards, this speech was adopted in its entirety by the Central Committee at its session held on 25 and 26 February, 1969.
2. Comrade Ghosh delivered this speech on the 27th October, 1967. Till then Liu Shaoqi was at the helm of the state. Later on when this speech was published as a booklet on the 6th October, 1970, after being adopted by the Central Committee, Liu Shaoqi had already been removed from that post. And afterwards he was expelled from the party.