



"It is not so important whether a party talks of great ideologies. Whether the ideal it preaches is really great is proved by whether the leaders, workers, and supporters of the party reflect a high standard of ethics and culture in their personal life, day-to-day behaviour and political conduct."

Comrade Shibdas Ghosh

31st ANNIVERSARY SPECIAL

- Message of 24th April
- Recent Developments In South-East Asia
- Kosygin's Visit

*Proletarian
Era*

Founder Editor-In-Chief

COMRADE SHIBDAS GHOSH

ORGAN OF SOCIALIST UNITY CENTRE OF INDIA (Fortnightly)

Vol. 12
No. 17

24th April '79
TUESDAY

Price 70 P.
Air Surcharge 4 P.

24th April is the Polestar in the revolutionary movement of the working class in our country. Thirty one years ago, on this day, the revolutionary party of the Indian proletariat came into being out of a historic struggle led by the great revolutionary genius **Comrade Shibdas Ghosh** along with a handful of revolutionary compatriots by his side.

Without a revolutionary party of their own the proletariat and other oppressed people are worse than a ship without a compass—all their struggles however heroic and full of sacrifices having the danger of being foundered at the rocks of opportunism and treacheries of the compromising leadership. And without a revolutionary theory not only to conduct economic and political battle but battle encompassing all aspects of life, ethics, culture to sex life, there cannot be a true revolutionary party. In order to fulfil this historic task in our land, handful of revolutionaries under the leadership of **Comrade Shibdas Ghosh** plunged into a grim, complex and tortuous struggle, thirty one year ago.

And what a struggle it was! A handful of unknown young souls in a rather hostile world with no resources to depend upon for bare survival, uncertainty haunting every step, greeted with jeers and taunting remarks from the leaders, cadres and supporters of the 'established' party, the then CPI busking in the glory and getting all the patronages of the Communist International, took upon themselves what seemed then to be an 'impossible' task of building up this revolutionary party of the proletariat. Yet they had one thing very much uncommon and a rare specimen in history—indomitable revolutionary daring and firm conviction that it is the correct line that triumphs ultimately—extreme privation, starvations days after days, mountain high difficulties are the prices that these revolutionaries had to pay with their lives for building up brick by brick the road of emancipation of the class, the masses and the society in our soil.

Today, the success of this giant revolutionary struggle is evident in the steady onward march throughout the length and breadth of the country of this revolutionary party in the midst of deception, utter bankruptcy and disintegration of the pseudo-Marxist parties who all have taken their stand in defence of moribund capitalism. It is the high sense of proletarian ethics and moral values and culture that the party breathes is attracting the oppressed people. The moral-ethical standard that our comrades reflect wins their admiration and respect. They see that it is a new type of party from leaders to cadres and unlike other pseudo-Marxist Parties does not merely talk big but is really big in integrity and character. Unlike those parties, for the leaders and cadres of this party, it is not just a kind of trade and source of income or a means to gain social position and careerism in bourgeois parliamentary politics. The seriousness, identification of individual's life with party life, total dedication to the cause of the proletariat, resolute defence of people's cause and aspiration and untiring ceaseless efforts to organise the masses on the correct base political line of anti-capitalist Socialist Revolution in our country, principled fight against all sorts of opportunism and deceitful conducts of the different non-revolutionary parties and above all the revolutionary boldness and courage of conviction to uphold truth make this party qualitatively different from all other parties who speak of people's interest but trample it at the bidding of the ruling capitalist class both from within the governments they run and outside.

MESSAGE OF 24th APRIL

That is why when the people of our country are in the midst of all round degeneration from economic political to cultural-ethical-moral aspects, when the very light of civilisation is being tried to be put off, it is this party alone that shows not only its utmost concern but is constantly urging the people to be wide awake about the heinous conspiracy of the ruling class and its agents to dehumanise the people and the society. It is the great revolutionary teaching of **Comrade Shibdas Ghosh** that even if a nation starves, it can stand up again provided it has its moral strength unimpaired. Bringing the lesson of history, he showed that revolutionaries, those who were the harbingers of a new society, in all ages, always conveyed to the society, through their life's examples the kernel of the revolutionary thoughts and ideas in higher sense of moral values of the incoming social order. And herein lies the surest test as to whether a party is really revolutionary or not, **Comrade Ghosh** has taught us that Revolution is not only a destroyer but also a creator. It destroys the old ideas and the institutions that sustain them but also creates the New Man and the New Society that can advance human civilisation. A revolutionary party being the instrument of such creation must show its distinctiveness in its character otherwise it fails to lead the masses and the society towards that sublime goal. SUCI's onward march therefore is the vindication of its correct base political line as also the dawning of consciousness among the people as to its distinctive character and leading role towards advancing to the cherished goal of social transformation. It also indicates the growing exposure of bankruptcy of the pseudo-Marxists as also their isolation. Above all, it vindicates the firm

revolutionary conviction of the pioneers that it is the correct base political line that matters.

While coming to the conclusion that there was no revolutionary party of the proletariat in our soil and for this historic need to fulfil the process of formation of a real revolutionary party of the proletariat—SUCI, was to be initiated, **Comrade Shibdas Ghosh** and his revolutionary compatriots were not guided solely by the fact that the then united CPI, had committed repeated mistakes to the serious detriment of revolutionary movement of the working class in our country. But judging the character of the mistakes they were convinced that those mistakes stemmed from the failure to grasp basically the correct Marxist outlook, method of analysis and method of application which results in the failure to correctly apply the fundamental principles of Marxism, not only in the economic and political fields in determining the stage of particular revolution, its strategy and tactics but also in the fields of ethics and culture. Today's concrete experiences make all the more glaring the fact that failure to follow the correct and scientific process of formation by the parties like CPI, CPI(M), CPI(ML) make those parties non-proletarian in class character and they are 'communists' only in name but social-democratic defenders of capitalism in reality.

In the process of formation of the revolutionary party of the proletariat in our soil, our party, SUCI, led by **Comrade Shibdas Ghosh** has set before the international working class movement a unique example, made positive contribution to party science since Lenin's contribution in this regard as to the correct understanding and methodology of achieving and consolidating democratic centralism and collective leadership in its concrete form within the party.

In order to organise and make the revolution victorious in a country, a revolutionary party of the proletariat must have the capacity to correctly apply the fundamental principles of Marxism-Leninism in concrete conditions and thereby continuously to elaborate, concretise, develop and enrich its revolutionary theories and Marxism as such. This is what the parties led by Lenin, Stalin and Mao Tse-tung did in their respective countries. With revolutionary modesty, it can be said that ever since the formation of this party under the leadership of the great Marxist thinker of the era **Comrade Shibdas Ghosh**, within the span of thirty one year's struggle, it has not only made valuable contributions to the treasure house of Marxism-Leninism that serve as the most developed concept up to this time and adequate understandings in philosophical-cultural-ethical fields but has also played its due role in the international communist movement by diagnosing for the first time, the serious defects and shortcomings both in its process of movement as also in its ideological-political-cultural-ethical fields that have given rise, over a long time, to the present day confusion, split or division in the camp of world proletariat.

It may be recalled that the so-called communist parties in our country have not only failed miserably to play due role in discharging the correct and conscious responsibility from the Marxist standpoint in the international communist movement as the vanguard of Indian proletariat but have only contributed their part in weakening it by reducing obligation to international proletarian movement or for that matter proletarian internationalism to blind obedience to the leaderships of this or that big party or by trying to build up national communist party.

(contd. to page 12)

On Recent Developments in South-East Asia

An Appeal to the Communists All over the World

The recent developments in South-East Asia particularly the overthrow of the Government of one workers' state like Cambodia through armed aggression led by another workers' state like Vietnam backed by and at the direct instigation of the revisionist leadership of the Soviet Union as also the continuous armed intrusions by the same Vietnam along the Southern border region of China, which, in the opinion of the Chinese leaders, crossed the limit of forbearance leading to what they called a "counter attack in self-defence" by China on Vietnam, cannot but cause serious concern to each and every genuine communist of the world. The Central Committee of the SUCI takes serious note of and feels deeply concerned at these incidents. These unfortunate incidents have, on the one hand, offered new opportunities in the hands of the imperialists, the bourgeoisie and their hangers-on to unleash a fresh anti-communist tirade in their bid to malign communism and, on the other, created utter confusions in the rank of the international communist movement to the serious detriment of the cause of the working class.

At a time when, in this third phase of intense general crisis of capitalism, the entire bourgeois world has been passing through an ever-mounting crisis of the very productive system further aggravated by the disintegration of the imperialist camp, the ignominious defeat of US imperialism, the bulwark of world imperialism, in Vietnam, Cambodia and Laos had made it so much weak and cornered that it is already in the defensive creating an excellent and a most favourable situation for world proletarian revolution. So, when it was incumbent upon communists all over the world to utilise this excellent international situation in favour of revolution by presenting a united face against imperialism-capitalism in general and the US imperialism in particular, they have, instead, painfully engaged themselves in open and armed confrontation as has happened in South-East Asia.

Dispassionate and unbiased attitude necessary

Now, however shocking these incidents may

be and whatever may be the intensity of the damage already inflicted, it is necessary, at this critical hour, to make a dispassionate, unbiased and scientific analysis of the whole situation with the sole object of ridding the communist movement of the present impasse. We have noted with dismay that this unbiased attitude is very much lacking today even among the communists. The so-called communist parties in India, true to their not quite unblemished record and tradition, have followed blindly on this occasion also either the line of the leadership of the Soviet-Vietnam combine or the line of the Chinese leadership without attempting to analyse the objective situation on their own. They have openly started abusing and spreading venom against either the Chinese or the Soviet leadership, which has nothing in common with Marxism-Leninism and are thereby helping to further malign communism and the principle of proletarian internationalism in the eye of people.

It is not difficult to

understand that the present impasse in the international communist movement has not come about overnight. Trekking a long course it has come to its present state. So, before examining the political stand and role of the parties involved in the present conflict and critically analysing the antecedents that led to these unfortunate developments, it is necessary to make, even if briefly, a scientific appraisal, on the anvil of Marxist-Leninist methodology and outlook, of the defects and shortcomings of the international communist movement, the reasons as to why they could not be eradicated in time and the factors that have positively contributed to the serious worsening of the situation.

Some serious defects and shortcomings in communist movement

Our Party, under the great leadership of **Comrade Shibdas Ghosh**, an outstanding Marxist thinker and philosopher of the era, since its inception, has been trying to draw urgent attention of the leaderships of different communist parties and more particularly the international communist leadership to the serious defects and shortcomings persisting in communist movement for so many decades with potential dangerous consequences. **Comrade Shibdas Ghosh**, through his outstanding analyses and brilliant expositions, which bear the touch of a great Marxist genius, has laid bare that mechanisation in the process of thinking and process of organisation as opposed to dialectical process of thinking and organisation, unbelievable

lowering of ideological-cultural standard, persistence of bourgeois humanist-nationalist thinking, morals and ethics, and such other serious confusions and shortcomings in the realm of ideology have, in the main, been instrumental in creating a veritable mess in the international communist movement and a breeding ground for revisionism-reformism.

Analysing the situation that led to the expulsion of the Communist League of Yugoslavia under the leadership of Marshal Tito from Cominform **Comrade Shibdas Ghosh** in his brilliant treatise "Self-Criticism of the Communist Camp" gave some serious warnings practically on the morrow of foundation of our Party. He pointed out that the then leadership of the international communist movement was largely influenced by mechanical process of thinking, that the Leninist principle of evolving the international line of revolution through dialectical interaction of ideas between different communist parties was not followed, that most of the parties chose, contrary to the Leninist principle of organisation, the easy way of mechanical centralisation that led to the formation of bureaucratic leadership at the top, that blind obedience to and unquestioning acceptance of the leadership were lauded as the sign of sense of discipline, so on and so forth, and observed that any attempt to cover up this truth would tantamount to self-deception and was fraught with disastrous consequences. He pointed out that the demand for 'Separate Balkan Federation' under the leadership of Tito was a glaring example of the presence of national chauvinism in the communist movement and suggested that it should be nipped in the bud by raising the ideological standard of the communists and thereby fighting out this menacing trend of nationalism. He observed that unless the world

communist movement and organisation could be freed from mechanisation, the Tito incident might not be the last one.

He, therefore, cautioned, as far back as 1948, the international communist movements with the following words: "Disruption in the communist movement has not died out with the burial of Trotskyism; if sufficient vigil is not constantly exercised, newer rifts in the communist camp cannot, in the context of present complex situation, be ruled out.

"Not only this; if this non-Marxist mechanical outlook prevailing at present in the matter of ideological questions is not rightly resolved in time, it may, no wonder, in the long run bring about a new phenomenon in the world history when people will witness that even after the establishment of socialist systems in different countries the communists, instead of further cementing the unity between them and making rapid strides for the establishment of world communist society, are engaged in open confrontation or even in war." (Self-Criticism of the Communist Camp, 15th September, 1948) It is a pity that this timely warning by this great leader of the proletariat was neither paid any heed nor taken notice of by any international communist authority. Had this been heeded in time the present-day communist movement might not have to suffer so much and pay so heavily.

Flood-gate of revisionism

The usurpation of the leadership of the CPSU and the Soviet state by the revisionist Khrushchev clique brought in its wake some dangerous and disastrous consequences in the international communist movement. It suffered division and disunity due

(contd. to page 4)

(contd. from page 3)
to the attack of modern revisionism which came from within the camp headed by the revisionist Soviet leadership. **Comrade Shibdas Ghosh** was the first to point out that the twentieth Congress of the CPSU "would open the flood-gate of revisionism". In fact it did.

It is known to all that serious differences on a number of ideological and organisational questions developed within the international communist movement. We can claim in all humility that our Party always took a distinct line in defence of Leninism and revolution and provided the ideological weapon for combating the revisionist line of the CPSU leadership. We were glad that subsequently, during the period of what was known as the 'Great Debate', when the revisionist leadership of the CPSU created serious confusions by providing all sorts of revisionist interpretation to all outstanding questions like war, peace, peaceful co-existence, peaceful transition from capitalism to socialism, etc, the leadership of the Chinese Communist Party came forward to uphold, in the main, the revolutionary banner of Leninism, although it is really painful that this brought about worsening of mutual relationship, especially between the CPSU and the CPC.

Our Party headed by **Comrade Shibdas Ghosh** pointed out time and again that on questions involving principle there should not be any compromise, that the correct way of resolving ideological differences was to encourage open polemical discussion and conduct relentless ideological struggle of painstaking education and persuasion involving the rank and file, the class and the masses, that there was no ground for worsening of mutual relationship between the communists involved in ideological struggle unless it was born out of a wrong understanding about communist unity,

that pending resolution of outstanding disputes, which might take time, what was urgently needed was to immediately end the bitterness that had seriously affected the communist movement and to present a united face against imperialism, the main enemy, and that on no account the inter-party bitterness should be allowed to adversely affect further the relation between the socialist states. We also tried to draw attention of the international communist leadership that the practice in the post-Lenin period of keeping all controversial matters limited within the confines of closed door meetings of different communist parties and the policy of hush-hush pursued in such cases were, in no small measure, responsible for lack of proper understanding of mutual relationship between different communist parties. We also warned that any attempt to resolve ideological differences between the different communist parties by organisational methods like breach of diplomatic relation between the socialist states, withdrawal of promised economic aid, revocation of trade relation, etc, were bound to fail in bringing about the unity. Because, we felt, this method of bullying the opponent to submission, even if it succeeded in a few cases, could at best achieve superficial unity but not conscious, voluntary unity based on unity in ideology, will and action which an ideological struggle aims at achieving.

Twelve-party declaration and Eighty-one party statement widened differences instead of cementing unity

But to our profound shock we found that instead of conducting a principled struggle and thrashing out all ideological differences, in the twelve-party declaration of 1957 and the eighty-one party statement of 1960 ideological differences were patched up by sacrificing principle even and, under the

An appeal to the world communists

cover of a seeming unity, queer admixtures of contradictory views on ideological questions of fundamental nature were adopted. In fact, these documents, instead of cementing unity, further widened the differences in the world communist movement only to the advantage of the revisionists. It is for this reason that **Comrade Shibdas Ghosh** observed: "Had the ideological differences been correctly resolved at the initial stage, when they were first detected, instead of patching them up by unprincipled compromises, international communist movement would have been saved from the setback which the present ideological differences between the powerful communist parties have brought upon it." (An Appeal to the Leaders of International Communist Movement, September 1963).

Dangerous trend of ultra-democracy after Stalin

Not only that; the sense of ultra-national feelings which was subdued during Stalin's life-time both inside and outside the party owing to a fierce ideological struggle conducted under his able leadership, but which was not obviously eradicated altogether, raised its ugly head when the revisionist leadership of the CPSU, in the name of fighting the cult of the individual, undertook virtually a programme of de-Stalinisation which seriously undermined the authority of the leadership. A tendency of ultra-democracy, liberalisation, and de-centralisation which followed as its concomitant effect, being mixed up with the pent-up nationalist feelings, helped further to deteriorate the situation in the communist world, manifesting itself, among others, in the attempt of counter-revolutionary coup in Hungary. Analysing these events **Comrade Shibdas Ghosh** pointed out:

"The trend of revisionism, reformism and democratisation which actually means de-centralisation that started growing in the sphere of thinking and organisational activity of the communist movement since the 20th Congress of the CPSU and has become a powerful force within a short time, is, to a great extent, responsible for the ideological confusion prevailing at present. At this juncture of intense class conflict in the international arena, we hold that it is of paramount importance to lay stress on the principles of proletarian internationalism, proletarian revolution, dictatorship of the proletariat and monolithic type of party organisation based on Democratic Centralism and on such other basic tenets of Marxist-Leninist principles. But in the sphere of mutual relationship between the socialist countries we observe that instead of correctly realising the necessity of adhering to the principle of proletarian internationalism, one-sided and unilateral emphasis has so long been given on questions like national sovereignty and equality of rights while developing mutual relation among them. And what is more, the Marxist class outlook and class approach to state machinery and democracy have been practically denied..." (Imre Nagy, 12th July, 1958)

Modern revisionism headed by CPSU is main danger

While exposing the different faces of modern revisionism **Comrade Shibdas Ghosh** has pointed out that after the exposure of the real face of social democratic forces in Europe, social democracy was working as a definite trend in the communist movement for a long time. Modern revisionism, he said, is nothing but an outward manifestation of that social democratic trend in the communist movement. **Comrade**

Ghosh has further pointed out that after its virtual death as a force to reckon with in the political movement, Trotskyism is also working as another trend or bent of mind in the communist movement. **Comrade Ghosh** also observed that the theory of formation of national democratic governments along with the national bourgeoisie of different capitalist countries as a means to 'non-capitalist and peaceful' transition to socialism was nothing but a peculiar fusion of these two trends of social democracy and Trotskyism in the communist movement. So, as the theory of the Soviet revisionist leadership to "transform parliament into an instrument of people's will" is a downright expression of the trend of unadulterated social democracy so also the theory of implanting revolution by destroying the old parliamentary set-up by combining with the military, bureaucracy, and the national bourgeoisie in different capitalist countries, or the theory of exporting revolution, is a manifestation of the conspiratorial bent of mind of Trotskyism. So, between imperialism and anti-imperialist liberation movement, and between capitalism and anti-capitalist revolutionary struggles—all varieties of revisionism and particularly modern revisionism headed by the revisionist Soviet leadership stand as force of compromise. Naturally, an essential pre-requisite for the victory of liberation movements and the revolutionary struggles today is to give complete defeat, both ideologically and organisationally, to all varieties of revisionism, particularly the Soviet revisionism. The recent developments in different countries, particularly in Angola, Zaire, Portugal, Afganistan, etc., clearly establish how correct these analyses of **Comrade Ghosh** were.

It is further to be noted, in this connection, that since the passing of the leadership of the party and the state into the hands of the revisionists, the foreign
(contd. to page 5)

(contd. from page 4)

policy of USSR is being decided mainly by the mentality of big power chauvinism, as a result of which the USSR adopted a policy of expanding its sphere of influence in collusion with America. In the mutual competition for establishing respective spheres of influence both America and Russia sometimes come to conflict, as, at some other times, they come to compromise. **Comrade Shibdas Ghosh** showed that "their area of agreement is limited and temporary; their sphere of conflict is gradually expanding."

Shift in US imperialist policy from war manoeuvre to peace manoeuvre

Moreover, the American policy of instigating local and partial war and their conspiracy to crush the revolutionary struggles in different countries by aggressing people in their homelands have already suffered a great jolt and thus the ground for and the area of the politics of nuclear blackmailing, which the US imperialists have been pursuing so long and had applied in the Caribbean islands, Tonkin and elsewhere, taking advantage of the weak-kneed policy of the revisionist Soviet leadership, have been substantially squeezed. Side by side, during this period, the bold and consistent stand of China in the matter of building up of strong anti-imperialist and particularly strong anti-American imperialist struggles in different countries, the glorious success of liberation war of the fighting people of Vietnam, Cambodia and Laos, the growing public opinion, inside America, against the US policy on Indo-Chinese war, the serious economic crisis that has engulfed the American economy and the consequent loss of position of American dollar in the international market—all these factors combined together have created such a situation that the

AN APPEAL TO THE WORLD COMMUNISTS

American imperialists have been compelled to give up its age-old policy of containment of China, make a retreat from the old position and give China its due recognition and honourable position in the UNO. And because of these factors American imperialism has been compelled to give up, although temporarily, its old policy of war manoeuvre and adopt the policy of peace manoeuvre. But it must be borne in mind that the war manoeuvre tactics and the peace manoeuvre tactics are nothing but varied expressions of the same imperialist tactics of interfering and infiltrating into and influencing the internal affairs of other countries.

Vietnam's liberation struggle—its glory and limitation

In order to have a correct understanding and clear picture about different aspects of the present Sino-Vietnam conflict it is necessary to keep the above background in mind and to make a scientific evaluation of Vietnam's liberation struggle, its glory as well as its limitations. There is no denying the fact that the valiant fight of the Vietnamese people, their indomitable courage and countless sacrifices, the protracted, tortuous and life-and-death struggle that the Vietnamese people had to wage against the most barbarous and ruthless butchery of mankind and civilisation let loose by the sordid military regime of the US imperialists and their Pentagon made Vietnam's revolution glorious and exemplary in so many respects to the toiling people of the whole world.

But while acknowledging with just pride and deference the very many achievements, successes and glorious sacrifices of Vietnam's revolution, no genuine communist can close his eyes to its limitations however. First of all, it is to be borne in mind that

"much of the growth and development of the present-day communist movement owe its origin to the period of decay, of humanistic appeal to common men, of anti-imperialist struggle in colonies and semi-colonies, to liberal sentiment against capitalist exploitation of peoples in metropolitan countries and to the superiority of socialist system over capitalism. Of the peoples all over the world joining the communist movement and strengthening it now all are not attracted and tied to it by their conscious communist conviction; indeed a very few of them are steered in communist education. Such a condition prevailing, there is little chance of uplifting the general ideological standard of the communists". (On Steps Taken by CPSU Against Stalin, October 1962). This analysis of **Comrade Ghosh** is applicable to all such countries, not excluding Vietnam.

Secondly, nobody can deny that Vietnam's liberation war had a great historical limitation inasmuch as the nationalist and humanist feelings of the people mixed up with the general and broad appeal of communism formed the motive force of this revolution. In fact, humanist moral values and nationalist feelings were the dominant trends in Vietnam's war of liberation since it was essentially an anti imperialist, national liberation struggle.

Beautifully elucidating this phenomenon of nationalism **Comrade Shibdas Ghosh** said that the nationalism which was conducive to revolution and people's cause in the period of liberation struggle, or the patriotic feelings that grew out of it, was quite compatible with proletarian internationalism of the communists. But after the successful culmination of the liberation struggle, if the nationalist and humanist feelings continue to remain in any socialist country, as admixture side

by side with the broad and general appeal of communism and if it cannot be completely rooted out from the ideological-cultural field and social life politically, ideologically and culturally by a painstaking, careful and arduous battle then it is quite likely that these nationalist-humanist sentiment and feelings which work directly or indirectly in the realm of thought as the root cause of all sorts of revisionist and reformist deviations appearing in the communist movement may even stand as stumbling block to further progress and consolidation of revolution. Therefore it is quite clear that the nationalist sentiment which might not be obstructing during the stage of liberation struggle may prove to be a serious obstacle in the period after liberation if it cannot be patterned and moulded in the spirit of proletarian internationalism on the edifice of higher proletarian culture free from national vanity and national humiliation which may get intermingled and remain as hangover in the mental make-up.

So, after the establishment of socialist states in different countries it is imperative to build up a very deep understanding and cohesion among the socialist states based on proletarian internationalism and higher ideological-cultural-ethical standard. This understanding and unity among the socialist states should not be such which we generally witness among the imperialists or the capitalists. It should be an understanding qualitatively different and completely free from the sentiment and feelings of national vanity and national humiliation, otherwise the question of obligation to proletarian internationalism is bound to be a lifeless slogan and reduced to a mere formal affair reflecting practically no emotion and depth of understanding. This is exactly what happened in some of the socialist countries and particularly in Vietnam.

National form of existence states has not outlived itself

Thirdly, we cannot forget for a moment that in this historical epoch when the national form of existence of states has not outlived itself and when national form of socialist revolution even has not yet been completely exhausted then there is every likelihood of national complexes raising their ugly heads unless these are thoroughly eradicated from mass mind by painstaking ideological cultural battle to raise their standard. So it is one thing to give defeat in a life-and-death battle, which is indeed exemplary, to the most rabid imperialist force like the USA but it is quite a different thing to develop a high ideological-cultural standard by successfully conducting an all-round ideological and cultural revolution and acquire an adequate standard of communist character which does not automatically follow as the concomitant effect of successful and glorious anti-imperialist revolution. So, the struggle to grasp the inner kernel and the nobility of communism and acquire a communist character is an altogether different and separate struggle which no genuine communist can afford to neglect or bypass.

Beside this, two other factors have not escaped our attention. When nationalism forms the dominant trend, then each and every victory against the enemy is supposed to stir up a sense of national pride. In the case of Vietnam the sense of this national pride was bound to be highly bolstered up since a small country like it had defeated the most powerful imperialist country of the world.

Moreover, long before China's revolution, some hundred years back, there was a time when the feudal rulers of China had invaded Vietnam. The sense of injured feelings of the Vietnamese people against China, which was so long subdued, might find an easy outlet given a favourable situation

(contd. to page 6)

(contd. from page 5)

today. China has accused that the present Vietnamese leaders have stooped so low that they are even fanning up this injured feeling of the Vietnamese people against China. The Chinese leaders have correctly pointed out that the Vietnamese leaders are fanning it up just to satisfy some narrow and immediate interests knowing it fully well that there is nothing in common among the conditions that existed hundred years back and the present-day conditions—but still then will it be wrong to say that the Chinese leaders are yet to throw light on the root cause of the phenomena of nationalism and the sense of national pride or national humiliation that continue to persist even in the workers' states after revolution particularly in the realm of thought, and provide theoretical answers to these questions? At least, to our knowledge they have not yet done anything of this kind.

Communism begins where humanism ends

So, it is clear that in this epoch of moribund capitalism, bourgeois humanism has nothing to offer to the people. Humanism must, therefore, be clearly distinguished from communism. In his celebrated book "On Steps Taken by CPSU Against Stalin—An Open Letter to Comrade Khrushchev and Other Comrades Abroad" Comrade Shibdas Ghosh made a new addition to the treasury of knowledge of Marxism-Leninism and said: "Communist moral is fundamentally different from humanistic moral value both in content and character. In the annals of human society humanism is not the last word. It is, undoubtedly, the most lively air that the oppressive bourgeois thinking is capable of producing. But the march of progress of society does not stop there and, hence, the sense of moral values does not find its zenith

in humanism. Communism begins where humanism ends".

Weak-kneed attitude of revisionist Soviet leadership

History has proved that, let alone carry forward that onward march of revolution, Vietnam's revolution could not make itself free from the complexes of narrow nationalism, it reflected a low level of consciousness and became practically a prisoner of pragmatism. It is well-known that Vietnam's revolution used to receive help from both Russia and China even after the Sino-Soviet rift. At a time when Vietnam had been receiving economic and other helps from both the sides, politically Vietnam remained for a long time quite favourably disposed to and inclined towards the revolutionary line of China as opposed to the revisionist line of the Soviet leadership. Vietnam did not support the weak-kneed Soviet attitude towards the US imperialists during the Caribbean and Tonkin crises. At such a crucial period when the Democratic Republic of Vietnam was attacked by the US imperialists near the Gulf of Tonkin, what the Soviet leadership did, in reality, despite their declared policy that "attack on any socialist country will be deemed to be an attack on her", is known to the whole world.

Our Party, under the leadership of Comrade Shibdas Ghosh, had severely condemned this absolutely meagre Soviet help of some conventional weapons only as against the required all-out military help, which Russia, and not China, was capable of providing, and pointed out that it was not only absolutely inadequate to meet the situation but was also directly helping the crisis-ridden economy of US imperialism by way of providing them a chance to continuously release their stockpile of arms. In fact, this revisionist attitude of the Soviet leadership made the Indo-Chinese war of liberation

AN APPEAL TO THE WORLD COMMUNISTS

so much prolonged and costlier in terms of bloodshed.

Bourgeois humanism is fundamentally opposed to proletarian internationalism

It is a pity that the close relation and understanding between Vietnam and China, which were there during the life-time of Comrade Ho Chi-Minh and in the phase of anti-imperialist struggle, got a serious jolt in the period after revolution, i.e. in the period of reconstruction when pragmatism eclipsed everything else in the attitude of the present leadership of Vietnam. It is worthwhile to recall, in this connection, an invaluable teaching of Comrade Shibdas Ghosh. He pointed out: "*It is the influence of bourgeois humanism and reactionary nationalism which are fundamentally opposed to proletarian internationalism that work directly or indirectly in the realm of thought as the root cause of all sorts of revisionist and reformist deviations appearing in the communist movement.*" (Imre Nagy)

Now, the influence of this reactionary nationalism not only formed the root cause of revisionism but at the same time fostered a typically pragmatic approach in them which, going a step further, appeared in the form of national domination reflected in their design to form 'Indo-China Federation' with a view to dominating over the others. So the relatively low ideological-cultural standard, virtual absence of the power of making critical appraisal of theory, predominance of national feelings and senti-

ment forming the breeding ground of revisionism and consequent failure to understand the heinous role played by the Soviet revisionist leadership and the pressing necessity to reconstruct the war-ravaged economy—all these factors combined together formed objectively the common ground of unity between Vietnam and Russia.

Question of people of ethnic origin

It is to be noted that the question of Chinese people of ethnic origin came to surface prominently and posed a serious problem the very moment the understanding between Vietnam and Russia took a definite shape at a period when South Vietnam was just liberated. It is to be noted that although China was able to resolve successfully the question of the people of ethnic origin with other neighbouring countries, it failed to do so with Vietnam because the revisionist leadership of the Soviet Union fanned up all sorts of narrow national sentiment against China in order to create a cleavage in the fraternal relationship that existed between these two countries and to form an anti-China axis with Vietnam for containing China in this region. Not only this; after the US imperialism went into the defensive in the background of the present international situation, the design of the Soviet politics was to tarnish the anti-imperialist image of China in this region—which it enjoyed because of its bold, consistent and enthusiastic support and active encouragement to all anti-imperialist struggles—to install some typical pro-Soviet Governments in this region and to use them even militarily as levers against China in its attempt to fill in the vacuum created and thereby fulfil its hegemonistic interest. It is in this background that the Soviet support behind Vietnam's slogan of 'Indo China Federation' should be read.

Slogan of 'Indo-China Federation'

The slogan of forming 'Indo-China Federation' by Vietnam is, therefore, reminiscent of the reactionary nationalist and out and out discredited slogan of separate 'Balkan Federation' by Yugoslavia under the leadership of Tito with the only difference that whereas, in case of Yugoslavia, Tito's party was expelled from Cominform by Stalin to save the international communist organisation from nationalist deviation, but in Vietnam's case, their slogan has been directly instigated by the revisionist leadership of the Soviet Union resulting in further fanning up of reactionary nationalist feelings and sentiment of Vietnam and serious deterioration of the situation in the communist world.

Urgent necessity of education and persuasion

In such a complex situation when the real necessity was to provide a thorough Marxist-Leninist explanation of the root cause of nationalism, to lay bare and expose the pernicious effect of national sentiment by helping to raise the ideological standard of the Vietnamese people which alone could act as a powerful instrument in their hand to fight against this non-Marxist attitude of the Vietnamese leadership and more particularly the revisionist politics of the Soviet leadership, then some oft-repeated reminders as to how and in what way the old treaties between China and Vietnam had been violated by Vietnam and appeals by the Chinese leaders to the Vietnamese people to cherish the old friendly ties between these two countries were of no avail particularly in the background of the most treacherous role played by the Soviet revisionist leadership.

So, in order to win the Vietnamese people on to the side of revolution it

(contd. to page 9)

SOVIET PREMIER KOSYGIN'S VISIT

The six-day visit of Soviet Premier Kosygin close on the heel of India's Foreign Minister Mr. Vajpayee's visit to China and the recent developments in South East Asia are very much significant for reasons more than one and evoke serious thinking in every one having the country's interest in mind. The way the Soviet Premier timed his visit and used the diplomatic hospitality and more particularly his use of uncivil language in his address to the Indian Parliament, the highest political body in the country, in violation of the minimum diplomatic norm and conduct to malign and whip up hatred against China cannot but be construed as anything other than a desperate and crude attempt to wreck the little advancement that has been made lately to normalise relationship and re-establish the traditional friendship between India and China—one that is the most ardent and sincere desire of peoples of both the countries. The incident of abuse of the Indian Parliament by a foreign dignitary is not only unprecedented but unusual inasmuch as such a thing normally happens in a country surrogate to a super-power whose wishes and desires it merely echoes, but it is unthinkable in a country which is sovereign and claims to be 'truly non-aligned'. This is just one aspect of the various other unseemly things connected with this visit.

The second striking feature, and the most objectionable part of it, is the definite attempt of the Soviet Premier to set down terms for good relations and economic co-operation between India and Russia for which pressure was built up both by Mr. Kosygin himself in his lengthy diplomatic duel with his Indian counterpart as also from outside by political parties and forces ranging from the Congress (I) to the CPI(M)—all vying with each other to get Soviet patronage. Although the pressure tactics on the part of the Soviet leaders are nothing new, the setting down of terms for bilateral relationship does not become any the less reprehensible in today's concrete perspective inasmuch as it demands reversing the process of normalisation of relations between India and China that has been initiated after much procrastination and bungling. It goes without saying that this kind of help and co-operation on set terms is not only not free from strings and stigmas but is also contrary to the vital interest of India and the genuine desire and aspiration of the Indian people.

Soviet attempt to brand China as 'aggressor'

It is to be noted that the Soviet diplomatic pressure was mounted on India government for branding

China as the "aggressor" in Vietnam and for recognising and welcoming the new regime in Cambodia set up by the Vietnamese armed forces at the direct instigation and support of the Soviet Union in the Joint Communique issued. This was the shrewd device applied by the Soviet Prime Minister to disturb the process of normalisation between India and China and in his attempt he got the support of not only the Congress (I), the Congress, the CPI and the known Soviet Janata lobby within the Party and its government but also from the CPI(M), who, all combined, wanted to create a political climate within the country particularly congenial to Mr. Kosygin. The India government, whether it liked it or not, has succumbed to this pressure by joining with the Soviet Union to demand "immediate, unconditional and total withdrawal of the Chinese troops from the territory of Vietnam", although neither the presence of the vast Vietnamese army in both Cambodia and Laos nor demand for its withdrawal had found any mention in the Communique. The India government claims its success in withstanding the Soviet pressure for recognition of the Vietnamese backed Cambodian government, which only fifteen states under the

Soviet influence have so far accorded recognition to. It is being circulated in the bourgeois dailies and has also been confirmed by Mr. Vajpayee's interview given to a weekly magazine that India had privately told Vietnam to withdraw its troops from Cambodia before any consideration could be given to the question of recognition of the new regime, but Vietnam has as yet not announced any intention to withdraw its troops.

Some weaknesses in Janata Government's stand revealed in Joint communique

The reiteration of the principles of sovereignty, equality and independence, non-use of force, inviolability of frontiers, territorial integrity of states, non-interference into internal affairs, etc, in the Communique is being claimed by the Indian side as a diplomatic gain that can be used to show its indirect condemnation of the Vietnamese action in Cambodia.

But the most notable thing in the Joint Communique is that while it records the Soviet appreciation of India's initiative to normalise relations with the South East Asian countries it makes no mention of the recent efforts towards unfreezing the relation between India and China. The special representative of the Statesman noted (March 17, '79) that the two sides seemed to differ with regard to "reading of Chinese mind". The Indian side was of the opinion that "there could be no harm in India pursuing its efforts to 'normalise' relations with China without sacrificing certain principles." These principles relate to solution of border problem to India's satisfaction, non-recognition of "Chinese right of taking punitive action" and "that a settlement with China would not compromise or retard the 'growth' of India's friendship with

other countries especially the Soviet Union which had been a close friend." But the "Russians on the other hand seemed to feel that the Chinese were intent upon creating instability in South East Asia as in other parts of the continent."

Soviet promises are only bait for India

It has also been noted in the bourgeois Press that the Soviet Prime Minister in his discussion with the Indian Prime Minister pointed out to the various aspects of deficiencies in the Indian military and defence and suggested improvements or filling up the gaps in the light of China's defence 'build up'. This clearly shows how the Soviet pressure is aiming at interfering into the vital aspects of India government's policy formulation.

It has been also reported in the bourgeois Press that definite Soviet proposals for modernisation of the Indian army including sophisticated submarines and new nuclear installation were made. Mr. Jagjivan Ram, India's Defence Minister, leaves nobody in doubt over what he has said recently in his interview with Dooradarshan (Statesman, 14th April 79). He has admitted that nuclear powered submarines may require consideration. Mr. Ram said that 'preparedness has to be maintained as far as China is concerned.' Referring to his observation in the Lok Sabha in connection with defence budget, he admitted:

"I did not purposely mention the name of China but any person will interpret what I said about the Himalayas as our preparedness so far as China is concerned."

Referring to Pakistan, the Indian Defence Minister said that the situation in Pakistan after the execution of Bhutto was such

that the Pakistan authorities would be fully bogged down in maintaining law and order and therefore would not take part in any misadventure.

As to foreign military aid he said: "If any assistance, is forthcoming from any other country it is welcome. But not in the form of personnel."

After Kosygin's visit, is there any doubt as to who is this military aid giver? When the Indian subcontinent is free from tension and there is not the slightest possibility of military confrontation with any of her neighbours including China, even according to the opinion of the traditional anti-China lobby, and when India government was responding to the Chinese initiative for normalisation of mutual relationship, such statements of the India's defence Minister immediately after the visit of the Soviet Premier are not difficult to understand even for a schoolboy politician.

Commenting on this new direction in Indo-Soviet relationship, a commentator notes (Economic Times, March 22):

"Mr Kosygin assured New Delhi the required help in every sphere including India's immediate and long term needs of military hardware and full assistance in the field of nuclear technology. (Mr. Desai did not seek nuclear fuel from the Soviet Union in his talks with Mr. Kosygin. The question according to informed sources will rise only if Washington finally chooses to go back on its pledged word.) Apart from the long-time economic help and assistance to the country including supply of 6,00,000 tonnes of additional crude in exchange of rice, ensuring of orders for two years to Ranchi Heavy Engineering, a subject broached and agreed to during Mr. Desai's visit to Moscow in (contd. to page 8)

The visit of Soviet Premier was aimed at wrecking the process of Sino-Indian normalisation

(contd. from page 7)
1977, the present agreement includes acceptance of Indian finance capital as partner in the Indo-Soviet joint venture in third countries like the subcontract of Rs. 400 crores in the Soviet turnkey project in Nigeria as also a similar high value project in Libya. A high power team from India is leaving for Moscow shortly to clinch the deals. (Emphasis added—P. Era)

It is therefore palpable that the Soviet Premier tried desperately to dissuade the India government from responding to the Chinese initiative for normalisation of relations with India to which the latter is lately responding with much hesitation and shrewd calculation. It is also clear that the Soviet government was holding out profuse assurances of help to Indian government including the military and financial deals, some spelt out and some not spelt out but of more significance according to Vajpayee. It is palpable then that from its containment of China policy, the Soviet leadership wants to assist India's military build-up as a counterbalance against China, a socialist state in Asia. It goes without saying that this is a dangerous move and fraught with evil consequences and the Janata government would do well not to step in this trap in the very vital interest of the country and the people.

China unlike Soviet Union did not set any term that might hamper India's relation with any other country

In his interview to Sunday, a weekly magazine (18. 3. 79), Mr. Vajpayee, India's Foreign Minister said: "The initiative came from the Chinese. I did not seek the invitation. The invitation first came in

March (last year—P. Era). For a long time no dates were fixed. Then they kept on reminding us. Leaders of other countries who had been to Peking and visited Delhi on their way back home also conveyed that the Chinese were prepared to discuss all questions, including the boundary question".

From the interview as also the report on his visit to China made to Mr. Kosygin at the latter's asking, contrary to diplomatic norm and conduct, by the Indian Foreign Minister, it is obvious that, in marked contrast to the attitude and approach of the Soviet leaders, the Chinese leadership confined their talks with the Indian side strictly within matters of bilateral interest and outstanding issue like the boundary question and they never set any term that might hamper India's relation with any other country, more particularly the Soviet Union.

The Chinese government and leadership have maintained this stand all through even after the August '71 Indo-Soviet Treaty. Even at that time the Chinese leaders said that this would not stand in the way of normalisation of Sino-Indian relationship so far as China was concerned. Chairman of the CPC and the Chinese Premier Hua Kuo-feng in his Report on the Work of the Government delivered at the First Session of the Fifth National People's Congress on February 26, 1978, said:

"The Chinese people have always cherished feelings of friendship for the Indian people. The people of both countries wish to see an increase in friendly contacts and an improvement in their relations. There are questions pending between China and India. Nevertheless relations can be further improved provided

serious efforts are made on both sides."

It is Soviet pressure to which India government is succumbing time and again supported and aided by even parties like CPI, CPI (M)

But the genuine aspiration of the Indian and Chinese people for normalisation of contacts and restoration of traditional friendship could not materialise because of the pressure tactics of the Soviet government and India government's succumbing to that pressure time and again. This time also that pressure is being mounted, aided and assisted by political parties like the Congress(I), Congress, a section of the Janata Party, the CPI and the CPI(M). This political situation helps the Janata government to get maximum leverage both internally and externally.

Internally, the Janata government has been able to draw the support even of the CPI who the other day was defining it as the "forces of right reaction" and was urging the CPI(M) to come out of the 'friendly relations' with it. Now it says, after Mr. Kosygin's visit, that it will not follow the policy of 'blind opposition' to the Janata Party. Mark the expression 'blind opposition'! A party calling itself 'communist' admits that it maintains 'blind opposition' to a government, that is to say, in determining its attitude to a party or government it is not guided by the class character and class purpose of the government of the party! However, the two revisionist parties the CPI and the CPI(M) are finding more closeness between themselves after each having openly declared change in its stand—the CPI(M) as regards its open support to the Soviet policies and joining in the anti-China chorus (although this

stand of the CPI(M) so long pursued covertly was noticed and pointed out by our Party long before) and the CPI as regards its stand on the Janata Party. Both the parties are congratulating each other. The Janata government has rallied the support of almost all the parliamentary parties from the Congress(I) to the CPI(M) in defence of its foreign policy particularly in relation to China which it will surely utilise for bargain.

Soviet's approval of Emergency rule & authoritarian measures of Indira government

In the background of this development, we would like to remind the people of our country certain historic facts and bare experiences which are very relevant.

It was the experience of our people that the Soviet leadership lent its full support and assistance to the India government and approved of its authoritarian acts like crushing the historic railway strike of 1974 and the clamping of hated Emergency rule. Not only this, the active role of KGB men in the administrative and other vital spheres of our country during the Emergency did not remain secret. All this support and assistance of the Soviet leadership went to the extent of interfering into the internal affairs of our country. Sensing the danger of this overbearing attitude of the Soviet leadership as also in consideration of other factors including the deep feelings of the people, the Janata Party, the bourgeois alternative to Indira's Congress, promised to undo the wrongs of the previous government and made a categorical commitment to the people in its Election Manifesto that:

"The Janata Party's foreign policy will reflect the nation's enlightened interests and aspirations and priorities at home..... It stands for friendship for all. It is committed to genuine non-alignment. It will strive for the peaceful

settlement of all international disputes and will work with other Third World Nations to establish a new and just international economic order.

"The Party will try to resolve such outstanding issues as remain with some of its neighbours and will certainly promote a good neighbour policy. It stands for regional co-operation for the common good and for global *detente* free of new blocs of sphere of influence and based on universal and general disarmament". (Election Manifesto of Janata Party—p. 25)

Mr. Morarji Desai's immediate post-election assurances, it may be recalled, were that India would be "properly non-aligned and that the Indo-Soviet treaty would not be allowed to be a stumbling block to her pursuit of friendship with her neighbour and other countries. The Indian Prime Minister made even the 'bold' assertion that: "It is left to Russia to do whatever they want."

Janata after assuming power went back on its promise to undo the wrongs

But within a week after assuming office Mr. Vajpayee, the Foreign Minister ruled out any possibility of change in foreign policy and reiterated this stand when Mr. Gromyko, Soviet Foreign Minister made a hurried visit to India by saying that: "India stands by its foreign policy obligation." This shift in position was further palpable by the insistence particularly by the Indian Prime Minister that 'unless (the border dispute) is settled properly to our satisfaction there cannot be complete restoration of normalcy between India and China. While the Indian Prime Minister was setting the term of border settlement for normalisation of Sino-Indian relationship he and his government took a completely different stand with regard to Pakistan. Normalisation of relations

(contd. to page 13)

(contd. from page 6)

was necessary to follow the course of education and persuasion, and not simply of punitive action, which was liable to create even a fanatic reaction among the Vietnamese people who were very much influenced by narrow nationalism and were constantly instigated by the revisionist Soviet leadership. But from all available reports, we have no knowledge whether any such course of education and persuasion was at all adopted or thought of by the CPC leadership.

Revisionist Soviet design to use one workers' state against another

Despite the dangerous consequences from which the revolutionary movements of the people particularly those of the South-East Asian countries are suffering at present and will have to suffer in future because of the combination of both the leaderships of Vietnam and Soviet Union in this region, it is completely wrong to describe Vietnam as a stooge or puppet of the Soviet Union. First of all, it should be clearly understood that he who is a pawn or puppet cannot himself pursue a hegemonistic policy and *vice versa*. Secondly, a country which has a long tradition of national pride and which aspires to be big may in some cases develop domineering attitude no doubt, but cannot just be a stooge of any other power. In fact, what the revisionist Soviet leadership is after, is their nefarious design of using one workers' state against another. The armed attack of Vietnam to overthrow the government of the workers' state of Cambodia being backed by and at the direct instigation of the revisionist leadership of the Soviet Union in its bid to fulfil hegemonistic design in South-East Asia, should be viewed in this perspective.

The Central Committee of our Party, in its resolu-

tion, noted with serious concern that a workers' state like Vietnam launched an armed attack to overthrow the government of another workers' state like Cambodia the people of which countries set up, only recently, an exemplary record of valiant fight and countless sacrifice particularly against the US imperialist aggression that led to the liberation and establishment of workers' state in both these countries. We appealed to all workers' states to cement their unity against imperialism - hegemonism and to resolve all their differences through mutual discussion and negotiation adhering to the principle of proletarian internationalism and not by taking up of arms by the one against the other.

Coming to the specific question of Sino-Vietnam armed conflict one would find that when China is telling that it is a "counter-attack in self-defence", Vietnam is accusing that it is an unprovoked act of aggression by China. When China is accusing Soviet Union with global hegemonism and Vietnam with regional hegemonism—the Soviet Union is hurling more or less similar epithets against China. Now how to know the truth?

It is necessary to apply science of probability

We all know that probability is also a science. It is necessary for the communists to apply this science of probability to know the truth. The Chinese leaders had repeatedly stated that what they did was done with a limited purpose, without any intention of grabbing even an inch of Vietnamese territory, and they would withdraw as soon as their limited purpose was fulfilled. They also declared that "we will not attack unless we are attacked; if we are attacked, we will certainly counter-attack".

If it was a case of pre-meditated, pre-planned and unprovoked act of aggression by China on

Vietnam, that is if it was an act not under compulsion—not a "counter-attack in self-defence" as China has put it—then how can it be explained that China has not kept a single inch of Vietnamese territory under its control? How is it that China has unilaterally withdrawn all its army from Vietnam despite the fact that the road to Hanoi became wide open to the Chinese army? Today, if there is at all any Chinese army, it is only in the disputed Vietnam-China border region and nowhere else. Those who are crying themselves hoarse over Chinese 'aggression' on Vietnam will do well to provide answers to these questions.

Then again, those who are trying to equate Vietnam's action, in Cambodia, of overthrowing the government of a workers' state and stationing of more than one lakh soldiers to fight the Khmer Rouge with that of limited counter attack by China can very well see for themselves that even after the actual cease-fire, withdrawal of armed forces and repeated appeals by the Chinese leadership to Vietnamese leadership—Vietnam has not only not responded to the peace proposal (upto the date of writing) but is coming out with all sorts of challenge against China. They are calling upon the entire army for greater mobilisation of strength, adopting the programme of Emergency military training, going ahead with all sorts of armed preparation, trying to kill time and refusing to respond to Chinese appeals on this or that plea. Do not these facts reveal in unmistakable terms that the Chinese action in Vietnam is completely different from that of Vietnam in Cambodia?

Soviet and Chinese charge of 'hegemonism' against each other examined

Now, as to the Soviet charge of 'hegemonism' against China, one must also conclude only after

An Appeal to the world communists

ascertaining truth from objective facts. Is there any single instance by which one can show that in any part of the world China is trying to exert its politics of 'hegemonism'? Is there even a single example by which one can prove that China's policy is very near to that of the Soviet Union as pursued in Angola, Zaire, Afganistan, Vietnam or elsewhere? Does China exert any political pressure on the internal affairs of any other country? What is the experience of the Indian people on this score? Leaving aside the example of Indo-Soviet treaty of 1971 which was a piece of downright Soviet interference on Indian sovereignty aimed at obstructing normalisation of India's relation, even if it was in India's interest, with any country hostile to the USSR as had been embodied in Clause X of the said treaty, the recent events will only confirm the truth that it is the Soviet Union and not China which does not miss any chance to interfere into the internal affairs of any country to suit its own interest. Who does not know that during the latest visit of the Soviet Premier Mr. Kosygin, he not only left no stone unturned for frantically pressurizing India government not to normalise relation with China but even went to the extent of nakedly violating all democratic norms and diplomatic protocol of using Indian Parliament for rabid anti-China campaign, but also of doing—of course abortively—whatever he could do to force India to recognise the newly installed government in Cambodia? Can anybody cite a single instance of China's similar pressure being brought to bear upon for influencing the internal politics of any country? Perhaps not.

Soviet provocation behind Vietnam's action

Excepting those who are nakedly pro-Soviet and diehard anti-Chinese in their attitude, all will accept the painful reality that the present leadership of Vietnam, instead of resolving the outstanding disputes with different neighbouring countries particularly with the neighbouring workers' states through peaceful negotiation and consultation in a spirit of amity and fraternity and on the basis of principle of proletarian internationalism, has, since long, taken recourse to continuous incursions, armed attacks, killing of civilian population within the Chinese territory with impunity at the instance of the revisionist leadership of the Soviet Union. The Soviet leaders can, of course, claim to their credit that they have been successful in worsening the relation between China and Vietnam, Vietnam and Cambodia, Cambodia and Laos, etc. So far as Vietnam is concerned, repeated appeals from the Chinese side for peaceful settlements went on the deaf ears of the Vietnamese leaders. The recent headlong and repeated incursions by Vietnam into the Chinese territory are parts of a single strategic operation—planned, provoked and nakedly backed by the revisionist leadership of the Soviet Union against which no appeal or attempt of persuasion from the Chinese side ultimately worked.

Point of 'timing' of China's action

There is another most important point which should be taken into consideration in this connection. Everybody knew that the Chinese leaders were very much eager to normalise relation with India. So, at a time when

(contd. to page 10)

(contd. from page 9)

Indian Foreign Minister Mr. Vajpayee was himself present in China as a state guest and was seriously busy in the actual exercise of settling issues with them it is not difficult to understand that the timing of the Chinese action, whether unprovoked or under compulsion, was liable to provide in the hands of the pro-Soviet lobby a golden opportunity to raise a hue and cry against China that might harden India's attitude hindering seriously the process of Sino-Indian accord. So the question is, how could China act in such a way which would only damage its own cause and strike at the very root of its own interest? The assumption that China did it of its own and not under compulsion precisely with the object of insinuating India, as the pro-Soviet lobby is trying to make people believe, may be given credence only if it is assumed that the Chinese leaders are mere children and do not even understand what is good or what is bad for them. Did not the Chinese leaders also know that taking advantage of the situation created out of this armed confrontation the revisionist leadership of the Soviet Union would try their best to create a cleavage in the process of normalisation of relation between India and China? Even a school boy politician does not find it difficult to understand. Naturally, can it be ruled out that it was the revisionist Soviet leadership which instigated Vietnam to carry on such provocations as would compel China to take precipitate action serving mainly the Soviet interest inasmuch as it would deter, even if temporarily, Sino-Indian accord? It is true that China has not, at all stages, sufficiently ventilated before the world public opinion the extent and incidents of Vietnamese incursions and the nature of Soviet instigation behind them, which could tear to pieces the attempt of the bourgeois Press to either suppress or distort the Chinese

point of view and bring to light, without any shadow of doubt, the real nature of compulsion that might have led to their counter-attack. But can this be a ground to confuse the whole issue and present a completely distorted picture unless one is biased or prompted by some ulterior motive? Even after all this, whether this particular timing could be avoided is difficult for anybody else to suggest. But it is worthwhile to recall that only recently, at the time of the Soviet backed Vietnamese aggression on Cambodia, China showed restraint wisely, and did not step into Soviet provocation.

Persistent Soviet attempt to wreck Sino-Indian accord

Moreover, the Soviet leaders did not fail to take note of the fact that in the sphere of diplomatic politics China has, of late, improved relations not only with Britain and the E.E.C. countries but also with Japan, USA and others. The adverse reaction of the Soviet backed Vietnamese aggression on Cambodia among most of the non-aligned countries as also among the ASEAN (Association of the South East Asian Nations) countries unmistakably proves that Russia's role has been highly resented in all these circles. So, at a time when Russia stands more or less isolated more than ever before, if China becomes successful in normalising relation with India, Soviet Union can hardly tolerate such a situation. In fact since the USA was forced to give up its containment of China policy and was compelled to normalise relation with China, which, despite the distorted version of the revisionist Soviet leaders and their drumbeaters in different countries as an unprincipled alliance, really marked the victory of China's policy consistent with the theory of peaceful co-existence, of preserving world peace and extending constant support to all anti-imperialist liberation struggles, the Soviet leaders

got apprehensive and perturbed. This discomfiture of theirs turned first into displeasure when the USA was forced to settle the outstanding problems of Taiwan with China, and then into anger when China was about to normalise relation with India. In the past too whenever India government attempted to normalise relation with China the revisionist Soviet leadership created hindrance in its path. They decided not to go by default this time also. But nobody can underestimate or ignore the dangerous consequences bound to follow from these incidents creating serious confusion not only in the mass mind but even among those who cherish the noble ideals of communism.

It will not be out of place to recall here a particular experience of the Indian people which they cannot but painfully note. During Emergency rule of Sm. Indira Gandhi, when all the hard won rights of the people were taken away and suppressed ruthlessly by her government, the Indian people who all along stood by the liberation struggle of Vietnam and extended all sorts of

AN APPEAL to the world COMMUNISTS

help, had the bitter experience that the Vietnamese leaders were at one with the Soviet leaders in supporting the black rule of Emergency. It is hightime that the Vietnamese leaders understand that all such acts on their part can help simply to malign the glory of Vietnam's revolution.

In India the people cannot but take note of the fact that on all such occasions in the past as well as at present the voices of the jingoists, the national chauvinists and the so-called proletarian internationalists rise in chorus to whip up anti-communist tirade

throughout the length and breadth of the country. In the present situation when, in the aggregate interest of the aspirant Indian bourgeoisie, it is necessary for them to maintain good relations both with the imperialist and socialist countries, with Soviet Union as well as China, they are unlikely to do anything against any country one-sidedly without looking at their overall and aggregate interest. Not only that; they will try to use the contradictions between these countries to make the best bargain out of them keeping intact their general interest of maligning communism and spreading all sorts of venom against it. The politics of the Congress, Congress(I) and the Janata Party can easily be explained in the light of the above.

Utter contradiction in CPI(M)'s stand

There is also nothing new when the CPI, the direct mouth-piece of the revisionist Soviet leadership in India, becomes very much active despite their much depleted organisational strength, as at present, in spreading profuse anti-Chinese venom with the blessing and support of all 'pro-Soviet' lobby and the behind-the-scene backing of the notorious KGB. It is quite natural that they will not miss any opportunity to refurbish, if possible at all, their image which they had lost because of their line-up with Sm. Gandhi and naked support to the black rule of Emergency, no matter how much that spoils the prospect of communist movement in this country. So, about this party, the less said the better.

But if anybody compares the stand of the CPI with that of the 'revolutionary' CPI(M) he would not find any essential difference between them. It is curious that typically anti-Chinese and even anti-communist and national jingoist slogans are being freely raised before the Indian people today, as

they were raised in the past also, by these parties who move under the signboard of communism and swear by Marxism-Leninism. They have come out in the open to denounce the "insane Chinese aggression" on Vietnam—as the Polit Bureau of the CPI(M) has put it—and abuse China with all sorts of filthy language, but in the same breath they urged the India government to recognise the so-called "revolutionary council" installed in power in Cambodia by the Soviet backed Vietnamese aggression. Their anti-Chinese bias has made them so much blind and insensible that the leaders of the CPI(M) cannot even detect the utter contradictions inherent in their stand. The CPI(M) leaders would do well to understand that it is not the so-called "insane acts of the Chinese leaders that have supplied ammunition to the reactionaries to fire one salvo after another" against communism and "slander the Marxist-Leninist doctrine", but it is the typically anti-Marxist stand of the CPI(M) leadership that has directly or indirectly strengthened the anti-China lobby in this country and has created a serious setback to the process of normalisation of relations between the two countries, which has nakedly expressed itself in the unabashed welcome of Kosygin's visit to India—one that was clearly directed against Sino-Indian accord.

In orientation and make-up both CPI and CPI(M) are national Communist Parties

It is true that lest its out-and-out pro-Soviet stand got exposed before the people and the rank and file, and in order to avoid the embarrassment of being bracketed with the CPI—it has successfully shelved the CPI's proposal for organising a joint campaign and, in its stead, has given a separate call for protest rally against the Chinese "aggression". But how far

(contd. to page 11)

An Appeal to the World Communists

(contd. from page 10)

it will be successful in pacifying the sentiment and feelings and provide answers to the serious questions from the rank and file is altogether a different matter.

We should recall, in this connection, one observation of our beloved leader **Comrade Shibdas Ghosh**. In his celebrated work "Why SUCI is the Only Genuine Communist Party in India" he observed the following :

"However much the CPI may talk of internationalism, both in orientation and make-up, it has long before degenerated into a national type of party in all respects. CPI(M), too, has, of late, stepped into the same line, i.e. to give a national type of orientation to its make-up." Behind all pseudo-radical slogans the national type of communist parties are trying to conceal their real colour. The present attempt of the CPI(M) to appear as the third national alternative within the frame-work of the bourgeois parliamentary system in order to save the crisis-ridden capitalism only confirms the above contention. Be that as it may, we firmly hold that the Indian people should come forward to remove all obstacles in the way of normalisation of relations between India and China, forge a good Sino-Indian relation, fight against all attempts to malign communism in general and the CPC in particular under whatsoever cover, and support all attempts to hold aloft the banner of proletarian internationalism on the basis of communist code of conduct and higher proletarian culture.

Some questions to Chinese leadership

Before we conclude, we feel it our bounden duty to ask the leadership of the CPC a few questions. Is it not a fact that between the Chinese Communist Party and the Workers' Party of Vietnam there had been a long history of close association and comradely relation, almost from the

inception of the communist movement in these countries, which covered the entire period from early twenties to the victorious end of the liberation struggle and thereafter? Who does not know that **Comrade Mao Tse-tung** and **Comrade Ho Chi-Minh** struggled together and worked together for a long time in building the communist and workers' parties in China and in countries of Indo-China? Is it not true that the deep revolutionary friendship between these countries, that was forged and promoted personally by **Comrade Mao Tse-tung** and **Comrade Ho Chi-Minh**, was considered as a concentrated expression of Sino-Vietnamese friendship? Is it not a fact of history that in their respective fight against the French imperialism, the Japanese imperialism and the US imperialism the peoples of these two countries stood the severest test both in the years of arduous struggle and in the two decades or so of the war of resistance against imperialism, shared weal and woe, and helped each other "uniting together, fighting together and winning victories together" as **Comrade Chou En-lai** has put it? How could such a legendary history of comradely relation turn so worse creating cleavage, embittering further and then leading to even armed conflict between them? Why the differences between the two leaderships—be it on the question of Chinese people of ethnic origin, on the border dispute, centring round the question of formation of Indo-China Federation, or on any other question—could not be resolved politically through ideological persuasion and exchange of ideas based on the principle of Marxism-Leninism and proletarian internationalism? If the influence of reactionary nationalism, that is national chauvinism and revisionist trend of thought stood in the way, what ideological struggle was conducted to wash these trends out?

We strongly hold that any party willing to uphold

the banner of proletarian internationalism and revolution cannot escape the historic responsibility to provide answers to these questions. It is in this context that we sincerely feel that the leadership of the communist party of China should come forward with the answers which it owes to the international communist movement. We expect them to enlighten the world communist movement on what ideological-theoretical guidance they provided, what method of political persuasion they adopted and what concrete steps they took to maintain and cement unity based on ideological centralism between these two parties and why all attempts, if at all, on their part ultimately failed. This is necessary to understand why the disputes among the socialist and workers' states could turn so worse as to break the traditional comradely relationship, as also to explain the reason how it was really possible for the revisionist clique represented by the leadership of the CPSU to play the Workers' Party of Vietnam against the CPC. Communists all over the world would gain if answers to all these questions are provided by the Chinese Party and relevant materials circulated among them for their benefit.

Keep going onward march of revolution

It is true that crisis had befallen communist movement again and again in the past, but it is equally true that always genuine communists came forward to keep going the onward march of revolution.

Let not the hullabaloo of the imperialists, the national jingoists, the old social democrats and the modern revisionists hamper the prospect of revolutionary movement in any country, let not temporary setback upset the course of history and let not the present impasse in the communist movement stand as a stumbling block to taking the right track. We have at

our disposal the store-house of experiences of the world proletarian revolutionary movement, we possess the Marxian science of dialectics, and we are confident that armed with the great teachings of **MARX**, **ENGELS**, **LENIN**, **STALIN**, **MAO TSE-TUNG** and **SHIBDAS GHOSH** we will win victory.

We fervently appeal to the Communist Parties all over the world in general and the Communist Parties of Vietnam, Cambodia, Laos and China in particular to restore friendship and normalise relations in accordance with the principle of proletarian internationalism and communist code of conduct keeping the following points in mind which they may find useful :

1. All ideological disputes must be resolved by intense ideological struggle through the painstaking and arduous method of education and persuasion involving not only the leaders and cadres but also the class and the masses following the principle of "Unity-Struggle-Unity" ;
2. Pending resolution of ideological disputes and normalisation of inter-party relation, state level relation between the socialist states should be improved and normalised and all outstanding disputes, including border disputes, should be resolved mutually in a spirit of amity and fraternity and on the basis of the principle of proletarian internationalism, and the policy of providing all possible economic help and cooperation for building up socialist economy of different countries should be restored ;
3. Nothing should be done which may have the effect of disrupting the unity of the world proletariat and the international communist movement in their fight against imperialism, the main enemy, and hegemonism, the main danger ;
4. The path of slanderous campaign should be abandoned, the viewpoints of different parties should be circulated among the communists of all countries to prevent any distortion, and the question of evolving an international media should be actively considered to facilitate exchange of opinion among the communists of different countries in their fight against imperialism and hegemonism ;
5. Conscious, voluntary unity based on unity in ideology, will and action and not by bullying the opponents to submission should be encouraged and developed ;
6. Relentless ideological and cultural battle covering all aspects of life for upgrading the standard of the leaders and the rank and file for fighting out the mechanical thought process, blind authoritarianism, fanaticism of all kinds, national chauvinism, etc, which are alien to proletarian internationalism through the process of dialectical interaction of ideas between the parties for evolving a correct Marxist-Leninist understanding on all issues should be encouraged—which is the need of the hour.

The 9th April, 1979,
48 Lenin Sarani,
Calcutta-700013

Central Committee
Socialist Unity Centre of India

There will be no issue of Proletarian Era on the 1st May. Our next issue will come out on the 15th May, 1979.

—Ed. P. Era.

(contd. from page 2)

The revolutionary party of the proletariat SUCI alone in our soil has held aloft the banner of the true concept of proletarian internationalism by engaging itself consciously into dialectical relationship with the international leadership, fighting consistently two opposite pernicious trends of either non-dialectical mechanical allegiance or nationalist reformist ultra-independence. On 24th April, not only we will recall with pride the invaluable contributions to world communist movement in general and on all important events and issues, made by this revolutionary party of Indian proletariat under the great leadership of **Comrade Shibdas Ghosh** but must make it a point to study and restudy those in order to keep our grip over the contemporary events and developments within the world proletarian movement.

The acid test of a revolutionary party of the proletariat, among others, is in its ability to formulate a correct base political line as regards determining the stage of revolution under the hegemony of the working class, its strategy and tactics. The determination of the strategy and tactics of revolution must not be subjective, mere copying of experiences in other countries but a correct reflection of the objective reality of the concrete alignment of forces within the country in the background of given international situation as also in conformity with the basic principles of Marxism-Leninism.

Our party SUCI has determined as the base political line of the proletariat the anti-Capitalist Socialist Revolution, by applying the general principles of Marxism-Leninism to concrete condition in our country. Our party led by the great Marxist thinker **Comrade Shibdas Ghosh** has pointed out again and again that as the fundamental question of every revolution is the question of state power that is to say, which class or classes are to be overthrown by which class

in alliance with which other classes, so in determining the class character of the Indian state the principal point to be taken into cognisance is the reality that after the transfer of power by the British imperialists, state power in our country passed on to a new class, the Indian national bourgeoisie. The Indian national bourgeoisie firmly entrenched in state power is doing all it can do at this stage of moribund capitalism, to consolidate the state machine and productive system. The entire economy including the agricultural economy has been transformed into capitalist economy and is under the firm grip of capitalist productive relation; not only there has been the birth of monopoly capital but there is monopoly finance capital—financial oligarchy which is a partner, though a junior partner in the international trust and cartel of finance capital. Not to mention only the markets of South East Asia but all over the globe, export of Indian finance capital as distinguished from export of commodity is taking ever increasing proportion and it is already a competitor to the finance capitals of advanced imperialist-capitalist countries. An ABC knowledge of Marxism-Leninism can identify this growing imperialist character of Indian capital.

In the light of these concrete facts and developments to bring any other questions like economic backwardness of the country or domination of foreign capital and even foreign political pressure is to muddle the real issue and to sink into economic determinism, forgetting the Leninist teaching that 'politics supersedes economics'. In our country, the pseudo-communist parties betraying their nationalist-reformist outlook have miserably failed to grasp the basic question of a revolution. They being under the influence of economic determinism hold that unless the unfinished tasks of the bourgeois democratic revolution are

completed the society can not 'skip over' to the stage of Socialist Revolution. Going against the fundamental teachings of Marxism-Leninism and the concrete reality they find their queer 'solution' in the formulation of the strategy and tactics of Peoples' Democratic Revolution or National Democratic Revolution as an 'intermediary' stage between the Bourgeois Democratic Revolution and Socialist Revolution even when the Indian national bourgeoisie is firmly entrenched in state power which they dare not deny and when collaboration agreements of Indian financial capital in different countries of the globe almost daily appear in the bourgeois press. That is to say, they have 'added' one more stage between the BDR and SR!

These reformist nationalist parties in the guise of 'communist parties' do not actually intend to overthrow the bourgeoisie from the state-power as they call their present phase of 'revolution' being against monopoly capitalism and not against capitalism as such. How can monopoly capitalism be fought and overthrown without fighting and overthrowing capitalism that gives its birth is known only to this brand of 'communists'! **Comrade Shibdas Ghosh**, exposing the very motive and objective of this kind of formulation of strategy and tactics of a 'revolution' has shown that when the principal task of the revolution is to dispossess the ruling bourgeois class of the state power, a revolution that does not formulate this task is not a state revolution as we understand from the basic principles of Marxism-Leninism. It is like the 'green revolution', 'wheat revolution', 'ballot revolution' as we often hear in bourgeois parliamentary politics. It means, these parties will seek parliamentary majority and coming to government will bring some reforms in the bourgeois constitution and declare that People's Democratic Revolution has

been completed!

Today, the parties like CPI(M) and CPI are behaving just like national democratic reformist parties. They are cooperating with the crisis-ridden bourgeoisie in installing two party system in our country. The bourgeoisie wants to install two-party system in order to channelise people's discontent to parliamentarism-legalism and thus stem the tide of militant mass movements against the mounting onslaughts of capitalist exploitation. Both these parties CPI and CPI(M) from their position in government and outside are piping the tune of bourgeois law and order, class harmony and social peace, arresting the mass movements from within through their mass fronts,

Strengthen SUCI the only genuine Communist Party in India

polluting the working class movement with class collaborationist thoughts and ideas and bourgeois reformist programme. By their service to the bourgeois class interest which better than it serves the branded bourgeois parties, CPI (M) more specially is earning the backing of the bourgeois class to appear as the third alternative in the bourgeois design of two party system in the country.

Comrade Shibdas Ghosh, warned the people long back that apparently it might appear to them that there were so many parties, Congress, Congress(O), Jana Sangha, Socialist (now in one—Jana Party) CPI, CPI (M) so on and so forth each contending with the other for power having their difference in political stands but viewed from the revolutionary politics there were in fact two sides opposed to each other—the forces of revolution and the forces of reaction or status quo. Today's concrete political

development and experiences bring home to the people that while the parties—Congress (I), Congress, Janata, CPI and CPI(M) are fighting between them, this fight is for power in bourgeois parliamentary politics with the backing of the ruling bourgeois class and has got nothing to do with the overthrow of the capitalist class rule of exploitation. All these parties are uniform in their approach to bourgeois law and order and thus stemming the tide of mass movements against capitalist exploitation. So, all these parties are for status quo and compose the forces of reaction.

It is SUCI, the revolutionary party of the Indian proletariat that alone upholds the banner

of the revolutionary. It is calling the people to realise that mere change of government nor any kind of bourgeois reform can bring solution to their basic problems in life. It is, therefore, no use wasting time over bourgeois reformist thinking. The need of the hour is to unite the forces of struggle against the excruciating burden of capitalist exploitation. For this is necessary a political united front of left and democratic parties and forces in order to provide the masses with a broad platform of united struggle. SUCI has always been stressing on the urgency of fulfilling this task to CPI(M), CPI and all other left and democratic parties but has failed in its efforts because of the opposition of CPI(M) in particular. On 24th April, our party renews its appeal to all these parties, their rank and file and supporters to make this necessity a reality on common agreed programme and a code of

(contd. to page 14)

(contd. from page 8)
with Pakistan did not bog down on the contentious issue of Kashmir question and it was Indian advice to Pakistan to keep aside the issue for bilateral settlement and instead concentrate on normalisation of relations in trade, commerce, communication, cultural exchanges and other fields. That was exactly the proposal of Chinese government to India but the latter has not accepted it. Commenting on this double standard of the India government in foreign policy, Mr. S. Nihal Singh of the Statesman pointed out (Statesman, February 6, '79) "...if the contentious nature of the major problems will not permit the two countries to come to any agreement on them, it would be wise of India to adopt a step by-step approach. There is no reason why India should not apply to herself in the relation to China the advice she has been giving Pakistan on her own relation with Islamabad...."

...the border question can only be tackled over the period of time, after public opinion in the two countries has been fully prepared for it. In the meantime India cannot opt out of playing her proper role in Asia which is not of a mere appendage of the Soviet Union."

Divergence of opinion among the Indian bourgeoisie about the right tactical line to take the fullest advantage of the global situation

But there seems to be divergence of opinion among the Indian bourgeoisie as to the right tactical line in foreign policy to get all the benefits of contradictions between the two super powers, Sino-Soviet conflict as also recent changes in geopolitics. That the Indian bourgeoisie is actuated by the desire to get the fullest advantage of the global situation so as to make India emerge as a strong power in Asia leaves no room for doubt from the various

comments of the bourgeois dailies as well as different postures of the Janata government at times even moving to cross purposes.

So, Mr. S. Nihal Singh of the Statesman, representing a definite trend urges upon the Janata Government that: "Having taken sides, however reluctantly, India cannot hope to influence events. *It was one thing to call for the Chinese troops withdrawal from Vietnam, quite another to declare publicly that China was the aggressor, whatever the domestic situation and pressures. All that India can hope to achieve is to insulate the gains made in seeking a rapprochement with China from the conflict between Peking on the one hand and the Soviet Union and Vietnam on the other.*"

(Statesman, February 27, '79—emphasis added)

The reason for this approach was made explicit by him in his another earlier writing on 6th February by pointing out that: "...it would be the height of folly to remain immobile by interpreting the Indo-Soviet relationship as an unsurmountable hurdle in the way of improving relations with China....if Chinese interest in tapping Indian technology and business acumen were to yield a major contract for India during Mr. Vajpayee's visit (there) is no reason why India should not benefit in a modest way from China's industrialization programme, which has sprouted multi-million dollar deals with Japan and the West."

But there is an opposite trend of thought which sees:

"From the Indian point of view, the visit (of Kosygin—P. Era) could not have taken place at a better time, for it has come in the wake of events that have served as a strong reminder of the *identity of approach on key issues of international relations* that has always existed between the two countries. The truth remains that despite the death of Mao and Chou En-lai, the fall of Bhutto,

CPM joined in the chorus of anti-China tirade

and the change of government in this country, *the basic alignments in the sub-continent have not changed. India and China have moved a long way towards normalising their relations, but the latent opposition between the two countries persists....Nor has the USA been able to resist the temptation of trying to use Pakistan as a counter-balance to India. In the situation the growing rapport between the USA and China cannot fail to imply greater insecurity for India. It is hardly surprising therefore, that India has once again drawn closer to the Soviet Union.*" (Editorial Comment—Economic Times, March 10, '79—emphasis added)

Normalisation of Sino-Indian relation is in the best interest of the country

We are to remind the Janata government that this line of distorted thinking based on deep anti-China bias and one-sided dependence on Soviet military and economic assistance fortified by the dangerous provision of the Indo-Soviet treaty of 1971 have always stood in the way of India's following a policy of non-alignment to which the Janata Party now stands committed. Not that the urge to shape out Indian foreign policy free from overbearing influence of the Soviet leadership was not felt by a section of the Indian bourgeoisie and the respective governments as also attempts were not made to that end in the past but every time it was the Soviet pressure to which those attempts foundered. It can be recalled that after the Chinese government gave recognition to Bangladesh

government such possibility developed but it was frustrated by Soviet pressure.

This time also the Soviet leadership has been in its frantic bid of foiling the Sino-Indian relations even to the point of absurdity. Just before Mr. Vajpayee's visit to China, the Soviet Press was ascribing the Naga hostilities in Assam villages to China's inspiration which was strongly denied by the Governor of Assam and Nagaland as also by the two state governments.

The flaring up of the border conflict between China and Vietnam synchronised with India's Foreign Minister's visit to China is not just accidental in as much as it helps the Soviet design and the fact cannot be overlooked that Mr. Vajpayee's visit was at the invitation of China whose leadership was well aware of the possible repercussion of any rash act. It is to be noted that the whole motive of the Soviet Premier's visit to India was to drive wedge between India and China and disturb the process of normalisation, capitalising a situation which is its own creation.

Treaties like the one of 1971 merely obstructs the weaker partner to follow free and independent foreign policy

It is obvious therefore that whenever there has been an occasion favourable for improving Sino-Indian relationship it is the Soviet pressure that has prevented the Indian Government from taking the right course through its economic and military aid and the lever of Indo-Soviet Treaty of 1971, more particularly its dangerous Clause X. The Indian ruling class has been swayed again and again from the pursuit of genuine non alignment, however reluctantly, to the serious detriment of the country's interest and its aspirant rule among the non-aligned countries of the Third World. This time also, the same move of the Soviet

leadership is very much there which the present Janata Government will have to view seriously. The government must note that their stand as expressed through the Joint Communiqué will only further alienate India from the mainstream of movement of the non-aligned countries particularly of South East Asia who have different views as regards the recent developments in the area. The government needs to bear in mind that the concrete experiences in recent developments in international politics including those in the Middle East serve as sufficient reminder that there is not much worth of Soviet assurances in time of actual need despite the Treaty like the one of 1971. Such Treaty merely obstructs the weaker partner to follow free and independent initiative in foreign affairs.

Our party's warning about Indo-Soviet Treaty borne out by history

It is worth recalling in this connection that it was our party alone in the country that showed the dangerous consequences of the treaty immediately after it was signed in August 1971. In an article "Indo-Soviet Treaty", Proletarian Era, Vol 5, No 3, of 15th September 1971 we quoted the Clause X of the Treaty which is most dangerous and is an insult. It runs thus: "Each contracting party solemnly declares that it shall not enter into any obligation, secret or public with one or more states which is incompatible with the Treaty. Each party further declares that no obligation exists, nor shall any obligation be entered into between itself and any other State or States which might cause military damage to the other party".

Our party then pointed out: "*One can not find any relevance or plausible justification under the present circumstances, for inclusion of such an ominous clause in the treaty other than the only purpose of isolating China, since at present, it is only with China and no*

(contd. to page 14)

24th APRIL

(Contd. from Page 12)

conduct without which, people remain helpless and dumb victim of capitalist onslaughts. It is time for these parties to prove their bonafide of their verbal commitment to the people by responding to this appeal of our party.

Our party would call upon the people to take a serious note of this political reality and intervene in this situation by helping SUCI in forging the unity of the oppressed people against the mounting class offensives of the ruling bourgeois class. On 24th April we will remind all serious political workers in our country of the teaching of Comrade Shibdas Ghosh that:

"Simply to talk of revolution is no revolutionary consciousness. So again to speak for the working class, for the proletariat—this too is no proletarian class consciousness. The correct revolutionary consciousness is the correct proletarian class consciousness and correct proletarian class consciousness is the correct proletarian party consciousness."

At this juncture of history when all the hitherto big 'Marxist' or left parties are revealing their perfidious roles and utter bankruptcies it is SUCI, the revolutionary party of the Indian proletariat that remains in the political horizon of the oppressed masses as the only ray of hope. It is the beacon light to those who in spite of their dedications and countless sacrifices have been failed by the treacherous leaderships. It is to them and millions of the oppressed people of our country, we appeal to recall the great teaching of Comrade Shibdas Ghosh:

"Out of the discontent of the workers and peasants in the society, time and again revolu-

tionary tide will try to surge forth in waves following waves—in waves after waves. It will try to burst out—the contradiction and conflicts brewed up within the society will time and again seek to express and demand a fundamental change of this order, will fervently appeal to human conscience, will urge upon the human consciousness and demand revolution. But there will be no revolution. Again and again the revolutionary tide will recede, will go astray. Time and again reaction will gain. Revolution will have to wait until a revolutionary party emerges with necessary strength to lead it."

Today, SUCI's emergence as the only defender of the banner of proletarian revolution is an unquestionable reality tested by time and concrete experiences. If the people ask: 'Where is the party, where is the leadership?' We dare answer: 'Here is that party, here is the leadership.' Know it and test it but don't forget that unless you give adequate strength to your own party, it is you, yourselves remain powerless. Know your party—the SUCI and strengthen it and then and then only you can develop your political power ultimately to challenge and remove the political power of the exploiting capitalist class that stands as the roadblock to liberation of the society and human progress.

24th April is the burning flame of the revolutionary urge that kindles the hearts of the millions with the hope of changing their position as slaves in this capitalist society to the real masters of socialist productive system. Time will come when this day will be a day of rejoice for the toiling people of our country, being the day of

(contd. from page 13)

other state the Soviet continues to maintain bad relation and in fact there exists a situation of military confrontation on border disputes between them..... *this particular clause will definitely act as a brake on our attempts to normalise relationship and restore old friendships with China.* ... There is no doubt about it, whatever might be the promise given otherwise by our government spokesmen".—(emphasis added —Ed. Board. P. Era)

History has borne out the truth of our party's analysis. To-day, the Indo-Soviet Joint Communiqué, in the very starting paragraph hails "the consolidation and the continuing development of Indo-Soviet relations in the spirit" of Indo Soviet Treaty of 1971 and the joint declaration of October 26, 1977."

CPI(M)'s pragmatic politics maligns the noble ideology of communism

We cannot but note with all seriousness the dangerous national chauvinistic stand that CPI(M) like CPI has taken, well timed with the visit of the Soviet Premier. Our party noted long back in 1971 the slow but steady surreptitious move of CPI(M) leadership towards Soviet revisionist leadership although it was maintaining the show of verbal opposition to Soviet revisionism to confuse its ranks. Today, the musk of so-called 'neutrality' or 'equi-distance'

creation of their most precious possession, the day of beginning of their revolutionary preparation. But before that, 24th April will come each year with the clarion call to the toiling and oppressed millions to wake up and organise themselves behind the revolutionary banner of SUCI—the Party that alone can lead them to emancipation.

**Long Live Revolution !
Long Live SUCI !
Long Live 24th April !**

Kosygin's Visit

is off. CPI(M) leadership has come out in open advocacy of the Soviet line and for its acceptance by the Indian Government along with parties like Congress (I), Congress, the known Soviet lobby within the Janata party and CPI. Its joining in the anti-China chorus is quite fitting with its ambition to appear as the third alternative in bourgeois parliamentary politics.

It is to be noted that CPI the 'blind loyal' to the Soviet and whom the Indian people take as 'Soviet voice' in the country, as also the Soviet Lobby within the Janata could not have brought sufficient pressure to bear upon the Desai Government had not CPI(M)'s open and vociferous efforts tilted the balance. CPI(M) leadership did not protest the way the Indian parliament was abused by the Soviet premier nor did it say anything against the open reference of China as the target of India's military build-up under Soviet pressure, both inside and outside the parliament. Rather, it took the course of maligning China in its Polit Bureau resolution by branding her as the 'aggressor' in Vietnam, approved of the Vietnamese intervention in Cambodia's internal affairs, demanded of the Indian government to give recognition to the new regime set up by the Vietnamese military force in Cambodia. It called upon its units and workers to mobilise anti-China demonstrations and rallies.

CORRECTIONS

Page Twelve, Column Five. 'It is SUCI the revolutionary Party..... the banner of revolutionary' the portion 'the revolutionary' should be read as banner of revolution.

Page Five, Column Five.

Subheading: Should be read as National form of "existence of states has not outlived itself".

The mistakes are regretted.

Ed. P. Era

From its position as the ruling power in two states as also with its political weightage with the Janata government it did all within its means to help the Soviet lobby to push through its motive. CPI(M) leadership will surely be rewarded by the Soviet revisionist leadership for the services it got from this party at an hour of its dire need but the toiling people in general and the honest rank of CPI(M) in particular should not fail to take note of the way leadership of this party has maligned the cause of Communism.

Genuine non-alignment and people's ardent desire demand normalisation of Sino-Indian relations

Indian People will demand of the Janata government to fulfill its commitment of "genuine non-alignment" by continuing and strengthening the process of normalisation with China that has just been initiated. The Sino-Vietnam conflict should not stand in the way nor should it be made an excuse. The government would do well to remember that considered from the aspect of vital interest of the country and the genuine aspiration of the people, it is urgent and brooks no delay however much there may be the Soviet pressure. Geo-political development around the Sub-Continent, India's aspirant role and position among the non-aligned countries of the Third World, the presence of naval forces of both the Superpowers in the Indian Ocean, the concrete experiences in the international events where the Soviet assurance got tested as also the paramount need of keeping the country free from the vortex of contention and collusion of the Superpowers make all the more urgent, the normalisation of relations of two big states in Asia—India and China.

Editor-in-Chief—NIHAR MUKHERJEE