

PROLETARIAN PATH

Vol. 1 No. 2 & 3

Aug-Dec, 1981



Editorial Board: Lashkar Singh, Moni Guha, Vi jay Singh

PROLETARIAN PATH

Vol 1 No. 2 & 3

Aug-Dec, 1981

EDITORIAL

Stalin—The Immortal

One hundred and two years ago in 1870, on this day of December 21 Joseph Vissaronovich Djugashevili was born. From his early teens he inseparably connected his life and activity with the history of the Bolsheviks and thus became STALIN. On March 5, 1953, this distinguished personality, the unfaulting fighter and the great theorist of Marxism-Leninism, ceased to breathe.

STALIN would not want us to write empty words of praise, rather, he would desire that the cause for which he laboured and struggled with such ruthless determination, the cause for which he lived, fought and died be once again raised to its proper place of supremacy in the strategy and tactics of the world proletarian revolution in this era of ascendancy of modern revisionism in the international and Indian Communist movement.

PROLETARIAN PATH commemorates the immortal birth day anniversary of STALIN by once again raising high the red flag to fight to the last in re-establishing and resurrecting the glorious revolutionary traditions of Marx, Engels, Lenin and Stalin in the determination of the strategy preservation and liberation, and the underemphasis on socialist (international) character of their heroic struggle and sacrifice, the dissolution of the Communist International required to be compounded after the war. In spite of the most favourable objective situation, the Communist Parties of the different countries, reacted in a disunited and pragmatic way, in absence of any proletarian internationalist guidance and direction and the different communist Parties tried to face the growing strength and aggressions of U. S. imperialism in the national context giving rise to nationalism in the Communist Parties. Those were no longer, sections and contingent of the world proletarian army. As a result, the international communist movement failed to correctly apprehend and seize the initiative in the process of development. And herein the unfaltering and unfaulting revolutionary Marxist-Leninist genius of Stalin intervened. Stalin proposed: to give up the strategy and tactics adopted at the 7th Congress of the Communist International, to initiate uncompromising struggle against the war conspiracy of the imperialists on the basis of organised mass mobilisation on all fronts, to reject the United Front with the Social Democracy from above, to revive the Communist International, to reject the policy of neutrality in the Trade Union movement and to re-introduce the aim of main blow at the compromising Parties and internally to do away with bourgeois cosmopolitanism, the remnants of the market economy and exchange between the agricultural products and industrial products through the medium of money and two centres of production, etc. STALIN came out in full stature. The revolutionary genius of Stalin revealed during the period of building socialism within the historical limitation of socialism in one country paled into insignificance in comparison with his superb revolutionary genius in the postwar period of socialism in several countries.

STALIN faced a stubborn revisionist opposition from his own Party—the CPSU and from the "stalwarts" of the international communist movement. Meanwhile the Communist Party of France led by M. Thorez adopted the Commonwealth' programme for Algeria and Indo-China, the Communist Party of Great Britain headed by Harry Pollitt and R. Palme Dutt adopted the massive programme of "British Road to Socialism", the Communist Party of India (undivided) adopted the programme of Parliamentary cretinism, betraying Telangana armed struggle and the Communist Party of China-headed by Mao Tse tung equated the New Democratic State with the dictatorship of the proletariat, where the national bourgeoisie were the partners of the State. Yes in this period Stalin, in the interests of world proletarian revolution and socialism, being minority in the CPSU and in the international communist movement, taking advantage of his towering personality and popularity, 'violated' the norms of formal democratic centralism. The strategy and tactics of the 7th Congress, in all its forms and methods turned into its opposites and became reformist and revisionist in the period of "approaching revolutionary outbreak" in

the post-war period and in the period of socialism in several countries, but the modern revisionists clung to it declaring it as the eternal law of Communist strategy and tactics of revolution. Herein lies the political roots of modern revisionism and the secret of denigrating and denouncing Stalin.

STALIN resolutely opposed modern revisionism, in all its forms, from the ideological errors to the revisionist programme and policies of several communist parties. His last major works against modern revisionism is his "Economic Problems of Socialism in the USSR" written in 1952, Stalin's main purpose in this work was to oppose from the standpoint of Marxism, various, false theories prevalent in the Soviet Union and several Communist Parties' leadership. A serious and genuine study of this work reveals the international character of modern revisionism and Stalin's determination to oppose it. If this is not clear at first sight, it is only because the work was written as part of discussion on a proposed text book on political economy.

The neo-revisionist CPI (M) upholds Stalin's life and activity up to 1945 and at the same time uphold the 7th Congress line of united front from above and not to direct its main blow at the opportunist Parties and like the rank bourgeois liberals wails about Stalin's 'violation of socialist democracy and democratic centralism' divorcing it from the concrete context.

PROLETARIAN PATH on this celebrated day of Stalin's birth, vows, that under no conditions, it will falter to follow the footsteps of the genius who gave practical and concrete shape of the historical necessity-based dream of Marx, Engels and Lenin and in course of giving this shape who further developed Marxism-Leninism.

Red Salute to Stalin.

Death to Modern Revisionism.

21st December, 1981

MAIN ARTICLE

Why Was Stalin Denigrated and Made a Controversial Figure

MONI GUHA

(Continued from previous issue)

CHAPTER—4

Mao Supplements Khrushchov

Khrushchov's secret Report was circulated by the State Department of the U. S. A., in June 1956, through the media of New York Times. Before that a rumor was floating in the air that Khrushchov delivered a secret speech. The fraternal delegates who went to Moscow to attend the 20th Congress of the CPSU pleaded their ignorance about any secret report. After the publication of the secret report in the New York Times, all the Communist Parties of the world were referring the secret report as "report attributed to Khrushchov", pleading still then, their absolute ignorance about it; There was neither any confirmation nor any denial of it by the Soviet Union. But the Communist Party of China, two months before the publication of Khrushchov's secret report by the U. S. State Department, came out with its **On The Historical Experience of the Dictatorship of the Proletariat**—an "analysis" based on Khrushchov's secret Report—in April 1956, virtually confirming the rumors of the secret report and providing theoretical justification in support of the secret report. Thus the Communist Party of China officially and formally confirmed Khrushchov's secret report as fact, at a time when all other communist parties of the world were decrying and denouncing the "alleged" secret report as another "Zinoviev letter". Thus the Communist Party of China officially and openly espoused Khrushchovite revisionism denouncing Marxism-Leninism and Stalin.

We like to draw the sharpest attention of the readers to the fact that whereas all the Communist Parties of the world including the C.P.G.B., C.P.F., C.P.U.S.A., and C.P., of Italy pleaded their ignorance about any secret report and its contents and whereas the delegates of these Parties rushed to Moscow after the publication of Khrushchov's secret report by the U. S. State Department, to demand and to know as to why they were not taken into confidence by the CPSU and how far the secret report was correct, in that case how the Communist Party of China came to possess a copy of the secret report? Secondly, from Roger Garudy's book we came to know that the fraternal delegates were allowed to hear the secret report on condition that they would not divulge the contents of it and as such no copy of the secret report was supplied to them. In that case, how the Communist Party of China got a copy of Khrushchov's secret report long before the U. S. Secret service could manage to get hold of a copy? This fact proves, unquestionably that the Communist Party of China had the complicity with the inner core of the Khrushchovite gang, however unpleasant it may sound.

After the publication of **On the Historical Experience** by the CPC Mao personally launched a malicious slander campaign against Stalin. On April 25, 1956 Mao delivered a report at an enlarged meeting of the Political Bureau of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of China entitled **On the Ten Major Relationships**, supplementing Khrushchov's secret report and attacking Stalin maliciously.

What did Mao supplement in his April 25, 1956 report? He said:

"Stalin did a number of wrong things in connection with China. —At the time of War of Liberation, Stalin first enjoined us, not to press on with revolution, maintaining that if Civil War flared up, the Chinese nation would run the risk of destroying itself. Then when fighting did erupt, he took us half seriously, half-skeptically. When we won the war, Stalin suspected that ours was a victory of Tito-type and in 1949 and 1950 the pressure on us was very strong indeed...."¹

In the same report Stalin was portrayed as an "exploiter" and "squeezer" of peasants!

It is reported that in another enlarged meeting of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of

¹ Mao; S. W., Vol. V, Peking, 1977. p. 304.

China held on September 28, 1962, Mao said among other things, that Stalin opposed the Chinese revolution and when Mao went to Moscow to conclude the Sino-Soviet Friendship and Mutual Assistance Pact, he had to wage “another battle” with Stalin. It was also said that Stalin did not want to sign the pact and after two months of battle at last Stalin signed the pact.

These were said against a MAN who is revered and respected by millions of people throughout the world by a MAN who is also revered and respected by millions of people throughout the world and both of them are recognised leaders of the international Communist movement and represent the interest of the world proletariat! This was said by a man who only in 1953. immediately after the death of Stalin said:

“Rallied around him [Stalin], we constantly received advice from him, constantly drew ideological strength from his works. ... He displayed the greatest wisdom in matters pertaining to the Chinese revolution. —¹

The Communist Party of China, in its **On the Question of Stalin** said that Khrushchov made 180° degrees about- turn quoting Khrushchov's 1937-38 speeches on Stalin and on Moscow Trial. How many degrees about turn and double-facedness were made by Mao?

Mao did not take the world Communist movement into confidence. He did not say what exactly was the “strong pressure”, what was the subject matter of “another battle”, why Stalin refused to sign the pact first and why he signed latter? The result is utter confusion, wild speculation and mud-slinging at one another. Can anybody believe that Stalin opposed the Chinese revolution? Can anybody, again, believe that Mao accused Stalin baselessly? The result is widespread crises in confidence and conviction, domination of bourgeois tricks of leg-pulling over proletarian straight forwardness and clean handling. Khrushchov's secret report and the unpardonable docility of the World Communist mis- leaders created deep crack in the foundations of discipline and loyalty to international democratic centralism, and Mao's April 25, 1956 report shattered and demolished all those Bolshevik qualities altogether.

Neither the Communist Party of China, nor the Communist Party of the Soviet Union even after their split threw any light on the subjects of differences between Stalin and Mao during the negotiation of Sino-Soviet Friendship and Mutual Assistance Pact in 1949-50. That there were deep differences and debates, there can be no doubt about that, as Mao had to stay in Moscow for more than two months, immediately after the Chinese revolution. What were the differences and debates for which Stalin was accused by Mao wantonly?

We are not at all concerned to justify Stalin or Mao dogmatically. We are not of the opinion that if Stalin made serious mistakes in theory or in practice the working class movement will gain if those mistakes are hushed up. In actual fact if Stalin made serious errors, a failure by the Communists to criticise and rectify those errors in Stalin's life-time certainly could not prevent them from doing considerable damage to the revolutionary movement, could not prevent imperialism from exploiting them in their favour. But since from 1935 onwards we find no such examples of serious damages in the world communist movement up to Stalin's death and on the contrary, since we find that under Stalin's farsighted guidance and leadership the most unfavourable conditions were turned in favour of revolution and victory which was the unique contribution of Stalin's leadership, we cannot accept the charges against Stalin without scientific historical analysis of those alleged “errors”. The ‘errors’ if they existed, at all, must be clearly identified and analysed. If that cannot be done ‘criticism’ of “Stalin's errors” expresses nothing more than subjective hostility to Stalin.

Then let us discuss first – the technical sides of the questions raised by Mao in his April 25, 1956 and September 28, 1962 reports at enlarged meetings of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of China against Stalin.

The Communist Party of China, in its **On Questions of Stalin and Khrushchov's Phoney Communism** —reported to be the writings of Mao —said that Stalin made self- criticism for his “wrong advice” “after the victory of the Chinese Revolution” If Stalin really made self-criticism for his “wrong advice” “after the victory of the Chinese revolution” why, then, Mao in referring to Stalin's “wrong advice” on April 25,1956, and on September 28,1962 reports did not say anything about Stalin's alleged

¹ Mao: "A Great Friendship", March, 1953, not included in vol. V.

“self-criticism”? We find in those two reports that despite Stalin’s so many “wrong deeds” Mao was magnanimous to attribute “70 per cent dialectical” to Stalin. Why, then, he did not display magnanimity in case of Stalin’s self-criticism and why did he not say “of course Stalin made self-criticism for his wrong advice after the victory of the Chinese revolution”? Secondly, Mao said in his April 25, 1956 report, “When we won the war Stalin suspected that our victory was a Tito- type.” In that case, Stalin cannot, certainly, make self- criticism even during the period of negotiations of Sino-Soviet Friendship and Mutual Assistance Pact in 1949, at least up to February 1950, when the “pressures” on China were “very strong indeed”. Logically, the question at once comes up precisely when after the victory of the Chinese revolution – Stalin made self-criticism? Curiously enough, neither Mao nor the CPC said anything about precisely when Stalin gave his “wrong advice” and **precisely when Stalin made "self-criticism"**! In both the cases, they remained vague, and vagueness as you know, is a fine art in painting a truth as a lie and vice-versa. ‘ After the victory’ began at the end of September, 1949, precisely on October I. 1949. Stalin lost his power of speaking on March, 3, 1953. Precisely when Stalin made his “self-criticism” between this time? You will get no answer. “At the time of War of Liberation began precisely on the very day of Japanese surrender on August 14, 1945 and lasted up to September, 1949. This “war of Liberation” had two phases. Up to September 1947, it was a mainly the phase of co-operation with Chiang Kai-Shek, it was not a phase of civil war. The second phase, the phase of mainly the full-scale civil war began in September 1947 and lasted up to September 1949. Precisely when Stalin enjoined the CPC ‘not to press on with revolution’? You will get no definite answer.

It is also reported that Mao said that it was only after China joined in the Korean war Stalin was convinced that Mao was not a Tito. In that case, we may assume, then, that Stalin might have made “self-criticism” only after October 8, 1950, when China joined in Korean war. In that case also, it will remain an assumption and the facts of history cannot be made on mere assumption.

Let us recapitulate a few pages from the history, before slandering Stalin in respect of Chinese revolution. On August 8, 1945, the Red Army engaged the main Japanese force which was occupying Manchuria, journeying 5,000 miles. The Soviet Army swept forward, capturing Manchuria, the Southern half of Sakhalin Islands and the Kuriles and liberating North Korea. Mao wrote on August 13, 1945, in an article entitled **The Present Situation and Our Policy After the Victory in the War of Resistance Against Japan:**

"These are the days of tremendous change in the situation in the Far East. The surrender of Japanese imperialism is now a foregone conclusion. THE DECISIVE FACTOR for **Japanese surrender**, is the entry of the Soviet Union in to the war. A million Red Army troops are entering China’s North-East, this force is irresistible. Japanese imperialism can no longer continue to fight.

“... The Soviet Union has sent its troops, the Red Army has come to help the Chinese people drive out the aggressor; such an event has never happened before in Chinese history. — ”¹

It was the Stalin leadership who facilitated the success of the Chinese revolution by driving out the Japanese imperialist forces from the Chinese soil. "The speedy surrender of the Japanese invaders has changed the whole situation ... In the past weeks our army has recovered fifty nine cities of various sizes and vast rural areas – and including those already in our hands we now control 175 cities thus winning great victory. --- The might of our army has shaken northern China and TOGETHER WITH THE SWEEPING ADVANCE OF THE SOVIET AND MONGOLIAN FORCES TO THE GREAT WALL, has created a **favourable position of our Party**," wrote Mao on August 26, 1945, in a circular of the Central Committee of the CPC entitled **Peace Negotiations With the Kuomintang**.²

Did all these happen automatically? Did the Stalin leadership play a role of blind tool towards the spectacular success of the Communist Party of China in establishing its power in North China as opposed to Chiang Kai Shek? Let us again recall to history.

“The Soviet Army quickly annihilated the Japanese Kwintang Army and liberated Northeast China. The Peoples’ Liberation Army fighting IN CO-ORDINATION WITH the Soviet Army energetically

1 Mao: S. W. Vol. IV, Peking 1963.

2 Ibid.

wiped out the Japanese and puppet troops, freeing a large number of medium sized and small cities from the enemy's occupation. — ”¹

It was Stalin who opened widely the gate of the success of the Chinese revolution and the Communist Party of China. Let us recall another event of 1940. When the Kuomintang, violating its united front agreement with the CPC attacked the New Fourth Army of the CPC Stalin stopped the supply of armaments under the third loan agreement with Chiang Kai-Shek, clearly stating that the Soviet armaments were not meant for launching civil war against the Chinese Communists but for fighting against Japanese imperialism. This made Chiang-Kai-Shek straight.

Were all these for opposing Chinese revolution, “not to press on with revolution”?

Did the Soviet Union and Stalin diplomatically help the people of China and the Communist Party of China against the conspiracy of Chiang Kai-Shek in collusion with U. S. imperialism to drown the Communist Party of China and its army so that the Chinese revolution and the liberation war may be victorious? Yes, it did. At the Moscow conference of the Foreign Ministers of the Soviet Union, the United States and Great Britain in December 1945, with the initiative of the Soviet Union and Molotov an agreement was reached on China in which the high contracting powers **agreed to follow the policy of non-interference so far the Chinese civil war was concerned.** The foreign Minister of the Soviet Union and the United States agreed that the Soviet and U.S. forces should be withdrawn from China at the earliest possible time. This agreement of non-interference helped the Chinese Communist army to a greater extent to continue the civil war in which the U. S. A. could not openly support Chiang Kai-Shek.

These facts are in the recorded history. Why, then, Stalin would “enjoin” the Chinese Communist Party” not to press on with revolution”—who helped the Chinese Communists so much, so long? There must be certain sound and valid political and ideological reasons for enjoining “not to press on with the revolution”—if Stalin at all “enjoined”. The tragedy of the International Communist movement —under the Soviet and Chinese modern revisionists—is that nobody except these two leaderships knows anything about it and the wild speculation and mud-slinging goes on unabated! In the recorded history we find that Stalin “enjoined” the Communist Party of China to co-operate with Chiang Kai-Shek and try to form a coalition Government with Chiang-Kai-Shek in September 1945, which Mao and the Communist Party of China accepted. That was in the first phase of the ‘ War of Liberation”.

Mao after referring to the Soviet Union's and U.S.A.'s instructions of not to launch a Civil War, wrote:

“It is possible that after the negotiations, the Kuo-mintang, under domestic and foreign pressure, may conditionally recognise our Party's status, OUR PARTY TOO MAY CONDITIONALLY RECOGNISE THE STATUS OF KUO-MINTANG. This would bring about a new-type of co-operation between the two parties (plus the Democratic League etc) AND OF PEACEFUL DEVELOPMENT. ...”²

These are from the recorded history and we accept these as facts. Why, then, such subjective hostility against Stalin? Let us face the facts again. Mao said he had to “wage another battle” with Stalin and felt “strong pressure in 1949 and 1950 during Mao’s stay in Moscow for negotiating a Sino-Soviet Friendship and Mutual Assistance Pact. As far as we know the issues involved during the course of negotiations were mainly three. They were: (i) the status of Mongolian Peoples’ Republic; (ii) delineations of Soviet-Chinese borders and (iii) Joint Sino-Soviet enterprises in the areas of common borders. These three issues, undoubtedly, involved far-reaching ideological questions.

Let us discuss the above three issues one by one.

(i) **On the Status of Mongolian Peoples’ Republic:** The Mongolian Peoples’ Republic came into existence in 1921. It is a land-locked country with an area of 600 000 sq. miles with barely 1 million population, situated between China and the Soviet Union. Up to 1911, before the fall of Manchu dynastic rule it was under the Central feudal Manchu Government of China. In 1911, after the fall of Manchu dynastic rule there was virtually no centralised administration in China and in consequence, like that of China itself, the local Warlords of Mongolia became independent and were being ruled by different

1 Hu Chiao MU: Thirty years of the CPC, Peking, 1951.

2 Mao ; On Chungking Negotiations, S. W. Vol. IV.

independent local chiefs. During the civil war and war against the white Russians in Asian Russia Mongolian people with the assistance and help of the Red Army established their own Republic, called Mongolian Peoples' Republic (M. P R.) in 1921. The Army of the MPR together with the Soviet Red Army liberated Manchuria and North east China defeating the Japanese occupation army in 1945. In 1945, after the defeat and surrender of the Japanese army of occupation and invasion Chiang Kai- Shek, in connivance with U. S. imperialism refused to recognise the MPR as an independent and sovereign State and demanded the inclusion of Mongolia in the Chinese Republic-arguing that it was always under China. On Stalin's proposal, the four power conference agreed to determine the status of Mongolia through a plebiscite of the Mongolian People. A plebiscite was duly held in 1945 and the overwhelming majority (more than 97%) voted against the inclusion and for the independent and sovereign status of Mongolia. All the States of the world had then, to recognise Mongolia as an independent and sovereign country and MPR as sovereign State. Chiang Kai-Shek was also compelled to recognise the MPR as an independent and sovereign State formally and officially but he did never establish any formal diplomatic relations with the MPR and was harbouring an evil design of gobbling it up.

This is, in brief, the history of the MPR before the Chinese revolution in 1949.

Immediately after the Chinese revolution, Mao went to Moscow in December, 1949 to conclude a Sino-Soviet Friendship and Mutual Assistance Pact and remained there up to mid-February, 1950. Immediately after Mao's return to China, the Communist Party of China through its New China Daily (predecessor to Peoples' Daily Peking) of Nanking-the official Daily, released a public statement on the status of Mongolian Peoples' Republic, on March 5, 1950. The following was the statement:

"During the time Sino-Soviet Treaty and Agreement . was signed, the foreign Ministers of China and Soviet Union exchanged notes to the effect that both the Governments affirmed that the independent status of the MPR was fully guaranteed as the result of plebiscite of 1945 and the **establishment of diplomatic relations by the Peoples' Republic of China.**

"To each and every truly patriotic Chinese our recognition of Mongolia as an independent State was right and proper act, but to the reactionary bloc of the Kuomintang, which was somewhat compelled to accord recognition to Mongolia, it has always been a bitter memory. It was they who after due recognition, fabricated rumors bringing insults to the Mongolian people and the Soviet Union. "The independence of Mongolia is the loss of Chinese territory", they said. **Among our people there are some who are not familiar with the actual conditions and who have been contaminated with the sentiments of "suzerainty" and they think the map of China appears out of shape and unreal without Mongolia.** There are people who have been intoxicated by the poison of "Hanism" propagated by the Kuomintang reactionary bloc. ... While the various ethnical groups within China were still under the oppression of both imperialism and feudalism and while their liberation was still very far off, Mongolia found rightful assistance from a socialist country—the Soviet Union—and by its own hard struggle achieved liberation and independence. Such liberation and independence we Chinese should hail and we should express our respect to the Mongolian people. We should learn from them, **we should not oppose their independence, we should not drag them to share our suffering.** They attained liberation twenty eight years ago and now march forward to socialism, as for us, we have just liberated ourselves. **Therefore, our attitude should be one of recognising its independence, NOT ONE OF PULLING THEM BACK TO OUR FOLD AND MAKING THEM FOLLOW US AGAIN.**

"In regard to Inner Mongolia, Tibet and other ethnical groups the present question is not how to divide ourselves and each try to become independent, but to unite our efforts to build strong, new, democratic China since we all have been liberated more or less during the same period."¹

We would most fervently request the readers to read the above passages not once but several times, especially the emphasised portions and to think deeply the following questions: The questions are: 1. Why immediately after the signing of the Sino-Soviet Friendship and Mutual Assistance Pact such a public statement was necessary? 2. Why, at all, "exchange of notes" were necessary for the affirmation of the independent status of the MPR? 3. Why at all, the written pledge for the establishment of diplomatic

1 Emphases both in bold and capital letters supplied.

relations by the PRC with the MPR was necessary? 4. Who wanted to drag Mongolia to share China's sufferings and who wanted to pull back Mongolia to China's fold among the Communists? 5. Who thought that the map of China would appear out of shape and unreal without Mongolia? 6. After signing the Treaty and agreement on the status of Mongolia why was it necessary again to declare publicly "We should not oppose their independence"?

It may also be noted that when the negotiations between Stalin and Mao came to an impasse Chou-Bn-Lai had to fly into Moscow on February 7, 1950 and finally the Agreement and Treaty were signed, to be ratified later in the year. Why?

From all these questions stems another question Was there a "battle" between Stalin and Mao during the negotiations of Sino-Soviet Friendship and Mutual Assistance Pact on the question of the status of Mongolia as Mao said that another battle was needed and Stalin refused to sign the Agreement?

It may also be noted in this connection that in reply to the question of Tass in an interview with Mao on January 2, 1950. Mao said, "I have come for several weeks. — The length of my sojourn depends on the period in which it will be possible to settle questions of interests to the Chinese Peoples' Republic. Among them, the first of all such questions as the existing Treaty of friendship and alliance between China and the USSR..." This "existing treaty" was the treaty between China's Republic, headed by Chiang Kai-Shek and the U.S.S.R. signed in August 1945. Mao demanded the abrogation of this Treaty as he considered the treaty as "unequal". In a broadcast in 1948 Mao announced that the Chinese Communist Party, once it came to power, would not recognise any unequal treaties past or present or any treaties entered into with Chiang regime during the civil war.

Let us recall in this connection the stand of Mao on the status of the M.P.R. In 1935 Mao told the American author of **Red Star Over China**: "In answer to a latter question, in another interview, Mao Tse-tung made the following statement concerning Outer Mongolia: "...When the peoples' revolution has been victorious in China the Outer Mongolian Republic will automatically become a part of the Chinese Federation, at their own will. The Mohammedan and Tibetan peoples likewise, will form autonomous republics attached to the Chinese federation."¹

Compare this statement of Mao with the public statement of the Communist Party of China, published in the **New China Daily** on March 5, 1950, which we quoted almost in full in which it was said that "some people" have been contaminated with the sentiment of "Suzerainty" and they think the map of China appears out of shape and unreal without Mongolia."

Let us also recall Mao's book **The Chinese Revolution and the Chinese Communist Party**, 1939 edition. Let us quote from one of the most trusted authors of the Mosist—Stuart Schram. He writes in his "Political leaders of the Twentieth Century" —Mao Tse-Tung:

"Although it was perfectly clear that the Mongolians wanted no part of either Chinese or Soviet suzerainty, this was a bitter pill to swallow [recognition of MPR as sovereign State] for a man who had been obsessed since earliest boyhood with the disintegration of the Chinese empire and who had always defined that empire in the broadest possible terms. In 1936 he had affirmed his belief that whenever the revolution was victorious in China, outer Mongolia would of its own accord join the Chinese federations and in 1939 he had defined the frontiers of China in such a way as to include both Outer and Inner Mongolia. There is no reason to believe that he had subsequently modified his views—but in this, as in many other respects, he was obliged to compromise with reality."²

In a footnote Stuart Schram writes:

In 'The Chinese Revolution and the Chinese Communist Party' he wrote: "The present boundaries of China are contiguous in the northeast, the north and part in the west to the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics." There follows an enumeration of the countries contiguous on the west, south and east. In the current edition an additional sentence has been inserted immediately after the one just cited: 'The northern frontier is contiguous to the Peoples' Republic of Mongolia,' (**Selected works**, Peking) Vol. II p. 305. There is no mention at all, either of Mongolia or of a northern frontier in the original version as

1 Edgar Snow: **Red Star over China**, Victor Gollancz Ltd, London, 1937, p. 102, fn.

2 Stuart Schram: **Mao Tse-Tung**, Penguin Book Ltd., 1967, p. 256.

published in 1939 by the official Chieh-fang She in Yenan. If this was an omission, it had still not been rectified either in an edition published in January 1949 at Peiping by the Hsinhua Agency or in one published in June 1949 at Hongkong. At the very least the 1939 version leaves the issue conspicuously open. (There is no other gap in Mao's meticulously country-by-country enumeration of all the bordering lands.) But it seems much more likely that the reference to the frontier in 'northeast and northwest' was meant to designate the whole semi-circular sweep of the boundary with the Soviet Union, **Mongolia being considered as part of the Chinese side.**"¹

It is clear from the above that up to 1949, even when Mao was negotiating a Sino-Soviet Friendship Pact in Moscow in 1949-50 he considered Mongolia as part of China. In 1943, Mao declared to Edgar Snow that the Government of new China will recognise Outer Mongolia as a "national Region" (Province) of China as an autonomous region! This time not as a member of Chinese federation, as the CPC under Mao's leadership by this time, has already given up the Leninist theory of federal states in a multi-national country. with the right of self-determination, including secession. Compare this attitude of Mao with the public statement of March 5, 1950 that some people among ourselves are contaminated with the poisonous thought 'of the Kuomintang reactionary bloc' that the map of China would appear out of shape and unreal without Mongolia'.

Mao, during (he negotiations with the USSR, demanded the abrogation of the Friendship treaty made by the Soviet Union with Chiang regime,. That treaty included the recognition of the MPR as an independent, sovereign State among others of which we will discuss in the next item. Now. abrogation of 1945 Friendship treaty with Chiang regime meant the abrogation of the recognition of the MPR as an independent and sovereign State Stalin agreed to abrogate (and actually abrogated) the 1945 friendship treaty with Chiang regime - provided the PRC recognises the independent and sovereign status of the MPR and establishes normal diplomatic relations with the MPR, afresh. This proposal of Stalin, perhaps was a "strong pressure" on Mao, against which Mao had to "wage another battle". Chou-En-lai had to fly into Moscow from China and at last after "waging battles" Mao had to give up the "battle". It was indeed a "pressure" to a bourgeois nationalist Mao. It was a "battle" between proletarian inter-nationalism represented by Stalin and bourgeois nationalism represented by Mao.

Considering Mao's stand, the contents of the 1949 edition of Mao's **Chinese Revolution and the Chinese Communist Party** etc. and also considering the fact that the Agreement was to be ratified later, possibly to be sure and guaranteed, Stalin requested the Communist Party of China to issue a categorical and unambiguous public statement on the question of the status of the MPR, strongly denouncing and decrying all the bourgeois nationalist and "Hanist" deviations and distortions that were existing in the Chinese Communist Party and its leadership. It may be noted that in post-1950 editions Mao 'rectified' his stand on north-east frontier.

That was a "strong pressure indeed" to Mao.

It may also be noted, in this connection, that in spite of the above categorical public statement China refused to sign a tripartite Sino-Soviet-Mongolian Pact in September, 1952. The details of disagreements are not known to us But we know that to facilitate the tripartite Sino-Soviet-Mongolian Pact the Chung-Cbang Railway network of Manchuria, which had been placed under Sino-Soviet joint administration in 1950 agreement, was returned to China's absolute control in 1952. Yet, the discussion on this tripartite agreement among the concerned foreign Ministers of these three countries reached such an impasse that ultimately Stalin had to intervene. In spite of that Chou-En-Lai pleaded his inability to sign the agreement. However, that Sino-Soviet- Mongolian Agreement was signed in 1954 — after the death of Stalin — when Mao found a blood brother in Khrushchov, when Khrushchov and Bulganin visited Peking. This tripartite agreement was entirely limited to the construction of Railway connecting the three countries.

We do not know what were the stipulations of the proposed tripartite agreement of 1952, nor do we know exactly why China refused to sign that agreement at that time. But we know, that after signing the tripartite agreement in 1954, China granted a loan of 160 million rubles to the Mongolian Peoples'

1 Ibid., fn., p. 256.

Republic and more than 10,000 Chinese “workers” were sent to MPR, ostensibly for the construction of joint railway road linking the three countries and on May. 15, 1957. Bulganin, the head of the USSR) and Tsedebell (the head of the MPR) issued a joint statement in strong terms against the infiltrations of foreigners, without naming China. (See Izvestia May 17. 1957) We can understand the Chinese attitude towards Mongolia from this instance also.

It was no wonder that a nationalist Mao felt humiliated and “strong pressure”. It was also no wonder that a Marxist-Leninist Stalin considered Mao a Tito-type .

(ii) **Delineation of Sino-Soviet Borders:** The agreement signed in 1950 delineated the respective borders, one in Soviet-Manchurian borders, the major border on which both had significant strategic interests and the other in Sinkiang, the vast interior province of China’s northwest adjacent to Soviet Central Asia- During the Anti- Japanese Resistance War, under agreement with Chiang regime, the principal rail network of Manchuria was under the Soviet control. Besides that, the important base at the tip of the Liaotung province — Port Arthur also was under the control of the Soviet Union, where the Soviet Union built a modern military establishment. The abrogation of 1945 Friendship treaty with Chiang regime necessitated new agreement with the , RC. Under the new agreement in 1950, while the principal rail network of Manchuria and Port Arthur were recognised by the Soviet Union as Chinese territory, the rail network of Manchuria was placed under joint administration (handed over to China’s absolute control in 1952), and Port Arthur was not immediately handed back to China in 1950 agreement for military reasons in which the interests of both China and the Soviet Union were involved. It was agreed in the agreement of 1950, that Port Arthur, together with its military installations will be handed over to China in 1952.

Mao waged “another battle” on these issues. We do not know what arguments were advanced by Stalin in favour of returning the control over Port Arthur. But we have a Leninist example as precedence. The Port of Hangoe was recognised as the territory of Finland after Finland was declared independent by the newly born Soviet Government of Russia in 1918. But, by mutual consent, the military administration of the port of Hangoe was controlled by Soviet Russia for military reasons, in view of the fact that it was strategically important for the defence of both the Soviet and Finnish Governments and Soviet Russia was militarily more capable than Finland. This agreement was signed, under the leadership of no less than a Leninist than Lenin himself, The, then, newly emerged Socialist Republic of Finland understood correctly the joint interests of both the countries as the concrete manifestation of proletarian internationalism while Mao viewed the issue of Port Arthur from the narrow bourgeois nationalist standpoint and naturally he took it as “strong pressure. ’

It is necessary to mention here, that when Chinese Chung-Chun Railway was handed back to China’s absolute control in 1952, winding up the joint administration over it, Port Arthur was not handed back though it was promised in 1950 agreement, that it would be handed back to China in 1952. Why did Stalin break his promise? Was not the act an example of ‘big-nation Chauvinism’ as Mao accused? In the interest of socialism as a whole Stalin could not oblige the nationalist Mao as a new situation in international politics arose after the agreement with China in 1949-50 in respect of Port Arthur and that was the war in Korea which had the possibility of spreading in China. Possibly China refused to sign the Sino-Soviet Mongolian tripartite agreement in 1952 for not handing back Port Arthur at that time. The Soviet Union declared again in 1952, most categorically, that Port Arthur belonged to China.

In this case also Mao had to succumb and thus lost his “battle”. Naturally, he felt “strong pressure”.

(iii) **Joint Enterprises:** The issue of ‘Joint enterprises was “another battle” of Mao against the “strong pressure” by Stalin. Marxism-Leninism and proletarian internationalism always advocated and upheld (from Marx to Stalin) the building of socialism **internationally**. Socialism in one country was the adaptation with a particular historical situation. Even then the socialist State can neither be a national State nor was it considered as a “national State”. (See Stalin-Emil Ludwig talk.) After 1945, socialism in several countries replaced socialism in one country and the objective and subjective bases of building socialism **internationally** emerged. From then the slogan, the stand “Socialism in one country” became not only a thing of the past but also reactionary and counterrevolutionary, so far as the construction of

socialism in victorious countries was concerned.¹

This qualitative and fundamental change did not enter into the heads of Tito and Mao and they stuck to ‘socialism in one country,’ ‘building socialism singly by its own resources and alone’. So Mao reacted strongly and sharply when Stalin proposed Joint Defence enterprises in Manchuria and Soviet-Sinkiang common borders, where common strategic interests of both the countries were involved Should Marxist-Leninists treat common borders of two socialist countries like those of nation and nationalist states always provoking excitement and building fortifications against one another? It is to be noted with particular care that Stalin did not propose joint enterprises in the heartland of China. He did not forget the national peculiarities and, unequal developments from that of the USSR. Mao failed to differentiate a socialist country from a capitalist country and he placed the socialist country —the Soviet Union—at par with a capitalist country and forgot the socialist character of the Soviet Union. So his nationalist bent of mind thought that a highly industrialised Soviet Union would take advantage of the backward China and exploit her like those of capitalist countries. It may be noted that the pact was a pact of **mutual** military assistance against all possible danger of onslaught of imperialism on both China and the Soviet Union and mutual defence and assistance naturally demanded common planning of defence and assistance in common borders and Mao refused the very basis of real **mutuality** in defence enterprises in common border areas! So another “battle” was necessary for Mao as he thought it to be a “strong pressure.” It was Chou En-lai armed with Party directives came to Moscow and compelled Mao to agree with Stalin’s proposal- No wonder that Stalin considered Mao “another Tito.”

These are the untold stories which Mao did not narrate in accusing Stalin wantonly. Mao has replaced the historical and objective analysis by his subjective impression — an impression of a bourgeois nationalist and in course of this the analysis of actual history has been consciously subordinated to the opportunist need of the subjective inclinations of this or that factions.

Lenin said “ it was the revisionists who gained a sad reputation for themselves by their departure from the fundamental views of Marxism, and by their fear or inability, to ‘settle accounts’ openly, explicitly, resolutely and clearly with the view they had abandoned.”² The modern revisionists, particularly Mao, have not ‘settled accounts’ ‘openly.’ On the contrary, he tried to ‘settle accounts’ by distorting and re-writing history, on the basis of personal hostility. In this respect the modern revisionists have been a hundred times dishonest than the Bernsteinians.

[To be continued]

“Khrushchev’s Report — A Historical Document”

Under the above heading — the editorial of the **Peoples’ Daily**, China, on February 19, 1956, welcomed Khrushchov’s Report at the 20th Congress of the CPSU. The editorial wrote that “the resolute belief that ‘war is not predestined and unavoidable’ will rouse millions and tens of millions of defenders in their determined struggle for the universal easing of international tension.” Yet, in its the “**Origin of our Differences**”, the CPC writes that they opposed Khrushchov’s ‘three peacefuls’ from the very beginning! Dishonesty! thy name is revisionism!

¹ This formulation is not applicable to-day since several socialist countries are now a thing of the past. The neo-imperialist Russia, in the name of building socialism internationally is to-day practising unbridled imperialism though in somewhat different manner than that of classical imperialism.

² Lenin: Materialism and Empirio-criticism—Introduction

March Forward to A General Strike

WORKERS!

To-day once again the time has come to defend our hard-won political right to strike with all our might. History has proved that strikes are the most effective weapon in the Trade Union armoury. Since the beginning of industrial capitalism, over two hundred years ago, labour has constantly, all over the world, resorted to strikes to win its economic demand and political rights, at times breaking the attempts of capitalist state to curb or prevent strikes through legal sanction.

The right to strike is an essential part of the democratic rights of the worker in a capitalist society: The right to sell his labour power at a price of his own choice. This right was won with fire and blood and if the Government under the pretext of Essential Service Maintenance Act is banning strikes, we will defend it once again with every sacrifice. But to win this battle we should have a direction. We should know why the bourgeoisie has attacked us to day in this manner. Why should we fight them? How can we fight them? Who can lead us?

No policy of the Government concerning labour is arbitrary. It reflects the nature of the Capital - Labour relationship, which the capitalist desires to impose in the context of the existing economic conditions. For the working class to build a revolutionary offensive to defeat the capitalist, it becomes necessary to discern the **strategy of the capitalist** at every phase, otherwise, the labour movement is forced to fight a piecemeal and tactical battle, without definite orientation and thus, is duped again and again into the capitalist orbit.

To-day the world capitalist system is rapidly nearing a crisis. Unable to recover from 1974-75 crisis, the severest since the second world war, it is becoming more aggravated Stagnation and recession has already affected many branches of the world economy. The Indian economy linked with the imperialist economy with a thousand threads, is also facing acute problems. Industrial sickness is spreading. First it affected the textile industry, then a large part of the engineering and now increasingly creeping into the base metal and petro-chemical industries. Whereas the old industries are already burdened with obsolete technology, the new industries set up in the 60's are already entering a phase when the technology is becoming outdated. Modernisation is necessary to survive in the conditions of ruthless capitalist-competition. But for modernisation money is needed. The crux of the problem faced by the Indian capitalist economy is the acute shortage of capital, the money has run out. The credit policy of the Reserve Bank like raising the Cash Reserve Ratio (CRR) twice in just five months from 6% to 7% and now to 8% is a reflection of this scarcity.

Capital, so desperately needed by the Indian bourgeoisie, can come from external sources by way of borrowing from world money market or through greater squeezing of the surplus value from the workers. Borrowing from international money market is limited. In the recent commitment made by the Government to the IMF this limit is SDR 1.8 billion. Further international borrowing in the contexts of increasing interest rates of imperialist countries, runaway inflation, rising oil prices, unfavourable trade terms, falling of prices of raw materials and stagnating world market, is bound to increase our indebtedness and dependence to the imperialist economy endangering domestic capital generation which is detrimental to the Indian capitalist economy.

A more safe option for the bourgeoisie is to generate capital internally at the expense of working class by increasing the share of unsold value of labour that the capitalist appropriates by depressing the real wage of the workers. This is achieved by simultaneously increasing the price of the essential commodities and curtailing all the possibilities of an increase in the money wage of the working people. But the capitalist is exposed in the long history of the labour battles and so cannot openly resort to wage cuts. For this reason the capitalist uses the face of neutrality that the capitalist state adorns in the form of 'democracy' 'Disguising the real face under the slogan of 'national interest' 'phoney war situation' etc.. it plans for a **State Control of Wages**.

In the beginning of capitalist development, when capitalism was still in the competitive stage, the workers set up independent centres for their economic struggles—the Trade Unions, through which the

workers ensured that the price of the commodity—labour power is not depressed, by the capitalists, below the value. These organs of economic struggle—the trade union—were independent of the capitalist and the state.

With the development of organised labour movements not only the wages were stopped from being depressed but were also increased. The capitalist tried, at first, to destroy the independence of the Trade Unions by buying of the Trade Union leaders, giving them special privileges and position in the state machinery and bourgeoisie parties, etc. But with the growing crisis even this relative dependence had become a fetter to the capitalist interest.

State control of wages is not possible without liquidating this independence of the Trade Unions. So the present capitalist offensive, beginning on the terrain of **economic struggle**, is directed against the **Independence** of Trade Unions, viz, the right of each trade union to settle the wages depending upon its bargaining strength through the process of free collective bargainings; the strategy being to transform the labour relations—the relation which is based on the sale of labour power to the capitalist—from the free collective bargaining of wages to one of **Complete State Control of Wage**.

That this process has already begun is evident from the following facts: (1) rise of prices of essential commodities by more than 20% in this year alone ; (2). the wage freeze policy of the Government ; (3) restriction of collective bargaining on bonus **only** to the extent provided by the Bonus Act; (4) Government's refusal to fully neutralise the rise in the cost of living.

In pursuing this strategy, the major step was the banning of strikes under the Essential Services Maintenance Act, the “essential” Service – covering all the branches of economy that are essential for the survival of the capitalist economy. By banning the right to strike the state forces the workers to **shift** the struggle from the open confrontation of labour and capital at the **factory level**, the point of commencement of class struggle, to legality, negotiations and direct communication with relevant state—departments. In this process (a) the masses of workers, are not involved in the struggle and become totally dependent on strata such as lawyers, professional trade unionists and state personnels, thereby breeding social reformist ideology, creating illusion of the neutrality of the state and the possibility of peaceful settlement of the labour-capital conflict,' and destroying: the will and confidence of the workers in the fight for their own emancipation. (b) the tempo of struggle is retarded and made protracted, allowing the capitalists to postpone any immediate crisis and also to manoeuvre such that the union is bled of its strength to utter defeat or to a minimum position enough for their ‘labour lieutenants’ to have a semblance of victory.

The political significance of the capitalist strategy is revealed, for, by denying the workers the right to determine their wages by collective bargaining, which in most of the cases culminates in a strike, precisely the period when the commodity capital-labour relationship is best revealed ; when the workers are most susceptible to the propaganda for proletarian revolution, its strategy and tactics and socialism when the workers are tempered politically and organisationally ; when from the mass of workers the best and vanguard elements are exposed, making the base for building and strengthening the true workers’ political Party ; when the reformist, opportunist and vacillating leadership is exposed as the lackey of the bourgeoisie, the capitalist attempts to crush the foundation from which will spring forth the political movements of the working class for their own emancipation.

The deteriorating condition of the masses is bound to raise the militancy of the workers. At Bombay on June 4, 1981, all the non-INTUC central trade unions and national federations came together to give a clarion call against the price hike and the Government's anti-labour policy. There is no doubt that from the view point of the majority of the workers this is a step forward.

Still from July 27 the capitalist launched its open offensive. If the power behind it were just law and the guns of the police, then the united strength of the Industrial 'workers could defeat it. The June 4, convention should have forewarned the capitalist of the workers strength and will. But it did not stop them. To think that the bourgeoisie made a mistake of judgement, would be to underestimate their true strength. Where is the real source of their strength? It exists in the mature: and tested of labour leaders in the service of capitalists, in the domination of the ideology of labour reformism **in the working class movement; in the susceptibility of all the central trade unions in varying degrees to the policy of**

state control and incorporation into the state.

WORKERS! The enemy is in our own ranks!

The Trade Union as an organ of struggle is an inherent and objective factor of the relation of labour and capital. trade union worth its name can exist without a show of struggle. The difference between a reformist and a revolutionary trade union movement is a question of forms of struggle and the axis of struggle which determines the reformist or revolutionary character of the union. A revolutionary trade union is one whose axis of struggle is not subservient to the strategy of capitalist but is in opposition to it.

INTUC by its allegiance to the Congress (I) policy of banning strikes has proved to be the main base of the Congress (I) strength to openly confront the working class. But this should not give us the illusion that only Congress (I) and INTUC are the allies of the bourgeoisie. The Janata Government which included the top leaders of the HMS in its rule presented an Industrial Relation Bill which planned to impose state control on wages and other labour matters under the bogey of “industrial democracy”. The continuity of capitalist policy is best revealed in the fact that the Congress (I) is also planning to revise the above bill in the form of amendments to the Industrial Disputes Act. Such a policy will act as an **auxiliary** to the more aggressive policy of **banning strikes**.

Even the Red Central Trade Unions are not mod: different from INTUC and HMS The CPI controlled AITUC has already exposed itself by to action in emergency when it supported the banning of strikes, and, as a member of the National Apex Body became a tool of the bourgeoisie in imposing anti-labour decisions on the workers. Tenia? instead of becoming the backbone of the workers' struggle against the anti-labour policy AITUC being the second biggest union, is diverting the mam issue into irrelevant ones From certain sections voices can be heard that the banning of the strikes is justified if there is a threat of external aggression.

CITU is the most militant section of the National campaign Committee and is in the forefront of the present agitation against the anti-labour policies of Congress (I) Government, But it does so not from a principled position of remaining **independent** of the capitalist policy of state regulated labour movement. In West Bengal where the CPM's Left Front Government exists, the CITU has expanded tremendously, not because of its open trade union **struggle at factory level** but by using the state machinery to solve various problems, CITU has no objection to voluntary arbitration. How can it. when CITU does so in West Bengal? In essence, the voluntary arbitration between CPM's Government and CITU is no different from voluntary arbitration between Congress (I) Government and INTUC. In both the cases, the open mass struggle of the workers including strike is sidetracked. The CITU's stand against voluntary arbitration becomes redundant, once the same political party contests both the Government and Trade Union, even though the state remains capitalist in character. It is not a surprise than that the capitalists in West Bengal, though uncertain about the character of CPM are happy at the labour discipline. In the character of the CITU in West Bengal we can see the future image of a state controlled Union at the Centre.

But then what is the genesis of the struggle of the non-INTUC Central Unions to day. Behind the façade of struggle against anti-labour policy the basic interest in the opposition to the general **discrimination** by the Congress Government. To them ‘anti-labour policy’ means the official patronage by the Government given to the INTUC. Their demand is for equal patronage. On no account are they opposed in **principle** to state control over labour in a capitalist society.

Within this general frame work CITU appears a militant one because unlike others **status quo** Unions, it is a new union and this cannot gain a foothold in the working class ,n areas where there is no Left Front Government without aggressing upon other established unions. And within the severest discrimination practised upon them by the official machinery, they are left with no option but to fight temporarily, for the right to strike.

All these unions have a common ground for unity ; the demand for equal patronage by the Government, though each has its own independent strategy for achieving the exclusive patronage of Government.

Vanguard Workers! struggle against all forms of opportunism and vacillation of AITUC, HMS, BMS and CITU.

Nevertheless, in the struggle against the strike ban, we should join all ranks, even those who are just temporary allies. The ESM ordinance was made into a bill by the Parliament in August, once again showing that Parliament does not represent the interest of the workers. No amount of workers protests had any effect. Nor can just demonstration and marches to Parliament or a one Day Bandh can have any effect. If the capitalists plan to shift the struggle from the factory level, then the best and the only weapon is a fight at the factory level. The only way to stop the ban on strikes is to go on a strike, a General Strike stopping the wheels of all industries. Against the capitalist offensive for banning strike, our slogan is STRIKE.

WORKERS: PROPAGATE, AGITATE AND ORGANISE FOR A GENERAL STRIKE.

Post-Script

The Hindi version of the above was distributed at the workers rally before the parliament in Delhi on November 13, 1981 by the PROLETARIAN PATH.

PROLETARIAN PATH while warmly congratulating the National Campaign Committee for declaring a general strike on 19th January, 1982, urges the organisers of the general strike to launch immediate campaign of propaganda and agitation against ESMA and other repressive laws* putting in the forefront the Central slogan for HIGHER FORM OF DEMOCRACY as a strategic alternative to the 'democracy' of the Indian ruling classes, linking it with the day to day immediate and partial demands. Organisers! do not blur the Class basis of this Government by issuing the non-class slogan of "Indira authoritarianism". Propaganda for socialism must not remain in the vault as fixed deposit for future use, it must not be 'on credit'. In day to day and partial struggles working people must be warned again and again, that their struggle is for socialism, for higher form democracy, in absence of which they cannot eliminate the threat of repression and oppression permanently, but can only retard it and that may also be purely temporarily.

Workers! Make the GENERAL STRIKE a grand success and march forward. MAKE 19th January, 1982, a red letter day in the history of Indian Working Class struggle.

The Soviet Society To-day

Of late the Soviet Journals and periodicals are writing article after article in systematic and planned way about the alarming rate of decline of the birth of population in the Soviet Union. In a recent article in **Komsomolskaya Pravda**, the author advised the workers to give up their technical and other training in night schools after working hours, as it saps all the energy and enthusiasm of the concerned workers as a result of which they find no urge and charm in producing children. Such is the extent and depth of the population crisis there. In fact, if one compares the birth rate of population of other European countries with that of the USSR **as a whole**, the situation of the Soviet Union cannot be considered as alarming as is being painted by the Soviet authority. Why, then, this alarmist hullo-bullow? The reason of this hullo-bullow, in fact, lies elsewhere. Let us try to find that out.

It was in 1976, at the 25th Congress of the CPSU, alarming picture of the declining rate of the Soviet population was first presented by Brezhnev and some inducement in the shape of cash award and benefits to the parents of more than one child was declared. But, even then, the population “crisis” continued. Brezhnev, in his report to the 26th Congress of the CPSU, held in February-March, 1981, said, “Acting on the instructions of the 25th Congress, the Central Committee gave serious attention to charting and implementing an effective **demographic policy** to population problem that have lately grown acute. However, it must be said bluntly, that so far there have been no perceptible change. What is needed is wider and more effective measures.” And after itemising the “effective measures” one by one, Brezhnev hastened to add a small clause. Listen to him. “At the same time, of course, close attention must be given to the specific situation in different republics and regions. This addition clearly betrays the real character of the population problem as well as socialism of the Soviet Union..

What is the “specific situation of different republics and regions? It is clear from this that the population problem is not acute in certain republics and regions and as such the mothers of more than one child are not eligible to get the benefits and facilities announced. From this, it is also clear, that the population problem, taking the Soviet Union **as a whole** into account, is not so acute as is painted by the soviet authority. The problem is the problem of **uneven** growth and decline of population and man-power. Herein lies the essence of the population problem of the Soviet Union.

In 1979, a **nationality-wise** census was taken by the Soviet authority and it was revealed that whereas in 1939, the percentage of the **ethnic** Russian was 58 of the total soviet population, in 1979 that has dropped to 52.4 and it is feared that by the end of the century, it may go down below 50% if immediate and effective measures are not taken to increase the birth rate of the **ethnic** Russian of the Russian Socialist Federated Soviet Republic (RSFSR). The headache of the Soviet authority is there. If the **ethnic** Russians predominate in the percentage of population in the multi-national Soviet Union. Socialism is considered safe. Otherwise socialism will be in great danger, if ethnic Russians become minority!

This is the reason of all hullo-bullow of the population crisis. This is the real character of the population problem as well as of socialism in the USSR.

Now after 64 years of socialism and “developed socialism” at that, as claimed by Brezhnev, we hear the cry “Socialism is in danger without the ethnic Russians”! One must study such socialism very, very, carefully and with real detachment.

II

Time and again Brezhnev declared that the “nationality issue’ has been resolved once for all in the Soviet Union Now, we hear from his report at the 26th Congress of the CPSU that “The Soviet nations are now more closely united than ever. Naturally this does not imply that all the problems of the relations between nationalities have been resolved.” The “developed socialism” of the Soviet Union after 64 years of socialism is now confronted with such a serious problem of “national minority” which the All Union Central Committee of the CPSU dared not handle. Brezhnev said in his report, “In recent years there has been a considerable growth in some republics of the number of citizens of non-indigenous [Mark it, please] nationalities. These have their own specific needs in terms of language, culture and everyday life. The Central Committees of the Communist parties of republics and the territorial and regional party

committees should go deeper into these matters and opportunely suggest ways of meeting these needs". We scent the Bundist slogan in it. We find, in essence, the problem of Assam in it. While the leaders of Assam movement do not hesitate to call the Indian citizens "foreigners" the Communist Brezhnev did blush to call the Soviet citizens "foreigners." and as such called them "non-indigenous"! The question of question is how in a "developed socialism" "Culture" and "everyday life" style can remain so different from one another in their fundamental and general features necessitating to go "deeper" into the problem for resolution? Are not the "Culture" and everyday life-style of the minority "non-indigenous" citizens and indigenous citizens socialist in character and content, in spite of their different form? Are not all the citizens of all the republics and regions of the of the Soviet Union imbued with proletarian internationalism and class stand of the working class or are still imbued with petty-bourgeois nationalism forgetting their working class character? Why these petty-bourgeois problems emerge in the Soviet Union after 64 years of socialism? Lenin said, "...The proletariat cannot support any consecration of nationalism; **on the contrary, it supports everything that helps to OBLITERATE NATIONAL DISTINCTIONS AND REMOVE NATIONAL BARRIERS; it supports everything that** makes the ties between nationalities closer and closer. ... To act differently means siding with reactionary nationalism." (Lenin, "Critical Notes on the National Question" in: Question of the National Policy and Proletarian Internationalism," Moscow, 1967, p. 28, emphases in capital letters and **bold** supplied.)

Lenin also said, "The slogan of national culture is a bourgeois (and often also Black Hundred and clerical) fraud. Our slogan is: the international culture of democracy and of the working class movement" (Lenin, "Critical Remarks on the National Questions" VOL. 20, Moscow, 1964, p. 23.) Has Lenin and proletarian **class** culture been outdated in the country of "developed socialism"?

In this connection, it may be mentioned that in reaction to the big-nation chauvinism of the Soviet authority naturally ("naturally" for such a "developed socialism") gave rise to narrow nationalism in different republics of the Soviet Union and the Communist Parties and Government of different republics demanding equal representation in the Central Committee of the CPSU and Government of the USSR. The demand is a demand of bourgeois equal representation, not a proletarian class demand. And this bourgeois demand has raised its ugly head in a socialist country and in a country of "developed socialism," after 64 years of socialism! Brezhnev, in his report said. "The population of the soviet republics is multinational. All nations, of course, have the right to be adequately represented in **their party** [is it a multi-national party or a class party Mr. Brezhnev?] and Government organs. Needless to say, the competence and ideological and moral makeup of each candidate must be carefully scrutinized." Here you see, Brezhnev, a bourgeois nationalist, **in principle** submits to the nationalist demand of equal representation in the Party's Central Committee – which is supposed to be a class party of the proletariat irrespective of nationality, language etc. but **in practice**, like a big-nation chauvinist rejects the demand of equal representation by raising the question of "competence, ideological and moral make-up"! This is the example of socialist consciousness and proletarian internationalism of the Soviet Union!

III

Specialists, technicians and skilled workers who were brought from the R.S.F.S.R. and other developed regions- to Siberia, Soviet Far East and Northern regions to develop those area are fleeing **en masse** abandoning the machines and tractors. It has led to the closing down of the factories and agricultural farm work there causing disorganisation of production and transport, scarcity of food and other necessities, consequently engendering black-market, speculation, profiteering, stealing etc. etc. On the other hand the stubborn resistance of the surplus man power to leave Central Asia and Caucasus and to go to the area of the R. S, F. S. R. to replenish the shortage of man-power there, is creating serious problems giving rise to **unemployment**, scarcity, black marketeering and all vices usual in the moribund and decaying capitalist society. Though Brezhnev said in his report that "...concrete steps have been mapped out to put an end to machinations with scarce commodities ... to stamp out all forms of abuse in this sphere" the grave situation in the Soviet Union especially in agriculture could not be concealed. Brezhnev also said, "It is sometimes argued that higher wage and salary increments in Siberia, the Soviet Far East and the Northern region should stop people from moving out of these regions. Increments must

be made, of course. But this alone will not solve the problem. More often than not a person leaves Siberia not because the climate is not suitable, or the pay is small, but because it is harder to get housing there and to put a child in Kindergartens and cultural centres are few and far between." Regarding Central Asia and Caucasus, he said, "The Central Asia and some parts of Caucasus there is, on the contrary, a surplus of man-power, particularly in the country side. This means that more inducements must be given to attract people living in these places to move to the territories now being developed." And finally Brezhnev lamented, "Nonetheless, to this day, many people prefer to move from north to south and from east to west although the rational location of productive forces requires movement in the opposite direction."

The condition is, undoubtedly grave, otherwise Brezhnev would not have the dirty linens of the Soviet Union to wash in a public pond in such a manner. From the above the only question arises in our mind, why after 64 years of socialism in the land of "developed socialism" labour has not become performance of "a conscious realisation of the necessity of working for the common good." In 1920, sixty one years ago Lenin said, "We shall work to do away with accursed. Maxim: "Every man for himself and the devil take the hindmost ...-and bring into the day-by-day life of the masses, the rule 'All for each and each for all'" (Lenin, C. W. Vol. 31, p. 124) It is not the ordinary people that are fleeing from Siberia, abandoning machines and tractors and disorganising production and transport, but the specialists technicians and skilled workers who constitute 43.8% to the party membership of the CPSU according to Brezhnev report. It is clear, that the citizens of the land of "developed socialism" and most enlightened citizens at that are not behaving any differently from those of the moribund and decaying capitalist society.

IV

It is clear from the report of Brezhnev that wider and deeper are Soviet crisis, the leadership seeks more the solution to it in reversion to capitalism.

Brezhnev, in his report after praising and recommending highly of private property and personal initiative in agriculture and paying lip service to collective farms and collectivist initiative urged the collective and state farmers to engage themselves more and more to private farming with personal initiative to develop and extend consumer market economy. He said in his report, "The state farms were and continue to be the mainstay of socialist agriculture. But this certainly does not mean that the potentialities of subsidiary individual holding may be neglected.

"The CPSU Central Committee has **deemed it necessary** [after 64 years of socialist agriculture?] to take decision on supplementary measures to develop individual holdings. It provides for establishing conditions—both material and moral – that would make citizens more interested in subsidiary farming...

"Maximum support should also be given to farms **run by individual enterprise** to supply their personnel".

The individual plots allowed to use as kitchen gardens for **family use** are to-day transformed from **personal property for personal or family consumption** to private property for production of commodities and "moral" encouragement, to such enterprises are given by "developed socialism" together with "material support"! And this material and moral support are also extended to the livestock and fodder raising and also to the officials and employees of the cities! It is clear that the form of group and state property are passing on to the individual economy.

As a result of all these capitalist measures the social decay of the Soviet society as is seen in the en masse fleeing from Siberian area, is strikingly reflected in Brezhnev's report. Among other things he repeatedly cited such phenomena as of "Egoism" and "avarice" and wide-spread alcoholism, which according to him, are "serious problem" and ' inflicts considerable damage on society". All the vices of a moribund society are seen in a society of "developed socialism" which demand not only serious but also loud thinking.

The Soviet Foreign Policy

The “peace” Brezhnev wants does not and cannot aim at mobilising the peoples to expose and oppose the war plans of the imperialist powers, to hinder and ban the armaments race, to put an end to the imperialist oppression and exploitation in the world. By “peace” he implies the preservation of the present imperialist status quo, the liquidation precisely of the resistance of the people towards the war mongering policy of the superpowers, the lowering of their vigilance towards the enslaving plans and plots of the imperialist powers. When Brezhnev speaks of “peace” he wants peace with the United States of America, he wants agreements, compromises and mutual concessions with U. S. imperialism for the division and domination of the world.

One such item is the Middle East oil. “The state of stability and tranquillity” Brezhnev says “can be established in this region through joint efforts by all the parties involved.” So Brezhnev says to Reagan, if you want to avoid the danger of war between us, we are ready to conclude an agreement, to preserve the interest of the two sides, that is, we must make mutual concessions to each other. ‘We are ready to negotiate with the U.S. A on the Persian Gulf, the Far East, Africa, Europe, the Indian Ocean and all the other regions of the world,” he says. Thus not only the USA, but also the Soviet Union has “vital, interest, that is imperialist interests in those zones. Now Brezhnev wants these “vital interests” to be mutually honoured and guaranteed by the two superpowers.

(Excerpted from the Editorial of **Zeri i popullit, the organ of the Central Committee of the Party of Labour, Albania** of March 18, 1981).

The cornerstone of the Soviet so-called peace policy of “détente” with the United States is a policy of open counterrevolutionary collaboration between U. S. imperialism and Soviet social imperialism for the division of superpower spheres of influence, for the domination of the world, which is carried out in the name of “easing tension” and “international security”.

According to the Brezhnevite doctrine, it is the two thermonuclear super powers and the maintenance of the so-called balance of terror between them which provides the key to preventing war. “The military and strategic equilibrium prevailing between the USSR and the USA, between the Warsaw Treaty and NATO” Brezhnev cynically claims, “is objectively a safeguard for peace”.

Brezhnev takes this craven apology for imperialism even farther: “A war danger does exist for the United States” Brezhnev argues, “but it originates ... from the arms race and from the tension that still obtains in the world. We are prepared to combat this true and not imaginary danger hand in hand with the United States”.

How splendid! The two superpowers are merely innocent angels who by no fault of their own have fallen prey to the evil dangers of the “arms race” and “tension”! And who might be responsible for this “arms race” and “tension”? From Brezhnev’s report one might conclude that it must be hobgoblins or sorcerers that are responsible for the nuclear stockpiles and for the bloodshed in El Salvador and Afghanistan and for all the other crimes of world imperialism headed by the two superpowers. (Excerpted from “The workers’ Advocate” organ of the Marxist-Leninist Party of the U. S. A.)

“Another major weakness of Brezhnev’s perspective has even more vital implications as it relates to the supreme question of evading a nuclear holocaust. He still argues for a parity in deterrent capacity, ignoring the fact that the logic of parity itself leads to an escalation of the arms race. Also, Brezhnev’s diplomacy is still focussed on summitry that is he still fails to realise that in the present stage of international relations, summit diplomacy has little chances of even starting, let alone success, without a massive intervention by popular forces.” (Excerpted from “The Marxist Review”. Calcutta, October-November 1981 issue.)

The Mass Line of Peace

Peace will be preserved and consolidated if the people take the cause of preserving peace in their own hands and uphold to the end. Hence a broad campaign for the preservation of peace, as means of exposing the criminal machinations of the war mongers is now of paramount importance.” STALIN

The Brezhnevian Line of “Peace”

“Perhaps, war catastrophes could be avoided if it were possible periodically to redistribute raw materials and market among the respective countries in conformity with their economic weight—by means of concerted and peaceful discussions. But this is impossible under the present capitalist conditions of world economic development.” STALIN. (from Stalin’s Election meeting speech, February 9, 1946.)

Political Notes

1. Discordant Notes in “Marxbadi Path”

On August 5, 1981 the West Bengal State Committee of the Communist Party of India Marxist, under the editorship of Shri Promode Das Gupta, the Secretary of the West Bengal State Committee and Polit Bureau member of the C. C., CPI (M), has brought out a quarterly “Theoretical” Journal **Marxbadi Path**, in Bengali, “to elevate the consciousness” of cadres and ranks “from the bourgeois democratic level to Marxist-Leninist level”. We welcome the “Marxbadi Path” as we are more than convinced that without public polemics no real alarm could be effectively sounded to the international as well as the Indian Communist movement.

It is somewhat interesting to note that the first issue of the **Marxbadi Path** has revealed fundamentally a quite different approach to the problem of revisionism from that of its Central leadership. Shri Das Gupta, in course of explaining the need of a theoretical Journal emphasised on the imperative need of the merciless exposure of modern revisionism, especially, on the basic principles of Marxism-Leninism. In mercilessly and quite justifiably exposing the modern revisionists and their deliberation and declaration in Berlin conference Shri Das Gupta said: “The Berlin Conference is a glaring example of how the modern revisionists have deviated from Marxism-Leninism. The Conference of the Communist and Workers’ Parties of Europe, held in Berlin, the theories propounded and advocated’ in that conference known as Euro-Communism have got no relevance with the basic principle of Marxism-Leninism”. It may be noted in this connection, that the CPSU was represented by no less a person than Brezhnev himself in this Conference. Brezhnev said in his speech: “The delegation of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union warmly greets the participants in the Conference of Communist and Workers’ Parties of Europe. We, convey to you, the feelings of **fraternal friendship and militant solidarity** from the 15.5 million Soviet Communists ” Shri Das Gupta in unmistakable terms denounces this “fraternal and militant solidarity” with the participants of Berlin Conference in his editorial and mercilessly criticises and denounces, especially, the Communist Parties of Great Britain, France, Italy, Spain and Japan. According to Shri Das Gupta, the speech of the representative of the Communist Party of Spain. Santiago Carrillo is “shameless”.

In itself, this denunciation is not significant as “...history knows not a few socialists, who, foaming at the mouth, called upon workers’ Parties of **other** countries to perform most revolutionary actions imaginable. But that does not mean that they did not in their own party or in their own country **shrink** from fighting **their own** opportunists, their own bourgeoisie...” (Stalin, Vol. 13, p. 99; emphases as in the original). It is significant because this approach to the Berlin Conference is fundamentally different from the approach of the neo-revisionist central leadership of the CPI(M). The Polit Bureau of the CPI(M) in quite consistency with its neo-revisionist sophistry, in a statement on Berlin Conference stated:

“The CPI(M) has been always of the view that it is the right and duty of every Communist Party to assess the situation in its country and work out its political and tactical line. **The P. B. is of the opinion that further study and discussion of the theoretical position taken by various parties should be pursued.**

“But at the same time, it considers it is urgent and-necessary to relate our Party’s position on aforesaid **key issues**”.

The P. B. then related its position “on the aforesaid key issues”, in which we are not right now interested. What we like to point out here is: the P. B. shelved the question of fighting modern revisionism and made a sort of winking non-aggression pact with it, avoided ideological struggle and practised unvarnished opportunism through sophistry. While the P. B. carefully, and “wisely” avoided and hushed up the exposure of the theoretical position taken up by the Berlin Conference participants in the name of “further study and discussion” disarming its cadres and ranks in their fight against modern revisionism, Shri Promode Das Gupta, sounded the alarm calling his cadres and ranks to get armed theoretically and ideologically against pernicious modern revisionism pinpointing the disastrous consequences of modern revisionism. While Das Gupta’s stand is categorical, unambiguous, robust, positive and revolutionary, the stand of the P.B. is centrist, ambiguous, fishy compromising and

dangerously opportunist, true to the characteristics of neo-revisionism. We wonder, how Shri Das Gupta reconciled himself in the P.B. meeting t

2. In Lieu of Our Promised So-Called “Rich Peasants’ Struggle”.

Shri Benoy Chowdhury, the land and land Revenue Minister of the Left front Government of West Bengal and a leading member of the CPI(M) in the concluding part of his article “The Problems Before the Peasant Movement” published in **Marxbadi Path**, No. 1, also strikes a discordant note against the line and practice of the Central leadership of the Party. He writes: “Because of the irrigation and some other consequential advantages, it has been possible for the emergence of capitalist landlords through the development of capitalism in agriculture in Punjab, Haryana, the **western** part of U.P., Maharashtra, Gujarat, five or six coastal districts of Andhra Pradesh and in some districts of Nonoor area of Tamilnadu. They are very much influential locally. Due to the very class position they are considered as the vote bank of the parties of the capitalists and landlords. They may have certain grievances on certain issues on all-India scale against the Central Government now in power and we may, even, temporarily take advantage of it. But under no circumstances must we forget that strategically their position is in the camp of our enemy. If anybody thinks that we will be in a position to establish ourselves in the backward areas relying on them would be sheer running after the mirage.” Elsewhere, in the same article, he writes “The newly emerged capitalist landlords who have replaced the old feudal landlords are one of the mam enemies of the peasantry in rural areas. **It would be a fatal mistake to consider them rich peasant, and our allies.**” (emphasis added).

Tins is a direct slap on the face of the Central leadership of the CPI(M), especially on the article written by Basav Punnaiah in **Peoples’ Democracy** in defence of CPI(M)’s support oi and participation in the so-called rich peasants’ struggle led by Shared Joshi and others.