

this understanding and are taking an anti-Leninist stand. It will be further seen that no Marxist-Leninist Party counterposes peaceful coexistence to a revolutionary alliance with oppressed peoples as our critics do. It is only the revisionists that distort the principle in this fashion. Our critics adopt this revisionist stand when they attack peaceful coexistence as inconsistent with a revolutionary alliance, etc. □

VII

Soviet Economic Aid, U.S. Imperialism, and Revisionism of the CPSU Leadership

SOVIET ECONOMIC AID

THE C.C. DRAFT IN DISCUSSING THE REVISIONIST conception of non-capitalist path says: "the assistance to the capitalists of these countries to develop capitalism is painted as Soviet aid for non-capitalist path". This is objected to by our critics. They say: "This description is misleading, giving the impression as though Soviet economic aid to the backward countries plays an anti-imperialist role, to resist imperialist pressures on these countries. Practice has shown that Soviet economic aid has been used to build a so-called public sector, subservient to the growth of monopoly capitalism, subservient to the penetration of American capitalism", etc.

This once more demonstrates how our critics miss the main point and make erroneous formulations. The C.C. Draft says that instead of helping the labouring masses of backward countries to avoid the stage of capitalist development before reaching socialism—the Leninist conception of non-capitalist path—help

is being rendered to the capitalists to build capitalism in the name of the non-capitalist path. This point is, of course, not understood—the difference between a correct and wrong conceptions of the non-capitalist path.

Is it incorrect to state that Soviet aid is given to the capitalists for developing capitalism? Or, do the critics suggest it is given to the feudal lords or landlords, or princes or the monopolists to stop the growth of capitalism? Why make absurd arguments? But such arguments arise from the unspoken premise that the Soviet Union is an imperialist Power and as an imperialist Power it cannot even help the growth of capitalism. They see absolutely no contradiction of interests between the Soviet Union and American imperialism, between the Soviet people and the interests of American imperialism, and hence they say Soviet aid must always be a subsidiary to American imperialist aid. The C.C. is not prepared to liquidate the existence of Soviet Union as a socialist country, notwithstanding the policies of its revisionist leadership.

The C.C., of course, has never argued that with the Soviet aid successful capitalism will be built in an underdeveloped country. The class on which the revisionists rely is incapable of liquidating its feudal heritage or its dependence on imperialism. That is why we have stated in our Programme: "With the emergence of the world socialist system, while utilizing socialist aid for building certain heavy industries, it actually uses it as an extremely useful counter to strike more favourable deals with the imperialists." This is the reality. Mark the words "while utilizing socialist aid for building certain heavy industries"; and the effect—an extremely useful counter, increasing its bargaining capacity.

There is no doubt that with the growth of capitalist development monopolies are increasing. But just to declare in an off-hand manner that we have reached the stage of *monopoly capitalism*, without any proof whatsoever, is not being serious. Do our critics realize that when they mention 'monopoly capitalism' in relation to India, they are presuming that India has already reached the high level of capitalist development obtaining in the most advanced countries?

What is monopoly capitalism? To quote Stalin: "Modern

capitalism, monopoly capitalism, cannot content itself with the average profit, which moreover has a tendency to decline, in view of the organic composition of capital... The main features and requirements of the basic economic law of modern capitalism might be formulated roughly in this way: The securing of the maximum capitalist profit through the exploitation, ruin and impoverishment of the majority of the population of that given country, through the enslavement and systematic robbery of the peoples of other countries", and lastly, "through wars and militarization of the national economy, which are utilized for the obtaining of highest profits" (*Economic Problems of Socialism*). Do our critics realize which stage of capitalism is represented by monopoly capitalism? Or, do they have their own definition of monopoly capitalism in mind?

There is no doubt that the revisionists use their economic aid as a weapon of pressure, that in China they used it as a weapon of blackmail. In some countries the aid they gave to bourgeois Governments was used to suppress people. It is equally true that they also incite anti-China policies. But this is not the point that is being discussed. Here the role of Soviet aid in relation to the non-capitalist path is being discussed, and it is shown that instead of helping the non-capitalist path it helps the capitalist path.

SOVIET UNION AND U.S. IMPERIALISM

Our critics castigate the C.C. Draft for saying that our criticism of the revisionist leadership of the CPSU for collaboration with U.S. imperialism does not mean that the Soviet Union has become an ally of U.S. imperialism or is working for sharing world hegemony with American imperialism and for the division of spheres of influence in the world, as this is tantamount to nothing short of placing the Soviet Union outside the socialist camp. It is obvious that our critics are firmly of the opinion that the Soviet Union has become an ally of imperialism and is working for dividing the world with American imperialism, i.e. it has become another imperialist Power. All this talk about collaboration, no compromise, is based on the firm conviction that the world has to face two imperialist Powers—the Soviet

Union and the USA. Hence the impatience with any analysis of revisionist outlook, any reference to illusions about imperialism—for the revisionists and the Soviet Union are identified with imperialism.

If they are honest and sincere then they should say openly that no socialist camp exists—it is liquidated—since the Soviet Union is an imperialist Power, and all other People's Democracies which follow the Soviet Union can be called colonies or whatever you want. Then you must make a new analysis of the epoch—not so much as an epoch of revolution, but an epoch in which the revolutionary movement has got its biggest set-back since imperialism has triumphed in nearly one-half of the socialist world. This is of such tremendous importance to the world revolutionary movement that it must be openly stated and corresponding conclusions drawn. Separate theses explaining the triumph of this counter-revolution and a new analysis based on it are essential if they believe in what they say. Then this should be the basis of their line and all pretence that they are fighting only revisionism should be dropped.

The C.C. Draft has denounced in the most unmistakable terms the manifestations of revisionist betrayal. It is necessary to quote from the Draft again. The Draft charges the CPSU leaders with pursuing a policy which appeases American imperialism, distorts the revolutionary movement, practises perfidy against China. Anyone who honestly reads the Draft will find the revisionists mercilessly exposed.

With all that, the Draft states that the Soviet Union is not collaborating for world domination, that it is not an ally.

The implications of considering the Soviet Union as an ally of imperialism have already been mentioned. Our critics will not have the courage to accept them and liquidate the socialist camp. What about the revisionist leaders? In the first place, when Marxist-Leninists discuss a phenomenon like the rise of revisionism in the international Communist movement, they do not concentrate on the individuals and their motives—Lenin warned against such crude petty bourgeois tendency—but the deep social causes of the phenomenon, its class origin. This is the main thing that has to be located to fight revisionism because without it the illusions which it nourishes and on which it bases

itself, the class prejudices it utilizes cannot be successfully exposed.

The Moscow Declaration of 1957 correctly stated: "The existence of bourgeois influence is an internal source of revisionism; while surrender to imperialist pressure is its external source." This is not challenged by any Party. This correctly describes the source of revisionism. It is in the light of this correct understanding that the C.C. Draft exposes the revisionist tactics as surrender to imperialism, as having illusions, as a poisonous current inside the working class movement.

What about the revisionist leaders of the CPSU? It may be argued they are leading a socialist state and their collaboration is leading to sharing world domination or redivision of the world?

Any Marxist-Leninist must again go to the class roots. Individual leaders must reflect the interests of some class in the global policies. Which are the interests that Leninism associates with world domination, redivision of the world, world hegemony, etc.? The striving for domination and redivision of the world is represented by the capitalist monopolies and trusts, by the domination of finance capital. Lenin teaches us: "Monopolist-capitalist associations, cartels, syndicates and trusts first divided the home market among themselves and obtained more or less complete possession of the industry of their own country. But under capitalism the home market is inevitably bound up with the foreign market . . . Capitalism long ago created a world market. As the export of capital increased, and as the foreign and colonial connections and 'spheres of influence' of the big monopolist associations expanded in all ways, things 'naturally gravitated' towards an international agreement among the associations, and towards the formation of international cartels . . . The principal feature of the latest stage of capitalism is the domination of monopolist associations of big employers. These monopolies are most firmly established when *all* the sources of raw materials are captured by one group, and we have seen with what zeal the international capitalist associations exert every effort to deprive these rivals of all opportunity of competing, to buy up, for example iron-fields, oil-fields, etc. Colonial possession alone gives the monopolies complete guarantees against all

contingencies in the struggle against competitors, including the adversary wanting to be protected by a law establishing a state monopoly. The more capitalism is developed, the more strongly the shortage of raw materials is felt, the more intense the competition and the hunt for sources of raw materials throughout the world, the more desperate the struggle for the acquisition of colonies" (Lenin, *Imperialism*, pp. 244 and 260).

Rise of monopoly, of monopolist associations of big employers is the basis of striving for world domination, for redivision of the world, for spheres of influence. When our critics urge that the revisionists are trying to share world domination and redivide the world, they must first show that monopoly today rules the Soviet society, that all socialist relations of production have disappeared, that monopoly capitalism has been restored and the revisionists are the spokesmen of these economic interests. They must show that the "privileged strata", the "capitalist elements" do not simply consist of bureaucrats and degenerates, but of monopolists, who, having captured the home market, require foreign markets and colonies for their very economic existence. In short, they must prove that a counter-revolution has taken place and capitalism has been fully restored.

But they themselves say that this has not taken place. On the other hand, they themselves assert with great confidence that the attempts to restore capitalism will not succeed.

They themselves say that though the revisionist leadership doggedly pursues its line of collaboration with imperialism, this does not mean that the cycle of restoration of capitalism is already complete and that the efforts of the revisionist leaders in this direction are going to succeed. They express a very high opinion of the great Soviet Communists with their long traditions of revolutionary struggles, of the Soviet people, and express confidence that they will see through the vile attempts to restore capitalism, discard the revisionists and preserve socialism in the Soviet Union.

Can you beat this? Here is a new contribution to Marxism. The cycle of restoration is not complete. Even the attempt at restoration will not succeed. The Soviet people will be able to preserve socialism. And yet they talk of the revisionist leaders

collaborating with imperialism to divide the world ! Which class, which elements have arisen ? Whose class needs demand world domination ? Don't ask them the question. Their class analysis does not include a reply to such questions. The mere fact that bourgeois elements have arisen or are arising does not prove the class need for world domination. According to Lenin, such domination is associated with monopolies, their hunt for foreign markets. But our critics insist that though socialism continues to exist in the Soviet Union—this is what they seem to imply when they say revisionists will not succeed—the Soviet Union is still an ally of American imperialism and the revisionist leaders represent class interests which demand world domination. They make wild generalizations but are afraid to see the logical conclusion of their formulations. Face to face with them, they retreat and begin to say capitalist restoration cannot take place in the Soviet Union.

How is then the policy of the Soviet revisionists explained ? On the basis of bourgeois influence as an internal source of revisionism and surrender to imperialism as the external source.

CLASS ROOTS OF REVISIONISM IN THE CPSU LEADERSHIP

Our critics tell the C.C. : You do not analyze the class roots of revisionism.

We have already said that bourgeois influence is the internal source of revisionism while surrender to imperialist pressure is its external source. This, of course, according to them, is not going to the class roots. To say that revisionism is a socialist country is due to bourgeois influence is, according to them, not going to the class roots; to say that surrender to imperialism is the external source is also not a class analysis. The growth of bourgeois influence inside a socialist state, including the rise of corrupt elements who grab position and money, is a class development; the surrender to imperialism is connected with it. But all this to them is not enough.

The first important thing that Lenin teaches us is that revisionism is a trend—a hostile trend which arises from within.

“But after Marxism had ousted all the more or less integral doctrines hostile to it, the tendencies expressed in these doctrines began to seek other channels... And the second half century of the existence of Marxism began (in the nineties) with the struggle of a trend hostile to Marxism within Marxism” (*Against Revisionism*, p. 114).

That is why revisionism has to be taken seriously, it disrupts the movement from within, under the garb of Marxism; therefore, its assumptions and practice are to be concretely exposed, unmasked, otherwise it misleads people. It does not take an openly hostile attitude to Marxism, that is why its real content has to be analyzed and uncovered. While it is true that objectively it serves the interests of imperialism, it cannot be successfully fought by simply ranting that it is an agency of imperialism, by equating it with imperialism. This is the A B C of fight against revisionism.

Lenin, therefore, took particular pains to analyze and expose its ideological foundations, its distortions of Marxism, its practice, and did not content himself with the declaration that it was a detachment of the bourgeoisie. He warned the workers about it but never substituted a serious ideological struggle by agitational denunciations and a pseudo-class analysis.

The reason was that Lenin knew that revisionists and revisionism were basing themselves on the prejudices, illusions of certain strata created by the historical conditions of his time. A patient struggle was required to win them over and unite the working class movement.

Lenin rejected any compromise to keep the revisionists in a united party, but he never gave up a patient ideological struggle against all its manifestations.

Lenin related the inevitability of revisionism to the influx of the ruined petty bourgeois, i.e. in the ranks of the proletariat, and importation of its world outlook in the proletarian movement ; he traced the collapse of the Second International to the opportunism of the Second International based on the privileged position of a section of the working class which got crumbs from the capitalist table during the days of “peaceful” advance, of the ripening of capitalism into imperialism. He said that the social chauvinists and opportunists could not be tolerated in the same

party with the revolutionaries. But he did not end his struggle after delivering this judgement. He continued to carry on his ideological warfare against them by analyzing and exposing their propaganda.

But what do our critics do? They do not provide any economic data. They say that though capitalist restoration has not taken place in the Soviet Union, still there are such strong capitalist elements in the country that to satisfy their class needs they want a redivision of the world, or to dominate the world.

The revisionist heresies that are dominating the CPSU policies have their roots in the past; they were repeatedly revealing themselves and Stalin had to fight them. Their basis was capitalist encirclement, survival of capitalism in the economic life and the minds of the people, low ideological development and bourgeois influences. In recent years the process has been accelerated opening the floodgates to bourgeois ideology and leading to bourgeois practices in production like material incentives, market competition. How far this new process has gone ahead has to be studied. But what is beyond doubt is that all these factors provide sufficient sustenance for the revisionist policies.

Addressing the Seventeenth Party Congress, Stalin said: "But can we say that we have already overcome the survivals of capitalism in the economic life? Still less can we say that we have overcome the survivals of capitalism in the minds of people. We cannot say that, not only because in development the minds of people lag behind their economic position, but also because the capitalist encirclement still exists, which endeavours to revive and sustain the survivals of capitalism in the economic life and in the minds of the people of the USSR... Naturally, these survivals cannot but be a favourable ground for a revival of the ideology of the defeated anti-Leninist groups in the minds of individual members of our Party. Add to this the not very high theoretical level of the majority of our Party members, the inadequate ideological work of the Party bodies... and you will understand the origin of the confusion on a number of questions of Leninism that exists in the minds of individual Party members ... Take for example the question of building a classless socialist society. The Seventeenth Party Conference declared that we are advancing towards the formation of a classless socialist

society. And yet, who does not know that the enunciation of this clear and elementary thesis of Leninism has given rise to not a little confusion in the minds of a section of Party members ... And they began to reason in this way. If it is a classless society we can relax the class struggle, we can relax the dictatorship of the proletariat and get rid of the state altogether, since it is fated to wither away soon in any case... Naturally, if this confusion of views and these non-Bolshevik sentiments obtained a hold over the majority of our Party, the Party would find itself demoralized and disarmed."

At the Eighteenth Party Congress also Stalin had to deal with the same deviation—regarding proletarian state: "The exploiting classes have already been abolished in our country... why then do we not help our socialist state to die away? These questions... show that these comrades have failed to understand the essential meaning of the doctrine... that they do not understand present-day international conditions, have overlooked capitalist encirclement and the danger it entails for the socialist country. These questions can only betray an underestimation of the capitalist encirclement but also an underestimation of the role and significance of the bourgeois states and their organs which send spies, assassins and wreckers in our country and are waiting for a favourable opportunity to attack it by armed force."

It is also known that immediately after the anti-fascist war bourgeois tendencies were found in several spheres of ideology, philosophy, economic theory, and they had to be fought. In other countries revisionism in the shape of rejection of dictatorship of the proletariat threatened to become an international phenomenon and it had to be fought by Stalin.

This is the origin and background to the revisionism of the present day.

No doubt, Khrushchov and his successors have tremendously accelerated the revisionist onslaught. Till Khrushchov got hold of the Party and state machine, CPSU as a whole was committed to fight revisionism and defend Marxism-Leninism. But after Stalin's death revisionist policies are officially sponsored leading to the resort to capitalist incentives and ideas of personal profit. That is why the C.C. Draft says, in the final analysis, this paves the way for restoration of a new type of capitalism.

Externally, the same process of revisionism is leading the Soviet leadership to compromise with American imperialism in the name of peace. In reality it is surrender to imperialist blackmail; it is an attempt to purchase temporary peace by stifling revolutionary struggles; an attempt to freeze the status quo by appeasing imperialism.

This is the line of the revisionists in socialist society who betray their proletarian responsibilities and who want to have a protected existence at the expense of the world revolutionary movement. □