

MADURAI DOCUMENT BETRAYS

REVISIONIST UNDERSTANDING OF THE NATURE OF CONTRADICTIONS

Editorial Board, Deshabrati

[This is an English rendering of one of the articles analysing the revisionist character of the Madurai ideological document, which are appearing in the Bengali Weekly, Deshabrati. This article, originally in Bengali, was published on October 5, 1967.]

—Editor, LIBERATION]

What is the essence of the General Line of the International Communist Movement as presented by the Central Committee of the great Chinese Communist Party?

“Workers of all countries, unite; workers of the world, unite with the oppressed peoples and oppressed nations; oppose imperialism and reaction in all countries; strive for world peace, national liberation, people’s democracy and socialism; consolidate and expand the Socialist camp; bring the proletarian world revolution step by step to complete victory; and establish a new world without imperialism, without capitalism and without the exploitation of man by man.”

[Letter of the C. P. C. Central Committee dated June 14, 1963 in reply to the letter of the CPSU Central Committee dated March 30, 1963]

What is the real nature of the profound significance underlying the General Line of the International Communist Movement presented by the CC of the CPC? This is the General Line which calls for carrying forward the resolute revolutionary struggles of the peoples of the world and

the proletarian world revolution step by step to complete victory by united revolutionary struggle; imperialism can be fought effectively and world peace defended only if the peoples of all countries wage a resolute united revolutionary struggle.

On the other hand (and as opposed to the Chinese Party), the leadership of the CPSU lays down and pursues a General Line which is devoid of revolutionary content and finds expression in “peaceful co-existence” and “peaceful competition” between the two social systems and “peaceful transition from capitalism to socialism.” By adopting this international line they have entered into an unholy alliance with US imperialism, created disruption in the world communist movement and have taken to the path of restoring capitalism in their own country.

Why is this so?

A concrete class analysis of world politics and economics and of actual world conditions as a whole, that is to say, a concrete class analysis of the fundamental contradictions in the contemporary world, constitutes the starting point from which the Communist Parties proceed to define the General Line of the international communist movement. Differences in the class analysis of the contradictions in the contemporary world and in regard to a correct understanding of their inter-connection as well as differences in correctly understanding the inter-connection of the struggles that grow out of those contradictions in the contemporary world—lie at the root of the ideological struggle between the CC of the CPC and the leadership of the CPSU. The CPSU leadership has completely rejected dialectical materialism and the dialectical materialist theory of knowledge and has had recourse to idealism, and their approach to the whole thing is purely subjective. The dialectical materialist theory of knowledge has been fully upheld in the assessment and analysis made by the Chinese Party leaders.

To anyone who has gone through the sections, namely, "New Epoch" and "On the Issue of Contradictions," of the Madurai document produced by the neo-revisionist leadership of our party, it would appear that they are, on the face of it, expressing their agreement with the Chinese Party and criticising the modern revisionists. And it is precisely here that the hateful deception of the neo-revisionist leadership of our party has revealed its worst features, or, it might be said, the full depth of their ignorance about the dialectical materialist theory and the dialectical materialist theory of knowledge. That explains why they are so anxious not to allow comrades to examine critically how far the Programme adopted at our Seventh Party Congress has succeeded in defining many strategic and tactical tasks of the international communist movement which arise out of the characteristic features of this era of ours.

Let us examine their deceptions. The Eighty-one Party Document formulated the specific features of our era in the following manner :

"Our time, whose main content is the transition from capitalism to socialism initiated by the Great October Socialist Revolution, is a time of struggle between the two opposing social systems, a time of socialist revolutions and national-liberation revolutions, a time of the breakdown of imperialism, of the abolition of the colonial system, a time of transition of more peoples to the socialist path, of the triumph of socialism and communism on a world-wide scale."

But how does the Madurai document present the characteristic features of the contemporary world in its "New Epoch" section? The Madurai document states :

"Ours is certainly a new epoch, an epoch of transition from capitalism, an epoch when the international socialist system is becoming the decisive factor determining

the course of world development, an epoch of rapid decay and disintegration of colonialism, an epoch of titanic class battles between the forces of moribund capitalism and of socialism and national liberation revolutions, and an epoch of the collapse of imperialism and the final victory of socialism and communism on a world scale."

[Madurai document, *People's Democracy* supplement of Sept. 3, 1967 ; p. 7.]

How did the formulation—"an epoch when the international socialist system is becoming the decisive factor determining the course of world development"—creep into the Madurai document in connection with the definition of the characteristics of the contemporary era? Readers can see for themselves that the Moscow statement of 1960 referred to this aspect like this—"a time of struggle between the two opposing social systems."

Can this difference be fortuitous? Does not this small difference signify a difference in understanding the role of the most important and new factors in the contemporary world as stated in the 1960 Moscow Statement? Of course, it does and the difference is quite important. It is absolutely necessary to understand properly these new factors in order to resolve correctly the basic issues of the contemporary world in a manner commensurate with the interests of peace, national independence, democracy and socialism.

How can the transition from capitalism to socialism constitute the main content, dominant trend and principal characteristic of the historical development of society? To formulate this as a characteristic of the contemporary world as has been done in the Madurai document, viz.—that this is "an epoch when the international socialist system is becoming the decisive factor determining the course of world development"—is to relegate all other factors to a secondary place. Not only that, the very significance of the

profound and comprehensive definition of the characteristics of the contemporary era as contained in the 1960 Statement, is thereby reduced to a meaningless thing. While analysing the new factors, the Statement not only referred to the transition from capitalism to socialism as the main content of our era, but also elucidated the method of its development and the content of this transition.

What then is that method and that content? In this new epoch, transition from capitalism to socialism will take place as a result of the struggle between the two systems, as a result of the socialist and national revolutions and as a result of the overthrow of imperialism and liquidation of the colonial system! That is why, the process of transition from capitalism to socialism is the result of revolutionary class-struggles both in the national and in the international sphere.

The world socialist system has become a decisive factor in the development of human society. But the main content, dominant trend and the principal characteristics of the historical development of human society are being determined by the sum total of the revolutionary struggles waged by the revolutionary forces for socialist transformation of society and against imperialism. This meaningful concept is clearly reflected in the understanding of the C. C. of the great Chinese Communist Party. The C. C. of the C.P.C. defines the line in these words: "This general line is one of resolute revolutionary struggle by the people of all countries and of carrying the proletarian world revolution forward to the end." [Ibid]

The "New Epoch" section of the Madurai document talks of the united action by the world socialist system, by the working class movements in the advanced capitalist countries and the national liberation struggles, by the broad popular movements against war and for world peace, and calls upon them to inflict defeat after defeat on imperialism. This section also refers to the fact that the modern

revisionists are disrupting the solidarity of the world socialist system and the unity of the international Communist movement, and undermining the national liberation struggles and the movements of the revolutionary working class. But while defining the characteristics of the epoch, it points to the socialist system as the "decisive" factor determining the course of world development and thus keeps the door open for an eventual compromise with revisionism.

DEVIATION FROM MATERIALIST DIALECTICS IN ASSESSING THE CONTRADICTIONS

The four fundamental contradictions in the contemporary world are :

- (i) the contradiction between the socialist camp and the imperialist camp ;
- (ii) the contradiction between the proletariat and the bourgeoisie in the capitalist countries ;
- (iii) the contradiction between the oppressed nations and imperialism ; and
- (iv) the contradiction among imperialist countries and among monopoly capitalist groups.

Of these, the contradiction between the socialist camp and the imperialist camp is a contradiction between two fundamentally different social systems, and from the class point of view this contradiction is a contradiction between the states under the proletarian dictatorship and the states under the dictatorship of monopoly capitalists.

These four kinds of contradictions are inter-related and influence each other. From the point of view of dialectical materialism, it is of utmost importance to find out the inter-connection between these contradictions and the concrete form in which they influence each other, that is to say, to find out properly their individual role. Further, according to the dialectical materialist viewpoint, it is the contradiction inherent in a thing or a phenomenon that acts as the motive force behind any change in the thing or

phenomenon while the external contradictions provide the circumstances for this change. The external contradictions create favourable or unfavourable circumstances and thereby encourage or discourage the internal contradiction—this sums up their role.

Three among the four fundamental contradictions in the contemporary world, the contradiction between the proletariat and the bourgeoisie in the capitalist countries, the contradiction between the oppressed nations and imperialism, and the contradiction among imperialist countries and among monopoly capitalist groups—are contradictions within the imperialist camp. According to the dialectical method, further collapse of imperialist camp and further development of the socialist camp, that is, transition from capitalism to socialism can take place only as the result of the actions of the internal contradictions of the imperialist camp.

The Soviet leaders reject this dialectical method. They hold that the contradiction between the socialist camp and the imperialist camp—which is only an external contradiction so far as the collapse of the imperialist camp is concerned—is the principal contradiction that will determine the collapse of the imperialist camp. Moreover, they look at it as a contradiction devoid of any revolutionary content. They refuse to see that it is basically a contradiction between states under the dictatorship of the proletariat and states under the dictatorship of the monopoly capitalists.

While speaking of the four contemporary contradictions the Madurai document has indulged in much learned discussion about the roles of contradictions—the central contradiction, the main contradiction etc. What is totally absent, however, is the inter-connection between and an analysis of the roles of contradictions, the chief thing in dialectical materialist assessment. This has led them to

make the following statement while defining the characteristics of the contemporary era: "This is an epoch when the international socialist system is becoming the decisive factor determining the course of world development." And while discussing the contradictions it has stated: "Notwithstanding the fact that" "the contradiction between the camp of socialism and the camp of imperialism remains as the central one among the fundamental contradictions of our time," "the one between the imperialists and oppressed nations has got accentuated and assumed the acutest form... and the intensification of this contradiction is, of course, *influencing* the course of all other contradictions, their growth and development." [Madurai document, p. 12]

That is, the socialist system is becoming "the decisive" factor determining the main content of the present epoch while the contradiction between the oppressed nations and imperialism, that is to say, the role of the national liberation struggles consists only in "*influencing*" the growth and development of all other contradictions. In other words, the course of development of the content, the path of transition from capitalism to socialism, will be determined not by the maturing of the internal contradictions but by the external contradiction, namely, the role of the socialist camp. It is only natural that the neo-revisionist leadership was so anxious to push the programme, full of the seeds of revisionism, through the Seventh Congress of our Party in a hurry and to forbid any discussion of the Party Programme and resolutions while circulating the document on the international ideological controversy for discussion.

There is no doubt that referring to the Socialist camp the Moscow Statement of 1960 said:

"It is the principal characteristic of our time that the world socialist system is becoming the decisive factor in the development of society."

How should we understand this profound concept? The contradiction between the two systems is one of the four fundamental contradictions which are working towards the collapse of the imperialist camp and its role must be appreciated in a dialectical materialist manner.

The world socialist system is a firm mainstay for the national liberation struggles and the working class movements in the capitalist countries. The successes achieved in the building of socialism and communism have transformed the socialist camp into a powerful international force. The emergence and development of the socialist camp not only influence the course of development of the contradictions but also exert a big influence towards the resolution of the contradictions. How? It is creating extremely favourable conditions for the people of different countries and for the revolutionary struggles for national liberation, democracy and socialism. Secondly, the socialist camp presents a real possibility for the prevention of a new world war, and this makes it possible to advance towards national liberation, democracy and socialism without a new world war. But this advance itself will be made as a result of the maturing of the internal contradictions of the world imperialist camp, by the people's revolutions to which it leads, by the smashing of the weak links of the world imperialist front. A united front of the revolutionary struggles of all countries is of utmost importance in order to break these weak links.

There can be no doubt that the vast areas of Asia, Africa and Latin America are the storm-centres of the revolutionary movements. It is here that the imperialist front must be broken and the revolutionary national liberation struggles are the means of doing this. But what makes these areas the storm-centres? The Madurai document has totally failed to grasp it.

With the shrinking of the world imperialist system various types of contradictions in the world are concentrated

in these areas (Asia, Africa and Latin America). Contradiction between the oppressed people on the one hand and imperialists and new and old colonialists on the other, contradiction between the peasantry and the feudalists, contradiction between the proletariat and the bourgeoisie, contradiction among different imperialists and contradiction between the socialist camp and the imperialist camp—all these are concentrated in these areas. And again, it is here that a powerful revolutionary force—people's movement for national liberation—has emerged with the force of a tremendous tidal wave, and the ruling bourgeoisie in various countries in these areas have not yet succeeded in building up a powerful state machinery comparable to that built up by the ruling classes in the Western countries. It is abundantly clear that these are the most valuable areas in the imperialist capitalist camp.

The Madurai document produced by the neo-revisionist leadership contains everything but a complete revolutionary theory—in point of fact, it is nothing but a patchwork of pieces of self-contradictory theoretical ventures. For a complete theory they would have to accept unequivocally either the general line of the CPC or that of the CPSU.

They do not dare come out openly against the general line of the CPC or go over to the modern revisionists directly since they are perfectly aware of the revolutionary consciousness of the toiling people of India and the Party ranks. But their cleverness cannot save them. However much they may criticise the Soviet revisionists, they are, in practice, pursuing the CPSU political line and that explains why, despite their revolutionary braggadocio, they have willingly tied themselves to the chariot-wheels of the state of the counter-revolutionary Indian ruling classes.