


*Proletarian
Era*



NOVEMBER REVOLUTION SPECIAL, 1981

“To a revolutionary, nothing is nobler than revolution, nothing is more precious than the revolutionary life. And that is why when in the interest of revolution and for leading the life of a revolutionary he is to give up anything, even his life, he never considers this at all a sacrifice”.

Comrade Shibdas Ghosh

Long Live The Great November Revolution !

Working people all over the globe will surely observe the 64th anniversary of the Great November Revolution of 1917 which brought into reality the first successful proletarian revolution in Russia to establish the dictatorship of the proletariat and a socialist system under it, led by the Bolshevik Party and as the concrete and personified expression of collective leadership of the party, Lenin, the great teacher and guide. There cannot be any meaning of remembering this great event in world history that ushered in the new era of proletarian revolution unless we grasp correctly and put into practice the lessons of this great revolution and this is what the Central Committee of our party, SUCI appeals to the working people to bear in mind.

The Central Committee has urged upon the working people to realise that unless they do so, it would not be possible to carry forward their struggles to accomplish the anti-capitalist Socialist Revolution in the country, through to success although without this they can never hope to put an end to the savage exploitation and the degeneration and decay that moribund capitalism breeds every moment, in all spheres of their life. We can accomplish this historic task only when we succeed in arming ourselves with the invaluable teachings of our great departed leader Comrade Shibdas Ghosh, who not only concretised Marxism-Leninism on our soil and in that process elaborated and enriched it further but also brought the understanding of Marxism-Leninism to a new height in the post-Lenin period.

Looking at the world scene, we can well see that in full vindication of the teaching of Comrade Shibdas Ghosh that imperialism-capitalism resorts to from war manoeuvre to peace manoeuvre and vice versa, which are two faces of the same imperialist designs of war, according to the need of their economics and politics. The US imperialism as one of the two superpowers headed by the Reagan Administration is making fresh and frantic bid to whip up war-like situation in general and in the Indian sub-continent in particular. It must not be forgotten that at this third intense phase of crisis of world capitalism such tension, the crisis-ridden bourgeoisie find to be of much advantage and relief.

Behind all these efforts of the imperialists-capitalists, our party has shown, lies the all-out, overall and unprecedented crisis of moribund capitalism for which in their bid to pass on the entire crisis of the system on

to the working people they are resorting to more and more fascist devices. That is why the Congress (I) Government led by Mrs. Gandhi that dons the radical cloak of 'progress and socialism' brings unending series of repressive measures mixing them with soothing vocabularies or so-called planning for growth etc. The sole purpose of this deceptive move is to push the country steadily to the path of fascism. This process of fascisation, just to have a further lease of life, however temporary, is going on in all capitalist countries, including India, no matter the degree of capitalist development, no matter the form of governments.

However painful it may be, but still it is the hard reality that international communist movement which heralded its first victory in the Great November Revolution advancing fast, suffered most from the foul attack of revisionism-reformism from within since the 20th Congress of CPSU when the revisionist clique usurped leadership and taking advantage of this brought distortions and misdirections in the international working class movement. We cannot forget in this connection that it is our beloved leader and teacher, Comrade Shibdas Ghosh who, before any party could take proper notice of the dangers hidden in the negative aspects of the 20th Congress, uttered the historic note of caution that these negative aspects, unless ideologically combated in time would "open the floodgate of revisionism" in the world proletarian movement. No need of reminding what future events have confirmed and are confirming still today.

"Modern revisionism" in the words of Comrade Ghosh, "is the main danger in the international communist movement as also in the national sphere". Today, the revisionists, social democratic parties like the CPI(M) and CPI in our country are coming in rescue, as the last prop, of crisis-ridden moribund capitalism. That is why even when the Indian working class is faced today with fascist attack like the ESMA, CPI(M) in particular, is trying hard so that no effective united movement can grow into irresistible force. Their hostility to SUCI stems mainly from this political role they are playing. We are to bear in mind the warning of Comrade Ghosh, that modern revisionist parties have every possibility of turning themselves fascist by virtually helping this exploitative capitalist system to survive and combining blindness and fanaticism with so-called militancy even while waving the red banner.

Concretising the lessons of the November Revolution and setting the tasks before us, Comrade Shibdas Ghosh has shown that we must strive for developing united democratic mass movements and conduct them, conducive to giving rise to alternative political power of the people in concrete shape of instruments of struggle for protracted battle that can ultimately smash and overthrow the bourgeois state machine. Only by this we can hold aloft the banner of the Great November Revolution.

Long Live the Great November Revolution !

The Post-Second World War International Situation and Lessons of the November Revolution

[On 7th November, 1967 a meeting was organised on the occasion of the Great November Revolution Day by the West Bengal State Committee of our party, the SUCI, at the Muslim Institute Hall, Calcutta. At this meeting, our beloved leader, teacher, guide, one of the foremost Marxist philosophers and thinkers of the era and the founder General Secretary of our Party, Comrade Shibdas Ghosh delivered an illuminating speech on the international and national situation. The portion of this speech relating to the international situation, earlier published in the November Revolution special issue of our Bengali organ Ganadabi dated 22nd November, 1967 is now presented in this English version. While every care has been taken in this translation to make it a true and correct representation of Comrade Ghosh's thought as embodied in the speech, error or inadequacy of expression, if any, is our responsibility. —Ed. P. Era]

This year, we are observing November Revolution Day in the midst of a number of very serious and significant events. You know that the international situation generally, and particularly the post-Second World War international situation unfolded great possibilities before the liberation struggles of the exploited masses of the world. But through continuous deterioration, the situation has come, since then, to such an agonising pass today, that too, you feel surely very much. I consider it necessary for us, on this great occasion, to analyse once again how could it happen at all, in the perspective of the lesson and objective of the November Revolution and the glorious example it set before mankind and the liberation struggles of the exploited masses.

The liberation struggles of the exploited masses are passing through an extremely complex and critical situation today. Whatever may be the difference or diversity

in the form of struggle of the exploited masses, in the specific course and twists and turns of their movements from country to country, it is an undeniable fact that today the mass movements in each and every country is faced with an extremely critical situation. The countries where revolutions have not yet been achieved, that is, where workers and peasants have not come into power, socialist revolution or people's democratic revolution, as the case may be, under the leadership of the working class have not yet been victorious, or the countries which are still fighting against the yoke of foreign imperialism for national freedom, for the establishment of independent sovereign national states—the movements in all these countries today are confronted with intense counter-revolutionary attacks from reactionary cliques. What is responsible for all this? What is its nature? Let us examine these questions thoroughly.

**The post-Second World War
International Situation Brought About
Immense Possibilities Before The
Revolutionary Struggle of
Different Countries**

In the post-Second World War situation, the emergence of a socialist camp as a parallel world system or system of states to the imperialist camp, the loss in strength of imperialism than before, the attainment of national freedom from the clutches of imperialism by many countries and establishment of national states in these newly independent resurgent nationalist countries and more particularly the mounting surge of the national freedom struggle in many a country of Asia, Africa and Latin America created such a situation in the world arena where it appeared to many people that the days of imperialism-capitalism were numbered. It seemed as if the dream of the working class, the aspiration of the exploited masses, was fast going to be a reality through successive victory of revolution from country to country. In the post-Second World War period, the international situation, actually offered such bright possibilities before the liberation struggles of the exploited masses.

The Soviet Union, even taken singly, was formidable in strength at that time. Militarily, politically and economically its supremacy was beyond any question. It appeared then that the Soviet Union alone was strong enough to confront the combined strength of the imperialist camp. Secondly, after the establishment of a New Democratic State by the revolution in China of seventy crores of people joined the socialist camp with her formidable strength. Moreover, the people's democratic countries of eastern Europe, Mongolia, North Korea and North Vietnam etc. taken together, marked the establishment of a world socialist camp over a vast part of the globe. As a result, not only the balance of world forces changed but the overall

supremacy of imperialism that was there was completely smashed and imperialism became, so to say, totally cornered. The world wide democratic movements in the capitalist-imperialist countries also pulsating with youthful vigour were found to be firmly moving towards ultimate victory, step by step. Truly, an upsurge of democratic mass movements of unprecedented dimension was created throughout the world when a strange thing happened and brought about a serious set back.

**As the then leader of the Socialist
Camp, it was the duty of Soviet
Union to foil imperialist
war conspiracy**

Before the anti-imperialist, anti-capitalist peace-loving and freedom loving people of the world, the Soviet Union, very naturally stood as the leader of the Socialist Camp. Being the first working class state based on Marxism-Leninism and built up and reared by Lenin and Stalin, there was unflinching confidence and high esteem in the minds of the people world over. Very naturally, it was for the Soviet Union to provide leadership to the socialist camp. It was then its task to coordinate the mass movements in the different countries with the peace movement of the socialist camp against the imperialist war conspiracy. As the leader of the socialist camp, the main task of the Soviet Union was, on the one hand, to maintain the relative superiority in the nuclear arms of the socialist camp over the imperialist one which can act as the guarantee of world peace against 'nuclear blackmailing' of imperialism, while on the other, not only to expose the real face of the imperialist's 'nuclear blackmailing', or 'atomic war-phobia', but also to unmask the nefarious US politics of engineering local and partial wars here and there all over the world, of instigating one country to get embroiled in war with another, of the policy of 'cash and

violence' and of wanton interference in the internal affairs of other countries through organising coup by stooges created by the CIA within the army of different countries. Not only this, as the leader of the socialist camp it was incumbent upon the Soviet Union to fully mobilise and consolidate the strength of the socialist camp in order to forge united resistance against this menace. Not just a moral opposition, the supreme task of the Soviet Union was to come forward to build up active resistance against imperialism with the firm resolve that the nefarious imperialist conspiracy must be foiled at any cost.

Prior to the Second World War, the slogan "we want peace" against the imperialist war design, raised from the socialist camp, had no real effectivity in practice excepting some ideological-moral significance. It had only a moral and humanitarian appeal, but did not have enough strength to ensure world peace. Soviet Union was then a loner being the only socialist state in the world. As a result, it could not make others pay any heed. The course of events in the world was then determined by the whims of the imperialists, rather by the inherent contradictions or conflicts in the economic laws of imperialism which generate wars. In fact, it was the requirement or necessity of imperialist economy and politics that acted as the determinant as to how long peace in international field would be maintained or when war would break out. Therefore, for the Soviet Union it was possible only to shout for peace and exert a moral influence to that end. As a matter of fact, the Soviet Union did not have sufficient strength at that time to create effective pressure on imperialism so as to impose peace, resist and foil their war conspiracy or determine whether there would be peace or war.

What I mean by 'maintaining peace' is just to maintain that condition in which

there is no war between the states in the world arena. Whether this world peace would be maintained or whether a war, a world war for that matter, would break out, was solely determined by the imperialists up to the breakout of Second World War. That is why the 'League of Nations' did not last long. Nobody paid any heed to the fervent appeals of the Soviet Union then. But after the Second World War, a powerful world socialist camp comprising the socialist countries emerged and imperialism had to pack up from vast territories of the world. This is why imperialism became, since then, more crisis-ridden. The extreme economic crisis that was there in the imperialist-capitalist countries before the Second World War as a result of which they were involved in conflicts with one another over domination of market leading to wars was not solved through it. The tragedy is this that the war in turn further intensified this capitalist crisis of markets because, the erstwhile world imperialist-capitalist market became substantially squeezed with the emergence of the world socialist camp. With the emergence of the socialist camp, the countries comprising it went out of the orbit of world capitalist market, all of which were previously under the single chain of imperialism-capitalism barring Soviet Russia. Therefore, what happened? Well, when the whole world was a market for loot by the imperialists-capitalists, even then there had been not one but two imperialist wars, because of acute crisis of imperialist-capitalist market; now with this market being further contracted after the war, the conflicts between imperialists over markets began to intensify further.

When such was the situation, a new factor was added; the newly independent countries of Asia-Africa, started trying their utmost, according to their respective capabilities, to consolidate their strength of capital and industries, and therefore

attempted to enter into the already shrunk world imperialist-capitalist market as new competitors. As there is competition between these newly independent resurgent nationalist countries amongst themselves centring round their respective attempt to extend influence in the world market on the one hand, so also definite efforts were marked among them to strive for unity in order to offer combined, united opposition to the traditional imperialist-capitalist countries of the world. Consequent to this effort for unity, these newly independent resurgent nationalist countries through Afro-Asian Solidarity Organisation, Bandung conference, Colombo Conference, forged among themselves some sort of a united front to pull together their economic power and resources to meet the competition and challenge of imperialism in the economic field. Since it was not possible for them to achieve this by economic strength alone, they created an anti-imperialist political atmosphere in its favour and by keeping themselves more or less free from the domination and command of big imperialist countries, kept on trying to increase their economic strength and industrial growth through mutual cooperation in the markets.

The international situation then was such that along with this, anti-war voices were being raised and the consciousness about the necessity of building up democratic movement was developing even inside the imperialist countries. This might be as a reaction to the war-like postures and threat of war by the US imperialism, immediately after the end of the Second World War. Such a thing did not happen after the First World War. After the First World War, for a long time, a pro-peace attitude did prevail throughout the world. And from this urge for peace the League of Nations was formed. But this time, right from the birth of the UNO, a bellicose attitude of the USA was clearly perceptible. The USA was feeling the necessity of a new war

taking all the capitalist countries together on her side; otherwise, its economy could not be sustained any more. This is a subject that requires a long discussion which I do not want to deal with in details today. Still then, to help you understand. I shall briefly take it up just now.

The Trend Of Militarisation of Economy In Imperialist-Capitalist Countries

Broadly speaking, the point is this: American economy is a capitalist economy and its problem is the problem of excess capital, that is the problem of excess finance capital. As you know, capital cannot sit idle. Even if a common man may not know this, at least the students of economics should. In case you do not know please try to understand that capital is such a thing which was created not for sitting idle. 'Mr. Capital' cannot sit idle. If 'he' is to sit idle he will definitely do some mischief or harm. Capital requires to be in motion all the time. What harm follows if capital remains idle? It brings about a tendency of inflation, prices of commodities keep on soaring rapidly. The reason is if money is not employed in production, then production cannot increase. As a result, since the production is low compared to the money in circulation, the value of money goes down steeply. Even this steep lowering of value of money would not have mattered much had common men's income risen in thousands compensating the loss. But in capitalist economy, common men's income cannot go up in that proportion. No doubt, their incomes in terms of money increase a little but real income does not increase—rather it falls. And if inflation be on serious scale, then prices of commodities soar up and people's life becomes unbearable. And accumulation of surplus money means that the channel of investment in industry is blocked. When it is

happens, production would necessarily slump. This would inevitably go on aggravating the problem of unemployment. Besides, increase of population remains always an additional problem. If for the sake of argument, we assume that the population remains constant, even then, with the existing population level, unemployment problem would go on increasing.

This is because production cannot remain fixed at a definite level for long. If it does not increase, it is bound to decrease, because in capitalist system, 'market' or demand either increases or decreases. Again, in capitalist system, this demand is not determined by the yardstick of man's actual needs and requirements, rather a man's needs solely depend upon his purchasing power. His 'needs' are determined taking into account his purchasing power according to his income and the market prices. Besides, when production falls, market prices of commodities soar up and the purchasing power of the low-income group of people and the unemployed naturally fall still more. Therefore, the market shrinks more and more. That is why, in accordance with the very law of capitalist economy, it must have a channel to invest capital in other countries. Secondly, whatever industries, whatever employment opportunities are there in a capitalist country—these cannot provide jobs to all. But neither can they accept the situation that the whole country teems with unemployed because that too would create even deeper crisis. Therefore, when they cannot increase production in the normal course through adequate industrialisation, an urge for production of armaments, a tendency of militarisation of the industries, appears in the economies of all capitalist countries. The advantage is that by this measure it is possible to create an artificial stimulation in the market, even if temporarily, since without a boom in the market, the indus-

tries cannot be run, production does not pick up and there is no urge for investment of capital, consequently number of 'shifts' are reduced in factories, factories close down and the number of unemployed in the country further increases. This is why unemployment is on the increase even in the USA. If the unemployed go on swelling in number on such a scale, then the whole production system may one day collapse under the impact of mounting unemployment and it may become impossible to keep going the production and the industries. Therefore, from the urge to stave off such a catastrophe they need to create boom in the market by such artificial means. The tendency of militarisation appears in such a specific situation.

What is meant by this militarisation of industries? It means that the government places orders and the government itself buys up the produce. It is not necessary to depend upon the market, that is the purchasing power of the common people for selling the products. Only, the government's military budget goes on increasing. Therefore, even if temporarily, the industries escape, what we call recession—a situation when there is no market, no work, no orders. The position becomes like this that the government places orders for manufacture of planes, fighters and various other military equipments and hardwares or for other similar wasteful products and the government itself purchases those. Therefore, since it does not have to depend upon the market or purchasing power of the people the economy can be protected somewhat from the mounting pressure of recession for the time being. But this method is beset with a paradox and bears an inherent contradiction within itself. It is like this: as more and more military hardwares and armaments are produced, if these are not released, then due to continuous stockpiling of the war materials produced, a tendency of stagnation is sure to appear in the economy conse-

quent to which the war industries will have to start closing down. But the government too cannot buy up these materials and stock them endlessly and without purpose. Therefore, to release the war materials they need local and partial wars. This basic economic feature is giving rise to crisis one after another which is at the root of the present war policy.

Imperialism Needs Local And Partial Wars To Bolster Up Its Crisis-Ridden Economy

This is the crux, the mystery behind the policy of American Imperialism of instigating one against the other, bossing over the countries around the globe and making forcible entries in other countries to do them "good" and in the name of protecting their "independence". Today, peace is synonymous with a big grave for the American Imperialist economy. Therefore, whether they succeed in triggering off world war or not, they need very badly local and partial wars here and there around the globe. For, they have to continuously increase their military strength. And if they go on increasing military strength and keeping arms race unabated they have no other alternative than to engineer localised and partial wars, conflicts and conflagration time to time, to release their stockpile. Now, does war mean only world war? When someone is anti-war, does it mean he is against world war only? War, partial or regional, imposed here and there by making their forcible entries by the imperialists—are they not equally wars? The way the USA is imposing itself on other nations and continuously pushing them to war against one another, is supplying information about one to the other to get them involved into conflicts and war with one another—are these not also wars? Say for example, Ram and Shyam are two persons. The USA is going to Ram and telling him that Shyam has done such and

such thing against him. Again, it is providing Shyam with the secret information about Ram and telling him. Ram is hatching such and such conspiracy against you. In this way the USA is providing both with information against each other with the sole object of inciting one against the other. They are carrying out such designs through their worldwide, international secret agencies.

During the last Indo-Pak war, the USA helped Pakistan with armaments, whatever might have been the official justification aired by it, its objective in doing this was very clear. By offering political support to Pakistan's demand for Kashmir, it did everything starting from creating tension in the sub-continent. In point of fact, the infiltrators from Pakistan entered India with the advice and help of American and British lobbies. Again, the CIA secretly supplied this information to India that Pakistani infiltrators were entering into her territory and thus cautioned India about its danger. Thus, they urged both the sides to gird up loins. They are advising Pakistan to send infiltrators into India and then to raise the question of Azad Kashmir in the UNO as otherwise the US cannot be of any help to Pakistan; at the same time, they are informing India that Pakistani infiltration is going on and to be alert about it. Report goes that it is the CIA which gave India first the information about Pakistani infiltration. In this way, the USA did wire pulling behind the screen so that both the countries were involved in war. What role the Indian ruling class did play on that occasion is altogether a different matter. I cite the example only to show what is the nature of politics that the USA is pursuing.

So, this is the country of Abraham Lincoln which once unfurled the flag of liberty and democracy. That country, the USA, is today committing piracy over countries, one after another. It would be

a mistake to view the matter as if we, the communists, always speak ill of that country. That is why, it is necessary to elucidate this point a bit. I can name two renowned personalities in Europe who are not communists Bertrand Russel and Jean Paul Sartre, whose thoughts basically have no agreement with communist ideology, who from philosophical point of view can be called even anti-communists or opposed to communism and whose thoughts are being used as major weapons by the bourgeoisie, the reactionaries, today. It is of course true that they are personally honest, they have dedication to and faith in their respective ideologies, they are humanists of the olden times. But they are not in any way communists. Even then, a personality, no less than that of the stature of Bertrand Russel at this age of ninetyfive, had the guts to declare that the US could no longer be called a democratic state. He said that "it is a sordid military regime, it can never be called a democratic government" He made this commentary on the US state in the Trial Court for war criminals which he set up in Stockholm.

It is not possible for Bertrand Russel to become a communist at this age of ninetyfive. Besides, he has fought the communists life long in the belief that the communists are against individual freedom. Had Bertrand Russel been younger in age and if he had the opportunities to analyse with a scientific outlook, perhaps he would have understood whither the 'Standard bearers' of so-called individual liberty are taking the world: The country of Abraham Lincoln, the citadel of civil liberties, is today reduced to a country of brigands. There is no heinous crime that it does not commit. The Nazis were condemned as war criminals. What the USA is doing today in Vietnam and in many other countries of the world puts the Nazis even to shame. The Gestapo activities and the activities of the Fifth Columnists

were once termed a grievous conspiracy against civilisation. I want to put the question: what the CIA and FBI today are doing all around? Is there any kind of mischief that they do not commit? They are engaged in all sorts of nefarious activities starting from political murders, engineering coup detat etc. all over the world. The one and only aim of all these activities of theirs is to maintain war psychosis here and there over the world, to engineer local and partial wars, to embroil one in conflict and battle with another so that the conventional weapons which are getting stockpiled with them and becoming obsolete, can be released by inducing different countries to consume. So, more the wars, more the war psychosis in the world, more the gain for them, the imperialists-capitalists and more specially the US imperialists.

Instead of foiling the war conspiracy of the imperialists the present Soviet leadership itself became a victim to the politics of nuclear blackmailing of the USA.

As the leader of the socialist camp, it was the bounden duty of the Soviet Union to correctly understand this nefarious character and heinous politics of the USA, to point out and expose their real face before the people of the world and to co-ordinate and integrate the politics of the socialist camp with the revolutionary mass movements of the world against the international plunder and piracy of the imperialism. But the Soviet Union could not understand a whit of this heinous politics of the US imperialism. The politics of nuclear blackmailing, of creating a nuclear war-phobia that the USA has been pursuing from the very beginning, has an ulterior motive. It knows very well that so long socialist camp has distinct superiority in nuclear strength, the US

cannot unleash nuclear war. For, if nuclear war breaks out in such a situation it is the USA that will suffer most and be ruined in no time. That is why it is trying to pose a threat before the world, trying to create panic on this score. By circulating various thrilling stories about how the world would burn in a moment to ashes if nuclear war breaks out, just as some people like H. G. Wells were writing scientific fictions to provide stories to the cinema. In short, the US imperialism is trying to create a panic among the people of the world, and engender a feeling that mankind itself would be exterminated in the event a nuclear war breaks out. Since, everything is after all meant for the people, nothing should ever be done which would utterly destroy mankind and civilisation etc. etc. The US objective of spreading such horror is to browbeat the socialist camp that in the event of its interest being jeopardised in any way, war will break out. So beware! Strange! As if, the responsibility to see that world war is not triggered off lies only with others and not with them. As if, it is the socialist camp with which lies the responsibility to ensure that world war does not break out and mankind is not destroyed, whereas their job is to force their presence in others lands to start wars! And if the USA is resisted, world war, nuclear war might break out, destroying the world, so it is for the others to silently tolerate all its devilish activities and appease it! But nonetheless, it is a fact that the US imperialism has succeeded in making the present Soviet leadership victim to the threat of nuclear blackmailing politics.

The Soviet leadership totally failed to grasp this character of US nuclear blackmailing politics. They could not understand at all that so long the Soviet Union and the socialist countries have nuclear superiority the USA would dare not unleash an atomic war. What is more, the cardinal point

is: foiling these conspiracies of imperialism is the only effective means or guarantee of thwarting nuclear warfare. Otherwise, if world war breaks out some day from these imperialist machinations then it would inevitably be a nuclear war. Therefore, nuclear war cannot be averted just by appeasement. So to thwart the nuclear war, one has to strike at the roots so that the imperialists do not succeed in making preparations for it. In order to implement it in practice, first of all, it is necessary to take full advantage of the contradictions within the imperialist camp so that the imperialists cannot unite together and form blocs for starting war by doing whatever is needed to achieve it; secondly, to support the newly independent resurgent nationalist countries in such contradictions against imperialism which exist between them in such a manner that the anti-imperialist struggle gets strengthened and imperialism can even more be cornered; thirdly, to actively help the working class in the capitalist-imperialist countries where they are fighting for revolution and the people of the colonial countries who are fighting for freedom, providing active help to these struggles so that revolutions in these countries succeed, being free from counter-revolutionary attacks and outside interference—in this way, such a congenial condition should be created so that revolutionary struggles in those countries can achieve final victory; fourthly, in case of foreign affairs to pursue such a diplomatic policy by which the USA can be isolated politically and economically—for it is the USA that is today providing leadership in organising international loot and plunder, in exporting counter revolution and is the chief instigator of wars in the world.

To co-ordinate the above programme was a very important task for the Soviet politics, its foreign policy and what relates to international communist movement in general. But after the demise of Comrade

Stalin, the Soviet leadership could not only not do this, but they brought a number of such conceptions into play which have as such no bearing on performing these tasks. Rather, due to these erroneous conceptions of the revisionist Soviet leadership, whatever support had developed among the people in favour of performing these tasks based on rather a superficial idea about it in the post-war period—everything was lost. Some irrelevant questions which the capitalists were continuously trying to introduce into the communist camp and create confusion among the common people, taking advantage of the low level of theoretical consciousness of the communists led to a situation when the present Soviet leadership became victim to all this, that is, the unfounded and unnecessary fear of the Soviet leadership for nuclear war and their overzealousness to maintain peace at any cost. As otherwise, they started arguing, world war would break out and if it happens then the whole civilisation would be destroyed !

True, peace has got to be maintained. But does maintaining of peace mean that the USA would force its presence in other countries and start war there, organise counter revolutions and engage in international piracy—but the USA should not be effectively resisted since peace would be disturbed thereby? What then would follow? The result would be that the USA would go on doing whatever it wants, but no effective resistance can be put up since such resistance could bring about world war. What a queer logic ! But Khrushchev's argument runs like this. His argument is : what will happen if the world war breaks out in the event the US is resisted? And in case of a world war, it cannot but be a nuclear war, and in case of a nuclear war, civilisation will be destroyed and if civilisation is thus destroyed, shall we build up socialism on the ashes? But the matter is just the reverse. The very presumption

that nuclear war would be triggered off the moment the USA is resisted is nothing but a subjective thinking, a utopia.

At the beginning the USA could not fully ascertain that its politics of nuclear blackmailing was working so well. For Soviet's anti-imperialist slogans were in full cry till then as it is even now. But the real face of Soviet's anti-US stand was not clear till then to the USA. And because of this, the USA was moving accordingly. As a result of defeat in the Korean war, the prestige of the US imperialist might was impaired. It happened in the Korean war that the Chinese volunteers even with their small and conventional weapons gave a good dressing down and sent back beyond Seoul the troops of the USA, the possessor of atom bombs, the most powerful among the imperialist-capitalist countries in the post-Second World War period. Again, lakhs of US troops are dying in Vietnam, but have not been able to advance their security even by an inch. The USA, to speak the truth, is in a precarious condition there, its crisis mounting every moment, only the military costs are increasing. Even by applying the most sophisticated modern armaments, so far produced, they have not been able to improve their position there.

Here too, it has become a question of prestige for the USA, it is now a hard struggle to defend that prestige. In an attempt to retrieve its prestige it has even plunged in some sort of adventure. The myth that was there about American might has been exploded after the Korean war. The main purpose of this adventure was to refurbish its image.

**Due To Wrong Steps Of The Soviet
Leadership USA's Lost Military
Prestige Was Regained
In The Carribeans**

The USA made the first experiment on its politics of nuclear blackmailing at

Carribeans. By this experiment, it tried to ascertain the real import of Soviet's anti-imperialist stand. The counter-action which had succeeded against the British on the Suez canal issue in reality, what was its depth—by critically examining the politics practised by Khushev and the conduct of the Soviet revisionist leadership on different issues, the American diplomats felt that they have been able to grasp the point correctly. In fact a kind of war-phobia gripped the Soviet leadership and they had already become the victims to nuclear war psychosis. Now, once the imperialists get the scent that the socialist camp is afraid of war, then what is expected naturally, is happening now. And this has happened due to the weakness of the Soviet leadership. The irony is this that the Soviet leadership could not grasp even that the US actually wanted to test the Soviet politics in the Carribeans. The leaders of the Soviet Communist Party could not grasp that by this, the US wanted to place the Soviet Union in such a position before the world to test as to what extent to go against imperialism in any trial of strength. That is, the US wanted to test specifically whether the Soviet Union would enter into a trial of strength with the USA in a partial or local war or it would counter with all out attack to stop the US piracy, even at the risk of a world war, if necessary? The USA resorted to the Carribbean blockade to test this, particularly.

They created the blockade in such a manner that if the Soviet Union could be drawn into a local war by threats and instigations, then since the area offered logistic advantage due to geographical contiguity to the USA, it would be possible for the US to defeat the Soviet Union. On the other hand, if the Soviet adopts such a policy that it would not only be involved in a local war with the USA on the issue but would not tolerate such American piracy at all, come what may, even if there

be a danger of a world war, that is, the US action would be considered by the Soviet leaders to be an all-out war between the USSR and the USA—then the USA would retrace its steps. Then by mouthing words of peace, posing as an emissary of peace it would retreat on the plea of maintaining world peace. The Carribbean blockade was viewed as an experiment to test the Soviet attitude to see how the Soviet reacts. And like a school boy politician, Khrushchev did the very thing what the USA expected of him to do.

Without understanding the true implication of the event, Khrushchev issued a threat at the very outset. He could not understand that the USA had not taken this move to be cowed down by threat. Actually, the USA wanted to see the real extent of the Soviet threat. The USA wanted to know specifically: whether the threat meant only that the Soviet would confine itself in a local war with the US warships there or it meant something more. The USA had then nothing to fear at the Soviet threat. Because it had the logistic advantage there. In a local war there, it is the Soviet that was sure to face the defeat. Or else, if the Soviet threat amounted to an all out war between the USA and the Soviet Union then the threat had some real danger for the USA and there were reasons to be afraid of. For it would then mean a world war. And in Intercontinental Ballistic Missiles (ICBM) the Soviet Union till then had superiority over and was far ahead of the USA. That means, the Soviets had such capacity that, sitting in their own country, they could blast out the USA within fifteen minutes. The ICBM's took only fifteen minutes to fly from one continent to another. This was the situation. Such deadly weapon was in the hands of the Soviet Union.

But what we saw was that the Soviet Union blasted first and in reply the USA gave counter threat. At first the Soviets

said: We are sending warships then. The USA accepted the challenge because all military strategists knew what this would amount to. All the military generals at once advised Khrushchev that Soviet Union would be defeated in a local war there. The Soviet Union would have to carry war-materials in ships and planes from thousands of miles away since it did not have the logistic advantage. It was not possible therefore for her to conduct and continue war this way. The only war the Soviet could opt was nuclear war and not local war. For, the USA would fight from its bases there and had close proximity and links with its bases, whereas the Soviet Union was thousands of miles away. It was not possible for the Soviet Union to carry things in submarines across many countries and fight there. Therefore, if a battle was to be fought at all, it could only be a world war and not a local war. Khrushchev said: Good God! If there be a world war, then the world would be destroyed, that cannot be! So, it was for the USSR to surrender. And Khrushchev actually capitulated to the US piracy in the name of peace. At this, a set of 'humbugs' clapped hands in appreciation. They said that by this, Khrushchev unfurled the banner of peace over the world. But they could not see what a grievous harm was perpetrated. By this, the reactionaries world over formed a high impression about the US Pentagon and its military might. The US military might regained its lost prestige. The glory the USA had lost in Korea was thus regained. A feeling gained ground amongst many: Here you see the USA's real power and the Soviet Union is not that strong as is said about it or appears from outside. And if the USA rises up in resistance the Soviet Union is afraid to confront it. The reactionary cliques all over the world was assured that the USA was really a dependable ally, they got bold and assured at the idea that such a strong US was by

their side. They had no reason to fear about revolution or liberation struggles of the people or anything else. Thus, the USA's prestige before the reactionary cliques and the image of Pentagon about its military might was refurbished and the US Administration as a whole regained its lost prestige.

The Soviet Leadership Trampled Upon All Accepted And Declared Policies On The Issue Of Open US Attack On North Vietnam

But this was only the first experiment that the USA made on the Soviet Union. Therefore, the USA thought that the Soviet Union might have grasped and got over the earlier mistake and that it might not be her permanent policy. Therefore, to test it the USA made another experiment, this time in Tonkin Bay. The war was going on in South Vietnam, but all on a sudden the USA attacked North Vietnam with gun-boats. It destroyed a number of North Vietnamese warships with torpedoes. In fact, they started the attack on North Vietnam by cooking up a story as an excuse, as they always do. By this attack, they tested and tried the Soviet Union, to see how the situation develops. That is, this was just its first step. For, the situation here was not exactly the same as that in the Carribeans. In this case the Soviet Union was committed to fulfil a declared policy that attack upon any socialist country would be considered as an attack upon the Soviet Union itself and the defence or security of any socialist country ultimately rested with the Soviet Union. But the whole incident of US attack on North Vietnam and subsequent events proved that the Soviet leaders were so much obsessed with nuclear war-phobia that they could so easily trample upon such an important declared policy of a socialist country on this issue.

Not only this, once there had been an understanding or a secret pact between the

Soviet Union and China according to which the Soviet Union was committed to help China in developing atomic weapons. But after discussions with the USA (I do not remember who was the US President then, Eisenhower or Kennedy, whoever he may be it is all the same), the Soviet Union gave an assurance to the USA that if the USA agrees that it would stop nuclear tests in the atmosphere and try to control atomic weapons, then the Soviet Union in its turn would not also provide any help to China in manufacturing atomic weapons. By this, the Soviet Union even divulged to the USA its secret pact with China. What all this boiled down to? Here the behaviour of the Soviet leadership was like that of a humanist or an honest priest, which has nothing to do with or any relevance in politics. This can be termed as an example of utter ignorance or an act of sheer servility of the Soviet leadership to the USA—whatever may be the case, its impact on practical politics was the same. The USA however took full advantage of this. When China subsequently criticised the USSR for having thus divulged the secret treaty to the USA, for not providing atomic weapons to her and in spite of being a socialist country, for having come to such an understanding with the USA which would damage and harm the socialist camp most and practically forced USSR to give a reply, the Soviet Union said: why should China need manufacture atomic weapons? Does she not know that the Soviet Union itself had enough nuclear strength meant for the entire socialist camp? What use, therefore, to unnecessarily divert and waste China's resources in this direction? Rather, the Soviet Union tried to make China believe that, instead, China should concentrate all its efforts and energy in economic development so that China would prosper economically in a planned way and bring about country's development very fast.

At that time, even such a queer

economic plan was churning in Khrushchev's brain that the socialist countries would be divided into a number of 'sectors'—the industries would be the affairs of certain socialist countries while some others would be agriculture-based. But no socialist country was in a position to accept rather was sure to reject such a planning. Because there is a national psychological make-up in each socialist country, each of them has national form of state, which it cannot outlive at present, existing independently and separately. The matter is not like this that the national character of the socialist states has become exhausted and a world socialist system has come into being. Rather, each socialist country today exists separately within its national boundary, with its own national psychological make-up. Nobody can deny this fact. In such a situation, no socialist country can sacrifice its economic power to others. The Soviet Union will have steel and possess other advanced technology and industry, while the others will switch over to agriculture only to supply raw materials to the Soviet industries—can any socialist country agree to such a preposterous proposition? None can agree and this is exactly what happened in practice—nobody did actually agree. Because it will take a long time for such a system to develop and work. When world socialist system would be established, conflicts between nations would disappear, when the socialist states would outlive their national form of existence and would merge into a unified, single international human society—only then can such a situation arise and not before that. Before that such forcible imposition would be taken by others as domineering attitude and looked upon with suspicion. In fact, such a suspicion regarding the Soviet Union has already reared its ugly head among the Balkan states. Even in China this is happening and this is bound to happen. There are objective reasons for this suspicion to grow because this plan of Khrushchev

bears no relation to the realities, in this plan there is no reflection of the existing reality of the present stage through which socialist revolution is passing. Therefore, it has not been possible for any one to accept such an unrealistic and fantastic plan.

Maintaining Nuclear Superiority Of The Socialist Camp Is The Only Guarantee Against Nuclear War

So, as I was telling, the Soviet Union was arguing on the similar line on the question of making nuclear bomb by China. Then China replied that the Soviet had initially committed a mischief and has followed it up with another mischief. The first one had been that in a sudden show of bravado, the Soviet Union had given the commitment to the USA that it would not carry on testing of nuclear arms in open air. At once some "progressive"(!) people like Rajagopalachari applauded and said that at long last here comes a humanist approach from the Soviet Union. And the USA which has been lagging behind the USSR in nuclear military strength utilised the respite in full to bridge the gap in strength by surreptitiously continuing particularly underground nuclear experiments. Within a short time the blunder of USSR came to light. What a self defeating policy the Soviet Union was pursuing, China said. (till then, China and the Soviet had not fallen apart) The avowed object for which the Soviet had stopped nuclear testing—the imperialists would not move even one step in that direction. They would pat and applaud the Soviet Union as a great 'humanist, while trying at the same time their best to see how soon they could remove the gap between them and the Soviet in nuclear strength. And the moment this gap is wiped out and the USA can supersede the Soviet Union in nuclear strength, all these 'humanistic' verbiages would be in vain and the atomic war may breakout

in actuality. That the USA is not unleashing a global war today, the major reason for that is the over all superiority of the Soviet Union in nuclear armament. The USA is well aware that even a slap from the USSR will be hard for it to stand. And here lies the true guarantee against nuclear war, because so long as imperialism exists, war maniacs are there, military regimes exist and the capitalist-imperialist states are run on the basis of militarisation of economy—war is a reality and the possibility of war does exist. Therefore, one of the major guarantees to stave off war is the superiority of the Soviet Union and the Socialist Camp in nuclear strength. Why did Soviet Union then stop nuclear testing, China questioned. China also argued that the Soviet should have told the USA only this much that it was ready to stop all testing and destroy its armaments provided the USA also was ready to destroy all its arms. That is why they should have talked not of just controlling nuclear testing, but about complete and all-out disarmament and about destroying all nuclear weapons. China objected to mere control over atomic weapons because, taking this opportunity, the USA would try to make good its gap in atomic strength compared to the Soviet Union. And the progress, in the field of technology, like any other field of science, does not follow such a course that since the Soviet Union today is advanced in this respect, this superiority would be there all through. Such thinking is simplistic and unscientific. There may be ups and downs. That is why, one should be always on guard against it. In science and technology, constant vigilance should be maintained so that the Soviet union does not, for a single moment lag behind even an inch from the US technology and nuclear science. Otherwise danger may befall any time. At the insistence of China and due to the pressure of other socialist states, the Soviet Union accepted this point for the time being, but

the difference continued even after this acceptance.

When the Soviet Union put pressure on China to desist from making atomic weapons, China did not agree, because, even at that time, many in the Chinese Communist Party had the apprehension that because of the course the Soviet Union had taken, willy-nilly the danger of war would come one day. Because war cannot be averted by chanting sermons like "We do not want war". What the Chinese leadership was trying to impress was that the Soviet's 'No war' attitude was almost similar to performing religious rites for so-called self-purification by fasting and chanting incantations. But to the true revolutionaries "No war" slogan can have one and only one implication and that is to pursue such a concrete and objective politics and programme through which the very designs, machinations and preparation for war by the imperialists would be foiled and imperialism would be more and more cornered through the victories of the anti-imperialist forces and movements. That is, even while making all sorts of preparation for war, in reality, imperialists would find themselves more and more in disadvantageous position than before regarding the feasibility of unleashing such wars. This means the imperialists should be placed into such a difficult position that while they will go on making all-out preparations for war and taking such plans one after another, they will find themselves more and more isolated within a span of few years through the successful culmination of the liberation struggles of the people in different countries—by the word, concrete and objective policy which the revolutionaries should follow at present, I mean precisely this.

Thus while the imperialists will be trying to 'manage' the situation sometimes here, sometimes there, sometime filling the gap here, sometimes there, i.e. by different

manoeuvres here and there they would find to their dismay, one day, that the situation has deteriorated further, and such dents have developed elsewhere that the situation has already gone beyond their power to 'manage'. That is, one country has gone out of the imperialist camp, revolution has been victorious in another country and some other has gone out of their orbit, and economic crisis has reached its peak. Thus by integrating and co-ordinating all the movements from various sides, imperialism is to be weakened so much so that their whole conspiracy to unleash war is defeated.

Therefore, the main tasks following from this suggestion should be concretised thus :

First, to strengthen the anti-imperialist national liberation struggles in the colonial countries and the anti-capitalist revolutionary movements of the people in the capitalist-imperialist countries ;

Secondly, to link up and integrate these national liberation struggles in the colonial countries and revolutionary movements of the people in the capitalist-imperialist countries ;

Thirdly, to integrate politically and diplomatically from all aspects the national liberation struggles of the colonial countries and the revolutionary movements of the capitalist-imperialist countries with the peace movement and the movement based on the policy of peaceful co-existence of the socialist camp and to thoroughly expose the real design behind the politics of nuclear blackmailing of the imperialists.

Fourthly, to take advantage of the contradictions between the imperialist countries, between the imperialist and the newly independent resurgent nationalist countries and the contradiction of the newly independent resurgent nationalist countries among themselves—to carefully study these contradictions and utilise them

in such a way as to take full advantage of these contradictions to make imperialism more and more weakened and isolated.

Thus by correctly applying this programme, making revolution victorious in country after country, cornering imperialism in such a manner it may be possible that while scheming for war it gets exterminated from the world before it can actually unleash a war. This is the only practical way of freeing the world from the threat of wars. This concrete situation had arisen after the Second World War, the situation in which the possibility of wars could have been totally eliminated by bringing an end to imperialism-capitalism in one country after another before imperialism could make full preparations for war. Even if that were not possible, at least such measures were needed to be taken whereby a number of capitalist countries could have been encircled to tie their hands by the success and impact of revolutionary struggles in all the countries so that they do not get objectively a situation to trigger off wars. And this is the only method of preventing wars. But the leadership of the Soviet Communist Party headed by Khrushchev chose the method of fasting, requests and appeals—some useless and hollow talks which the devil or the tiger like the imperialists do not pay any heed to.

The imperialist ruling cliques are devils to the bone. And it should be always kept in mind that in any imperialist country, an administrator, even if he is not personally a scoundrel, has no option but to prepare for war driven by the exigency of the imperialist economy and politics. The question, whether a particular person in power of such a country is good or bad is absolutely irrelevant here. A man even if he is personally good or honest, that does not mean that he can run a clean administration honestly with pro-people attitude. The military generals, the war mongers of that country, that is, the big monopoly capitalists would not like him unless he

accedes to boost up the war economy. Whatever policies he may adopt politically despite the fact that he is a humanist and has a flexible approach, the monopolists will throw him out unless he shapes the economy basically in conformity with war economy. This happens because it is they who control the real power. In this matter they cannot depend on any individual. What happens if an administrator in a capitalist-imperialist state is good and humane? He is helpless in this system, he is practically powerless. Either he has to serve this system or, if he cannot do so, he has to get out of power because those who control real power would not tolerate him, would drive him out. May be, for this, a political murder might be organised but it is sure that he will not be in power and the imperialists would ultimately stick to their chosen course.

In the post-Second World War period, such a situation had arisen that once I opined that we had almost reached the threshold of world revolution, so to say, just a few yards from it. Just at that moment the world communist movement was led to a labyrinth. That is, the situation was such that there was a bright possibility of revolution becoming victorious from country to country. The power of resistance of imperialism was totally shattered. All the imperialist countries of Europe were then totally war-ravaged. They were producing below capacity. They were not able to feed the people. There was a surge of anti-imperialist liberation struggles in the colonies. As a result, they were unable to keep the working class of their respective countries satisfied. So long, they had tried to keep their working class contented by plundering the colonial markets. As a result, apparent quiet had reigned in those countries. But many a country having now come out of the yoke of imperialism, and the prospect of imperialist exploitation in those newly independent resurgent nationalist countries having

diminished due to setting up of new industries there, naturally a tremendous pressure came upon the imperialist economy. In reality, the whole US economy stands on quicksand. The situation is such that it may tumble down at any moment. Its whole economic system stands on war economy. The type of war depending on which it has maintained its economic stability at present is that it is a local, partial, temporary affair—it cannot last long. And it can make these local wars going mainly because the national liberation movements have not yet been victorious. Thus, the very moment the victory of national liberation struggles of different colonial and dependent countries would be completed, the opportunities for the imperialists to trigger off local wars would also diminish. Therefore, the task of the Socialist Camp under the leadership of the Soviet Union was to impose the policy of peaceful co-existence upon them.

**The Real Revolutionary Significance
Of The Policy Of Peaceful Co-existence
And The Soviet Leadership's Failure
To Grasp The Same**

How did this policy of peaceful co-existence appear at all? The imperialists always take resort to this propaganda that the communists are forcibly imposing communism upon the world. It is in reply to this that Comrade Stalin propounded the theory of peaceful co-existence. In reply to the imperialist propaganda that communists want to establish communism in different countries forcibly through war, Comrade Stalin said that it was a blatant lie; a socialist state does not believe in such theory and method as well. Again, after the war, the USA started a clamour that its existence was at stake—and it is the communists who were endangering their existence. By this, the USA meant that resisting the Soviet was its policy then. In reply, the Soviet Union said: No, it is not true that their existence is threatened by

the Soviet Union. Soviet military might does not pose a danger to them and asserted that the Socialist Camp is ready to give a blank cheque that if attacked, the Soviet Union would only then counter attack, otherwise, it would not touch anybody and would never interfere in the internal affairs of any country. But the imperialists too would have to put their signature on it and abide by it. They would have to declare at the same time and assure that they too would not force their presence in any country to oppress the people there, would not attack any country, aggress on and annex any land. Then the Soviet Union would have no conflict with them and the question of resisting imperialist interference or aggression by the Soviet would not arise at all. It would mean that nobody can interfere in the internal affairs of any country.

Because, the communists know that revolution cannot be imported from outside. If the forces within the country cannot generate the invincible strength of revolution, then by external instigations there can at best be "monkey dance" for some days in the name of revolution, but not a revolution proper. Revolution can succeed in a country only when it attracts the people, can make firm root in that particular soil and help develop the forces of revolution by drawing necessary strength from within. Revolution triumphs in a country only when such conditions are created. External help can then add to its strength—and that much. But unless the revolutionary forces can draw food and nourishment from their own soil in a country, they cannot acquire invincible strength of revolution. For example, the revolutionary strength of Vietnam is not based on the help and is not fed from outside. Had it been so, it could have been torn into pieces by the US military might in no time. But that could not be done, because the revolution there grew drawing its vitality from its own soil and sustained therefrom.

There, even a boy of nine joins the battle, rifle in hand—mother, son, daughter, all have taken up arms. Even when cultivating in the fields, they are shooting down planes with their rifles. Therefore, is it a hot-headed frivolous act of a few people in the name of revolution inspired from outside? Its roots go down deep into the soil of the country. Revolutionary consciousness has grown among the people, they have become imbued with revolutionary consciousness. True, the Soviet Union, China, the Socialist Camp as a whole, all progressive people of the world, those who yearn for liberation, all support the liberation struggle of Vietnam.

But this support to the liberation struggle of the Vietnamese people—is this an interference in the internal affairs of Vietnam? It is an elementary knowledge that just as science, epistemology, theories etc. have no geographical or national boundaries, so also there can be no geographical or national barriers in sympathising with the movement for progress. I can recall, once the Congressites wanted to send volunteers under the leadership of Jawaharlal Nehru in the Spanish freedom struggle against fascism. That was an internal affair of Spain. But why did they still want to send volunteers? Because, it was a progressive struggle by the people against reaction. It is for all freedom loving people, whoever once fought or are fighting today for genuine freedom, who still value freedom, to help in freedom struggles all over the world. But freedom is not attained anywhere just with the help of others. Every country has to earn its own freedom by itself. But wherever there is a struggle for freedom—if anybody aspires for his own freedom then he would surely have sympathy and support for the freedom movements of others. Whoever can, will help. But others cannot come and win freedom for them. They themselves have to win their own freedom and fight for it. When they can acquire strength from the

soil of their own country only then would that be invincible.

This is the theory and concept of the communists. On this was built the basic tenet of communism:—"Revolution can neither be imported nor exported". One of the fundamental principles of Marxism or dialectical materialism from which this tenet follows, runs thus:—"The internal contradiction is the basic cause of any change of matter, while external contradiction only influences or can influence that change".

But unless the internal contradiction matures, that is unless the internal condition is ripe no change or revolution can take place. Therefore for a revolution to take place in any country the communists need not impose it in hot haste from outside. For, the concept of exporting revolution through military operation from outside has found no place, other than in the thoughts of Trotsky, in the mainstream of Marxism, and this is real Marxism. This concept has no place in Stalin's thinking nor is it in the thinkings of the leadership of China. Nor can it be the thinking of any genuine communist. It was a concept of Trotsky. Trotsky's contention was that after the establishment of socialism in one country, its primary task would be to export revolution to other countries by sending army there. That was the theory of "permanent revolution" propounded by Trotsky. But the Leninist theory, the Marxist theory, that became historically established against this, is that if revolutions are attempted in this manner by imposition upon other people, then the bourgeoisie of those countries would make use of the sentiment for freedom present among their people against the revolution itself. They would term these as aggression and as a result, the revolutionary movement that was growing inside the country would in the natural course face serious set back. This is excess or extremism in the name of revolution and

not the real course of revolution. And I feel that another point should be touched here. It was Stalin and not Khrushchev who enunciated the theory of peaceful co-existence. On the basis of Leninist teachings this theory was evolved at the time of Stalin. Khrushchev has now degraded that theory, but he is giving such airs as if he is the propounder of this theory. But the students of Marxism-Leninism cannot be deceived by this. They know very well that it is Stalin and not Khrushchev who really enunciated this theory.

So it is clear that the theory of peaceful co-existence came into being to counter the imperialist propaganda. By this, the Soviet Union wanted to tell the people of the world that it was ready to follow the principle of peaceful co-existence, but they should force the USA to follow the same. As the USA was running hither and thither on the plea of defending freedom, was the Soviet Union going that way anywhere on the same plea of defending freedom or suppressing reaction? Like the USA, had the Soviet Union sent troops or raided any country by bombing? Is there till now a single instance that Soviet Union has rushed to any country to counter the military intervention of the USA, which in the opinion of the Soviet Union, is out and out reactionary? Besides, who assigned the USA to be the 'sentinel' of world freedom? Therefore, the Soviet Union declared that let the people of each country determine their own destiny. Which country would welcome communism and which would carry the banner of democratic ideal of Abraham Lincoln, whither they will go let the people of the country decide for themselves. In the struggle between capitalists and the working class, between the reactionaries and the progressives in the different countries, let the people of each country fight it out with the exploiters, the bourgeoisie of that particular country. Let not the imperialists aggress on other countries in the name

of defending democracy. The Soviet Union, as such, has no need to do the same—it can give a blank cheque. But let the imperialists agree that they would not attack others.

I remember aright that when Stalin first propounded this theory of peaceful co-existence, the Trotskyites in our country viewed that it was nothing but a policy of class collaboration. Their point was how could there be peaceful co-existence with the imperialists, the fascists or the capitalists? In their opinion it was nothing but a policy of class collaboration. I pointed out in reply to them that they had not at all understood the contention of the theory of peaceful co-existence. Are they not the camp followers of 'permanent revolution', who talk loudly of 'permanent revolution' today to oppose communism tomorrow, to enlist their names in the American Free Society! And exactly this has happened with them. All should understand that the policy of peaceful co-existence is never a policy of class-collaboration. In reality, it is an objective socialist approach to keep the revolutionary movements in country to country free from organised attacks of international counter revolution and guarantee peace. It is such a policy in support of which not only the people of the bourgeois countries would respond but even a group among the capitalists would respond. On the other hand, by this, those among the capitalists who are war mongers, warmaniacs, would be totally isolated and cornered. The effectivity of this policy is that even those forces in the different countries who do not share communist ideology but are against war—even they would resist war if it breaks out in their country and would put pressure to bear upon the imperialists to accept the principle of peaceful co-existence. In reply to the clamours the imperialists are raising that the communists are endangering their existence, it is these sections of people who would retort that since the socialist camp

is giving a blank cheque that it would not interfere in the internal affairs of any country, then why should the imperialists openly attack it? They, themselves would accuse that it is the CIA, the US agency, that is instigating and fomenting trouble in different countries.

Let the imperialists conduct ideological propaganda just as the socialist camp preaches its ideology. But the USA is not doing this. It is sending CIA agents into countries and poking its nose into the internal affairs of other countries through its policy of "cash and violence". They have not been able to adduce any reliable proof against the socialist camp being guilty of this crime, but they are spreading the false propaganda that the socialist countries too are operating by creating fifth columnists inside other countries just like the CIA. This is nothing but a heinous political slander out and out. Those in different countries who believe in communism and propagate it—they call them the fifth columnists. My question is whether acceptance of a noble ideology in life and struggling hard for that—is it like working as a stooge? If that be so, then by accepting the concept of bourgeois democracy, one becomes equally a stooge either of the USA or of Britain. Again, when we use electricity we become stooges of foreign country because electricity was not invented by an Indian scientist. How can those who argue like this be made to understand that just as science cannot be bound up in a single country, having no country of its own, so theories, philosophy, science and epistemology etc. too have no country or race of their own. Communism is an ideology—how can it have barriers of countries and nations? Those who would like it, would accept it. When Russia first accepted communist ideology it had to face the accusation that since this ideology first originated in Germany, by embracing this ideology the Russians had become stooges of Germany. Everybody knows that this

ideology originated not in Russia, but in Germany. Karl Marx, the founder of this ideology, was driven out of his country, Germany, and died in England later. Engels too, who was the close associate of Marx in developing this ideology, came from Germany. Thus we see that it is Germany that gave birth to this ideology, but Russia consummated this ideology through revolution. After Russia, China organised revolution guided by this Marxist ideology. At the time of Chinese revolution, China was condemned as a lackey of the Soviet Union. It was said that through this, the Soviet imperialism was expanding its territory. These are all false propaganda. There should be a limit to confusing the people by taking advantage of their low level of consciousness. Taking advantage of the lack of political consciousness and consequent weakness of the people, the imperialists are even crossing that limit. This is because the common people do not generally think about these, nor do they ponder over these problems. They talk in simplistic language and terms. They do not think even about the nature of the main problems and the trends in the country's politics.

Besides, history has proved beyond doubt who are really the stooges. Communists of real worth in any country have never become the stooges of anybody. Real communists everywhere are fighting for the noble ideal of freedom, for the liberation of the country. The real point here—they are fighting for liberating the masses from exploitations of all kind—they are the most worthy and best sons of the soil. We know that today the bourgeoisie, the reactionaries, would not accept this. Their interest is different, so they speak differently. In fact they call them patriots who are spineless, who barter away all the noble qualities of a man in lieu of money. Let the imperialists adorn these people with whatever medal they like, but the Soviet stand was that let there be an international

understanding that they would not come in support of such "patriots" (1) anywhere. Soviet Union was giving word that it would not go in support of even those whom they know to be the revolutionaries, the worthiest and best sons of the soil. Was this condition acceptable to the imperialists? If they agree, let them sign on the agreement. This was the real meaning of pursuing the policy of peaceful co-existence that is, it meant that the policy of peaceful co-existence would have to be imposed upon the imperialists, they would have to be forced to accept it. Its objective was to protect the revolutionary movements of the different countries from the conspiracy and attacks of international counter-revolutionary forces.

If we take the case of Chinese revolution it will be clear what a tremendous difficulty they had to undergo. Who does not know that the might they possessed could have destroyed Chiang Kai Shek's power in one blast. But the USA backed up Chiang Kai Shek with all its military and economic might. Therefore, did the Chinese people fight against just Chiang Kai Shek alone? They had to fight against the total US military strength in the Pacific and against all-out counter revolutionary attack of international capitalism. The object of the policy of peaceful co-existence was to put at halt such imperialist attacks. A socialist country does not need to export revolutions to other countries. In any country, revolution triumphs by drawing the majority of the people in its favour. Therefore, it is an invincible force by itself. Who helped the Russians for the victory of their revolution? Nobody. But after revolution, the imperialist countries, encircling and attacking from all sides could not destroy the nascent Soviet State. The situation today is no more like that. It is now the time for sounding the victory-drum of revolution from country to country. Now, nobody can defeat the revolutionary movement of any country

today. In every country the forces of revolution are irresistible today. For their victory, they hardly need any external assistance. What they need only is protection from international counter-revolutionary attacks. Take the case of the Vietnamese people. Be it socialism, democracy or any other kind of independent state they want to establish in their country, it is to be guaranteed that they can do so by fighting it out with the reactionary forces of their own. But what happened in reality? International reaction, that is, USA, Britain and other powerful and advanced capitalist-imperialist countries arrayed themselves with all their military might behind the reactionary forces inside the country whom the Vietnamese people could have kicked out in no time. Therefore, the unarmed Vietnamese people now have to fight against united forces of international reaction singlehanded. This means revolutionary movement of the practically unarmed people in each country has today to confront the mighty international imperialist military power with all its sophisticated arms, and therefore the revolutions are failing to make headway. That is why, the real significance of the policy of peaceful co-existence was to protect this victorious and onward march of revolution of the exploited masses, the victorious march of freedom struggle and socialism from country to country, from the interferences of external predatory forces.

But Khrushchev reduced this policy of peaceful co-existence to such a pass that it meant that both the socialist and imperialist camps, with their respective systems would exist in "permanent" peace and harmony. It virtually meant allowing the imperialist forces to come to socialist countries for good dinner, introduce Jazz music, Twist Dance and such other perversities to pollute the cultural life as also degenerate the rising generations in the socialist countries to be reduced to hard-boiled drunkards, night club goers etc. And

regarding the misdeeds perpetrated by the USA by aggressing on other countries, the Soviet stand would be only to tell that these are heinous, anti-humanitarian acts and these may lead to war—this much, but the Soviet Union would not confront and resist such actions actively, because it pursues the policy of peaceful co-existence! Therefore, the Soviet Union would not go anywhere to resist these dark deeds of the imperialists just like the principle-mongers! It transpires that Khrushchev's policy of peaceful co-existence virtually means that sitting tight the socialist countries would just sermonise like a moralist full of obsession and virtually allow the US pirates to aggress on other land. Does this mean adherence to the policy of peaceful co-existence? This can never be accepted as correct. The true purport of the policy of peaceful co-existence is that as Soviet Union would not interfere anywhere, so it would not allow the USA too to do so. The USA has no right to go with warships and instigate Israel to be at war with Egypt. What right of piracy the USA has in open waters? This also cannot be allowed. Once, the imperialists could not be made to pay heed to this as the Soviet had then not that strength. Today, the socialist camp certainly possesses that might. Backed by this strength it was the duty of the Soviet Union to force them to strictly abide by this policy of non-interference in the internal affairs of any country. This was the real significance of the policy of peaceful co-existence.

**The Low Standard Of Ideological
Consciousness Of The Soviet
Leadership And The Causes of
Crisis In World Communist
Movement**

The present leadership of the Soviet Communist Party could not grasp this significance of the policy of peaceful co-existence. This, they could not do because

of their low level of ideological standard. Now we are to probe a little as to how this low standard prevailed and wherefrom it came. See in science any high standard connotes that it is high standard in the relative sense. One's capacity to understand is very high or consciousness is of a very high standard—this means that his thinking and knowledge are of a very high standard in a given situation. That is, in a given situation, in the background of contemporary problems he reflects a very clear understanding and possesses a critical power of analysis of high standard. But if the level of his consciousness remains static there—if he fails to uplift his standard continually keeping pace with the newer and newer problems that appear with the change of time and condition, then this high standard of today becomes low in the perspective of the changed situation, in relation to newer and newer problems. There are many people who are not men of science, who do not keep information about developments of science or who are out and out opposed to science and naturally when a new theory comes into being in science, a new theory relegates a prevailing one to the background, they say that science does not stand on truth. They say how is it that science tells one thing as correct today, and another thing as correct the next day—how therefore, can there be truth in science? But they do not know even that science never says that the earlier proposition was all wrong. In science, just as the Euclidean geometry is correct, so also is Einsteinian geometry. Einsteinian geometry is not applicable in the domain of Euclidean geometry. Their domains or fields of activities are different. Newtonian mechanics in its domain is still valid and true, it has not been proved wrong there. But there are certain fields where Newtonian mechanics is inadequate. That gave birth to Einsteinian theory to cover those fields. Therefore, both the Newtonian mechanics and Einstein's theory are correct,

only their fields of application are different. Again, in a changed situation, facing a number of new problems, perhaps it might be found that Einstein's theory has become inadequate in tackling them. Then science will advance further and newer theories will come into being. It is in this way that the scientific theories have been advancing, there have been continuous advancement in all spheres, in all aspects of science. This equally holds good for social science. This is true for the development of political knowledge, economics and all aspects of political science as well.

Because, the leadership in Soviet Union possesses a wealth of experiences, has made revolution victorious, because the leadership in China has made revolution successful and MaoTse-tung has given birth to newer strategy and tactics of revolution, because they are endowed with such vast experiences in so many fields, therefore their level of consciousness can never become inadequate, even in the relative sense, or their present high standard of consciousness will remain the same forever—such a concept is erroneous. Many communists hold such wrong conceptions, and from this grows blindness. But it should always be borne in mind that communism has no relation with blindness. At least the way in which we have understood communism, our party has understood it—we hold that there is no relation between blindness and communism. We hold that Dialectical Materialism, on which the whole theory of communism stands, is such a science which will continuously develop, advance and constantly throw light on newer and newer problems of life, society and epistemology. Therefore, the communists would grasp the old truths, try to grasp the new ones and in this way continuously develop and advance Marxism. Despite the widespread gigantic economic activities in the Soviet Union in Stalin's time, and despite the great advancement and increase of organisational strength

of the communist movement from country to country under Stalin's leadership, it is true that adequate importance was not given in the sphere of ideological movement, that is, on cultivation of philosophy or this theoretical aspect of epistemology. As a result, because of the failure to continuously advance the standard of ideological consciousness in pace with the great advancement of economic and technological sciences, a big gap has developed between the two. Consequently, the standard of ideological consciousness is falling fast. And if the standard of consciousness goes down and down like this then in future it will eventually give rise to deeper crisis—that is, facing the then complex problems, this leadership of low standard will not be able to throw light find the way out and tackle those problems. As a result, they will bring various sorts of vices in the communist movement.

Let me clarify the point a bit further. What I am trying to bring home, is that the efforts that go on to organise revolution on the basis of communist ideology in different countries over the globe, at the initial stage, are not only not inimical to nationalism conducive to liberation struggle, and the patriotism born out of this nationalism in turn is not opposed to revolutionary communist movement, it rather finds agreement with it. But after revolution, after the establishment of socialist state in a number of countries, a truly international sense of unity has got to be forged among the socialist countries. This unity or understanding is not like the understanding between the capitalist countries, that is, between the USA and Great Britain or between Great Britain and India, or it is not like the understanding between the capitalists of India and those of USA. It is an understanding of entirely different nature. It is the unity among the communists free from national vanity, it signifies a genuine attempt at unity of the socialist states completely free from national

vanity in the interest of international proletarian revolution and liberation of mankind from all sorts of exploitation, in the interest of socialism. The very national mental make-up which did not cause any harm during freedom struggle or at the time of revolution, unless fought out in post-revolutionary period and attuned with proletarian internationalism, would one day trigger off conflicts even between the communist countries. When the dispute between Tito and Soviet leadership surfaced, I gave the pointer that the way the communists were moving, the way the feeling of national humiliation, centring round the national states, was still mingled in their mental make-up as an alloy, the influence of mechanical thinking that was still present within the communist movement and in the mutual relation between the communist countries, the domineering attitude still prevailing—if all these remain, then even though it may appear inconceivable, I would not be astonished at all if the communist countries were found to be fighting and confronting one another after the establishment of socialism through victory of revolution from one country to another all over the globe.

I thought even as much that unless these short-comings could be eradicated from the international communist movement, then even after capitalism-imperialism were wiped out, the national form of existence of the socialist states still remaining, a serious problem would arise in combining them together and establishing a single, unified international society of mankind—such a society where the necessity and urge for separate identity of nations would die out. The humanists too had visualised such a unified universal social order. Rabindranath and Bertrand Russell too had such an idea. They in their own way, dreamt of such a society, though utopian. But the communists have conceived of such a society, scientifically, realistically. In my opinion

if the problems in communist movement which I have dwelt on, persist then that would put serious obstacle to the process of developing such united community of mankind. The teaching of Marxism-Leninism is that wars and conflicts are objective outcomes of the conflicts inherent in imperialist capitalist economy and politics. But now I find that if what is going on among the communists centring round national question and national mental make-up and mechanical thought process is not eradicated in due time, then that would create new problems amongst us even after imperialism-capitalism is abolished. All these are due to the inadequate standard of consciousness among the communists.

Here the workers of our party have to remember the particular point: it is an essential task of theirs to make the people understand that what is truth must be voiced. They have to courageously point out where the Chinese leadership has upheld the truth, has spoken correctly. They need not care for what the bourgeoisie would say, because in order to uphold truth one has to pay for, make some sacrifice—it has always been so and will be so, today. This is a task not for the cowards. At the same time, we are to bear in mind that this attitude is also to be given up that since China is saying so it must be true. It is also not correct to think that since Mao Tse-tung is a wise man, therefore whatever he says is true, every analysis of his is faultless. No, we are to critically examine his analysis as well. For example, if he says that the revolution in India is anti-imperialist and anti-feudal and that India has not yet attained freedom—should we swallow and parrot that? In my opinion, this should not be. The communist movement in India will not be able to strike its roots if such an attitude continues, it will languish. The heads that are there on the shoulders of the Indian communists are not for copying others but

for acting on their own. It means there should not be national vanity but one should have an independent spirit, vigour and an independent power of thinking—and these are not for copying. Herein lies the secret of success for the communist movement to win over the masses of the country, to strike deep roots in the soil. No one has ever been able to make revolutionary ideology strike roots in the national soil by copying others.

They (the party workers) should remember that these basic theoretical aspects of the present dispute between the Soviet Union and China are very important. The Soviet Union has put forward some such unrealistic conceptions about the policy of peaceful co-existence; is pursuing such politically wrong, if not apolitical outlook about nuclear blackmailing which is responsible for their passive support to the national freedom struggles. Consequently, the nature of support and assistance which is essential for the decisive victory of those struggles is not forthcoming. As for example when they had the responsibility of protecting Vietnam, they are providing help to Vietnam only to that extent as is normally done by one state to another in distress. As I have already pointed out it was their declared pledge that they would consider any attack on a socialist state as an attack upon the Soviet Union itself; but today when the USA is carrying on daily bombing raids on North Vietnam and conducting attacks on the economy—the industries, factories, roads, bridges, dams etc.—and in fact is mounting an all-out attack against the whole people of that country, the Soviet Union, in the name of helping Vietnam, is sending some weapons just for defence. That is, the nature of Soviet help is such that if the US planes come to raid, they can just be shot down and nothing more. I do not say that such weapons are not necessary. It is also true that if Vietnam did not receive even such weapons it would have been placed in

greater difficulty. Vietnam may be grateful to the Soviet Union for this because whatever help is coming from the Soviet is helping it. But what is the Soviet Union actually doing? The help it is providing amounts to this that if enemy planes come, these can be shot down. Again, what is the extent of this help? It cannot be called a massive aid of equipment that can shoot the US airforce out of the sky.

The Nature Of Soviet Help To Vietnam Is Objectively Helping To Sustain The War-Economy Of The USA

Now if anybody asks the Soviet Union that, supposing in an incident, US planes from the Sixth Fleet in the Mediterranean or an US base in Turkey or Israel would have flown over to the Soviet Union, say Moscow or Petrograd and destroyed bridges and dams by continuous bombing, what would have been its reaction? Would it have, even in such a situation, simply sat tight and shot at the planes? Would it have then only said to the USA, lest the world war might start just this: Look, don't do this, this is violation of peace, remember, it is you who are attacking—would it have allowed the USA to carry on continuous attacks like this? If not, then what would it have done? It can reasonably be guessed that the Soviet Union would have retaliated, would have blasted off the base from which the US was conducting the attacks, that is, would have struck at the roots of the US attack. It is obvious. But why Soviet Union is not taking this attitude on Vietnam issue? If it has not done that, then the Soviet Union does not consider the question of its own security and that of North Vietnam as one and the same. To them, there is a difference between the two. If this be the case then does the talk of proletarian internationalism fit in at all with them? What necessity then was there of their loud talks of proletarian internationalism? How could the Soviet then advise other socialist countries

that they need not require to develop their own nuclear strength since the Soviet Union would protect them as and when necessary from imperialist attacks? Is it giving that protection today? Can the help it is giving to Vietnam be deemed in any way a real protection?

Here too, the Soviet leaders have failed to comprehend another aspect of the US politics. They are thinking that the help they are giving to Vietnam for protecting them is the real help. It cannot be denied that this help has in one sense enabled Vietnam to defend itself somewhat, but there is another aspect too. That is stark reality. What is that? The USA wants to keep the war going for the very needs of its economy, but it cannot go on fighting without an opponent. Therefore, it is necessary that the country USA fights against also requires to draw some strength from any source for the continuity of the war. It is the Soviet Union which is providing such strength to Vietnam and as a result is objectively helping the USA to clear its stockpile of armaments. For, the Soviet leaders failed even to understand that in the very interest of its economy, the USA required its piled up arms to be released and destroyed through this war. Because unless the arms are destroyed and planes burnt out, the boom they are seeking to continue in their economy through militarisation of the industries would not last long. The arms produced by their armament factories will accumulate. But the Soviet thinks that the USA is getting a good rebuff when with the equipment that is provided to Vietnam American planes are being destroyed. But it is no rebuff to the USA; rather in a sense it is coming to her help. So when the USA has made its forcible presence in Vietnam and a war is raging there, those who think that the defence weapons the Soviet is supplying to the Vietnamese, has put the USA in a serious difficulty, are committing a grievous mistake.

The loss the USA is suffering there, is political and moral. The war being prolonged, many Americans are dying in the Vietnam war. Many mothers have lost their sons, many wives their husbands, many sisters their brothers. It has its impact on the US people. What for this war?—they have started thinking. For whom they are fighting there? Questions are agitating their minds: is it true what the Pentagon bosses are trying to make them believe? Or, is the truth otherwise? Because people are not allowed there to know the whole truth, such a mentality has developed there that whatever comes from the government should be accepted as truth. If this be so, then how can it be ascertained whether what the government says is true or not? Particularly, where the government itself is a bunch of swindlers, criminals, the matter naturally becomes different. Therefore, the people should always judge for themselves. Besides, if what the government is saying is true, why then they have such objection to allow the people to voice and express their opinion? Let the people be given the right to judge what is true and what is not. No, they will not allow that. Their attitude is such that whatever they say is truth and would have to be accepted as such. And to say anything different from the official version will be construed as blasphemy, a treason! In this way, the US government has not allowed the people to know the truth. The American people too were so long quite blissfully satisfied with their fast living and worldly comforts. They did not bother about these questions so long. From traditional anti-communist bias, they have thought so long that the communists are bad people—because they have been fed with such queer and concocted stories about the communists. Being used to this type of propaganda they formed the idea that there was not much difference between a communist and a beast—say, a rhinoceros or a gorilla. All such distorted ideas

about the communists were deliberately dished out to them. But those among them who travelled different countries, have come in contact with people there, have come to know of the other side, started to realise the truth gradually. Even men like Bertrand Russell and Jean Paul Sartre who because of their wisdom and sagacity are held in high esteem by the American people, they too are voicing against the USA. The impact of all these is having its effect upon the American people. Besides, they see for themselves that the war is taking a heavy toll, they are losing their sons. The people who are going to the war are coming back with different experiences. They are going to the war front with the simple faith that they are going to fight for justice, freedom and democracy. But there they are finding the matter quite different. They are witnessing that it is the Vietnamese who are fighting against US aggression for the freedom of their country. Not even one among the common people there is on the side of the US. Therefore, many of those who are going to the Vietnam front are turning against war. And when these disillusioned people are coming back the state is gagging their voice, sacking them from service so that they cannot spread discontent and dissatisfaction among the armed forces and destroy their morale. As a result of all these, gradually the American people are being able to get at the truth.

Questions are agitating their minds as to whose freedom they are going to fight for in Vietnam? The hundreds of thousands who died—what for did they lay down their lives? Are they fighting there for stooges like the Ky government or fighting there to serve the interest of the Pentagon? Or else are they fighting for safeguarding the interest of the big bosses of Wall Street who are war merchants, war-criminals who amass profits by selling war materials? If that be so, what is the interest of the American masses in that?

Thus, a new awakening has dawned on the American people.

Armed With Higher Moral Strength, The Vietnamese Communists Have Inspired The American People Too

An American journalist while reporting on North Vietnam during the war has also given a description of Saigon, the city which US dollars have flooded. It is gathered from the reports that he was officially sent there to assess the Vietnamese attitude to the peace proposal as also to send a comparative report on the two parts under different rules there. These news came out in the Statesman. In his study he has shown the comparative picture of social situations and the moral standards of the two parts as also the type and character of the rule of that part in defence of which the US troops have been ostensibly stationed there. Side by side with this the description of North Vietnam that he has given is amazing! He reports that in North Vietnam amidst grim battle and severe bombing raids people, before dawn are coming out and removing the rubbles of destruction to clear the road. But in Saigon where the US are spending millions of dollars, rubbish and dirt even worse than what you see in Calcutta streets are piling up. People there do not move out of their homes before late morning. The streets are often not swept or cleaned. Side by side he has also presented a picture of respective moral standards in the two parts. He has given a description of how the children in North Vietnam behave, the moral standard of the people and the civic life there. In it he has shown that amidst such a devastating war, the women are doing everything. They are guarding the grounds and again coming underground into the shelters during bombings. They are attending to all other daily chores. And in the midst of all these they are singing, organising theatre shows and through various recreational activities enlivening the

society with vitality. It is a new way of life altogether. For them there is no place for fear, perversion of any kind ; only the concern for the country is uppermost in their mind. Wherefrom they get this ? How could they attain this new approach to life, this consciousness, this standard of ethics morality? It is because they have been imbued with the noble ideology and consciousness of communism. Only as a result of this has it been possible for them to conduct their life like this.

So, the international situation in the post-Second World War period was such that the socialist forces had made great progress. Starting from only one country the communists have become a great force now the world over. The revolutionary movements are coming to shape in different countries. Despite such tremendous attacks by the USA and no effective Soviet resistance against the same, the Latin American countries are carrying on their freedom struggle courageously. The freedom loving people of Vietnam are fighting amidst multitude of difficulties and the people's struggles for liberation are gaining in strength from country to country. As a result the communist movement is posing a serious challenge to the capitalists and the imperialists the world over. The very name communist is striking terror among the capitalists. The invincible advance of the communists can no longer be contained—the imperialists are getting scared at this reality more and more. But it is really strange that despite imperialism being weakened and cornered and socialist camp and the world revolutionary movement having gained so much in strength, imperialism can still show domineering attitude, arrogance so much so that it is aggressing on other countries even today. That is why I made the comment that when we communists had reached within ten yards, so to say, from the threshold of final victory, fell into a labyrinth. Due to various wrong practices

and theoretical muddle, confusions and even trickeries we are again falling back by miles. This could happen due to the weakness of ideological struggles and low standard of consciousness in the communist movement.

Practice Of Higher Ideology, Theory And Character Is Essential

Those who think only in terms of day to day struggles and feel concerned only about providing mass line and particular slogans to be raised and about increasing the party strength, anyhow—I would request them to ponder deeply over a very important point. Such attitude prevails in the so-called communist parties of our country, and unless we remain vigilant we too may fall victim to this attitude any time. So-called communist parties in our country whenever they gain somehow in party strength, they become so much power conscious that they lose their head. How far are their workers advancing ideologically, whether theoretical consciousness among them is increasing, whether the workers who are swelling their ranks are imbued with correct communist consciousness, whether the base of higher communist ethics and morality and ideological dedication exist in them, whether they have the necessary advanced thinking and conceptions or command over different branches of knowledge—science, philosophy etc. or simply some passionate slogan shouters swelling the ranks—they do not pay any attention to these very important aspects. One cannot really distinguish this type of “communist” workers from the loafers in the localities unless one knows them to be the cadres of particular parties. They are the workers who come to crowd those parties and swell their membership figures of which the leaders feel so boastful. Swelling the party in this method may increase the strength numerically which may be of help in parliamentary election politics, in making some leaders or getting the propaganda work done but this

brings severe setback to the cultural ideological atmosphere, to the very revolutionary outlook and mental make-up, essential for revolution. Because the common people who want to understand communism, communist ideology by observing the filthy behaviour and conduct of such rank and file party workers, go against communism. From daily contact with such party workers, they find that these people who talk about communism have practically no difference with the lumpens of the locality, they are just like those lumpens even in knowledge, learning; intelligence, ethics, morality—in all aspects. Unless one knows beforehand that such an individual is a member of the communist party, there is nothing to distinguish him from others.

However, it is not possible for me to dwell any more upon the international situation at this meeting because I shall have to speak about the national situation too in some length, I am concluding the discussion on international situation by reminding you that even the unity of the socialist camp has got disrupted because of this weakness in ideological struggles of the communist movement, shortcomings and low standard of ideological consciousness from leaders to workers. Consequently, instead of taking up a united or combined

stand behind the people's liberation movements from country to country, the socialist states themselves have suffered disintegration creating advantages only to the imperialists. True, this disunity in the international communist movement is providing a temporary advantage to the imperialists, but there is nothing in this for them to be elated. Rather, in my opinion this surfacing of the weaknesses in the socialist camp at this stage will be of benefit in one sense. It would have wrought far more damage if instead of surfacing at this stage, it came later. Because of this weakness coming to limelight the communists all over the world are now feeling the urgent necessity of constant cultivation and practice of the ideology and theory of international proletarian revolution. The realisation has begun to dawn upon them that it is not possible to organise revolution by sheer slogan chanting, nor can by this the unity of the communist parties be ensured. And if the standard of ideological consciousness cannot be continuously uplifted and the banner of proletarian internationalism held aloft, then the communist parties would fight among themselves on the basis of national mental complexes. If their level of consciousness remains at such a low level then they are bound to fight each other on the basis of national mental complex and in fact in that case there is no escape.

PROLETARIAN ERA

Organ of Socialist Unity Centre of India (Fortnightly)

Founder Editor-in-Chief : **Comrade Shibdas Ghosh**

Vol. 15	NOVEMBER 7, '81	PRICE : 2 Rupees
No. 5	SATURDAY	Air Surcharge 5 P.

Editor-in-Chief : **Nihar Mukherjee**