

Propositions for the Unity of the International Communist Movement

[At the International Seminar held in Brussels, Belgium from May 3 - 5 last under the auspices of the PTB, Workers' Party of Belgium, which was attended by representatives of communist and workers' parties, four declarations — 'Crisis of Balkan States', 'On North Korea', 'Greetings to Cuba' and 'Proposals for the Unity of the International Communist Movement' were adopted. All the declarations have been endorsed by the Central Committee of our party at its meeting from 9-16 June last. Comrade Nihar Mukherjee, our beloved General Secretary, has signed the main declaration 'Propositions for the Unity of the International Communist Movement'.

In the backdrop of counter-revolution and restoration of capitalism in the erstwhile socialist states this move towards consolidation of the international communist movement is of immense importance. So, we publish hereunder the entire text of the main declaration for the perusal of all concerned. - Editor, Proletarian Era.]

Introduction.

1. The Gorbachev-Yeltsin counter-revolution has brought the complete restoration of capitalism in the former socialist countries of eastern Europe and in the Soviet Union. This is a victory of imperialism and reaction, an important setback for all communist and progressive forces all over the world.
2. This counter-revolution has exacerbated all fundamental contradictions in the world : the contradiction between the socialist countries and imperialism, the contradiction between the oppressed peoples of Asia,

Africa and Latin America and imperialism, the contradictions between the imperialist powers and the contradiction between the working class and the bourgeoisie. The forces of reaction, racism, fascism and war have started a worldwide offensive.

3. In this situation, there is an urgent need for communist parties and organisations who stay to the revolutionary principles or Marxism-Leninism to unite, to draw lesson of the counter-revolutionary processes that have destroyed socialism in the Soviet Union, to exchange their experiences and analysis and co-ordinate their work.

The former divisions between Marxist-Leninist parties can be overcome

1. Since 1956, the international communist movement has been divided and split, mainly due to the revisionist line adopted by Khrushchev, but also under the influence of ultra-left attitudes.
2. Today, as a result of the restoration of capitalism under Gorbachev, the "pro-Soviet" tendency, which once constituted the majority, has atomised into innumerable tendencies. In the sixties, a "pro-Chinese" tendency had emerged which split into various tendencies after Mao's death. There has been a "pro-Albanian" tendency, which has also split after the collapse of socialism in Albania, and a "pro-Cuban" tendency, mainly in Latin America. Some parties, finally,

(Contd. on page 4)

Proletarian Era

Organ of SOCIALIST UNITY CENTRE OF INDIA
Founder Editor-in-Chief :
COMRADE SHIBDAS GHOSH

Volume 27 No 18
Price Rs. 1.25

July 7, 1994
Air Surcharge 5p

Anti-people Yeltsin regime joins imperialist NATO band for its survival : SUCI

Condemning Russia's decision to join the NATO, Comrade Nihar Mukherjee, General Secretary, SUCI, has issued the following statement on 23.6.94 :

Russia's signing of NATO pact under the leadership of the hated imperialist stooge Boris Yeltsin, making the country a partner of the NATO is yet another retrograde development that marks its complete surrender — not only politically but also militarily — to the hegemonistic diktat of the US administration.

This clearly indicates that the unconstitutional and illegitimate regime of Yeltsin imposed on the people of Russia needs for its survival even military backing of the NATO — an alliance armed with all sorts of nuclear teeth which all along had incurred wrath, resentment and vehement indignation of the peace-loving people all over the world. This further proves to the hilt the hollowness of the 'peaceable' intention of the imperialists. It is admitted by all that the correct course to bring about peace would have been dissolution of the NATO and complete disarmament, including of nuclear arms — but not strengthening this organisation itself adding more nuclear arms to the arsenal and putting them under its direct control. This development would also pose serious threat to the other republics of Russia.

When the contradiction between capitalist-imperialist countries is getting more and more sharpened today despite the attempt to patch up the same through the GATT agreement — the danger of war is lurking more and more menacingly.

While we express the hope that the freedom-loving people of Russia will continue to step up their resistance movement against the autocratic-dictatorial Yeltsin regime, we strongly protest against this decision and express our deep sense of solidarity with the struggling people of Russia.

Comrade Arun Singh pointed out that the success of the movement against commercialisation of education or for that matter the success of any movement did lie in the correctness of the line on which the movement was being conducted.

(Contd. on page 8)

National Convention of Mass Organisations against GATT and NEIP held amidst great enthusiasm

20th Sept. Rail Roko

The National Platform of Mass Organisations, in continuation of its April 5 massive protest demonstration held in Delhi, organised a National Convention on June 21 at Talkatora Stadium against the New Economic and Industrial policies of the Central government and the GATT agreement. The Convention was a grand success, with thousands belonging to organisations of workers, peasants, agricultural workers, students, youth, women, cultural groups and other democratic sections of the people attending it.

At the Convention the leaders called upon the people to build up a united battle against the New Economic and Industrial Policy and the GATT treaty.

Among the leaders present in the Convention were Comrade Ashutosh Banerjee, vice-President, UTUC(LS), Comrade Satyawan, member, Executive Committee, AIKKMS and Comrade Arun Singh, President, AIDSO. The other speakers were Comrade A.B. Bardhan, AITUC, Comrade M.K. Pandhe, CITU, Sri Umraolal Purohit, HMS, Sri Bhan Singh, BKMU, Comrad D.D. Sastri, TUCC, Comrade Sunil Sengupta, UTUC, Comrade Dipankar Bhattacharya, AICTU, Comrade D.K. Patole, IFTU, Comrade

29th Sept. General Strike

Brinda Karat, AIDWA, Comrade Vimal Farooqi NFIW, Comrade Md. Selim, DYFI, Comrade N.K. Shukla, AIKS, Comrade Sukomal Sen, SGEF and Comrade Raman Kutty, CGEF.

The Presidium which conducted the Convention, consisted of, among others, Comrade Girijeswar Singh of UTUC(LS), Comrade Sadhana Chowdhury of AIMSS and Comrade Rajinder Singh of DYU.

Comrade Ashutosh Banerjee, in his penetratingly analytical speech, pointed out that the mass of organised people under the banner of the National Platform of Mass Organisations did, however, touch only a fringe in comparison to the unorganised masses living in this vast country. So, the prime duty before us today was to take this resistance movement to the grass-roots level. Comrade Banerjee warned that extensive retrenchment due to NEIP and the GATT would force the workers to sink in unethical means of livelihood and these policies would make the students self-centered and careerist with no obligation to society. He urged the people to defeat these policies through militant movements.

Comrade Satyawan emphasized the need to form struggle committees with a view to developing alternative people's power in due course.

Signs of Change in Indo-US relations

Observers of the Indo-US relations over decades, or those generally who watch closely the global political and diplomatic alignments, cannot have failed to notice the subtle yet significant change now coming about in this arena. Given the background of the enormity of the changed global political scene now, the crisis in the international capitalist market, and the world imperialist design to redivide the market in a bid to overcome the situation, it is not surprising to see both the Indian and the US governments engaging in diplomatic manoeuvring to mend their political relation and reach a new understanding for what they stress would be 'mutually beneficiary'. The Indian Prime Minister's recent visit to the USA and the latter's response together underscore a careful step taken in this direction by the rulers of either country, necessitated by the emerging new realities.

It is common knowledge that the Indo-US relation, meaning the relation between the governments and the ruling cliques of the two countries, has taken quite a few twists but fewer turns. One may wonder what prompted the US government to maintain a 'tilt' all along towards the Pakistani rulers, especially in strategic-military terms, and what induced the Indian rulers to forge alliance with the erstwhile Soviet Union; or what for all the twists of acrimony between the Indian and the US governments over nuclear non-proliferation, missiles programme, Diego Garcia, super-computer, cryogenic rocket engine; and, perhaps more intriguing, why the intermittent resumption of talks and conciliatory gestures by the two, which tend now to become a turnaround in their relation for 'mutual benefit'. All this and the signs of the new turn have to be understood in the perspective of the foreign policy position of each in relation to the other in the decades since India became independent and in the national and international political-economic background of this turbulent period.

Independent India's foreign policy, taking its early shape in the hands of the then newly installed Congress government headed by Jawaharlal Nehru, had been dictated by the internal necessity of growing national capitalism in an international situation of intense crisis of capitalism in general and a capitalist-imperialist camp existing with a parallel socialist camp alongside. On the one hand, the Indian national capital, being part and parcel of the international capital and driven by anti-revolution fear complex, had unity of interest with world capitalism-imperialism. On the other, in this third phase of intense general crisis of capitalism as a whole, and, in particular, Indian national capital having given birth to finance capital and financial oligarchy and gradually acquiring imperialist traits, features, character and reaching the imperialist stage, its interest came more and more in conflict with western imperialism in the economic spheres. At the same time, from its interest to take advantage of the then growing world socialist market and to enter into trade relations with that camp on easy terms and receive financial and technological assistance without strings from the socialist countries, especially from the USSR, and, further, under the then growing stature of socialism in the

eyes of the peoples of the Third World countries, including the Indian people, the ruling capitalist class of India sought closer ties with the socialist camp. It is a matter of fact, and our party showed it by detailed analysis on every relevant occasion, that this urge, in the main, of the newly resurgent and other less developed capitalist countries for capitalist growth by bargaining with both the capitalist-imperialist and the socialist camps gave birth to the policy of non-alignment and later to the Non-Aligned Movement. The Indian government, as the caretaker of the Indian capitalist state, has been among its champions but to reap full dividends for the Indian capital, exploiting the markets of the member countries, enhancing its military power, gaining political stature and rising in course as a regional superpower. In other words, it had been the objective of the Indian capitalist class to use the platform of the Non-Aligned Movement to secure political leverage and eminence, utilise the same for economic thrust into the markets of these countries, enhance correspondingly its military power in its drive to rise as the regional superpower, and, in the process, further advance its economic-political-military ambition and thus consolidate the strength of capitalism in this country using all means.

The Government of India's foreign policy has necessarily been, as it has to be, an extension and reflection of this urge and interest of the Indian capitalist class, in particular of the monopoly capitalists, the financial oligarchy, in the given international setup. Consequently, the conflict of interest between the US rulers and the ruling Indian capitalist class, and the opportunity available until recently with the Indian capitalist class to bargain with both the capitalist-imperialist and the socialist camps determined Indian government's foreign policy stand in relation to the US to be formal, at times verging on unfriendly. Nor the anti-imperialist role and mood of the Indian people, since the days of the national independence movement, could be disregarded by the national capitalist rules of India in adopting this stance vis-a-vis US imperialism. On the other, as is well-known, the US foreign policy stand in relation to South Asia, India in particular, in the post Second World War period was guided by a number of considerations. Firstly, the US imperialism had emerged as the superpower in the capitalist-imperialist camp, needing larger shares and greater controls of the world capitalist market, including the war-ravaged Europe itself, oil-rich west Asian countries, potential fields of south and south-east Asian countries, including newly independent India and Pakistan, and Latin American and African countries. Secondly, as head of the political-economic-military strategic network of the capitalist-imperialist camp against the then socialist camp headed by the USSR, it launched and fostered the NATO, CENTO, SEATO and other military alliances, rallying both the developed and developing countries of Europe, Asia and Africa in exchange for economic dole with the object to encircle, contain and sabotage the socialist camp in a long drawn cold war. The US ruling clique's policy of containment of China, pursued for long, was a

naked and ugly manifestation of their avowed global objective of 'containment of communism' itself. Thirdly, assessing the aspirations of the Indian and the Pakistani bourgeoisie; the levels of development of capitalism in the two countries and the degree and kind of urge of their respective ruling class to enter into collaboration with the US finance capital and permit it an access to the home market; the measures of resistance offered by the anti-imperialist attitudes of the people of either country against US infiltration and domination of the respective home market; facility to influence the ruling class and government of each; and the military strategic positions of these two, US imperialism decided to put Pakistan in priority over India in its foreign policy stand to safeguard its economic-political-military interests in this part of the globe. All the acrimony between the two over the decades and whatever advances each offered to the other at other times to patch up the mutual strain were simply the result of the contradiction and conflict between the foreign policy stand of each in relation to the other.

Initially, it will be recalled, the US rulers had initiated attempts, even as they favoured the Pakistani rulers with financial and military assistance, to influence the Indian government and win friends in the ruling circle and the intelligentsia by giving some technological assistance, financial help and food under PL 480 and other schemes and promoting exchanges. But in the twists and turns of the international relations and also owing to the internal economic-political compulsions of each, the mutual conflict of interest over issues namely Kashmir, non-proliferation of nuclear arms, Non-Aligned Movement, Indian government's increasingly closer ties with the USSR and Indian bourgeoisie's aspiration and ambition to grow into a regional superpower came to dominate the Indo-US relation in the main. Side by side, to promote and safeguard the class interest of the Indian bourgeoisie, the Indian government entered into larger numbers of economic and military treaties with the USSR, including a 20-year treaty during Indira Gandhi's regime, allowing the Soviet defence, as is well-known, deep penetration into the Indian defence. This development gave a further twist in the Indo-US relation, causing relapse of bitterness.

The conflict, at its different stages, led the Indian government to protest against the USA setting up a naval base in the Indian Ocean island of Diego Garcia from fear that the US military presence would put the Indian regional hegemony in jeopardy. Whereas the US imperialist ruling clique, pursuing its global hegemonistic strategy, has all along sought to pressurise the Indian government to desist from pursuing an independent nuclear arms building policy and sign the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty, the Indian ruling clique, nursing its regional hegemonistic ambition, has equally refused to oblige and, in the name of keeping its 'nuclear option' open, has doubtless advanced far on its nuclear programme course. This did sharpen the conflict. Whereas the Indian government, for historical-political-military strategic reasons, would not budge from

(Contd. on page 5)

Intensification of crisis of capitalist-imperialist market, despite GATT treaty, confirms the analysis of Marxist-Leninist authorities

The seven-year long tense and heated negotiation of Eighth Round of GATT, which started in Punta del Este of Uruguay ended after signing of the final agreement in the Moroccan city of Marrakesh. The capitalist-imperialist camp is projecting this agreement as the harbinger of a new world economic order and a free trade era. The leaders of the ruling Congress(I) of our country have also joined in this chorus. The monopoly press and the publicity media are shouting louder in praise of this GATT agreement. But what is the reality? Everytime the capitalist-imperialist countries come to an agreement for resolution of their crisis they claim that it would usher in a new economic era; but in no time this new arrangement falls through further sharpening the crisis. It is to be noted that no less a person than Mr Peter Sutherland, the Director General of GATT and its chief spokesman, even had to admit in an interview with *The Washington Post* that the signing of the historic Uruguay Round trade agreement in Marrakesh marked the beginning, not the end of the bitter trade disputes. According to him there would be disputes between the US and Japan, the US and China, the US and Europe and between developed and developing countries. This view of Mr Sutherland is only the reflection of the intense crisis of capitalism-imperialism. As a matter of fact this GATT agreement is just a desperate attempt to minimise by mutual agreement the intense contradictions among the capitalist-imperialist countries. The entire capitalist world is tottering with the impact of the crisis. The number of the unemployed of G-7 countries is more than 30 million. Mr Clinton, the President of the USA, the leader of the imperialist camp, had to admit that the real wages of the US workers have not increased in the last 20 years. Most of the big multinationals of the industrial city of Detroit are terminally sick. In order to safeguard the high rate of profit in the present situation marked by tremendous recessionary pressure, big companies like Ford, General Motors, Lockheed, Chrysler, IBM, Bank and Insurance companies have retrenched large number of workers. In the USA 1.6 million jobs have been abolished since 1989 and the process is continuing till now. About 15,000 industries of that country have either been sold or totally closed. In the name of increasing the productivity of labour, there has been large-scale retrenchment in the USA and as a result the percentage of the unemployed had risen to 15 in 1991. The unemployment among the managerial staff of the industries is 55 per cent. The situation is so grave that the Second Harvest, the largest food bank of America stated that one out of ten i.e., 26 million Americans, had to depend for their subsistence on charitable food agencies. Most of them are desperate families driven into the ranks of destitute, the hungry and homeless by joblessness.

The situation in Germany, the leader of the European Union is no better. Nine hundred thousand jobs have been abolished there in 1991 alone. It has already been declared that four hundred thousand more jobs would be abolished. In textile industry alone three hundred eighty five

thousand workers had been retrenched. As a result the percentage of the unemployed has jumped to 12. But this rate of unemployment and retrenchment is not considered sufficient by the German capitalists. The German Ambassador to Italy stated in Rome that in order to attain the highest level of productivity 38% of the German workforce is to be retrenched.

The situation is same in Britain. 65% of the workforce of the British Railways has been retrenched from 1960 to 1980. The four major banks of Britain have declared that they would retrench 25% of their workforce,

The picture is no different in Japan, the haven of capitalist development. In the last twenty years there has been a shrinkage of the employment opportunities by 65 per cent. As a result of automation 20% of the clerical hands has already been retrenched and many more are apprehending retrenchment in near future. The major causes of job losses are low level capacity utilisation due to slack demand, lay off and displacing labour by newer technology for maximisation of profit.

This crisis of capitalism is endemic in the capitalist economic system itself. The reality is that today capitalism has no way out to avert the intense crisis. Lenin pointed out: "... certain economic evils are part of capitalism as such, whatever the political superstructure, and that it is impossible to eliminate them economically without eliminating capitalism itself." (*A Caricature of Marxism And Imperialist Economism*)

The law of maximum profit is the basic law of monopoly capitalism. In order to earn maximum profit the common people are subjected to ruthless exploitation, and so the purchasing power of the people continuously dwindles. This creates shrinkage of market owing to the fall of demand of the consumer goods. This sharpens contradiction between productive capacity and the existing squeezed market, because market means in capitalist economy the purchasing power of the people. This is true not only for the national market but for the world market too where the imperialists are exploiting the entire people of the world including those of their countries. Moreover, in order to ensure maximum profit the capitalists try to increase their competitive power through continuous upgradation of technology. The capitalists and their lackeys are gleeful about the so-called technological revolution of today. They are trying to point out that the Marxists failed to visualise the vitality of capitalism to survive through 'technological revolution'. But Marx long ago showed: "The bourgeoisie cannot exist without constantly revolutionising the instruments of production... Constant revolutionising of production, uninterrupted disturbance of all social conditions, everlasting uncertainty and agitation distinguish the bourgeois epoch from all earlier ones." (*Communist Manifesto*) In the early period of capitalism, technological progress and mechanization and modernisation of agriculture opened the door for all-out development of industries and thus scope of employment increased at a rapid rate. But immediately after that period

capitalism was enmeshed in crisis. In the era of imperialism and decadent capitalism technological development cannot bring about all-out development of industries; rather it creates the very opposite condition by largescale retrenchment through automation.

Lenin analysed how modernisation brought about disaster in the era of imperialism and showed: "By increasing the productivity of labour, technical progress enables the capitalists to intensify the exploitation of workers, engendering a relative reduction in the demand for labour power (that is, the increase in demand for labour power is not proportional to [lags behind] the increase in capital) simultaneously with a relative and absolute increase in its supply. This together with the above-mentioned basic tendencies of capitalism, leads to a growth of unemployment, poverty, exploitation, oppression and degradation." (*Collected Works, Vol. 41: page 44*)

The present conditions of the USA, the West European countries and Japan proved to the hilt this teaching of Lenin. In order to come out of the present desperate situation these countries are trying frantically for newer markets for the outlets of their excess finance capital and surplus products. Behind the absurdity of free trade and the smokescreen of new economic order the imperialists are actually trying to rearrange the world market through the multilateral agreement in a 'peaceful way'. But how far this attempt to establish trade tranquillity will succeed is clear from the ominous signals that we get from the actual playground. It must be remembered that the Uruguay Round of GATT was signed in the background of the dismantling of socialism in the Soviet Union and the former socialist states of eastern Europe. At first the imperialist camp was jubilant in the hope of an expanded capitalist market. But the crisis of capitalism was so intense that this jubilation was very short-lived, as despite this expanded market all the major imperialist countries were in the grip of the most severe recession, dangerously threatening the system. The heated exchanges, acrimony and bickerings during the Uruguay Round of GATT negotiation brought to the fore the profundity of contradictions among the imperialist countries. Even after signing of the GATT agreement by the foreign ministers on 15th December 1993 the talk between President Clinton and Mr Hosokawa, the then Prime Minister of Japan, broke down and this, at that time seemed to open the way for a trade war between the USA and Japan. Determination of the right share of the market is the bone of contention among the imperialist countries. Each of these countries has been demanding to open the doors of others while keeping its own door closed. The GATT pledged to fight protectionism, but in actual practice it is seen that the advanced industrialised countries are doing just the opposite when their interests are in jeopardy. But they are at the same time hoodwinking the people with the absurd slogan of free trade.

Without proper understanding of the nature of contradictions among the imperialist countries

(Contd. on page 6)

Brussels Declaration

Fight Revisionism : hold high the banner of Marxism-Leninism

(Contd. from page 1)

- maintained an "independent" position vis-a-vis the tendencies mentioned.
3. Whatever opinion one may have about the correctness or necessity of these splits at a certain point in history, today the possibility exists to overcome these divisions and to unite Marxist-Leninist parties, traditionally divided along pro-Soviet, pro-Chinese, pro-Albanian, pro-Cuban or independent lines.
 4. All parties that are loyal to Marxism-Leninism are aware that revisionism has weakened and divided the international communist movement and that it has finally degenerated into open treason.
 5. After the complete restoration of capitalism in the Soviet Union, all the communists can agree that revisionism is the most dangerous ideological enemy of Marxism-Leninism. Life has proven that revisionism represents the bourgeoisie within the communist movement.
 6. The various divisions and splits that have occurred over the last 35 years have seriously weakened the entire international communist movement.
 7. In the past, there have been regroupings of parties and organisations based on a specific political and ideological orientation. Within the various groupings, some parties have succeeded in striking deep roots among the masses, have acquired a revolutionary experience of their own, and have succeeded in linking Marxism-Leninism with the reality of their country. Within each of these groupings, some organisations have deviated to Left or Right opportunism, roamed about without a grip on the struggle, and disappeared.
 8. In the actual situation, all parties that stay to the revolutionary principles of Marxism-Leninism feel the need to bypass the former divisions and unite.
 9. Communists must unite on the basis of Marxism-Leninism and proletarian internationalism. Unity based on Marxism-Leninism must be strengthened by fighting Right and Left opportunism. We have to accept that disagreements, some of them very serious, may exist for a long time, to accept criticism and counter criticism, and to preserve unity. Upholding both Marxism-Leninism and unity are two aspects of a consistent revolutionary policy.
- Fight revisionism and defend Marxism-Leninism**
1. Since its establishment in 1919, the International Communist Movement has stirred history and changed the outlook of the world. The Second Congress of the Communist International held in July 1920 adopted a constitution, requirements for admission, the Manifesto and other essential resolutions which characterised the international communist movement vis-a-vis Social Democracy. Until 1956, it maintained its revolutionary orientation, its unity and its strength and its influence in the world continued to increase.
 2. In order to reappear on the world scene as a significant current, the International Communist Movement must claim this common history.
 3. Lenin has continued the revolutionary work of Marx and Engels and has developed it under the new conditions of imperialism. He led down the principles of communist party building and he elaborated the strategy and tactics of the socialist revolution and put them into practice. He denounced social-democracy as the ideology of the bourgeoisie and of imperialism inside the working class movement. He formulated the guiding lines for socialist construction under the dictatorship of the proletariat.
 4. Stalin has applied the Leninist principles and under his leadership, the Bolshevik Party transformed a backward and ruined country into an industrialised socialist country. The collectivisation and modernisation of soviet agriculture, the socialist industrialisation, the cultural revolution, the building of strong defence forces with the Red Army as its core, the victory in the patriotic anti-fascist war, the reconstruction of the country and the adoption of a consistent foreign policy defending world peace and supporting the anti-colonial and anti-neo-colonial struggles in Asia, Africa and Latin America are achievements of historical and worldwide significance.
 5. Stalin maintained that class struggle continues under socialism. He stressed that the old feudal and bourgeois forces did not cease their fight for restoration, and the opportunists within the Party, the Trotskyites, the Bukharinites, the bourgeois nationalists and the bureaucratic elements helped the anti-socialist classes and strata to regroup their forces.
 6. Khrushchev has imposed a revisionist line on the Soviet Party and on the International Communist Movement. This line was formulated in his report to the XXth Congress, his secret report on Stalin, and his report to the XXIIInd Congress.
 7. In 1956 Khrushchev has launched an attack on Stalin's internal and foreign policy in order to change the fundamental ideological and political line of the Party. Subsequently, a gradual degeneration of the whole political and economic system has taken place.
 8. Brezhnev has never questioned the revisionist programme of the XXth and XXIIInd Congress. He even "developed" the theses on "the state and the Party of the whole people", and declared that the restoration of capitalism in the Soviet Union was no longer possible. He destroyed all revolutionary vigilance and put an end to the class struggle against bureaucratism, technocratism, careerism and corruption.
 9. It was under Brezhnev's rule that a new bourgeoisie was able to consolidate itself into a class which was able to dominate the political scene and to impose its open dictatorship under Gorbachev.
 10. In the whole world, the bourgeoisie celebrates the defeat of socialism. In fact, we have witnessed the defeat of revisionism initiated 35 years ago by Khrushchev. This revisionism has ended in a complete economic failure, in capitulation to imperialism, in capitalist restoration, in a social catastrophe and in reactionary civil war.
 11. Khrushchev started his destructive work by alleging that he criticised Stalin's errors with the aim of restoring Leninism in its original purity. Gorbachev made the same demagogic promises to disorient the leftist forces. But the criticism of "Stalinism" was only a trick to camouflage the attacks on all Marxist-Leninist principles. The day Gorbachev had completely destroyed "Stalinism", he declared his open hostility to Leninism and his adherence to social democracy.
 12. The discussion about the experience of the CPSU under Stalin must be reopened in the International Communist Movement. Anti-Stalinism has been the Trojan Horse for anti-communism, introduced in the ranks of the International Communist Movement.
 13. For a certain period of time, disagreements about the assessment of the work of comrade Stalin will remain. These discussions should be tackled in a scientific manner and based on class positions.
 14. By hindsight we may say that, after the XXth Congress of the CPSU, the majority of communist parties dearly underestimated Khrushchev revisionism.
 15. In the sixties, it was Mao Zedong who had best grasped the danger of revisionism. Enver Hoxha, Ho Chi Minh, Kim Il Sung and Che Guevara also made important contributions to the fight against revisionism.
 16. In the light of the degeneration of the Soviet Union there is a need to re-evaluate the work of comrade Mao Zedong. By leading the national democratic revolution and its transformation into the socialist revolution in a large Third World country, he has made a contribution of worldwide significance. Mao Zedong resisted Khrushchev and later on Brezhnev's revisionism. He made the first attempt in history to draw the masses into the fight against degenerative tendencies within the Party.
 17. Different opinions in the International Communist Movement on the merits of Mao Zedong will remain for a certain time; they should be treated in an impartial way, searching for the truth on the basis of the facts.
 18. The ideological struggle against revisionism is a complex and prolonged task. Revisionism, that has destroyed so many

(Contd. on page 8)

Indo-US relations, embodiment of mutual conflict and identity of interest

(Contd. from page 2)

its Kashmir position, the US clique has all along patronised the Pakistani government, casting its eye on Kashmir's obvious military strategic and attendant political importance. This sharpened the conflict further. Whereas, again, the Indian government doggedly pursues its missiles programme as an integral part of its military build-up in keeping with its regional hegemonistic ambition, the US clique has sought to scuttle it by forcing the Yeltsin government of Russia to turn back from giving India the agreed supply of cryogenic rocket engine for the missiles. The conflict has further aggravated. The list has grown longer with threat of taking action against India under the US trade law Special 301, denying sale of Cray super computer, so on.

But it must be recalled here that while the conflict sharpened the Indian government hardly thought it necessary to protest and move against the US bullying and piracy around the world, say, in Haiti, Nicaragua, Iraq, Lebanon or Somalia. Is it an enigma?

Or, the Indian Prime Minister's recent US visit is a case in point. It came off almost on the heels of the US under secretary of state for South Asian Affairs Robin Raphael's questioning Kashmir's accession to India and the denial of cryogenic rocket engine to scuttle Indian government's missiles programme. The parliamentary opposition had demanded in a voice that the visit be called off, when it had come to light that a secret Indo-US talk, preparatory to the visit, had been held in London and the Prithvi rocket trial launch had been put off under instruction from the Prime Minister's office on the eve of the visit. The visit came off. Some quarters point to the scanty publicity in the US media for the visit, or the very lean attendance at the joint session of the US Congress to hear the Indian Prime Minister address, to argue that the visit has been a flop. Some other quarters argue that India's economic and political interest has been sold out to the USA. The Congress (I) and the government and monopoly controlled media in India, of course, claim that the visit has brought in a 'great achievement' for India.

Understanding the implications of the visit — 'success', or 'flop' or 'sell out' — is a matter which ought to be based on the real politico-economic content of the Indo-US relations over the decades and the current international setup and situation. The one thing to be constantly borne in mind is that the Indo-US relation, as discussed above, has all along been determined and shaped by the mutual conflict or identity of interest of US imperialism and Indian monopoly capitalism or financial oligarchy in the given international setup. Conflict has resulted in acrimony and identity in mutual acquiescing in. For instance, the Indian government has generally not opened its mouth, let alone move, against US global overlordism and, on the other, the US government has generally kept silent over Indian government's expansionist exercises, like, say,

annexation of Sikkim and sending army to Sri Lanka.

With the restoration of capitalism in the erstwhile Soviet Union and other East European socialist countries and consequent disintegration of the socialist camp, the present international setup is radically different from that of the period when the Indo-US relation began to take its shape. It has also come as a stark reality that the enlargement of the capitalist market with addition of these restored capitalist markets has not lessened, nor brought about a relent, in the all-pervasive general crisis of international capitalism. The singular most notable development today in the capitalist-imperialist world is the attempt now underway to redivide the world capitalist market among the imperialist powers, with other developed and developing countries circumscribed to join the agreement of redivision under compulsion of respective national as also international situation.

Our party has shown in a number of analyses of this complex development that the Indian government has been a willing signatory to this agreement in the sole interest of safeguarding the aggregate interest of the Indian capitalist class, particularly the monopolists and financial oligarchy, in order that they also can have a share in this new world economic order of capitalism-imperialism. The new economic reforms undertaken by the Indian government has been necessitated by the internal crisis of the Indian capitalist class and at the same time by the need to adjust to the world imperialist bid for a new global economic order.

Evidently, with the global perspective so transformed, change in the Indo-US relation has become not only a necessity but an urgency from the positions of both the US and the Indian governments. The areas of conflict are mostly political and the area of identity is based essentially on class outlook. The present situation of the capitalist-imperialist world demands priority of economic ordering, and all the media reports and careful scrutiny of the dialogues and the joint communique of Clinton-Rao summit point to this direction : both sides agree to brush aside or underplay, for the present, the political 'irritants', that is the issues of conflict, and instead promote economic collaboration. It is, therefore, not surprising to see the mutually vexing issues of Kashmir, Non-Proliferation Treaty, India's missiles programme or regional hegemonistic ambition standing out as no hindrance to reaching an agreement on economic collaboration. The US investment in India is already over 2 billion dollars, nearly 38% of total foreign investment approvals and obviously the highest. In the next three years this investment is expected to go up to somewhere between 20 and 25 billion dollars, mainly in the core sector. There has been an Indian Interest Group, a lobby of 26 big American investors. There is now clear indication that the uncertainty over supply of sophisticated military hardware for the Indian defence, since the disintegration of the USSR, has been sought to be

overcome by an agreement with the US government which provides for enhancing 'military cooperation at the civilian and service levels.' Earlier still, there had been a joint naval exercise of the USA and India, and during the war with Iraq the USA sought and got refuelling facility for its aircrafts from the Indian government. To consolidate this move towards Indo-US collaboration about half a dozen high-level US officials are scheduled to visit India by this year end.

The signs of a turnaround are indeed clear. Feelers were being sent from either side since the eighties, especially with problems within the then USSR surfacing. The US government was not keen to embarrass the Indian counterpart on the issue of human rights violation in Kashmir at the Geneva hearing. It has been blowing hot and cold on the issue of Pakistani government's material support to terrorist activity in Kashmir, or declaring Pakistan a terrorist state delaying agreed supply of F16 planes to Pakistan and appointment of its envoy to India. In this perspective it should not prove difficult to understand that the secret London talks, US deputy secretary of state Srobe Talbott's prior visit to India, announcement of a new telecom policy giving access to US multinationals, deferment of launch of Prithvi were all mutual conciliatory gestures, a colly piloted operation for a summit with a businesslike agenda and involving a Prime Minister with a slender parliamentary majority and faced with a bickering opposition at home.

Evidently, to ensure attainment of desired objectives of both sides the visit was conducted in a meticulously planned course and deliberately removed from media fanfare to avoid undesirable after-effects in India and Pakistan. It has been called a 'working visit' not a 'state visit' since it has been considered a step towards collaboration, not conclusion of the same. President Clinton did not only not insist on the Kashmir question and the like issues of difference, he avoided the US refrain of human rights, a means to pressurise the opponent to accept dictated terms, much as he allowed China to continue to enjoy the most favoured nation status in order to conclude economic deals with that country. In the given perspective the visit underscores a mature approach of the Indian government in favour of the Indian capitalist class.

Those who were in the habit of calling the Indian government a puppet of the USA whenever they could notice the farmer moving closer to the latter and who later started labelling the Indian government as progressive as it moved closer to the USSR have altogether failed, owing to their fancy, to judge the real content of both the Indo-US and the Indo-USSR relations, in particular the motive of the Indian ruling class behind the foreign policy stands in relation to the USA and the erstwhile USSR. They fail to see that neither the Indian government's hobnobbing with the USSR as also its acrimony with the USA betrayed its anti-imperialist stand, nor its conciliatory gestures or collaborative bid to mend

(Contd. on page 7)

Behind the smokescreen of Free Trade, Imperialists try to introduce Managed Trade

(Contd. from page 3)

and the intense rivalry among themselves for a larger chunk of the world market, it is neither possible to realise why the slogan of free trade is just a hoax today nor the real class motive behind the GATT.

Lenin pointed out: "Monopolist capitalist associations, cartels, syndicates and trusts first divided the home market among themselves and obtained more or less complete possession of the industry of their own country. But under capitalism the home market is inevitably bound up with the foreign market. Capitalism long ago created a one market. As the export of capital increased, and as the foreign and colonial connections and 'spheres of influence' of the big monopolist associations expanded in all ways, things 'naturally' gravitated towards an international agreement among these associations, and towards the formation of international cartels." (*Imperialism, The Highest Stage Of Capitalism*)

The present-day name of these international cartels is multinational corporations. Comrade Shibdas Ghosh, the founder General Secretary of our party lucidly showed: "As the small states are today struggling unitedly against the big states, and big states also are struggling unitedly against the super big states, so they are trying for the merger of capital of these states in a new form. Now this flow of capital of one country beyond the national boundary to another country, this merger of capital of one country with that of another country, which is called cosmopolitanism — they have termed it at the present time 'multinational'. But, as long as it is on the basis of capitalism, i.e. as long as the monopoly capital and financial oligarchy are behind it and it is on the basis of finance capital, it is nothing but a new arrangement like the old international trust and cartel, whatever might be its name; and it reflects imperialist characteristics." (Free translation from *Sanskritik Abakshay O Bekar Samasyar Samadhan Kon Pathey*)

All these show beyond doubt that since the advent of monopoly capitalism i.e. imperialism, the real tendency is towards monopolisation and formation of trusts and cartels which is just the opposite of free trade.

This is the real picture in the era of imperialism. The international and our national leaders supporting the GATT may cry hoarse on ushering in of an era of free trade and free competition, but the reality is that free trade and free competition completely disappeared in the later part of the nineteenth century. In the same treatise on imperialism Lenin showed: "This is something quite different from the old free competition between manufacturers, scattered and out of touch with one another, and producing for an unknown market. Concentration has reached the point at which it is possible to make an approximate estimate of all sources of raw materials (for example, the iron-ore deposits) of a country and even, as we shall see of several countries, or of the whole world. Not only are such estimates made, but these sources are captured by gigantic monopolist associations. An approximate estimate of the capacity of the markets is also made,

and the associations 'divide' them up amongst themselves by agreement." (*Ibid*)

As already stated the object of each monopolist association is to get a larger share of the market, and with this objective the various monopolist associations struggle among themselves. The form of this struggle may be "today peaceful, tomorrow war like and next day warlike again". From the beginning of this century the imperialist countries of Europe raised the slogan of the United States of Europe. The object was to unitedly plunder the resources of the globe by the capitalist associations of the imperialist countries by mutually agreeing to divide or redivide the world market. When they failed to agree mutually for this division or redivision of the world market, they resorted to war, and again after the war they gave the call of the United States of Europe or Common Market. If we study the history of Europe of this century we can see that the form of struggle for the division or redivision of the world market sometimes assumed peaceful character and sometimes became warlike. The "forms of struggle constantly changes because of varying and relatively temporary causes, but its class content cannot change while classes exist." (*Ibid*)

The GATT which is nothing but a mutual agreement for the division of world market among the imperialist countries, came into being in the background of the post-Second World War scenario. Before the war the imperialist countries tried to temporarily resolve their contradictions by bilateral agreement. During the war these countries tried to snatch the market of their respective rivals with the aim of resolving their crises of over production. As the crisis is interwoven and the process of squeezing of market is inherent in capitalism so after the war the capitalist market got further squeezed and the contradictions among the imperialist countries further sharpened. After the war Britain and France lost their preeminent positions, and Germany and Japan were the vanquished nations. It was the USA which emerged as the only predominant imperialist power of the world. The post-Second World War situation was brilliantly analysed by Comrade Shibdas Ghosh, the leader, teacher and guide of our party. He pointed out: "Before the Second World War, too, in spite of the all-embracing world capitalist market, the powerful capitalist countries were suffering from want or shortage of market. Each of the two imperialist power blocs that locked horns in the last world war, was actuated by its desire to defeat its adversary in the war, captured the market of its enemy, gain world supremacy and get out of the capitalist overproduction and excess capital. But the outcome of war did not justify their hope; rather it has aggravated the crisis of the market further. The loss of the vast territory which now comprises the world socialist market from under the capitalist system has contracted the world capitalist market appreciably. Over and above this contraction of the world capitalist market as a whole, the sphere of exploitation of the world's resources by the major capitalist-imperialist countries has contracted further, inasmuch as many of their colonies have gone out of their

monopoly control by gaining national independence. The bourgeoisie of these newly independent former colonial countries are not only reconstructing the national economy of these countries, which is resulting in a continuous contraction of the market of the powerful capitalist countries, but in some cases are also coming out as competitors of the major capitalist countries in the sphere of international trade." (*Selected Works, Vol. II, page 44*)

In the post-Second World War situation the object of the US imperialists was to get market to arrange for the outlet of its surplus finance capital. But the international situation was such at that time that it was not possible to get that market by another war. In a situation when the socialist camp headed by the Soviet Union was standing as a bulwark against imperialism and when the international working class movement and the world peace movement were acting as deterrents to any gun-boat diplomacy of the imperialists for the expansion of their market, a new strategy was adopted to serve the interests mainly of the US imperialists by minimising the contradictions among the imperialist countries through multilateral trade agreement, viz. GATT. The GATT started its activities officially in 1948 and India was one of its 23 original founder members. (Although it may be mentioned that GATT was founded in 1947.)

The objective of GATT was to establish trade peace or trade tranquillity. But the signing of GATT did not achieve that objective; rather the crisis further deepened necessitating a series of agreements one after another. The Uruguay Round which ended in Marrakesh is the eighth agreement since 1948. The present crisis is so intense and the contradictions among the imperialists are so profound that they could not find any way out by considering only the trade and tariff of commodities, which had been the purview of all previous GATT agreements. By confining only on commodities they would fail to touch even the fringe of the problem created by the rivalry between themselves. In order to solve this problem, the purview of GATT was expanded and the entire area of production both material and intellectual besides the vast area of natural resources and even services, were included in the purview of GATT mainly in the interests of the US imperialists.

The Washington Post in reporting the comments of Mr Peter Sutherland stated: "In 1947 when GATT was founded the US controlled half of the world's \$25 billion trade. Today, the US is involved in less than 15 per cent of global commercial exchanges, which have zoomed to a value of \$1640 billion, according to GATT.

"Much of that power has shifted to the affluent economies of Japan and Western Europe, which have become more assertive of their interests against those of the US.

"And as other nations' economies (developing countries) grow, they are pressing new demands on the major industrial powers."

What Mr Sutherland admitted on the basis of

(Contd on Page 7)

To Fight Imperialist Capital fight against National Bourgeois State

(Contd. from page 6)

reality only confirms the analysis of Comrade Shibdas Ghosh regarding the possibility of newly independent capitalist countries emerging as competitors of the imperialist countries.

In the background of such intense contradictions among the imperialist countries, they have formed rival economic unions with the sole purpose of protecting their respective multinationals and ensuring their super profit. They are mouthing the slogan of free trade, but in reality they are more and more going towards a managed trading system containing in-built protectionism. But this attempt to avert crisis will fail and surely lead them to a greater crisis, and the entire burden of the crisis will more and more be shifted on to the common people and more so to the people of the less developed countries of the world.

Now the question is why India which is among the developing capitalist countries tries to be in the bandwagon of the imperialist countries so far as GATT is concerned. It is however to be borne in mind that India is the most developed among the developing capitalist countries. The present New Economic Policy of the Government of India and its ardent advocacy for GATT must be viewed in the background of the intense rivalry between the imperialist countries and the class motive of the Indian aspirant bourgeois class. The Government of India embarked upon implementing the successive five-year plans for the relatively speediest, widest and freest development of capitalist economy of our country since independence. But this attempt has been initiated at a time when world capitalist economy has been passing through the third phase of the intense crisis of capitalism. Comrade Shibdas Ghosh showed that all these five-year plans were associated with a shadow of crisis and the Indian capitalist class could get rid of this crisis only to plunge into a greater crisis. The compulsion which has forced the government of India to adopt the New Economic Policy and accept GATT, indicates the intensity and depth of crisis of Indian capitalism. Now the burden of this crisis has always been shifted to the common people in the interest of the capitalist class. It is true that some percentage of the middle class people has some purchasing power because of the inflationary economy; but this section of the people is negligible compared to the vast masses of the people who are destitutes. Moreover, because of the ruthless capitalist exploitation many more have been joining the ranks of the destitutes and so the internal market is gradually squeezed. Again the potentiality of the productivity far exceeds the projected demand of the internal market. It is because of this reason the capitalists are exporting the excess capital obtained by fleecing the common people. Our party analysed that despite crisis Indian capitalist economy had gained considerable strength at the cost of the common people; Indian capitalism had transformed itself into monopoly giving birth to finance capital through merger of banking capital and industrial capital, and this merger of banking capital and industrial capital had given birth to financial oligarchy controlling the entire economic and social life of the country. The transformation to monopoly and

the birth of finance capital and financial oligarchy signify that Indian capitalist system has attained imperialist character. Export of capital as distinct from export of commodities means imperialism. Compared to the USA, western Europe or Japan, Indian capitalist economy may be less developed, but it is to be noted that India has already become a regional superpower. And as an imperialist country India enters into competition with the other imperialist countries too. Explaining this character of Indian capitalism, Comrade Shibdas Ghosh showed: "... the fact remains that the Indian monopoly capitalist class is already a partner of such international trust and cartel, the international economic organisation of monopoly finance capital — may be a junior partner but still a partner and a competitor too." (*Why SUCI is the Only Genuine Communist Party of India*)

Now before the fall of Soviet Union and the socialist states of eastern Europe India had the advantage of extracting concessions from both the imperialist camp and the socialist camp by following the policy of non-alignment. But in the changed international situation obtaining now India has not only lost its bargaining leverage but a vast market also of the erstwhile Soviet Union and socialist states of East Europe. In this changed international situation India has no other alternative but to come to an understanding with the imperialists alone for getting a share of the world market. The New Economic Policy was initiated with that aim in view. The acceptance of GATT has been the extension of this New Economic Policy of the Government of India.

As a result of all these policies of the Government of India, lakhs of people will lose jobs, employment opportunities will further shrink, some additional millions of people will join the rank of those who are deprived of food, shelter, health care and education, farmers will not get subsidy, food subsidy will go, and freight and fare will further increase adding unbearable sufferings of the common people. And all these most unbearable sufferings are being inflicted upon the common people in the interest of a microscopic minority comprising the monopoly houses who want to jointly exploit the world market in collaboration with their counterparts of the developed countries.

It is thus seen that Indian capitalism has become sufficiently matured and attained imperialist character. The degree of maturity is such that the signing of GATT has been hailed not only by the industrial lobby but by some sections of the agricultural lobby also, confirming that the Indian agricultural products have become commodities not only of the national market but of the international market also.

In any agreement between different countries bargaining and counter-bargaining are resorted to, and in GATT also the same thing happened. In this bargaining and counter-bargaining all the countries have conceded from their initial position in order to arrive at an agreement which all of them considered essential to resolve their crisis and each country voluntarily accepted GATT in the interest of the ruling capitalist class of their countries. So Mr Clinton said while addressing the Senate that the USA

had no other alternative, and Mr P.V. Narasimha Rao, the Indian Prime Minister also said that India had no other alternative. It must be understood that the Indian ruling class came to a settlement in its own interest as did the US ruling class. In such a situation it is naive to raise the question of economic sovereignty. Those who are raising the question of sovereignty, are actually shielding the national capital — may be knowingly or unknowingly. As the national capital is trying to enter the world market in collaboration with the imperialists so in lieu of this advantage it is opening the home market to the imperialists for their exploitation. On this question of imperialists exploitation Comrade Shibdas Ghosh long ago explained: "Whatever imperialist exploitation exists in our country, it exists due to the policy pursued by the ruling bourgeois class of our country, of understanding and collaboration with the big imperialist countries, in the interest of further strengthening Indian capitalism in the present international and national situation." (Free translation from *Sanskritik Abakshay O Bekar Samasyar Samadhan Kon Pathay*)

During the national independence movement the people of our country waged struggle against the exploitation of imperialist finance capital; but now after coming to power the national bourgeoisie being confronted with the crisis are opening the door of unhindered exploitation of the people of the country by the imperialist finance capital. So to fight against foreign imperialist finance capital struggle has to be waged against the national bourgeois state. Those who are not putting the question directly in this way and instead raising the questions like "national sovereignty" or "waging anew the national independence struggle", etc., are in reality helping in confusing the people on the question of struggle against the national bourgeois state.

Indo-US relations

(Contd. from page 5)

relations with the USA is evidence of selling itself out. There is pressure no doubt from the US imperialists on the Indian government, but there is an undeniable urge of the Indian capitalist class, the financial oligarchy in particular, to forge collaboration with US imperialism in selected spheres in the given world setup and situation. The Indian Prime Minister repeatedly assured his US corporate audience that India's economic reforms programme would continue unchecked and he claimed that India was poised to emerge as the single biggest free market. His visit has been sought to be lauded as marking his political astuteness. The tragedy is that this projection has no insignificant contribution behind it coming from the bankruptcy of the so-called left forces in this country.

It is to be seen how this change in the Indo-US relation shapes out in the twists and turns of world capitalism-imperialism. It does not mean a turnaround of the USA from its stand on Pakistan, nor a turnaround of the Indian government from its stand in relation to Russia, at least for the present. But it means that the Indian people and the left forces ought to understand the true nature and implications of the change while they would come out to organise movements against the US imperialist machinations against the Indian people. We cannot fight against US imperialism without fighting at the same time the ruling Indian capitalist class.

Brussels Declaration

(Contd. from page 4)

parties, will not disappear spontaneously. Tito's revisionism had been criticised by the international communist movement as early as in 1948. Khrushchev, in developing his opportunist course, did in fact copy many revisionist theses of Titoism. If the revisionist ideas and theses are not analysed and criticised in depth, they continue to exist and the liquidationist current can strike again and claim new victims. The relationship between the lines of Khrushchev and Brezhnev and the policies of Gorbachev, must be analysed in depth, as well as the development of the degenerative process from its origins till its outcome.

Fight splitism and maintain unity

1. Khrushchev started to destroy the organisational unity of the International Communist Movement by expelling the parties who opposed his revisionism.
2. But subsequent sectarianism and ultra-Leftism resulted in innumerable unjustifiable splits. Real differences in analysis and judgement led to antagonism and rupture. There have been important ideological and political conflicts about Czechoslovakia in 1968, Cambodia in 1979, Afghanistan in 1980, the elimination of the Gang of Four in 1976, the Three Worlds Theory in 1977, the line of Deng Xiaoping in the early 1980s, and so on.
3. All these conflicts were important. Fundamental disagreements have to be clarified, but it requires time and serious materialist analysis and debates. Each party should have studied the different colliding standpoints in earnest, formulate its own standpoint while preserving the unity of the movement.
4. Every party applies the Marxist-Leninist principles to the present reality according to its own concept. Nobody can demand con-

cessions from another party on points the latter considers essential. Every party defines its policy in complete independence. But this doesn't contradict the duty to maintain the unity of the international communist movement, for this unity is also an important question of principle.

5. Ample documentation exists on the practice of the CIA and other secret services to exploit the disagreements between communist parties. The enemy is aware of the importance of unity among communists and he often supports all centrifugal tendencies, sponsoring as well Right revisionism as Leftist positions, in order to accelerate divisions and splits.
6. By safeguarding the movement's unity, each Party will be able to learn more and faster. We can learn not only from the parties with which we generally agree, but also from those who are following, in our opinion, a Left or Right opportunist course.
7. First of all, our judgement can be wrong. Secondly, experience has taught that parties can draw lessons from certain aspects of the mass work, the experiences, the theoretical work, and so on of parties with whom they disagree.

Thirdly, fundamental disagreements must not preclude certain forms of co-operation and common struggle as regards racism, trade union rights, anti-imperialist struggle, etc.

Fourthly, we must take possible developments into account. Certain parties which we consider to be Right or Left opportunist may correct themselves, or some factions may develop positively. Finally, the parties we consider opportunist may degenerate completely, and openly defect to the bourgeoisie. Maintaining relations with them can teach us many useful lessons by negative example.

Organisational proposals

1. We propose to organise a realistic unitary initiative, adapted to the present reality and needs, to bring together, once a year or every two years, all parties loyal to Marxism-Leninism and proletarian internationalism. A realistic unitary initiative can guarantee efficiency and optimum results with a rational investment of time and higher cadres. The majority of communist parties, notably in the Third World, do not have the financial resources nor the cadres available to travel abroad several times a year in order to meet with the different components of the International Communist Movement. The resources of each of our organisations are limited. None of us can thoroughly study all essential subjects. We can have only a limited number of valuable practical experiences. Each of us, in order to progress in a faster way, must make the effort to assimilate the best theoretical works and the best practical experiences of the others. This also pleads for a unitary initiative.
2. Communist parties from the different tendencies within the International Communist Movement should agree on a common concept. In order to elaborate this common concept as well as the modalities for its

application, an Organising Bureau should be set up, which, per continent or subcontinent, comprises a significant representation of the three or four Marxist-Leninist existing currents.

3. In the actual situation, it is not possible to build a new international organisation on the model of the Third International with a leading body and a common discipline for all members. The basic aim of the unitary communist initiative is to stimulate exchanges and co-operation.
4. For the moment, the most suitable organisational form for the unitary initiative is the seminars. Its first purpose is the exchange of information, documents and analyses. Through the presentation of political and theoretical analyses and reports of the practical experiences, the different parties learn to know each other and to share their knowledge.

Secondly, debates on crucial issues of common interest should be organised.

Thirdly, co-ordination of actions and activities can be organised on a voluntary base. Resolutions will eventually be drafted in a spirit of consensus and they can be adopted or rejected on an individual base. Proposals for resolutions should be submitted before the seminar starts and after an open discussion, a draft committee shall write the resolutions to be submitted.

5. We propose that the Organising Bureau prepares an international conference of the Communist Movement for the year 1997, the 80th anniversary of the Great October Revolution. During the three years to come, serious and systematic preparations should be undertaken.
6. This Proposition for the Unity of the International Communist Movement will be the base for discussions and consultations in the year to come. All parties will be asked to subscribe to this document or to submit written amendments. A final draft of this Proposition will be discussed and adopted at the seminar to be held on 2-4 May 1995 in Brussels.

7. The Conference of 1997 should at least have the following points on its agenda :

The history of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union under Lenin, Stalin, Khrushchev, Brezhnev and Gorbachev, the development of revisionism and the final collapse.

The New World Order, its nature and contradictions and the new conditions of peoples struggles against imperialism.

Lenin and the October Revolution

8. Different seminars will be organised in the years to come on these issues, as a preparation for the Conference. The seminar of May 2-4, 1995 in Brussels will concentrate on the first issue: The history of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union and the development of revisionism.
9. Studies by different parties on these three issues will be printed in book form. This will enhance the preparations and discussions for the International Conference.

Brussels, May 3, 1994

Delhi Convention

(Contd. from page 1)

In the Convention a Draft Declaration was accepted and the following programme was adopted to intensify the movements against NEIP and the GATT.

Action Programme

- Demonstrations to be held on July 14, expressing solidarity with the All India Strike of Central Public Sector Workers called by the Committee of Public Sector Trade Unions.
- State-wise, district-wise, industry-wise and section-wise conventions to be completed by middle of August, 1994.
- Observance of a National Protest Week from August 3 to 9 against the economic policies.
- All India Rail Roko movement on September 20.
- Countrywide Torch Light processions on September 27.
- Countrywide General Strike and Hartal on September 29, 1994.

EDITOR-IN-CHIEF : NIHAR MUKHERJEE