

The Tenth Congress of the Communist Party of China

Zhou Enlai's Report to the Tenth Congress of the CPC contained revelations about Lin Biao, confirming our party's analysis of the Ninth Congress. The Tenth Congress expounded some inestimable teachings vindicating our party's line of thinking ever since its inception.

Comrades,

You have heard the questions raised at this meeting on the Report and Constitution of the Communist Party of China at its Tenth Congress. I shall discuss, keeping in view all these questions and on the basis of deliberations on this in our Central Committee, and try to see that no important points are left out.

While dealing with the Report of the Ninth Congress of the CPC, you know that even though, on the whole, we were in agreement with the main political line of the Ninth Congress we had severely criticized some aspects of the Report presented by Lin Biao's and two clauses of the Constitution. I feel we should keep in view the Ninth Congress first of all while we discuss the Report placed by Zhou Enlai at the Tenth Congress — because, you have all noted, this Tenth Congress has upheld, and in fact reiterated, the main political line and analysis of the Ninth Congress. So we should not forget even for a moment that the Tenth Congress has adopted the same political line as that of the Ninth Congress.

Why this Tenth Congress

At the very outset, a question may arise: What was the necessity for this Tenth Congress? On examination, the answer we find is: on the one hand, to show how by defeating the Lin Biao clique they have defended the party's base political line from the danger of deviation posed by the political activities of the Lin Biao leadership arising out of his influence in the sphere of thinking and organizational activities; and, on the other, to decide which principles they will adopt to combat whatever remains still of that danger within society to implement the base political line of the Ninth Congress — all these issues were discussed in the Tenth Congress. In other words, the Tenth Congress aimed at freeing the political line of the Ninth Congress and the party from Lin Biao's impact or legacy and, at the same time, at eliminating the mistakes, inconsistencies, anomalies, platitudes and many unnecessary things that crept into the Report of the Ninth Congress, using the occasion to rectify these drawbacks in the political line of the Ninth Congress and the Constitution. Another object was to take lessons from the very process of struggle, the very weapon with which the Lin Biao clique was defeated at this stage — although we are not sure whether the Lin Biao clique has been defeated completely and the entire party freed from his legacy — and to prepare the party and the people as a whole for struggle on the basis of some definite principles, so that, if the struggle between two-lines centring round the contradiction between the bourgeoisie and the proletariat arises within the party in future, the struggle in the party can be conducted taking correct course on the basis of Marxism-Leninism and Mao Zedong Thought, and firm strides taken towards victories of socialism, one after another, by consolidating the dictatorship of the proletariat.

Now, there are some remarkable aspects of the Report of the Tenth Congress which we cannot but note. I shall

mention these during this discussion and give my views thereon. But before that I wish to draw attention to some points, only by grasping which correctly we shall be able to play our role in the country and abroad and avail of whatever limited scope is there to influence the international communist movement ideologically. But that will depend on whether we are able to take necessary lessons from all developments and realize the mistakes properly. So we should neither underestimate ourselves or others, nor overestimate or unnecessarily praise ourselves and others. We should examine dispassionately which analyses of the Tenth Congress have confirmed the contributions of our party in the ideological sphere. Only then would this discussion be purposive.

Why we did not publish our analysis of the Ninth Congress

Our comrades have surely noted that whatever apprehensions we had expressed about Lin Biao while discussing the Report of the Ninth Congress by studying some symptoms and basing ourselves on the law of probability, despite insufficient data on hand, have now been proved to be correct. Though our analysis on the Ninth Congress Report was not published, those among you present then at the General Body meeting on that occasion would surely recall the party's analysis. I had explained then why we could not publish our analysis and I reiterate it now. You surely remember that I had requested the Central Committee not to publish our analysis. Because, although the Central Committee had accepted my analysis based on the law of probability, we had no factual data to prove it, nor did we know all the events and developments. Having taken note of and observed all this — and that too from outside — simply by applying the law of probability some things struck my mind: about these I made certain comments and expressed my opinion. Whatever we might feel about the

shortcomings of the CPC, since we had no materials to substantiate our reading, we thought it irresponsible to conclude only on the basis of our study ; more so because this would help in maligning and objectively undermining the prestige and authority of the CPC and Mao who, in spite of some mistakes and shortcomings, had, in the main, held aloft the noble banner of revolution in the international communist movement. And this is what we did not want to do, for we know that had we then published our analysis, in reality it would have objectively strengthened those parties and forces who were opposing the revolutionary line of the CPC.

Some comrades argued then in favour of publishing our analyses on the Ninth Congress and Lin Biao, saying if history subsequently confirmed this analysis to be correct, that would have a startling effect. I retorted : ‘Yes, we can certainly do so if our object is to show how learned we are and flaunt our pedantry’. But it can never be our object to project in an obnoxious manner how learned, how great men of knowledge we are. There is another, more important aspect; we cannot afford to do anything that might lower the prestige of the CPC and undermine the authority of Mao Zedong which, despite some shortcomings, limitations or defects of mechanical approach in some cases, already pointed out, has a profound contribution to and a powerful role in the revolutionary movement.

During personal discussions, some comrades even apprehended that if we published it later, there would be no dearth of people who would disbelieve us, and say that we were blowing up the whole thing and thus belittle its importance. I told those comrades only this : ‘We cannot decide on the basis of what such people of evil intent think of us, people who have never been able to happily accept the glorious role of our party, rather, who harbour envy ; more important is, we should not do anything unethical’. All of you know that our Central Committee endorsed this view

and so our analysis on the Ninth Congress has so far not been published.

But now the CPC itself is criticizing openly the activities of the Lin Biao clique and trying to rectify some of the mistakes committed at the Ninth Congress from the forum of the Tenth Congress, thus creating an atmosphere conducive to healthy discussion. So, I see no reason not to publish now our old observations and analyses. In fact, it has been decided by our Central Committee to publish our analysis on the Ninth Congress together with that on the Tenth.

The Tenth Congress confirmed our earlier analysis

At the very outset I said that our comrades should seriously note some viewpoints and analyses put forward by the CPC in its Tenth Congress Report. Because, since the inception of our party we have been trying to highlight certain issues in the realm of ideological struggle within the communist movement — and so far we have not seen any recognized leadership in the international communist movement talking in support of it — now this has happened for the first time at the Tenth Congress of the CPC. A little discussion would reveal that many observations in the Tenth Congress Report corroborate the analyses of our party made long back. If we can bring these home, that would not only help to strengthen our party and give a fillip to our activities, but would at the same time prove the historical truth that judged from the point of view of party leadership, its characteristic features and process of thinking, ours is the only genuine communist party in India and that in spite of our limited capacity, we have been able to make some contribution to the international communist movement. However, we shall be successful in this task only if we can understand the party's line correctly and apply it always in conformity with our main objective.

We had noted that there were two vital aspects in the

main political line of the Ninth Congress Report. *First*, to determine the principal contradictions in the present-day world and accordingly decide the main features of the foreign policy of China. *Second*, to decide the basic political approach of the party with respect to consolidating the dictatorship of the proletariat during the entire transitional period from when the people's democratic revolution of China entered into the stage of socialist revolution and the establishment of socialism.

Besides, at the Ninth Congress, they had inserted some new clauses, not only in the Report but in the Constitution, too. I do not know how many of you, comrades, are aware of the difference between saying something in the Political Report and incorporating it in the Constitution. It is no doubt important when something is said in the Political Report; but as soon as it is incorporated in the Constitution its importance increases manifold — it becomes binding to a great extent, for a certain period, somewhat binding on the party. It is no longer something which could be visualized one way today and differently tomorrow. Political workers should be very much conscious about this.

Be that as it may, you have surely noted that those two paragraphs of the Constitution adopted at the Ninth Congress, where Mao Zedong Thought was described as Marxism-Leninism of the era, and the present era was characterized as a new one, in the same way as Khrushchev had described the present era as the era of disintegration of imperialism, have both been omitted from the Constitution in the Tenth Congress. The two paragraphs deleted are : "... Mao Zedong Thought is Marxism-Leninism of the era in which imperialism is heading for total collapse and socialism is advancing to worldwide victory.

... and in the great struggle of the contemporary international communist movement against imperialism, modern revisionism and the reactionaries of various countries, Comrade Mao Zedong has integrated the universal

truth of Marxism-Leninism with concrete practice of revolution, inherited, defended and developed Marxism-Leninism and has brought it to a higher and a *completely new stage.*” (emphasis added)

**Despite important changes in international situation,
there has been no basic change
in the character of present era**

Thus, our criticism of these two clauses stands vindicated by this decision of the Tenth Congress. While dealing with the Ninth Congress Report and Constitution, I had discussed at length to show why, first of all, despite accepting Mao Zedong as a leading communist authority, Mao Zedong Thought cannot be called the Marxism-Leninism of the era, and, secondly, although many significant changes have taken place in the post-Second World War situation, the present period still remains the “era of imperialism, war and proletarian revolution” as characterized by Lenin and there has been no fundamental qualitative change. I do not want to go into all that again. The Tenth Congress, however, by deleting these two clauses from the Constitution, has vindicated the correctness of our analysis.

Our veteran comrades would surely remember that when Khrushchev was dreaming of peaceful transition to socialism and had started saying in justification that it was no more the era of “imperialism, war and proletarian revolution”, but the “era of disintegration of imperialism”, it was even at that time, in 1959-60, that I wrote in the article *War and Peace, Peaceful Co-existence and Peaceful Transition to Socialism* that “...every Marxist-Leninist must know that every epoch is bound to witness, in the natural process of its development, various vital changes. But notwithstanding these changes, the principal characteristic features of the epoch remain in force...”, that is, it remains the era of

imperialism, war and proletarian revolution as enunciated by Lenin.

Now, compare what Zhou Enlai has said in the Tenth Congress Report : “Since Lenin’s death, the world situation has undergone great changes. But the era has not changed. The fundamental principles of Leninism are not outdated; they remain the theoretical basis, guiding our thinking today.” So, one thing is clear. Just as Khrushchev had characterized this as a new era to establish his revisionist theory, so also Lin Biao, in the name of fighting revisionism, chewed the cud of the same Khrushchevite theory. Therefore, in evaluating the present era, Lin Biao committed the same mistake as Khrushchev did.

Only our party made a comprehensive appraisal of the Ninth Congress

I do not know what is the concept of leader or leadership of those who support the CPC and regard Mao Zedong as an authority. But it is true that if a leader has ever been let down, it is not by his enemies, but by his so-called disciples. This is what has happened all along. It is the disciples who have let down the leader by following him blindly, offering wrong interpretations, interpreting him in an opportunistic manner, and considering him to be infallible. Many followers of Mao Zedong whether they admit it or not, consider him to be above committing mistakes. Again, some people in our country even started saying that Lin Biao was a greater revolutionary than Mao and upheld the correct line. These people will now either become anti-communist and talk nonsense or without much fuss accept just the opposite. These kind of problems have always cropped up with the ultra-revolutionaries.

So, despite recognizing the fact that it was the CPC which was holding high the banner of international revolution, we had made criticisms of the various lapses in

the Ninth Congress Report which no other party, whether pro-CPC or opposing it, had undertaken. The main objection of those who opposed the CPC was that the Ninth Congress Report indulged in Mao-cult and they strongly objected to the use of the term “successor”. They condemned the very concept of “successor” as something alien to Marxism. Besides these two, the CPI(M)¹ Polit Bureau added just one more point which was : Lenin had already provided historical analysis of the indispensable necessity of continuing class struggle under the dictatorship of the proletariat, and the CPI(M) could not agree with the claim by Lin Biao in the Ninth Congress Report that the observations of Mao Zedong on these questions were new additions to the theory and practice of Marxism. They referred also to some more quotations from Lenin on the same questions which had not been cited in Lin Biao Report. But they did not go any further.

In our discussion on the Ninth Congress Report we dealt with not only these points but provided analysis on the standard of this party, its mentality of blindly showering undue praise on the leader, the theoretical inconsistencies, the character of Lin Biao leadership as well as on whether Mao Zedong Thought could be called the Marxism-Leninism of the era and, if not, why not, and many other such important points. Of course, while criticizing the CPC, the CPI(M), despite what it professed, did so with an attitude similar to that of the CPI, to malign the CPC and undermine Mao’s authority. But our party criticized the CPC from fraternal outlook with the object of strengthening Mao’s correct leadership. There should be no difficulty in realizing this. So we can claim with all humility that, to our knowledge, ours was the only communist party in the world which made a comprehensive critical discussion on the Report and the Constitution of the Ninth Congress. And you have seen what the CPC has now said on those questions at the Tenth Congress is almost similar to our earlier criticism.

So, they have virtually confirmed the truth of our stand.

In this connection, I cannot but mention one point. You know, our party, since its inception, even while truly accepting the international communist leadership, has been adhering to the principle that our relation with this leadership is not mechanical but governed by the principle of unity and struggle and pointed out and criticized any failings of theirs. Because, Marxism teaches us that as loyalty to a leadership does not mean blind copying, so also criticizing it does not mean flouting or undermining it. It is of vital importance for every Marxist to differentiate between the two, for, the object of this criticism is to help the leadership rectify its mistakes and strengthen it on the basis of Marxist norms of criticism. But we had to face adverse criticism and derisions for this. Those who did not understand that criticism of the leadership was for strengthening it, used to ridicule our comrades and say : “You think that you are very wise, and that no one in the world is so intelligent as your leaders are ! With no capacity to accomplish anything, how dare you criticize such big parties in the international communist movement ?” But now we see, it is not that the capacity for thinking will be limited just because the capacity for work is limited — Karl Marx did not graciously formulate like this in any of his articles or treatises ! Rather, just the opposite is to be found there. A man may have to “go against the tide” to uphold a truth — this is what all great Marxist leaders of the world have taught us time and again.

In the Tenth Congress, Mao Zedong has again emphatically asserted this and upheld the lesson that to go against the tide is the quality of a good communist. He has said that in the interest of upholding the correct political line, good communists do not hesitate to even swim against the tide. That is, good communists have never deserted the correct line out of fear of being isolated and ultimately it is they who have come out victorious.

Ideological and political lines determine everything

See, what has been stated in the Report of the Tenth Congress; it has been stated: "... 'The correctness or incorrectness of the ideological and political line decides everything'. If one's line is incorrect, one's downfall is inevitable even with the control of the central, local and army leadership. If one's line is correct and even if one has not a single soldier at first, there will be soldiers, and even if there is no political power, political power will be gained. This is borne out by the historical experience of our Party and by that of the international communist movement since the time of Marx. Lin Biao wanted to 'have everything under his command and everything at his disposal', but he ended up in having nothing under his command and nothing at his disposal. The crux of the matter is this. This is an irrefutable truth."

So, what do we find ? We find the CPC saying that Lin Biao had everything, but what he did not have was the correct political line. And that is why today he has lost everything he once had. The same holds good for Liu Shaoqi, too. At one time he usurped control over everything—the party, the state and the military power. But although he had so much, he did not possess the most important thing, the correct political line. That is why they all have been thrown onto the dustbin of history. And those who did have then nothing except the correct political line have today regained everything.

Please note that although it is such a gigantic, established and powerful party, the CPC is laying the main stress on and giving the utmost importance to the correctness or incorrectness of political line rather than the strength of the party. They are not teaching their cadres, the countrymen and the working class of the world to judge like this that since their party is so big and powerful, that alone proves their political line to be correct.

But both the big so-called communist parties in our country are exhorting their party workers and the people to approach this question just the other way round. They are trying to make use of the greater strength and popular support, relatively speaking, which they enjoy at present compared to the others. Without laying stress on analysis of ideology and base political line, they are stressing the party strength which they possess and are thus explaining to their workers that since the strength of their party is big, their base political line must be correct ; otherwise, how have they gained in strength ? In this way, they are diluting the importance of examining the base political line and engendering the tendency of fanatic arrogance of strength inside the party. Just this single point, if intently observed, makes it clear what sort of parties these are ! So, today, when all over the world and particularly in our country, the opportunist tendency to swim with the tide and side with the more powerful is widespread in political movements, the way the CPC, a mighty revolutionary party of international renown, has attached such importance to the question of correctness of ideology and base political line is, I think, of great significance.

**The hard and arduous struggle
to build up SUCI(C) as genuine party of the
proletariat on correct base political line**

It was by strictly sticking to this principle that our party was born on the Indian soil. Right from the inception of our party till now, we have all through laid utmost stress on this Marxist-Leninist principle. Today, many new comrades would not perhaps be quite able to comprehend what was our position then. Remember, when we, just a handful in number, dreamt of building a genuine revolutionary party of the proletariat in such a vast country with virtually no resources at all, we were all unknown and very common

political workers indeed. There was not even a single reputed leader among us. Except conviction, dedication, determination, correct ideology and correct revolutionary political line, we had nothing else, no resources at all, no experienced worker to speak of. But we were determined to conduct a relentless struggle, braving all difficulties and adversity, against the then prevailing current, just on the basis of dedication to ideology and the correct revolutionary political line. Remember, at that time, when the so-called communist party in our country was recognized by the international communist leadership, political workers and all those who were attracted towards Marxism-Leninism and communist movement, naturally felt inclined to support the CPI.

This situation created an enormous obstacle before us in building up our new party. Even in the minds of those whom we could convince on questions relating to theory and political line and who understood us somewhat, a question cropped up again and again, making them hesitant to take up the correct course : ‘Such a small party you are. Will you be able to achieve your goal ? Is it at all possible ? Your energy and labour are being wasted’. Veteran comrades surely would recall what we replied then.

At that time we stated in unequivocal terms : the decisive point to be realized is whether the viewpoint and stand of our party, from its base political line and covering all aspects of the realm of thought, are correct or not. If those are correct, then struggle would have to be conducted on the basis of those only. It won’t do to be afraid of or shy away on any pretext ; one would have to swim against the tide ; to join a party calling itself communist simply because it is big—even if that party is wrong, and joining it a blunder—this tendency would have to be fought ; the mentality for conducting such a struggle would have to be acquired. If it is true that the party calling itself communist has not developed with the character of a communist party and is in

reality a petty bourgeois social democratic party, then the revolutionaries have no option but to strive relentlessly to form a revolutionary party'. See, a very important teaching of Engels has been cited in the Tenth Congress Report. Engels said that Marx and he himself spent a lot of time fighting against the pseudo socialists; that they had not come to fight against any individual bourgeois, for they regarded the bourgeoisie as a class and on its basis conducted struggles. All these have but one meaning, that is, one and all have to imbibe the attitude of sticking to the line and not budging even an inch. So, it has been said that if the base political line is correct, then struggle for sticking to the line; do not waver even an inch this or that way under any pressure. Such strength of mind is to be attained. None should deviate from ideology and the base political line and drift towards those who have at present bigger manpower and exert greater influence and dominating power over the people.

We have repeatedly said that if the parties with wrong ideology and base political line are strengthened on any pretext, then not only does it not achieve anything fruitful but, worse still, such parties with enhanced strength do much greater harm to the people's movements and eventually put greater obstacles in the path of revolution. But if the ideology and base political line are correct, then even if the strength of a party is meagre to start with, it goes on increasing from one to two, two to five, from hundred to thousand and so on, by going on to win the support of millions of people—that party ultimately captures political power and wins the world. You all know, it is by grasping this fundamental teaching that our party began its journey. This basic teaching is not only a teaching of Marxism-Leninism of the present times; it has been a noble teaching of ethics of all ages. In every age, even in the distant past when religion had to make its way against various obstacles and advance and raise its head high amidst strong adversity,

the religious preachers, too, had to uphold this teaching and work with it. Although the wording and phraseology appear to be similar, the realization of this teaching has been different in different ages in accordance with the specific necessity, ideology and object of struggle. The religious preachers had one conception of this invaluable sense of ethics, the bourgeoisie or the petty bourgeoisie had another, while today this conception has assumed a new form on the basis of the class struggle of the proletarian revolutionaries and the new complexities of life. In this ever changing world even the understanding of any principle is not static ; it is not rigid but dynamic—it has a distinct form within the limits of a particular time and specific category of understanding. Nobody but the Marxist-Leninists understand this.

So, as I was saying, a correct proposition, a truth, a correct analysis gains much greater importance and makes a deeper imprint on people's mind when it is put forward by the leadership of a party of the CPC's standing and tradition than if it is said or done by a small party like ours having no international recognition and not enough organizational strength. Thus the decisive point on which we have all along laid great stress has now been confirmed at the Tenth Congress. Understood correctly, the significance of this observation of the Tenth Congress becomes : If you want to be a revolutionary and want to bring about revolution, learn to go against the prevailing tide for the sake of truth, ideology and correct line. In the face of arduous struggle, no revolutionary suffers from despondency ; rather, to brave the odds with courage is the true hallmark of a revolutionary. Besides, as the guideline for identifying the correct line from the wrong one, the Tenth Congress quoted Mao Zedong thus : "Practise Marxism, and not revisionism ; unite and don't split ; be open and above board, and don't intrigue and conspire". We too have time and again stressed the importance of realizing the correct line. You all know, we began with the motto of relentless struggle on the basis of

the correct line, and we are guided by this even today. The real strength of our party lies in such mental make-up of our workers and leaders.

There is no doubt that this guideline of the Tenth Congress will be very useful to us if our comrades can correctly point out that even such a long time after making revolution successful, the CPC still considers the struggle of pursuing the correct line to be the most important struggle. Between ideology, principle and strength, they have given priority to ideology-principle, and have sought to build up strength for giving concrete shape to the correct ideology and principles.

A question has come seeking clarification whether the Tenth Congress Report has considered the struggle between the two superpowers for hegemony to be the major contradiction in the present era. This question really has no leg to stand on. Such confusion has arisen because of the inability to grasp that it is the main political line of the Ninth Congress that has in fact been adopted at the Tenth—minus the Lin Biao legacy and after rectification of some shortcomings and mistakes.

Our assessment of newly independent countries correct

While discussing the Ninth Congress Report, dealing with the four major contradictions of the present-day world, we had said that the contradiction of the newly independent resurgent nationalist countries with imperialism, on the one hand, and with the socialist camp, on the other, that is appearing in diverse forms should be given due importance.

You know that as early as 1959-60, we marked the emergence of the newly independent resurgent nationalist countries of Asia and Africa as a very important development in the international arena in the post-Second World War period. And even if one had reservations in accepting the contradiction of the newly independent bourgeois nationalist

countries with imperialism, on the one hand, and the socialist countries, on the other, as the fifth contradiction along with the four major contradictions of the era enunciated by Lenin - Stalin we suggested laying equal stress on this at least — because it was influencing the international events and the four contradictions — as if it were acting as the fifth contradiction. Because, the contradiction that came about centring round the emergence of the newly independent nationalist countries could not really be placed in the category of the contradiction between imperialism and national liberation struggle. Therefore, if one does not understand the true character and role of this contradiction in influencing the four major contradictions in the present-day world, the attempt to go by only the four major contradictions specified by Lenin would be tantamount to falling into the clutches of dogmatism.

After all these 14-15 years, the CPC, while it discussed the role of the Third World in the Tenth Congress Report, has placed a viewpoint which, although not exactly the same as ours, is largely similar to it. It has been said at the Tenth Congress: "The awakening and the growth of the Third World is a *major event* in the contemporary international relation. The Third World ... is playing an even more *significant role* in international affairs". (emphasis added)

So you see, the emergence of the Third World has been viewed to be a major event in contemporary international relation, that is, in influencing the four major contradictions enunciated by Lenin - Stalin. Again, it has also been said that the Third World is playing an increasingly significant role in international affairs, that is, in influencing the four major contradictions viewed by Lenin -Stalin. If by emergence of the Third World the CPC implies the emergence of the resurgent nationalist countries of Asia-Africa-Latin America, then through this stand at the Tenth Congress, they have virtually concurred with our conclusion in 1959-60 on this issue. But the way in which we have spoken of the

emergence of the resurgent nationalist countries and of viewing their contradiction with the imperialist countries, on the one hand, and socialist countries, on the other, with the same importance as that of a new, the fifth contradiction—that although these countries play an anti-imperialist role in a particular situation, the advanced ones among them can themselves attain latent imperialist character in future and virtually play the role of agents of imperialism in crushing the mass movements in their respective countries—whether the CPC has understood the matter in this way is a different question.

It has been said towards the end of the above mentioned paragraphs of the Tenth Congress Report :”The struggle of the Asian, African and Latin American peoples to win and *defend national independence* and *safeguard state sovereignty* and national resources have further deepened and broadened.” (emphasis added) You must have noticed that the struggle of the peoples of Asia, Africa and Latin America has not merely been described as struggle to attain freedom, but as struggle to defend the independence achieved and even to safeguard state sovereignty in some cases. This can have only one implication. It is : the CPC, at the Tenth Congress, now considers many of the newly independent countries, or at least some of them to be sovereign national bourgeois countries—which in reality cannot but presuppose capitalist state machines in the words of Lenin, however backward those countries might be in terms of capitalist development.

Therefore, there is no real basis for what a group of so-called Marxist-Leninists say, by invoking the CPC, when they assert that the newly independent resurgent nationalist countries, all and sundry, are in the stage of people’s democratic revolution. Actually, these so-called Marxist-Leninists have arrived at such a wrong conclusion because of their tendency of following blindly, without any reference to time and place, the theory of people’s democratic

revolution prescribed by Zhdanov at the Cominform indiscriminately as well as the analysis of the CPC. Now this observation of the CPC at the Tenth Congress has come as an unambiguous, strong corroboration of the stand taken by our party, right from the time of achieving independence, of defining the Indian state as a national bourgeois state, that is, a capitalist state machine, though backward.

In our old literature, we have reiterated another important point : It is one thing to support the resurgent nationalist countries when they oppose the imperialist forces on the question of war and peace, but it is an altogether different thing, when extending this support, to view the “peace policy” of these resurgent nationalist countries to be on a par with the peace policy of a socialist country. In this context, I want to draw attention to another point too. We find that those who could not grasp correctly the character of state in these resurgent nationalist countries, have, because of their inability to grasp this, themselves fallen into a self-contradiction while supporting the anti-imperialist policy of such countries. The very same capitalist class of these countries whom they have branded as lackeys of imperialism as per the theory of people’s democratic revolution, have again been termed progressive by them because of their avowed anti-imperialist peace policy ! We cannot understand how this is possible. We have criticized the approach of not only the CPSU but the CPC as well on this issue. Even at the time of the Bandung Conference, when they raised the slogan ‘*Hindi-Chini bhai bhai*’² they projected Nehru in such a way as a champion of peace that through this, not only the difference between the peace policy of a socialist country and Nehru’s stand was not highlighted, but the specific class interest of the Indian capitalists that was operating in pursuing the anti-imperialist peace policy in the then particular situation, was also not exposed. Hence, the anti-imperialist peace policies and specific measures to ‘secure peace’ pursued by the capitalist class of these resurgent

nationalist countries were applauded uncritically. But the difference between the peace policy of socialist countries and their policy, the possibility of fascism appearing in diverse forms in the state structure and administrative machinery of these countries and the imperialistic and expansionist trend that is trying to rear its head in the more advanced among these countries and that, from this angle, it is they who are virtually going to play the major role as the agents of world imperialism-capitalism in the Asian-African-Latin American countries in suppressing growth and advance of socialist movement — these dangerous aspects were not pointed out and no effort at all to make the people conscious about these through relentless ideological struggles, has been observed. In our old literature, we have repeatedly stressed these dangers.

One tendency remains hidden within another

It appears from the Report of the 10th Congress that they have been able to understand this aspect in principle, although they have broached the subject somewhat differently. They have said an important thing. They have said : When we are fighting against the bourgeoisie, then also we often overlook that the question of unity with them is inherent in it. Again when we unite with them in a particular respect, then again we sometimes forget that there is necessity of struggle against them. They have sought to establish this theoretical proposition by citing from the history of the CPC. It has been clearly said about this in the Tenth Congress Report : “Chairman Mao has constantly taught us : It is imperative to note that within one tendency another remains hidden. Opposition to Chen Tu-hsiu’s Right opportunism which advocated ‘all alliance, no struggle’ covered Wang Ming’s ‘Left’ opportunism which advocated ‘all struggle, no alliance’. Today, in both international and domestic struggles, tendencies may still occur similar to

those of the past, namely, when there was an alliance with the bourgeoisie, necessary struggles were forgotten, and when there was a split with the bourgeoisie, the possibility of an alliance under given conditions was forgotten". It is required of us to do our best to discern and rectify such tendencies in time."

In this context, I would like to touch upon the necessity of pursuing the principle of 'unity-struggle-unity' in united movements. The important basic principle over which we have been fighting uncompromisingly against all sorts of right and left opportunistic deviations in the communist movement and left democratic movement in the country is the indispensable necessity of conducting ideological struggles within united fronts. Surprisingly, strong pressure against pursuit of this Marxist-Leninist principle of 'unity-struggle-unity' by our party has come and is still coming mainly from the two big so-called communist parties. They are constantly misrepresenting to their party workers, supporters and the people at large this Marxist-Leninist principle pursued by us and confusing them by saying that we pay lip service to unity but actually oppose it in deed since we criticize the CPI and the CPI(M) within the united movement — although the fact is that we criticize them always on questions of ideology, principle and tactics of struggle only. Unity among the left and democratic forces has come about on the basis of different issues in the struggle against the common or main enemy at different times. Even within this unity, while conducting united struggles differences are bound to crop up over the object of struggle, matters concerning tactics, norms and approach as a result of different political lines — and centring round these differences the aspect of releasing relentless ideological struggle even within this unity can never be undermined. It is alone with an eye to the vested interest of anyhow maintaining leadership or from left or right opportunistic deviations that the importance of this can be undermined or

denied. Even at a time when we feel the necessity for conducting united struggles against the main enemy or a particular danger by forming united front, we cannot forget that within the very united struggle against the main enemy or danger lie hidden the dangers of another kind for leading the movement astray. Besides, to deny the struggle that is constantly appearing within united movement centring round ideology, line and approach means discarding in effect principle, ideology and political line without actually saying so, which is tantamount to compromising on ideology and base political line. Because, in the struggle against the common enemy or against the main danger or a tendency at a given time, although we are united on the basis of a definite and commonly agreed programme at the particular time, differences of opinion centring round tactics of movement, norms, principles and approach are bound to arise within the united movement if we really mean the respective different base political lines that we profess. Therefore, those who hold that since there are differences in ideology, outlook and base political line, neither can there be unity and united movement nor can a united front be forged, are wrong; similarly those who think that since united movement or united front has developed on the basis of particular issues or a programme, mutual criticism or ideological struggles regarding the objective of the movement and matters relating to tactics, norms, conduct and approach, hinder the united struggle, too, are utterly wrong. Both these groups are suffering from either left or right deviation. One of them preaches all unity and no struggle while the other, all struggle and no unity. We hold that because differences exist in ideology and base political line, these are reflected within the united front or the united movement as well. But these need not hinder unity or weaken united movement. Rather, there is indisputable necessity of conducting healthy ideological struggle between the opposing base political lines in the united movement in

the very interest of the united struggles of the masses so that these may be led to their consummation, because, if compromises on basic ideology and principle are made then that weakens the united movement and ultimately disrupts the unity itself. The Tenth Congress of the CPC has now duly highlighted the Marxist-Leninist principle of unity-struggle-unity and emphasized the truth culled from the experience of Marxist-Leninist movements since long that within the struggle against a particular opportunist force or inimical tendency there inheres within it another opportunist force or tendency.

Peace or war

— both possibilities are equally real

See, how the Tenth Congress of the CPC has confirmed another important analysis of our party! When the revisionist Khrushchev leadership of the CPSU openly started saying that Lenin's profound thesis about imperialism generating war and the law of inevitability of war had become invalid, they underrated the danger of war and started stressing exclusively the possibility of peace, virtually reduced the principle of peaceful co-existence of Lenin and Stalin to peaceful capitulation, started to newly characterize the present era as an era of disintegration of imperialism, got trapped by US policy of nuclear blackmailing, or else started conspiring with the USA, in whichever way you may understand it today, and in the name of fighting the cult of personality actually started de-Stalinization — then serious differences arose in world communist circles on these questions and the difference with the CPC, too, gradually came into the open. When communists in many countries, being influenced by the various documents, pamphlets and articles published by the CPC to fight the revisionist line of thinking of Khrushchev, started opposing revisionism, then in the very movement against neo-revisionism launched by them could be discerned another hidden tendency. It was the

tendency, the inclination to deny the utility of peace movement, peace talks and the policy of peaceful co-existence itself. Because of this, they kept stressing only the danger of war and began to cite out of context such quotations from Lenin, Stalin and Mao which created even such confusion as if the CPC was denying the concrete possibility of preserving peace and thrusting peace upon the imperialists. How wrong this concept was, I showed while discussing the Ninth Congress Report. As a result of such one-sided polemics, the confusion became so much as to create the impression that the CPC was opposed to the policy of peaceful co-existence propounded by Lenin and Stalin and was advocating spread of socialism and communism through war.

**The analysis of our party,
now confirmed by the Tenth Congress,
should be examined in this background**

As far back as 1959-60 when all these controversies were on, we showed that to lay one-sided stress on the peace movement and overrate the possibility of preserving peace, or to emphasize the danger of war in one-sided manner were both wrong. During that time observed that in the present era, if the national liberation struggles, revolutionary movements of the working class in capitalist countries and the peace movements from country to country did not weaken, if the socialist camp stuck to the correct course, if their politics remained correct and if they maintained constant vigilance against the imperialistic policy of aggression and interference then the imperialists would not be able to actually trigger off war and would be finished off even as they plot wars. But if the leadership went astray, if there was disunity and if the political line became wrong, then war might break out any time since all economic and political factors for war were there. This was our analysis. On the basis of comprehensive evaluation of the post-World

War international situation, we declared categorically that, in the changed situation, there was the concrete possibility of thrusting peace upon the imperialists and preserving peace, on the one hand, and, on the other, there was the real danger of outbreak of war if the socialist countries, the communists, revolutionary movements and mass movements from country to country slackened vigil or committed mistakes. Both possibilities are real. At long last, we find the CPC corroborating this analysis of ours on war and peace in definite terms at its Tenth Congress. This is no mean credit for our party. The Tenth Congress Report says: "The danger of a new world war still exists, and the people of all countries must get prepared. But revolution is the main trend in the world today. It will be possible to prevent such a war, so long as the peoples, who are becoming more and more awakened, keep the orientation clearly in sight, heighten their vigilance, strengthen unity and persevere in struggle. Should the imperialists be bent on unleashing such a war, it will inevitably give rise to greater revolution on a world-wide scale and hasten their doom". Yet you see, the Soviet and the Chinese leaderships had so far been fighting over all these issues from opposite directions. Although we could not influence the opinions in the world communist movement owing to our limited strength, it will have to be acknowledged today that it was our analysis on these issues that was correct. At least the Tenth Congress Report corroborates this.

The veteran comrades present here know that after revisionist Khrushchev and his clique had usurped the CPSU leadership, they started muddling up, from a revisionist outlook, the basic teachings and conclusions of Lenin and Stalin on the questions of war, peace and peaceful co-existence in the era of "imperialism, war and proletarian revolution" as enunciated by Lenin. Although the 20th Congress of the CPSU raised some important issues, we analysed to show that the possibility of deviation from

Leninism and of opening of the floodgate of revisionism was inherent in it. In all fairness we may claim that it was we who sounded this note of caution to the communist parties of the world. You all know how severely we criticized at that time certain contentions of Khrushchev and Mikoyan in the 20th Congress Report. Our speeches, articles, pamphlets and various documents of that period testify to this. But no writings, statements or analyses of any other communist party of the world, not even the CPC or of Mao Zedong had this approach — at least not to my knowledge. Rather after the 20th Congress, of which Khrushchev and Mikoyan were the chief architects, and in which the possibility of opening the floodgates of revisionism was hidden, Mao Zedong sent greetings to the CC of the CPSU saying – I do not remember the exact words, but something to the effect that – The Central Committee of the CPSU headed by Comrade Khrushchev has illumined the path. The other communist parties throughout the world, too, praised the Khrushchev leadership without noting the revisionist tendency hidden in the 20th Congress.

**Mere revisionist usurpation of leadership of
party and state does not *ipso facto* mean
restoration of bourgeois dictatorship**

Let us now revert to the Tenth Congress Report. Where, to what extent, and why our party differed or does still differ with the statements in the Ninth Congress Report about the character of the Soviet state and our criticism at that time of these and about the contradictory observations throughout the Report on this question — there is no need of repeating that. But if you compare the Tenth Congress Report with that of the Ninth Congress, you would find that the present Report has been substantially freed from the inconsistencies and self-contradictions of the earlier Report and that particular quotation from Mao Zedong about which we said

it helped to confound confusion has also been omitted from the Tenth Congress Report. I would draw attention to another point of this Report where it says : “The essence of the counter-revolutionary revisionist line they³ pursued and the criminal aim of the counter-revolutionary armed coup d’etat they launched were to usurp the supreme power of the party and the state, thoroughly betray the line of the Ninth Congress, radically change the party’s basic line and policies for the entire historical period of socialism, turn the Marxist-Leninist Chinese Communist Party into a revisionist, fascist party, subvert the dictatorship of the proletariat and restore capitalism.” Although this has been said about the Lin Biao clique in the context of China, it reveals the same reasoning with which they characterize the Soviet state as social imperialist. I have already said that this type of reasoning suffers from over-simplification. We could not agree with the childish argument that usurpation of the party and the state leadership by the revisionists itself automatically proves that the bourgeois dictatorship has been established there and capitalism restored. We do not think such reasoning is compatible with Marxism. But more on this later.

What is social imperialism

Before that, I want to discuss another point. A question has come up: What does the term social imperialism mean ? What does it really signify ? If a socialist state, even as it is talking of socialism and waving the banner of communism, continues to get polluted and treading the counter-revolutionary path, becoming imperialist ultimately, it would have a difference with a traditional imperialist state. What is it ? The difference lies in the centralism of socialist rule, on the one hand, and, on the other, in the confusion created by its radical slogans — an illusion which a traditional imperialist country cannot generate because its rulers are already known to be exploiting oppressors; it is not possible

for them to confuse the masses by talking of socialism or communism. The CPC leadership has used the term social imperialism to distinguish this. This is one aspect.

Second, whatever the extent of operation of the bourgeois democratic rights and concomitant advantages on the basis of old tradition in the imperialist countries in spite of its imperialist and butcher character, the same is not possible in a social imperialist state. Take a country like the USA, the leader of the imperialist world which has been described by a man like Bertrand Russell to be a sordid military regime; what a great row was even there over the Watergate scandal; what commotion against the Pentagon, the army and the whole state, so that even one minister after another had to resign under pressure of public opinion. But an incident as this cannot even be imagined in a socialist country turned social imperialist, because they would confuse and befool the people in the country and outside by their Marxist jargon, their label of progressiveness. By invoking Marxism, they would try to establish that to go against their state is to go against progress and people's interest, and while doing this, they would come out to crush the people ruthlessly. So, whatever scope of democratic opposition is there even in the traditional capitalist-imperialist countries would be far less there. There would be more ruthless oppression, more confusion in the name of progress. In this sense, it must be admitted that if social imperialism is actually established in a country, then the onslaughts that would come upon democratic rights and individual freedom would be even more severe than in a traditional imperialist country. So, if one really considers a country social imperialist — leaving aside whether such assessment is correct or not — it is but natural to view that country to be even more ruthless than the USA, the chief of the imperialist camp. I would request those, who have expressed doubt about the rationale of the CPC in equating the Soviet Union with the USA, to consider the question

from this angle. Another question has come up which needs to be clearly understood. If we cannot develop a thorough understanding of Marxism and cannot sharpen it continually, such confusion is bound to recur. The question raised is: All Marxists know that the foreign policy of a country follows from its economic base ; now, since we find that the Soviet Union is moving in league with the imperialist USA on many an issue, is that not sufficient proof of imperialist character of the Soviet state ?

It is grievously erroneous to view the matter in this way. I like to ask : Cannot the leadership of a communist party ever deviate or commit a mistake ? Or cannot the leadership of a party be usurped by agent provocateurs at any time, under any circumstance, even if temporarily ? And if that happens, can such a leadership because it has the backing of the state, be dislodged immediately ? And if not, is it not natural that the leadership would hobnob with the imperialists in the sphere of foreign policy and join in imperialist intrigues ? So, since Marxism has it that foreign policy is the reflection of domestic policy, especially the economic base of a country, can it be concluded then and there that the economy of the country has been transformed into imperialist economy ? I strongly feel this is not Marxism. This is economic determinism in the name of Marxism. Take for example, the state structure, the state system. We know the Marxist analysis that the state is the superstructure of a given economic base. But it is also true, as Lenin said, that politics supersedes economy, meaning, in the present time, politics and political developments strongly influence economic matters and act as the determinant.

Relation between base and superstructure

Say, we are discussing the possibility that if the party leadership in a socialist country gets polluted even though the socialist economic base remains intact, the same base might become rotten in course of time unless the leadership

could be saved from degenerating. Since the economic base is intact, so the leadership, too, would automatically remain correct — the relation between the base and the superstructure or between idea and matter, as we say from another angle, is not mechanical like this. It is to fight such mechanical understanding that Lenin said that politics supersedes economy. And so the CPC leadership started arguing that since political events influenced economic affairs in a big way, therefore, as soon as the leadership was usurped by the revisionists, it had to be concluded that the socialist economic base, too, had been transformed into a capitalist base. I consider this, too, reflects a mechanical understanding of the relation between the base and the superstructure, although this is being said in the name of fighting economic determinism. Be that as it may, if you think deeply you would understand that Lenin's *April Thesis* stands upon this realization. Viewed in the perspective of economic and social backwardness, it would have been natural to characterize the Russian revolution as bourgeois democratic revolution. But in determining the stage of revolution, Lenin always considered the class character of the state, and not economic backwardness or anything else, to be the principal and the determinant factor.

Not only this. In examining the question whether a state had acquired the character of a national sovereign capitalist state, Lenin did not consider the economic dependence of that country upon an imperialist country to be important at all. We know Lenin's views in the dispute between Kautsky and Rosa Luxemburg on this issue which he discussed in his book *Right of Nations to Self-determination*, and on which there have been many discussions in our party. If these theories are correctly understood, there should be no difficulty whatsoever in grasping why, in spite of some remnants of feudalism in the Indian economy for some time even after the transfer of power — and in that sense the revolution being still economically in the stage of democratic

revolution — we arrived at the conclusion that the Indian revolution was in the stage of socialist revolution right from then. Right at the time of transfer of power we had said that since the state had become a state of the bourgeois class through achieving independence, *in that sense and to that extent*, Indian revolution had entered the stage of socialist revolution. And now there are no remnants even of feudalism in the economy — whatever remains of it is in the cultural realm as hangover from the old society because of compromise by the national leadership. Although the tenet that the foreign policy is a reflection of the economic base of a country is true in a general way, its particular understanding is to be grasped and conclusion drawn only by examining the particular situation from all aspects.

**The Soviet revisionist leadership is
moving hand in glove with USA
to extend their sphere of influence**

Some time back, an article on the Brezhnev-Nixon meet was published in the *Proletarian Era*, the English organ of our party. We had discussed in it that the revisionist leadership of the Soviet Union was moving hand in glove with the USA in trying to extend its sphere of influence. That analysis has been proved prophetic, so to say, through the subsequent developments in the Arab-Israel conflict. During those incidents too, a statement was issued by the Central Committee of our party which was far more categorical than the Chinese stand. Although the CPC did not go as far as we did, the nature and tenor of their criticism of the USSR were more or less similar to ours. The only difference has been that whereas the CPC has generally referred to the Soviet Union we have referred to the revisionist leadership of the USSR on each issue while criticizing, because, unlike the CPC, we have not yet been able to conclude beyond doubt that the Soviet state has been reduced to a social imperialist

state. But while we have strongly condemned and criticized the Soviet revisionist leadership, we have at the same time made an appeal to the people of the Soviet Union and of the whole world. Expressing concern at the way the revisionist Soviet leadership is now allowing the international monopoly capital, their corporate houses, to open offices and agencies, the way their capitalist tendency is growing there, speculation is on the rise, the sphere of commodity circulation and small production are on the increase and profit incentive is increasingly playing an important role, we have cautioned that, unless these trends and tendencies can be checked without further delay, the very state founded and reared by Lenin and Stalin would be endangered and capitalist production relation established in place of socialist production relation. So we have appealed to the people of the world, particularly of the Soviet Union, to come forward to save the first socialist state on the globe.

Two instruments of the working class — party and state

Here I wish to remind you of some important observations of Lenin. Lenin clearly highlighted one thing, when he said: It is to be remembered that prior to revolution, the working class wields only one instrument and that is its party — and, I may add, this party, too, is unarmed in most cases — but after the revolution it wields two instruments — the party and the state. That Lenin referred to these two separately and distinctly, carries a significance. It is not that as soon as an instrument, the party leadership becomes polluted, the other organ, too, automatically becomes corrupted. Now, once a controversy arose among the communists on the issue: just because the dictatorship of the proletariat has been established in a country, whether it can be said that dictatorship of the party has been established there; conversely, whether it is correct to say that the dictatorship of the proletariat has been established as soon

as the dictatorship of the party is established. Lenin said that if the dictatorship of the proletariat is really established, that is, if the proletariat as a class came to state power, then it would have to be assumed that the party dictatorship, too, had been established there as the proletariat class could operate only through the party; but to understand if the dictatorship of the proletariat had really been established through establishment of the party dictatorship, it would have to be examined whether the proletariat as a class had attained real power of the state.

I think Mao Zedong has viewed this second postulate of Lenin incorrectly and whether or not he explicitly says so he framed an argument on its basis like this: since Lenin held that it could not always be said automatically that the dictatorship of the proletariat had been established even if the party dictatorship had been established, therefore it could be argued on the same logic that if the leadership of a party became revisionist at some point of time after it had captured the state power, the dictatorship of the proletariat could not have been established there at all. I do not consider the issue so simple.

My question is : Why did Lenin distinguish between the two instruments that the proletariat wields after the revolution ? What does it really signify ? Although functions of these two instruments are not only interrelated but also interdependent to a large extent, I consider the two to have separate entity and some relative independence. If that is so, how can it be said without analysing the events that as soon as one of the two instruments became polluted, the other, too, got polluted automatically ? Can the working class which has forged an instrument with toil and blood of many a struggle allow it to turn corrupt so easily and without resistance? There can certainly be great damage if the party leadership turns revisionist, but it is not that at once the party degenerates lock, stock and barrel. Herein lies the significance of differentiating between the two instruments

which I do not think Mao Zedong, despite his great qualities, power and ability, has been able to grasp. As soon as one of the two instruments gets corrupt, the other, too, turns corrupt — this, I think, is a wrong understanding of Lenin's thesis. In that case, they will have to answer a question: If it be true that the state also becomes polluted, as soon as the party leadership is usurped by the revisionists, then why did not the CPC conclude that the Soviet state had degenerated to a capitalist state on the very day they characterized the Khrushchev leadership as revisionist? Why did they take so much time to arrive at this conclusion? It is not that a man becomes a renegade the moment he starts to deviate. History of international communist movement is replete with instances to show this. I do not wish to dwell upon it any more.

How to judge if Soviet state has turned social imperialistsocial imperialist

A question has been raised : What are the characteristic features which go to show that a socialist state, in the course of deviation, has turned into a capitalist state? Much time is needed to discuss this question thoroughly, which I do not have now. Surely you remember that at the time of discussing the Ninth Congress Report, I raised a number of fundamental issues regarding this question. You will have to understand the matter keeping in view those fundamental aspects. I had said then that to conclude like this, it would have to be shown that a fundamental change had come about in the system of production, production relation and motive force of production in the Soviet Union and that capitalist production relation and motive force of production being restored in place of socialist production relation and motive force of production, it had basically changed the very economic system. Since a question has been raised on this again, let me touch upon it briefly.

I feel, the issue merits consideration from different

angles. First, you will have to examine in which direction their political activities, that is, their political moves are trending. Although they are moving in league with the imperialists in different respects, whether they have contradiction with the imperialists, that is, whether they play an anti-imperialist role on the question of freedom struggle, liberation war, even if to some extent. Whether they always, in every respect, move in league with the imperialists or despite such a tendency, a contradiction, too, is in existence. Take, for example, Vietnam, especially North Vietnam which is conducting heroic struggle against the US imperialists. Naturally, they cannot find any friends among the imperialists. This is one aspect. Again, Vietnam, as far as we can see now, is on the side of China and against the Soviet Union in the struggle against revisionism. But while criticizing the Soviet Union on various ideological questions, they are still inclined to consider it a friend. Why ? This should be thought over. They have tremendous direct experience of sufferings at the hands of US imperialism. But see, in spite of the Soviet recognition of the US puppet Lon Nol,⁴ they still consider the Soviet Union a friend in the struggle against US imperialism and have difference of opinion with China on this point. This is the tenor I found in the stand taken in a document of their Central Committee prior to the demise of Ho Chi Minh. They are against Soviet revisionism alright, but they have not been able to agree with the CPC's assessment of the Soviet Union. What is being gained from the contradiction between the Soviet Union and US imperialism is a different matter altogether. But it should be noted that contradictions are there.

Second, it will have to be ascertained whether the production relation in the Soviet Union has been totally changed, that is, whether socialist production relation there has been replaced by capitalist production relation. More precisely, whether the production relation based on social ownership of means of production has been totally changed.

In this context, I would like to discuss one or two more points, as otherwise confusion may arise while trying to grasp the problem. We have to understand that nationalization of industries in a capitalist state does not mean social ownership. Even if industries are nationalized in the capitalist system, maximization of profit remains the aim of production; there is no change in the worker-owner relationship, that is, exploitation and oppression continue. The only change is that the state becomes the owner, instead of an individual. Moreover, the norms to determine the wages of a worker are not the same in the capitalist and socialist systems. In the capitalist system, the worker never gets fair wages — is always deprived of the legitimate value of his labour, the fair wages. The way the wages of a worker can be fixed in a socialist country, because the production there has a social aim, cannot be done in a capitalist country as the production there is conducted to maximize profit.

Anyone conversant with economics knows that as the labour power remains embodied in the product, it cannot be separated out and measured. The way of determining the wages on the basis of natural justice is : after deducting from the surplus value created in society that portion which is needed for overall economic uplift of society and people, and different types of cultural activities, and such other necessities, that is, the portion needed to be spent in the interest of workers for their advancement, the balance amount should be spent on wages of workers. This is one aspect. Second, how much each worker would get individually should be determined on the basis of the principle of ‘to each according to his ability’. And because the socialist system is free from individual as well as institutional expropriation, the benefit obtained by a worker through this process, this principle of determining the wages cannot be had in a capitalist country as a big chunk of the surplus value there goes away as profit of the owners. Even if the state there becomes the owner instead of an individual,

there is no change in this. It goes without saying that state capital is born through this process of nationalization of industries and it is this state capital, state monopoly capital in particular, which acts as the rock-bottom economic foundation of fascism. Besides, a large portion of surplus value that is spent for development of industry, development of the 'country', development of roads and communications, etc., in the capitalist system is pocketed by the bureaucrats and the people are deprived in this way, too. This is what I have understood as regards the economic theory of Marx.

Therefore, to conclude that the socialist economy of the USSR has been reduced to a capitalist economy, it will have to be made clear to me that the socialized industries there have been transformed to acquire the characteristics of nationalized industries in the capitalist system and whether it can be said to have given birth to state capital. It would not suffice to say simply that speculation and commodity circulation are increasing there and profit incentive is playing an important role; these would have to be substantiated with relevant data. If anybody can provide such conclusive authentic data, we shall be grateful. But before that, we do not think it can be said conclusively that the Soviet state has turned into a social imperialist state—simply by depending on the argument that the revisionists have usurped the party and state leadership there.

You have all heard that it is wrong to declare Mao Zedong's thoughts as Marxism-Leninism of this era. The Tenth Congress Report has confirmed the analysis of our party in this regard; and this portion has been deleted from the Constitution.

Lin Biao's main concern was to usurp power

Now, a few words about Lin Biao. From outside what have we seen him to be at the Ninth Congress? He is not only the Vice-chairman of the party but is placing the Report at the Congress, is a close comrade-in-arms of Mao Zedong

and is being thought of as the successor to Mao. During the discussion on the Ninth Congress Report I spelt out the impression we had formed about him by studying that Report and some relevant events. I had said that if Lin Biao succeeded Mao as the theoretician and leader of the CPC and if the leadership of the party and power is vested in him, then, it must be said, the future of the CPC was bleak. I spoke at length about the reasons for forming this impression, so there is no need to discuss it anew. I said that the question of political line was not important to Lin Biao; his main concern was to usurp the power of the party and the state. He wanted to do this even while he repeatedly raised the slogan “Long Live Mao Zedong” and chanted quotations from Mao. I had shown what a level of sycophancy he had stooped to. Now see, what Zhou Enlai has said about him in the Tenth Congress Report: “Lin Biao and his handful of sworn followers were a counter-revolutionary conspiratorial clique who never showed up without a copy of ‘quotations’ in hand, and never opened their mouths without shouting ‘Long Live’ and who spoke nice things to your face but stabbed you in the back.”

Needless to say, such characterization of Lin Biao was not made by them at the time of the Ninth Congress. But although we did not have the necessary data and proof but basing ourselves only on the logic of probability we had said that it could be that Mao himself was virtually under arrest by Lin Biao and it appeared that to eulogize Mao was a deception of his to pave the way for usurping power.

I had said that the Lin Biao clique had perhaps concentrated such powers in its hands that Mao could do little about it although he was present at the Congress. It seemed to me that such a situation had arisen there. Although the Tenth Congress Report mentions that Mao had criticized the shortcomings and mistakes of Lin Biao, admonished him and tried to rectify him, a question naturally arises: How does a man whose integrity is suspect, get opportunity to

place the Report at the Congress ? Is someone opposed to the party's political line allowed to read out the Report at the Congress ? Or the reality was such that even if Mao had this apprehension, he was virtually powerless to act ? These should be pondered over. After all this time, now at the Tenth Congress, unequivocal charge has been brought against Lin Biao that he not only attempted to usurp all power of the party and the state but even conspired to assassinate Mao — a conspiracy which was eventually foiled.

Incidentally, let us see how the Report of the Ninth Congress was prepared and what the Tenth Congress says on this. It has been said that at first Chen Pota and Lin Biao jointly drafted a Report which was rejected by the Central Committee. Subsequently, the Report was prepared under the guidance of Mao. But nothing has been said about who drafted the Report and whether Lin Biao or any of his men had a hand in it. It is to be noted that in the Central Committee, Chen Pota had opposed this Report but Lin Biao had not. My point is that, on the basis of this scanty information in the Tenth Congress Report, we cannot say whether or not Lin Biao had a hand in preparing the Ninth Congress Report. If he had, then taking this opportunity, he had inserted empty praises of Mao while he also got himself described in the Report as the disciple, inheritor and successor to Mao. To whatever extent Mao appears to have detected such motive of Lin Biao, he could never have allowed him to place the Report at the Party Congress, unless the situation was such that Lin Biao already exercised total control over the party from within. So, it could be that although he felt the necessity of opposing Lin Biao, Mao did not do it as he himself would have to do it and he did not feel it expedient to involve himself. Perhaps he needed some time to consolidate his power and position before he could take appropriate steps at an opportune moment. He could have thought like this. That is, even though Lin Biao had done all this, since he had been preaching Mao's line, in that

situation, it was wise for Mao to strengthen the hands of Zhou Enlai and such others. And this is exactly what happened. When the Lin Biao clique proposed his name in place of Liu Shaoqi as the President of China at the Central Committee and the First and Second Plenary Sessions, Mao Zedong directly opposed it. So, Lin Biao got alarmed; he realized that it was impossible for him to become President in Mao's lifetime. And if he now opposed Mao, his own followers would snub him because he had been projecting himself as Mao's right hand man, a protagonist of Mao's thought, etc. He could not challenge the authority of Mao which had helped to protect the party even amidst such difficulties. So, he had to keep on chanting the name of Mao while conspiring to kill him, as has been revealed in the Tenth Congress Report.

**Need for being freed from influence of
authoritarianism and mechanical thought process**

Incidentally, I wish to draw attention to another aspect. Right from the inception of our party, we have been fighting against the tendency of blind authoritarianism and mechanization of thought process in the international communist movement. Suppose, a leader in a revolutionary party who was a true revolutionary in the past, may be a front-ranking leader, has degenerated and become anti-party. What should be our approach to such a phenomenon? During discussion on the Ninth Congress Report and particularly while discussing the Liu Shaoqi affair, I had dealt with this from various angles. So there is no necessity to reiterate the same here. But the point is — whenever we judge such a phenomenon, no matter who is involved— Liu Shaoqi or Lin Biao — if we suffer from mechanical concept or are swayed by emotion then there is danger that the very purpose of the criticism would be lost. Whether such a person was a traitor from the very beginning, or whether in spite of being a revolutionary at the beginning he went

astray, deviated later because of failure to conduct struggles covering all aspects of life or due to whatever reason — in order to correctly understand these, the leadership should have wisdom and a clear conception about style or method of work within the party. That is, it should not act basing itself only on reports. When a leadership can grasp the logic of probability and apply it correctly, then many a danger can be averted or, at least, there is scope for this. So the question of a leadership acquiring this faculty, based on the science of Marxism, in conducting struggles and of developing scientific conception about different aspects of epistemology is very important. Needless to say, to become free from the influence of mechanical thought process, which has done much damage to the international communist movement, is a precondition for acquiring such faculty.

At the same time, one should not forget the indispensability of struggle on the basis of principle, that is, of not compromising on basic principles. When the *12-Party Declaration* was drafted, Mao Zedong himself was present on behalf of the CPC. You also know that Liu Shaoqi presented the *81-Party Statement* on behalf of the CPC. But despite that how in these two documents there had been undue compromises on the question of principle and ideology, and what had been our party's criticism in this regard — you are quite aware about all these. You know that our party has been trying for long to highlight these questions. So, I am not going to discuss this here.

A serious theoretical mistake

Comrades, there is a serious mistake in the Tenth Congress Report which has not escaped my notice. So many of you comrades raised questions and talked about so much but none of you referred to this. I want to ask you very seriously: How do you read a document of this nature? Do you study it critically, fully read it with deep concentration of mind and wholly involving yourselves? Such important

documents should never be read casually. However, before I read out from the Report to show the nature of this serious fault and through which statements it is revealed, it is necessary to speak about the issue even if briefly.

What was the nature of the dictatorship in China in the first stage after the new democratic revolution was successful? As it comes to my mind, the class-alignment, the form of dictatorship of the state established in China after the revolution was what is called democratic dictatorship of the proletariat and peasantry (D.D.P.P.) in classical Marxist literature. Mao Zedong, in his own language, has called this the people's democratic dictatorship. What was the form of this dictatorship? It was a special type of class alliance with the whole of the peasantry under the leadership of the working class, under its dictatorship. The situation was somewhat similar to that obtaining in Russia after the revolution and prior to banning the Constituent Assembly and introduction of the dictatorship of the proletariat. Now, because the urban petty bourgeoisie had a special role in the Chinese Revolution and the administration contained people from that stratum, Mao, instead of terming it as a special type of class alliance between the workers and the peasants, called it people's democratic dictatorship with a particular objective in view, and I support such coining.

Let me read out what they have said in the Tenth Congress Report about the character of the dictatorship in that particular period : "However, as the Chinese revolution developed further and specially when it turned socialist in nature, and became more and more thoroughgoing — aiming at the complete overthrow of the bourgeoisie and all other exploiting classes — the establishment of the dictatorship of the proletariat in place of the dictatorship of the bourgeoisie" etc., etc. See, what an anomaly ! How can the stage after the successful new democratic revolution in China be called the stage of bourgeois dictatorship? But this is what they have said. A question may arise: Does the CPC really

consider it to be the stage of bourgeois dictatorship or is it just a faulty theoretical expression? There can be no doubt that the CPC considers it to be the stage not of bourgeois dictatorship but of the people's democratic dictatorship. How could there be such a faulty theoretical expression then? Two possibilities strike me in this regard.

Firstly, while repeatedly chanting two-line, two line struggle, i.e., struggle between two lines, a tendency may have worked in them that might have resulted in this shortcoming. That is, as the Chinese Revolution attains the stage of socialist revolution when the dictatorship of the proletariat becomes established, since it is the dictatorship of the proletariat, it must have come about after defeating the bourgeois dictatorship!

The second possibility is: Liu Shaoqi's supporters had managed to attain majority in the leading committee of the party in the period under question; now, since Liu is a revisionist and as the theory that the character of the party and the state changes as soon as the revisionists usurp the party leadership works in their mind, they might have denoted that period to be the period of bourgeois dictatorship under the influence of this thinking. This possibility cannot be ruled out. If it be so they might have viewed that the dictatorship of the proletariat was established through the Cultural Revolution. It has not been spelt out like this in the Report — I am only speaking of the possibility. But the main point is, to put it in that way, whatever may be the reason, is wrong and there can be no question of supporting it.

A few words about two-line struggle

Now, a few words about two-line struggle. The way this struggle between two lines was viewed in the Ninth Congress Report, particularly the way they spoke as if there would always be two-line struggle within a working class

party and the very existence of the party was based on two-line struggle — I discussed then why such an approach was wrong and how it could crop up. At the Tenth Congress, however, the issue has not been viewed that way. Therefore, it appears to us that there has been some correction although they have not spoken clearly about the two-line struggle, the way we understand it. They have said now that the class struggle going on outside finds reflection inside the party and, as a result, there would be struggle between two lines from time to time. They have not said that such struggle would go on within the party all the time. For instance, what they wanted to say, in a way, is that there have been such two-line struggles ten times in the history of their party and there would be such struggles perhaps twenty to thirty times more before classless society is attained. Now, one may object to the positive tone in which it has been asserted that two-line struggles would be there. For, whether this would happen or not depends on certain factors.

It is not that two-line struggle within the party is an entity independent of people's will. What is the crux of the matter? What determines whether opposing thoughts on fundamental questions would appear within the party or not? If the party leadership is capable, if it can grasp the science of Marxism covering and coordinating the different branches of epistemology, and if it has a good command over the logic of probability and psychology, then it can understand at the slightest indication what the party workers want to say, can grasp the nature and import of each and every problem and so does not get into a crisis unawares. But when the bureaucratic style of work prevails in the party, the leaders just issue circulars, deliver speeches, conduct classes, pen articles and see that the mass line is provided to the party workers but they do not maintain close association with the comrades, remain vigilant about their conduct and lead collective life with them, then the

probability of this danger remains. And to lead collective life does not just mean staying together in camps, keep staying in villages all together or living in peasant households. Again, someone might think that although he lives with his wife and children in a separate house, since they, too, are party comrades and he lives with them, it can be taken for granted that he is having association with party comrades round the clock. This also is a wrong concept.

It is necessary that through the process of constant common association, constant common discussion and constant common activity the leaders themselves associate with comrades in such a manner so that the comrades can find answers to their every problem in minutest detail and the struggle to acquire communist ethics and culture gets strengthened. So, we have to continually improve our style of work, norms of discussion and criticism, our outlook as well as mode of reasoning — in a word, everything. We have to go on improving our style of work so that our cadre-strength increases, the number of units grows and the ability to solve the complex problems of the ever-growing organization is enhanced. Even if it is adequate today, it will have to be improved further. See, that is why they have given the call for struggle-criticism-transformation at the Tenth Congress. It means, through criticism and self-criticism, change yourselves continually so that you can tackle the ever-changing situations and complex problems arising all the time. And with this is to be integrated the struggle to acquire comprehensive knowledge of the science of Marxism. Only then can it be possible to fight the bureaucratic style of work and keep ourselves free from mistakes and lapses. It is not that there would or could no longer be any mistakes, but the possibility of this would be narrowed down.

It is the capacity for anticipating and grasping the different problems and wisdom of the leadership that determine how far the two-line struggle can be restrained.

So, the frequency of this two-line struggle is largely dependent on how far the task of inner-party struggle, inner-party education can be conducted correctly and uniformity of thinking and ideological centralism developed on its basis. Therefore, it is wrong to think that it is independent of people's will. The struggle between bourgeois and proletarian lines of thinking arises only when the contradiction within the party takes the shape of conflict. But so long as this does not reach the stage of conflict, it remains, with the mistakes and shortcomings, within the orbit of proletarian line.

We are confident, Mao leadership would protect Chinese Revolution

I shall conclude with one more point. The Tenth Congress Report has helped to overcome many shortcomings, theoretical confusion and self-contradiction of the Ninth Congress and highlighted and reiterated many important educative aspects. From that point of view, this Report is very commendable and deserves to be hailed. But you know, when discussing about the Chinese Cultural Revolution, even while unstintedly praising it to be magnificent, I had referred to some serious shortcomings. I had observed that unless those could be eradicated forthwith, the danger of revisionism could again rear its head in China. Studying the Tenth Congress Report, I have had the feeling that they have not yet been able to grasp those shortcomings or else, it did not come to my notice. In the discussion on Cultural Revolution, I had said that while they were conducting the Cultural Revolution against the influence of bourgeois and old reactionary culture that had persisted in diverse subtle forms within the party and in social life, they had not yet been able to put forward any scientific concept as to what were the character, form and distinctive features of proletarian culture and how these

differed fundamentally with the bourgeois humanist culture and values; as a result, even if they solved the immediate problem through the Cultural Revolution, individualism would continue to persist in the social life and many a problem would crop up from this. Because in this era, even in the advanced capitalist countries, individual liberty, individual rights and sense of individuality which had once inspired man to struggle, are being reduced to privileges although the necessity for united struggle against exploitation and oppression is still there in those conditions also. The right to equality which was once a slogan of bourgeois democratic revolution has in reality remained just a slogan in the capitalist countries. The struggle for emancipation of the individual has entered a new stage after the right to equality has been established in the real sense in the socialist system and a totally new condition has developed in the natural course of things with the individual enjoying more and more opportunity, advantage and freedom as compared to the bourgeois social system; unless this can be grasped and pinpointed scientifically, individual freedom and sense of individual rights would create anew privileges even among the communists.

Under the influence of this individualism, a new kind of economic opportunism would appear among the workers after the socialist revolution if their consciousness remains at a low level. Besides, under influence of modern revisionism and due to lack of even rudimentary understanding of the true character of the contradiction inherent in the socialist system and the basic law of development of socialist economy, a group of theorists hold that the main aim of the socialist system is to anyhow increase production because, according to them, socialism loses all its meaning to the workers unless they receive more material benefits than in the advanced capitalist countries. So, in their bid to anyhow increase production in total disregard to the laws of development of socialist

economy, they even advocate and provide bourgeois material incentive as a result of which capitalist tendencies start appearing at various levels in the production system, tendencies of anarchy and speculation crop up and ultimately the very existence of the socialist economy and system becomes imperiled. So, hankering for material benefit and incentive would surface among the workers and individual opportunism would appear and grow. This is a new type of individualism, and I had termed it socialist individualism.

I had also shown that in socialist system, this contradiction between individual interest and social interest is antagonistic in nature. So long as this contradiction cannot be turned into a non-antagonistic one in relation to production and distribution, the state would not wither away although classes might be abolished as an economic category. That is, the state with its coercion would exist as a reflection of the antagonistic contradiction between individual interest and social interest. Hence, emancipation of the individual would not come. In this situation, demands for establishing individual rights would be raised anew, tendency of the individual to revolt would increase and social aim and objective, strength of and dedication in the communist ideology would be undermined. So, either the repression of the state would increase resulting in further intensification of disaffection of the individual or else, liberalizations would come, one after another, and in their wake revisionism and the danger of capitalist restoration.

Therefore, along with the struggle for uninterrupted advancement of socialist revolution, ceaseless struggle for identification of individual interest with social interest would have to be released in the realm of culture in order to transform the antagonistic contradiction between individual interest and social interest into a non-antagonistic one. The working class would have to understand that in

the socialist system there is no more necessity of struggle against a class in power to achieve rights and freedom. Rather, the old bourgeois concepts and habits about individual freedom and individuality which still persist in diverse subtle forms, are obstructing the process of merger of the individual necessity into the social necessity. This is what stands in the way of emancipation of the individual today.

I think, to achieve this, the concept that a true communist is one who can unconditionally surrender individual interest to the interest of the society, of the party and of revolution, is no longer adequate. This concept embodied in the books *On Communist Education* by Kalinin and *How To Be A Good Communist* by Liu Shaoqi — although criticized now, once this book used to be highly acclaimed by the CPC—basically reflects the bourgeois humanist sense of values. If the standard of consciousness remains at this level, the struggle for emancipation of the individual that has entered a new, complex stage in the socialist system could not be resolved fully and it would not be possible to bring about complete dedication by defeating the tendency of individualism. In today's situation, in order to attain the high standard of communist character, one would have to give up unreservedly, unhesitatingly, unconditionally and happily one's individuality and individual interest, in that way identify oneself with the interest of the party and revolution and conduct arduous, painstaking struggle on that basis. In my discussion on Chinese Cultural Revolution I raised these questions.

Secondly, I emphasized: unless the understanding of Marxism-Leninism that guides revolution and helps in its advancement up to a certain stage can be further developed through philosophical advancement of Marxism-Leninism in consonance with the newer problems, newer complexities that arise when class struggle enters into a completely

different stage in the post-revolution period and with the advancements in natural sciences and in the economic, social and political spheres, then the old standard of consciousness becomes inadequate and the level of thinking declines in the changed context. And if the philosophical and cultural levels remain low then given suitable environment in a complex situation, that can breed revisionism any time and endanger revolution.

Thirdly, so long as individual consciousness does not advance to the level of social consciousness, there would be a role for the individual to play as the leader of social revolution. Without this, organizing revolution cannot be contemplated even. A party which does not understand the importance of this, fails to personify the collective leadership of the party through a leader, and does not project that leader in the mass imagination, does not concretely view the revolution at all. Whenever revolutionary activity had to be concretely organized in any country, this task had to be fulfilled as a real necessity for the revolution. Here the point to be understood is that the concretization of leadership through an individual operates both in bourgeois democratic revolution and in proletarian revolution. But there is a fundamental difference between the two with respect to their character and nature. Unless this can be grasped, a mechanical approach towards a particular individual leadership would arise in proletarian revolution, too. And from this would stem the cult of the individual and all its evil effects; either blind allegiance to the leadership or blind opposition to it. So, a mechanical relationship would develop with that particular leader, too, instead of a dialectical one, the overall standard of consciousness in the party would be lowered and ultimately even the leader adversely affected thereby. Although the emergence of Mao Zedong as the leader of the Chinese Revolution is a historic event without which the revolution itself might not have been accomplished and the projection

of Mao before the country and the people serves them well, they have as yet been unable to present any clear-cut scientific concept pinpointing the difference between the individual leadership in bourgeois revolution and this concretized, personified expression of collective leadership in the proletarian revolution, and show in which process, in the course of historical development, has the emergence of this particular leader come about as an indispensable necessity of the revolution.

They have failed to show that since the bourgeois revolution is for establishing individual ownership and right over means of production — a revolution in one sense for development and flowering of individual and individuality — it is the individual leadership that directs the collective from outside, so to say, even within the framework of ‘model’ bourgeois democracy. That is, in practice, the democratic leadership remains formal there. But since the socialist revolution is for establishing collective ownership in place of individual ownership over means of production, the very concept of leadership that has evolved in the working class movement is the concept of collective leadership. In a proletarian party, this collective leadership evolves through the dialectical interaction of ideas of all its members, and the collective leadership in the true sense emerges in the party only when it is personified through a leader. So far as I know, the CPC has not as yet provided such concept about collective leadership. As a result, various confusions and mechanical approaches would persist in their concept about leadership. Besides these, I had referred to some other shortcomings of theirs. I do not wish to go into all that again. Even while hailing the Chinese Cultural Revolution as magnificent, I had referred to such shortcomings and said that if those weaknesses persisted, the immediate problems before the Cultural Revolution might be solved but the danger of further crises would remain. If they cannot grasp the reasons why the

tendency of individualism is on the increase in the new situation after revolution, and the character of this socialist individualism and if they cannot evolve a new, advanced concept of proletarian ethics capable of combating these, and if their concept of collective leadership continues to be mechanical, then there would again be problems once the tide of Cultural Revolution subsides somewhat and stable condition arises. Particularly, the coming new generation would fall victim to this socialist individualism and, as a result, the danger of a new type of revisionism may appear.

It is a matter of great pleasure and hope that they have been able to rectify many major shortcomings and mistakes of the Ninth Congress at the Tenth and I have high regard for Mao Zedong's ability and wisdom that have, I think, made this possible. So, I can reasonably hope that the CPC under the leadership of Comrade Mao Zedong would be able to eradicate quickly these weaknesses, too, and defend the Chinese Revolution against revisionist deviation. Our party has this hope and confidence.⁵ This discussion may not have covered all the points, neither is it possible to do it in one discourse, but I feel I have touched upon all important points. I conclude here today. Long Live Revolution !

Speech on November 6, 1973.
Together with the analysis of the
Ninth Congress of the CPC, this
was published in a booklet in
Bengali on August 5, 1981.

NOTES :

1. A party in India now playing full-fledged social democratic role of compromising force between labour and capital in the name of

communism. At that time it felt some concern about theories—right or wrong—which it does not do now at all.

2. Indians and Chinese are brethren.
3. The Lin Biao clique.
4. US puppet government in Kampuchea headed by Lon Nol.
5. After the demise of Comrade Mao Zedong, the Central Committee of our party guided by the thoughts of the departed leader, Comrade Shibdas Ghosh, analysed to show that under the leadership of Deng Xiaoping, it was the revisionists who usurped power in the party and the state in China.