

IN DEFENCE OF
MARXISM LENINISM
MAO TSETUNG THOUGHT
AND
GENERAL LINE OF
INTERNATIONAL
COMMUNIST MOVEMENT

CENTRE OF COMMUNIST REVOLUTIONARIES OF INDIA

PREFACE

The main text of the document, "In Defence of Marxism-Leninism-Mao Tsetung Thought and General Line of International Communist Movement", was prepared in Circa 1978. At that time, the People's Daily editorial of August 1977 that had expounded the Three World Theory and its application to the current international situation, generated an international ideological controversy. In this regard, there emerged a sharp divergence of views, in the C. C. of the UCCRI (ML) too.

It was prepared by Comrade HBS, representing the minority view in the C. C., as a draft for discussion in the C. C. with the objective of thoroughly examining and resolving the differences and arriving at a unified position on the ideological-political issues involved. Subsequently, as the divergent ideological-political lines remained intact in the C. C., it was issued as the minority draft document for inner-organisational discussions preparatory to the proposed conference of the Organisation. However, the inner-organisational discussions did not get initiated and a split occurred in the UCCRI (ML) in September, 1979.

A special conference of the UCCRI (ML) led by Com. HBS was held in January, 1982. The document under reference (alongwith another one titled "On the internal Developments in China") was submitted to the Special Conference for deliberation and approval. The Central Committee (Provisional) while submitting this document to the conference proposed certain official amendments. It was felt that the formal pattern and arguementation-structure of the text, influenced as these were by the specific circumstances of its birth, called for its reshaping so as to serve the purpose of a positive statement of our International line. Such a full fledged reshaping of the text being not feasible, some formal pruning and addition of some points (regarding

the fact and international implications of China's change of colour) were sought to be effected through the official amendments. The Special Conference, in its second sitting of Feb. 1982, unanimously upheld the amended version of the main text as well as the supplement as international line document of the UCCRI (ML) led by Com. HBS. The March, 1985 Regular Conference of the said Organisation reiterated the decision of the 1982 Special Conference.

The August, 1988 Unity Convention of five Communist Revolutionary Groups that brought into being the unified Organisation, the CCRI-upheld this document as its official international line document. Of course, the document is not up-to-date regarding the analysis of international political developments (a deficiency that is sought to be compensated, to a certain extent, by the Dec., 1988 Political Resolution of the CCRI). Still the basic ideological political stand-point and orientation provided by the document are relevant even today and constitute a reliable weapon in the ideological struggle against opportunist trends of the right or the "left" variety. On this consideration, the CCRI deemed the document fit to be its official international line document. In due course of the time, the CCRI intends to prepare a more comprehensive and compact document for the purpose. Till then, the readers are requested to receive this document with due consideration of its historical significance as well as limitations.

February, 1989

Central Committee,
C. C. R. I.

IN DEFENCE OF MARXISM-LENINISM- MAO TSETUNG THOUGHT AND THE GENERAL LINE OF INTERNATIONAL COMMUNIST MOVEMENT

(Upheld by the Special Conference of
UCCRI (M-L), Feb. 25-27, 1982)

The ideological controversy and polemics presently going on among the international communist movement, involve not only the questions of policy to be adopted in the present period of its development (i.e., tactical orientation of the movement) but also the statement and affirmation of the general line of the international communist movement. It is so because, in the debate, apparently over the questions of tactical orientation of the movement, certain principles of Marxist-Leninist theory are being interpreted and applied in a controversial manner which have a bearing on the general line of the international communist movement.

II. The general line of the international communist movement can correctly be defined only in the theoretical framework of the Marxist-Leninist characterisation of the present epoch, and on the basis of class analysis of all the fundamental contradictions of the contemporary world and all the struggles emanating therefrom, which are inter-related and constitute the essential content of this epoch. It is not addressed to, and based on, the class analysis of the non-fundamental contradictions, in the contemporary world (those come under the purview of the class analysis for defining day to day tactics and short-term policies of different contingents of the international communist movement).

It "must take as its guiding principle the Marxist-Leninist revolutionary theory concerning the historical mission of the proletariat and must not depart from it." (From "A proposal concerning the General line of the International Communist Movement." June 14, 1963 Letter of the CPC).

III. The tactical orientation of the international communist movement is based on the periodic analysis of the process of development of the fundamental contradictions of the world and the significant changes occurring therein, while the fundamental contradictions maintain their continuity and validity. Thus the tactical orientation remains subservient to the general line of the international communist movement, it indicates the most appropriate and immediate direction of advance of the movement in a given period. In the long process of development of the world proletarian revolution in the present epoch, different periods of its development are marked by the change in tactical orientation, while the general line of international communist movement remains, basically unchanged.

IV. A comprehensive statement of the general line of the international communist movement, at a given period, not only should point out the basic direction for the revolutionary struggles of the proletariat and people of all countries, but also the current direction i.e., the tactical orientation of their common world revolutionary struggle. In other words it should point out not only the general course of class alignment and direction of epochal struggle between world proletarian revolution and world imperialist counter revolution, but also the chief reactionary force or forces by whom the imperialist counter revolutionary global strategy is mainly, being carried out, in the given period, and against whom the concentrated fire of the world revolution is currently to be directed.

V. The above, seemingly obvious, formulations are intimated by an important Marxist-Leninist principle, viz,

the principle of conceiving and forging organic connection between the immediate and ultimate, specific and general, partial and basic, tactical and strategic tasks, struggles and orientation of the revolutionary movement. Both the "revolutionary" phrase-monger and the reformist violate this principle by negating or impairing this organic connection, with the same objective, and result of non-realisation of the basic, strategic goals of the revolutionary movement. The former with his barren assertions of the basic, strategic objectives and orientation while obliterating or ignoring the immediate, tactical tasks and orientation through only which the concrete realisation of these can proceed; and the latter with his sole pre-occupation with the immediate, partial objectives, investing these with excessive importance and independent legitimacy and not subordinating these to the requirements of the basic strategic objectives, despite the ritualistic reiterations, which are relegated and consigned to an indefinite future for materialisation. For Marxist-Leninists to remain faithful to this principle, it is imperative to combat the erroneous and eclectic view, which is directly opposed to the dialectical character and conception of this inter-connection between the immediate, partial objectives and struggles and the long range, basic ones of the revolutionary movement; the view which comprehends and attempts to establish this connection only in a mechanical sequence i.e., the later operating only after the fruition of the former. This view refuses to recognise that in the revolutionary scheme of things (operations, phenomena) the immediate, the partial, the tactical, the particular, the defensive is impregnated with the ultimate, the basic, the strategic, the general, the offensive, that the latter grows and matures, in embryonic form, in the former; that in the development of the former, the latter is manifested and realised in a peculiar and limited form, though is not exhausted by this form. Thus, this view, actually, negates the continuity in the development of the

revolutionary struggle (effected through gradual movement and leaps). And this is the view point of reformism of Social Democracy. This is precisely how reformism sacrifices the basic interests of the proletariat and revolutionary people on the altar of momentary interests by snapping or distorting the organic connection between the two.

Here are some illustrations from the writings of great Marxists which contain the statement and application of this principle:—

"The communist fight for the attainment of the immediate aims, for the enforcement of the momentary interests of the working class; but in the movement of present, they also represent and take care of the future of that movement." (Emphasis added)

—Communist Manifesto.

"One should know how to combine the struggle for democracy and the struggle for the socialist revolution, subordinating the first to the second. In this lies the whole difficulty; In this is the whole essence." (Emphasis added) (Letter to Inessa Armand, Lenin, Dec. 25. 1916).

"While actively leading immediate struggles, communist in the capitalist countries should link them with the struggle for long range and general interests, educate the masses in a Marxist-Leninist revolutionary spirit, ceaselessly raise their political consciousness and undertake the historical tasks of the proletarian revolution. If they fail to do so, if they regard the immediate movement as everything, determine their conduct from case to case, adapt themselves to the events of the day and sacrifice the basic interests of the proletariat that is out and out social democracy." (Emphasis added) (Proposal concerning the General Line of the International Communist Movement, CPC letter, June 14, 1963).

VI. Another important theoretical principle, emanating from Leninist theory of world proletarian revolution in the

imperialist epoch, is this that the most vital and general link connecting various component parts of the world proletarian revolution, various phases and stage of its development, various fronts and levels at which revolutionary fight is conducted, is the hegemony of proletariat. Hence one of the important criteria to assess the correctness or otherwise of any strategic or tactical orientation, policy or tactic of communist movement is whether or not, and to what extent, it leads to the promotion or strengthening of the hegemony of proletariat in the revolutionary struggle and over the various class forces involved in it.

VII. In the epoch of imperialism and proletarian revolution, the revolutionary traits of the bourgeoisie have turned into their opposites, transforming it from a progressive force upholding democracy and nationalism into a reactionary and counter revolutionary force, a "decrepit bourgeoisie which is capable only of raping, not of freeing nations" (though the national bourgeoisie of colonial and semi-colonial countries being oppressed by imperialism, "retains a certain revolutionary quality at certain periods and to a certain degree—even in the era of imperialism in its opposition to the foreign imperialists," as distinct from the anti-democratic counter-revolutionary monopoly bourgeoisie tied to imperialism in compradorial relationship). This "imperialist, rapacious, predatory, reactionary bourgeoisie strives for domination over weaker and small nations, and when confronted by more powerful imperialist adversaries, threatening domination over it, or actually dominating it, it works up rabid national chauvinism and war frenzy in a desperate gamble to seek robber parity with them. In either case, its role is detrimental to the interests of the people of its own country and betrays its hostile character in relation to the genuine national cause of other peoples.

In this regard, any view which, overtly or by implication, attempts at investing this imperialist bourgeoisie with progressive or revolutionary attributes and role, while

affirming the Leninist characterisation of the present epoch, is liable to the charge of revising some of the fundamental thesis of Lenin on the character of imperialism and its conductor, the senile bourgeoisie. It will be Trotskyism turned inside-out. Trotskyism attempted a revision of the Leninist thesis on national and colonial questions from a 'Left' opportunist position, by attributing the counter-revolutionary character and role of the bourgeoisie of imperialist countries, to the oppressed bourgeoisie of the colonial or semi-colonial countries, effacing thereby the sharp distinction between oppressing and oppressed nations — the most important fundamental idea of the thesis, whereas, it would be an attempt at revising the Leninist thesis from a right opportunist position, if the same distinction between oppressed nations and oppressing nations is effaced the other way round, by attributing the revolutionary anti-imperialist potentialities of the bourgeoisie of colonial or semi-colonial countries to the bourgeoisie of the imperialist countries.

Trotskyism effaced the distinction between the capitalistically advanced imperialist oppressing nations and capitalistically backward, oppressed nations of colonial, semi-colonial countries by mechanically applying the revolutionary experience and tactical principles of European communist movement to the colonial East and rejecting the tactic of forming a national united front inclusive of national bourgeoisie against imperialism and for national liberation in these oppressed countries. Whereas it would be an attempt at effacing the same distinction from a right opportunist position, if this tactic of forming a national united front (inclusive of imperialist bourgeoisie) for national liberation is applied to the capitalistically advanced, imperialist oppressing countries.

VIII. The concept of the principal enemy, in a given period, and that of forming a broad united front against it, is not applicable in an identical fashion to the revolutionary

movement in one country and that in the international arena. This assertion is made on the basis of the fact that, so far as the aspect (factor) of state power is concerned, a country is a single entity, whereas the world is not.

Hence in a country the principal task, at a given movement, is one and the same for the all contingents of the revolutionary movement throughout the country. Consequently, all other tasks are directly and immediately related to the principal task through being rendered non-principal for the given period, whereas in the world, the different contingents of the communist and revolutionary movement have different principal tasks, at a given moment. Consequently, due to the interplay of various fundamental contradictions, whichever principal common task confronts the international communist and revolutionary movement, at a given moment, it does not, usually render directly and immediately the principal tasks of different contingents of international communist and revolutionary movement, non-principal. Its co-ordination with the respective principal tasks of different revolutionary contingents assumes different forms and extent, depending upon the nature of those tasks and its own nature. Obviously, this matter has a bearing on the nature and inter-connection of the united fronts operating at national levels and of that at the international level.

Any view which does not take this distinction into consideration and mechanically seeks to apply the concepts of principal enemy, principal task and broad united front against the principal enemy, at international level the way these are applied at the country level, is bound to lead to a course entirely different from that of Marxism-Leninism-Mao Tse-tung Thought.

IX. The correct understanding and application of the Leninist tactical principle of utilising the contradictions among the enemies involves clarity on two questions: what is the objective of utilizing the enemy contradictions? and

how should these be utilised to serve this objective ?

The objective of utilising the contradictions among the enemies is, to serve the revolution, not only to achieve some immediate purpose but to promote the general interests (cause) of the revolutionary movement viz. raising the revolutionary spirit, consciousness, level of organisation, fighting capacity and strength of the revolutionary forces. It is the revolutionary objective which demarcates the revolutionary from the reformist approach towards utilising the contradictions among the enemies.

It is the development of various contradictions (contradictions between the revolutionary forces and the enemy and the contradictions within the enemy camp itself) that creates the basis of utilising the contradictions among the enemies. The forms and scope of exploiting these contradictions depending on the basis actually existing, in a given situation (which is determined by taking into cognizance the position of these contradictions at that time).

By adopting appropriate policy slogans we provide or create the necessary condition (or conditions) of exploitation of contradictions among the enemies, on the existing basis, in a given situation. If the necessary condition is not created the opportunity of exploiting the contradiction among the enemies, latent in the existing basis, will remain unrealised (or not fully realised).

Alliance with a section of the enemy is one of the forms, and not the only form, of utilising contradictions among the enemy camp. It is not obligatory on our part to enter into temporary alliance with a section of the enemy, even when the basis of utilising the contradictions among the enemy in this form, exists, because, the feasibility of adopting a form of utilising the contradictions among the enemy at a given time is one thing, and advisability (or desirability) of doing so is another. Utilisation of the contradictions among the enemy camp in the form of an alliance with a section of it is of conditional nature. Whether it is proper to resort to

this form (alliance with a section of the enemy) at a given time or not depends upon whether we have (in relation to the strength of the section of enemy) the minimum strength (ideological maturity, solidity of our organisation, expanse of the organised masses under our leadership, general influence and prestige of our organisation etc.) required for the purpose or not. Only if this required condition is available, we will be able to practice the principle of 'maintaining independence and initiative within the united front', establish our leadership over the united movement and make this alliance serve the revolution. Otherwise, either the immediate aim of the movement will be defeated through the betrayal of the treacherous ally, or the gains of the achieved aim will be usurped by it to the detriment of the revolutionary movement. Of course, the errors of judgement cannot be ruled out but entering into an alliance with such a treacherous enemy without due consideration of the above stated condition, is tantamount to ignoring or not tackling the central question of such alliances—who would utilise whom? and speculating in conducting the revolutionary movement.

"...the comprador Chinese big bourgeoisie has always been a target of the revolution. However, different groups within this big bourgeoisie are backed by different imperialist powers, so that when contradictions among these powers become sharp and when the edge of the revolution is mainly directed against a particular power, the big bourgeois groups dependent upon the other powers may join the struggle against that particular imperialist power to a certain extent and for a certain time. At such times, in order to weaken the enemy and add to its own reserves, the Chinese proletariat may form a united front with these groups and should maintain it as far as possible provided it is advantageous to the revolution." ("Introducing the Communist" Mao Oct. 4, 1959)

It is tricky affair to comment, in a general way, upon

the question as to which form (or combination of forms) of utilising the contradictions among the enemies is to be employed in what circumstances (as is the case with all questions of tactics). Never the less, basing upon the past experience of the communist movement, certain broad propositions, regarding our conduct in this matter can be made as follows.

At a time, when the enemy camp is plagued with dissensions, infighting and resultant crisis and confusion but the nature or extent of their dog fights is such as not to warrant any purposeful distinction between various cliques or sections, we should utilise their contradictions by boldly advancing the revolutionary movement to gain at their cost and cause more confusion in their midst (in contrast with the situation when the enemy camp is in relative unity and stability). Such was the case at the time of the first split in the then ruling Congress party, in our country. At the international level it was the period in Europe, during Second World War, between August 1939, when Soviet-German Treaty of Non-Aggression was signed, and June 1941, when German Fascist armies attacked Soviet Russia.

At a time, when, along with a situation of serious discord, conflict and crisis in the enemy camp, some more or less important distinction between its different sections can be made but the contradiction between ourselves and any of these sections has still not developed to a principal position to the exclusion of other sections, we should utilise the contradictions by making a differentiated attack, in nature or extent or both, and turn to our advantage certain positive features, even though temporary, in the position of some sections. One type of such case was just before and during the Emergency period in our country. Another type of case was the distinction in the positions of European belligerent powers and the United States of America (during roughly the same period of Second World War, as men-

tioned above) which was as yet not switching its economy to war programme, its rule to fascist suppression of the American people and was not directly participating in the war.

When, apart from there being a situation of serious conflict and crisis in the enemy camp, the contradiction between ourselves and a section of the enemies has come to the fore as principal contradiction but the contradiction between this section of the enemy and other sections has still not reached a critical point and the basis of forming an alliance between ourselves and the sections other than the principal enemy has not matured, at such a time, we should manoeuvre with other sections of the enemy in various ways so as to avoid, a state of active confrontation and hostility with these sections and concentrate our attack on the principal enemy. This type of situation was being faced by the Chinese revolution in years 1935-36 during the period of anti-Japanese national united front policy, excluding the ruling classes of China. "Moreover, unity is by no means prevalent even in the camp of the landlord and comprador classes. Since the contention for China among many imperialist powers has generated contending groups of traitors in their service, with contradictions and conflicts among them, the party should employ a variety of methods to ensure that for the time being some of those counter-revolutionary forces do not actively oppose the anti-Japanese front. The same tactics should be applied in dealing with the imperialist powers other than Japan" (C. P. C. Polit Bureau's Resolution on the present political situation and the tasks of the Party, Dec. 25, 1935.)

When contradiction between ourselves and a section of the enemies has assumed principal position and the contradiction between this section and other section or sections of the enemies has also crossed a critical point (a point beyond which the chances of mutual accommodation of their interests become minimal and one's interests cannot be

advanced without imperiling those of the others) thus providing us a basis for entering into a temporary alliance with the section of the enemy other than the principal one, at such a time we would strive hard to form a united front against the common enemy with this section provided that it is advantageous to the revolution.

In the above case, if the underlined condition, is lacking, in such a situation we should not enter into a united front with a section of the enemy but instead would utilise the contradiction among the enemies by coordinating, in various ways, our independent activity with the activity of this section to obtain joint opposition to the principal enemy. This last type of case may be the situation facing the Indian revolution if it is to fight against principal foreign enemy with the present state of affairs of the communist revolutionary movement.

One more point should be kept in mind while considering the various forms of utilising the contradictions within the enemy camp, namely, the difference, in various respects, in the condition and conduct of the proletariat in power and that of the proletariat struggling for the seizure of power. Though in both cases, the conduct of the proletariat is subject to the requirements of the over all interest of promoting the world proletarian revolution, it need not always be identical in form at a given moment.

In a nutshell, in our approach to the tactical question of utilising the contradictions among the enemies, we should proceed from a clear conception of the objective of this exercise, determine our policy and practice in strict conformity with the actually existing basis for it while taking up and solving the central problem 'who shall utilise whom' (in other words, who shall lead whom in achieving whose objective).

X. In discussing the problems of war, peace and revolution, the first and foremost question again, is: Do the Leninist approach, concepts and thesis concerning war and

related matters remain still valid and the indispensable theoretical basis for analysis, for defining a correct revolutionary policy and tasks of the proletariat? Or, have they (or some of these) been left behind, rendered obsolete, by the development of history since the time of Lenin? Our answer should be, categorically, affirmative that Lenin's teachings on war and revolution remain valid and relevant.

The basic Leninist approach to the understanding of war is that:—

"Every war is the continuation of politics by other means".(1)

"Everything depends on the system of political relations before the war and during the war".(2)

"The character of the war (whether it is reactionary or revolutionary) does not depend on who the attacker was, or in whose country the 'enemy' is stationed; it depends on what class is waging the war, and of what politics this war is a continuation".(3)

The basic Leninist concepts regarding the war and the questions of national defence are:—

Nationality and Fatherland are not general concepts but historical concepts i.e., having "historically transient limits". "The working class must first 'establish itself within the frame work of the nation'—the Communist Manifesto declares, emphasising the limits and conditions of our recognition of nationality and fatherland as essential forms of the bourgeois system and, consequently of the bourgeois fatherland. The opportunists distort that truth by carrying over to the era of the end of capitalism what applies to the era of its rise. And of this era, of the tasks of the proletariat in the struggle

(1) V. I. Lenin, Collected works Vol. 22, Page 310.

"The Junius Pamphlet"

(2) V. I. Lenin, Collected works, Vol. 35, Page 264.

"To Inessa Armand"

(3) V. I. Lenin, Collected works, Vol. 28, Page 280.

"Proletarian Revolution and Renegade Kautsky"

to destroy not feudalism but capitalism the Communist Manifesto gives a clear and precise formula: "the working men have no country".(4)

In the condition of a world war, each case in the war should be considered not in isolation from but in connection with the general war as a whole, whether the decisive influence is being exerted by 'the national element' or the 'element of imperialist rivalry'.

"A national war might be transformed into an imperialist war and vice versa", under given conditions.(5)

The main Leninist thesis concerning war and related tasks of the proletariat are:

"The main types of these systems" (of political relations between states) "(a) the relation of the oppressed nation to the oppressing, (b) the relation between two oppressing nations on account of the loot, its deviation etc, (c) the relation of a national state which does not oppress others to one which oppresses, to a particularly reactionary state".(6)

The wars waged by imperialist bourgeoisie are predatory, reactionary unjust wars.

In these advanced countries (Britain, France, Germany etc.) the national problem was solved long ago ; national unity outlived its purpose long ago ; objectively, there are no "general national tasks" to be accomplished. Hence, only in these countries is it possible now to 'blow up' national unity and establish class unity". "The under developed countries are a different matter. They embrace the whole of Eastern Europe and the colonies and semi-colonies. In those areas, as a rule, there still exist oppressed and

- (4) V. I. Lenin, Collected works, Vol. 21, Page 38.
"Position and Tasks of Socialist International"
(5) V. I. Lenin, Collected works, Vol. 22, Page 309.
"The Junius Pamphlet"
(6) V. I. Lenin, Collected works, Vol. 35, Page 264.
"To Inessa Armand"

capitalistically underdeveloped nations. Objectively, these nations still have general national tasks to accomplish, namely, democratic tasks, the task of throwing off foreign oppression".(7)

The anti-imperialist wars waged by oppressed nations and people are revolutionary, just wars.

A war waged by a national state which does not oppress others, against an oppressor, particularly reactionary state (who aims at turning back the development of the former, pushing her back from national unity to dismemberment) can, under certain conditions, assume progressive, just character. It will be "a peculiar variety of national war".

"If the war is a reactionary, imperialist war, that is if it is being waged by two world groups of the imperialist, rapacious, predatory, reactionary bourgeoisie, then every bourgeoisie (even of the smallest country) becomes a participant in the plunder, and my duty as a representative of the revolutionary proletariat is to prepare for the world proletarian revolution as the only escape from the horrors of a world war. I must argue, not from the point of view of 'my' country (for that is the argument of wretched stupid, petty bourgeois nationalists who does not realise that he is only a plaything in the hands of imperialist bourgeoisie) but from the point of view of my share in the preparation, in the propaganda, and in the acceleration of the world proletarian revolution" (8)

"From the stand point of progress, from the standpoint of the progressive class, the imperialist bourgeois war, the war of highly developed capitalism, can, objectively, be opposed only with a war against the bourgeoisie i.e., primarily civil war for power between the proletariat and the

- (7) V. I. Lenin Collected works, Vol. 23, Page 59.
"A Caricature of Marxism"
(8) V. I. Lenin, Collected works, Vol. 28, Page, 286-87.
"Proletarian Revolution and Renegade Kautsky"

bourgeoisie, for unless, such a war is waged, serious progress is impossible".(9)

".....Intensive effort to convert the war of the nations into civil war is the only socialist activity in the era of imperialist armed conflict of the bourgeoisie of all nations."(10)

"The fundamental slogan of converting the imperialist war into civil war is not conditioned by the existing balance of class forces, and bright and dim chances of immediate seizure of power by the proletariat (which factor is to be considered for deciding concrete forms of struggle and steps to be taken at a given time) but by the character of the war...inattentive and unscrupulous people only too frequently confuse two different problems, viz,—that of the direction to be followed, i.e. the choice of one of two different roads, and that of the ease of attaining our goal, or the nearness of its attainment along a given road."

In the capitalist countries, the preparations for war, and its actual operation, are accompanied on the one hand, by the growth of reaction, intensified exploitation and suppression of the toiling masses, and on the other hand, by accentuation of the political crisis, and, rapid maturing of the objective revolutionary situation that "inevitably gives rise to revolutionary sentiments, steels and enlightens all the best and most class conscious proletarians." Also there are millions of semi-proletarians and petty bourgeoisie "whom the horrors of war will not only intimidate and depress but also enlighten, teach, awaken, organise, steel and prepare for the war against the bourgeoisie of their 'own' country and 'foreign' countries."(11)

(9) V. I. Lenin, Collected works, Vol. 22, Page 316.

"Junius Pamphlet"

(10) V. I. Lenin, Collected works, Vol. 21, Page 40.

"Position and Tasks of Socialist International"

(11) (i) V. I. Lenin, Collected works, Vol. 21, Page 251.

"The Collapse of the second International"

(11) (ii) V. I. Lenin, Collected works, Vol. 21, Page 40.

"Position and tasks of Socialist International"

Both war and revolution are off-shoots of the same root-cause—the irreconcilable contradictions of the imperialist system and their extreme accentuation resulting in profound crisis of the system. War is the response of the decadent bourgeoisie towards solving this crisis in its own interests. Both contend to overtake each other.

The experience of the Second World War vindicated the soundness and vitality of the Leninist stand point, though it was applied to cope with situations different in many respects, from those which Lenin faced during and before the First World War. Just before and during the Second World War, the international communist movement, represented by the Comintern, had to work out the common practical orientation on the basis of this Leninist standpoint, keeping in view two new factors. First, the existence of a thriving socialist country, Soviet Union (under the conditions of imperialist encirclement and threat of a war of aggression being imposed on it by a smaller or bigger combination of imperialist powers) which was having an impact on the whole course of events, and whose defence was of paramount significance for the whole revolutionary and progressive movement. Second, the emergence of fascism, the monster child of the decadent bourgeoisie—imperialism, manifestations of the extreme reaction, the international situation underwent three main periods of development in relation to the Second World War and three corresponding tactical orientations of the international communist and revolutionary movement were worked out.

First Period: 1935 to 1939: The period of world people's peace front or international united front against Fascism and War.

In this period the danger of war had developed into the threat of war, particularly a war of aggression against Soviet Union by the Fascist block of countries vanguarded by Fascist Germany and militarist Japan. These Axis powers were also directing their intervention or aggression

against the developing revolutions, in China (Japanese imperialism) and Spain (German and Italian fascists). They were threatening or committing aggression against many small nations and weak states and also hurting the interests of other imperialist powers. One peculiarity of this situation was that, only one group of imperialist powers was pushing the war without being challenged for the time being, by the other group. (It was on the basis of this peculiarity that the imperialist powers were categorised into aggressor and non aggressor powers, for that period).

In correspondence with this objective situation, a common tactical orientation for the international communist movement was worked out which centered around the defence of Soviet Union and world peace and called upon the world proletariat for creating a broad people's anti-war Front (which was to include not only other classes, but also weak nations and peoples whose independence and security were menaced by war). This anti-war front was directed against the forces of extreme reaction and war instigation, especially the Axis-powers who had come forward as the most pronounced and direct vehicle of such a phenomenon. As the policy of aggression of these Axis powers was leading to a differentiation in the policy of the great imperialist powers, some of which or some sections of which were interested in the defence of the status-quo and in a temporary and conditional defence of peace ; also as the contradictions among the big imperialist powers were developing in such a way as to cause obstruction to the creation of a formidable bloc for war against the Soviet Union. This created an opportunity for the international proletariat and the foreign policy of Soviet Union to utilise in the struggle against war, the position taken by these imperialist powers. The tactical orientation embraced this aspect also. "At the base of our revolutionary strategy and consequently of our concrete struggle against war, we put the concentration of forces against the Japanese militarists who threatened an

onslaught on the Soviet Union at its eastern frontiers and who are striving to destroy the conquests of the Chinese revolution, and against German Fascism—the chief instigator of war in Europe. We endeavour to utilise all differences existing in the position of the various imperialist powers. We must utilise them skillfully in the interests of the defence of peace, not forgetting for a moment the necessity of delivering a blow against the enemy in our own countries, against our 'own' imperialism". (Erocli, The Fight for Peace and Against Imperialist war—Report to the 7th Congress of Communist International, August 13, 1935.)

This tactical orientation, while specifically tackling the immediate central problems of preventing an anti-Soviet war, checking the aggression of the fascist countries and delaying the outbreak of an imperialist world war for as long as possible, addressed itself to the immediate perspective of the developing situation and movement. In a true Leninist spirit it linked the tasks of that period with the tasks ahead : "for all capitalist countries the beginning of war will denote the onset of a revolutionary crisis and during this crisis we shall with all our strength at the head of the masses to convert the imperialist war into a civil war against bourgeoisie, we shall fight for revolution and for the conquest of power." "We not only do not hide the slogan of the conversion of imperialist war into a civil war, which, in case of war, remains the fundamental slogan of bolsheviks, but by fighting desperately for peace we desire, as the result of this fight, to unite around the revolutionary vanguard the masses of the workers, toiling peasants and also the petty bourgeoisie, which the proletariat must lead along the path of the conversion of imperialist war into civil war against the bourgeoisie." (ibid)

Second Period : From 1939 to June 1941 : The period of imperialist war and the struggle of the international proletariat for ending this war, or seeking a way out of this war through revolution. The salient features of this period were :

Soviet Union had, for the time being, freed itself from the dragnet of imperialist encirclement and war by concluding a non-aggression pact with Germany and defeating the conspiracy and double dealing of the treacherous Anglo-French bourgeoisie, particularly the reactionary ruling circles of Great Britain. Both groups of imperialists were, at the time, confronting each other in a predatory war for a new repartition of the earth, the colonial possession and source of raw materials, for hegemony in Europe and world domination. In the capitalist countries, a realignment of class forces was taking place. The social democratic parties which were earlier part of the popular front against fascism and war, were casting their lot with their respective imperialist rulers and their war-policies. Most of the capitalist Governments which earlier maintained 'neutrality' were getting themselves tagged, overtly or covertly, with one or other group of belligerents, either to share the spoils of victory in war or to fatten on the war orders for their ammunition factories.

In the changed conditions a new tactical orientation was adopted for that period. The concentration of attack on fascist powers was replaced with opening out the attack on all belligerent powers: Popular fronts policy was changed into the policy of hoisting the proletarian banner of war against war and for world proletarian revolution. Around this revolutionary banner were sought to be rallied millions of semi-proletarians and distressed petty bourgeoisie masses yearning for social liberation in the capitalist countries and thousands of millions of oppressed peoples in the colonial and semi-colonial countries struggling for national liberation. With the determined support and assistance of the Soviet Union (who was, at that time, in a relatively better position to do so) the revolutionary movement envisaged favourable situation and better prospects for its advance (while the enemy—imperialism—was getting enmeshed and embroiled in debilitating internecine war). Comrade Dimitrov, General Secretary of communist international, sized up the

situation and delineated the new orientation for that period in a policy statement, captioned; "The war and the working class" 1939, re-affirming and applying Leninist stand point to the concrete conditions of the period: "In this character and essence, the present war is, on the part of both the warring sides, an imperialist unjust war... Now, as in 1914, the war is being waged by the imperialist bourgeoisie. The war is direct continuation of the struggle between the imperialist powers for a new repartition of the earth, for world hegemony...and not at all in defence of 'democracy', 'liberty', 'international law' and the guarantee of the independence of the small countries and people, as is being howled by the bourgeoisie press and the social democratic deceivers of the working class. The responsibility for the war lies with the ruling circles of the belligerent states... whereas previously the above mentioned European states were divided into aggressors and non-aggressor powers i.e., into such as were directly the war makers, and such as for the time being did not come out openly as aggressors, although behind the scenes, they encouraged aggression against other countries, now this division does not correspond to the real position. This difference has disappeared... that which in the period preceding the present war was characteristic of the regime of the Fascist countries, is becoming, in conditions of the war let loose, increasingly prevalent in the countries of so called bourgeoisie democracy... For the working class there is only one true stand, namely, irreconcilable, courageous struggle against the imperialist war, struggle against the culprits and vehicles of this war primarily in their own countries, struggle to end this war... The Communist parties and the working class of the capitalist countries will be inspired by the heroic example of the Russian Bolsheviks, by the example of the Party of Lenin and Stalin, which in 1914-18 showed the proletariat the true way out of the war and subsequently secured the victory of socialism over one-sixth of the globe."

Third Period: From 1941 to the end of Second World War: The period of world People's war in defence of Soviet Union under attack from German fascist hordes or of broadest possible international anti-fascist united front: With the perfidious attack by German fascists on Soviet Union in violation of the non-aggression pact between the two, the main theatre of war shifted to the German Soviet battle lines, and the character of on going war was radically transformed. Soviet Union's war in defence of its socialist state power its people and land against fascist aggressors became the all-determining element in the war as against element of imperialist rivalry, and consequently, the war assumed just character in essence. In case of defeat of Soviet Union, the only citadel of world revolution and light existing then, a period of blackest reaction would have set in for the people of all countries through out the world struggling for social and national revolution, for peace and progress. Hence, an all out struggle, on the part of all revolutionary and progressive forces, for defending Soviet Union, for preventing the eventuality of its being vanquished, emerged as the paramount task of the world revolutionary movement. The situation regarding the inter-imperialist contradiction and the position of the imperialist powers opposed to Axis powers was also markedly different from that of the First Period. In the new situation, having already witnessed the westward aggressive designs and advances of ambitious German fascists, they could not afford the fall of Soviet Union to German armies at less than enormously heavy cost to German war-capacity. Though true to their inherent reactionary nature, they also wished for Soviet Union's utter ruination in war and its utter dependence on them for survival and recovery (of course, not the recovery of its socialist economy.)

So, in accordance with the requirements and tasks of the new situation a new tactical orientation was taken up by the

international communist movement of forming the broadest possible international anti-fascist united front which envisaged, apart from other combinations of class forces, an alliance between Soviet Union and a group of imperialist powers in the fight against the war of aggression of the Axis-powers, and appropriate adjustments of various contradictions at the hands of various sections of communist international to the demands of the common principal contradiction of the world revolutionary forces with the aggressor Axis-powers. The new tactical orientation enjoined upon all contingents of international communist movement constantly to keep in view of the revolutionary perspective and the treacherous nature of the temporary imperialist allies; to maintain independence and strive to gain revolutionary ground in the current struggle, without imparting the promotion of common supreme task of the period—the defeat of the aggressor fascist bloc. The emergence of the forces of socialism and national liberation with enormously enhanced strength and prestige out of World War II proved that the tactical orientations worked out by Comintern for tackling the problems of war in its different phases were basically correct, not with standing the fact that certain mistakes were committed, and some section of Comintern exhibited serious right opportunist tendencies in their thinking and practice of their period.

It is a notable point that the anti-fascist united front of the first period and the anti-fascist united front of the third period were not identical in their content, where as the former was a peace front (for the prevention of an anti-Soviet war and delaying so long as possible, the imperialist war) which was not solely but mainly directed against countries of the fascist bloc, and did not include imperialist powers in a blanket way; the latter was a war-front (for defeating the war of aggression imposed on Soviet Union and the world people by the fascist bloc) which was solely directed against the aggressor—Axis powers and did include

other imperialist powers. Alliance of Soviet Union—a socialist country—with certain imperialist powers, in a special situation, was unprecedented. It did not conflict with the basic Leninist stand-point, first, because this alliance took place in a just war, and not in an imperialist war (and consequently it was made to serve a just cause, whatever the considerations of the imperialist participants might be); Anyhow, such an alliance of a socialist country with some of imperialist powers could be conceived and justified only in conditions of the Third period. This tactic could not be applied and justified, say, in the second period ie, in the conditions of imperialist war. At the time of the imperialist war when some people were making conjectures about the possibility of 'Soviet Union's participation in the war, aligning with this or that side, Mao Tse Tung explicitly stated that socialist countries, as a matter of principle, do not get involved in an unjust imperialist war and do not line up with belligerent imperialist countries in such a war, and that Soviet Union would not violate this principle: "The Soviet Union is a Socialist country...and it necessarily maintains a clear cut two fold attitude towards wars:

(i) it firmly refuses to take part in any unjust, predatory and imperialist war and maintains strict neutrality towards the belligerents. Hence the Soviet Red Army will never disregard principles and join either of the imperialist-war-fronts.

(ii) it actively supports just and non predatory wars of liberation...and it will certainly give help to any war for the liberation of the masses or of a nation which break out in other countries in the future, and it will certainly give help to any wars that contribute to the defence of peace."

(Identity of interests between the Soviet Union and all mankind, Sept. 28, 1939).

Another important point in the experience of the second world war is related to the question of national independence

of weak capitalist states in face of an aggression by one or more big imperialist powers. The Seventh Congress of the Communist International, while working out the tactical orientation for the first period, proclaimed for 'small nations and weak states "the right to defend their national independence" against the attacks of big imperialist powers. And communists were asked upon actively to intervene, in such a case, in the armed struggle for national independence (in which the national bourgeoisie may, under certain conditions, participate) to fight in the front ranks of the struggle converting it into genuine people's war to defeat the imperialist enemy. The chief consideration underlying this decision of communist international was that of weak capitalist states should not be equated with big predatory imperialist states. Some people, failing to understand that the decision was mainly applicable to the first period, when wars of aggression by fascist powers on some small nations and weak capitalist states in Europe (who were not a party to any imperialist war-front) were anticipated, tended to view events of the second period in the light of this decision. Consequently, when fascist Germany attacked and occupied Poland (a weak state but a party to the Anglo-French war front) during the imperialist war, they were confused over the fact that Soviet Union and the international communist movement did not come out in support of the Polish Government and the ruling class. Mao Tsetung gave a candid analysis of this event to clear up the misty understanding of such people: "In the war, this reactionary Polish Government, willingly drove the Polish people to serve as cannon fodder for British and French finance capital and it willingly served as a sector of the reactionary front of international finance capital...it would be wrong for us to waste sympathy on it. As for Polish people they are victims, they should rise up against the oppression of the German fascists and against their own reactionary land lord and bourgeois classes and

es tablish an independent, free and democratic Polish State." (ibid) (Emphasis added)

By the way, does not it sound strange that for a country under occupation by fascist aggressors, Mao did not single out foreign imperialist occupiers as the principal enemy and target of the revolutionary people but bracketed both of them foreign imperialist aggressors and the native ruling classes together as the target, and set the task for the Polish revolutionary as not restoring the independence of Poland but of establishing a people's democratic Poland? This is a brilliant application of the Leninist standpoint on the question of national independence in an imperialist war in relation to the countries attached to one or the other imperialist war-front

SECTION--II

THE EARLIER AGREED POSITION ON THE GENERAL LINE AND ITS RELEVANCE TO THE RESTATEMENT OF LINE IN THE PRESENT

At present an ideological controversy is going on in the international communist movement over defining and affirming the general line of the movement and its current direction. Back in early sixties, one such controversy had flared up which led to a sharp demarcation between forces of Marxism-Leninism and forces of modern revisionism. Marxist-Leninists closed their ranks on the basis of a common understanding of the general line and its immediate direction, at that time, a cogent statement and elaboration of which was contained in CPC's June 1963 Letter to C. P. S. U. titled, "A proposal Concerning The General Line of the International Communist Movement."

Since then, important developments have taken place in the world and in the proletarian revolutionary movement,

which call for necessary modifications in the statement of the line and its immediate direction. But the basic approach, principles and framework of that line remain valid even today. So, it should be taken as the point of departure in proceeding to analyse the important developments since then, various current international phenomena, and to define our position vis-a-vis these.

In its most precise form the general line as well as its immediate global direction, was stated at that time, in the following way: "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, without the exploitation of man by man."

"This, in our view, is the general line of the international communist movement at the present stage."

"This general line...is directed against the counter revolutionary global strategy of U. S. imperialism."

The basis for determining the immediate global direction (of the general line) "against the counter-revolutionary global strategy of U. S. imperialism" was the following assessment of the unprecedented super-power hegemonic role of U. S. imperialism in the situation existing then.

"Taking advantage of the situation after the World War II, the U. S. imperialists stepped into the shoes of the German, Italian and Japanese fascists, and have been trying to erect a huge world empire such as has never been known before. The strategic objectives of U. S. imperialism have been to grab and dominate the intermediate zone lying between the United States and the socialist camp, put down the revolutions of the oppressed peoples and nations, proceed to

destroy the socialist countries, and thus to subject all the peoples and countries of the world, including its allies, to domination and enslavement by U. S. monopoly capital."

"U. S. imperialism", is "biggest international exploiter", "the mainstay of colonialism today", "the main force of aggression and war." It "is the chief bulwark of world reaction and an international gendarme...it has become the enemy of the people of the whole world."

Hence the tactical orientation of the international communist movement: "The international proletariat must and can unite all the forces that can be united, make use of the internal contradictions in the enemy camp and establish the broadest united front against the U. S. imperialists and their lackeys."

The fact that U. S. imperialism, with the colossal financial and military might of a super power, had succeeded or was succeeding in controlling most of the capitalist countries also and was dominating, in varying degrees, even other big imperialist countries, entrusted upon the proletariat of these countries a special task of fighting against "foreign" domination, along with the basic task of struggling against exploitation and rule of monopoly capital of their "own" country. This "foreign" domination was a source not only of intensified exploitation of the proletariat and other working people of these countries, but also of counter-revolutionary offensive against the capitalist system. Hence the need and significance of the struggle against "foreign" domination, existent or threatened, was not to be counterposed to the struggle against one's 'own' imperialist bourgeoisie, for these two struggles complemented each other.

In the national democratic revolutionary struggle of the people of colonial and semi-colonial countries also, the proletariat and its party, while struggling against all foreign oppression and for national liberation, would be directing special efforts to the exposure and combating of expansionist, aggressive designs and acts, various intrigues and traps of U. S. imperialism, and each and every act of betrayal of national

interests by the native reactionaries—the lackeys of imperialism headed by U. S. imperialists; even if this arch-enemy might not be directly oppressing them they were not to be complacent of its possible intervention to save the tottering positions of other colonial powers and to replace them partially or wholly.

The socialist countries, politically the most influential segment of the international communist movement, while pursuing the general line of their foreign policy (strengthening unity and friendship among the socialist countries on the basis of Marxism-Leninism and extending fraternal mutual assistance and co-operation on the basis of proletarian internationalism; striving for peaceful co-existence with countries having different social systems and opposing the imperialist policies of aggression and war, thus, isolating the imperialist forces of aggression and war and enlisting the support of all peace loving people and countries in defending world peace; opposing the anti-communist, anti-popular and counter-revolutionary policies of the reactionaries of all countries and, encouraging, actively supporting and helping the revolutionary struggles of the proletariat and working people of all countries and the liberation struggles of the oppressed nations) were to direct the sharp edge of their socialist diplomacy, political propaganda and campaign etc, against U. S. imperialism's counter-revolutionary designs and acts of pushing forward its hegemony, aggression and war-repartition; and constantly seeking those issues and areas where the interests of other imperialist powers did not coincide with or clashes with the interest of U. S. imperialism so as to manoeuvre on the basis with the former and secure vantage position in the bitter struggle against the latter. (An example of successful manoeuvring of such kind was the breaching by socialist China of economic blockade and diplomatic isolation imposed on it by imperialist powers, chiefly U. S. imperialists.)

The elaboration of the general line of international

communist movement, at that time, was aimed at repudiating certain erroneous views on the fundamental contradictions in the contemporary world and the struggles to which they gave rise. Among these erroneous views, one was "The view which blots out the class content of the contradiction between the socialist and the imperialist camps and fails to see this contradictions as one between states under the dictatorship of the proletariat and states under the dictatorship of the monopoly capitalist." Proceeding from this view, an opportunist leadership of Soviet Union was practising all round cooperation with imperialist countries, especially U. S imperialism, in the name of "peaceful co-existence" emasculating, thereby, the revolutionary content of the Leninist-foreign policy of a socialist country and renouncing proletarian internationalist obligations to "oppose imperialism and reaction in all countries" and actively support and "help the revolutionary struggle of the oppressed classes and nations of the world." Instead, it sought the revolutionary struggles of the oppressed classes and nations to be dovetailed to the opportunist requirements of its foreign policy aims of seeking the goodwill and cooperation of the imperialist countries, chiefly U. S imperialism. Catering to the same aims in a more positive fashion, another pernicious view advocated by the C. P. S. U. leadership was that in the national and democratic revolutionary movement of the people of semi-colonial countries of Asia, Africa and Latin America, the struggle for the defence and consolidating of political independence constituted the main aspect (or practically the essence of the movement) and the remnant 'influence' of imperialism or 'dependence' upon imperialists could be, gradually, eradicated in the course of their struggle for economic independence which had come to "the front."

"The peoples are now faced with the problems of consolidating their political independence, overcoming economic and cultural backwardness and putting an end to all forms

of dependence upon imperialism". "Now when political independence has been won, the struggle of the young sovereign states against imperialism for their ultimate national revival for economic independence comes to the front". (C. P. S. U...March 1963) This view denies the semi-colonial or neo-colonial status of majority of these countries and was the cornerstone of the reformist concept of "National Democracy" allegedly being materialised through the development of "national economies" under the aegis of the reactionary bourgeois and landlord ruling classes with the "effective" economic assistance of the socialist countries. The hard fact that the reactionary regimes in these countries were pursuing anti-people, anti-national policies and persecuting the communists and democrats earnestly struggling for national liberation and development, national and economic, was sought to be explained away as temporary phenomena in constantly changing political conditions and regimes for the better: "In an endeavour to strengthen its dominant position after the attainment of independence the right wing national bourgeoisie sometimes succeeds in establishing reactionary political regimes for a time, and starts persecuting communists and other democrats. However, such regimes are short lived..." (ibid) (one such "short lived" regime has been 'living' in India for the last thirty years!)

In short, this view was "neglecting or undermining the contradictions...between the oppressed nations and imperialism" and hypothesising "that the contradiction between the oppressed nations and imperialism can be resolved without revolution by the oppressed nations". In terms of political practice, this view was inducing the proletariat and the broad masses in these countries to accept the hegemony of the bourgeoisie, covered with Marxist-Leninist phraseology. This apologia of neo-colonialism was exposed and combated at that time.

The detailed exposition of the general line and connected

principles served also to combat certain other erroneous views and tendencies betrayed by the C. P. S. U. leadership which had a bearing on the unity of the international communist movement. One such tendency was to violate the principle guiding relations among fraternal parties, namely the principle of solidarity, the principle of mutual support and mutual assistance, the principle of independence and equality and the principle of reaching unanimity through consultation—all on the basis of Marxism and proletarian internationalism. The opportunist leadership of the C. P. S. U. was distorting "the principle of solidarity" by reducing it to the one way solidarity of other parties with C. P. S. U., not a mutual affairs. While showing formal allegiance to "the principle of independence and equality", it was actually adopting patriarchal ways in relations with them. Not bothering about "the principle of reaching unanimity through consultation", it proclaimed its own line and documents as the common line of the international communist movement and sought to impose it on other fraternal parties going to the length of threatening those who would not fall in line with criticism and extending ideological differences with ruling communist parties to the sphere of state relation. Showing scant regard for the views and assessment of the international communist movement, it arrogated the right to itself of unilaterally revising the unanimous verdict of international communist movement on the Titoite revisionist clique--renegades and traitors to the cause of socialism, a counter-revolutionary bridgehead for corroding, corrupting and sabotaging the socialist system and dictatorship of the proletariat in socialist countries—and of smuggling it back into the socialist community under the bogus pretext of "cementing together of all the anti-imperialist forces of the world."

"As far as Yugoslavia is concerned, we maintain...that it is a socialist country, and in our relations with it we strive to establish closer relations between the Federative

People's Republic of Yugoslavia and the socialist commonwealth, in accordance with the policy pursued by the fraternal parties for the cementing together of all the anti-imperialist forces of the world" (C. P. S. U. letter to C. P. C., March 30, 1963.)

The opportunist leadership of C. P. S. U. needed this ganging up with Titoite revisionists to augment its forces for vehemently fighting the forces of genuine Marxism-Leninism dubbed by it as the danger in the international communist movement (unilaterally reversing, thereby, another unanimous verdict of international communist movement that revisionism was the main danger). This somersault by the C. P. S. U. leadership was laid bare and condemned in no uncertain terms then:

"U. S. imperialism and its NATO partners have spent several thousand million of U. S. dollars nursing the Tito clique for a long time. Cloaked as 'Marxist-Leninist' and flaunting the banner of a 'socialist country', the Tito clique has been undermining the international communist movement and the revolutionary cause of the people of the world, serving as a special detachment of U. S. imperialism."

"It is completely groundless and out of keeping with the facts to assert...that the Tito clique is an anti-imperialist force."

"Firm Marxist-Leninists and genuine Marxist-Leninist parties must put principle first. They must not barter away principles, approving one thing today and another tomorrow, advocating one thing today and another tomorrow."

SECTION III

Now, let us attempt broadly to survey the significant developments that have taken place in the movement of various political forces operating in the world and in their relationships, and their bearing on the general line and immediate orientation of the international communist movement, in the present period.

The most significant negative development already occurring at that time, was, until the year 1976, the transformation of the Soviet Union and majority of socialist countries into neo-capitalist countries and their defection to the enemy camp of imperialism. This development resulted in the disintegration of the socialist camp—the politico-economic and military bulwark of socialism manifesting the combined might of all the socialist countries—and in reformistic degeneration of greater part of the international communist movement, along with a series of divisions and dislocations in the national liberation movements. It was a serious setback to the developing proletarian world revolution, which reversed the favourable balance of forces between socialism and imperialism. But it failed in stamping out of existence the camp of socialism, represented by the genuine socialist countries persevering in continuing the revolution and the revolutionary and progressive forces rallied around them, though the capacity and effectiveness of this to influence and shape the course of international developments, was drastically impaired. This circumstance contributed to the problems of socialist countries related to their defence and imperialist encirclement and to the difficulties and tortuousness of the advance and victory of proletarian socialism or national democratic revolutions in the countries comprising imperialist system. But the fact that despite this new circumstance, peoples of Indo-China gloriously won their wars of national liberation, routing the mightiest imperialist power, U. S. imperialism, and many African countries achieved independence by defeating the colonial powers through armed struggle, shows that the negative impact of this new circumstance, though great, was still limited and not overwhelming.

Since the year 1976, the course of this negative development has run full circle with the usurpation of proletarian state power and party leadership by revisionist-bourgeois forces in China, after the passing away of com. Mao Tsetung,

with the desertion of the leadership of P. L. A. from the camp of Marxist-Leninist force, the socialist states which had survived the onslaught of Modern revisionism in the late 50's and early 60's, have now changed colour. (The process of degeneration of these socialist states into bourgeois revisionist states may be at different stages of consummation but for all practical purposes, socialist state system should be treated as no more existing)

The loss of socialist states as centres of parallel proletarian political powers and reliable bases of world proletarian revolution, especially that of socialist China, which used to play a central role in this respect, constitutes a great setback for the international communist movement and revolutionary farces the world over. It had considerably weakened the subjective factors of world proletarian revolution in the direct sense that the most powerful revolutionary segment is lost to enemy, and indirectly, through causing ideological-political confusion among and disintegration of the ranks of Marxist-Leninist of all lands. Only a small number of Marxist-Leninist contingents could, as yet, stand up to this new major onslaught of modern revisionism, while a great number of Marxist-Leninist and other revolutionary forces have been swallowed by it. Obviously this development has rendered the advance of world proletarian revolution extremely difficult and tortuous, despite the fact that objective situation of world historical process is pregnant with great revolutionary potentialities. The transformation of China from a powerful factor for revolution and peace into a reactionary regional power, virtually allied with one imperialist bloc headed by US imperialist super power, has contributed to the growth of factors for aggression and war.

Another important development of the period since of Great Debate is that Soviet Union has emerged as a social-imperialist super power with a strong and highly centralised economic base and superstructure which it usurped and put

into service of its imperialist ambition and plans, with its control over the armed forces of the Warsaw pact, converted from being a mighty arm of socialism, security of nations and world peace, into an international gendarme of counter revolution, aggression and war; with the enormous prestige of socialist Soviet Union and the great Lenin which it could misuse to dupe and mobilise the people of Soviet Union and the world for the predatory aims of its foreign policy—the social imperialist super power could seriously challenge the other imperialist super power in the mad drive for dominating and exploiting the whole world. With this development, another dangerous centre of counter-revolutionary intervention, aggression and war has appeared on the world scene, menacing the revolutionary movements of oppressed classes and oppressed nations, the independence and security of peoples and countries all over the world and the world peace, along with and in contention with the other already operating such centre—U. S. imperialist super power. The operation of this new factor has greatly upset the relative equilibrium of the world imperialist system which, otherwise also, was constantly and increasingly being disturbed by the operation of other inter-imperialist contradictions as well as other contradictions of the imperialist system. This development has influenced, in various ways, the development of all the fundamental contradictions obtaining in the contemporary world and contributed to the accentuation of the pace of events, both in terms of war and revolution. This social imperialist super power has become, along with the other super power, the common and arch-enemy of the world people.

Being a late-comer to the imperialist 'feast' it wishes to grab and gulp down too much and too fast, and to that end, has been displaying more ferocious and adventurist conduct. With a highly centralised economy and a fascist state at its command it has been transforming, with comparative ease, huge financial and natural resources to war industry

at the cost of economic and cultural welfare of masses of the Russian people. The economic and military potential of its East-European allies is more firmly tied to its requirements as an imperialist super power than is the case with the Western block headed by US imperialism. Moreover, so many revisionist 'communist' parties working in various countries serve, in varying degrees, as instruments and apologists of social-imperialist designs and acts of this super power. These revisionist parties, and some nationalist forces corrupted and controlled by Soviet social imperialism, act as its drummer boys not only in front of the people of other countries but also the people of Soviet union to embellish its false image of a great socialist power and its various acts of intervention or aggression as selfless proletarian internationalist acts that further the cause of world proletarian revolution and world peace. In this way, they render assistance to Soviet imperialist rulers in diffusing the resentment of the people of Soviet Union against the reactionary internal and external policies of this super power. All these factors make this super power a formidable rival of other imperialist powers, particularly the US imperialist super power; and a dangerous foe of the people of the world. The task of exposing its real character should attract special attention of proletarian revolutionary forces the world over.

Notwithstanding its frightening posture, this social imperialist super power is a "colossus with feet of clay". First, its economic strength is not matching with the demands of its global role as a super power. Its over reliance on military power and frenzied build-up of huge war-machine, out of proportion with its financial economic base, has resulted in a very lopsided development of its economy—prolonged stagnation in agriculture and backwardness of its consumer goods industry. Second, it is a late comer aspiring to secure dominant position for itself in the world arena, wherein a formidable super power is

already well entrenched, unlike the post-war situation when US imperialism entered the world arena as super power. Third, it is showing symptoms of old age disorder in its very prime and lacking the vitality of an up coming imperialist power. Unlike the vitality of German imperialism as an up-coming imperialist power of the time of World War I. Within a short span of decade of its adulthood, it is plagued with crisis and decline—it is encountering serious financial difficulties and incurring huge debts, internal as well as external and the rate of increase of its total industrial output value is continuously descending. (Source : Peking Review). And fourth it is spreading its tentacles in times of great awakening of the people all over the world, when people have got valuable experiences in their struggles against the other super power, U. S. imperialism, and have a better awareness of the mode of operation of a super power, the extent of danger posed by it and the effective ways of combating it. Despite its deceptive signboard of "socialism", its hideous features have been considerably exposed within a short period and it is facing ever more the resistance of the people everywhere.

In the other capitalist imperialist camp, one important development is that the myth about the all conquering might of the Dollar and the Pentagon has been shattered in recent years. Conforming to the Leninist law of uneven economic development of imperialism, the wealthiest imperialist power U. S. A. increasingly betrayed the trail of economic sluggishness and decay while other imperialist powers, especially Germany and Japan, attained comparatively faster rate of growth, favourable balance of payments, and relatively sound currency. They are now competing with U. S. capital more effectively than earlier, altering the state of affairs wherein U. S. capital enjoyed almost unchallenged domination over world imperialist economic system (though they are still not a match to the far greater financial economic power of U. S. monopoly

capital). Incurring the active hostility of all the peoples of the world, and encircled by their liberation and resistance struggle, U. S. imperialist super power had received severe blows during all these years, in particular, the glorious victory of Vietnamese, Laotians and Kampuchian wars of liberation resulting in humiliating debacle of U. S. aggressor forces, has been a great set back to its global counter revolutionary strategy, forcing a change in its methods and tactical plans for realising its global hegemonic aims, and causing tremors throughout its neo-colonial empire. As a result of all this, U. S. imperialism is encountering great difficulty at home and abroad. Its relations with its imperialist allies and reactionary lackeys are under strain, demanding readjustments in accordance with the new situation, which process cannot but be accompanied with confusion, resentment and discard among them. This circumstance enthuses all the revolutionary and progressive forces, presenting them favourable conditions and bright prospects for attacking with renewed vigour and confidence, the shaky edifice of capitalist imperialism. As the crisis of U. S. imperialism is aggravated by, and contributes to, the acute general crisis of world imperialism, its attempts, from a dominant position, at rescuing its ailing economy at the cost of its imperialist allies, and their attempts at escaping from taking this burden upon their economies give rise to recurring conflicts of interests among them. Owing to this, apart from other factors, this imperialist allinace is showing forth serious cracks in it. Within the broad framework of their alliance, the intensification of contradiction between U. S. imperialist super power and European and Japanese imperialist powers, the resentment of the latter at the overbearing conduct of the former, the divergence of their interests and attitudes concerning certain issues, at certain times, provide the international proletariat and other revolutionary forces more scope than earlier for utilizing these rifts among their enemies, under given conditions and

in suitable forms, so as to be able to concentrate their fire against U. S. imperialist super power, which along with the other super power is still "the mainstay of neo-colonialism", "the main force of aggression and war", the "common arch enemy of the world people".

The general crisis of world capitalist system has entered in its advanced stage. For about two decades after the war it was not experiencing acute crisis owing to a peculiar combination of factors in the post war years (decline and virtual collapse of England and France; defeated and ravaged Germany, Japan and Italy; U. S. imperialism unscathed and enriched by war, with its enormous finance capital and most advanced technology to be invested in a situation of vacuum) capitalism exhibited an artificial vitality for a time. Now there is a marked change in the situation prevailing in the early sixties. Acute crisis has pervaded almost all spheres of economic activity in the capitalist world. After 1973, when it was at its peak, it marginally subsided, and a feeble trend of economic recovery was noticed, but within two years the crisis again regained its momentum. Apart from the earlier symptoms (high inflation along with stagnation, crumbling of the currency system, energy crisis, high incidence of unemployment etc) at present it is getting expression in the growing protectionist tendencies and trade war on the part of all the developed capitalist countries. This is leading to the accentuation of all the fundamental contradictions of this system. Along with the peoples of the under-developed countries of Asia, Africa and Latin America, the working class and other toiling sections in the developed capitalist countries are facing the brunt of this crisis. The period of relative social peace, which was already being overtaken by the trend of growing working class battles during the early sixties, is going completely and finally to give way to a new period of revolutionary upheavals in these citadels of monopoly capital. No doubt as long as these metropolises

are able to retain their control over and super-exploitation of the labour power and rich resources of the backward dependent countries, the economic basis of bribing the upper crust of their working class and of social democracy will not completely vanish. Nevertheless in the conditions of the present acute crisis of capitalism, the political capital of Social Democracy and every other variety of opportunism shall get more and more exhausted with every passing day. Objectively, a revolutionary situation is in the making and is going to develop fast in these countries. This is the objective basis which will enable the proletariat and its vanguard—Marxist-Leninist parties and groups—to make up the deficiency of the revolutionary subjective factor, much faster than in normal times, provided they firmly adhere to a revolutionary orientation and follow correct policies in tune with concrete conditions and the aspirations and moods of the masses. Of course, in view of the powerful and modernised state machinery of the developed capitalist countries, and potential threat of intervention by one or other super powers, the success and sustenance of proletarian revolution in this part will generally require a set of favourable conditions (such as the entanglement and exhaustion of the native imperialist forces in a national liberation war in a colonial or semi-colonial country, the dislocation and strife in the state machinery as, for example, in the situation in Portugal immediately after its loss of African colonies and the expiry of Salazar regime or the situation of imperialist war, situation in which the two super powers are so pre-occupied with and inter-locked in some issue of contention as to be unable to intervene etc.) but unless the proletariat organises its activities in this direction, unless it seriously and perseveringly makes preparations for the socialist revolution it will not be able to avail of such favourable conjunctures when they present themselves.

The most positive development since that period is the great awakening of the oppressed peoples and nations of the

east. The process of involvement of colonial people in the mainstream of international politics, which commenced with the ushering in of the new epoch of imperialism and proletarian revolution, was greatly accelerated by the two world wars, especially Second World War and the victories of socialism. This ongoing process had already assumed gigantic dimensions by the time of earlier statement of the general line and policy of the international communist movement. The national democratic revolutionary movement in these areas was then acknowledged as one of 'The two great historical currents of our time' (the other being the international socialist revolutionary movement). Since then, the anti-colonial struggles and national democratic revolutionary movements had made great strides, the most significant advance being the glorious victory of national democratic revolution of the Indo-Chinese peoples along with victory of nationalist forces in the wars of independence in many African countries. The marked features of the present situation in this regard are the extensive character of the movement against neo colonialist oppression and exploitation, the phenomenal increase in the nationalist and revolutionary sentiments and consciousness of the broadest sections of the peoples of Asia, Africa and Latin America, popularly known as the Third World, spelling the doom of neo-colonialism—the most sophisticated and last weapon of dying imperialism—and causing great anxiety and nervousness in the minds of neo-colonialist robbers and their trained watchdogs, the native reactionary ruling classes. Some of the important factors which contributed to this phenomenon are: total collapse of old type colonialism and the great victories of national liberation and independence movements and vulnerability of the imperialist colossus witnessed by the oppressed millions during these years, which evoked and enhanced their national self respect and self confidence; moral and political exposure of imperialist powers, particularly U. S. imperialism due to their criminal inhuman acts and

barefaced hypocrisy and lies seen at their maximum worst during these years; the impact of the deepened world capitalist crisis which is exacting a particularly heavy toll from the toiling people of backward dependent countries, depriving them of work opportunities and subsistence incomes, relentlessly driving most of them down the way of pauperisation and slow death, thus drawing most of them into active struggles. This phenomenon offers, today more than ever, great opportunities and scope for the bold advance of the national democratic revolutionary movement, only if genuine Marxist-Leninists do not allow themselves and revolutionary movement to be duped and derailed by bourgeois demagogues, do not lose their revolutionary orientation, rely on the basic masses of people, win over all progressive and patriotic forces, expose and paralyse the compromising elements and deal unrelenting blows at the reactionary ruling classes and their imperialist over-lords.

One somewhat novel element in this situation is the deeply disturbed relationship between imperialist powers (traditional as well as with a social coating) and their lackey ruling cliques in the semi-colonial countries. This demonstration of defiance-inservility on the part of various reactionary ruling cliques, not rare spectacle these days, is prompted by varied considerations involving their selfish class interests (but never the national interest). Their chief political consideration concerning the security and stability of their rule is to countermand and defuse every brewing upsurge in the nationalist and revolutionary sentiments of their subjects by their nationalist demogogy, mock-blasts against imperialism and its attempts at interference in and domination over their "independent" economies and policies. The pitch of this chorus of nationalist demogogy heightens whenever some important development in the world takes place which has or is likely to have serious repercussions on the national consciousness of the broad masses of people in these countries. In the early seventies, when the victory of national

liberation wars of Indo-Chinenes' peoples and the defeat of mightiest imperialist power U. S. imperialism was a foregone conclusion and later when it became a fact, an historic development of this kind took place with tremendous political and moral impact on the world people, particularly the people of Asia, Africa and Latin America (the period after the second world war and before the Great Debate, the victorious Chinese revolution, and defeat of U. S. imperialist aggressive war in Korea were such type of developments). As a consequence, a lot of noise has been made since that time by various reactionary ruling cliques about their 'independent' and 'anti-imperialist' position, for public consumption. But this sort of posturing is not a serious factor in the disturbed relationship between the imperialists and their native lackeys. Their trouble arises when, in the face of mounting pressure of the struggles of the toiling people and other patriotic sections against neo-colonial exploitation and oppression, certain retracing of steps or loss of some ground on the part of the imperialists and their lackeys becomes necessary, but they are unable to reach a common understanding on the nature and extent of the concessions to be made to pacify the people. Such a situation of temporary and non-fundamental conflict between the needs of the reactionary ruling cliques and their imperialist overlords is caused by the fact that the conduct of later is guided mainly by the needs of their international imperialist strategy whereas the conduct of the former is guided mainly by needs of ensuring the safety and prolongation of their rule in their own country. Hence, pressed hard by peoples protest movement, the reactionary ruling cliques are, at certain times forced to move contrary to the exact wishes of their imperialist masters against some crude manifestations of neo-colonial exploitation and oppression or interference, without essentially undermining the interests of the latter. Sometimes, even in anticipation of strong oppositional reaction of the people, these cliques dare not comply with the demands of their masters in toto and

in the manner these demands are sought to be fulfilled. (In other situations when the peoples' anti-imperialist movement is weak or the imperialist pressure on these lackeys is far greater than the people's pressure, the very same ruling cliques capitulate to the dictates of their masters or are replaced by other cliques which are more pliant). On the other hand, the imperialist powers, beset with difficulties in coping with the world-wide resistance of revolutionary forces against their counter-revolutionary strategy and actions and with the pressure of other imperialist competitors are compelled to retreat from certain positions or make certain adjustments, causing apprehensions and uncertainties in the minds of their old time lackeys who are well aware that their overlords can ditch them with least compunction, whenever the formers' overall imperialist interests so require and find the latter dispensable.

The other important factor in their disturbed relationship is economic one. In the condition of deepened general crisis of world capitalist system, the great squeeze made on the under-developed countries by international big monopoly capital not only renders the toiling millions in these countries destitute, wrecks the enterprises of small and medium capitalists and jeopardises the professional carriers of broad sections of the intelligensia, thus generating great turbulence in the national politics which shakes the reactionary rule but also results in relative shrinkage of the share of revolutionary ruling classes out of the neo-colonial loot of these countries. Hence these reactionary classes and their regimes grumble, protest and plead for better terms from international monopoly capitalists appealing to their 'good will' and enlightened selfinterest, and in cases even threatned some irresolute moves for realising the same but always remaining within safe limits of international neo-colonial order (No wonder that during all these years of quest for 'New International Economic Order', in the present decade, the penetration of and domination over, the economies of under-

developed countries of Asia, Africa and Latin America by foreign monopoly capital and the debt burden of these countries has increased many fold).

Apart from the factors stated above, the intensified rivalry and contention among different imperialist powers and multinational monopoly groups, particularly between two imperialist super powers, for markets, sources of raw materials and spheres of influence in these vast and vulnerable areas considerably add to the disturbance and uncertainty in the relations of imperialist overlords with their lackey reactionary classes of these countries, resulting in shifting loyalties and stances of reactionary ruling cliques towards various imperialist powers—depending upon the changes in the inter-imperialist balance of forces and upon the prospects of better terms of national sell-out.

Speaking in general terms this somewhat unconventional feature of the present situation—the disturbed relationship of neo-colonial powers and their native lackeys—is one of the expressions of deep general crisis of world capitalist system and the neo-colonial order. It is beneficial to the cause of advancing national democratic revolutionary movement which is storming the rear of world imperialist system—weak link of the imperialist chain, beneficial not only in the sense it undermines the political prestige and credibility of imperialism (which is being subjected to frequent public criticism, though fake, by even its political underlings in the semi-colonial countries) and of these reactionary lackeys (who under pressure of changing requirements of parasitic politics and diplomacy have to make frequent voltefaces in their pronouncements about various imperialist powers) facilitating their exposure at the hands of national liberationist forces, but also in the sense that it provides more scope and initiative to these forces to make skilful use of the selfish wranglings on certain issues among their enemies to focus and push forward such issues in a revolutionary fashion, or to focus the attack on one or the other imperialist power or grouping with

which the reactionary lackeys are momentarily having troubled relations. More so, if one or the other super power is involved (both of which, being the biggest exploiters and oppressors of these peoples and nations, are the special target of their anti-imperialist movement). But, for the proletariat and other broad sections of people struggling for national and social liberation to be able to make proper use of this situation of disturbed relationship of imperialist powers and their lackey ruling cliques for furthering the revolutionary cause, it is imperative never-to-forget that such conflict of interests has a limited and non-fundamental character and this can, at best, be made to serve as an auxiliary factor in the life and death struggle for resolving the fundamental contradictions between the oppressed nations and imperialism in which the oppressed nation (comprising of workers, peasants, petty bourgeoisie and national bourgeoisie along with other patriots) constitutes one pole as against the other pole constituted of imperialism and native reaction—the instrument of imperialist rule in semi-colonial country. The proletarian movement in the imperialist countries, while extending determined support to oppressed peoples and nations struggling for national liberation, can supplement this support by criticising and exposing the positions of imperialist bourgeoisie, primarily of their own country, as well as of other countries, on such issues that are highlighted in these wranglings among imperialist powers and their lackey ruling cliques in the semi-colonial countries.

An important development in recent years is the intensified contention between the two imperialist super powers for world domination and consequent acts of aggression, expansion and war drive. Finance capital by its very nature is hegemonic and the pursuit of hegemony cannot be carried, in today's world, beyond certain limits without resorting to the force of arms. Hence all imperialism, without exception, maintains its inherent aggressiveness and always strive to its utmost capacity, for hegemony over weaker countries. But

today as the situation stands, it is mainly the two super powers who are capable of this role independently of one or the other super power, that is why, the two super powers are considered as the main force and source of aggression and war and main target of the world peoples' movement against the outbreak of new world war. Both the super powers, in pursuance of their counter revolutionary global strategies for world domination and war, have built up world-wide military political complexes involving multi-lateral and bilateral pacts and treaties, military bases and other facilities dotting the entire globe, the king-pins of which are NATO and Warsaw Pact. Any opposition to super powers' drive for world hegemony and war which does not aim at weakening, disintegrating and dismantling these counter-revolutionary edifices—the instruments of aggression and world war—cannot but be superficial or hypocritical. In undertaking the important tasks of mobilising the world people against hegemonism and war drive of the two super powers, international proletariat should judge various political forces by the attitude towards and place in, the military political edifice and counter-revolutionary global strategy of either super power and define its relations with them accordingly. The big imperialist powers (West Germany, France, Great Britain, Japan etc) have linked up their war potential and their destiny as neo-colonialist powers with the counter revolutionary global strategy of US imperialism and huge war apparatus set up to carry it out. As junior partners in this imperialist alliance presided over by US imperialism they seek to protect their respective neo-colonialist interests and promote their own hegemonic designs, while striving always for a better position and prospects within this alliance, in struggle with U.S. imperialism and one another. To a lesser extent same thing applies to the East European powers in their relationship with the other super power (the difference of extent lies in the fact that they are not big imperialist powers like

their western counterparts and consequently have far less capacity for competitive collaboration with their boss-cum-ally Soviet social imperialism). These developed capitalist countries, member-states of NATO and Warsaw Pact respectively, are vital supports of the huge war structures at the disposal of the two super powers. The armed forces of most of the underdeveloped semi-colonial countries are nurtured and controlled by the super powers and their allies as mercenary armies to be used for suppressing revolutionary movements, bullying small countries into submission, engineering local conflicts and intervention in these countries; and as the most dependable material in the eventuality of an imperialist war, most of these countries are tied in varying degrees and in various ways to the war chariot of one imperialist grouping or the other. It is in this context that the position of non-aligned countries assumes significance. Non-alignment is a limited military-political concept. Those weak and small countries who, though under reactionary rule, but owing to various reasons do not lend themselves to the counter revolutionary imperialist strategy of aggression and war, should be considered as non-aligned countries and a positive factor for international peace and security.

The rapid build up of Soviet social imperialism's war potential and the intensification of super powers contention for global supremacy have influenced the western imperialist alliance in a complex manner. The serious challenge posed by the hostile social imperialist camp has toned down the centrifugal tendencies lately developing within the imperialist alliance led by U.S. imperialism and spurred closer military collaboration among them (implying relatively more dependence on the part of other imperialist powers on the most powerful and dominantly U.S. super power) but U.S. super power having to confront the rival super power at a time when it itself is steeped in evermounting political economic troubles, is not objectively in a position to step

up (or even consolidate) its domination over allied imperialist powers (the way it could manage during the two decades following world war II.) On the contrary, as the objective situation exerts its pressure, the allies of U. S. imperialism are going to assume relatively greater role and say in the affairs of this military alliance (signs of steeped up militarisation, on their part, are already visible). However, as the two military blocks commanded by the super powers move on towards eventual confrontation, evoking growing opposition of the people of the world, especially the people of the Europe who are likely to bear the brunt of war devastation, some member states of these military blocks, having no or insignificant stakes in the costly war, are growing jittery over the consequences of this exercise in belligerency and they tend or will tend in near future to escape from the obligations of military alliance. The international proletarian movement should strive to further such tendencies through the pressure of peoples' movements, in order to weaken or disintegrate both of the military blocks by securing the detachment of such states from these or at least helping them move to an inactive position.

In their relentless drive for world domination and war preparation, the two super powers, with the assistance of their respective allies, strive to outpace each other in getting hold of strategically important areas and sea-routes. In this mad rush, they ride roughshod over the rights of the countries in the vast zone of Asia, Africa, and Latin America, committing various acts of encroachment on their territorial rights, of intimidation to make them follow their dictates, and of interference in their internal affairs to effect desired changes in their regime, thereby antagonising the people of all the lands and provoking and accentuating the resistance of the broad sections of nationalist forces. These acts of super power high-handedness strain their relations even with the lackey ruling cliques of these countries because these aggressive acts disturb the condition

of alliance for joint oppression and exploitation between imperialism and native reaction—the carrying out of imperialist oppression by milder and sophisticated means. Such a situation greatly facilitates the revolutionary work of exposing and isolating these imperialist super powers at national and international plane and mobilising the broadest sections of the revolutionary and patriotic forces against super power high-handedness and laying bare in the course of such struggles, the anti-national capitulationist character of the reactionary ruling classes.

The danger of world war has grown in recent years; the international proletariat and all progressive people should take full cognisance of this fact, cast off all complacency and be prepared for it. But the trend of war has, still, not overtaken the trend of revolution; war has not become the central problems of international politics and consequently of the policy of international communist movement at the present time. The growth of war-danger has brought forth an important present-day task of the international communist movement, the task of building up a world wide movement for opposing the imperialist war drive and preventing the outbreak of a new world war; but its central tasks still remains the carrying out of revolution ie, the overthrow of imperialism through struggles of social and national liberation. It is a question of determining the main channel of world proletarian revolution at the present movement: whether it can be promoted mainly through an anti-war movements, or mainly through proletarian revolutionary and national liberation struggles. This question has a bearing on the current policy and tactics to be adopted by the international communist movement in conformity with the priority of the task.

When we say that today revolution, and not war, is still the central task of the international communist movement, it implies that the political alignment of class forces for carrying out a proletarian socialist or national democratic

revolution is, still, the central vehicle of the revolutionary movement and has not been supplanted by the political alignment of class forces for opposing imperialist war-drive, uniting with all those forces which can be united for the specific purpose of opposing imperialist war-drive, remains a complementary activity to the political alignment for fulfilling the central tasks of carrying out of revolution. Hegemonism of the two super powers is a two way connection linking their counter revolutionary global strategy of intervention and suppression of peoples' revolutionary movements and their global strategy of aggression on other countries and war. Today, the hegemonism of the two super powers is mainly proceeding on the former course ; in their fierce contention for world domination, the sharp edge of their offensive is directed not against each other's allies but against the revolutionary movements of the people for national and social liberation, though it is being done also in preparation for mutual confrontation. Hence, the struggle of the world people against super powers is developing mainly in conjunction with their struggles for national and social liberation, not with their struggles against imperialist drive for aggression over other countries and world war. Hence, factors for both revolution and war are growing. Still, world war is being sought to be prevented through revolution by the people of the world. Of course, the degeneration of all the socialist states and transformation of China into a reactionary regional power in league with western imperialist bloc have greatly impaired prospects of the success of world people in preventing war through revolution. In case the development of revolution lags behind the development of war and the danger of war becomes threat of war, the international proletariat and world people shall bring the present anti-war movement to the forefront of the struggle and combat with all their might, each and every war measure and provocation by the two super powers while seeking to

utilise every rift on this count between the super powers and their present day allies and skilfully exploit the positions of those who show hesitancy or opposition towards the war programme. But it is ridiculous to suggest that the future war will take the form of either the super powers' (both or one of them) involving all other countries and all of them fighting a war of resistance, or mutually fighting out the war, single handed. Such projections clash with the historical experience of world wars, present day realities of the system of political relations among the states, and even with common sense. Any future world war, whatever may be its course of development, will be a war involving imperialist groupings. And the international proletariat, all progressive and peace-loving forces, shall have to confront not only the two super powers but also their imperialist allies and reactionary lackeys and deal crushing blows against all the belligerents conducting an unjust war.

When we are making revolution to prevent the war and when we shall be fighting against the out break of war to promote the revolution on both counts, the two imperialist super powers happen to be the most dangerous enemies and foremost targets of the international proletariat and the people of the world in their revolutionary and just struggles. In fighting these common arch enemies as spearheads of counter-revolution and war, international proletariat must grasp their specific features (apart from their common features) to locate their strong and weak points and their preferred mode of operation, and choose the methods and varying emphasis, accordingly. For instance, social imperialist super power is donning the garb of a socialist power and by dint of it, is capable of practicing political deception and creating ideological confusion among sizeable sections of the toiling people ; hoisting a sham platform of anti-imperialism, it obtains access to the national liberationist forces, creates splits and degeneration among their ranks to control and use them as tools of its neo-colonial expansion. Hence,

in combating its neo-colonial designs and acts, international proletariat should direct special effort towards its political-ideological exposures, and call the bluff of its anti-imperialism by coming forward as the staunch and genuine force in the struggle against all kinds of neo-colonialism. Also, the people, particularly the toiling masses, should be helped to see the true features of the revisionist, neo-revisionist parties, social democrats of the various hues and ruling class politicians who resort to socialist demogogy, as the actual or potential lackeys of social imperialism. The political platform of the other super power--human rights, individual freedom and 'democratic' society--has lost much of its lustre; economic financial might and technological superiority are its distinctive assets as tools of neo-colonial domination. Apart from directly practising financial slavery through usurious credits, project-aid, and financial-Technical collaboration with other less developed countries, it uses World Bank and its various agencies to extend or perpetuate its neo-colonial stranglehold on the economic and political life of the people of various countries. Hence, special efforts should be made directed to combat it in this field. Also people should be made alert to its attempts at fostering obscurantist and revivalist forces, communalists and racists, upon whom it often relies to divert or fight the rising democratic and revolutionary peoples movement.

Although presently, U. S. imperialist super power (along with its imperialist allies) has a command over, comparatively, much large neo-colonial set-up, spheres of influence, sources of raw-materials and markets, it is encountering tremendous difficulties to maintain its hold on this neo-colonial empire in the face of world-wide struggles of the anti-imperialist forces, and increasing pressure of a formidable rival in the form of Soviet social imperialist super power. Hence, the menace posed by the other super power, as a spearhead of counter-revolution should in no way be underestimated and considered as having a lesser dimension in any

way. Wherever the people are struggling to hit and drive out the wild beast of U. S imperialism, the social-imperialist bear invariably attempts to poke in its ugly snout. And unless the proletarian revolutionaries and the people are alert to this danger, if they relax their guard, even slightly, towards the lurking danger of the other super power while struggling to get rid of one super power, their struggle for emancipation is liable to get frustrated. The logic of the present world situation where two counter-revolutionary giants are fiercely contending for exclusive hegemony over the world at the cost of the nations and peoples of the world struggling for national and social liberation, and at each others' cost, and the contemporary experience of world-wide struggles, prove that the let-up in the fight against one super power renders even the fight against other super power ineffective. It is so, because this provides an opportunity to the latter and its lackeys of posing as the champions of the struggle against the former, thereby confusing or rallying around itself sections of anti-imperialist forces. Apart from the varying emphasis in the mode of fighting against these new colonial super powers as the spearheads of counter-revolution and the varying emphasis, in concrete cases, (according to the variation in time and place) in delivering blows against them, any attempt to make policy distinction in general between the two by proletarian revolutionaries, will result in leading them off the revolutionary track.

Considering them as the main sources of aggression and war, international proletariat should not relent in pursuing a firm line of exposing and resisting the acts of aggression and war-mongering of both the super powers. It should not entertain or foster any illusion about the dangerous nature and claims of either of the super powers regarding the criminal course to war to achieve domination over the world. From the overall viewpoint, both are equally dangerous as sources of war and as enemies of the security of peace-loving nations and peoples. Of course, every

phenomenon is marked by disequilibrium in general, and no two aspects of a contradiction are, usually, in completely even state of being. In this sense the two super powers in conflict cannot be viewed identically and some sort of differentiation can be made between the two. But a differentiation can be of marginal or serious nature. One meant for the purpose of tactical emphasis which can be quickly and easily changed when required, the other meant for the purpose of working out a policy to be consistently followed over a considerable period of time, change in which requires marked change in the situation. With its ignominious and costly defeat at the hands of Indo-Chinese people and the accompanying economic-political crisis hitting it hard, the prestige and position of U. S. imperialism as the mightiest imperialist power was seriously impaired (it is still in the process of absorbing the shock-effects of that development). As a consequence, it was forced to make adjustments in its tactics and plans for achieving its aims of world domination. Along with this, the serious challenge posed by Soviet social imperialism as rival super power in seeking world domination (who, taking advantage of its entanglement in Indo-China, came up from behind to a matching position of contention) it was obliged to relent for a while its military pressure on socialist countries. Keeping in mind the bitter experience of its aggression over the countries of Indo-China, it has to adopt a policy of avoiding counter-revolutionary direct involvement of its armed forces in far-flung areas and raising up or fortifying instead, regional power centres of counter-revolution to make Asians fight Asians with the support of American arms and money. But owing to the fact that its hideous face as a savage counter-revolutionary force has got exposed, more than ever, and the regimes and forces it is attempting to shore-up and rely on, are utterly discredited, nationally and internationally, the successful operation of its new counter-revolutionary plans and tactics is constantly being frustrated by upheaval of peoples'

discontent and struggles. Soviet social imperialism is currently taking advantage of this situation to gain new ground because in many cases it succeeds in channelising such people's discontent to its benefit, owing, firstly, to the weakness or lack of communist revolutionary leadership, and secondly, to the fact that most of the regimes and forces acting as sub-centres of counter-revolution and aggression under its patronage (for instance, Cuba and Vietnam) have not yet got sufficiently exposed and discredited in the eyes of their own people and world over, for those are having either socialist pretensions or anti-imperialist past and it takes some time for the people to be able to see them in their true colours. This situation enabled Soviet social imperialism to come out in recent years in a more bellicose posture of contention with the other super power for world domination. But this does not provide the basis for international proletariat to make a policy differentiation between the two super powers to the effect that Soviet social imperialism is the more dangerous source of war and US imperialism the less dangerous one. First, the difference between the respective postures of the two super powers is increasingly diminishing. Having readjusted its response to the new situation, caused by serious political and military setbacks abroad and widespread popular opposition within US to its acts of intervention and aggression, during the years of Carter Regime, and having found in revisionist China an important political and military ally in the East, US imperialism is presently adopting a no less bellicose posture of contention with the other super power for world domination. Secondly, and that is more important, the only sound basis for such a characterisation of an imperialist power (ie, it being more or less dangerous source of war) is, whether or not, and to what extent, it is striving for domination over the world, and making preparations for war, resorting to acts of intervention and aggression, directed against the revolutionary forces and peace-loving people, to achieve such domination.

It is on this basis that the two imperialist super powers are found to be the most dangerous sources of war in the present times, and a corresponding orientation towards spearheading the anti-war movement against both of them is taken by the international communist movement. A general characterisation that one of them is a more dangerous source of war and primary target in the struggle against hegemonism and war, would conflict with and negate the policy formulation that at present the two super powers are locked up in fierce contention for world hegemony and are leading towards war. This would amount to treating one of them as most dangerous source of war. This would mean that one imperialist power (the most dangerous source of war) is imposing war on other reluctant imperialist power. Such characterisation would be the most dangerous source of distorting the perspective and policy of international proletariat leading it in a position of actually contributing not to world peace but the war effort of one super power and its allies against the other super power. The ideological source prompting international proletariat for taking up such a course cannot be Marxism-Leninism Mao-Tsetung thought, but the bankrupt imperialist theory of balance of force between bellicose powers as a safeguard against the outbreak of war. Obviously such a course militates against the cause of world peace and world revolution.

SECTION IV

The international political relations, in a given period, and the role played by different political forces in them, are based on the obtaining international economic relations and the role played by different classes in them. Therefore, to have a proper understanding of international political situation and the tasks of the international proletariat arising thereof, it is very important to analyse the

international economic relations as they stand and develop in the given period.

It was from this angle that com. Mao Tsetung, in some talk, depicts the international position of various countries of the world, in his typical popular style, as belonging to three distinct sections of the world or three distinct worlds, the most privileged, first world, USA, and Soviet Union; the underdog, third world, countries of Asia, Africa, and Latin America, with the exception of Japan; the in between, second world, the European countries, Canada, Japan, Australia etc. (The socialist countries, on account of their level of development and strength should be grouped only with the third-world countries.) "China belongs to Third world, for China cannot compare with the rich or powerful countries politically, economically etc. She can be grouped only with the relatively poor countries." (From a talk by Chaitman Mao in February, 1974) As is the case with all of his popular saying, this formula rests upon a years long serious objective study and analysis of the international scene (has been documented in the Reports to the Ninth and the Tenth National Congress of Communist Party of China.) This differentiation of the world succinctly delineates the position of each group of countries in the present day economic relations of world imperialism. All the contradictions of imperialism are related to, and sharpened by, the economic relationships expressed in this differential placing of the countries of the world.

The salient implications of this differentiation, as regards the basic appraisal of international situation, the prospects of the world proletarian revolution and the tasks of the international proletariat etc. are following :—

(a) It points to the emergence of two extremely powerful, financially and militarily, centres of world imperialism who dominate the whole imperialist system of exploitation and oppression. This concentration of imperialist-neo-colonial power has led, and is leading to, the intensification of

exploitation and oppression of the people world over, most of all, the people in the third world, constituting overwhelming majority of world population, who are finding it impossible to go on living in such intolerable condition of impoverishment and servitude. Moreover, proceeding from their position of dominance, these two imperialist super powers try, in an arbitrary fashion, to steer the economic (political) affairs of the world to usurp maximum benefits, to the chagrin of the monopoly capitalists of second world countries and other exploiters who share, more or less, the neo-colonial loot, and the two fiercely contend with each other to acquire exclusive access to the booty, disturbing thereby the whole mechanism of imperialist system. All this is at the root of great disorder and turbulence prevailing in the world. Thus it lays bare the material basis of the evermore developing crisis in the imperialist system, the accentuation of all the contradictions of imperialism, and of the bright prospects of world proletarian revolutionary movement as a consequence of rapid revolutionisation of the mood of the broad masses of the people and serious discord among the top exploiters and oppressors, characteristic of the prevailing situation.

(b) It points to the location of the relative position of various links in the imperialist chain—the strongest, relatively weak, and the weakest links—for the purpose of mapping out the strategic plan of international proletariat for developing world proletarian revolution to hit the imperialist system hard with concentrated energy at weakest links (third world countries under colonial dependence); to make serious preparations and get ready to hit at the weak links (second world countries) at the opportune moment; and in this process which renders the strong ones shaky and weakened lay the ground and gather forces for finally storming the strongest link (first world of the super powers), thus smashing the whole chain of imperialist system and establishing the socialist system world over.

(c) It points to the global nature of the counter-revolutionary interests, policies and connections of the two imperialist super powers which makes them international gendarmes, the main source of counter revolutionary intervention, aggression and war, and the common enemy of the people of the world, and invests the revolutionary struggles world over with the task of guarding against or combatting any interference, control, intervention and aggression by the two super powers and resolutely opposing their preparations for and apparatuses of unleashing a new world war. It provides the international proletariat with a tactical orientation to seek, at various levels in various forms, the building up of as broad as possible opposition to the policies and acts of super powers domination, intimidation and war while unswervingly striving to accomplish other revolutionary tasks.

It would be sheer distortion of comrade Mao Tsetung's valuable statement if this differentiation of the world is made out to be the depiction, as such, of alignment of political forces of the world in the present day international class struggle, demarcating our enemies (first world) our friend (second world), and ourselves (third world), and that as a corollary, the present day policy of the international communist movement should be of third world (ourselves) uniting with the second world (friends) to oppose the first world (enemies).

In order to better appreciate Mao Tsetung's view point in differentiating the countries of the world, and the distorted nature of its interpretation of the above type, let us briefly refer to Lenin's analysis of the post world-war first international situation when he differentiated the countries of the world, along with their population into three main groups. In the opening part of his 'Report On the International Situation and the Fundamental Tasks of the Communist International' to the second Congress of the Comintern which made this grouping as the point of

departure for analysing international situation, he observed "Imperialism's economic relations constitute the core of the entire international situation as it now exists". From this angle, he proceeded to analyse 'Imperialism's economic relations' and provided a graphic description of these relations showing the position of three groups of population of the world in these relations. "In the oppressed colonies—countries which are being dismembered, such as Persia, Turkey and China and in countries that were defeated and have been relegated to the position of colonies—there are 1,250 million inhabitants. Not more than 250,000,000 inhabit countries that have retained their old position but have become economically dependent upon America, and all of which during the war, were militarily dependent, once the war involved the whole world and did not permit a single state to remain really neutral. And, finally, we have not more than 250,000,000 inhabitants in countries whose top stratum, the capitalist alone, benefitted from the partition of the world. We thus get total of about 1,750 million comprising the entire population of the world. I would like to remind you of this picture of the world, for all the basic contradictions of capitalism, of imperialism which are leading up to revolution...are all connected with this partitioning of the world's population."

And in the next lines he comments on the nature, and the central implication, of this grouping, "of course, these figures give the economic picture of the world only approximately, in broad outlines. And comrades, it is natural that, with the population of the world divided in this way, exploitation by finance capital, the capitalist monopolies, has increased many times over". (Emphasis added)

Lenin projected this situation as the source of acute economic crisis and consequently of political crisis, of the imperialist system. He noted in this situation, "...the maturing of the two conditions for the world revolution," because there was, "... discord at the top, among this handful,

this very small number of very rich countries," and there were "... 1250 million people who find it impossible to live in the conditions of servitude which advanced and civilised capitalism wishes to impose on them". He focussed it in connection with the fundamental tasks of communist international relating to world proletarian revolution. Quite naturally, the central theme of this thesis on Comintern's fundamental tasks was intensification of the preparations for proletarian revolution in the capitalist countries (and determinedly supporting and assisting the national democratic revolutionary movements in the colonial and semi-colonial countries).

At another place Lenin discusses the bearing of this international situation on the course of development of world proletarian revolution:—

"The system of international relationship has now taken a form in which one of the states of Europe, viz, Germany, has been enslaved by the victorious countries. Furthermore, a number of states in the West, find themselves in a position, as the result of their victory, to utilise the victory to make a number of insignificant concessions to their oppressed classes—concessions which nevertheless retard the revolutionary movement in these countries and create some semblance of 'social peace'.

"At the same time, precisely as a result of the last imperialist war, a number of countries...in the East, India, China etc, have been completely dislodged from their groove, their development has definitely shifted to the general European capitalist lines. The general European ferment has begun to affect them, and it is now clear to the whole world that they have been drawn into a process of development that cannot but lead to a crisis in the whole of world capitalism."

In view of this fact, and in connection with it, "the West European" capitalist countries will consummate their development towards socialism, not as we formerly expected.

They are consummating it not by the even 'maturing' of socialism in them, but by the exploitation of some countries by others, by the exploitation of the first of the countries to be vanquished in the imperialist war combined with the exploitation of the whole of the East. On the other hand, precisely as a result of the first imperialist war, the East has definitely come into revolutionary movement, has been definitely drawn into the general mainstream of the world revolutionary movement." (Lenin, Vol. XXVIII. p-415-16 as quoted by Stalin in October revolution and Tactics of Russian Communists p-417).

And Stalin rounds off this statement by observing :

"If we add to this the fact that not only defeated countries are being exploited by the victorious countries but that some of the victorious countries are falling into the orbit of financial exploitation at the hands of the most powerful of the victorious countries, America and Britain ; that the contradictions among all these countries are an extremely important factor in the disintegration of world imperialism, that in addition to these countries, very profound contradictions exist and are developing within each of these because of the existence, alongside, these countries of the great Republic of Soviets—if all this is taken into consideration then the picture of the special character of the international situation will become more or less complete." (December 17, 1924, J. Stalin on the Road to October.)

The actual course of revolutionary development in the post First World War period testified to the correctness and far-sightedness of these observations of Lenin. Apart from the general upswing in the national liberation movements in the colonial East, proletarian revolutions rocked Hungary, Bulgaria and Germany—The very capitalist-imperialist countries, under the terms of the Versailles treaty (the other victim country of this and the Brest Litovsk Treaty, Russia, had already gone through a victorious proletarian revolution). Had the proletariat at that time

misunderstood the international situation and the grouping of countries by Lenin, and taken this grouping as such for the alignment of political forces of the world, in that case these revolutions would have been fore-doomed. On the other hand, if the revolutions in the abovenamed countries were not victorious and were ultimately crushed by the bourgeoisie, it was, apart from other factors, mainly because the proletariat had not sufficiently made preparations for the eventuality, and in Hungary particularly, had not politically demarcated from, and isolated in a thorough going way, the social democrats (which is an important part of these preparations) who betrayed the revolution and became accomplices in suppressing it. (This revolutionary attempt was the proletariat's way of eradicating foreign domination over their respective countries by breaking loose of imperialist system, of which such domination is a perennial feature. When proletariat's attempt failed, fascism took over these countries and they headed for imperialist war ; that was decadent bourgeoisie's way.)

So, we see how Lenin, while analysing the international situation in the framework of imperialism's economic relations and the position of different countries in this relationship, always kept in mind the position and role of different class-forces and drew political conclusions and worked out political tasks of international communist movement from this total perception. Like Lenin, Mao Tsetung's analysis of international situation, at different times, have always been permeated with class analytical approach, with an insight of the interplay of various class-forces at international and national levels. His recent analysis of the international situation in terms of the differentiation of these countries of the world into three categories of worlds, is no exception. If one were to view this differentiation of three worlds in a distorted way, as discussed earlier, knocking out its revolutionary kernel, its class content, it would be an act of violation of, and violence against, the whole teachings of

Mao Tsetung. It would result, in theory, in confusing the friends and enemies, fundamental and non-fundamental contradictions, fundamental and ephemeral nature of class relationships, fundamental and special tasks, primary and secondary tasks, bourgeois nationalism and proletarian internationalism, and in practice, in neglecting or renouncing revolutionary tasks under the pretext of the requirements of some immediate task (but bungling even the latter), renouncing the hegemony of the proletariat in the struggle for national and social liberation and establishing a tailist unity with one or other section of the reactionary ruling classes, and thus sliding down the path of social democracy—betrayal of the cause of world proletarian revolution cloaked in Marxist-Leninist phraseology.

SUPPLEMENT

ONSLAUGHT OF NEW OPPORTUNIST CURRENTS

In the main text, we have presented in broad outlines our assessment of the present international situation and what, in our view, should be the general line of the international communist movement and its specific direction in the present situation.

This revolutionary line of international communist movement for pushing ahead the historic process of world proletarian revolution and the guiding ideology which this line is based on, Marxism-Leninism-Mao Tsetung Thought, are under attack from various opportunist quarters. Along with modern revisionism centred around the renegade leading clique of CPSU, Trotskyite revisionism, Titoite revisionism, social-democratism, new leftism etc., new opportunist currents are pitted against the proletarian revolutionary line and ideology. Special ideological efforts, on the part of Marxist-Leninist forces world-wide, need to be directed

against the latter currents, because, the process of their exposure has just begun and the ideological menace posed by these has, as yet, not been sufficiently contained.

Of these latter opportunist currents, the major one has its fountain-head in the renegade Teng-Hua leading clique of CPC. This renegade leading clique of CPC has ganged up with all the bourgeois and reactionary forces of China to bury the socialist revolution of China and carry out allround capitalist restoration there. In order to provide theoretical justification of its criminal course of action and smoothen the process of counter-revolutionary restoration, it has denounced the basic theory and line, expounded by Com. Mao Tse-tung for developing socialist revolution, replacing it with the revisionist theory of productive forces and a bourgeois pragmatist line for building state monopoly capitalism, yet shamelessly claiming Mao Tse-tung Thought as its guiding ideology.

As an extension of the counter-revolutionary role of this clique inside China, on international plane, it is busy in ganging up with Western imperialism led by US imperialism and its reactionary lackeys all the world over and seeks to do to world proletarian revolutionary movements what it has done to victorious revolution in China. In order to provide theoretical justification for its betrayal of world proletarian revolutionary movement and smoothen the process of disorientation, degeneration and disintegration of world proletarian revolutionary movement, it has surreptitiously renounced the revolutionary legacy of the great struggle against modern revisionism waged by Marxist-Leninists of all lands under the leadership of Mao Tse-tung, in the sixties, renounced the Marxist-Leninist critique on Khrushchev's phoney communism, the fraudulent "self administrative" socialism of Tito sustained by millions of US dollars, the wholesale revisionism of the Italian and the French Communist parties, Khrushchev's apologia for neo-colonialism (down playing of the neo-colonial rule of

imperialist powers over most of the ex-colonies, prettifying of the anti-communist, anti-popular reactionary regimes in these countries, and emphasising of the task of developing national economies and down-grading of the pressing task of making national democratic revolution in these countries) and Khrushchev's anti-Leninist fallacies in denying the inherently aggressive nature of imperialism etc. It has renounced, without acknowledging, the general line of the international communist movement and substituted it with the counter-revolutionary class collaborationist "Three World Theory" fabricated by arc-revisionist Teng-Hsio Ping, yet shamelessly claiming that its international conduct and line is dictated by Mao Tse-tung Thought.

It is not fortuitous that the renegade Teng-Hua ruling clique wishes to erase the memory of that monumental struggle against modern revisionism waged by Marxist-Leninist forces with Mao Tse-tung at the head. The phenomenon of the rise to power of renegade Khrushchev-revisionist clique in Soviet Union and its carrying favour with US imperialism and various lackey reactionary regimes was accompanied by a systematic ideological onslaught against international communist movement on the basis of a set of revisionist theses put forward by this clique with the objective of disorientating and decimating world proletarian revolutionary movement and its political vanguard. Today, the phenomenon of the rise to power of renegade Teng-Hua leading clique of CPC in China and its unashamed honey-mooning with the US imperialism and various lackey reactionary regimes, is being accompanied by a similar systematic ideological onslaught against international communist movement on the basis of the revisionist "Three World Theory" with the similar counter-revolutionary objectives.

The present ideological onslaught of Teng-Hua revisionism is not much different in its content and objectives from the previous one of modern revisionism. Certain

differences in the respective physiognomy of the two are due to different historical conditions in which these took shape. Modern revisionism centred around the renegade Khrushchev clique advocating capitulation to US imperialism at a time when crisis in the world capitalist system and the danger of world war had not acquired grave dimensions. Hence this capitulation took on a pacifist complexion, Teng-Hua opportunism is advocating capitulation to US imperialism at a time when world capitalist system is caught up in grave economic political social crisis and intensified imperialist rivalry, particularly between the two imperialist super powers, and is heading towards a global armed conflagration. Under these conditions of crisis and war danger, all hues of international opportunism are driven towards aligning with one or the other imperialist super power and company, and, ipso facto, against the rival one. Hence, the capitulation of Teng-Hua revisionist clique to US imperialism has taken on a militant complexion owing to its vociferous denunciation of the rival imperialist super power, Soviet social imperialism. While its verbal crusades against Soviet social imperialism also serve as a smokescreen for covering its retreat from revolutionary fighting positions of red China against imperialism and reaction to the lap of US imperialism, both its alignment with US imperialism and confrontation with Soviet social imperialism are promoted by its counter-revolutionary aspiration of making China a regional hegemonistic power with the US imperialist financial, technological and military patronage.

Leaving aside the phenomenon of naturally enthusiastic response to Teng's 'Three World Theory', of the right-opportunistically inclined elements nestling inside international Marxist-Leninist movement whose thinking and practice found great theoretical support in the systematised revisionist ideological, political platform of "Three World Theory", how is it that this bankrupt theory could temporarily succeed even in confusing or winning over

considerable sections of genuine Marxist-Leninist and other revolutionary ranks? Familiarity with Khrushchevian modern revisionism and the experience of the great struggle against it should have enabled these Marxist-Leninist forces better and quickly to recognise the hideous features of Teng-Hua revisionism despite the deceptive red veil of Mao Tse-tung Thought put on these. But it did not happen that way. Apart from the fact, indicated by this development, that our forces were not adequately posted with Marxist theory, hence were liable to be taken in by superficial political phenomena and pragmatic and eclectic logic of the arguments of Teng-Hua revisionists, a major reason of their failure in their encounter with "Three World Theory" is that there are certain relatively new features in the present day international situation which demanded to be appraised and explained by international Marxist-Leninist movement. Taking advantage of the lack of systematic Marxist-Leninist explanation of these features, the Teng-Hua revisionist clique juggled with these phenomena and wove a revisionist "Three World Theory" around these. The deceptive potential of "Three World Theory" lies in its seemingly plausible, though actually false, explanations of these phenomena.

These phenomena are (A) serious disparity, in terms of financial-military power, between first-rate imperialist powers—USA and Soviet Union, on the one hand and second-rate imperialist powers—England, France, West Germany, Japan, Canada etc., on the other hand; sharpening contradictions between the former and the latter, (B) extremely accentuated contradiction between the two first-rate imperialist powers or super powers on account of their drive for attaining exclusive global domination; relative demotion of US imperialism from its earlier status of being the unquestionably supreme imperialist power of the world, under the impact of serious setbacks suffered by it at the hands of national liberation movements of the oppressed-peoples, the rise of a rival imperialist super power contesting

for the supreme imperialist status, and stiff economic competition from West German and Japanese monopoly capital; stepped-up expansionist and aggressive activities of Soviet social imperialism and (C) The disturbed relationship of imperialist masters and lackey domestic reactionary rulers of underdeveloped countries, particularly the latter's bickerings over the terms of financial collaboration and the terms of trade.

Let us briefly examine how Teng-Hua revisionism lends distorted meanings to these political phenomena in order wholly to revise the Leninist orientation of international communist movement.

All these political phenomena are expressions of the operation of the law of uneven development of capitalism, and the operation of two fundamental contradictions of the world, the contradictions which have got extremely accentuated at present, namely, the inter-imperialist contradiction, and the contradiction between imperialism and the oppressed nations. But, the Teng-Hua revisionists avoid to discuss these phenomena in the context of these fundamental contradictions. Why? Because, discussion within such theoretical frame gives far less scope for opportunist sophistry, for eclectic jumbling together of phenomena of different order, which are their patent weapons of deceit.

They evade answering in a clear-cut fashion the vital questions concerning the present stage and targets of world proletarian revolution. Have the world social progression and consequent political development during the period since the Great Debate radically changed the fundamental contradictions of the Leninist era? If not, doesn't it follow that all imperialism and reaction remain the targets of world proletarian revolution during the whole period of the present stage? If so, doesn't it follow that distinctions made in the targets of proletarian revolutionary movements, in the present stage, can only be either for policy purposes of

directing concentrated attack against the principal target which are valid only for the given historical period or phase of the revolution, or for purposes of ever-shifting tactical emphasis in dealing with various components of the principal target and those of the non-principal target?

Proceeding from the fact of existing disparity in the respective strengths of the first-rate imperialist powers and the second-rate imperialist powers, instead of making a policy distinction between these imperialist enemies for the purpose of directing concentrated attack against the two super powers in the present period, the "Three worldists" raise this distinction to the level of basic demarcation that implies a radical transformation of the character and role of the second-rate imperialist powers. From being imperialist enemies and targets of world proletarian revolution, though relegated to a position of secondary importance for the present period of concentrated fight against the two super powers at international plane, those get metamorphosed, at the hands of "Three worldists", into "middle forces" having "dual character."

The concept of "middle forces" having "dual character" applies to such social forces as do not constitute the target of revolution at a given stage of its development and have some potential for playing a role in the revolutionary movements to a certain extent, under certain condition. As for example, is the case of national bourgeoisie of an oppressed country in the stage of national democratic revolution. Under no circumstances does this concept apply to a section of enemy forces constituting the target of revolution. Even when a tactical alliance is forged by revolutionary forces with a section of enemy forces against the principal enemy, this section does not lose its enemy-character to become "middle forces" having "dual character."

By attributing "dual character" to these imperialist powers the "Three worldists" change the fundamental content of the contradiction between the second-rate imperialist powers

and the two imperialist super powers. It no more remains an inter-imperialist contradiction, imperialism at one pole of this contradiction gets transformed into something of a lower order having "dual character" and imperialism at the other pole gets transformed into something of higher order, 'hegemonism'. Referring to the second-rate imperialist powers, the "Three Worldists" state: "They oppress and exploit the oppressed nations and are at the same time controlled and bullied by the super powers. They have a dual character, and stand in contradiction with both the first and the third worlds. But they are still a force the third world can win over or unite with in the struggle against hegemonism." (Chairman Mao's theory of the differentiation of the three worlds... Peking Review, No. 45, 1977, p. 17).

According to these caricaturists of Leninism, the second-rate imperialist powers have "dual character" of being, "at the same time", imperialist oppressor forces and anti-hegemonist forces. So, for these revisionists, it is not a question of making a distinction between Chief hegemonist power and secondary hegemonist powers (hegemonism being an inherent characteristic of imperialism) and making use of the contradiction between the two, but a question of handling a new fundamental contradiction between the hegemonist imperialist super powers and allegedly anti-hegemonist imperialist powers so as to unite with the latter in the world-wide struggle for overthrowing hegemonism which turns out to be the target of world proletarian revolution in its present anti-hegemonist stage of development preceding the stage of socialist revolution for overthrowing world imperialism (i.e. the world capitalist system).

As the basic content of the struggle of the world people against the two super powers and that of the struggle of the second-rate imperialist powers against the super powers is made out to be the same, that is, anti-hegemonist, it becomes their "common struggle"; "In the common struggle against Soviet Union and the United States, it is both

necessary and possible to ally with the second-world under given conditions." (ibid)

What is the stuff that the 'anti-hegemonism' of these imperialist powers is made of? Referring to the state of western imperialists alliance led by US imperialism, the "Three Worldists," state: "True, the monopoly capitalists of West European countries, Japan, etc., have a thousand and one ties with the United States and, in face of the menace posed by Soviet social imperialism these countries still have to rely on the US 'Protective Umbrella'. But so long as the United States continues its policy of control, they will not cease in their struggle against such control and for equal partnership." (ibid, p. 30) (emphasis added). In their own words, the objective of this struggle against the over-bearing behaviour of US imperialism is to realise "equal partnership." Well, may we ask, "equal partnership" in what and for what? Isn't "equal partnership" being sought in the predatory imperialist alliance for perpetuating and intensifying oppression and exploitation of under developed countries, and contending with social imperialism for this neo-colonial loot? Doesn't it show that while US imperialism seeks, through "its policy of control", to limit the scope of imperialist contention and loot on the part of these powers, they, through their struggle against such control seek to enlarge this scope, and that friction between the two sides, on this score, is just another dimension of the fundamental contradiction between USA and these countries as imperialist powers?

Building a case for 'anti-hegemonism' of these imperialist powers, in another context, they state: "In certain cases, their own interests even compel them to make certain concessions to Third world countries or to give some support to third world's struggle against hegemonism or to remain neutral". Why "In Certain cases"? What is the situation "taken as a whole" (to use their favourite phrase)? And which imperialists are not occasionally compelled by "their

own interests" "to make certain concessions to third world countries"? All imperialists are. Only these "certain concessions", are made with a view to perpetuate or extend imperialist stranglehold on the third world countries. As an instance of "support" rendered "to third world's struggle against hegemonism" by these imperialist powers, they refer to the incident of mercenary attack backed by Soviet lackey Nato clique of Angola on Zaire's province of Katanga in the year 1977. "This year, when Zaire was repelling the armed invasion masterminded by the Soviet Union, France rendered it some logistic support." (ibid, p. 30). By what distortion of language can be landing of the French Commandos in Katanga be termed "some logistic support"? If the entry of French imperialist troops in Zaire in a concerted move by Belgium, USA and France to bolster up the military efforts of their lackey Mobutu clique and safeguard their respective imperialist interests in Zaire was an act of "Support to third world's struggle against hegemonism" then what is to be called imperialist intervention? According to this twisted logic of the "Three worldists" when Cuban Troops, East German and Soviet Union's military advisers were engaged in bolstering up the military efforts of the lackey Nato clique of Angola in repelling South African armed invasion masterminded by US imperialism, they were actually giving "some support to third world struggle against hegemonism"! To be, more exact, "some logistic support"!

Thus, whether viewed in relation to the super powers, the "first world" or in relation to the under developed countries, the 'third world', the 'anti-hegemonism' of these second-rate imperialist powers turns out to be a striving for imperialist contention with the super powers. No doubt an uneven contention, all the same an imperialist contention. The "Three Worldists" wish to detrack the forces of world proletarian revolution from the Marxist-Leninist course of skillfully utilising the contradiction between second-rate

imperialist powers and the super powers, as contradictions within the enemy imperialist camp and direct the revolutionary forces to the class-collaborationist course of seeking a strategic alliance with the second-rate imperialist forces, at domestic and international plane, since these are allegedly no more enemy forces at this stage of world proletarian revolution.

As in the case of other revisionist concepts woven into Teng's 'Three World Theory', so in their revisionist distortion of the distinction between the two super powers and the second-rate imperialist powers they deploy all their skills in trickery to palm it off as comrade Mao-Tsetung's ideas. They dig out an utterance by Mao in 1970 regarding the handling of West European powers by China at the plane of socialist diplomacy in order to break through the encirclement imposed on it by US imperialism and Soviet social imperialism. At that time, he said: "we should win over these countries such as Britain, France and West Germany." They deliberately cause confusion between the foreign policy concept of 'winning over' certain states to the side of socialist China on some matters and the strategic concept of 'winning over' certain social forces to the side of the proletariat as revolutionary allies.

They give the following excerpt from Mao's comments on the Suez Canal incident in 1956. "In the Middle East, two kinds of contradictions and three kinds of forces are in conflict. The two kinds of contradictions; first, those between different imperialist powers, that is between the US and Britain and between the US and France, and, second, those between the imperialist powers and the oppressed. The Three kinds of forces are; One, the US, the biggest imperialist power, two, Britain and France, second-rate imperialist powers, and three, the oppressed nations". They claim that "It is not difficult to see that Chairman Mao's analysis of the three kinds of forces was the forerunner of his theory of the three worlds. The difference between the two

is chiefly due to the existence however precarious of a socialist camp at the time." (ibid, p. 17)

We wish to quote in detail from the same talk by Mao Tsetung to show how his dialectical and revolutionary treatment of the concerned questions, far from being a progenator of 'Three world theory', is a damning indictment of the revisionist line encompassed in Teng's 'Three World Theory.'

Referring to the phenomenon of intensifying contention among imperialist powers, he said: "Their embroilment is to our advantage. We, the socialist countries, should pursue the policy of consolidating ourselves and not yielding in single inch of our land. We will struggle against any one who tries to make us to do so. This is where we draw the line beyond which they can be left to quarrel among themselves. Then shall we speak or not? Yes we shall. We certainly will support the anti-imperialist struggle of the people in Asia, Africa and Latin America and the revolutionary struggles of the people of all countries.

"As for the relations between the imperialist countries and ourselves, 'they are among us and we are among them', we support the people's revolution in their countries and they conduct subversive activities in ours. We have our men in their midst, that is, the communist, the revolutionary workers, farmers, and intellectuals, and the progressives in their countries. They have their men in our midst, and in China for instance they have among us many people from the bourgeoisie and the democratic parties and also the landlord class.....

"In short, our assessment of the international situation is still that the embroilment of the imperialist countries contending for colonies is the greater contradictions. They try to cover-up the contradictions between themselves by playing up their contradictions with us. We can make use of their contradictions, a lot can be done in this connection. This is a matter of importance for our external policy."

(Talks at Conference of Party Committee Secretaries—Mao-Jan, 1957) (All emphasis added).

In dealing with phenomenon of disturbed relationship between the reactionary ruling clique in Asia, Africa and Latin America and their imperialist masters, the "Three Worldists" go whole hog in revising the basic thesis of Lenin, Stalin and Mao-Tsetung on colonial revolution and present a topsy-turvy picture of the realities of class rule of the domestic ruling classes and tasks of revolutionary movement in the countries of this region.

Trampling under foot Lenin's important injunction that communists must expose the systematic deception practised by imperialism through setting up such states as are economically, politically and militarily dependent on it and proclaiming these to be independent national states, the "Three Worldists" come forward as propagandists of this deception. In a sweeping manner, they depict the countries of Asia, Africa and Latin America as more or less independent national states. They dish out a distorted appraisal of the historical phenomenon of collapse of old colonial system after World War II. Whereas a number of countries of this region won their political independence through hardfought people's struggles of national liberation and national resistance against fascist occupation armies, in large majority of cases independence was 'conferred' by imperialists on their colonies through 'transfer of power' to their trusted lackeys under the pressure of obtaining historical, political circumstances, with the result that the colonial state power structures were not demolished in these countries. Even in the case of nationalist regimes that came to power on the crest of popular national upsurge at that time, some were toppled through imperialist machinations and replaced with more pliant ones and the reactionary state-structures were refurbished, while in some others, the upper-sections of the new ruling bourgeois classes gradually developed reactionary traits and became the

retainers of colonialist and feudal interests. Of course, there are still a number of progressive nationalist states struggling to defend and consolidate their political independence and national economies against the economic, political and military pressures of imperialist powers particularly the two super powers. But, the majority of Asian, African and Latin American countries are under neo-colonial rule wherein the domestic reactionary classes share state power in varying measures with their imperialist masters. For the people of most of the underdeveloped countries, it is primarily a matter of breaking the shackles of neo-colonialism and accomplishing national democratic revolution all the while resisting attempts, on the part of any imperialist power, particularly a super power for bringing them under complete subjugation. Only in the case of some progressive national states the task of defending and consolidating political independence and national economy assumes first-rate importance.

The "Three Worldists" not only down-play the role of neo-colonialism in these countries, they also give a distorted account of its mode of operation impairing, thereby, the political vigilance and consciousness of revolutionary forces. Reducing neo-colonialism essentially to the attempts of imperialist powers at directly exercising control on the basis of their capacity for exerting military pressure at the given time, over these countries, they state: "Europe, which is the focus of contention between the two hegemonist powers has drawn and pinned down the bulk of their strength. They are not likely to maintain tight control over many third world countries, for it is very often the case that they cannot grab at one without losing hold of another." (ibid, p. 27)

By such talk they seek to create the false impression that neo-colonialism does not hold sway over these countries chiefly through the medium of the domestic reactionary ruling classes. They down play the phenomenon of the neo-

colonialism and project a distorted view of its mode of operation, because any reference to the medium of neo-colonial hold over these countries brings into discussion a crucial question which they avoid like hot coal, that is, the question of state-power in these countries. By putting aside the question of state power, they feel free to discuss the political role of these countries enbloc as third world countries and that of all the class forces enbloc as 'country'. In their typical deceptive phraseology they seek to wriggle out of this "complex situation" created by their indiscriminate tie-up of forces having qualitatively different political character and role; "Their (third world countries) social and political systems differ, the level of their economic development is not uniform, and there are constant changes in the political situation in each country. Hence it is often the case that the authorities of these countries adopt different attitudes towards imperialism and the super powers and their own people.....But taken as a whole, the majority of these countries are for struggle against imperialism and hegemonism." So, all the differences listed here prove to be of marginal relevance as these do not essentially affect their common trait of struggle against imperialism and hegemonism: "There are of course struggles between different political forces within the third world countries themselves. Some people are revolutionaries who firmly stand for carrying through the national democratic revolution. Others are progressives and middle of the roaders of various descriptions. A few are reactionaries. And there are even some agents of imperialism or social imperialism.....However, this complex situation does not affect the basic fact that the third world countries are the main force in the struggle against imperialism and hegemonism." So, the fact that 'country' covers national democratic revolutionary forces on the one hand and reactionaries and imperialist agents on the other does not alter their "basic fact". They tell us the secret of it, "when we look at a question, we must grasp its essence

and its main aspect..." (ibid, p-28.) What the "Three worldists" seek through their above statements is precisely to prevent the people from grasping the "essence" and "main aspect" of the question since the essence and main aspect of the political character and role of a country is determined by the class character of its state power. All their phraseology is designed to conceal the real basic fact about these countries, that it is these "few reactionaries" and "even some agents of imperialism or social-imperialism", who hold state-power in most of these countries. And this state power, far from being an instrument of struggle for smashing up neo-colonialism, is a powerful weapon of neo-colonialism ever-aimed at the people and their revolutionary movements in these countries. Under conditions of neo-colonialism, all talk of anti-imperialist struggle of the people of these countries is pure humbug if this struggle is not directed against the lackey big bourgeois and feudal classes and their reactionary state power.

The so many wranglings between the reactionary ruling classes and their imperialist masters on non-basic issues, that are not concerned with any substantial change in the neo-colonial setup but, at best, with some reformist alterations in it, do not affect the basic character and role of the former which continues to be reactionary and pro-imperialist. It is another matter that revolutionaries can use such wranglings to their benefit, in an appropriate way.

The "Three worldists" shamelessly eulogise and defend the lackey reactionary state power in these countries by saying that "By exercising the state power in their hands the independent third world countries have gained broader arenas and more means to carry on the struggle than in the past.....The fact that the Asian, African and Latin American countries.....have boldly taken their destiny into their own hands and wrested back the rights due them..... (ibid, p. 26). They refer to the struggle of the people of these countries merely for duping the gullible, actually, when they

say that, the third world countries are the main force in the world-wide struggle against imperialism and hegemonism, the purpose is to glorify the political role of the states of this region. Although they use the terms 'world', 'countries' and 'people' interchangeably to cause confusion, at some places they can be pinned down to get the truth. For instance, in their following statement about the second world countries, "they have a dual character and stand in contradiction with both the first and the third worlds". Who has a dual character? It cannot be said of the people of the second world, nor can the people of the second world be standing in contradiction with the third world. Without any shadow of doubt, here 'second world' means the states in Europe and other places. The 'first world' also denotes imperialist states, USA and Soviet Union, since the people of these two countries cannot be the target of the struggle of 'Third World' and the 'Second World'. How can it be different in the case of 'third world'? Moreover, Teng Hsiao-ping would have no need for rigging-up a new 'theory' to say that the struggling people of Asia, Africa and Latin America are the main force in the world-wide struggle against imperialism which has been an established stand of international Marxist-Leninist movement ever since the Great Debate, were it not for conferring this exalted role of being main anti-imperialist force upon the states of Asia, Africa and Latin America.

Through the eclectic method of knocking together, into a hybrid whole, phenomena of different order or differentiating phenomena of essentially similar nature into qualitatively different categories, the "Three World Theorists" mutilate the fundamental contradiction between imperialism and oppressed nations and the fundamental contradictions between various imperialist powers, transforming the reactionary ruling clique in underdeveloped countries into the main anti-imperialist force and the imperialist ruling cliques in highly developed capitalist

countries into an anti-hegemonist force. All these revisionist acrobatics of "Three Worldists" are meant for selling their line of un-adulterated class collaboration and tying up of proletarian and other revolutionary forces to the boot-laces of the ruling cliques of both the 'Third World' and the 'Second World', both for renouncing revolutionary tasks concerning the struggle against imperialism and reaction and those concerning the struggle against unjust criminal inter-imperialist war.

This is not all. Unfolding of the revisionist logic of "Three World Theory" thus far does not fully serve the counter revolutionary objectives of the renegade Teng-Hua clique. This much of "Three World Theory" would, no doubt, throw its followers into the arms of the "second world" imperialist rulers and the "Third World" reactionary rulers but it still carries a formal message of directing concentrated fire against hegemonism of the two super powers (notwithstanding the fact that opportunistic embracing, on the part of revolutionary forces, of 'second world' imperialists and 'third world' reactionary lackeys of imperialism would knock out the bottom of their struggle against hegemonism and war-drive of the two super powers). This would not accord with the demands of Teng-Hua clique's present capitulationist tie-up with one of the super powers, US imperialism. This clique needs theoretic justification of its ganging-up with one of the chief enemies of the people of the world of proletarian revolution and world peace. Hence cooking up of the revisionist thesis of differentiating the 'first world'. According to which, as a hegemonist power and instigator of world war Soviet social imperialism is the more dangerous than US imperialism and is "the primary target" in the struggle against hegemonism and war.

This thesis is the real king-pin of Teng's 'Three world theory', and the line of uniting with US imperialism and its lackeys world-wide in the struggle against Soviet social

imperialism, singled out as the principal enemy, is the operative line of the whole "Three world theory". All the noise of "three worldists" while dealing with the 'third world' and the 'second world' about concentrating the revolutionary attack on the hegemonism of two super powers is aimed at taming the ideological resistance of revolutionary forces against the class-collaborationist course of action and then ultimately leading them into the lap of US imperialism.

The "Three Worldists" first, transform the policy-distinction (meant for deciding "the primary target" from among the imperialist enemies) between the two imperialist super powers and the second-rate imperialist powers into a basic distinction (meant for demarcating enemies and friends). Then they transform the specific distinctions (meant for deciding specific mode of fighting against each segment of the "primary target") between the two super powers into policy distinction, in violation of all norms of Marxist-Leninist strategy and tactics.

Their differentiation between US imperialism and Soviet social imperialism rests on distortion of Marxist logic. One of their chief-arguments in favour of this differentiation is that "soviet social imperialism is an imperialist power following on the heels of the United States and is therefore "more aggressive and adventurous" and that according to Lenin late-comers among imperialist countries are "even more rapacious, even more predatory". So what to conclude from this? When Lenin said this in reference to the late-comer German imperialism he concluded from this that inter-imperialist war was inevitable and not that the late comer German imperialism was the "primary target" of proletarian revolutionary movement.

They say that US imperialism, "has over-reached itself and all it can do at present is to strive to protect its interests and go over to the defensive in its overall strategy". So what to conclude from this? Any conclusion, relevant to the formulation of current policy of international

proletarian revolutionary movement, can only be drawn on the basis of the answers to the following two questions. First, "its overall strategy" in which US imperialism can but "go over to the defensive" is in pursuit of what? For seeking exclusive world hegemony in contention with Soviet social imperialism. Second, what line of conduct is taken, at present, by US imperialism in this contention for exclusive world hegemony, whether of contending with its rival chiefly through other means than war and seeking, for the time being to ward off the war or, of preparing for war? Of feverishly preparing for a world war. Both the answers are there in their own statement, "each super power sets exclusive world hegemony as its goal and to this end makes frantic preparations for a new world war" (emphasis added, p. 19) "The war-machine of each of the two super powers in peace time assumes a magnitude unprecedented in human history". (emphasis added, p. 20) In the criminal imperialist operation of forcible redivision of the world, where each super power seeks to realise exclusive world hegemony, the circumstance of US imperialism having to fight in a state of strategic defensive, that is, having more to exert in retaining and consolidating its earlier huge colonial exploits than in seizing new territories, does in no way change the predatory character of its endeavour before and during the actual outbreak of the imperialist war. A super power may employ an "offensive strategy" or "go over to the defensive in its overall strategy", the imperialist striving for seizing or for retaining colonial possessions through military means is equally predatory in both the cases. It gives no scope to international proletarian revolutionary movement for meting out differential treatment to Soviet social imperialism and US imperialism. They juggle with military statistics to give the impression that Soviet social imperialism is a more formidable military power than US imperialism. First, it is factually wrong to assert so. In the wide range of military weaponry and other apparatus, each of the two

super powers is having comparative lead in certain branches and comparative lag in other branches. However, in terms of over-all military might there exists almost parity between them. Secondly, which is more important, in view of the gigantic military build-up, on the part of both the super powers, even if one of them acquires an edge over the other in this respect, it would not affect in a significant way, the capability or role of either of them as an aggressive imperialist super power and would be irrelevant to the question of formulating the policy of international proletarian movement towards the two super powers.

They say that while US imperialism has time and again met with resistance and been subjected to exposure and denunciation... Soviet social imperialism "wears the mask of 'socialism'" and has not "completely lost its capacity to deceive" people, that "arduous efforts are called for to help the people of the world to recognise its true features." Right, it should only imply that the exposure of its fake socialism and real social imperialism should be an important feature of our revolutionary propaganda. But, since when has it become a Marxist-Leninist tactic to treat the politically less-exposed enemy as "the primary target" and, the notorious one as the secondary target? Demanding that revolutionary struggles of the peoples of the world against US imperialism be left to their fate without the guidance and leadership of international proletariat, the "Third Worldists" say that "Progressive world opinion is already familiar with its true nature and will go on fighting against it."

Surely, the revolutionary people of the world "will go on fighting against it" and genuine Marxist-Leninist of the world will see to it that they are led to do so more vigorously and more effectively with the uprooting of the poisonous weed of the "Three World Theory."

The other opportunist current that strives ideologically, politically to disorientate international Marxist-Leninist

movement from its revolutionary course in this period, is generated by the leadership of PLA. This opportunist current is wrapped up in the mechanistic, revisionist, 'Two World Theory' propounded by Enver Hoxa. It is presented as an anti-dote to the class-collaborationist 'Three World Theory' of Teng Hsiao Ping. But, notwithstanding the revolutionary rhetoric in which it is couched, the 'Two World Theory' of Enver Hoxa is as inconsistent, anti-dialectical, and revisionist in nature as the 'Three World Theory' of Teng Hsiao Ping. Both of these opportunist platforms are structured on the ideological basis of the mutilating treatment of the major contradictions of the contemporary world and flagrant distortions of the teachings of Marx, Engels, Lenin, Stalin and Mao Tsetung, in particular, the negation of Mao-Tsetung Thought. Consequently both of these are out to serve the same political purpose, that is, sabotaging the advance of world proletarian revolution through projecting wrong analysis of the contemporary world situation, the revolutionary tasks emanating therefrom and the strategy and tactics of international communist movement for realising these tasks.

In "Imperialism and the Revolution", alleged to be a classic work of Enver Hoxa, one comes across his exposition of the 'Two World Theory'. Referring to certain utterances of Lenin and Stalin in connection with the emergence of Soviet Russia and of a new major contradictions, the contradiction between socialist system and capitalist system, Enver Hoxa sets out to depict the present world political situation and activity of various political forces in terms of the global clash of the two worlds, the world of socialism and the world of capitalism. He states:

(A) "After the victory of October Revolution, Lenin and Stalin said, 'In our times there are two worlds, the socialist world and the capitalist world...' (Imperialism and Revolution, p. 15)

(B) "Today, there are two worlds as before, and the struggle between two worlds, between two opposing classes, between socialism and capitalism, is there not only on the national scale but is also on an international scale." (p. 16)

(C) "...We are firm defenders of the Leninist theory of two worlds, we are part of the new socialist world and we are struggling to destroy the old capitalist system..." (p. 149)

This absolutising of one of the major contradictions operating in the contemporary world, namely the contradiction between the socialist system and the capitalist (imperialist) system is meant for depreciating the role of other major contradictions, and ascribing a pivotal role to Albania as the leading factor of the aspect of socialism locked in mortal conflict with capitalism world-wide. No person with moderate intelligence can fail to notice that such an appraisal of the present day world political situation has no relevance to the actual class struggles that are unfolding in the world arena.

Throughout the years of fifties and sixties, the world witnessed the stormy unfolding of the contradiction between imperialism and the oppressed nations and peoples, generally, in the national liberation movements of the peoples of Asia, Africa and Latin America. The contradiction is still maintaining its acuteness and has, in no way subsided. Any proposed strategy for world proletarian revolution to day which does not take cognisance of the crucial role of this contradiction and the revolutionary struggles emanating from it, can but be an apologia of neo-colonialism and a blue print for sabotaging the advance of world proletarian revolution. In this respect Enver Hoxa's 'Two World Theory' seeks to accomplish, under cover of revolutionary phrases, what renegade Khrushchev attempted and failed, on the eve of the Great Debate.

The protagonists of 'Two World Theory' not only devalue the great historical current of national democratic revolutionary movement that is pounding the vast rear

areas of imperialism and hastening its inevitable collapse, they also revise the Marxist-Leninist characterisation pertaining to the anti-imperialist and anti-feudal content of national democratic revolutionary movement. Finding it difficult to fit the semi-feudal, semi-colonial societies of Asia, Africa and Latin America into the "two worlds" pattern of their conception, they choose to present these as capitalist societies. According to Enver Hoxa, "The bourgeoisie, which has in its hands the state power of these countries, protects that very capitalist society to which the proletariat, along with rural and urban poor, wants to overthrow."

The situation regarding the class rule and class confrontation in these countries is made out to be essentially no different from that of western capitalist countries. "In both the 'third world' and 'second world' countries the bourgeois capitalist classes are the same class forces which rule the proletariat and the people... Here also, the main force is the proletariat." (p. 21)

Of course, they do not deny that the ruling bourgeoisie in most of these countries is in league with the foreign imperialist oppressors. Accordingly, the two fundamental social contradictions operating in these countries are depicted by them in the following manner :

"To aspire for the internal unity of the third world in the real sense means to aspire for unity between the oppressed class and the oppressor class, it means, an attempt to mitigate the contradictions between the bourgeoisie and the labouring people, between the people and foreign tyrants." (p. 121) And the chief internal contradiction operating in these countries, in general, is said to be not between the broad masses of the people and feudalism but between the former and the big bourgeoisie : "In this period of imperialism, native big bourgeoisie is the main internal enemy of the revolution, not only in the developed capitalist countries, but also oppressed and dependent countries..." (p. 97) Thus the crucial revolutionary task to

be taken up by the proletarian leadership in these countries, that is, the task of carrying out the agrarian revolution through unleashing the revolutionary fighting potential of primarily the peasant masses, is sought to be abandoned. In other words, the kernel of new democratic revolution is discarded under cover of revolutionary sounding phrases about the proletarian crusade against the capitalist world. In this attempt, they reveal themselves as actually being rescuers of feudalism.

This revision on the programmatic plane, of the chief target of the new democratic revolution leads the 'Two Worldists' into bungling over the question of strategic alignment of class forces for this revolution. They formally advocate the forging of worker peasant alliance but actually knock-out the basis of this alliance in semi-feudal semi-colonial countries, that being the agrarian revolutionary programme and movement. They reluctantly concede the possibility of drawing the national bourgeoisie into people's revolutionary alliance for national democratic revolution but recoil from the prospect of its participation in the new state to be set-up, under the leadership of proletariat, after the victory of this alliance. It indicates that they consider the national bourgeoisie to be at best a tactical ally and not a strategic ally of the proletariat in national democratic revolution. In fact, they reject the very concept of New Democracy as a state-form for implementing the programme of national democratic revolution.

The rejection of new democratic stage of revolution in countries of Asia, Africa and Latin America, on the part of 'Two Worldists', is also implicit in their underassessment of the dimensions of democratic and national tasks in these countries. They not only emasculate the anti-feudal task but waterdown the anti-imperialist task too by obliterating the qualitative distinction between the phenomenon of imperialist colonialist oppression in these countries and the factor of domination in relations between the relatively

weaker and the mighty imperialist countries. They visualise or portray only a quantitative difference, in this respect, between the countries of Asia, Africa, Latin America; on the one hand and the developed capitalist countries on the other hand, the former being "more dependent on foreign capital" than the latter (Imperialism and Revolution p. 222) (emphasis added). Consequently, for them, the democratic and anti-imperialist tasks do not constitute the very content of revolution, at this stage, in the former countries but merely, "the democratic and anti-imperialist tasks of the revolution have special importance" there. (ibid). On the basis of the above appraisal of the revolutionary tasks, they vaguely suggest some sort of "interlacing of the national-democratic, anti-imperialist, national liberation revolution with the socialist revolution." (p. 174) In the context of Asia, Africa and Latin America, the Trotskyite-thesis of "inter-lacing" or "intertwining" socialist revolution is a patent recipe for making a mess of either revolution.

In accordance with their revisionist propositions concerning the programme and strategy of revolution in Asia, Africa and Latin America, they also advocate a mechanical-revisionist-military line for the revolution. They categorically reject the path of waging "protracted peoples war" and establishing "parallel people's political power" in revolutionary rural base areas with the aim of encircling and ultimately capturing the cities, and mechanically recommend instead the Bolshevik experience of insurrection in the cities preceded by considerable period of political and military preparations, for making revolution in countries of Asia, Africa and Latin America. In this connection, they state "In all conditions and circumstances, it (the revolutionary party of the working class) carries out an unceasing revolutionary struggle and activity in various forms, in order to prepare itself and the masses for the decisive battles in the revolution, for the overthrow of the rule of the bourgeoisie with revolutionary violence. But only when the

revolutionary situation has fully matured does it put armed insurrection directly on the order of the day and take all the political, ideological, organisational and military measures to carry it through to victory." (p. 236)

This course of action, prescribed by the "two-worldists", even for the revolutionary forces of Asia, Africa and Latin America stands in clear contravention of historically-validated understanding of international communist movement that armed revolution in these countries is essentially peasant armed struggle. Any attempt at conducting armed struggle not primarily based on the strength and struggle of the peasant masses, would result in disastrous defeat of revolutionary forces in most cases. From this angle, the path of revolution in these countries, as pointed out by the 'two-worldists' is fraught with "left" deviations on the part of the revolutionary forces who may look upto these opportunists for revolutionary guidance. But, more note-worthy aspect of this line is its right opportunism veiled under revolutionary sounding phrases. In these countries, the revolutionary situation and movement develop quite unevenly due to the backward and unevenly developed character of their economies. Here, more often than not the revolutionaries find themselves simultaneously confronted with certain rural areas of sharply developing class contradictions and conflicts demanding higher forms of revolutionary organisation and struggle, and other areas marked by weak or sluggish revolutionary movement, while the mass movement in the cities and towns still being at the level of struggle for partial demands. In such circumstances for a communist revolutionary party to take the line that "...only when the revolutionary situation has fully matured does it put armed insurrection directly on the order of the day" (emphasis added) is tantamount to renouncing armed struggle, for a country-wide "fully matured" revolutionary situation would be a rare phenomenon. Thus, the plan or posture of working for a countrywide insurrection or

insurrection in major industrial city-centres can be a convenient pretext, on the part of these opportunists, for ditching, restraining or liquidating popular revolutionary upsurges, particularly the armed struggle and forces of peasant masses.

The other major contradiction which they depreciate and distort is the contradiction among different imperialist powers. In recent years, contradictions falling in this category, particularly the contradiction between two imperialist super powers, US imperialism and soviet social imperialism, underwent process of accelerated intensification. The fierce contention between the two super powers for global hegemony is showing no let up, generating great turmoil all the world over and driving them to war. The development of this contradiction tend to out-pace the development of other major contradictions, pushing it towards exercising decisive influence on the course of world political developments for a certain period. Such an eventuality does not fit into Hoxa's 'two world' pattern based on an unaltering decisive role of the contradiction between socialism and capitalism. So, whenever the 'two worldists' have willynilly to speak of the intensifying contradictions among imperialist powers, particularly, between two imperialist super powers, they always hasten to de-emphasise this point by highlighting the intensification of other contradictions or the conciliatory aspect of inter-imperialist relationship. This is how Hoxa soft-peddles the inter-imperialist contradiction :

"...between the United States of America and the Soviet Union, there is an obvious tendency towards maintaining the the status quo" "Of course, while the United States of America and NATO are striving to preserve this status quo with the Soviet Union, at the same time, they have contradiction with it, but these contradictions have not yet reached such a level as to justify the Chinese refrain that war in Europe is imminent". (p. 28)

"The two super powers...have the suppression of the revolution and socialism as the first point in their programmewhich is an expression of the irreconcilable contradiction between socialism and capitalism....." (p. 281) ".....the existence of contradictions and rifts among the imperialist powers and groupings in no way over-rides or displaces to a position of secondary importance the contradictions between labour and capital in the capitalist and imperialist countries, or the contradiction between the oppressed peoples and their imperialist oppressors. Precisely these, the contradictions between the proletariat and the bourgeoisie, between the oppressed peoples and imperialism, between socialism and capitalism, are the most profound, they are permanent, irreconcilable contradictions". (p. 300)

The playing down of the intensity and role of the inter-imperialist contradiction, and the possibilities latent in it for maneuvering by the revolutionary forces, fosters a rigid policy posture rendering the revolutionary leadership incapable of properly handling the problems of war and revolution.

The mutilating treatment of the inter-imperialist contradiction at the hands of 'two worldists', finds expression in their analysis of the relationship between the second-rate imperialist countries and the two super powers. While they play down the conflict of imperialist interests which is the essence of the relationship between the two super powers and the weaker imperialist countries, they tend to magnify the factor of former's domination over the latter into a phenomenon of national oppression. In this respect, their position is not much different from that of Teng-Hua revisionists. The only point of difference turns out to be on the alignment of class forces for struggle against this national oppression. Whereas the 'Three Worldists' place the ruling classes of these countries in this alignment, the 'two worldists' conceive this alignment of forces without and against the ruling classes. Both are one in assigning

the national task to the revolution in these imperialist countries, only, the line of the 'two worldists' on this question is inconsistent, stopping short of embracing the logical conclusion of its premise that US imperialism and soviet social imperialism "deny them (the weaker imperialist countries) their national identity". (p. 287)

Formally, the 'two worldists' consider the two super powers, U. S. imperialism and soviet social imperialism to be the chief enemies of people of the world, equally hostile to the cause of peace and revolution but in effect the whole thrust of their analysis of international situation is directed against U. S. imperialism as the most powerful and dangerous enemy. The soft corner in their hearts for soviet social imperialism peeps through so many of their utterances about how it happens to be a harassed super power who is forced by the devilish U. S. imperialism to enter into a costly arms-race and is being encircled and threatened by the formidable U. S.-Peking-Tokyo axis, so on and so forth. Here is Hoxa in action as the cosmetologist of soviet social imperialism :

"The problem is that the increase of U. S. military potential relatively weakens soviet fighting strength and forces the soviet Union to follow the United States of America step by step in order to balance its military potential and aggressive power. However, keeping up with U. S. imperialism in the armaments race weakens the economy of the Soviet Union, because it means that large material, monetary and human funds are transferred from the economy to the army. This is what is worrying Brezhnev and company". (p. 289)

"The Chinese revisionists need this treaty and the friendship with Japan, so that, together with the Japanese militarists, they can threaten Soviet social imperialism and possibly liquidate it and its influence in Asia." (p. 43)

"...It is most likely that the policy of the United States of America and the wrong strategy of China itself, may impel the Soviet Union to increase its military strength, even

further, and as the imperialist power it is, to attack China first.

"On its part China has a marked inclination to attack the Soviet Union when it feels strong enough, because it has great territorial ambitions towards Siberia and other territories in the Far East." (p. 366)

That is not all. Hoxa goes to the absurd length of portraying Soviet social imperialism itself as a victim of imperialist domination, which got itself caught up in the hegemonic claws of mighty U. S. imperialism; "...any state, big or small, which gets caught up in the mechanism of imperialism suffers curtailment or loss of its political freedom, its independence and sovereignty. Even the Soviet Union has been reduced to this state of curtailed sovereignty...". (p. 351)

So, notwithstanding their formal pronouncements to the effect that both of the two super powers are the chief and equally dangerous enemies of people of the world, the real message of the 'two worldists', delivered through such utterances as fore-quoted is that the international proletariat and other revolutionary forces should direct the sharp edge of their struggle at international plane, against U. S. imperialism and the imperialist bloc under its leadership.

The economic approach exhibited by the 'two worldists' in their comprehension of the menace posed by various imperialist powers and that of the phenomenon of neo-colonial oppression leads them to misconceive and mishandle not only the various manifestations of the inter-imperialist contradiction but also the other major contradiction, the contradiction between the proletariat and the bourgeoisie in capitalist countries. In all the countries that come under the operation of the latter contradiction, excepting the U. S. A., they adulterate the class contradiction between the proletariat and the bourgeoisie by surreptitiously grafting on it a fictitious national contradiction between the people of these countries and their foreign

oppressors mainly the U. S. imperialism.

If the 'two worldists' betray their confused and opportunist thinking in the matter of comprehending the state of development and relative importance of these three major contradictions respectively, they fare no better in the case of their most prized contradiction, the contradiction between the socialist system and the capitalist (imperialist) system.

The socialist countries seek to resolve this contradiction by working for the internal disintegration of the capitalist-imperialist system, that is, by acting and developing as reliable revolutionary bases for inspiring, supporting and assisting the development and victory of revolutionary forces in the capitalist imperialist system. The imperialist countries seek to resolve this contradiction by weakening and destroying the socialist countries, preferably through military economic blockade and armed intervention or aggression, when feasible, but more patently by promoting internal degeneration of these countries through encouraging and strengthening the counter-revolutionary restorationist forces. Therefore, the successful handling of this contradiction, on the part of the proletariat in power, requires that it should be able not only to grasp and tackle the problems concerning the direct dealings between the socialist countries and capitalist countries but also grasp the process of development of each aspect of this contradiction to influence this development in favour of proletarian revolution and communism. In other words, it should be able correctly to grasp and treat the internal contradictions of the process of development of each aspect.

The fallacious thinking of the 'two-worldists' permeating their appraisal of the major contradictions of the imperialist system has already been discussed. Their conception of the nature of socialist society and its internal contradictions is even more fallacious. Actually, it was the anti-dialectical and economic approach of Enver Hoxa to the problems

of socialist revolution and construction that impelled him to openly come out against Mao-Tsetung Thought and reveal himself as an opportunist in a Marxist-Leninist garb.

Enver Hoxa denies the Marxist-Leninist thesis that the process of development of socialist society constitutes a protracted revolutionary transition from capitalism to communism. For him the coming into being of socialist society marks a complete rupture from capitalist society, a consummation of the process of transformation of one social phenomenon into the other entirely new social phenomenon. It is in this meaning that he interprets and uses the Marxist formulation about socialism being the lower stage of communism.

Socialism is termed as the lower stage of communism because one of the aspects constituting its entity is the aspect of nascent communism which is the ascending aspect. But this aspect, nascent communism, grows through struggle against the other aspect of the socialist entity, the aspect of dying capitalism. It is the unity of these two opposite aspects that determines the character of socialist society, its being, and it is the struggle of these two aspects that determines the process of development of socialist society, its becoming.

In his typical metaphysical manner, Hoxa visualises socialist society as a monolithic phenomenon with the sole content of nascent communism. This denial, on the part of Hoxa, of the existence, in the socialist society, of dying capitalism, of the fundamental contradiction between nascent communism and dying capitalism, between the respective class protagonists of these conflicting aspects, is prompted by his simplistic notion that since the victory of socialist revolution constitutes a qualitative leap from old capitalist society, it means termination of the old process and its fundamental contradiction, and the beginning of new process encompassing new fundamental contradiction. He seems to be oblivious of the other dimension of the

movement of contradictions, that is, the mutual transformation of the principal and the non-principal aspects of a contradiction which constitutes a qualitative change, marking the conclusion of a definite stage in the process of development of contradiction but not the complete resolution of the contradiction, effected through the gobbling up one aspect by its opposite. Hence, his inability to recognise that the qualitative leap involved in the victory of socialist revolution does not abolish the fundamental contradiction that causes it, namely, the contradiction between the proletariat and the bourgeoisie which continues to unfold itself under new conditions and forms in socialist society. On this issue, he reveals his ignorance of Marxist dialectics through his attack on Mao Tse-tung's masterly exposition of the mode of operation of contradiction, specifically in socialist society. Hoxa complains that: "The mutual transformation of the opposites into each other, understood as a mere exchange of places and not as a resolution of the contradiction and a qualitative change of the very phenomenon which comprises these opposites, is used by Mao Tsetung as a formal pattern to which everything is subject," and puts up the charge against Mao, "Thus, he does not see the socialist revolution as a qualitative change of society in which antagonistic classes and the oppression and exploitation of man by man are abolished, but conceives it as a simple change of places between the bourgeoisie and the proletariat." (emphasis added, p. 415)

As a corollary to his conception of socialist revolution as an absolute qualitative change of society, Hoxa denies any qualitative distinction between socialism and communism, and fulminates against Mao-Tsetung for pointing out this distinction: "...openly revising the Marxist-Leninist concept of socialism and communism, which, in essence, are two phases of the one type of socio-economic order, and which are distinguished from each other only by the degree of their development and maturity, Mao Tsetung presents socialism

as something diametrically opposite to communism". (p. 417)

To put it mildly, these views of Enver Hoxa show that he dogmatically refuses to learn from the historical experience of dictatorship of proletariat and building of socialism in Soviet Union and China. He clings fast to certain limitations of earlier Marxist-Leninist understanding of the complex reality and problems of socialist society, and so doing, in new historical conditions, slides into the company of modern revisionists. Today, having witnessed the phenomena of usurpation of political power by bourgeois-revisionist forces and capitalist restoration in the great citadels of socialism—Soviet Union and Peoples Republic of China—to maintain that "antagonistic classes...are abolished" by the victorious socialist revolution, that the socialist society does not have at its core the fundamental contradiction between the proletariat and the bourgeoisie which determines or conditions all the processes of its base and super structure, the operations of the dictatorship of proletariat and the party of proletariat, amounts to the abandoning of socialist revolution halfway and reneging from the historical task of the proletariat of carrying out revolutionary transition to a communist society.

This is what Enver Hoxa is doing and advocating. No wonder he is found venomously attacking Mao-Tsetung's great theory of continuing revolution under the conditions of dictatorship of proletariat, and its glorious practice in the Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution of China. According to his own admission, Hoxa and his other colleagues had, from the very beginning, "doubts" over Mao's theses pertaining to the colonial revolution, New Democracy, protracted people's war, the class character and class struggle in socialist society etc., but what unnerved them and assisted their slump into opportunism was the great revolutionary turmoil during the cultural revolution that shook, exposed and toppled those very notions, concepts, orientations and practices which were enshrined in their bosom. And

what made them crane and crow was the defeat of the Cultural Revolution.

No matter how frenziedly Hoxa and his 'two worldist' drummer-boys chant about the global clash, taking place between the 'capitalist world' and 'Socialist world', about the pivotal role, in world political developments, being played by the contradiction between the socialist system and the capitalist (imperialist) system, about Hoxa's masterly handling of this contradiction in the interests of the development of socialist Albania and world proletarian revolution, the fate of those who betray their incapability of properly grasping the fundamental contradictions of socialist system or the fundamental contradictions of imperialist system, is to become the victims or instruments of the transformation of the former into the latter, that is, of resolving this contradiction in favour of Imperialism.

Errata.

Page	Para	Line	Incorrect	Correct
2	2	7	Add after : international	communist movement. In conformity with the general line of the international
2	2	11	different	different
2	2	12	marked	marked
2	3	8	alignmen	alignment
2	3	8	n	and
2	3	13	concentrated	concentrated
3	1	27	refuses	refuses
4	1	2	reformism	reformism,
4	5	1	communist	communists
4	5	7	recard	regard
6	1	7	opportunists	opportunist
7	2	3	County	Country
8	3	6	depending	depends
9	2	14	1959	1939
13	1	4	obsolete	obsolete
13	2	1	at	of
14	2	3	add after : general	character of that war with an assessment of the determining element in the
14	5	4	devison	division
15	1	3	task	tasks
17	2	18	of the	of its
19	1	9	Erocli	(Ercoli)

Page	Para	Line	Incorrect	Correct
20	2	3	ovening	evening
21	1	5	this	its
23	1	22	not with standing	notwithstanding
28	4	14	to the	to be
29	2	23	clashes	clashed
32	1	21	criticism	ostracism
35	1	2	force	forces
35	2	6	farces	forces
35	3	1	Since of	Since the time of
41	1	25	example, in	example, was
41	1	28	situation	and situation
41	1	29	and	or
45	2	10	revolutionary	reactionary
47	1	19	in	in a
48	1	2	add after : capable	of striving for hegemony on a global scale and unleashing a world war for realising this nefarious aim. Other imperialist powers are incapable
49	2	2	powers	powers'
49	2	10	dominantly	dominant
50	1	6	steeped	stepped
50	1	13	states	stakes
50	1	13	War-amble	War-gamble
51	2	13	tasks	task
51	2	17	can	can be
56	1	11	ignominin	ignomin
57	1	20	differance	difference
59	2	16	saying,	sayings,
68	1	7	as	has
68	2	6	Carrying	Currying
69	1	16	ipso,	ipso

Page	Para	Line	Incorrect	Correct
72	3	5	Condition	Conditions
75	2	9	Contradiction	Contradictions
77	3	4	in	a
77	3	9	struggle	struggles
77	4	5	Communist	Communists
78	2	2	clique	cliques
86	2	1	has	"has
87	2	6	Contradictions	Contradiction
90	1	1	this	these
90	3	5	emasculate	emaciate