SUPPLEMENT TO

ment of the state of the state

Vol. XI No. 16 April 21, 1963

Mark Tild in



NEITHER REVISIONISM NOR DOGMATISM IS OUR GUIDE

REPLY TO THE CHINESE "MIRROR"

by S. A. DANGE Chairman, CPI

—Neither Revisionism—— Nor Dogmatism Is Our Guide

From Friendship To Hostility

PEOPLE'S DAILY, the central organ of the Communist Party of China carried an editorial on March 9, entitled, "A Mirror For Revisionists". We have reproduced it in the NEW AGE of March 31. That editorial is a virulent attack on the Communist Party of India, its policies and its leadership. And as it has been broadcast in several languages through the Peking Radio and the press, throughout the world, it has become neces sary for us to give a reply.

of the oppressed nations, even

though it was mainly led by

our people and our national

movement have had relations of fraternal solidarity and

friendship with the Chinese people's Revolution. The history

of our two countries has no

Party was born in 1925, out of

24, it was reared up in a na-

tional atmosphere which was of

friendship and solidarity with the Chinese Revolution; it had

not to contend with a hostile

national movement in order to

show its proletarian interna-tional solidarity with the Chi-

different with regard to the

state in the world then. It was

under constant fire from impe-

Communists openly stood in solidarity with this first citadel

ration. In this, we had no help

or sympathy from the Congress leadership. But neither had

we active hostility. We worked freely within the Congress

One may say that, that may be true for those days, but things surely changed after

India became independent and

the bourgeoisie came to power in India and a socialist regime

But these two states of two

different classes need not ne-

there were no compelling ob-

cessarily develop hostility; and

jective factors to necessitate

have been, here and there.

India and China which gave

the world the Five Principle

showed how two, states with

different social systems can

two countries became free, so-

India had not developed hosti-

lity. On the contrary, they signed the Panch Sheel treaty

. For years after the

China and bourgeois

and colla-

friendship

unist Party was

movement and organ

established in China.

Not Imperative

Hostility

Soviet Union, the only socialist

nese working class.

The position, however,

hostility, but only of

relation

the national bourgeo

Hence, when our

-friendship.

T is not easy for us nor are movement in those days accepwe in a happy position to enter into a controversy with the Communist Party of China. The Communist Party of

China is a great Party. Under its leadership, six hundred million people fought imperialism and feudalism, liberated their country and took steps towards socialism. No Communication would desire to have differences and conflicts with such a

mpared to their achievements, we, in India, are a small Party. We have no revolution to our credit. In fact, during of the struggle against British imperialism, our Party received, from time to time, helpful fraternal advice from the Chinese Party. Therefore, there is no question of our assuming high-brow airs or giving advice in political tones o the seasoned leadership of

Neither our national surroun dings nor our history are such that we as a Party should be influenced into positions of opposition or hostility to the Communist Party of China or to the Chinese people.

Solidarity With Chinese Revolution

Even the National Congress and its leadership, which guided the anti-imperialist struggle of the Indian people in the British period, 2nd relations of friendship and cooperation with the Chinese Revolution. It was the merit of Jawaharlal Nehru that, while the Congress leader ship would have preferred t in insular and confined to its national shell, he put the national movement in fraterna solidarity with the struggles of oppressed peoples and ries. That was why the Nais worth remembering that the Mission went to Yenan, the headquarters Man Tse-tung and the liberated areas and not to Chiang Kai-shek. When the Chinese Revolution was under imperialist fire, "Hands off China" movement was one of the platforms in our national

The National Congress had declared solidarity with the Spanish revolution and against

One cannot say, therefore, that India, because it is bour-geois, must clash with China because it is socialist. In fact, both being newly independent countries, had common anti-imperialist approach, had comon desire for peace and hence camp of the world against war

One may ask: Perhaps, the bsence of hostility and the treaty of friendship were due more to the attitude of socialist China than due to bourgeois India? Or perhaps, it was more due to some hypocritical tacti cal reasons on the part of the Indian bourgeoisie that it entered into such a treaty of riendshin? Or. perhaps, socialist China made some gene-rous concessions to India's bePeople's Daily in an article en-titled "The Revolution in Tibet and Nehru's Philosophy" had said the following:

"In international affairs, the Indian Government headed by Prime Minister Nehru, has been reflecting generally the will of the Indian people and playing an imp and praiseworthy role in opposing war and colonialisand safeguarding peace, carrying out a foreign policy of friendship with China, with the Soviet Union and with other socialist coun-tries, of not joining in military blocs of United imperialism. But for historical reasons. India's big boorattempting to maintain a certain legacy from British colonial rulers."

S. A. DANGE

nefit which persuaded the greedy bourgeoisie to be fri with the socialist state? e to be friends

These are futile questions By the 1954 treaty, India gave up all the privileges that it had inherited from British imperialism. Those who think that India wants to inherit all the "illegal" encroachments of British imperialism such as MacMahon Line, because of its alleged reactionary drive for expansion, might do well to omber that in the 1954 Tibet to be China's region. Indi gave up the extra-territorial rights she had in Tibet as sucor to British rule. India withdrew her army detach-ments form Tibet and handed over Indian postal and tele-graph installations and other buildings to China.

Later on, after the Tibetan bellion of the Dalai Lama. India-China differences came to the fore Though the Indian Government granted asylum to Dalai Lama and connived at some of his harmful political activities, nevertheless it refused to accept the demand of the reactionary parties in India to raise the question of Tibet in the UNO. And even now, after the events of October 1962 and the massive Chinese sion, those reactionaries who talk of liberation of Tibet do

not find many supporters here. This was made possible bee the Indian Governmen in spite of being bourgeois and containing many reactionary elements, was following policies which were not dictated by American or British imperial ists or their allies in India.

Did the Chinese leadership accept this fact? They did so before but now they do not.

Reply To The Chinese "Mirror"

So, in spite of the big bourgeois links with British imperialism, "the Indian Government headed by Prime Minis ter Nehru" was anti-imperialist, anti-war, in the camp and friendly with China and the socialist countries, etc.

These are the words of People's Daily, that is, of the lea-dership of the Communist Party of China, on May 6,

27 1962 cantioned: "More on Nehru's Philosophy in the Light of the Sino-Indian Boundary Question", they adopted a different position. In this, the same leadership of the Communist Party of China writes:

tion of independence, Indian ruling circles, headed by Nehru, inherited the nialist rulers and hence tried their best to preserve them; they have become increas brazen in carrying out pensionist policy."

A comparison of the two charge the confusion in which the Chinese ship is in regard to the understanding of the Indian situation. The two evaluations con tradict each other so crudely

In another article on October

"After China's proclama-

They do not seem to realise that if the Indian ruling cir-cles headed by Nehru had exangionist ambitions and w being guided by imperialist s and behests, they would not have given up the Tibetan bases, withdrawn, their army and signed a Treaty of Friendship in 1954. They would not have given up the heights and the plateau of Tibet in 1954, in order to start reclimb-

in 1954, hailed as the first of Writing on May 6, 1959, the ing them in 1959 and invite a its kind in the world.

People's Daily in an article en- war in the bargain in unfavourable terrain and condi-

At least this much credit and common sense should have been granted to the Indian big bourgeoisie, its leader Nebru and his imperialist advisers, in the analysis of the People's Daily. It seems the first Chinese light on Nehru's philoso-phy in May 1959 showed him as anti-imperialist and a friend of China. "More light" however, and "further inquiry in October 1962 showed him to

Has The Basic Policy Changed?

basic foreign policy of peace, non-alignment and antinon-alignment colonialism undergone a fundamental change or has the light and vision of the Chinese leadership undergone a change?

The question is a very serious one. It has confused our Party for a long time. How could one distrust the conclusions and facts of a Party like versed in the theory of Marxof history and has so success fully solved the problems of Over, some of the facts cited about Indian conditions which form the basis of their conclusions were true.

It is a fact that India at-

tained independence, but vesti-ges of imperialist capital re-mained. In ten years after independence, British capital doubled its volume and American capital has penetrated Indian economy at a very fast rate. The land problem has not been solved and the pea-sant is discontented. Industrial and agricultural production is in crisis and is n trated in a few hands. The socalled Five-Year Plans are meeting with serious difficul-ties inherent in the capitalist and more dependent on foreign aid, particularly American aid as expressed in strikes, etc., is suppressed by the Government with violence. The reactionary parties and groups which have grown stronger and are in league with the imperialists are trying to take the country into the American war camp and give up its non-alignment.

Taken by themselves, are these bare facts, as cited, on the whole wrong? They are not. So the conclusion the Chinese leadership draws in

"These fects prove that economically India has not freed itself from dependence on imperialism. What is dif-US imperialism is gradually taking over British imperial-

NEITHER REVISIONISM NOR DOGMATISM

Root Cause of

Hostility

S already stated, it has been a very baffling problem for our Party to find the real sources of the India-

China conflict and that too on the border issue. For a long

time, our Party could not determine its precise stand on the

border question. Not only were the maps baffling; the poli-

tics of the matter was even more baffling than the maps. We could not think that the experienced Marxist-Leninist lead-

ership of China could be so serious and dogmatic and go wrong on the border question. At the same time, we could not hold the opinion that the Nehru Government was itch-

Of course, we did not fail to Chinese maps on the other,

ing for expansion and war against China.

Hence

note that reactionaries in India,

and the imperialists, would like to embroil China and India

in a conflict and thus weaken

tionary forces, we called for a peaceful settlement through

regotiations. We did not com-

mit ourselves as to which map

or boundary line was ours or Chinese and on what line the

At the end of August 1959,

horder clash took place at

long letter was sent by Chou En-lai, Prime Minister of

China, to Nehru in reply to his letter of March 22—that is,

after a long interval of six

months. In this letter. China

called the MacMahon Line "a

recognise it and virtually made

demand that the territory of

90 000 square kilometres south

of the line is theirs. The letter

"Mr Prime Minister, how

under coercion such an ille-

gal line which would have it

grace itself by selling out its

territory—and such a large piece of territory at that?"

This letter, and the tension

following from the border clash

at Longju, were utilised by the

reactionaries to attack the

Party. But even genuine patrio-tic people also demanded as to what we had to say with re-

gard to this claim of China

Did we accept the MacMahon Line or not? Did we accept

that China was, committing

that the CEC of the Party mel

at Calcutta and adoped a reso-lution on September 25, 1959,

resolved through friendly

discussions and negotiation

without either side making prior acceptance of its own

The resolution had stated:

these differ

aggression or not?

which the ger

It was in such

Evolution Of

Our Stand

product of British policy

aggression". They refused

Longiu and tension mo in India. On September

while warning against

India." And further:

In a word, in their efforts to satisfy their own needs and meet the demands of US imperialism, the Indian ruling circles headed by Nehru have become pawns in the international anti-China campaign. This is the 700t cause and background of the Sino-Indian boundary dispute" (Italics-S.A.D.)

If the facts are as they are, which Marxist-Leninist will then differ with these conclu-

The Communist Party of India has not only differed with such conclusions drawn by the Chinese Party. It has serious differences with statement of the facts also. with the

Each fact by itself is correct but it is incomplete and as such, it gives an incorrect pic ture of the totality. To state facts incompletely, to study a phenomenon one-sidedly is surely not a Marxist-Leninist method Need we say that to the experienced Chinese leaders, who can teach us a lot on how to study "contradictions in all their aspects?

Has foreign capital doubled creased? It has. But something. nore also has happened to Indian economy, namely-

Side by side with Anglo-American or imperialist capital, India has accepted ans and aid from the So ist countries as well. The aid from Socialist countries gone in to build such vital and in India of India on imperialist aid has been reduced. India's inde-pendence has become stronger, though it does not mean that the presence of Anglo-American capital is not a threat to

The relative strength and b volume of Indian capital, taken together with capital socialist countries. grown more than American anital as such. In a newlyreted non-aligned country, this fact has profound signific-

Along with the private C sector of capital, there has grown a state sector of capital in India. This sector is state-capitalist by its nature. But in a backward economy; it can play a progressive role

ndian economy are absent Chinese nicture. from the They mention the state sector mdemn it as mere reaucratic monopoly reaucratic monopoly the service of monopoly groups. The new technical base of Indian industry, which Imperialism dislikes, and the new working class and intelli-gentsia, which reaction fears, ire nowhere in the Chinese

Land problem is not solved and the peasant is discontent-ed. But feudalism does not remain intact. It has been curb-ed to a large extent, though not eradicated. A greater push to land reforms is necessary

strength despite the rise and growth of right reaction. The

APRIL 21, 1963

growin of right reaction. The modern revisionists come in establishment of the Kerala the way.

Government was a pointer. In this task, the Chinese leaGovernment does suppress dership wished the Indian the strike struggles. But work-

ers and secure successes and realise their demands. Even during the Emergency and the regime of the Defence of India Rules, Wage Boards have declared wage increases and recalcitrant employers had to

"The dictatorship of the big ourgeoisie and landlords" has not given up its parliamentary form and bourgeois democratic content with elections on the basis of adult franchise. These facts, too, are absent from the

Chinese picture. Besides, in India, the Communist Party exists and func-tions along with other democratic forces and is the first Opposition Party to the ruling Congress Party. The foreign policy of the

peace, non-alignment and anti-colonialism. At the same time, it is true that it vacillates and weakens before reactionary

On December 7, 1961, the Chinese leadership wrote that "the foreign policy of the Indian ruling clique in recent years has received increasingly open approval and pra m Washington." Just then, on December 18, the Indian army marched into Goa and liberated it from four hundred years of Portuguese rule.
Washington and London were furious with Nehru and wanted the UNO to intervene but the Soviet Union's veto stopped them. There is not a word

Important Ingredients Missed

Such, in brief, should be a tatement of facts of the Indian situation. But if one were to read the Chinese version, one would miss these most import-ant ingredients of the Indian situation. Having missed or purposely ignored some of the ortant ingredients and seeing only those that they like to see through their pre-con-ceived notions, the Chinese leadership could not but come to the conclusion, as mentio ed above, regarding the root cause of the India-China conflict.

It is obvious the root cause is not what they state. we do not absolve the Indian reactionaries and imperialists of their responsibility in pushing India to a crisis, the root e of the India-China clash is that the Chines These three most vital facts itself has changed its approach of the industrial growth of to the basic problems that conepoch and the manner of solv-

capital in thinks that India is already a monopoly base of the American imperialists, that Nehru is a "tool of the American dollar", that anti-China campaign in India grows in direct proportion to the amount of US aid", that the Indian masses are all the Indian masses are all yearning and ready to overthrow the Government, So an armed conflict with such a Government is necessary and inevitable both in the interests of the Indian people and Chinese people, because only through armed conflict, anywhere The struggle to combat con-centration of wealth and pro-tect the rights and liberties of lackeys can be fought enemy of mankind—and their lackeys can be fought and the people has been gathering voverthrown. World revolution modern revisionists come in

advance on the NEFA border, by an attack from within the country and thus hold the Nehru Government in a sort of they pincer movement. This they have indicated in their statement of October 27, 1962.

lispute thus would appear to be, not the maps nor past his-tory—but political and ideolo-gical attitudes. Hence their least desire to settle it.

Such is the real origin and course of the India-China conflict, the journey from friendship to hostility, from deadlock to the near-war offensive of October-November 1962. That is why the MacMahon Line, which was acceptable to the Chinese lea-dership on the Burmese side, is unacceptable to them on the product of one and the same imperialist aggression".

the pre-condition of com-

ing negotiations."

On the question of aggression, the resolution had said:

"The CEC takes this on-

portunity to reiterate emphatically that our Party

stands with the rest of the

people for the territorial in-tegrity of India and it shall

be second to none in saie-guarding it. But the Com-mittee is confident that So-

cialist China can never com-

mit aggression against India,

just as our country has no

This part of the resolution

raised some crucial questions

It was attacked as using dou-ble standards. Socialist China,

by the very fact of its socialist

system, cannot commit aggres-sion. But India, under the ca-

pitalist system, as at present led by the Congress leadership and Nehru has no intention to

commit aggression. In China's case, it is ruled out by the

capitalism. Only the policies of

non-alignment and peaceful co-existence accepted by India,

tem, rule out the intention.

rally, we were misunderstood

further facilitated by an article

in the (Monthly) New Age, which virtually admitted the correctness of the Chinese

claims and it had to be contra dicted by a statement of the Central Office of the Party.

Under such conditions of ension and conflict, the Cen-

a delegation with the Calcutta resolution to meet the Chinese

leadership at the time of the

On the MacMahon Line, the

Party was coming to the con-clusion that the Chinese were

India's boundary. But we did not want to make a statement

cussed the matter with the broother Party and first apprised

not right in not accepting it

tral Executive Committee

basic laws of socialism. in India's case, it is not ruled out by the basic laws of its

gression against China.

intention of committing ag-

and to none in safe-

the Tibetan uprising, though we did not ignore the role of Indian reaction, yet we did not agree with the Chinese version of India's role in it and their statement that it was "instigat ed by Nehru"

Was it wise on our part to stick to formalities and norms of inter-Party relations and refuse to take positions in public which we considered to be sition to the positions of a brother Party?

Contempt Of Indian Leadership

It is not that we had not told the Chinese Party about our views before sending this dele-gation. But the Chinese com-rades had treated our leadership with contempt. General Secretary Ajoy Ghosh had written to them several times. On May 3 and 5, 1959, he wrote to them two long letters on the Tibetan events, in which, while blaming the Indian reactionaries for the anti-China cam-paign and some of Nehru's statements on Tibet, we asked the Chinese leaders to correct some of their statements which we thought were wrong.

All that we received in answer to these two long letters was a short and curt reply. "It was certainly not the kind of reply that we expected from a fraternal Party concerning is-sues which vitally concerned our movement and the friendship between countries in a critical situ which demanded mutual understanding." (From the Me-National Council at its meeting

Again, on August 20, 1959, a letter was sent to the Coma letter was sent to the Com-munist Party of China which

thering strength is a campolicy, against India-China friendship, and also against the Communist Party of India Continuation and accentuation of the present differences would gravely differences differences would gravely endanger India's foreign policy, help the Right-wing to take India towards America and would also help the drive against the Communist Party

Appeal To Negotiate

even under the capitalist sys-Again, on September 13, 959, following certain border Such theoretical niceties, va-lid for Marxist-Leninist underincidents, a letter was sent, which said: sanding, were beyond the reach of the common people. Natu-

in "I would earnestly request you that some steps be taken for negotiations and exchange of views between the Chinese People's Republic and the Government of India. Any delay would assist the very forces that seek to create hostility against China and pull India towards the Anglo-American camp. Such a de-velopment would do grievous damage to the cause of peace and Afro-Asian solidarity.... Further, it would facilitate Right-wing offensive against progressives in the Congress, against democracy and against our Party under the signboard of 'national secu-rity' and 'national interests'." Despite this, the Central

Executive would not take a stand on the MacMahon Line differing from that of the Chinese, and on the question of ecion until our delegation Similarly, on the question of vince them about the harm

claims, viz., the MacMahon Line in one case and the

NEW AGE SUPPLEMENT

APRIL 21, 1963

NEW AGE SUPPLEMENT

tion of September 25, 1959, we declared that a Socialist country cannot commit aggression, that both China and India do not want war against each other, but want to live in

When we spoke of "defending the integrity of the country against any aggression", people would ask, whose aggression we had in mind. When we talked of defence, none of us was prepared to say openly, for a long time, that it had reference to the India-China border conflict and that aggression had reference to the Chinese actions and claims. Thousands of Party members felt that China was not behaving properly to-wards a country like India. But very few were prepared to name her openly as an aggres-

Our failure to take a stand on the MacMahon Line as the border of India and on the question of aggression prejudi-ced our position as a patriotic party in the eyes of the Indian people. Not only we suffered reverses as a Party, even th general democratic movem and India-China friendship suffered a serious setba

Even then, neither the Tibetan events nor the border question dominated the minds of the people. The dominant people in 1959 was one of distisfaction with the internal policies of the Government, its. hostile attitude to the workers novement, to the problems of the people and its protection of vested interests. Opposition to the Congress rule was more in the minds of the politically conscious people than the events of Tibet or the border, as was seen in the strike of the Government employees. People generally supported the Government in its foreign policy of peace and non-align-ment, while opposing it in its internal policies in relation to the toiling masses.

But the incident of the

shooting of Indian soldiers in the Ladakh area (Octob 1959) shook the country. Perple's indignation rose to a new height. Ajoy Ghosh, General Secretary of the Party, had to issue a statement on October 24, 1959, expressing deep rentment at the tragic incident It was no longer possible to

The Communist Party India was bearing a great l den. To come in conflict with the Communist Party of China was not an easy thing. Some of us had not even the confider that we were right either in the appraisal of facts or in the theoretical approach to the

Marxist-Leninist Party in such a border conflict between two countries, one of which is socialist and another a bourgeois democracy, both belonging to the common camp of peace and anti-colonialism? India, under the bourgeois rule, could go wrong, but could China under Communist leadership

the relations between two peoand two friendly counruling Communist Party put on a border or a territorial prob-lem when faced with the ques-

that their stand was causing, tion of losing or retaining China issue but on serious President Eisenhower We were trying to observe friendship of a newly-liberated issues affecting the whole Com- those days—on the eve country, trying to overcome the vestiges of its former colonial

> ed us. But we did not formulate them or put them for discussion before the Pary ranks. We hoped, perhaps, with a cer-tain amount of fatalism, that the wisdom of the Chinese leadership would solve the problem. But it did not.

Why This Retrospection

Why are we relating all this

in retrospect?
In order, first, to recall how things developed and in what contradictions and impermissible positions the Chinese leadership had landed itself and our Party and our two great countries.

some people that the Commu-nist Party of India never broke the inter-Party norms of beha-viour, about which the Chinese leadership are making so much hullabaloo in the international Communist movement and their controversies with it

Thirdly, we want to show that it is not only the present leadership or the "clique" as they call it, that has totally disagreed with the Chinese arguments and positions but that long ago, under the leadership of Ajoy Ghosh and the National Council of that period, our Party had come to conclusion. sions which were totally at variance with those of the Chi-

nese Party.
And fourthly, before his death in January 1962, Com-rade Ajoy Ghosh had to issue a sharp statement openly con-tradicting the Chinese view for which he got from them the compliment of "trailing behind Nehru". (December 7, 1981)

It was long after these events still more vehemently because more dispetrous things had happened not only on India-

ful settlement.

ment on the incident on September 9, 1959. This was the

first time that any socialist

country or a Communist Party had openly indicated its

regret at the dispute.
The Chinese Party reacted

violently against the state-

ment. They took it as an open condemnation of China, which

it was not. They said that in

III

Fundamental

Difference with World

Communist Movement

The India-China border conflict had attracted the

attention of all sections of world opinion. The friend-ship treaty of 1954 had displeased the imperialists

abroad and reactionaries at home in India The differ-

ences on the border and the clashes of 1959 now pleas-

ed the imperialists abroad and reactionaries at home in

India. The Communist Parties of the world and the

socialist countries, on the contrary, were pleased with

the 1954 treaty and they all regretted the clash of 1959. But no Communist Party or socialist country except

of course, the Chinese, had said anything openly about

the border conflict. Everyone of them desired a peace-

H OWEVER, after the clash in Longiu area and the viet Union and the Soviet tension following from it, the Government had "aided with news agency of the Soviet bourgeois Nehru against Socia-Union, TASS, issued a state-list China". They said that

issuing the statement, the American imperialism and

issues affecting the whole Com-munist world and the world of

vestiges of its former colonial democracy and peace.

Slavery?

Such and many other very fundamental questions botherclash with the majority of the clash with the majority of the clash with Enrice of the world unist Parties of the world and the common understanding that bound them all: The India cident in the world controversy. From a local affair, it has been lifted into a question affecting the whole world Communist movement and the Chinese way of thinking and action in world

politics. The root cause of the disaster that took place in October-November, 1962 on the India-China border lies basically in the wrong understanding of the Chinese leadership in relation to the present epoch and the problems of war, peace and anti-imperialism, the problems of peaceful coexistence, national liberation and class struggle Secondly, we want to remind the problem and the role of ome people that the Communewell liberated countries, their revolutionary struggles and forms of transition to socialism, the problems of modern revism and dogmatism. On all these questions, which vitally affect every country and every Party, the Chinese leadership has clashed with the majority of the Parties in the world and the common understanding una-nimously arrived at in the 81-Parties Moscow Statement of

1960. Hence, it is no longer the question as to how the Chinese leadership evaluates the class relations and the politicaleconomic situation in India alone. It is now a question how they look at the whole world situation. The India-China issue has become a part of the ideological issue now being argued ment

And the proment is no long er conducted within the private precincts of the Communist Parties. It is in the full view of the whole world, including "the enemy, who rejoices in it"
When, why and how did this

> confidence is expressed," the TASS statement said, "that the Government of the People's Republic of China and the Government of the Republic of India will not allow the incident to fur-ther the aims of those cirtional situation not to im-prove but to worsen. The pressed the connuence was both Governments will settle mutual interests in the spirit of traditional friendship na and India This will also

Charge Against

They said: 'Making no distinction between right and wrong. the statement expressed 'regret' over the border clash and in reality condemned China's correct stand. They even said that it was 'tragic' and 'deplorable'. Here is the first instance in history in which a socialist country, instead of condemning the instead of condemning the . It was just in this period armed provocations of the that the famous "Honqui" ar-

those days-on the eve of the

Thus the CPSU had abandoned proletarian internationalism and deserted so-cialist China, in favour of American imperialism and capitalist India. The CPSU and Khrushchov had fallen in the mire of revisionism

ment which has figured so prominently in this controversy, say? It said:

"It is a noteworthy fact that this incident has been caught up by those circles in Western countries, in the United States especially who are seeking to prevent a relaxation of international tension and aggravate the situation on the eve of exchange of visits between the Chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers, N. S. Khrushchov, and the Presi-D. Eisenhower, By such methods they hope to paralyse the growing desire in Wes ern countries for an under-standing with the socialist States on questions connected with the ending of the

"One cannot but regret the fact that an incident has taken place on the Chinese-Indian border. The Soviet Tinion maintains friendly relations with both the People's Republic China and the Republic of India.

"The Chinese and Soviet peoples are bound by un-breakable ties of fraternal friendship, based on the great principles of proletarian internationalism Friendly cooperation between USSR and India is developing successfully in conformity with the ideas of peaceful co-existence.

"The attempt to utilise the incident that has occurred on the Chinese-Indian border for the purpose of fan-ning the cold war and undermining friendship bet-ween nations should be vigorously condemned." 'In Soviet leading circles

cles who want the internaleading Soviet circles ex-pressed the confidence that misunderstanding taking into account their between the peoples of Chihelp to strengthen the for-ces standing for peace and international cooperation."

Soviet Party

What have the Chinese leadership to object to such a statement?

reactionaries of a capitalist country, condemned another fraternal socialist country such armed provocation. ("Whence the Differences" etc., Peoples Daily editorial 27 Feb. 1963. FLP, Peking.

pp. 11-12). One can easily see the way the Chinese read even the well-meaning statements. Writing in another place, they say:

"Throughout the Sino-Indian boundary dispute, these people (ie. the CPSU and others) have falled to distinguish right from wrong, have pretended to be China 'brother' in words. while actually regarding the Indian reactionary group as their kinsmen. Should not se people examine their conscience and ask themselves what has become of what has become of their proletarian internationalism?" ("Workers of All Countries Unite etc." P.D. Editorial; 15.12.63. FLP Peking. p. 11).

Thus the Chinese leadership condemned the Soviet Union even for expressing regret over the clash and firing and called it desertion of pro-letarian internationalism. Is it any wonder if it has hurled worse epithets at us when we as a Party of the country directly involved in the clash, disagreed with them, refused to support their invasion and decided to stand in defence of the country?

Sole Support:

Not one among the world's Communist Parties, except that of Albania, supported the Chinese leadership, in these fantastic and slanderous

It should be noted, for the sake of understanding the approach of the Chinese lea-dership to the India-China border problem, that they not only had differences with "bourgeois Nehru" and the Communist Party of India on this question, they had at the same time, developed sharp and fundamental difference with the world Communist movement on all the most important propositions of Marx-ism-Leninism in their application to the present epoch.

It should be remembered that in these controversies, the Chinese leadership was supported by only the Albanians who went to the length of accusing the CPSU and its leadership of "prettifying" or "embellishing" imperialism, of trying to please American im-perialism in the period between 1959 and 1960. In fact, the reply of Chou

En-lai of September 8, 1959, making for the first time the astounding claims to the NEFA area south of the Mac-Mahon Line, the Longju clash and the TASS stat September 9, and the Ladakh firing—all came in a period when the Chinese leadership when the Chinese leadership had decided to break away from all those profound understandings which had been given to the world Communist movement by the 20th Congress of the CPSU of 1956 and the Moscow Declaration of 1957. APRIL 21: 1963

NEITHER REVISIONISM NOR DOGMATISM

ticles, titled "Long Live Lenin- ing it and invading the NEFA we must examine the class nearby and easy to attack— On the India-China border, ism" appeared. It was just in area.

On the India-China border, so the Chinese leadership had it was allayed by the Nehruselise and big landlords, retaken upon itself the role of the class and in fact, and the class area. ism" appeared. It was just in area. big Communist Parties in the world, including ours, were attacked on totally false pretexts, in the Peking meetin of the World Federation, of Trade Unions, as being revi-sionist, of tailing behind the national bourgeoisle or the imperialists and of repudiating the fundamental principles of Marxism-Leninism.

Attitude On

MacMahon Line

In fact, in 1954, at the time

of the signing of the Panch Sheel Treaty, when the ques-

Chon En-lai, whether there

left over in view of the Treaty

and the Indian withdrawal from Tibet, Chou En-lai let

the impression be conveyed that there was almost none, and though the MacMahon

Tine was not recognised by

relations, there would not be

any difficulty about it.

Also, the Chinese leadership

had solemnly promised our

delegation to Peking in Octo-

It is not as if Nehru had not raised it or that the

Chinese had no approach

concerning it. The 1954 approach was of settlement, the

no settlement or "concessions". When asked why they had not

taken up this question in 1954, when outstanding issues like that of Tibet and Panch Sheel

were being satiled and India had rightly withdrawn from Tibet, the Chinese reply was

that "the time was not ripe

Hence, it appears that when

in 1959, the ideological back-ground had changed, the time had become ripe to put their

new theses to test on the In-dia-China border issue.

One may say, was it not that the Tibetan events and

the interference of the Indian

not helped-by the Indian Go-

vernment and Nehru also,

were the real cause of the

break up of the 1954 friend-

ship and of the subsequent

In the first place, the India Government's attitude to the

Tibetan events, though wrong

ideologically and politically, had not led to any act of

crossing the boundaries nor had it in any way prevented

the Chinese from dealing with

the Dalai Lama's rebellion

effectively and in a short time.

dership says, the India Gov-ernment's attitude before 1954

had also not been helpful and friendly. In fact, they say that

the Indian Government, tak-

ing advantage of China's pre-occupations in 1950 in Korea and elsewhere had forcibly

occupied more than 90,000

square kilometres of China's

erritory" and subsequently

crossed the MacMahon Line

If that was so, then how is

Friendship Treaty with India,

which had already committed

this "aggression" and brushed aside the discussion of the

MacMahan Line which Nehru

square kilometre aggression of India" prevent the Treaty

And why should a petty Tibetan rebellion or a small

hand of Indian soldiers in

Why did not the "90,000"

at several points.

wanted to raise?

of 1954?

Secondly, as the Chinese lea-

for it."

clashes?

That is not so.

one of 1959 was of a fight and

ber 1959 that they would n cross the MacMahon Line.

na, in view of the friend

were any territorial que

It almost appears that the attitude and actions of the Chinese leadership on the India-China border in 1959 and 1960 were more a rehearsal and test of their Marxism-Leninism and their under standing of "peaceful co-existence", of their new attitude to newly liberated, nonaligned democratic countries of the Peace Zone and their role vis-a-vis imperialism.

Hence they levelled the following attack on the CPSU:

"After the Camp David talks the heads of certain comrades were turned and they became more and more intemperate in their public attacks on the foreign and domestic policies of the mmunist Party. They publicly abused the Chinese Communist Party as attempting to 'test by force' the stability of the capitalist system, and as 'craving for war like a cock for a fight'. They also attacked the Chinese Communist Party for its general line of socia list construction, its big leap forward and its people's communes and they spread the slander that the Chinese the stander that the clinics the standard was carrying out an 'adventurist' policy in its direction of the State." ("Whence the Differences etc.", p. 12).

The 1959-60 clashes on the India-China border and skir-mishes with the international Communist movement were based on this mood and approach as seen in this extract, which had no basis or any truth.

It was under these condi tions that the 81-Parties met, threshed out the differences was issued as a manifesto of the world working class and the world Communist movement in December, 1960.

We are not going into the controversial propositions that were argued and settled at the Conference nor are we reviewing at this place the results of the Conference, Here we are only drawing attention to the ideological background of the India-China conflict the thinking that dominated the minds of the Chinese comrades and formed the backand clashes.

We are not here arguing as to which map was right and whose claims were correct or incorrect. Our purpose at the present stage of the argument is to find out the ideological-political background of the events as they took place.

Because, territorially the position is that the Chinese are strongly and securely in Ladakh where they have their arterial road to Sinklang. There were neither Indian people nor Chinese people but ocks and mountains. In the 1963? Eastern area, the Indian side is south of the MacMahon Line and the Chinese in 1959 had Indian boundary question, no avowed intention of cross-says: "To understand this,

Ridge and Longiu have broken the friendship and prevented

1963?
The Chinese leadership, in order to explain the Sino-houndary question,

resented by Nehru..." etc.

In pursuance of this very approach, to understand the Chinese actions, we have to examine and understand their class approach and ideological tion was raised by Nehru with dealing with the big bourgeoisie and landlords and the imperialists, "with whom they are closely connected".

And when we do that, we find that the Chinese ideological approach and concrete behaviour of the period 1954-57 in dealing with questions of imperialism, war, peace, co-existence, etc. have undergone a change. They have come to the approach of "head-on-clash" at all costs and anywhere—but at whose cost and where, is to be shrew-dly determined by them.

In 1959, they developed differences on all import-ant ideological questions and also in their con-crete application, with the world Communist movement. They attacked Khrushchov's efforts to meet Eisenhower and the Camp David talks to lessen world tension, as sur-rendering to American impe-rialist blackmail. And in similar vein, they rejected our suggestion that Chou En-lai should meet Nehru to settle the border question. But they had no objection, it appears, to meeting Montgomery in

Peking.

Were not the changes in ideological approaches mainly responsible for the peculiar and unhelpful behaviour of the Chinese leadership in relation to India-China border question? Facts do point that

China's Responsibility

This does not mean that the Indian side had not made mistakes or may not have given some cause for provocations or that we give them a clean bill. But it does mean that Socialist China and its leadership, guided by Mark-ism-Leninism, could have and should have settled the issue on the basis of the Leninist principle of treating all such horder questions

It did not do so mainly because of the change in their strategical and tactical concepts about the "world revo-lution", as they put it, and their differences with the world Communist movement. and particularly with the So-viet Union and the CPSU, the acknowledged vanguard of the movement. They wrote and they acted on the international arena in opposition to their line because "For a long time, these

comrades have eagerly pronagated erroneous and attacked the Chinese Communist Party, banishing the Moscow Declaration of 1957 from their minds. They within the international Communist movement and ger of losing their bearings in the struggle against imperialism.

("Whence the Differences

subsided and the official teams on either side started We are trying to understand the problem in this way be-cause, if we, as Marxists, do not look at it this way, we will have to look at the Chinese of maps, delineation, markleadership as being guided by mere consideration of terriings, positions, etc. The teams made their report and things tory and ancient history, maps and boundaries and sacrificing stopped there. There was fur-ther stalling, until the big exthe friendship of a thousan million Asian people, at the altar of the legacies of Genattention to the changes in ghiz Khan-type ambitions. That obviously is wrong. If the Chinese policy on the In-dia-China dispute by refer-That obviously is wrong. If that were so, then the 1954 Treaty of Friendship and the ring to the ideological posi-tions they had begun to adopt. speeches and formulations of those days would sound inexplicable.

War or no war, friendship or no friendship, territorial claim on every inch or no claim, compromise and concessions or no compromise and no concessions, offensive or stay put where you are-all these questions are questions of class politics and ideology, and

ought to be so particularly with a Socialist State. They had one idea about India and relations with it in November 1949 when the famous exchange of greetings took place between our Party and the Chinese Party. They had a different idea about it in 1954, when Chou En-lai spoke in Delhi. They again changed it in 1959-60, despite the 1957 Moscow Declaration. There is a consistent at-

tempt on the part of the Chinese leadership to do things in terms of their Marxist-Leninist understanding. Whether that understanding is right or wrong in some s, is another matter.

Hence, all Marxist-Leninist Parties in the world, today argue about the India-China border problem in terms of Marxism-Leninism and not in terms of claims, maps and history. We also should do the

since

other ways.

present and future history.

biggest Parties differ or one pits itself against the others

who is the arbiter? Quite ob-viously, a world conference of the Communist and Workers

showed the spirit of realism and unity. Collapse Of ame. Some people in India and 1960 Agreement

elsewhere have been busy in digging up maps, military Within a few months, however, this spirit again under-went a change. The Moscow Declaration remained the history of the past, encroachments of British military ex-peditions, the Treaties, etc. History is being dug up right guiding line in the quotations since the dynasties of the Mahabharat or the Manchus and statements of the Chinese leadership. But their interpretations, emphasis and their own deductions brought them back to the old pre-Conof old and recent days, to help the claims of one or the other side or to prove the "justness" of one or the other. ference positions on all vital We will not deal with that aspect here, simply because, as we said above, neither the origin nor the solution lie very much in these studies though they are useful in

In this, the Albanian Party became the spearhead of the new schism and the Chinese Party lent its support and soon came out in the open with the same approach and But if past history and maps conflict with Marxism-Leninism and the needs of statement. The Agreement of 1960 collapsed in reality, though it retained its forma

joint work on sifting the fac-tual material on the question

plosion of October 1962.

Once again we have to draw

The agreement of the World

nmunist Parties in the

was a great achievement. All

world now had a document, a product of collective thought

and unanimous agreement.

It is suggested by some peo-

ple that the World Conference

and the Declaration had, in fact, confirmed and adopted

the criticisms made by the Chinese leadership and the

line proposed by them. In

view of the unanimity at the

Conference, such a question need not have been raised. But

since it is raised it is neces-

of the document will show

that those main propositions which the Chinese had put forward in their Honqui arti-

cles on "Long Live Leninism"

In fact, the position of the

world Parties at the Con-ference was found to be such

that the Chinese criticism

and propositions had no chance of winning any sup-

port and hence a unanimous doccment became possible as

the Chinese leadership also

were not accepted by the Cor

the C

ference

validity.

It was under such conditions that the world-shaking crisis in the Caribbean arose which of these, indeed should have the decisiv decisive claim on our understand-ing and approach? Obviously, Marxism-Leninism. It is so And it was in the same Octowith the Chinese leadership ber-November, almost to the same day, that the new exaccording to their own light.

It should be so with the Inplosion on the India-China border and the massive Chidian leadership and the world Communist leadership. When nese invasion took place. the understanding of the two

As both these events have world significance and are politically and ideologically linked, we will see how the Caribbean events developed and what they meant to the etc", p. 12).

That makes it clear as daylight. According to the Chiness leadership, the world's

Communist Parties have gone
wrong and described the fight against imperialism and their
tools like Nehru—who was

NEW AGE SUPPLEMENT

NEW AGE SUPPLEMENT

Soviet Union and the CPSU of doing this in order to please

list China". They said that the CPSU had violated the

principle of proletarian inter-

nationalism in issuing that

statement and the stand that

ing to them, the Soviet Union should have supported China

Above all, they charged the

they had taken in it. Accord-

unequivocally.

APRIL 21, 1963

accused the Soviet Union, the CPSU and Khrushchov of a "second Munich" over Cuba, of having surrendered to the ckmail of American impe-"scared of being rialism. stiff" and being "cowardly as mice" when faced with war by American aggressor this being the inevitable result of revisionism and de tion of Marxism-Leninism.

We, in India, who opposed the adventurist line Chinese leadership on the India-China dispute and the in-October-November vasion of and adpoted the November 1 resolution on National De-fence and National Unity re-

of course, has not the same

world war and thermo-nucclear destruction, a threat to mankind. Here, it was only a question of a small war, which perhaps may have led to a big There it was a question of a

great and might Communist Party, the leader of the Great builder of the first Cor nist State in the world. We certainly do not put ourselves in comparison with them.

not miss the comparisons, because otherwise we will not be able to understand the fence and National Unity received the same accusations, the same abuses and epithets.

Our attitude and resolution of friendship once again between the two countries.

Political Outlook **Behind China's Massive Offensive**

HE Caribbean events are well-known and do not need detailed presentation. The US imperialists do not want the existence of a revolutionary socialist Cuba on the continent of America and right under their nose. It stands there as an infectious example to the Latin American countries. American imperialism which has been going round the world suppressing democratic revolutions considers it a defeat that Cuba exists on the American continent itself, a tiny country that overthrew the dictatorship of American finance, nationalised American plantations, banks and factories which exploited her so long, carried out agrarian refrom and has taken steps to lay the foundations of socialism

The Cuban revolution was Cuba, had lent her med hailed by all the world's range missiles and other arms democratic forces and was for defence. The Americans promised help and protection by the Soviet Union and other countries. Fidel Castro said:

"We know that without the Soviet Union, without the socialist camp, without assistance they render us, the victory of the revolution in such a small co try as Cuba would have been impossible in view of imperialist aggression."

that, too, of the Soviet Union, Counter-revolutionary landright under their belly, so to lords and financiers had tried to overthrow with American aid the Government of Fidel Castro in April 1961 but they failed. Opportunist fascist nigre bands could not stand Union, considered it a defeat before the revolutionary army be in Cuba, for the defence of of Cuba. So, now the American imperialists decided to invade Cuba with all their forces

At the beginning of September 1962, the American Government once again began moves to surround and invade Cuba under the plea that Cuba was getting arms from the Soviet Union to invade America, that Cuba had become a war base of the Soviet Union on the American continent, which meant shattering the age-old Monroe Doctrine of American imperialism.

The Americans knew that the Soviet Union would come to the aid of Cuba and that meant risking a world war. But the "mad men", the adventurists and militarists, went ahead, despite warnings from the Soviet Union.

The Soviet Union, in accordance with the treaty with swift pace. The US command

India and the democratic importance or significance as rallied for action all its armthe decisions of the Soviet of ores, including troops
the Chinese Party openly
There it was a question of the 6th Fleet, in the Mediterranean Sea, and the 7th Fleet, based in the Taiwan area. Several airborne, in-fantry and armoured divisions, adding up to nearly 100,0000 servicemen, were singled out for an attack on

Cuba alone.

Besides, 183 warships, with 85,000 sailors on board, were advanced toward the shores of Cuba. The landing on Cuba was to be covered by several thousand aircrafts. carrying atomic and hydrogen bomi stayed up in the air on round-But one must not and canthe-clock patrol. Reservists

objected particularly to the stationing of the missiles be-

cause in their presence the

naval base which was in Cubs

itself, could be successfully fought back, though the mis-

siles were not capable of an

offensive range of invading

But it is a fact that once

ot least the TIS imperialists

had the taste of having mis-

speak. The imperialists who

paraded their missiles in Tur-

key, Japan and the numerous

bases girdling the Soviet

Throughout September and

October, the American impe-

rialists made preparations as if for a World War. On Sep-

tember 7, the USA called Re-servists for active duty be-

causes of "Cuba and other

international tensions." On

October 5, the American naval

moves started. On October 18, Soviet Union's Gromyko met

Kennedy to protest. On Octo-ber 22, the naval blackade of

Cuha hegan On October 23

to discuss the aggressive steps

the UN Security Council met

The events developed at a

viet missiles should

siles of another power.

the Cuban revolution.

War Drums

Beat

of USA.

attack from the American

these aggressive steps by the US Government. "In the face of such intensified war preparations we, on our part, were forced to carry out appropriate measures. The Soviet Gov-ernment instructed the USSR Defence Minister to ready the entire army the Soviet Union for action, and first of all, the Soviet intercontinental and strategic missile troops, surface-to-air missile and anti-air-

> aviation, and naval forces. "Our submarine fleet, including atomic submarines took up positions as instructed. Increased military preparedness was announc for the land troops and the discharge from the So viet army of senior-age men of the strategic missile troops, anti-aircraft defence troops and submarine fleet was held up. The armed forces of the Warsaw Treaty countries were also readled

craft defence of the country

fighter aviation of the anti-

ircraft defence. strategie

were called up.

The troops of the NATO allies of the US in Europe were

also readied for action. A joint Command of the US and Latin American countries was

set up. Some of the latter countries sent their warships

to take part in the blockade

thermonuclear war hovered over the world as a result of

of Cuba. The danger of

for action. "In these conditions, if one or the other side did not show restraint did not do prevent the development of war, an explosion would have followed with irreparable consequences."

(N.S. Khruchov's Report to the Supreme Soviet, Decemher 12. 1962)

While warning the US Government not to play with fire and the fate of the world, the Soviet Government appealed to all the peoples to block the road of the aggressors. It simultaneously took steps in the United Nations.

However, the US Government's militarist forces were poised for attack on October 27, according to information given by the Cuban Government's militarist forces ment and other sources:

"Immediate action was necessary to prevent the attack on Cuba and to preserve peace. A message was sent to the President of the United States, suggesting a mutually acceptable solution. It was still not too late at that moment to extinguish the wick of war which had already begun to

"When forwarding this meassage, we took into ac-

message also expressed alarm and a desire to find a way out of the situation which had taken shape. We declared that if the United States pledged not to invade Cuba, and would also hold other ally-States back from aggression against Cuba nen the Soviet Union would be ready to remove from Cuba those weapons which the United States call 'offensive."

"In reply, the President of the US, on his part, de- ed by every Socialical clared, that if the Soviet and Communist Pa Government agreed to remove those weapons from Cuba, then the US Government would lift the qua-rantine, i.e. the blockade, and give assurances that both the United States and other countries of the hemisphere would not invade Cuba. The President declared quite definitely, and the entire world knows this, that the United States would not attack Cuba and would also hold its allies back from any similar action.

"But we had shipped our weapons to Cuba precisely to prevent an attack on her That was why the Soviet Government confirmed its readiness to withdraw ballistic missiles from Cuba.

"Thus, briefly speaking, a mutually acceptable decision was reached, which meant a victory for reason and success for the cause of neace...

"On October 29, negotiations began in New York between representatives of the USSR, the United States, and Cuba with the participation of U Thant."

Conciliation And Peace

Meanwhile, both sides got down to fulfilling the commitments they had assumed The Soviet Union withdrew all the rockets from Cuba. On its part, on November 20, the US Government lifted the naval blockade of Cuba and recalled its warships from the area. They also recalled the troops and aircraft from the area of Florida, demobilised the callup reservists. Simultaneously, the President reaffirmed the US pledge that Cuba would not be invaded. On November 21, the Chinese ceased fire on the India-China border.

What is the net outcome of all these developments?

The US imperialists wanted to liquidate the Cuban revolution and, if necessary, risk a World War for it. But they remains and goes forward than before. World war and the massacre of millions thermonnclear weapons is

Anyone believing in the preservation of free Cuba and world peace should rejoice in this result. The imperialists curbed despite the fact that the ag-gressive nature of imperialm had not changed.

What was the reaction of the Chinese leadership to this forces, victory of the peace forces, because it has direct bearing of the socialist camp led by on the India-China dispute. the Soviet Union of the Cuban revolution? They nounced it as a "second Mu- India-China border dispute also nich" and surrender to Ame-flared up and assumed serious rican imperialist' nuclear near-war proportions in this

count that the President's blackmail. How was it a surrender, if Cuba remains free. is not invaded and the world is also saved from war?

The Chinese leadership in their anti-Soviet, dogmatist propaganda, sidetrack just dust about Cuba's sovereignty being surrendered to American "inspection" to see if the They loudly proclaim as if they alone support the five demands of Fidel Castro. These demands are supportand Communist Party in the world. Speaking about it at the Supreme Soviet Khrush chov said:

"The Cuban Government legitimately insisted that any solution of the Caribbean crisis must be a long-term nature and include guarantees for the Cuban Republic, that would shield it against aggression and ensure for the Cuban people an opportunity to their new life in conditions of peace. This is the aim of the well-known five points advanced by the Cuban Prime Minister, Fidel Castro, in his speech of October 28, which we fully sup-

According to Chinese propaganda, Khrushchov surndered to the American blackmail in that he withdrew the missiles. He committed what they call 'the error of capitulation." Did the crisis develop and was world war threate question of missiles? The main question, the central point of the crisis, was not whether the missiles remain in Cuba or go back to the Soviet Union. The question was whether US imperialism is allowed to invade Cuba or not, whether Cuba remains or goes

The missiles went, the aggressors withdrew their invasion and Cuba remained. The aggressors withdrew, not be-cause the missiles were withdrawn, but because they too saw the wisdom of not risking e of the a world war in the fac might of the socialist camp and the world's democratic and peace forces. But the Chinese insist that it was surrender, "capitulation" by ple who were "scared stiff."

Not content with inciting the Cubans and the world's working class and people against the Soviet Union and the CPSU, the Chinese leadership blames the Soviet Union for having sent the rockets to Cuba. They call it "adventur-ism" and "nuclear blackmail, used by Khrushchov against the US imperialists. One can easily see that this is the same argument which the US imperialists are using against the

It is not possible to go into all the unbecoming propaga amounting to filthy abuse that the Chinese have launched against the CPSU and those who support it. The best pos-sible report on the Caribbean desire for war was curbed. sible report on the Caribbean World war could be averted episode can be found in the speech of Khrushchov to the Supreme Soviet on December 12. 1962.

We, however, are concerned with it in our present argument because it has direct bearing

It may be a coincidence a very significant one, that the

APRIL 21, 1963

-NEITHER REVISIONISM NOR DOGMATISM

very period. Chinese protests The Chinese have made a and skirmishes began mounting up in September. Kennedy started mounting tension from September 7, when he called army to clear out the Chinese up the reservists.

On September 8, the Chinese crossed the Thagla Ridge on the McMahon Line and cross-ed into Indian territory. On September 20, they opened fire on the Indian forces and on October 9, began their attacks with mortar guns. On October 20, by a major military action, ok the Indian noste at Dhola, etc. Thus, on October 20, the Chinese forces launched their major offensive, just cowith the days of the American naval blockade and full-scale mobilisation for

No doubt exchanges of notes on either side making allega-tions of a soldier crossing the frontiers here and there in various sectors and thus "violating" the territorial rights of each other were going on. But there had been no real military clashes since 1959. The events of October-November 1962. owever, were no longer of that tyne. They were in the na-

In the Ladakh area, the Chinese had swept away the Indian posts set up in that area, by their militray forces. In the McMahon Line area, they crossed the Line and effected a large-scale advance south of Line in the NEFA area, which they claimed was also theirs.

Nature Of Dispute Changed

In this offensive, the border dispute underwent a funda-This was no longer clashes or frontier guards moving up and down. The Chinese had thrown in whole divisions, modern weapons, and were operating as if in a regular war.

Their preparations, as always, were thorough and calculated. They advaned swiftly and surprised the Indian forces in their own areas. Town after town fell: Tawang fell on October 23. Sela was taken on November 17, and Bomdila, which is 70 kilometres south of the Mc-Mahon Line, fell on November 18. On November 21, they were in Chakoo. Similar things happened in the Ladakh sector.

The Chinese army had desd the Himalayas and had reached the plains of NEFA in their almost unhampered march from October 20 to November 21. On that day, when they were nearing the borders of were nearing Assam, they declared cease That was 24 hours after the Americans had lifted the naval blockade of Cuba and retired. A strange coincidence,

In India, the Caribbean events were not in the minds of the people so much. All eyes were on the advancing Chinese armies. And the sol question asked was: Where will they stop and will anyone stop And how? Nobody at that stage stopped them, ex cept themselves. They declared a cease-fire on their own on the night of November 21, saying that they would retreat to the North of the McMahon Line from December 1, 1962 and take up those positions which they had held in November

What was the reason for this sudden burst of the offensive, almost on a war scale, without Soviet Union, they should have mobilised their forces to be first which is under British occupa-

Illogical Argument

In the first place, this had reference to the occupation by the Chinese of the Dhola post, which the Indian side claims to be south of the McMahon Line. The whole dispute here is of a distance of four or five miles.

great play on the speech of

he said that he had asked his

Secondly, whenever questions have been raised in Parliament on the issue of recovering the territories occupied by the Chiways said that they would not rest until eyery inch of Indian territory is "tleared of the Chinese". That does not mean, every such statement was a cal for an all-out war on the Chinese.

Thirdly, military action of the Chinese forces along the Mc-Mahon Line had not begun after the October 12 speech, but long before, that is, on September 8 itcelf

Fourthly, the Chinese knew very well that the Indian army not at all poised or prepared for any offensive. The Chinese reconnaissance was efficient and widespread enough to know the Indian conditions and intentions.

Fifthly, the Chinese were en-trenched on a plateau behind them, while the Indians had to fight from positions of climbing ridges, which militarily was of disadvantage.

Sixthly, there was no reason for the Chinese to make largescale advance up to the borders of Assam, if they were merely repulsing an attack. The Chinese offensive was

well prepared in advance and were ready to go any th. They said, in advance in they their statements, that the Indian hotheads had to be taught a lesson, and after the cease-fire they said that they retreated after "teaching the Indian aggressors a lesson."
The Chinese were very well

aware that a world crisis was brewing over Cuba and that the . US imperialists were preparing an invasion. They were also aware that the Soviet Union, as the strongest power in opposibear the brunt of the war, and that the war would be a gigan-tic world conflagration, involving nuclear weapons on either side. They very well knew that the British and other imperialists in the NATO combine had been asked to be ready with

Under such conditions, what should any one believing in preventing war and preserving world peace and the world people from thermo-nuclear des-truction, have done in his own sphere? The Chinese leadershi have always been talking of fighting the Americans on Taiwan, of expelling the imperialists from every inch of Chinese territory and giving them "titfor-tat" Here was a situation brewing for such an opportunity, when they could have put their slogans into practical action instead of merely talking "tit-for-tat" and "exposing" and once again, only "exposing" the US imperialists.

As true Marxists-Leninists, not scared stiff, they should have mobilised their forces for action-knowing that the US is engaged in the Caribbean and would soon clash with

against Hong Kong, tion, against Macao which is under Portuguese occupation

As they keep announcing to the world that they had already given some several hundre serious warnings to the US war-mongers about violation of Chinese territory, what better opportunity, from the point of view of political and military strategy, and from the point of view of "uncompromising" Marxism-Leninism could there have been to defeat imperialism once for all and liquidate it completely from the face of the Chinese soil.

What Is China's Explanation?

nese leadership did not do anything of the kind. It went on issuing warnings to Nehru and mobilising armies in the Himalayas, the Konka Pass and Thagla Ridge, while Taiwan, Kowloon, Hongkong, Macac were left in peace and the Soviet Union was asked to look after the protection of Cuba, to handle the US imperialists and the impending world war. What explanation is there for such a peculiar proletarian international solidarity?

Strange to say that the Chi-

Speaking in the Supreme Soviet, Khrushchov asked:

"What do these people, who call themselves Marxists-Leninists, want? Why they working, in fact, for what Adenauer pressing for conflicts, for an aggravation of international tension? It is correctly said that if you go left, you will come out on the right. If an objective view of things is taken, during the crisis around Cuba, they actually acted like people who wanted to provoke a conflict, they wanted to engineer a clash between the Soviet Un the United States. But what does staging a clash between these two great world powers mean? This means triggering

off a world thermo-nuclear "It would be interesting to know how they themselves would act in such a war. I don't think they would be eager to take part in it. Evidently they would prefer to sit out. But then may it be asked: What do they want?

We are too small a Party to

suggest an answer.
One may ask: Did they want India more than Hong Macao which are in the reach of a stone's throw and which have been occupied by rea blue-blooded imperialists and not by the pale expansi aggressor Nehru, far off in the Himalayas?

One may ask: why this war on the India-China border on such a large-scale, just when the Caribbean crisis and world war being threatened? Was it all a coincidence?

It would be worthwhile to study it. It is difficult for us to venture a categoric answer enced, brave and a pure Marxist-Leninist Party as that of China.

The Chinese leadership may turn the question back and ask us whether it was not the Indian Government, the Indian reactionaries and Nehru who

NEW AGE SUPPLEMENT

the Caribbean crisis and the imminent threat of world war. Were they not preparing to serve their imperialist masters?

The quesion is well put. But it must be remembered that for that task US imperialism had plane had a base in Peshawar, not in Kashmir or Assam. The American military bases were That the Chinese policy not in India nor was India a member of the SEATO.

India all along has been more worried with Pakistanı aggression and had scarcely noticed even the building of the Aksai Chin Road. India was not a friend of the imperialists in cold war, but was in peace camp. Not SEATO but Panch-sheel was her line.

Further, it may be remem-bered that only an year ago in December 1961, India had liberated Goa from the Portuguese fascist imperialists and, as a result had incurred the displeasure of the Anglo-American nperialists and risked the

A Sore Point

When we mention Goa and Macao in comparison, the Chinese leadership feels very much irritated. Referring to the comparison between the action on Goa and the lack of action on Hong Kong and Macao, they

"Anyone with a discerning eye can see at once that your sole intention is to prove that the Chinese are cowards. To he frank there is no need for the Chinese people to prove their courage and staunchness in combating imperialism by making a show of force on the questions of Hong Kong and Macao.

"The imperialists, and the US imperialists in particular, have had occasion to sample our courage and staunchness the Korean people, the finest sons and daughters of the Chinese people fought for blood on the battlefields of Korea to repulse the US ag-gressors. Don't you feel it 'stunid' and 'deplorable' on your part to taunt us on the questions of Hong Kong and Macao?

"We know very well, and you know, too, that you are, to put it plainly, bringing up the questions of Hong Kong and Macao merely as a figleaf to hide your disgraceful performance in the Caribbean crisis. But all this is futile." [Comment on the Statement

of C.P.U.S.A. P.D. Editorial dated 8.3.1963. F.L.P Peking, p. 141

Then they hurl a question which certainly is a gem in confusion. They say: "How can the correct policy of the Chi-nese people on the questions of Hong Kong and Macao be mentioned in the same breath with your erroneous policy on the Caribbean, crisis?"

What does it mean? The "correct policy" on Hong Kong and Macao allows it to

continue as an imperialist colony, a smugglers' den and arms base? And the "erroneous policy" on the Caribbean has kept Cuba's freedom safe from American invasion? Does it mean that following

China's "correct policy" regarding Hong Kong and Macao, were getting ready to attack Soviet Union should have al-china by taking advantage of lowed USA to once again make to accept the Colombo propo-

E ... 700.

Cuba its colony? Certainly, the Chinese do not mean that way?

Then what does it mean? That the Chinese are correct in not seeking war with Britain or with the United States on Hong Kong or Taiwan, but that been arming Pakistan, not the Soviet Union and Castro India. The U-2 American spy are wrong in avoiding war, and a world war at that, even when Cuba remains free?

> not to annihilate British and Portuguese imperialism around the Hong Kong and Macao seas is correct, but the Soviet and Castro's policy not to accept a head-on clash and "annihilate IIS imperialism" with a thermonuclear world war even when the imperialists withdraw their invasion plans was "erroneous", was a "disgraceful perfor-

> Then who called them cowards for their "correct po-licy" on Hong Kong and Macao Taiwan? Is there anyone nese Revolution, the courage and the sufferings of the Chinese Party and the Chinese

And why bring the Korean War and the gallant struggle you fought there? And even there, after defeating the Americans, you had to allow them to reoccupy South Korea, which at first was over-run by Kim Il-sung's North Korean Army. Why did you accept the 38th Parallel, instead of expelling the US imperialists completely from South Korea?

So, compromises are sary. Each thing has to be done in its own time, according to conditions. That is, why it is wrong to blame the Soviet on and Castro for not going with a head-on clash with US imperialists when they retreated and accepted Cuba's existence and freedom. That was not 'a shameful performance' glorious, brilliant and brave

Why India In Particular?

· Moreover, if you can tolerate British and Portuguese imperialism in Hong Kong and Macao and can have trade and good relations with these ancient and "proved aggressors", was it so very important to be insistent, vociferous and warlike about the deserted moun-tains of Ladakh or the Thagla Ridge and Longin even at the cost of friendship with a country like India, giving a setback India, and making it easier for in a non-aligned India?

One may ask: Is that correct policy and pure, unerring Marxism-Leninism? One may even borrow your phrase, and ask: Was not your attack of October 20 an error of adventurism? And your sudden uni lateral cease-fire-what was it? It was a good correction of that error, though only a partial

And why did you do it? In consonance with your long ex-perience to do swift manoeuvres, you realised that with the Cuban invasion put off and with the "prospects" of a war —i.e., a world war—having receded, it was political wisdom and good tactics, to halt the march to India.

in fact, congratulate you for this decision and now urge upon you to follow the logic of your unilateral cease-fire by a total abandonment of fire

Great Historic Opportunity Lost

In fact, we venture to suggest to the Chinese leadership what, to the Chinese leadership what, as true Marxist-Leninists, they should and could have done, and by not doing it, how they missed a great historic opportunity.

When the world was threatened with a thermonuclear war by the US imperialists' projec-ted invasion of Cuba, and when the naval blockade began on October 22 and troops were mobilised, and the Soviet Government issued its warning to the US on October 23, the Chinese, instead of advancing of the McMahon Line, should have halted their advance, withdrawn their armies and issued an appeal to the Indian Government and Nehru that, as two peace-loving, antiimperialist States of Asia, they should give up their skirmish charges and counter-charges, sit down for peaceful settlem and lend our energies to stop the mad imperialists.

The Chinese did issue a statement on October 24. But it was not at all helpful because it talked of the Chinese troops remaining in the areas of "actual control", while the Indian Government spoke of both sides retreating to the positions prior to September 8, 1962. Hence that statement was not taken to be actuated by genuine sentiments of peace and settlement. The Chinese would have los nothing by agreeing to vacate those areas which they had occupied after & September They even failed to define their meaning of the "line of actual control" for a

The Indian Government, before relations became bitter, was prepared to recog-nise the Chinese need for the Aksai Chin Road to link up with their Sinkiang Province No one in India, except hardened warmongers and American agents, would have quarrelled on that. A suitable formula honourable to both sides, could have been found, and it was in

But the Chinese leadership was obsessed with its so-called past history. It considered nists" greater 'Indian' expar enemies than the expansi in Hong Kong or Macao or Tai-wan. And the great opportunity of eliminating the cracks in the Sino-Indian friendship in the context of the Caribbean crisis was not taken.

On the contrary, the offensive was pressed forward right till November 21. It was called off after the tension had eased in the Caribbean and world war averted. If Marxism-Leninism had not been obscured by sentiments of national glory, ancient claims and boundaries, the role of China as well as India at that crucial moment in recent history would have been

It may be said that it was the Indian reactionaries who were bent upon aggression, upon raising border dispute, upon claiming and seizing territory get more dollars.

One may ask a counter question: If the raising of the border dispute by India result of her expansion ambition, why is it that China sin, cast the first stone."

VIII

sals and peacefully settle the has raised the border question even with a socialist country Mongolia? After ·like India-China dispute began, China has been having talks and "settlements" as if by a roll-call, with Burma, Nepal, Mongolia and perhaps some others. Was China's progress held up for want of these boundary settlements? If India is to be blamed as the initiator of border disputes, are the others also in the same category and even the socialist

All Marxists-Leninists know the place that border questions should occupy in the relations between two counries. questions of boundary and even f territories are sub o questions of friendship between two peoples, of relations a newly-liberated hetween country struggling against im-perialism and the duty of a gialist state and a Communist Party to help such a country to go forward. Such a policy is in the interests of not only that state but of socialism also. Lenin settled the claims rai-

sed by the newly-liberated State of Turkey by agreeing to give away that part of Soviet Armenia which Turkey and Kemal Pasha wanted on the asis of historical claims. Have the Chinese shown even the slightest spirit of Ler their dealings with India and the cause of friendship between the two countries?

Chinese Claim Incorrect

One might ask as to why we do not, in the same breath, criticise India for raising the claims and not giving in to the claims of Socialist China. We do not do so here because we do not think that China's claims are right and the mann raising them are right. In the proper sphere and place, our Party has criticised the Indian Government for its mistakes in approach wherever they have

Moreover, we do not expect a bourgeois state to show the Leninist understanding on bor-der problems. To it, nationalism is natural: to a socialist state, it sible. Yet, it is a fact is impermissible. Yet, it is a fact that the leader of the Indian Government has tried to keep away from chauvinism as far was possible in the context of the prevailing as it was evidenced at the Chin Bhavan ceremony in Santini-ketan. Even under conditions of strong pressure from reac-tionary forces, the leadership of the national bourgeoisie said that there should be no hatred of the Chinese people

and their culture. Could not the wise leadership of socialist China have taken advantage of this and not allowed the differences to go to the stage of war? They could have if their Marxism-Leninism, according to the opinion in the overwhelming part of the international Communist world. had not become tainted by dogmatism and nationalism.

Some people say that the Party of India has Communist Party of India has no right to point out and criticise the dogmatism and sectarianism of the great Chinese Party because our Party itself suffers from deviations of revisionism and dogmatism. This something like the argument of with China is the Bible which said: "Let him who hath not committed any

committed many errors of revisionism and more of the latter than former or vice versa is not the point here. That is perhaps one of tured to publicly criticise Chinese leadership; our National Council dership; even when the opinion that the Chinese leadership had violated the 81

Parties' understanding, we only

informed the fraternal Parties

and did not engage in any de-

bate on it until we were atta-

However, leaving aside the discussion of our own sins, which we certainly will do elsewhere, the question before us at present is: How far have the Chinese—sometimes called Al-banians for the sake of form in the international controversy-gone in their deviations which in the main, is the rea their attitude towards India and the horder question? They can not find an alibi by nointing to the Indian reactionaries their behaviour, or to our revisionism or dogmat

Dogmatism Equally Dangerous

As the 81-Parties' Statement points out, revisionism is the chief danger in the Communist movement. But i ent But it nism and dogmatism can also become the main danger at one another stage in the development of some Parties. The question is: Has it not become so in the Chinese Party. the Albanian Party, etc.?

Speaking at the Supreme Soviet on December 12, Khrush-chov said:

"The modern leftist opportunists and sectarians whom the Albanian leaders are the most open spokesmen cover by noisy pseudo-revolutionary phrases their struggle against the Leninis licy of peace and peacecoexistence. As has already been said, they have slipped down to Trotskite positions. It is not hard to see that such a policy undermines the unity forces coming out against imperialism, that it plays into the hands of the most aggressive imperialist circles of the Western powers, encouraging their anti-Com munist designs."

This is exactly what is happening in India as a result of the policy of the Chinese Party and those who support them on the border conflict and the Chinese offensives massive Chinese offensive even the Colombo proposals of the six nonaligned powers nothing but a continuation their dogmatist, sectarian outlook, which plays into the hands of Indian reactionaries and foreign imperialists.

How could such an experi-enced Party like that of China hich was so realistic and sober in its strategy and tactics of dealing with the imperialists and the national bourgeoisie in the period of the civil war and the anti-imperialist anti-feudal revolution, and which is even today following tactics of not touching Hong Kong, Macao and Taiwan but trying out the path of negotiations through China and the USA in Warsaw, become so "patriotic" about all

"It is historically true that China was powerful and invaded other countries in the past but that occurred under the rule of the feudal landlord class. China today is a People's China, a socialist system is China; its social fundamentally different and its domestic and foreign poli-cies are fundamentally different from those of the past."

Why then quarrel on the maps of that feudal past, lose the friendship of the Indian people and facilitate the manoeuvres of imperialists? Why has orolefarian internationalism gone into the service of nationalism? Is it more legal than the "illegal McMahon Line"?

Because, as Khrushchov re-

"As V. I. Lenin warned, underestimation of the struggle against leftwing opportunism resulted in the disorder becoming neglected be infantile long ago. The peculiarities of the development of the Com-munist movement in our time, when the peoples of coun-tries with most diverse levels of economic and social development are taking the road able conditions for the spread of leftwing Communism. It as always found a foothold tability of representatives of the petty geoisie, in their jumping from one extreme ot another.

"The left-sectarian disorder is nourished by nationalism lerable when it is manifested the activities of a ruling Party, on the policy of which the destinies of the people depend to a large degree. comes dangerous since it is lirected against the policy of such vital problems as those which of war and peace, which affect the destinies of all

"It cannot be denied that due to all these causes, leftwing opportunism, dogmatism sectarianism and more becoming a serious danger in the world Communist movement. Not to see this means to be afraid to face away from reality and fail to realise the responsibility borne by Marxist-Leninis

Rejection Of Criticism

But the Chinese leadership rejects this criticism and deounces the majority of the movement as being themselves revisionists, defenders of imperialism, opponents of the naliberation movement. tional class struggle and betrayers of

As a result, at several Congresses of Communist and Workers' Parties like in Bulgaria Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Italy. etc., the Chinese had to be criticised.

And in these criticisms they were also blamed for their at-titude towards the India-China Marxism-Leninism. After the dogmatism already on our re-Tass statement of September cord?

We, in India, have surely the past borders and conquests 1959, this was the first time that of the Chinese emperors? They
themselves admit;
to take a stand on this question and criticise China,

> The criticism and disapproval of the Chinese, line by these Parties on the question of India, of course, does not mean that they approve of all the things that the Indian Governmen has done from time to time. They are even afraid that. Indian Reaction, in league with imperialists, might try rate measures to secure an up erhand in India and change the foreign and internal policies of India in a reactionary, proimperialist direction. Hence should see reason and bring about peaceful settlement as soon as possible.

Instead of taking heed from these fraternal criticisms, the Chinese leadership has hurled big propaganda blasts through the radio and the press against all these Parties, charging then with all possible crir it was pointed out that majority them, they began comparing themselves with Lenin and Liebnecht who, they said, also were in a minority.

Tenin in the Second International and Liebnecht in the Reichstag in the period of the d War and the revolutions following it, swept away the revisionists and Lenin's thinking came to be accepted by the majority. So it will be in the case of Peking and its revisionist critics everywhere

Do We Need Third World War?

Does the parallel suggest that War and the revolutions that may follow, so that Leninism this time, not from Moscow but from Peking, may triumph in ment? And in order to achieve on clashes with the imperialists and their allies, and not avoid the inevitable world war as it was done in the Caribbean but not so in the Himalavas where it was pursued re-"betrayal" in the Caribbean? We that history will not lead that way.

These are serious questions and not just polemics of an idle hour. That is why the CPSU and other Parties are making serious efforts to once again sit round the table and try to arrive at an agreed solution. The Communist Party of India also asked for a world meeting in its resolution dated December 3, 1962. Exeryone eems to agree.

In the meanwhile. nese leadership has threatened to read out from their "book of account", the sinful record of fortyfour Parties who, they say, so far "attacked" and the entries about us in that "book of account" in the most recent period—A Mirror for ists-has been ed on March 9, 1963, in the People's Daily.

We will, therefore, deal with it, so that when we all have to before the Judgment Throne of the Grand Inquisito of Marxism-Leninism and his assistants, our case may not go by default. Haven't we a long

NEITHER REVISIONISM NOR DOGMATISM

V National Defence in the Light of Marxism-Leninism

W E have already seen in what position the Party found itself as a result of the India-China dispute and the statements and resolutions it adopted from time to time since 1959. In August 1962, the situation had already become alarming enough to attract the attention of our National Council in its meeting at Hyderabad, which

"The armed two countries are so poised against each other that there is always danger of clashes taking place between them any moment. One incident has already taken place in nel on the Indian side were injured which has justifiably evoked resentment from the Indian people.

"The National Council supports the policy of the Prime Minister of India, Pandit Minister of India, Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru, of making all efforts to bring about a peaceful negotiated settle-ment of the border question even while taking necessary measures for the defence of the country."

The resolution then mentions the efforts made by both Gov-"to maintain ernments "to maintain con-tacts": "The Council noted with satisfaction that the Government of India is taking steps to prevent any further worsening of the situation" and observed that "the Chinese response to India's initiative has been positive...."

Warning Against Reaction

The Council also warned against the reactionary parties in the country. It said:

"The Council, ho notes that efforts are, on the other hand, being made to put pressure on the Govern-ment to reverse its policy of negotiating a settlement. tain political parties and groups in the untry are carrying on a vicious campaign against the Defence Minister and Prime Minister to the effect that they are trying to barter away the country's honour and integrity.

"Those who carry on this attack on the Governme policies are in reality attacking the entire foreign policy of the country, the policy of national problems and of nonwith military blocs. For, what they are advocating in the name of safeguarding our frontiers is the abandonment of the method of peaceful negotiations and the adoption of a policy aligning our country on the

side of imperialist powers. "The Council hop patriotic citizens of the country would rally the against these efforts and support the Government of India in its efforts to start negotiations with the Government of China in a calm and peaceful atmosphere

The Council had met from August 14 to 20, 1962. The there was long debate, the re-solution was passed with overwhelming majority with only a few disagreeing on one or two words and their implica-

the resolution caused by the

forces of the dangerous closeness armies and the news of clashes was completely justified. The tension did not go down. the contrary, as already stated, by September 8, the rces had begun attacking and throwing out the Indian posts from areas which the Chines said were theirs but which the Indian Governme ed. A full-scale offensive was

Validity Of McMahon Line

The September-October claand the subsequent massive invasion of the Chinese forces on the Ladakh and Mc-Jahon Line sector threw the whole country out of its previous mood of expectations easing of tension and negotiations. War seemed to have hecome inevitable and was already at the doorstep. In fact, the people did not want war. But it was there. When the first vague reports

of the crossing of the McMahon Line came, the Secretariat of the Party met and issued a statement on October 17, in which it said:

"The Secretariat of the National Council of the Communist Party of India expresses its grave concern at the seri-ous happenings on the NEFA border. There have been clash-es between the Chinese and Indian armed forces, leading to loss of life.

"The situation is all the more alarming in view of the fact that only a few weeks ago, strong hopes had risen in the minds of our people that a climate for negotiations was being created and that meetings be-tween the two sides for the necessary preliminaries were in the offing. All these hopes have been belied by the new tensions that developed on the NEFA border.

"This border has comparatively free from heen hances especially in view of the fact that there existed the McMahon a virtually demarcated bor-der line, between India and China. Thus one least expected serious differences and clashes on the McMahon Line.
"Reports of the Govern-

ment of India show that the Chinese forces have crossed to the South of the McMahon Line and thus violate Indian territory, though the Chinese deny this. The Communist Party of India has always maintained that the McMahon Line is the border of India. Hence all necessteps to defend it are

"The National Council resolution of our Party passed at Hyderabad lent its suprt to the Governm orts at negotiations, while taking necessary steps for

This statement was interpreted as showing equivocal atti-tude between what the Gov-ernment of India reports "show" and what the Chinese an impression, which was not warranted by the wording, the Chairman issued a clarifying statement on October 19.

serious news of the Chinese advance began to pour in and roused great passions among the neonle. They rallied behind the Government under the slogan of national defence, despite the exploitation and hardship they were suffering inder that very Government Government declared a state of emergency suspe certain vital parts of the Con-

The reactionary parties immediately whipped up anti-Communist hysteria, demanded banning of the Party and the arrest of its leaders. The PSP took the lead and was joi in by the Jan Sangh, the Swaothers. The Congress Party and Congress Governments sibly showed neutrality but the Government apparatus was more inclined to agree with the reactionary parties as against

Anti-Communism this got the ear of the masses more readily than before. And when the masses were neutralised started attacks on our offices, private homes, bookshops, etc. ible, Party ranks Wherever possible, Party ranks defended their places well, but the odds were against them and the police too connived at the kers and in some cases. even helped them. All this became possible be-

cause people were led to be-lieve that we were on the Chinese side, that we were not patriotic and would not defend the country, that as "interna-tionalists", we would rather help the Chinese than the Indian Government, that the In-dian Communist Party had done a similar thing in the past, that its hatred of the bourgeois-landlord Congress, its Government and Nehru was than its love for the independence of the country, that in fact it would consider conquest by socialist China, s loss of independence but liberation of the country from its capitalist rulers, that unists were showing the so on and so forth. There was limit to the abuse that was poured on the Party in

Wrong Comparison

In the midst of such a situation, on October 27, the Peking Radio broadcast its long haran gue on "More on Nehru's Phi-losophy in the Light of the Ques tion" Briefly put, the assess ment of the Indian situation in this long article was that India had fallen in the hands of the American imperialists, that Nehru and his Government were the agents of U.S. imperialism and hence fighting China.

Then they put the following question: "What stand should Marxists-Leninists take on this policy of reactionary nationalism, followed by Nehru?" Obiously, it meant what should the Indian Communist Party do. They did not want to what they wanted us directly

the defence of the borders." to do. So they followed the parable method and said: "Here a review of an epi-

which occurred more thirty years ago, may be useful." (emphasis—S.A.D.) The episode showed that

nary Kuomintang clique whipped up an anti-Soviet campaign, arrested and killed Soviet diplomatic officials and attacked the Soviet border, the Soviet army was compelled to act in selflefence and defeated this military provocation. The article says: "What the Soviet Union

did was perfectly right... Sino-Indian relations today bear certain similarities, to Sing-Soviet relations more

So the Indian Party should do today what the Chinese Party did thirty years ago in the dispute between Chiang Kai-shek and the Soviet Union in which the Soviet Union was

right. What did the Chinese Party do? They issued a declaration condemning the Kuomintang clique and called on "the broa masses to rise against the war on the Soviet Union," and in response to this call "many Communists, workers, peasants, students and progressives gloriously laid down their lives.

They further on say:
"Today the Com and progressives of India are in a situation somewhat simifar to that of the Comm and progressives of China more than 30 years ago." "But it is surprising", says

the Peking People's Daily, after quoting a letter from an "ordinary Indian" that "in India some self-styled Marxicts Teninists such as S. A. Dange should trail closely behind Nehru" and "support the Indian Government."

Anyone knowing anything of history and today's conditions, will see that the conditions today have nothing similar to conditions thirty years least of all the Chinese Indian conditions.

There was no socialist world system, no non-aligned newly pherated countries no nossibi lity of curbing war, no powerful peace movement, no 81-Parties Statement and no Soviet Union mightier than the imperialists.

China had warlords, was infested with several imperialisms and the Chinese Party had a Red Army which was partly a legacy from the split in the KMT and which was a special feature of China's revolution India and the world today has no similarity with what China and the world was 30 years

ago.

But that is just the thing that is wrong with the Chinese leadership today. They still live ideologically in the Chinese world of thirty years ago and want the world movement also to do the same. No wonder they are cross with everyone and quarrelling the majority of the Parties in

The lesson and advice thirty years ago was broadcast through the radio, which, we believe, could be heard by the Indian police also and not by a selected circle of the Indian munists only, on October 27. three days crucial meeting of the National Council of our Party.

With such advice and information broadcast from Peking Radio, the Government of India did not require anybody's

help to persuade them number of Indian Communists, progress ves, ctc., who "under extremely difficult conditions stood firm for truth, justice and unflinching struggles. wonder from where they got

The Party had no idea of the gravity of the Chinese invasion for quite some time and was not prepared ideologically and politically for such a situation. It was thought that this time, too, the crisis would blow over. But this time it was not a mere clash like the old one in Lato be a full-scale invasion.

Demands came from all sides, including Party units, that the Party's National Council meet and take a decision on the question. Accordingly, the Council was called and met on October 31, deliberated for two days and adopted its resolution For National Defence Against Chinese Aggression" ember 2.

Turning Point

The resolution was adopted by a large majority. There were two alternate rewhich were defeated. The reso-lution of November 2, was a lution of November 2, was a turning point in the history of the Party. Naturally, it was bound to be a subject matter of great controversy both in-side the Party in India and outside.

It is this resolution which the Chinese denounced most So let us see what is the main line of the resolution and the criticism levelled against it.

The following twentyons points are the main points of the resolution:

That China has committed aggression against India and is called "aggressor" 2 That the Communist

Party must support defence of the country. 3 We appeal to all friendly countries to throw their atmosphere of peaceful negotiations once again, meant: (a) hostilities stop: (b) the Chinese forces withdraw where they were on

September 7, 1962. The conflict dist

5 Weakens the struggle against imperialism; and 6 Threatens world peace.

between these two big countries of Asia would be a disaster which all must avo

8 The conflict has enabled reaction to become stron-

Strengthened opponents 9 of India's policy of peace, and non-alignment, which has been basically correct, though consistent execution.

10 The conflict facilitates attempts of reaction to drag India in the Anglo-America imperialist war camp;

Promotes war hysteria;

12 destroys the friendship between the Indian and Chinese people.

13 The resolution refutes the characterisation of India's economy, her internal conditions and her foreign

NEW AGE SUPPLEMENT

We did not expect a so-cialist country to have military clashes with a non-aligned democratic country of the peace camp, even though it is a capitalist country.

25 China has violated the 81-Farties understanding.

16 We are not opposed to buying arms from anyone on commercial basis but opposed to foreign army person-

17 We support national unity for national defence.

18 We ask Government to put burdens of defence on the rich and not on the poor, who cannot bear it.

19 We want Government and people to take measures against anti-national interests, their profiteering, high prices and disruption of my by monopoly groups;

Party units, members and supporters to undertake point programme as basis for their activities in the immedihere these seven points as they

To take an active part in the work of the popular committees which are being set up in support of the defence

To exert their best to build up the National De-fence Fund.

To work resolutely for increase in production for defence and people's needs.

To mobilise public opi-nion against price rises, blackmarketing and profiteering and other anti-social activities, which hit the working people and the nation

e To campaign tirelessly against those groups, parties and elements seek narrow political tage out of the present crisis.

To oppose attempts to force India to give up her foreign policy of non-alignment and peace and thereby put her camp and involve India in a prolonged full-scale war.

To support all moves taken by the Government of India to bring about a peaceful setflement consistent with the honour and dignity of

the country.

It should be noted here that though some leading comrades and provincial units disagreed with some of the twentyone points or the basic line of the solution, not one unit refu to implement the seven points f the programme. This resolution has evoked

total denunciation from the

Chinese leadership.

The most organised, openly expressed criticism of the resolution is, of course, found in the Chinese broadcasts, their papers and statements. The points that they make happen to be common to a large extent with the points made by some other critics of the resolution.

made by the Chinese leader- main question is whether from the point of riew Marxism Lenin-ism itself the resolution is fundamentally wrong". The controversy in the National Council was not ovements, but on the of the resolution. on impro main line

> Is Our Resolution Fundamentally Wrong?

The "most fundamental" points that have been raised by the resolution, and which have been vehemently argued inside the Party among us and between us and the nationalist opinion in the country are two.

Defence and aggression. In the Communist ideology, the question of defence and defencism has or derence, and derends has had an important place; in fact, it was a key issue of theory and practice, between Lenin and the revisionists, at the time of the imperialist world war of 1914-18.

Among the Communists, the question whether to defend the economy by monopoly groups; and to

20 protect the rights and living standards of the toiling people.

21 We must fight back the anti-communism and attacks on the Party.

Basing itself on these points, the resolution of these points, the resolution of the party.

The matter is not so simple, however. The concept of a Nation, which we all Indians feel Nation, which we all minants resisted today or other people feel about their own country, arises in the minds of men only when a country has entered the period of capitalism.

Nationalism appears a concept, as an integrated feeling when the old feudal social order begins to disintegrate and the new bourgeois order and social relations have begun to blossom forth. That is why in Communist theory, nationalism is described as bourgeots nationalism.

Nationalism is an advance on Nationalism is an advance on feudal separatism and division. But when capitalism has taken hold of the world, there appears a new concept of a higher social order based on socialism. It is based not on nationalism but on proletarian internationalism.

It is in its own interest the bourgeoisie seeks to utilise the feelings of nationalism to strengthen its class rule over the country, over the working class and other tolling nations. Nationalism is also used by the bourgeoisie to suppress or overcome the class struggle of the working class. gle of the working class.

It tries to pit the so-called wider interests of the nation against the narrow interests of a class. It asks the proletariat to set aside its class interests and questions of proletarian internationalism and stand behind its bourgeoisie, in its fight against another country.

Under the system of class rule, in the present case the rule of the bourgeoisie, what does de-fence of the country mean? Even if working class and its Party do not like the bourgeoisie and are struggling against it, the moment one admits the obligation of defence of the country, one agrees to support the Government of the bourgeoisie of the country.

Because, defence independent of the government, is never possible. There cannot be two armies of There cannot be two armes or two different classes defending the same country in two different ways crime against proletarian internationalism. As soon as the Soviet under two separate class leader-ships, unless the two classes have established two separate govern-ments, as was the case in China

ments, as was the case in China in the anti-Japanese war period.

So, proletarian internationalism unites with bourgeois nation-alism for a limited task, that is, of the resolution.

It may be possible to find defence of the country. On this blemishes in the resolution but the basis, our resolution of support to

defence has been characterised by our critics as national chauvin rgeois nationalism, betrayal of letarian internationalism and tailing behind the bourgeoisie. The quotation from the Mirror says:

"Internally, the national chau-"Internally, the national chauvinism of the Dange clique
serves the reactionary nationalist purposes of India's big bourgeoisie and big landlords; externally, it serves the purposes
of US imperialism which is promoting neo-colonialism in India
. Their policy constitutes a
betrayal of the international
proletariat as well as a betrayal
of the Indian people."

ences between one socialist state and another newly-liberated, non-aligned, anti-imperialist, democra-tic state. Such a problem has arisen only after the Second World War, when twelve states hecame socialist and several countries became liberated from imperialism. Some became bourgeois democracies, some became national democracies and

What is the reasoning behind

this criticism? Is support of one's own bour-geoisic always a betrayal of the international proletariat? In what conditions can it be consistent with proletarian internationalism? In short, in what kind of a war, what kind of a tittude should the working class and the Communist Party take in relation to the bour-

Common Understanding And Differences

There is a general common understanding on the question, but just as there have arisen differences on many questions of ideology, there are likely to be differences on this point also.

In the days when bourgeois na m me days when bourgeous na-tions came into existence and began to attack each other, the newly arisen working class was faced with this problem. And it was resolved according to the posi-tion in each country and the level of its development.

of its development.

Then came capitalist imperialism, when the industrialised capitalist countries conquered colonies for markets and for export of capital and exploitation. That was the heyday of capitalism's aggressive wars all over the world.

In the subjugated countries, it was the duty of the proletariat, wherever it had come up as a result of the introduction of capitalist relations in those countries by the conquering imperialists, to join hands with the national bourgeoiste and defeat the imperialists.

In such a case, the cause of undetarian internationalism was

In such a case, the cause of proletarian internationalism was served by the working class through progressive (bourgeois) nationalism. The two were not contradictory, hut complementary to each other.

In the imperialist country, it was the duty of the proletariat to refuse to support its bourgeoisie in the conquest and subjugation of the colonies, but to support the liberation movement of the subject people.

ject people.

When there is a war between two imperialist countries, as in 1914-18, what is the position of proletarian internationalism of the working class? It is a war for sharing the world market, re-dividing the world among the im-perialist robbers, though each robber pretends to be attacked by the other and calls upon the working class to defend the counworking class to defend the country, that is, the robbers' government and their predatory policy.

In this case, Lenin refused to support the war and the Tsarist Covernment of Russia, and Karl Liebnecht refused to support the Cerman Government, Lenin cave

German Government. Lenin gave the slogan of turning the impe-rialist war into a civil war. "Defencism" in this case was a Government was established, Lenin called for a peace treaty with Germany and also for defence of the Soviet Union against the figusion of the 14 nations 124 the Anglo-American imperialis to overthrow the Soviet state.

gard to war and defence are there. bourgeoiste has become expansion-war to overthrow imperialism, ist. With that as the basic argu-ment, what they did subsequently imperialism, war to protect the independence of even a capitalist

country against an imperialist at-tack, are all just wars and in such a war, the working class, the Communists, can and should unite with the national bourgeoiste in a

common front to carry it out.

But one problem did not exist in the days of Lenin—the prob-lem of differences between social-ist states or the problem of differ-

acute differences, perween socialists states, as their systems of economy are not based on exploitation or the rule of exploiting classes. Their systems are not based on the laws of hostile capitalists.

pased on the laws of hostile capi-talist competition and crisis, but on socialist cooperation and divi-sion of labour as was laid down in the platform of the COMECON

The India-China differences are

what the government is building is not socialism but capitalism

When two such States come in conflict and a war takes place,

should the working class and the Communists in the bourgeois state

private and state capitalism.

against internationalism.

In this argument, it is assumed

is infailible, that it does not com-mit a mistake, that since objec-tively it does not need colonies or subject states, it cannot go to war with anybody unless it is first at-tacked. War with a newly-libe-rated, independent country is alien to socialism. It does not do so in

the new epoch even with imperialist states, unless they attack first.

In the India-China dispute, it is,

ent is building

A New Type

Of Difference

Our position has been that, firstly, the attack south of the McMahon Line is unwarranted; it is a breach of an undertaking understanding given to the India Government by the Chinese side that they would not cross the Line. The Line, even if made by British imperialism and lence called "illegal" by the Chinese, was now an inherited boundary like all other boundaries of our country. The Chinese had recog-nised it in Burma and had pro-mised to do so in regard to India.

nationhood.

It is clear that differences between socialist states cannot and must not lead to solution by armed clash or war. They may differ and quarrel, but they have to resolve the quarrel by peaceful means. There are no objective factors for acute differences, between socialist states, as their systems of eco-

should not exhibit the blind nationalist fervour boundaries as it is natural to a national bourgeois state by its very class nature and the stage of very class nature and the stage or its development, and to begin or prolong a conflict on it. In fact, the leading section of the bour-geoiste has adopted an attitude of sober realism from time to time and disapproved of blind nysteria on the question boosted up by the

Fourthly, even assuming that the socialist state had been attacked first, as they allege, then, after having defended itself successfully and having lost nothing at all in the bargain, it should not have advanced beyond the point The India China differences are absolutely of a new type. In this case, one is a socialist state; the other is a bourgeois state. The socialist state in which the working class is in power is abolishing classes and building socialism. In the bourgeois state, the bourgeoiste has prower, exploits the workers. of attack or the McMahon Line of

has power, exploits the workers, peasants and middle classes and is building capitalism. Fifthly, such a behaviour on the part of the socialist state strengthens the reactionaries in the opposite state, weakens interna-tionalism and facilitates the man-Thus, in the direction of economic development, the two are in opposite directions. Though India has adopted the goal of socialism, imperialism.

When the socialist state fails to see these facts, it is the duty of the Party in the bourgeois state to correct it and preserve its own positions by joining hands in a united front with its national bourgeoisie, by respecting the national sentiment of the genuine mass of people, on the slogan of

communists in the bourgeois state never support but always oppose the bourgeois government? Or is our slogan of defence correct in the present case from the point of view of proletarian internation-By doing so, what does the working class and the Party which appears, according to some people, to have given up proletarian inter-nationalism achieve? Does it tail Some opponents of our resolu-tion say that the slogan of defence lines up the working class behind behind the bourgeoisie? Does it hand over the working class to an alien ideology and its loyalty to an alien class? Does it give up class struggle and anti-impe struggle, by doing so? as an axiom that the socialist state is infallible, that it does not com-

Our understanding is that it does does not do any of these things, if all the twenty-one points of our resolution are adhered to as the basis and along with the seven points of implementation are acted upon in terms of the class out-look on Marxism Leninism. If one look on Marxism-Leninism. If one takes the only one slogan of defence and forget the other twenty-one points, then one ceases to be internationalist and commits the error of capitulating before reactionary beweren

In the India-China dispute, it is, therefore, very strongly argued by some that it is India which attacked first, which claimed an "illegal line" as its own and possessed it—hence the clash. Who attacked first, thus became a major question to decide whether our slogan of defence is right or warned. crime against proletarian internationalism. As soon as the Soviet Covernment was established, Lenin called for a peace treaty with Cermany and also for defence of the Soviet Union against the infrastion of the 14 nations led by the Anglo-American imperialists to overthrow the Soviet state.

Thus the major propositions of Thus the major propositions of proletarian internationalism in re-

our country has a parliamentary democratic set up, not a military dictatorship and the people are not in that stage of discontent in which they find themselves under a fascist dictatorship. The Indian National Congress has not become Kuomintang and Nehru is not Chiang Kai-shek. What may happen in the future is not the point now.

All this in the end serves the interests of the Indian people, of anti-imperialism and of socialism. Such is the main content of the twenty-one points of the

We feel that from this point of view, our slogan of defence was correct and consistent with prole-tarian internationalism, both "internally" and "externally"

class struggle.

actionaries to escape their resp sibility and their attempts

objective conditions very well.

For all these reasons, our slogan the twentyone points, is not in defence of a reactionary bourgeois nationalism but is a proper, healthy nationalist slogan consisism of a Party of the working class in a country like India in

It must be noted here with special emphasis that in the Na-

NEITHER REVISIONISM NOR DOGMATISM

strongly attached to this national bourgeois leadership and its gov-ernment led by Nehru, than they are to any old capitalist or imperialist country.

The Government of the bour-geoiste is following a policy of nonalignment, which is anti-im-perialist in its objective effect and is in the peace camp.

"The National Council pays its homage to the memory of those who have fallen in the defence of our borders. The Communist Party has always stood for the defence of the country, including the strength-cning of the defence of our borders. In today's condition, there is no question of any imithere is no question of any uni-lateral cease-fire by India. There is no question of surrender to superior might."

The Party's united front for The Party's united front for defence, along with the fulfilment of other tasks, keeps reactionary forces from strengthening their hold on the masses and prevents the rapid penetration of the impe-

It saves the ideology of Communism and the reputation of the socialist camp as friend of the newly-liberated country, from being discredited among the

A united front does not mean tailing behind or merging with the bourgeoisie, the alien class. United Front is also a form of

Resolution In Totality

In the twenty-one points, we maintain our positions of struggle maintain our positions of struggle against vested interests, high prices, profiteering and for pro-tection of workers rights and standards. These po and the warning against war hysteria and hatred of the Chinese people keep the Party in the united front and at the same time keep it away from tailing behind an alien class.

When existence of nonalignment and the fight to preserve it is anti-imperialist and even sections of the bourgeoiste are for it, how is united front with it against interpretal alism and serves imperial ism? In this manner, many ques-tions can be raised and answered. It is said that the slogan of defence gives an alibi to the re-

foment war and carry out their reactionary aims.

If that had been so, then why were we not taken in the all-party National Defence Committees? Why does reaction attack us more than any other party? Why do the foreign imperialist circles atthe foreign imperialist circles at-tack us? Why were there more arrests of Communists who fully supported the resolution with all its twenty-one points?

It was hecause the basic twenty-

one points and the seven points of implementation did not give room implementation did not give room for the reactionaries and did not give up our class positions. Our critics, it seems, had not seen the full resolution in action and its aftermath and did not know the

APRIL 21, 1963

tional Council meeting of November, when no one had yet been only furthering dissensions arrested and everyone of the in our Party, But how to conful to Marxism-Leninism but point here is that the Chinese than fall into neo-colonialism arrested and everyone of the leading comrades was present, vince them of it?

After all this long argument about theories and textbooks. one simple test stands out the best-and it is that it is all very bad for the people of our two friendly countries shoot-ing down each other. Wars are fought by common toiling people shooting each other down.

The moment bullets flew across the McMahon Line or in Ladakh or anywhere, proletarian internationalism was a casualty on both sides, who-soever's map was right or wrong and whatever the slogans of the Parties be. Perhaps this looks too simple. But in this epoch of so-

cialism and elimination of all

pler to avoid wars on borders

and maps between two such countries as India and China,

despite the proddings of reac-

either side and solve the ques-

have revised our previous po-sition in this matter, in view

Some people say that if a

territory is in dispute and a

boundary is not demarcated

ing of the disputed boundary

or entry into the dispute

territory cannot be called aggression. If this logic is ac-

cepted, then neither India nor

But do the Chinese leader-

ship accept this position? They do not. They have main-

large scale since 1950. It for-

China was busy in the Korean

war against US imperialism.
They then say: "The Indian

ruling circles brazenly did what the British imperialists

had not dared to do." That

was the first aggression of

India against China. The second was when India "instigated the Tibetan rebel-

China is an aggressor.

by agreement, then the cros

of new happenings.

India Aggressor Since

1950: Says China

world wars, it should be

We are sure this was truly and incerely meant.

The other draft said:

leading comrades was there were two alternate

tions moved, in addition to the majority resolution. In those two drafts also, the slogan of defence

was admitted. One of these drafts

"The Council pays its humble tribute to officers and jawans of the Indian army, who have had to face heavy odds in de-fending the country. It salutes the memory of those who have given their precious lives in fighting for the defence of the soil. It conveys its heartfelt sympathy to the families of those who had thus to lay down

"The National Council at its second controversial question Hyderabad meeting, expressed the Party's support to the policy of the Prime Minister of India, that of aggression. India calls China an ag-gressor and China calls India Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru, of Pandit Jawaharial Nehru, of making all efforts to bring about a peaceful negotiated settlement of the border question even while taking measures for the defence of the country. "Basing itself on that declaration of the Council the Cartalian of the Council the Cartalian of the Council the Cartalian of the Cartal an aggressor. We had said in our previous resolution that a socialist country cannot com-mit aggression nor has India any intentions of war. But the

tion of the Council, the Central cretariat stated on the 17th October that all measures which the Government takes to defend the territory south of the McMahon Line are justi-fied. Now that the Chinese armed forces are well within the territory south of the Mc-Mahon Line and are advancing both in NEFA and in Ladakh, the Council all the mor its support to the Government in all its requisite defence mea-

"The Council hopes that every step will be taken to improve the defence position consistent with the dignity, independence and the basic policies of our country."

This too was truly and sincerely diby occupied "more than 90,000 square kilometres of China's territory", that is, the NEFA area, in 1950, when

Thus in the National Council no one at that time had any difference of opinion on the correctness of the slogan of was unanimous on the slogan of defending the country. Does it mean that the National Council was unanimously giving an alibito reaction, absolving them of their responsibility or was not emphasising or had given up the slogan of peaceful negotiations? Nothing of the kind.

lion" for her expansionisi Why then criticise only the The third was when they majority resolution as un-Marxist, as a betrayal of proaltered arbitrarily and unila-terally their map of the Sinoletarian internationalism, and as a piece of chauvinism, lin-Indian boundary and claimed 33,000 sq. kilometre in the Eastern sector and 2,000 in the ing up the Party in support of the bourgeois Government and try to divide the Comcentral sector, territory "which has been always under munists in India into pure and Chinese jurisdiction." impure, true and The fourth was when they "crossed the so-called Mc-Mahon Line at several points."

Chinese Help Further Dissension

Tf "defence" is the test and the parallel of the Sinc episode the guiding line, then all of us had become impure, including the "true" ones! By such arguments, the Chinese leadership is not being help-

leadership does not accept as a result of aggression. that there need be no talk of Unable to wipe out their aggression as such and that past record from people's since there is the dispute, let memories and to justify their us see how it can be settled. The Indian side then returned the accusation in the same coin but with more verified two official teams' reports.

Our Party first did not agree to the use of the term aggression on either side. In the case of China, because we did not think a socialist China would commit aggression wilfully and knowingly. In the case of India, we did

not believe that the Indian Government pursuing as it did a policy of peace and friendship had any intention or reason for committing aggression against China.

When, however, the Chinese crossed the McMahon Line in October 1962, in breach of their promise, we changed our opinion and considered it as aggression.

A question has been raised tion by peaceful negotiations. whether that is a correct des-cription of the Chinese action and once again, it is asked whether the word aggression can be applied to a socialist country's action, even assuming it to be wrong. We shall now turn to the

We do not think that it is necessary to go into any long philosophical argument over this question. It is true the term aggression has far wider class meaning than crossing of a boundary or occupying a territory claiming it as yours.

In the capitalist-imperialist November resolution calls China an aggressor. Thus we

history of 19th and 20th century, all expansions of the capitalist-imperialist countries on the continents of Asia, Africa, Latin America have been aggressions. The wars of aggression to capture colonies, to exploit them, to export capital to them, to find markets and raw materials for the capitalist monopolies have all been wars of aggres-

There was no socialist country then and the first socialist revolution, the October Revo-lution, was born out of strugtained that India has been committing aggression after aggression against China on a gle against such aggressive

wars. Capitalist-imperialists wage wars of aggression in order to overcome the crisis of their capitalist system. A socialist economy does not suffer from any such crisis arising from contradiction between productive forces and production relations as are found in

Aggression Contrary To Socialism's Law

Hence socialism by the very laws of its development does not require aggression against other countries, other people. The more socialism grows, the greater is the retreat of aggression, as was seen in the birth of liberated countries working class, directly con-after the Second World War, neeted with the events and and the defeat of German. Japanese and Italian imperialism, the weakening of Anglo-American Imperialism the world socialist system, in which the birth of socialist China has a big and significant place.

The aggressive wars that imperialists tried against . Egypt, Syria, North Vietnam or North Korea, Laos, etc., failed completely. More and

own aggressions and counter-revolutionary interventions against movements of freedom, the imperialists tried to label the help rendered by the socialist countries to liberation movements as

sion", in the UNO debates. Similarly, in the War Pacts such as SEATO, etc., they labelled the popular revolu-tionary uprisings against tyrants and US-sponsored dictators as "internal aggression" by Communism.

In our characterisations we In our characterisations, we certainly do not have in mind any of these meanings of aggression. When speaking of Chinese aggression, we used the term as it is popularly understood, that the Chinese have violated India's territory or invaded it with military forces. Intrusion, invasion, violation, occupation, aggression—we have had quite a spate of terms on this episode.

Aggression In General Sense

We think that though the We think that though the Chinese violation of Indian territory is not aggression in the capitalist-imperialist sense, yet it is aggression in the popular sense of the term. Some people point out the fact that the socialist countries

tries and other Communist Parties do not use this term in relation to China's action. But they do not use it in re-lation to India also. We think the socialist countries have their own reasons for doing so. Let alone socialist countries, even Ali Sabri, the UAR representative, refused to use that term in spite of unseemly pressure from some journa-lists in India when he was here

in the case of any one of the parties, they would have taken sides in the dispute, which would not be helpful in bringing about a settlement Their use of the term may, in fact, make the situation worse.

Even as it is, the Chinese leadership has taken strong objection even to the Soviet Union's attitude of neutrality in the dispute and friendship with both countries, as ex-pressed in the TASS statement, which showed concern in the matter and hoped that both sides would settle the dispute by peaceful negotia-tions and blamed the imperialists for fanning the fires.

The use of the term aggression for a member of the so-cialist camp would be unjustified on their part and would create many unhealthy com-plications in the international diplomatic field. But whatever reasons may apply to them. we as a Party of the Indian all their repercussions on our Party, people and the country as a whole, did what we con-sidered right and necessary in the given situation.

Moreover, one cannot be sure to what length the Chinese leadership may go, and what other meaning may be attached to such references to its neighbouring countries' past treaties over the last hundred years, whose "correc-tion" history demands.

When issues about the libemore countries attained free-dom from imperialist slavery ration of Hong Kong and

APRIL 21 1983

These are the big and main aggressions that China nut up

with India long before In-dia began to speak of Chinese

aggression. Their story begins

from 1950 itself. This, in spite of the Friendship Treaty of

1954. We are not going into the

("Comment on the Statement of CPUSA.")

One more point in our resolution aroused some apprehensions in the minds of the friends of our Party. That was the reference to purchase of arms "from any country". This had a reference to buying arms both from the Soviet Union and other socialist countries and also from the USA and other imperialist

A large scale dumping of US arms in India with largescale American personnel to man them would slowly turn India into an American war base, drag her into the SEATO bloc and thereby end her non-alignment and independence. Even the speeches of Nehru showed an awareness of such a danger.

Doubts And Apprehensions

Hence, if our Party supported American arms purchase, is it not supporting a dangerous trend and shall we also not be drawn into their net? Such apprehensions were natural and justified by his-

It must be noted however that this point in the resolution also warned against the personnel. But everyone knows that with arms also come some men and so it begins. Extreme vigilance is necessary in this respect.

Under the pressure of reactionaries and the pro-Amerimands for imports of American arms, for an American "air umbrella" are being canvassed for The reactionary press and some men in high places are also being pressu-rised and are reported to be softening under the pressure, to accept the umbrella, give arms bases and all that go

The Party is not unaware of the dangers. And in its meeting of February 11, 1963, the National Council adopted the following resolution on "Western Arms Proposals":

the Communist Party of India expresses its serious terms and conditions alleged to have been recently stipuof the USA and UK with regard to their arms sup-plies to meet India's defence requirements.

"According to these re-ports, which have been widely publicised in leading Indian dailies and have not yet been contradicted by the Government of India Government of India, the Western proposals include the following

That the operational control of certain types of military equipment and India should remain, not in dal emperors and kings invi- AITUC met on November 16, Indian but in foreign hands; ted the British and French 1962 to discuss the Truce Reso-

That an "air umbrella" arms, officers and "company the danger. What is required should be provided over troops", to help their own next is firm policy and action India by foreign air forces, forces to be trained with new to unite all the democratic employing foreign pilots and technicians, but based on Indian airfields and instal-

C That India should permit such foreign air forces or aircraft carriers to be based on the Andaman and Nicobar Islands. "The National Council is

strongly of opinion that such proposals, if correctly reported, are inconsistent with India's declared policy as repeatedly explained by the Prime Minister, of developing our own indepen-dent defence potential in consonance with the country's sovereignty instead of becoming dependent on foreign agencies.
"Further, the reported

Western proposals contain within themselves the danger of foreign military bases heing established on Indian soil and of India getting involved, willy-nilly, in certain types of military agree-ments inconsistent with the policy of nonalignment and "The National Council

considers such proposals to be dangerous and, therefore, objectionable. Development and strengthening of our country's defences should not deviate from the principles of purchasing arms without strings, operational control in Indian hands, no foreign bases or foreign military forces of Indian soil, India's basic defence potential, and non-involvement in military pacts.

"The National Council wreas upon the Government"

of national emergency.

Resorting to incomplete quotations, entirely torn out of context, connecting half or even quarter sentences from various places in the report into a twisted chain leading to slanderous conclusions, the authors of the Mirror have pronounced the following verdict:

"Here Dange, completely density the class nature of the state, openly describes as belonging to the people a state which is under the dictatorship of the big bourgeoise and big

urges upon the Government of India to allay the fears and suspicions aroused on this score in the public mind by the spate of inspired reports regarding Western proposals brought by the US-UK-Canada Defence Mission to New Delhi. The National Council resolves to send a deputation to the Prime Minister to seek further clarification in this regard and to explain the Party's point of view there-

Party On The Alert

From the point of view of guarding India's independen-ce, democracy and her policy of peace and nonalignment it is necessary for the Party to be constantly on the alert and educate the people on the point of view expressed in the above resolution.
In the interview granted to

"The National Council of the Party delegation on February 14, 1963, the Prime Minister repudiated any idea of

India has to remember that cemed specialised weapons given to once upon a time, India's feuIndia should remain, not in dal emperors and kings inviAITUC met on November 16

weapons and new art of war,

and the British. Once again, evitably our resolutions will with the lure of new weapons remain mere plous ones. The and air umbrellas, to fight the way to do so is not to attack Chinese on the borders, let the resolution but work for its us not lose our independence correct fulfilment.

to the imperialists and be The best solution, of course,

country.

It is good that many in the Congress leadership realise into a hot war.

forces, including our Party, behind this policy. If such new in those days.

As a result, India lost her active political democratic independence to the French unity does not take place, in-

naive or foolish enough to win is to settle the dispute quickly on the borders and lose the by peaceful negotiations and not allow it to continue in a

T.U. Line Consistent With Working Class Interests

IN reproducing the distorted images of reality, the authors of the Mirror have chosen as their central point the report placed by me as the General Secretary of the AFTUC in the General Council meeting on November 16, 1962, particularly those portions of the report which dealt with the questions of industrial truce in the period of national emergency.

which is under the dictatorship of the big bourgeoisie and big landlords. He has completely gone over to the side of the bourgeoisie and has publicly called for unstinted support of called for unstinted support of the bourgeoisie. Completely abandoning the Marxist-Leninist theory of class struggle, he openly advocates class collabo-ration. Dange and company, have thoroughly degenerated and become cat's paws of the Indian big bourgeoisie."

What however is the reality which has been so horribly distorted by the *Mirror*?

It was in the beginning of November that the Indian Gov-ernment called a tripartite confer-ence of trade unions, employers and government representatives, and government representatives, to discuss questions of industrial truce in the emergency period.

Taking advantage of the advance of the Chinese armies and the mood among the people, the employers wanted a blanket ban on all strikes, all demands of wage increases, more production, in short wanted to do all they would not have been all the light and the strikes and the strikes are strikes. not have been able to do in dis-arming the workers and worsening their conditions of work and wages.

The Government had declared his accepting either an um-brella or giving arms-bases to any foreign power.

Ine Government nad declared their intention to see that price rises and proficering by vested interests did not take place. But or giving arms-bases to any foreign power.

In spite of this, one has to remember that the imperialists are quite power-ful and have support among certain circles of the ruling Congress Party also. With the help of such of those among them who believe in popular.

help of such of those among them, who believe in nonalignment and anti-imperialism and know the dangers of Right reaction, the Party has to keep the masses alert against this danger, in spite of the difficult conditions in which we have to work.

The other organisations had agreed to a draft to which the workers wages from rise in prices, but wages from rise in prices, but was done so far as changing the draft of the resolution was constant.

lution, get reports from the states and to clarify questions regarding future work in the matter of de-fence of the country, as well as defence of the people's interests from the hands of profiteers, who always take advantage of war and

elves. It would be enough to refer to some passages from the report, which the Mirror is supposed to reflect, to see as to where these distortions arise from few seconds. distortions arise from from the report or from aberrations elsewhere?

Slanders Exposed

The Mirror quotes a passage saying that under conditions of the national emergency ... trade unions of the AITUC do modify unions of the AITUC do modify temporarily their normal relations with the companies..." But it takes that statement in isolation and not in the context of its preceding and subsequent para-graphs. Here are these relevant paragraphs:
"And the modification of

class relations that is required is called industrial truce. In industrial relations, the projection of a political position translates itself into an industrial truce, if we accept that modification of our relations with the bourgeoisie is necessary. This is the logic of my position.

The Mirror quotes only

'And therefore we say that under conditions of the national emergency, defence and near-war conditions require that the trade unions of the AITUC do modify temporarily their normal relations with the bournormal relations with the bour-geoisie, their functioning and approach to the questions of the working class. We agree to modify and we then decide as to how we modify. To what extent does the modification go?

go?

"Some people put the question thus: Does the national emergency eliminate questions of exploitation, competition, burdens on the working class and profiteering? Does the national bourgeoiste declare that all profits are extinguished or that all profits belong to the nation? No, it does not. Since they have not accepted that condition, I cannot accept this condition of not protecting mycondition of not protecting my-self as a worker from the attacks of the exploiters, which must be modified by them also."

Is this going over to the bour-geoiste and giving it "unstinted support"?

The report says:

"The rections taken by the bourgeois government against sections of the bourgeoisie (this is reference to banning certain speculative markets, viz., in gold) should be taken advantage of by the working class and we should press for more such actions. For instance, we should ask for take over of the banks. ask for take over of the banks. Similarly, we should ask for converting the secret reserves of the banks into defence of the banks into defence bonds." "I had written to the Prime

"I had written to the Prime Minister about this, stating that defence at the front must also mean defence of the people. For the bourgeoisle, war is an opportunity to enrich itself. That is its fundamental law. But they have to combat it."

Does this sound like "unstanted" support and forgetting class nature of the bourgeoisle, its government and the class struggle"?

But the Mirror refuses to see this Speaking about nonalignment

ment and the class struggle to see this. Speaking about nonalignment and class, the report says:

"A working class is never nonaligned. It is always aligned with the working class of the whole world, of both the countries." whole world, or both the countries of capitalism and socialism.
But a bourgeoisie and its government and the country ruled by it can be nonaligned as India

today is"

Is this passage a sample of forgetting internationalism?

The Mirror quotes one half sentence. But it nowhere mentions

the following declaration:
"If the Indian Government tomorrow takes a position in the imperialist camp and establishes a fascist rule, and goes in for a policy of armaments and war of conquest or aggression, our nationalism will cease to be progressive."
Further on the report says:

"India is today a progressive, anti-imperialist nation, in which ism is still progressive the sense that all its position on the advocacy of peace and peaceful coexistence are posi-tions of internationalism. All positions of opposition to settling problems between two countries by war are positions of internat

"All positions of nonalignment, being in essence anti-imperialist, are positions of internationalism. So you will see from this that in our case, nationalism dear

Only

The Mirror quotes only half the line because it does not like the other three lines, which do not suit it. It quotes: "We have to stand by our nationalism... What is omitted here is the following continuation which completes the

"We have to stand by our nationalism, because the other people have deserted internationalism on the questions of war and peace and settling questions between two states by peaceful means."

The passage on class collabo peaceful means."
The passage on class collaboration which also is half-quoted,

says:
"Industrial truce is, in a sense, class collaboration. But it is consciously accepted because both classes are faced with a situation when a developing, peace-loving free nation is in

In the same connection, the AFFUC resolution on Industrial Truce, among others, warns as follows:

"While unhesitatingly accept-ing this obligation as its patriotic

____NEITHER REVISIONISM NOR DOGMATISM

duty, the AITUC cannot forget we are sure, will not deceive anythat control over production does not rest in the workers hands under the present system. As a capitalist system, the dominant control is in the hands of private employers and the gov-ernment, and labour is denied any voice in the control or regu-

"The AITUC also knows that while many employers sin-cerely want to serve the country's interests, many others would put profits before patriot-ism. Past experience shows that ism. Past experience shows that selfish, profitmongering interests try to utilise an emergency situation, such as the present, to their own narrow advantage, to raise prices, fleece the working people and themselves grow still richer.

"The AITUC is, therefore, of The AITUC is, therefore, of the firm opinion that the worker must be positively assisted to unleash the full strength of his capacity for providing the goods and services urgently needed today both for the Army needed today both for the Army and for the civilian population. Mere eschewing of work stop-pages, though essential, is not enough. All obstacles in the path of the workers productive capacity must be removed. No selfish vested interests can be allowed to frustrate the workers' energy and to sap his patriotic enthusiasm. It is precisely from this standpoint that the Industrial Truce Resolution of November 3, 1962, suffers from

Why has the truthful Mirror

These passages have been given here, not only to show how the Mirror distorts our image to suit its own purpose but also to show how the trade unions were gearing to the new situation without giving up basic class positions.

Warning Against Chauvinism

Warning the workers about chauvinism, the report says:

"Then the question will come —can there be a chauvinistic approach to the problem? There will be, and in the trade unions, we should be on guard. Preach-ing hatred against the people of another country is chauvinism. In spite of attacks from reactionaries, we cannot preach hatred between two peoples.

"What we should try for is a peaceful settlement. The stand-point of chauvinism is no settle-ment but prolonged war. Even sane bourgeois politicians do not do it. But sometimes some insane tradeunionists might insane tradeunionists attempt to do it. Because once you start, that way, you start with the logic of nationalism not harmonised with interna-tionalism. Therefore, preaching hatred between peoples should be avoided."

And the AITUC resolution, after outlining demands of the after outlining demands of the worker, ends with the passage:

The AITUC calls upon the workers, while defending the country, not to fall a vic-tim to chauvinism and to for-get their international duties. To preach racial hatred against any people, even in conditions of war, is not healthy either for winning victory or for the nning victory or for the cause tries are immortal. Indian cul-ture and tradition have always preached the noble ideal of peace and friendship with all nations and people. The work-

APRIL 21, 1963

one.

The Mirror has great hatred for the name of Nehru. So it does not like our sending greetings to him on his 78rd birthday. The particular hirthday was coming in conditions when all the reactionaries in India and outside were conspiring to remove him and smash the policies of peace and nonalignment. A message in such conditions was all the more necessary and we sent it.

The Mirror insists that this is not an ordinary courtesy letter. Of course, it is not. At the same time, it is not a message conveying the theses of the Communist Party on a whole range of problems. On November 14, 1962, Nehru was senemes of reactionary forces, and hence, greater was the necessity to emphasise the policies he stands for and should stand for. It was a countesy letter in a critical period and hence with reference to a policy, but surely not meant to convey our Vijaywada theses.

Attitude Towards Nehru

Our Party has never maintained our rary nas never maintained nor does the message, that India under Nehru is building socialism. But there is also the fact, Nehru does speak of some ideals of so-cialism, though they are not scientific.

Writing on May 6, 1959, People's Daily, producer of the same Mirror, wrote:

"Mr. Nehru, Prime Minis of our friendly neighbour India, is one of the statesmen who is one of the statesmen who enjoy prestige in the world. In particular, we cannot forget that he is a friend of China and an opponent of the imperialist policy of war and aggression. Furthermore, he has also made a number of enlightened statements on social numbers of ments on social progress."

This picture of Nehru changed into its opposite for Mirror in 1963. But to us, with all his faults, vacillations, anti-working class actions, he is still anti-imperialist and in November 1963, when the American imperialists, taking ad-vantage of the Chinese invasion, vantage of the Children washing, were trying to conspire against India's policies, should we not have wished him to live long? Should we not wish him to live long to realise his "ideals of building to realise his "ideals of building" ideals of building to realise his "ideals of building to reali ing a prosperous and socialist

Our culture prevented us from adding in the same breath, in a birthday message, that "though we say this only about your ideals, we know that as a bourgeois your practice of socialism is all capitalist bunk."

We regret we have not the culture and courage of Mirror to perpetrate such horror. We appreciate ideas as such in everyone and criticise wrong practice the right place, at the right th

What we are trying to point out is how wrongly the Chinese leader-ship are behaving towards us. Not content with having distorted and perverted our statements and policies, they even descend to the worst possible level of hurling at us cheap abuses and accusations which no Communist Party in the world has ever hurled at another Party.

When the Chinese advance When the Chinese advance grew faster on the borders, the India Government began arresting Communists all over the country. The arrests were on a large scale just when the Chinese armies had arrived near the borders of Assam. Among those arrested were members of the National Council, members of Parliament and State

nations and people. The working class must carry this tradition forward."

In face of these statements, the distortions made by the Mirror,

members of Parliament and State legislatures, municipal councillors, trade union workers, women workers and the General Secretary of the Party, who, however, was released within a week of his

The alarm at the Chinese advance encouraged the reactionary forces to demand an attack on the Party, to demand a ban on it and the arrests of its leaders. They also wanted to smash our trade unions and mass bases. It was not only those who were supposed to have opposed the resolution on defence that were arrested.

If they disagree with our policies, they can; by all means, criticise, call us revisionists, reformists, degmatists or anything they like. These are at least forms of political criticism. To denounce she who were supposed to have opposed the resolution on defence that were arrested. wanted to smash our trade unions and mass bases. It was not only those who were supposed to have opposed the resolution on defence that were arrested.

Even those who, after the November 2 resolution, had taken to

ment intelligence had no names and no knowledge of things. Who furnished the list? Surrep-

titious and open propaganda now done by some persons for which the key was supplied by the Peking Radio and is now recorded in the Mirror, says the list was supplied by the so-called Dange and company.

The Mirror writes:

". Dange and company have used the power of the Indian ruling groups to push aside the people who disagree with them within the Indian Communist Party and to split the Party wide apart."

"Dange clique exploited the situation and sent their trusted followers on the heels of the police, to take over the leading organs of the Party Committees in a number of States. Ine purpose of these actions by the Dange clique was to reconstitute the Indian Communist Party so as to serve the ends of the big bourgeoisie."

The informants of the Chinese leadership in India and outside seem to have told them things in a hurry and without knowing facts, Except in two states, in no state were the leading organs of the Party Committees taken over. West Bengal was taken over under the central direction because the majority of the state council were in jails and those who were to function "temporarily" for them were from the same old state

CPI's Leadership

Except for two states, no changes were called for anywhere. The Mirror does not know that the majority in the National Council as elected in the last Party Congress was not of the type whom the Peking Radio would like to patrionise and encourage to fight us and split away from us.

us and split away from us.

To describe a unanimously elected leadership as "clique" shows the blind prejudice with which the Peking writers are looking at us. As for those comrades, who have resigned from the Secretariat, we have all along requested them not to do so nor have we refused to give them their due respect, position and work. We respect, position and work. We have so far not filled any of these leading posts, hoping comrades having any differences with the centre to change their minds.

arrest, on strong representation from the Party.

All the papers of the Communist Parties in the world protested against these arrests.

The alarm at the Chinese advance encouraged the reactionary move facilities nor the courage to do such a thing, especially after the shove. They are not helpful to unity fit our movement nor in the world Communist movement.

If they disagree with our policies they can be all means and the Chinese revolution, Chiang Kai-

ember 2 resolution, had taken to carrying it out in full were also among those arrested; in fact, at one time they were the majority among the arrested in majority of the States.

In contrast to the approach of the world Parties, how did the Chinese leadership act? When we were under fire from the American imperialists and the reactionaries from the Right, the Chinese leadership genered fire on us from the

from the Right, the Chinese leadership opened fire on us from the Left and in a manner which showed to what depths they had gone in regard to us.

The Peking Radio broadcast put out that the Government had arrested these Communists "acting on a list of names previously furnished to it," as if the Government intelligence had no names leave it to history to decide. The regret is that in the meanwhile, despite all efforts at unity, some people seem to be bent on "splitting the movement wide apart." We can only hope the working class and the people will show them the right path.

Beyond expressing such hopes what else can we do? The Chinese Party is the ruling party of a great country of 700 million people. We certainly cannot claim that we have the right to advise them on

But why should they arrogate the right to interfere in our inner-The right to meterer in our merer Party affairs, tell us what to do or not to do with our hourgeoiste and who among us "is true Marxist revolutionary" or not, or who is "splitting the Party?"

Thought Of Mao Tse-tung

But it seems the Chinese leadership now claims omniscience. Not
content with being the correct
builders of their revolution they
now wish to advise the whole
world. Now some things may be
good for the Chinese Party but
may not be good for others. Let
us take an example.

It is well-known that all world
Parties in their Party Constitutions
abide by Marxism-Leninism. But
the Chinese Party found it necessary to add to it, hasing themselves on their own experience and
the necessity of their revolution.

In the Constitution of their But it seems the Chinese leader-

In the Constitution of their Party adopted at the 7th National Party Congress in June 1945, Article 2 of the Constitution of the Party lays down the following:

"The duties of a Party membershall be the following:

"(a) to endeavour to raise the level of his consciousness and to understand the fundamentals of Marxism Leninism and Thought of Mao Tse-tung." (p. 149, On the Party by Liu Shao-chi)

It may be pointed out that the Thought is with a capital T and is not merely thoughts.

So the Chinese Party has, along with the fundamentals of Marxism-Leninism, also the Thought of a great national leader of theirs, Comrade Mao Tse-tung. What other Parties have such a fortune? And we certainly are nowhere within the neighbourhood of such a personality or its cult and Thought.

Should we try to emulate or Should we try to emulate or imitate them in this also? In fact, one might say that even Stalin had not the courage to set up his Thought in the Constitution of the CPSU side by aide with that of Leninism, though he had done If the Chinese leadership really wanted to help healthy develop-

the 81-Parties Meeting.

Similarly in the practice of the Chinese revolution, Chiang Kaishek was known to be a hangman of the revolution since his betrayal of 1926. Yet, when the Japanese invaded China in 1936, Mao Tsetung and the Chinese Party proposed a united front with Chiang When he was captured by discontented Generals and they wanted to kill him for failure to agree to an anti-Japanese united agree to an anti-Japanese united front and introduce democratic reforms, the Party got him releas ed in the Sian incident. The Kuomintang then did make efforts to forge some united very halting.

Chinese Party And Chiang

"All the people, with the Com-munists and other democrats, then pinned great hopes on the Kuo-mintang Government... But such hopes come to nothing. Many patriotic political prisoners swere still in jail." (Selected Works, Mao tse-tung), . Then a front came up for a time during the Second World War. It broke again. Again it was proposed and so That is Chinese history.

We do not compare our present problem or the India-China dispute with that war. We only wanted to show how patient the Chinese Party was in the united front tactics and that with hangman Chiang Kai-shek.

Neither is our Party in that happy position nor has our bourgeoisie yet gone into that unhappy position. Yet why should we be asked to follow lessons of "thirty years before"? which have no validity for us? And if we do not do the beautiful to the state of the state o no validity for usr And Ir we do not do so, why, please, why interfere in our work and force on us the "Thought of Mao Tsetung" to the exclusion of our own, which, however poor it may be is our own understanding of be, is our own understanding of our situation and Marxism-Lenin

Each country has its own path Each county has its own path and peculiarities. The Indonesians have their own peculiarities and their own path. Theirs now is the second largest Party in Asia. They have fought heroically in the liberation movement. They have still to live under a "Cuided December 10" in the liberation of the liber Democracy" and the handicaps of a military regime tempered by the leadership of President Sukarno.

Their united fronts and class Their united fronts and class alliances are suitable to their own situation. The Party is a member of the Coalition Government under Sukarno. Their latest report shows that even then the cost of living has risen terribly and workers are suffering. Com. Aidit, the Chairman, in fact said that even though the Party was not able to solve the problem, by being in the Government, in cooperation with the bourgeoiste, yet it had to follow that path in the given circumstances of the balance of forces of Indonesia and its antiforces of Indonesia and its anti-imperialist, anti-feudal task. Who will criticise them for this? Cer-

Similarly, we in India also must find our own path on the basis of Marxism-Leninism. Nobody else's path will suit us, be it Chinese, Russian, British, Indo-nesian, though we should certainly The 81 Parties statement laid down the common thought but the application has to be ours. Why then should the Chinese leadership try to divide us? The world Communist Communist movement needs unity arrived on the basis of common understanding and the infallibility of anyb

NEW AGE SUPPLEMENT

VII

在1966年中,在1966年度中发展的

For Unity of World and Indian Communist Movement

HE unilateral cease-fire declared by China on the night of November 21, with the readiness to with-draw troops to the "line of actual control" from December 1, was a wise step. They could appear before the world as really desiring a peaceful settlement once again.

India reciprocated by observing the cease-fire on her side but wanted the Chinese forces to withdraw, not to an un-defined line of "actual control" but the line they held on September 7, 1962, before any negotiations could be thought

In the argument that followed the cease-fire, it was stated that the Chinese "line of actual control" was the one they had in 1959. This line, they said, was even better in some respects than the line ome respects than the line of September 7, 1962, asked for by the Indian side. If it was so, why would they not agree to September 7, 1962?

to September 7, 1962?

In the meanwhile, the Government of UAR, Ghana, Ceylon, Burma, Indonesia and Cambodia, met and proposed to mediate on this question of where to withdraw in order to begin negotiations for a settlement. The mediation of the Colombo Pawers for a settlement. The metalstion of the Colombo Powers or Colombo Six, as they are called in this dispute, was accepted by both sides.

Colombo Powers' Proposals

When the proposals of the Colombo Six with their clari-fications were made known to India and China, India accept-ed them in full, that is, the proposals with clarifications.
The Chinese leadership first The Chinese leadership first gave an answer of "positive" response, when they were not yet sure of India's acceptance. But when India made known her acceptance in toto and asked China to do the same, the Chinese leadership refu-

sed to do so.

In fact, at one stage, some of their leading spokesmen charged the Colombo leaders of not giving "identical clari-fications" to both parties. When this was denied, they yust stalled and refused to say anything but did not accept the proposals, thus creating a deadlock.

This deadlock facilitated the scheme of Rightwing reaction-ary forces in India and the imperialists, abroad.

When the Chinese side re-

fused to accept even the proposals of six non-aligned na-tions of Asia-Africa, who were friendly both to China and India, they lost whatever good impression and relaxation of tension they had achieved by their unilateral cease-fire Those who had admired their "unprecedented generosity" of the cease-fire were embarras-sed by their new perversity in not accepting the Colombo proposals.

proposals.

After a few days of shouting about "harassment" and "persecution" of the Chinese citizens in Indian detention camps, they announced that they would release all the Indian prisoners of were in their dian prisoners of war in their hands. The Government of India also agreed to allow the Chinese nationals to leave India, if they wished, in the

Chinese ships that were sent

for them.

Though the situation in India has undergone a material change since the cease-fire and the Colombo mediation, yet the refusal of the Chinese side to accept the Colombo proposals has kept up the feeling of suspense alive. Peo-ple can be persuaded to lend a sympathetic ear to the ques-tion: "Will the Chinese start again and when? The resolution of the Central Executive Committee of our Party in its meeting of April 15, 1963, says:
"The Central Executive

Committee deeply deplores that the Chinese Government unreasonably persists in pressing forward its unilateral proposals and in carrying forward its unilateral proposals and in carrying on a propaganda campaign of slander against

India.
"The ensuing deadlock in India-China relations keeps up the political climate of suspicion and fear of China, which the Indian Rightwing forces planfully utilise for their campaign of seeking military aid from the impemilitary aid from the imperialists and challenging the progressive policies of the Nehru Government. The Chinese attitude thus Chinese attitude thus strengthens the very forces which do not desire India-China negotiations and a peaceful settlement.

The adamant Chinese attitude, coupled with their threatening notes and dis-ruptive moves, encourages the demand for ever greater military aid from the West.
It is a dangerous develoument which weakens India internally as well as internationally.

"The Central Executive Committee once again calls

Committee once again calls for vigilance against the U.S. proposal for an 'air umbrella' and its demand for bases on Indian soil.

"Not only that, The U.S. Government, however, has made no secret of its demand that the price of its continuing and increasing military and economic aid to military and economic aid to India is our willingness to hand over Kashmir to Pakistan.

It says further:

"Though the Government of India has rejected the U.S. demand to change In-U. S. demand to change India's basic policies, yet it has made serious concessions in the name of Emergency by agreeing to the stationing of the U. S. Military Mission in Delhi and by granting U. S. Military Observers the right of inspection, etc., and thus allowing them to interfere matters. This in defence matters. This cannot but encourage the U.S. imperialists to keep up the pressure against the policy of non-alignment and threaten Indian sovereign-

... India's firm adherence to our independent self-reliant defence policy will get us all our military requirements from all fri-endly countries, without in any way compromising our basic policies. Weakening before imperialist pressure before imperialist pressure will encourage Indian rightwing, damage Indian sove-reignty, weaken non-alignment and cause dismay among all the peace-loving

"Prime Minister Nehru has repeately stated that India is opposed to a military solution of our dispute with China. The Communist Party of India extends its full support to the Govern-ment of India's offer of arbitration to settle the dis-pute, if negotiations fail."

Opposition To Tax Proposals

The exigencies of a war-like situation and the continua-tion of the deadlock was bound to evoke a demand for raising money for defence and development. The makers and development. The makers of the new year's budget fully knew that the people will accept the logic that defence needs money and money means taxes. The new budget imposed heavy taxes on the people to make provisions for defence and development.

The reaction of the toiling masses to the budget and the

masses to the budget and the new taxes were one of opposition because the taxes lav heavily on them alone. Noting this fact, the CEC on April 14, 1963, adopted its resolution on "The Budget Proposals and Alternative Sources of Funds for National Development and National Defence," in which

"There cannot be two opinions that for our economic development, as well as for building up of the country's defence potential, additional resources are to be rais-ed. The real point at issue is where and how to find the needed resources.

"In the recent months, it has been amply demonstrated how our people are ready to make the greatest measure of sacrifice when called upon to do so in the interests of the nation. Indeed, it is the working people of our country, suffering from many a want, who contributed most to the national defence fund and otherwise to the cause of the nation's defence. This, how-ever, cannot be said of the millionaires, monopolists and other sections of the wealthy people. They have, on the contrary, sought to exploit the Emergency to gather benefits. for themselves. It was expected that the present budgetary proposals will be so devised as to compel these rich people to make their due contributions towards the fulfilment of our national purposes.

"Instead of raising ade quate resources from the rich, and adopting other effective economic measures, such as nationalisation of banking, oil industry, etc., which has become an urgent necessity for the future our economy as a whole, the current budget proposals place new economic burdens on the masses who are already over-taxed and struck by constantly rising prices.

The greater part of the additional taxes and levies un-

der the Central Budget is pro-posed to be raised through Union Excise duties, compul-sory deposit schemes, surcharge on income-tax of even those belonging to the lowest income brackets. Almost all the necessi-tion of life in the country are brackets. Almost all the necessa-ties of life in the country are already taxed. Yet additional levies are imposed even on such necessities of life as kerosene, tobacco, sugar, tea, soap. Prices of postcards have also been increased"

nationalisation of the Thus nationalisation of the banks and some of the big monopolies is the solution to the problem of resources and taxes.

What do these resolutions

polies is the solution to the problem of resources and taxes.

What do these resolutions
show? They show that while the
Party, in the emergency of the
November war-crisis was all out
for defence of the country, it has
not given up the defence of people's interests. While recognising
the needs of defence and development and money for the same, it
has shown where to find it without harming those very toiling
classes who are the real producers
of wealth and defenders of the
country. To defend the country,
it is not necessary to hit the
people and save the rich — that
is the way, we ought to think
and do think.

During this very period, the

and do think.

During this very period, the trade unions have been able to secure from the Covernment and the employers, certain wage-increases and beneficial awards. Despite the attacks made on our trade union workers, we have been able to make good mine. trade union workers, we have been able to make good gains in a number of cases, such as wage-awards and agreements in iron and steel, coal, coffee, life insur-ance, etc., etc. The AITUC has not deserted the defence of the working class, as the Chinese slander campaign suggests. Taking advantage of the emer-gency, monopolists have tried to strengthen the positions of pri-vate capital and secure a curb on the expansion of the State Sector a number of cases, such as wage-

the expansion of the State Sector and have succeeded in some cases and have succeeded in some cases as in shipping, oil, etc. At the same time, the Gold Control Order, insofar as it seeks to weaken smuggling and reduction of gold price has not pleased them. The bans on certain speculative markets was also not to their liking.

While agreements with the

While agreements with the imperialist bloc for trade and "aid" are sought on a larger imperialist bloc for trade and "aid" are sought on a larger scale, trade with the socialist countries and their assistance to the growth of independent Indian economy have also grown.

Such in brief is the way in which our Party looks at the situation that is developing in the new year.

w year. And because we refuse to give up the defence of the people, while fully standing for the defence of the country, the reactionary forces and the Government have tried to weaken and disrupt our Party by arrests of Party and trade union leaders and workers.

Campaign For Release Of Communists

The National Council and the Central Secretariat have taken a number of steps to secure the release of our comrades. A number of deputations, since the days of the very first arrests till now, have been continually meeting the Prime Minister, the Home Minister, the State Chief Ministers, for purpose.

meetings have been held Mass meetings have been held and questions raised in Parliament and State Assemblies to answer the allegations against the arrested comrades and to get them released. Every Party paper has campaigned for them. As a result of this movement, a number of comrades in some of the States have been released. The campaign to secure the release of the have been released. The cam-paign to secure the release of the remaining ones will continue,

until all are out.

The Party in every State is gathering new momentum. Under

its auspices and its Red Flag, mighty demonstrations are taking place against the attacks of the monopolists on the life and living of the working people and the toiling intelligentsia.

In Tamiland for

Tamilnad, for example In Tamilnad, for example, 40,000 people organised a mighty demonstration against the Swatantra Party and its reactionary policies. Thousands of new members from the ranks of the working class and toiling peasantry are joining the Party.

class and toiling peasantry are joining the Party.

In several States, the drive for Party funds has received enthusiastic response. Is this the picture of a Party that has be-trayed the masses, that is disintegrating because of its "revisionism" and desertion of Marxism-Leninism?

The attitude of the Chinese

n-Leninismr The attitude of the Chinese leaders with respect to the accep-tance of the Colombo proposals,

tance of the Colombo proposals, resulting in a cold war, has armed the reactionaries to perpetuate the emergency and its use against the Communist Party of India as a whole.

The reactionary forces in the country have kept up the anti-Communist drive by splitting the democratic forces. However, undeterred by these difficulties, the various units of the Communist Party are steadfastly discharging their duty.

Uphold Unity Against Splitters

Thus it can be seen that the basic line of the November resolution foiled the moves of the right-wing reactionaries and imperiolises to isolate the Party right-wing reactionaries and imperialists to isolate the Party from the masses and thereby kill it. It enabled the Party to hold on to its bases and its class. The subsequent changes in the situation and resolutions follow-

situation and resolutions follow-ing from it enabled the Party to activise the masses, to coordinate the defence of their class interests with the interests of the country, against the monopolists and hig landlords and their selfish parasitio

The further development of the basic line thus foils once again the game of the right-wing re-action and imperialists to capture the mind of the masses and impose their policies on them, which are both anti-national and anti-

The Chinese leadership may onveniently ignore these facts but they will not be able to conceal the truth, by their noise, from the progressive forces in the world

The three campaigns — for the defence of workers and toiling people's standard of living, against the taxes on the poor in the budget and for the release of Community prisoners — combined budget and for the release of Communist prisoners — combined with support to the needs of defence and development of the country — that are being conducted under the banner of the Communist Party of India, while under fire from the reactionaries

Communist Party of India, while under fire from the reactionaries and the emergency laws used by the Government against the Communist Party, are irrefutable testimonies against the false and slanderous allegations made by the Communist Party of China and those who support it.

Contrary to the interest of the unity of the world Communist movement, the Chinese leadership has, through these allegations, virtually given a call for a split within the ranks of the Communist Party of India.

We are, however, confident that international Communist unity and the unity of the Communist unity and the unity of the Communist the Wardsts-Leninists all over the world, will be saved and wisdom will ultimately prevail upon the Chinese leadership and dissuade them from their splitting activities.

We, of the Communist Party of activities.

We, of the Communist Party of We, of the Communist Party of India, will leave no stone un-turned, to defeat every splitting move and uphold the barner of Communist unity.