

RED STAR

PLATFORM FOR COMMUNIST REVOLUTIONARIES

Vol. 8

No. 11

November 1999

Rs. 5.00

- **Military Coup in Pakistan**
 - **13th Lok Sabha Elections: CPI (ML) Red Flag Succeed in Political Campaign**
 - **Put Ideological Political Line in Command**
 - **Japanese Imperialism in Crisis**
 - **On Neo-Colonialism**
 - **Experience of Chinese Revolution Continue to Inspire World proletariat**
-

Press Statements

Vajpayee Govt. - Tool For Imperialist Domination

The victory of BJP led NDA in this election could happen in a situation of increasing consensus among both Congress and BJP, and among all other parties representing ruling class interests regarding the IMF-World Bank-WTO dictated globalisation-liberalisation policies. It also happened when none of the parties who were in opposition challenged the dangerous escalation of criminalisation, communalisation and corruption. Rather there was a consensus in favour of these also among them. The election was reduced to mudslinging. Neither the intensifying pauperisation of the masses under the 'New Economic Policy', nor growing threats of communal fascism, utilised to cover up surrender to imperialist dictates in both vital foreign and internal policy matters, were targeted for attack. National issues got sidelined and communal, casteist, parochial loyalties and issues concerning state or local administration got prominence.

In spite of these, BJP could not increase its strength and Congress got a good beating, frustrating the efforts of ruling classes to polarise Indian politics between them. BJP could get a majority only through a loose alliance of 24 parties. There is a further fragmentation of political spectrum reflecting the spread of economic crisis to political scene.

Continuation of Vajpayee government me-

ans continuation and intensification of anti-people, anti-national policies. Already diesel prices are hiked 40%. There are moves to sign CTBT and to surrender to US imperialist dictates on foreign policy matters. Instead of de-escalating tension and improving relations with neighbouring countries, BJP is advocating further nuclear and conventional armamentation. Enslavement of the country and pauperisation of the masses are going to get intensified as NDA is committed to second generation of imperialist dictated reforms, and to opening the country to MNCs. To cover up their treacherous policies, communalisation is going to be whipped up more.

This unprecedentedly dangerous situation calls for an offensive by the genuine left forces to mobilise the people around an anti-imperialist, democratic, secular programme, and to launch uncompromising struggle against globalisation liberalisation policies and communalisation. When the traditional left led by CPI (M) is degenerating fast by tailing behind, ruling class forces and policies, we appeal to all genuine left and revolutionary forces to take up people's cause unitedly and build up a powerful anti-imperialist democratic movement.

New Delhi
October 11, 1999

All India Secretary
CPI (ML) Red Flag

Defend Reservation as a Democratic Right

The ruling by a Constitutional Bench of the Supreme Court denying reservation to the Scheduled Castes and Scheduled Tribes in promotion in service, and in selection to super-speciality courses goes against the basic concept of reservation to the socially backward sections adopted at the time of framing the Constitution as a result of prolonged struggles by democratic forces and those sections who are socially and economically backward due to millenniums of social oppression. We oppose this ruling and view with concern that the central government has not taken any action so far to nullify it. We appeal to all progressive democratic forces to rally with the SC/ST sections for opposing this ruling.

This Supreme Court ruling cannot be seen isolated from the economic policies presently followed based on globalisation-liberalisation-privatisation and market system. Interpretations that Article 16 of the Constitution enabling reservation is not a fundamental right, and that efficiency of administration, merit and quality should be the criteria smack of casteism. Equality of opportunity should not be interpreted in abstract manner isolated from social reality and history.

This ruling questioning the very validity of reservation as a democratic right should be seen in the overall context of reservation as a whole
(Contd. P. 24)

Military Coup in Pakistan

The military coup in Pakistan ousting the Pakistan Muslim League (N) government led by Nawaz Sharif has further sharpened not only the contradictions within that country, but also in South Asia and nearby regions. Especially in the present context when Vajpayee government coming to power utilising the Kargil conflict and anti-Pakistan communal sabre-rattling will be bent upon utilising the coup and its follow-up developments for furthering its Hindutva agenda. It also assumes significance when US government is pursuing its hegemonic efforts at global level, and as a part of it in South Asia.

Right from the time of formation of Pakistan the US imperialists have manoeuvred the comprador ruling classes and their political representatives to serve the global interests of imperialist system. Systematically the military and bureaucratic establishments were manipulated for this. In the 1950s itself the first military take over was instigated by US imperialism. Thereafter also whenever the elected governments were found insufficient to serve imperialist interests and the contradictions between civilian government and military sharpened, the military took over twice again and US supported it. Same thing has happened this time also. These imperialist manoeuvres have degenerated Pakistan in to full-fledged neo-colony, with its economy in crisis, vast masses pauperised and IMF-World Bank-MNCs in full control.

In 1980s the Soviet involvement in Afghanistan had become a bonanza for Pak rulers as US imperialists started pumping huge amounts to Pakistan to train and arm Islamic fundamentalist forces including Bin Laden and Taliban to oust the Soviet forces and their collaborators. The Pak rulers became synonym for corruption. The Benazir Bhutto government was a good example for this. When people's revolt erupted against it the president ordered its dismissal and called for new election. Nawaz Sharif's PML(N) came to power with two-third majority. While taking over Sharif had promised that Benazir's corruption will be investigated and the fortunes she had deposited in foreign banks will be brought back. Though Benazir's family came under pressure, the corrupt bureaucratic establishment continued, and Sharif himself started amassing fortunes through various agreements signed with the MNCs. As Pak economy went on facing crisis and started people protesting, Sharif tried to

bolster his regime by accepting *Shariat Law* and declaring Pakistan as an Islamic state. Simultaneously his regime encouraged communal divisions, by supporting Sunni extremists to attack minority Shias, Christians and Mujahars. The close relation with Taliban was also maintained.

During these years the economic crisis worsened. Under globalisation and penetration of MNCs whatever industrial infrastructure earlier existed also came under severe strain. Electricity, diesel and drinking water became more costly. Price-rise and unemployment became growing phenomena. Whatever welfare measures existed were also cut down. Naturally people started opposing. All opposition groups started protesting. Dictatorial moves to silence opposition also started misfiring.

Meanwhile with the Pokhran nuclear blasts by Vajpayee government and Pakistani retaliation by its own nuclear blast were utilised by the religious fundamentalists in Pakistan also to whip up jingoism. In a way Vajpayee government's nuclear policy became helpful for Pakistan to achieve strategic parity with India as nuclear powers, while in conventional armaments it was far below India. The Islamic fundamentalist groups engaged in Kashmir as well as Pak army planned the now infamous Kargil incursion utilising this situation. At this juncture Nawaz Sharif's Lahore meeting with Vajpayee only angered these sections. Sharif's agreement before Clinton to withdraw Pak forces and infiltrators from Indian side of the Line of Control (LOC) further angered them.

All these developments led to increasing protest movements by the opposition parties, communal killings, and especially to estrangement of relation between army and Sharif's government. This growing contradiction, especially after Kargil debacle, was public knowledge. There were talks of military take over. It was in order to prevent this Nawaz Sharif dismissed army Chief General Pervez Musharraf when he had gone to Sri Lanka on a visit. But Musharraf who anticipated this, had made his own arrangements. He struck back through his loyal officers and eventually took over dismissing Sharif. This is now called a *velvet coup* as not a bullet was fired and the taking over was smooth. Opposition to military coup is nominal, only handful of PML(N) members led protest demonstrations. Opposition parties have welcomed the coup. Only

question raised is when another civilian government can be expected. But everybody know that US interests will be a determining factor in all these developments.

Like the earlier occasions when army took over in Pakistan, this time also it is clear that the coup is not going to better the life of the masses of people. It will only worsen. The neocolonisation shall intensify further. At the same time influence of Islamic fundamentalists will grow. Such a military-fundamentalist alliance in power means worsening of the Indo-Pak relations especially when BJP led government has come to power in India. It will also provide more openings to US imperialists to exert more influence in this region.

As far as US imperialists are concerned this region has assumed more importance. Firstly it is a growing market. Secondly Pak-Afghan corridor is important to enter the former Soviet republics in Central Asia having vast petroleum deposits. Thirdly US is concerned about possibility for any tie-up among India, China and Russia. Because of these and other reasons US is interested to utilise Pakistan for destabilising this region. US is also manipulating Kashmir question like East Timor issue for this. So Clinton's statement expressing concern about Pak military coup is only a farce. His talk about return of democracy there is a farce. Like earlier times this time also US manoeuvring was one of the main reasons for this coup. And only if US wants a change over to civilian rule is possible there.

The military coap in Pakistan and heinous moves by US Imperialism to increase its hegemony in this region, especially at a time when the BJP-led NDA government is also faithfully serving the imperialist camp, and when Islamic fundamentalists there and Hindu fundamentalists here are dividing the people to help the destabilisation efforts of Yankees, poses a great challenge before the progressive democratic forces in both countries. It is the task of these forces to expose the US manipulations and the role played by the rulers in both the countries.

As far as the democratic forces in our country is concerned it is going to be a testing time. In the name of stability the Vajpayee government is going to impose restrictions on even existing parliamentary rules. The coup in Pakistan will be utilised to cover up more autocratic moves. Side by side communalisation will be promoted. And US Imperialists are going to intensify their hegemonic efforts. In this situation it is the urgent task of these forces to mobilise the broad masses against the imperialist comp

led by US imperialism and against communalisation.

Bofors Case

The CBI action to file FIR including Rajiv Gandhi also among the accused and promise of filing a second part including Hinduja and others after 13 years of investigation is more of a political step by the BJP-led government to embarrass the Congress party. Vajpayee government very well knows that no other political party from the opposition also will support Congress in Bofors case. As expected the Congress leadership has lost balance and is trying do all forms of acrobatics to save the Nehru dynasty without which it cannot survive.

But the issue before the people is how for the Vajpayee government will go ahead with this Bofors scam. Then, what about the numerous scams in which many of the ministers, top bureaucrats and political leaders are involved? Among them quite a few including Sukh Ram, Arun Nehru and others are presently with BJP. There are allegations of large scale corruption against many ministers from BJP-led state cabinets, and against some of the ministers and prime-minister's secretariat during the 13 month long Vajpayee government will this government dare to take action against them?

Charges of large scale corruption and numerous scams started coming up involving first hundreds and later thousands of crores of rupees from the time the liberalisation was initially started in 1980s during Rajiv regime. From that time numerous cases were filed and numerous cases were dropped according to whims of governments in power. Still in not a single case a clear verdict has come out. Not a single accused is punished so far. As the whole ruling system is corrupt, its various arms are helping each other to escape. And the compradors coming to power have no will or desire to act as they themselves and those around them are also scamsters,

In this situation filing of Bofors Case is nothing more than a political stunt. Only people's movements can compel the rulers to act atleast for namesake.

13th Lok Sabha Elections: CPI (ML) Red Flag succeeds in political campaign

The two months long election campaign organised by the five state committees where 13 candidates were put up for Lok Sabha and the political campaign organised in the other states based on the *election manifesto* putting forward Anti-imperialist democratic programme and calling for building up Anti-imperialist democratic alternative have succeeded in greatly achieving the twin objectives of propagating the party's approach before the people and of expanding the party's influence among the left masses. Tens of thousands of copies of the *election manifesto* published in six languages were distributed among the left forces and broad masses. It was a vigorous political propaganda with hundreds of well attended public meetings and thousands of street-corner/junction meetings. All the state committees issued appeals explaining the anti-imperialist anti-feudal struggles launched during the past decades, exposing central/state governmental policies and appealing to all democratic, secular forces to rally for the candidates of revolutionary left and democratic organisations. The *election manifesto* had stated: "CPI (ML) Red Flag appeals to the working class, peasantry and all other toiling masses, and the progressive democratic patriotic and secular forces to rally for building up this anti-imperialist democratic alternative and vote for the candidates put forward by our party and the revolutionary democratic forces who are basically supporting this anti-imperialist democratic programme".

The political campaign launched by CPI(ML) Red Flag was significant in many respects. It called for a polarisation against the comprador ruling class policies enslaving the country to neocolonisation. It propagated the anti-imperialist programme calling for scrapping the 'new economic policies' of globalisation-liberalisation privatisation, quitting WTO, kicking out IMF-WB-MNCs, writing off imperialist debts, and struggling for self-reliant national development policy. It pointed out the communal fascist threats posed by the Sangh Parivar forces represented by BJP in the main in order to cover up the implementation of the imperialist dictated economic policies, and focussed the attack on BJP and Congress. As pointed out in the *manifesto* the campaign exposed the regional parties, the so-called social justice parties, who

have aligned or non-aligned with BJP or Congress, for advocating the very same anti people economic policies. During the campaign the CPI(M) and CPI leaderships were severely condemned for the opportunist policy of trailing behind Congress in the name of fighting against communalism. This CPI (M) argument could not convince their own cadres and supporters. Through this campaign the party could initiate the polarisation of the left masses around the genuine left alternative.

This campaign, especially in the states where the candidates were put up could lead to winning over of many CPI (M) and CPI cadres to the party's side. The Mass base got consolidated and expanded. In Delhi state the campaign organised by the Delhi state organising committee for the Outer Delhi constituency is a good example. Eventhough the party organisation was limited and weak, and the campaign could be extended only to 9 out of the 23 assembly constituencies, with the support of all left forces and left masses, the party candidate could collect 9372 votes. It reflects the effectiveness of the campaign.

In Karnataka where the left movement is very weak and the CPI (M) CPI leaderships have betrayed the left masses by continuously trailing behind the ruling class forces, and this time behind the Janatha Dal (S) while collaborating with Congress (I), the campaign launched by the party and the results were significant still the party could not consolidate the mass base built up through numerous struggles because of organisational limitations. The campaign was started very late due to extreme financial and other technical difficulties. Still our party candidates could get 53700 votes for Raichur and 15600 votes for Koppal constituencies. Though this result was not reflected in the results of assembly constituencies due to technical problems, the performance in the electoral struggle is going to encourage the struggles in various fields in coming days.

In Kerala, where the party had put candidates for seven constituencies, the campaign reached at par with that of the CPI (M) led LDF at many places. The CPI (M) line was thoroughly exposed. Its 'communalism main threat' propaganda was roundly attacked and the relation between intensifying neocolonisation and com-

munalisation was well explained. The whole party organisation and all its supporters could be mobilised in the campaign. Still in a sharply divided political situation in Kerala, the party could collect only the political votes. This is clear from the fact that even in Vadakara and Kozhikode constituencies where the party had maximum organisational strength and the campaign was most effective only 10708 and 10275 votes were polled. It calls for spreading the party to grass root level urgently, and building class/mass organisations more effectively.

In TN party had put candidates in two constituencies. Coimbatore and Chidambaram. At Coimbatore there was an effective campaign mobilising the whole organisation and with the support of CPI, CPI (M) cadres and supporters who extended support to the anti-imperialist democratic programme put forward by the party. At Chidambaram also campaign could be launched in some areas of the constituency. In the TN situation where the descendent of Dravidian trend DMK, AIADMK and other splinter groups like MEMK have degenerated as agents of international capital, and have allied with either EJP or Congress, when CPI (M) CPI leaderships have totally degenerated to social democratic positions trailing behind DMK so far and now behind AIADMK, when the so-called neo-Anbeckerite parties claiming to stand for dalit cause have also taken the heinous position of toering ruling class politics, the necessity for a genuine left alternative to mobilise the left masses is strongly felt in the political spectrum. It is in this context CPI (ML) Red Flag entered the scene, however small way it may be. At Chidambaram there were attacks on dalit sections on poll day making it difficult for these oppressed sections to cast their votes. At Coimbatore 3300 votes were polled for com. Cherkottayan.

At Bhadrak constituency in Orissa also a good campaign was organised though it was disturbed severely due to rain and floods in many areas. In spite of it com. Damodaran Das could get 1124 votes.

In the states where candidates could not be put up were also a campaign was organised to propagate the politics of anti-imperialist democratic alternative. Election Manifesto and hand bills explaining CPI (ML) Red Flag's political line were distributed in large number.

The most significant thing during this campaign was the mobilisation of all party members and supporters for it. The campaign succeeded in taking the party's basic line and approach towards the people. In this way it was a great success.

com: Appu martyrdom day observed

On 10th October com: Appu's martyrdom day was observed by Coimbatore district committee of CPI (ML) Red Flag. In the morning at Kottaimedu, the birthplace of com: Appu, local comrades, friends and relatives of com: Appu assembled in front of a red-garlanded photo of Appu in his memory. In the evening the well attended public meeting was addressed by com: N. P. Kumar, party's district committee secretary. Com: T. K. Mony presided. Com: Loorthu, brother of com: Appu and party member also spoke. Com: Damodaran of CPI (ML) Liberation also addressed the meeting.

Vajpayee government's first year's agenda

The president's address to joint sitting of Lok Sabha and Rajya Sabha conceals more than what it reveals. Remove the glossy picture about increased growth rates, one crore employment and 20 lakhs houses per year, inflation reaching lowest levels etc which are more of a propaganda, the agenda talks volumes for Vajpayee government's readiness to surrender the people's interests to imperialist camp. While talking about universal nuclear disarmament in a hollow manner, this government is conspiring to sign C.T.B. T. No proposals to mend relations with south Asian countries are mentioned.

In the home front the address lauds the anti-people *new economic policy* and promises to carry forward second generation of reforms. It talks about getting better WTO deal in coming round of talks when the WTO itself is a tool for imposing market system and to loot the neo colonies. It talks about expanding primary education and health care, when even the existing facilities accessible to the poor are taken away. It presents cocked up statistics to prove inflation is going down, when actually it is increasing. This economic policy will only ruin the people more.

At the same, in the name of comprehensive electoral reforms and studying the functioning of the Constitution so far the address hints, about BJP's hidden agenda for further autocratisation of the existing ruling system.

The address hailed by ruling class media, and foreign and native ruling sections will only accelerate the economic crisis in the country and pauperise the vast masses further.

M. M. Somasekharan

Put Ideological Political Line in Command

[A response to CPI (ML) People's War critique]

Introduction

The September '98 issue of Red Star (RS) had published a response to the criticism against CPI (ML) Red Flag (hereafter RF) published in their *Vanguard*, the bimonthly publication of CPI (ML) People's War (PW). This response was delayed as we could get this Vanguard issue quite late. Unfortunately PW does not follow the practice of sending their publications in exchange to other organisations even when criticisms are published against them, and even when other organisations are regularly sending their publications to all available addresses of PW comrades. In this reply we had dealt in detail with the principal theoretical questions confronting the Communist movement today and the refusal of PW to take cognizance of them. There we had clearly pointed out that PW is pursuing a petty-bourgeois anarchist and sectarian line quite out of tune with the concrete conditions of today. In response to this rejoinder, the January-February issues of *People's March* (PM) - which is the name of the publication of PW now - has published a reply raising a series of questions deviating the debate from the cardinal theoretical questions we had raised.

Though we were sending two copies each of all issues of RS to the Vanguard address, neither we were informed of the change in address, nor the copies of PM were sent to us. So once again we could get this issue of PM very late. That is why this rejoinder to PM's criticism got delayed. We are of the view that as polemics on ideological-political-organisational lines are taking place among the different ML trends and organisations, it will be a healthy practice to regularly exchange the publications. We hope PW will amend its present practice and start sending its publications to other organisations on a regular basis. What we want to point out is that the rejoinder got delayed not because the PM critique raised any serious theoretical questions difficult to respond to, but because this issue of PM came to our notice quite late.

1 General background of the struggle against sectarianism

Today the relevance of the struggle against sectarianism is much more within the Marxist-Leninist movement. It does not in any way mean that the relevance of the struggle against revisionism which the Marxist-Leninist movement considers as the main danger within the Communist movement has in anyway decreased. On the contrary, it is so because the struggle against sectarianism is indispensable for waging effective struggle against revisionism. The experience of the last three decades prove this.

It was in the very same period when Marxist-Leninist movements everywhere were claiming that they were continuing the struggle against revisionism without any break that the CPC and the PLA went under the influence of revisionism, and this strengthened revisionist influence within the Marxist-Leninist movements globally. The collapse of Soviet Union and East European countries which had degenerated to revisionist path earlier, and the propaganda unleashed by imperialist camp against socialism strengthened the revisionist influence further. Alongwith these, weaknesses in the Communist Parties, their incapability to understand and evaluate the socialist trends and forces coming up against the global imperialist system due to their sectarian outlook are leading many of them to defeatist positions.

Besides, a close examination makes it clear that what is hidden within the external leftist forms in many groups and organisations which are claiming themselves as revolutionary, and claiming to be waging armed struggle, is nothing but powerful rightist deviations. Today only those sections which are historically very backward will say that the meaning of the struggle against revisionism is repetition of certain pledges, or worship of any particular form of struggle including armed struggle. In the final analysis, even when the differentiation among

the right, the left, and the revolutionary sections are related to different aspects like strategy, tactics and forms of struggle, the real differentiation lies in the concrete analysis of the historical contexts—in the concrete analysis of the concrete situation of revolution. The most effective weapon for this in the hands of the Marxists is the concrete analysis of the concrete situation which Lenin had repeatedly emphasised, and repeatedly utilised in the struggle against both 'left' and right sections including Narodniks and Mensheviks. It is this realisation which has led us to the firm stand that the bourgeois trends and forces including revisionism getting strengthened inside and outside the movement cannot be defeated utilising the rusted romanticism of 'left' adventurism and sectarianism, which are petty-bourgeois in class content. Not observing, or refusing to recognise the spreading of the darkness of revisionism within and without the limited circles of petty-bourgeois romantic dreams spreading under sectarian influence will be a self-betrayal. It is becoming impossible day by day for the petty-bourgeois groups in India like in some other parts of the world which are cajoling themselves and living in small small islets of theirs under the Lin Piaoist influence of the late 1960s and early 1970s, to join the ranks of the revolutionary forces without embracing the broad realities of class struggle. It is within this general background we are seeing the ideological struggle against C P I (ML) People's War.

2. The upside down method exposes idealism

It is in this context the reply of PW in *People's March* to the rejoinder of CPI (ML) Red Flag becomes noteworthy. Stating that this article in *Red Star* criticising the political positions of PW shows the rightist deviation of RF, and that RF is trying to wriggle out from giving clearcut answers, the PM article puts forward five points. It starts with asking the first question whether RF accepts the strategy of area-wise seizure of political power through a protracted people's war. It is followed by whether RF accepts agrarian revolution as the axis of the new democratic revolution, and by the demand that RF should clearly state what the predominant mode of production within India today is. The remaining two queries are concerning of nature of organisation. The very method of presentation of the subject itself shows a model of an order of petty-bourgeois sectarian beliefs. While a

Marxist starts from the concrete analysis of the relations of production and proceeds to the analysis and understanding of the stage of revolution, from there to subjects like its content and specificities, and then towards its strategy and tactics, an idealist influenced by sectarian thinking invariably starts from the subjective understanding and beliefs somehow achieved about the tactics and strategy of revolution, and then in accordance with them formulate the stage of revolution and from there the relations of production. There was a period when the whole Marxist-Leninist movement was under the vicious grip of extreme sectarianism during which all of us who were claiming the heritage of CPI (ML) were considering the acceptance or rejection of annihilation line as the determining factor of the political line which should form the basis of unity of Marxist-Leninist forces. The method which preaches that tactics determine the strategy, and accordingly the concrete situation, is undiluted idealist thinking. It makes some symbols, signs and formulae considered as simple universal truths for revolution as primary or fundamental for the epistemology of revolution. Marxism has always fought against such upside down idealistic positions.

3. The dogma called Chinese path

Not only in the method of arranging the issues in the introduction, this critique is examining RF and, in general, Indian revolution based on the subject of strategy and tactics, right from the first sub title 'on strategy and tactics'. PW is doing this not without having its stand about the concrete conditions in India. The critique states in bold letters: "PW clearly states that in essence the Indian revolution will follow the Chinese path, and the differences that exist have been clearly outlined in the PW document 'Strategy and Tactics'." This statement and the position taken by PW accordingly are definitely linked to the positions they had raised in the beginning about their and our approaches towards the production relations in India, and about neocolonisation. We are seeing it as a matter of getting liberated from the decadence of the dogmatic and sectarian petty-bourgeois heritage not only of PW, but also of all other sections including ours had in the past. This is a question of transcending the limitations and weaknesses of the 1970 Party Programme and the line that developed based on it. This line which had many aspects and which is related to

various factors of a period deserves a close examination. PW is asking with a shock, with quite a surprise whether RF is questioning the Chinese path of people's war. What is the unquestionable divine quality this path has about which one cannot raise even a doubt, one is compelled to ask. It is by enshrining some of the eternal 'truths' like this, which are unquestionable, abstract, and claimed to be universal, above all living trends of Marxism and in place of concrete analysis of the concrete situation, that the petty-bourgeois revolutionary groups in India enjoy self-satisfaction,

By quoting our sentence that "present Indian situation is basically different from that of pre-1949 China" PW states that this statement explains that RF is not seriously thinking about armed struggle. According to this rationalism of PW, class struggle means armed struggle, armed struggle means Chinese path, and so the pre-revolutionary situation of China and present situation of India are *basically* similar.

Dogmas cannot replace objective conditions. PW does not utilise any Marxist analytical methods, or go against them, when it concludes that the changes in the world and in India in the post-Chinese revolution period, and the difference India had from the pre-revolutionary China and is having today are not basic, but merely differences in details.

4. Pre-revolutionary China and present India

The basic differences between pre-revolutionary China and present India are so specifically clear that all who are not affected by the attract of sectarianism can easily see them. We have repeatedly explained the transformation that imperialism has undergone in the post-Second World War period through our documents and numerous articles published in Red Star and Red Flag. These positions about neocolonialism is also party to this present debate. It can be seen that the spread of the monopolisation of global economic, political power through the unprecedented dominance achieved in the internationalisation of capital and in the growth of MNCs, the formation and domination of global political, economic institutions like UN, IMF, World Bank, the capability to wage remote controlled warfare from spying to widespread destruction from a distant centre etc has taken

imperialism to a more degenerated neocolonial phase. The major changes that significantly influenced the productive sector are the electronic leaps in the fields of information and communication, and the big developments in the field of bio-technology.

Among these the former, in addition to its influences in the field of production, represents major changes in the field of domination and control by imperialist political power, and the global social, political institutions. It invariably influences the forms and contents of the revolutions in this phase. As far as the second factor, the bio-technology is concerned, it has given shape to global agri-business giants which are capable of bringing about great transformations in the agrarian sector also which not only in the neocolonies, but also in the developed imperialist countries was lagging behind so far in all respects including in the field of relations of production. Though there are still many limitations and obstacles, the process of integrating the agrarian sector as a whole with imperialist agri-business is getting speeded up. In addition to the condensed positions put forward in RF's party documents about these changes, RS and RF have published numerous articles about them. Besides, based on this evaluation our class/mass organisations have launched numerous struggles reflecting these changes, and taking up issues raised by these changes. These cannot be dealt in detail in such an article like this.

Not only after the Second World War, even in the first half of this century itself there were basic differences between India and China. While India was a colony of Britain, China was never fully colonised by any capitalist imperialist power. In this case, China was an exception. That is why China was called semi-colonial. Lenin had explained this. The general recognised principle in Lenin's studies on imperialism is that imperialism has divided the world in full. Only China, turkey like countries remained exception to this, as semi-colonies. Lenin saw semi-colony only as a changing form, a period of transformation. To use such a concept to explain the post-1947 India like countries is dangerous. Even while calling China semi-colony, it should be remembered that, Lenin never included the Latin American countries, which can be called earlier models of the present Asian, African, Latin American countries which have gone through so-called 'decolonisation', in the table of semi-colonies.

Till Chiang Kalshek led Koumintang to the side of counter revolution, the CPC was functioning in China as a part and continuation of the revolutionary democracy initiated by Sun-Yatsen. It was in the middle of the struggles to complete democratic revolution by scoring victories over the war lords who were fighting each other that Koumintang and the CPC splitted and took the path of counter revolution and revolution. It was when in India Britain had consolidated a centralised state power through centuries of domination, that in the vast areas of China where political centralisation was not consolidated the CPC advanced establishing centres of red political power. Mao has explained these specific features of China in many of his important articles like "why red political power can exist in China".

More than all of these, the most significant factor is the differences that existed between the two countries in the fields of production and its organisation. In China, the penetration of imperialist forces had started spreading market relations to agrarian sector also. It had led to beginning of transformations in agrarian sector. Mao has scientifically analysed these changes. Mao used the term 'semi-feudal' to denote this transformatory character. Moreover, in China this semi feudal semi-colonial system or systems were not fully consolidated through political institutionalisation beyond the slow penetration of imperialist capital relations. In China, at least temporarily the situation prevailed to a certain extent for these systems to exist independently. In a not systematised condition when Koumintang on the one hand and the war lords on the other were fighting each other, as we have seen, the CPC grew fighting against them as another power centre.

But the feudal forces in India had fully surrendered to colonial power and had become its dependants. Not through the loose strings of market relations as in China, but the landlordism in India was transformed as part of colonial capital accumulation directly through various means including regular tax system. British imperialism did this by conquering and breaking the backbone of traditional land relations, by reorganising it suitably for colonial rule and capital accumulation, and by creating a new system of ownership. The history of numerous agrarian revolts during this period reveal the then complex agrarian relations. That is why all the agrarian revolts in India automatically became part of the anti-colonial Independence struggle.

So overthrowing the agrarian relations in India was not possible only as a part of the anti-colonial struggles. In India the colonial rule and agrarian structure were not two separate distinct forces, they were both part of the very same political economic structure. A small difference could be seen only in the princely states existing within British India. Those were also nominal. To understand all these, we request the PW comrades to seriously study the Colonial Theses and connected documents of the Communist International, studies and discussions linked to them, and the documents and history of the Communist movement in India of that phase.

Though Congress had not taken a firm stand against landlordism it had recognised the indivisible relation between the agrarian relations and colonialism, and the necessity to put forward demand of land reforms to make the independence struggle popular. The orientation and goals were different, it was the Champaran agrarian struggle which paved the way for the entrance of Gandhian leadership in Indian independence struggle. Afterwards also Congress had tried in its own way, in conformity with the bourgeois class interests, to consider problems of land relations and questions like caste system in the anti-British struggle, and to link them with the Independence struggle. The Communist movement of today can determine its path only by taking lessons from these complex issues in our history.

5 Chinese revolution and class/mass organisations

During those days the strength of the working class in China was proportionately much less than that of India. But the number of people who know that at that time there was a trade union movement under the leadership of CPC and that it had led many significant working class struggles and uprisings in the cities including Shanghai and in Koumintang China, are few nowadays. The history of Chinese liberation teaches that in the victory of Chinese revolution this trade union movement also played an important role.

Besides, Mao gave a new orientation to CPC with a very big organised agrarian upsurge in Hunan. In the concrete conditions of China though this upsurge paved the way for formation of PLA, the CPC and PLA advanced by consolidating the support of the organised strength of

(Contd. P. 12)

JAPANESE IMPERIALISM IN CRISIS

In the 1980s Japanese growth was maintained by Reagan's military Keynesianism—tax cuts for the rich, increased arms spending and huge government budget deficits which made US 'the importer of last resort'. Japanese goods flooded US. By Plaza Accord of 1985 Japanese imports were made more expensive. Though Japanese government tried to reorient export industries to serve domestic market by pushing interest rates down it worked only temporarily. Japanese export industries took advantage of this easy money policy. Between 1986 and 1991 net investments in Japan jumped to \$ 3.5 trillion.

Japanese stock exchange rates and property prices also grew fast. In 1990, as Japanese interest rates were raised to 6%, the 'bubble economy' began deflate. The Nikkei index of share prices got reduced fast and now it is one-third of what was in 1990. The banks were left with loans that cannot be repaid. Bad loans reached staggering figure of \$ 1 trillion.

The Japanese industry responded by cutting domestic investment. At the same time it hiked investment in *Tiger* countries from 2.9 to 8.1 billion dollar. But when the Tigers collapsed in second half of 1997, Japanese economy was hit by falling profits from these investments more bad loans for Japanese banks, and drastic decline in export market.

From early 1990s in spite of the talks of neo-liberalism, Japanese government tried to revive the economy by the Keynesian policy of fiscal reflation, cutting taxes and boosting government spending. As the crisis and recession intensify now a new package is implemented. A further 24 trillion yen (\$ 198 billion) boost to the economy from increased public spending, tax cut and government loans. To save the crisis-ridden banking system, Japanese government has nationalised the *Long Term Credit Bank* and announced a rescue fund up to 60 trillion yen to save 18 more major banks from collapse.

The banks are reluctant to sort out their bad debt problem. To demand return of loans would cause collapse of many companies and reveal just how little of those loans the banks will be able to recoup. What happened when Hokkaido Takushoku bank collapsed last year

is frightening the banking sector. Today the Japanese bad debt problem and crisis in banking sector is four times more severe than what US went through in early 1990s. The imperialist mouthpiece, *The Economist* put it this way: "If tough measures are taken, in the short run the economy will suffer, as banks shrink their loans sharply, and bankruptcies and unemployment will soar. A credible, tough reform plan should in one way boost confidence, but meanwhile a worsening recession will hurt confidence in other ways. No one can know in advance whether the good effect will outweigh the bad". (26 Sept. 98)

The productive sector is suffering from acute overcapacity in key areas of production. Rate of profit of non-financial corporations started falling. For the first time in 50 years Hitachi reported its first losses. Unless there is miraculous recovery of the world economy boosting Japan's export markets this overcapacity problem will become more serious. A number of western economists, who were ardent advocates of neo-liberalism are now advising Japan wholesale nationalisation of biggest banks, and pumping money in to the economy, an inflationary policy. These advices are coming from those who had warned of the evils of inflation and who have been the most committed advocates of privatisation and free market. They may still talk of it, but for them all pragmatic tactics are OK so far it helps the survival of imperialism.

But after all these years of neo-liberalism and free market, an inflationary policy is fraught with danger. It may frighten the investors away. A devaluation of yen will create financial instability not only in Japan but also in the whole region, East and Southeast Asia. It may even worsen the rapidly slowing European and US economies also. The fact is that the imperialist think-tanks have no answers to this crisis. So short-term survival tactics are employed together with plundering the economies of the neo-colonies. That the crisis in these countries will have its effects in the world economy, and will ruin the already fragile economies of these poor countries are taken for granted. It is the theory of the survival of the fittest, and the super players, G-7, surviving at the cost of all others.

The comprador economists in our country are consciously concealing what is happening in these super economies of imperialist system and chanting the only *mantra* known to them: globalise and liberalise more and more. Yes, it is what is wanted by their imperialist masters to save their economies. The compradors are outright traitors also.

(From P. 10)

tens of millions of peasantry through implementing agrarian reforms based on an agrarian programme with the objective of establishing democratic agrarian relations. Breaking down traditional agrarian relations and implementing a practical programme for unleashing the independent initiative of the peasantry was part of the Chinese revolutionary path. For CPC the agrarian reforms were not a romantic agenda to be achieved after achieving political power. Its agrarian programme was integrally linked to the revolutionary path, to the programme for capture of political power, and to its daily tasks.

All these are pointed out in order to show that the CPC was firmly standing within the perspective of the Communist International, and implementing its guidelines for building up the class/mass organisations and for developing class struggle according to the concrete conditions of China.

6. LinPiaoist path in the name of Chinese path

The ML groups in India who are repeating that 'China's path is India's path' are really cheating themselves. It is not because China's path cannot be successfully implemented in India as the objective conditions of India are different from those of pre-revolutionary China. Even when it was claimed that China's path is India's path, the fact is that the line which came up within the ML movement in India in the years following the 9th Congress of the CPC was basically different from the Chinese path itself. Even while talking about protracted people's war, the path shown by 9th Congress of the CPC was so blind that it was impossible to see beyond 1975. In the 9th Congress in 1969 LinPiao rejected the Leninist analysis about present era, and put forward a subjective stand about the total collapse of imperialism and wor-

ldwide victory of socialism covered with left phrase-mongering.

This treacherous evaluation of the historic victory of revolution coming out in the name of CPC led the ML movements all over the world to sectarian left adventurist policies. As far as India is concerned the whole activities were reduced to the line of annihilation. It was evaluated that activities for building class/mass organisations and different forms of struggles including parliamentary struggles as time-consuming and high ways leading to revisionism. It was evaluated that the perspective of the Communist International followed by the CPC during Chinese revolution were outdated. Not only the positions of the Comintern, the general line and other stands put forward by the CPC before 1968 during the *Great Debate* against Krushchevism were also in effect neglected.

What could not have happened in a great party like CPC happened when matters inside the CPC reached such a stage that Lin Piao was declared the successor of Mao. Lin Piao who could take the leadership of the CPC in his hand and absolutely control it at least for some time put Mao on the pedestal like a God, and tried indirectly to establish Mao Thought as the Marxism-Leninism of the new era. Instead of propagating Mao's total contributions in a comprehensive manner in the Marxist style linking with the concrete historical situation, Lin Piao published the *Quotations* as universal truths, as sacred gospels. Lin Piao published the *Red Book* and a small book called "Long Live the Victory of People's War". These were widely propagated in India in early 1970s. It was the metaphysical and one-sided ideas in this 'book of Lin Piao which helped the growth of some too simplistic understanding about the Chinese path in the ML circles during those days.

It was soon proved in China that Lin Piao was a rightist fortune hunter, a left phrase-monger and traitor. We know from the documents of the 10th Congress of CPC held in 1973 that in the years in-between there were efforts to rectify the LinPiaoist evaluation about present era, and about the misunderstandings about Mao Thought. We also know that a big rectification campaign took place in the CPC when Lin Piao 'Thoughts' were roundly criticised as those talking behind *Confucian idealism*. But the outside world did not receive a self-critical and comprehensive document about the process

of rectification in such a great party like CPC and its perspective. Maybe the struggle that was waged immediately against Deng and the death of important comrades of the Politbureau were reasons for this. With the death of Chu Te, Chou-Enlai, Kang Shen and then Mao within the span of a short period created the situation favourable to the sabotage by the Dengists.

It is a fact that the ML forces in India and elsewhere did not seriously consider even the rectification in 1973 Congress after the Lin Piaoist phase. Moreover, a handful of modern Lin Piaoists are now going to such an extent to which even Lin Piao would not have dared to go, with projects like *Maoism*. These vulgar repetitions of history is not becoming anyway significant as it is simply hollow. Thus, what is followed here in the name of China's path is nothing other than the Lin Piaoist path.

7. Global background for the deviations

Today it is very clear that in the decades following Second World War the imperialist globalisation has strengthened in all fields, economic, political, technological etc. It was in this period when the Communist International was dissolved citing numerous reasons like national complexities, and the Cominform which was formed soon could not last long. With this the discussions held and guidelines provided during Comintern about imperialism and revolution came to a halt. No collective effort was made in these decades for the effective evaluation of imperialism which was undergoing many changes in its forms and content, and which was preparing itself in new ways to combat the challenges raised by proletarian revolution. What the Krushchevite CPSU leadership did was to evaluate that imperialism had become extremely weakened. The superficial features of 'decolonisation' was utilised for this evaluation. From there it proceeded to formulate theories of peaceful transition for capturing political power. In the absence of democratic functioning promoting discussions among the Communist parties with the dissolution of Comintern, the CPSU leadership started utilising the international conferences it had started convening as tools of its foreign policy.

These were the decades when proletarian internationalism got considerably weakened among the Communist parties. In this phase,

not only within the CPSU, even in all other Communist parties including the CPC the bourgeois outlooks got strengthened more or less. The deviations and weaknesses manifested during these years regarding the evaluation of the changes taking place to the imperialist system then, in the evaluation of the class character of the ruling classes in the 'newly independent countries', and in recognising the growing relevance of proletarian internationalism infected even the CPC. A good example for this is the positional changes of the Chinese government towards Nehru government during these years. It was later, during the split in the International Communist movement, the great heritage of the Communist International including political positions about neocolonialism was upheld by the CPC under the leadership of Mao. Still, the CPC did not examine the cardinal question regarding the international responsibility of re-establishing the Communist International. Moreover, later it even gradually abandoned the positions it had taken during the *Great Debate* and moved toward the stand of rejecting the existence of socialist bloc.

The second half of the 1960s witnessed the end of the economic boom that marked the imperialist advances in the post War years. Once again the imperialist crisis started intensifying. Including the *Spring revolt* in France, great disorders started surfacing in all imperialist countries. In this turbulent period, the frustration created by the degeneration of the vast majority of Communist parties to Krushchovian path and they becoming the propagandists of the Krushchovian school of peaceful transition, ignited the petty-bourgeois dreams about the historic victories of revolution, and promoted the affinity towards Cuban revolution. It should be remembered that during the Cuban revolution there was very strong resentment against the pro-Krushchevite Communist party there. Che Guevara's contemporary Bolivian experience and martyrdom encouraged this approach. All patient and time consuming activities for mobilising the masses for revolution were misinterpreted as Krushchovian line. All the important tasks from building up class/mass organisations, establishing organised proletarian class leadership to revolution utilising all forms of struggles including parliamentary struggle for developing class struggle were depicted as revisionism. This is the background in which knowingly and unknowingly the *Focco* theory influenced the ML movement then.

On the other hand, the CPC by defaulting to fulfill their international responsibilities did not act to resist this deviation. Moreover, the erroneous trends that had got strengthened within CPC during those years only encouraged this deviation. It was at this time the Lin Biaoist definition of the new era about collapse of imperialism surfaced, which also encouraged these erroneous tendencies. The theories and understandings which got strengthened through focussing on the numerous reports coming out in bourgeois media about the initiative of the youth in the *Cultural Revolution* in China, and through their petty-bourgeois theorisation were also not corrected by the CPC leadership. As a result, many erroneous understandings spread all over the world during these years like making the quotation "political power grows out of the barrel of a gun" in to a gospel, and by putting forward the symbol of hammer, sickle and gun which was the popular symbol in China representing the unity of workers, peasants and army during the Cultural Revolution as the new revolutionary Communist symbol. Because of these developments, the great Marxist theoretical heritage which scored great victories through numerous historic struggles starting from the struggle against the petty-bourgeois anarchist from Marx's time, and which marked great advances through the struggles waged by Lenin and Communist International got greatly diluted. And this situation gave birth to the sectarian deviation to the ML movement as a whole in late 1960s and early 1970s, and to the survival of numerous petty bourgeois absurd splinter groups all over the world as can be seen today. Our appeal to all these groups including PW who are moving farther and farther away from Marxism is that they should examine these historical facts.

The weakening of proletarian internationalism and CPC's refusal to rebuild and move along the path of an international Communist movement on the one hand, led to some type of romantic internationalism based on dangerous and idealistic concepts like China's Chairman our Chairman, China's path our path etc on the other hand. We can advance the Communist movement only by recognising the severe damage these two extremes caused to world revolution and Indian revolution.

8. Approach towards history and the line

For a group like PW which is enslaved to

petty-bourgeois sectarianism It is difficult to understand how RF which is taking the basic positions as explained above can uphold Naxalbari and CPI (ML), how it can see Charu Majumdar as a great revolutionary, and how it can support the revolutionary struggles in Philippines and Peru. To understand this, the basic Marxist understanding that history and line are not one and the same upholding the line and upholding the history are not one and the same is needed. Definitely line and history are related. Moreover, often line has crucial role in determining the course of history. But it does not mean both are one and the same. This polemics between RF and PW itself prove that the struggle led by the CPC against Krushchovian revisionism, which later openly surrendered to US imperialism as a part of it the struggle against CPI and CPI (M) who had degenerated to serving ruling class interests and the formation of CPI (ML) following Naxalbari struggle in the concrete conditions of India, the outbreak of anti-imperialist anti-feudal struggles following it, and the leadership given by Com: Charu Majumdar to them are historically justified great pillars. It was CPI (ML), which not only politically upheld the China's path, but also put forward the imperialist subservience of Indian ruling classes, and the relevance of agrarian democratic revolution. It is by moving along this path the concrete conditions of the New Democratic Revolution (NDR) in India are analysed. This does not mean that one should embrace the international and national deviations which led to the disintegration of the ML movement all over the world, and which caused terrific reverses to the international Communist movement.

In the world situation of 1967 Naxalbari struggle, and in the condition of the ideological struggle in the Communist movement in India, whatever may be the limitations, the formation of CPI (ML) and the struggles it led marked a basic positive shift to the movement. But when the Chinese Communist Party could develop a Chinese path according to the concrete conditions there and could lead the democratic revolution towards victory in 28 years after its formation, in India 30 years after formation of CPI (ML), after the experience of so much of splits, disintegrations and setbacks, if PW like forces have only the mechanical repetitions about China's path to contribute, it cannot become anything more than a comic theatre in history. We have in front of us, in

addition to our own setbacks, not only the setbacks in Soviet Union and East European countries, the collapse of Communist leaderships in China, Albania, Vietnam, Kampuchea and other countries also. Even then, if an organisation is not prepared to discuss about imperialism, the new survival characteristics it is gaining, and the real character of the balance of power between capitalist and socialist forces, and subject them for a re-evaluation, or feeling compelled to do so, it can only be stated that it is moving farther away from Marxist positions. The forces who firmly uphold the continuity of the great Communist movement historically, have to gain new strength today to fulfil their historic tasks by pursuing the path of severe self-criticism and alongwith it consistent rectification.

A sectarian group cannot understand why we support not only the struggles in Philippines and Peru, but also the positive aspects of struggles led by PW like forces if there are any, and the struggles of the working class and oppressed masses taking place in Europe or elsewhere or in India under the leaderships of even reformists and revisionists. One has to be materialist to understand that class struggle is not the creation of a line taking shape in the brain of a small petty-bourgeois clique, and that the line emerges from the class struggle taking place in the society and from the history of class struggles. PW can confront and find answers to the problems faced by the Communist movement today only if it comes out from its idealist concepts about line to the broad and complex realities of the class struggle taking place inside and outside the country.

9. Collective activities and the line

It is based on the differences in approach explained above, the differences between RF and PW in the approach towards united front also should be viewed. Our united front approach is related to the broad interests of class struggle. That is why we are inviting not only CPI (ML) Liberation but also organisations like PW to unite on all necessary and possible occasions and situations. It is the sectarian positions of PW which is often becoming obstacle to it. In the united front approach also all petty-bourgeois sectarian organisations including PW act according to the particular interests of their subjective lines. This is creating in them, like in all other matters, a de-constructed situ-

ation. Split towards dual forms. On the one hand, these organisations find self-satisfaction in the absolute purity of their own line. On the other hand, to satisfy mere pragmatic interests they form secret and open fronts with George Fernandes, Thikkayat, Agnivesh, Medha Patkar, why even with BSP, Chenna Reddy, Laloo Prasad like forces. We do not say that we should keep life-long untouchability with all such forces. What we point out is that like two sides of the same coin, these organisations maintain abstract idealist positions and pragmatism simultaneously.

PW's self justification and criticism against us about the question of RF making relations with 'Liberation' for united activities raise an interesting matter. From the time Liberation decided in its Second Congress in 1976 to uphold the line of Hua and Deng, we have continued our principled criticism against Liberation's line to this day. But PW should not forget one important factor in its relation with us. While PW and RF were holding important bilateral discussions to form a common platform during 1991-1992 just before the split in PW, the main obstacle for it was PW's insistence that 'Theory of Three Worlds' should be written down as the basis of the unity. PW should not forget while they were insisting for writing down Dengist TWT, RF was always waging a principled struggle against this class-collaborationist theory. Even then, while we were continuing our principled criticism against Liberation which had surrendered to Dengist line, and against PW which was upholding Dengist TWT, and we were maintaining our differences, we were always seeking possibilities for joint activities with both.

10. Relevance of class/mass organisations and the mass line

PW tries to defend against our criticism by stating that it is following mass line, and is mobilising lakhs of people. It is a fact that most of the organisations have now abandoned the line of isolated actions widespread in the beginning of 1970s. Pragmatic steps to gain mass support without abandoning the basic deviations in the old line have necessarily taken them to this position. But, in order to recognise that for the Marxists, masses does not mean mobs one should abandon bourgeois, petty-bourgeois positions. For the Communists masses means united front of the classes. How can the organ-

sations which are not having the Marxist outlook to build class/mass organisations apply mass line in their practice? A communist party, which is the organisation of the vanguard fighters of the working class, surrounded by broad masses organised under the banner of different class/mass organisations; Lenin and Communist International teach that only a party surrounded by broad masses in this way, and working based on democratic centralism can become a Communist party.

A Marxist will assert that sectarian petty-bourgeois groups like PW are not only having the mass line, they are totally ignorant of democratic centralism. In this critique, in one place PW is also mentioning democratic centralism. But its democratic centralism acts by a state committee dismissing a central committee! From our own experience we know that PW's democratic centralism in united front activities means imposing its own dictates on other constituents. We do not say that PW is unaware of the four principles of democratic centralism. What we point out is that PW cannot understand the political content of democratic centralism. We do not think that four petty-bourgeois sectarian groups can merge together and function under democratic centralism. What is maximum possible is a liberal petty-bourgeois pragmatic alliance. And if PW can transform into an organisation implementing democratic centralism, we shall consider it as a positive step. Because to that extent struggle against sectarianism would have taken place inside it. Then it will be compelled to move towards the path of proletarian organisation. But all these will remain just wishful thoughts until PW start fighting against its basic line itself, against its petty-bourgeois anarchist line itself.

11. On principal contradiction

PW is putting forward an extremely strange position with regard to principal contradiction. It shows that it has replaced Marxism with what a distorted theoretical outlook. The present outlook among Marxists regarding principal contradiction is put forward in Mao's work "On Contradiction." If someone asks whether there is any relation between the concept of principal contradiction in "On Contradiction" and what PW is saying about it, we can only say that when PW is dealing with Marxist teachings in its own subjective ways to serve its pragmatic interests, it is Marxism which is getting mortally

mauled, or eliminated. As copies of "On Contradiction" is sufficiently available in India, we do not want to quote from it to show how PW has distorted its positions.

Mao's teachings on principal contradiction is a cognitive tool to analyse the society. Beyond that, if it is taken as an abstract law of dialectics it will lead to dangerous idealist deviations. It is from this standpoint we have avoided it from the international document and Party Programme. Of course we are of the view that this stand should be subjected to discussion. But about what PW says, it does not even deserve a discussion.

In all the documents of the ICM, or in the Party Programme of the CPC we could collect, there is no such usage like principal contradiction as later became widespread in the ML documents. PW says it is there in CPC documents. If they quote from these documents, or make them available we can gladly discuss this question. Like PW and most other groups we also thought it is there. But later we found no such usage in all the documents we could collect. So PW should, or in that matter any other group, which insist on the usage of principal contradiction, should make the concerned documents, if there are any, available. And it is not merely a question of whether such references are there in CPC documents or not. We feel that according to the materialist outlook of Marxism, and based on the political experience of the ML movement all these years, our stand on principal contradiction is correct.

But starting from the question of principal contradiction, what PW writes about world revolution brings out its vulgar mechanical outlooks about it. The PM critique states ".....to compare the entity of World Socialist Revolution with that of Indian revolution is to confuse the issue. The World Socialist Revolution is an ensemble of separate revolutions in different countries, for which there may, or may not be a 'principal contradiction', while the Indian revolution (or the revolution in any one country) is not an ensemble of separate anti-imperialist revolutions and anti-feudal revolutions, but a composite whole, wherein at different times one particular contradiction will be principal," (p-22)

Such a concept can give rise to all sorts of petty-bourgeois vulgarisations. From Marx to Mao and all the three internationals had seen

the revolutions in all countries as part of World Socialist Revolution. They have never seen World Socialist Revolution as an ensemble of revolutions in A, B, C, D countries. In the Asian, African, Latin American countries, in place of bourgeois democratic revolutions, the New Democratic Revolutions became theoretically possible because these new revolutions became part of the October Socialist Revolution, that is the World Socialist Revolution. From the time Marx and Engels prepared the Communist Manifesto for International Communist League, this is the revolutionary outlook of Marxists all over the world. Even when Lenin developed the earlier Marxist concepts by stating that revolution is possible even in one country, he was not putting Marx and Engels upside down like the PW intellectual Tushar. On the contrary, Lenin was developing their concepts about world revolution according to the more complex new situation. In the struggle against the Trotskyian phrase mongering about world revolution Lenin and Stalin have explained this Marxist understanding repeatedly. By interpreting World Socialist Revolution as an ensemble of different revolutions in different countries PW is in effect emptying the socialist content from the revolutions in Asian, African, Latin American countries including India.

In fact, this is not an accidental philosophical mistake. As pointed out earlier, the outlook which reject the existence of socialist bloc is also doing the very same thing. By doing so they are abandoning Lenin's *Colonial Theses* and Mao's teachings about New Democratic Revolution. These forces seeking brotherhood with all those armed or unarmed struggles taking place based on bourgeois nationalist, racist ethnic, casteist like concepts all over the world knowingly or unknowingly without any attempt to differentiate them is also not accidental. In front of them, revolution is a mere weapon devoid of all socialist content.

12. Internationalisation of capital and internal consequences

What we aimed at through the International document adopted by the 1997 Conference of RF, through all our documents and articles dealing with neo colonialism, and through our critique of PW positions was to resist all attempts to change the Leninist definition of present era indulged in by various forces like the Krushchovites as well as Lin Piaoists, and by all those

ML groups who tailed behind this position knowingly or unknowingly. To effectively do it, it is necessary to define the forms and content imperialism newly attained in the post-Second World War years. It is in this process we have put forward our understanding of imperialism today, and neocolonialism, in continuation to Lenin's studies on imperialism, and the concepts put forward by Great Debate documents on neocolonialism.

Today the sectarian ML groups including PW are rejecting Leninism in the name of Maoism or by explaining Mao Tsetung Thought as Maoism. They are exhibiting a dual character. On the one hand, they are formulating and implementing theoretical and practical plans which in effect claim that all the theoretical approaches, outlooks and class positions of Leninism and Communist International are outdated. On the other hand, they pretend to uphold Lenin's books after throwing abroad Leninist approaches to analyse the characteristics of present day concrete conditions. This approach thoroughly exposes their petty-bourgeois positions.

The way PM article is raising the question, which is the predominant mode of production within the country, while trying to explain its approach towards neocolonialism and criticising RF, itself exposes how much distant PW is from Marxist analytical methods, and Marxism itself. To a great extent, the answer we get for a question is related to the method of posing the question. When a rationalist or mechanical materialist poses a question, a Marxist cannot give the answer they expect. For example, PW reduces the categories like neo colony, semi-colony, colony etc. to merely something which defines the relation between a backward country and the imperialists. They also argue that these categories do not explain the class relations within the country. To see differently, in a Marxist way, PW comrades will have to develop their Marxist understanding starting from *Communist Manifesto*. When the Marxists discuss about contemporary imperialism, what PW should understand at the outset itself is that we are not dealing with something like old "Roman empire". It is based on the teachings on modern capitalism analysed by Marx in *Capital* that categories like imperialism, neocolony, semi-colony etc are used today. That PW is ignorant about capitalist mode of production and relations became clear from the way

they defined internationalism while discussing about principal contradiction. This question needs further clarifications here in order to expose PW positions.

The Communist Manifesto itself explains that from the time of its birth capitalism has tried for, on the one hand, consolidating national boundaries and giving birth to nation states, and on the other hand, for transcending the national boundaries and to achieve global character, and that this is a contradiction which defines one of the internal characteristics of capitalism. Even one and half centuries back Marx had given clear indications about the role colonialism is playing in India, and how it is going to influence the class relations here on long term basis. All the above mentioned categories are part of the class relations which grew and developed under capitalist system. This is because the capital, which is the basis of the capitalist production system, is trying to conquer and transform the whole world in its own image. Moreover, the most important characteristic of imperialism, which itself emerges with the transformation of capitalism to monopoly capitalism, is the export of capital. On the other side, within the capitalist countries itself along with the industrial revolution and the primitive capital accumulation the role played by colonial plunder from the period of mercantile capitalism is undisputable. The role of *Plassey War* and the colonial plunder following it in India in the industrial revolution of Britain are part of the history of political economy. What we want to say is that the capitalist imperialist countries, colonies and relations among them are not something which connects distinctly separate factors as PW sees. All of them are interpenetrating and interrelated factors.

What is relevant is that once coming into contact with capitalism the traditional feudalism and all pre-capitalist relations start losing their 'purity'. But these changes following the emergence of capitalism takes place as an extremely complex process. It is not only taking place within the economic laws of motion. Social, political, cultural like factors also influence it. It is impossible for Capitalism to extend its survival without continuing and accelerating the process of transforming the world more and more in its own image, and pulling all pre-capitalist relations towards capitalist production relations. Today, there is no national identity abstractly separated from the global motive

process of capitalist capital. What is happening inside and outside of each country is relatively linked to this global process. It means that in order to fully understand the production relations within the country including those in the agrarian sector, they should be studied linked to the concrete structure of the global capital relations which includes what is taking place outside the country also, or extends to the international level. For example, we have already pointed out the development in the field of biotechnology, the multinational agri-business which has developed based on this also, and the transformations they are bringing about in the agrarian production relations in the capitalist countries themselves and in other countries. These factors should be taken in to consideration in the examination of contemporary Indian agrarian relations also. We are seeing today that even the political parties who stood for land reforms in the 1970s are trying to remove land ceiling in the interest of agri-business. Probably, also because of the reason that heavy investments in land are not very profitable, we are seeing in Europe and elsewhere a picture of peasants being made contracted middle men in the agri business chain. In the vast agricultural sector in India also this tendency is getting strengthened.

A comprehensive study of the agrarian relations in India is not coming in the limits of this article. On the contrary, what is attempted here is to put forward a political economic approach helpful for such a study. In the Asian African Latin American countries which are under imperialist domination the capitalist, neocolonial relations are spreading without settling accounts with the old landlord relations, and leaving behind the various tasks of the agrarian democratic revolution. And these neocolonial relations are spreading at global level, in different countries, in different regions, and in areas where different items are cultivated in unequal, specialised, and most complex ways. This leads to the question how 'semi-feudal' should be viewed. While imperialism is compelled due to economic reasons to spread the capitalist production relations on the one hand, due to various social and political relations it is also compelled to restrict it and distort it, on the other hand. As in all other matters, this dual character is a reflection of the internal contradictions of the capitalist imperialist system in present neocolonial phase. The most important political conclusion is that production relations from

feudal, semi-feudal to capitalist relations are ultimately part of the imperialist globalisation. They are all existing serving the imperialist capital accumulation.

What is important is to recognise the interdependence between the tasks of democratic revolution in the agrarian sector, and the tasks of anti-imperialist national democratic revolution. As we have pointed out earlier, this was recognised from the time of the anti-British independence struggle. Throwing away this readily available historical truth, petty-bourgeois sectarians are seeking justifications in theoretical exercises and mystifications.

Today the daily tasks of the agricultural workers organisations, peasant organisations and other mass organisations include the launching of struggles and working for protecting the jobs and raising the wages of the agricultural workers whose numbers are continuously increasing, against market relations serving monopoly interests struggle for the demands of the peasantry, mobilising masses against the numerous problems including ecological problems created by the imperialist agri-business giants through anti-people and profit motivated use of bio-technology and patent laws etc. Along with this we should have an agrarian programme to put before the people. It should include the various aspects of democratisation of land relations starting from the slogan 'land to the tiller', and various other tasks from nationalisation of land to socialisation of the co-operative farms in the direction of socialism. It should be an agrarian programme corresponding to the concrete conditions of today, and fulfilling the democratic needs according to the varying conditions and unequal development in different regions. What is required is to historically understand these complexities of the concrete situation, and get down to the broad arena of more difficult, tiring and, of course, time consuming class struggle. What we have to tell to PW is that instead of taking up this task, do not climb the mountains and go to jungles seeking shortcuts to revolution. Instead of seeing armed struggle as a part of class struggle similar to its erroneous approach to various matters as explained above, our comradely appeal to PW is to abandon the shortcut of making class struggle as a part of, and under the dictates of armed struggle.

13. Develop class struggle, Build up Bolshevik style party

The PM article is also raising some organisational questions regarding legal and illegal organisational work, on intensification and Bolshevisation of struggle etc. These are also raised in continuation to their earlier discussed approaches. What we had pointed out and what we are again pointing out is that PW and similar organisations have basically different political and organisational forms and content from what is put forward in the organisational guidelines of Communist International. Our basic understanding is that these organisations are still maintaining basically different outlooks from that of Communist International on various aspects like the class basis of the party, on organisational principles which ensure democratic centralism within the party, on the relation between party and class/mass organisations, on the relevance of linking open and secret, and legal and illegal activities, on the approach towards various forms of struggles including parliamentary forms of struggle and democracy etc. Only when PW like organisations put forward their approaches towards above questions in precise, theoretical terms an effective ideological struggle is possible. On these basic approaches what we have to point out is that we follow all the basic formulations and guidelines put forward by Lenin and Communist International. As all these are available documents, their repetitions are not necessary.

What we understand about PW position from the PM article and other documents is that for it class struggle means armed struggle. Marginally some other organisations also may be implementing the same approach with a utilitarian approach. When such sectarian groups with reductionist and oversimplified approach is talking about intensifying class struggle, it means increasing the degree of their armed struggle in some small areas they are operating. Already the revolutionary movement in India is facing the evil consequences of such intensification of armed actions.

The Marxists do not stand against intensification of class struggle. They always strive for it. But when a Marxist talks about intensifying class struggle it has a different meaning. Marxists view the leading of class struggle with a broad perspective. They see class struggle as having various dimensions, magnitudes, and levels.

On Neo-Colonialism

[Following the publication of the General Line documents and nine comments including 'Apologists of Neocolonialism' by the CPC in 1963 against the Krushchovite revisionist line, not only the Marxist-Leninists but also the nationalist forces in Third World countries got actively involved in the studies about and struggle against world imperialist system led by US imperialism. There was almost unanimity among the progressive forces that after Second World War, imperialism had replaced colonialism with neocolonialism. Kwame Nkrumah (1909-1972), the first president of the Republic of Ghana was a staunch African nationalist and close friend of People's Republic of China. In his article, "Neo colonialism: The Last Stage of imperialism" published in 1966 he explained the features of continued exploitation of former colonies after their formal political independence.

For them it includes the spreading and deepening of class struggle making it subjected to conscious organisational work, linking it with the question of political power as part of the party programme, etc. What a Marxist means by intensification of class struggle is to make the working class and its allies and the class/mass organisations including them capable of standing face to face against the concrete practice of the political power of the ruling classes, and to lead them forward. The forms of this intensification are not singular, but plural. The Communist party should be capable enough to lead the class struggle in all its complexities, in all its forms, through all means.

Today Bolshevisation means a political reorganisation rooted in the teachings of Communist International, and in the history of the Indian Communist movement. This cannot be a repetition of history. But a reorganisation at a higher level capable of facing and resolving the problems raised by present concrete realities.

Our appeal to PW like organisations is that they should become ready to confront the challenges posed by the concrete features of this historic conjuncture. Then only the ideological struggle shall elevate from the narrow world of dogmas, to serve the broad interests of class struggle. ●

Today, when neocolonisation is reaching its peak with all the former colonies, semi-colonies and dependent countries of the colonial period being reduced to neocolonies under the globalisation of imperialist system, even many of the so-called Marxist-Leninist forces who claim to uphold the *Great Debate* documents of the CPC are refusing even to glance through 'Apologists of Neocolonialism' by the CPC of 1963. It is in this context we are reproducing below extracts from Nkrumah's article to show how a lively debate was encouraged by the Great Debate in the 1960s. It was the domination of the sectarian trend within the CPC by the time of its 1969 Ninth Congress, and the spread of various petty-bourgeois anarchist trends in the late 1960s like Franz Fanon's theorisation of youth power, Carlos Marighello's urban guerilla warfare theories, Che Guevara's foco theory etc, all of them counterposing Mao's 'On New Democracy' and other contributions, which put an abrupt end to these healthy debates and caused severe setback to the ICM, alongwith Krushchovite revisionism. The Communist movement can overcome the setbacks and once again advance only by developing the studies on imperialism and neocolonialism, and developing strategy and tactics to combat the comprador regimes in the neocolonies—RS]

The neocolonialism of today represents imperialism in its final and perhaps its most dangerous stage. In the past it was possible to convert a country upon which a colonial regime had been imposed. Egypt in the nineteenth century is an example into a colonial territory. Today this process is no longer feasible. Old-fashioned colonialism is by no means entirely abolished. It still constitutes an African problem, but it is everywhere on the retreat. Once a territory has become nominally independent it is no longer possible, as it was in the last century, to reverse the process. In place of colonialism as the main instrument of imperialism we have today neocolonialism.

The essence of neocolonialism is that the State which is subject to it is, in theory, independent and has all the outward trappings of international sovereignty. In reality its economic system and thus its political policy is directed from outside.

The methods and form of this direction can take various shapes. For example, in an extreme case the troops of the imperial power may garrison the territory of the neo-colonial State and control the government of it. More often, however, neo-colonialist control is exercised through economic or monetary means. The neo-colonial State may be obliged to take the manufactured products of the imperialist power to the exclusion of competing products from elsewhere. Control over government policy in the neo-colonial State may be secured by payments towards the cost of running the State, by the provision of civil servants in positions where they can dictate policy, and by monetary control over foreign exchange through the imposition of a banking system controlled by the imperial power.

Where neo-colonialism exists the power exercising control is often the State which formerly ruled the territory in question, but this is not necessarily an example. In the case of South Vietnam the former imperial power was France, but neo-colonial control of the State has now gone to the United States. It is possible that neo-colonial control may be exercised by a consortium of financial interests which are not specifically identifiable with any particular State. The control of the Congo by great international financial concerns is a case in point.

The result of neo-colonialism is that foreign capital is used for the exploitation rather than for the development of the less developed parts of the world. Investment under neo-colonialism increases rather than decreases the gap between the rich and the poor countries of the world.

The struggle against neocolonialism is not aimed at excluding the capital of the developed world from operating in less developed countries but against that being used in such a way as to impoverish the less developed.

Neo-colonialism is also the worst form of imperialism. For those who practice it, it means power without responsibility and for those who suffer from it, it means exploitation without redress. In the days of old-fashioned colonialism, the imperial power had at least to explain and justify at home the actions it was taking abroad. In the colony those who served the ruling imperial-power could at least look to its protection against any violent move by their opponents. With neocolonialism neither is the case.

Above all, neocolonialism, like colonialism before it, postpones the facing of the social issues which will have to be faced by the fully developed sector of the world before the danger of world war can be eliminated or the problem of world poverty resolved.

Neo-colonialism, like colonialism, is an attempt to export the social conflicts of the capitalist countries. The temporary success of this policy can be seen in the ever-widening gap between the richer and the poorer nations of the world. But the internal contradictions and conflicts of neocolonialism make it certain that it cannot endure as a permanent world policy. ●

Anti-terminator movement: Partial victory

The world-wide movement by anti-imperialist popular forces against "terminator technology" or sterile seed technology has scored a partial victory. The MNC giant, Monsanto who owns patent rights for terminator technology has announced that it would not commercialise it. Monsanto's chief executive has stated that it is making "a public commitment not to commercialise sterile seed technologies." Earlier the UK based MNC, the Astra Zeneca had also made a similar commitment. These MNCs were forced to make this public retreat due to world-wide agitations by the progressive forces.

But we should not remain complacent. Terminator is synonymous with corporate greed. Monsanto like companies will continue with research to develop specific genes responsible for value added bio-technology traits which can be activated or de-activated. At some point, either through a corporate take over, or a change in management, trait control could easily be transformed back in to genetic seed sterilisation. Then these sterile seeds can be smuggled in to different countries. Especially when the comprador forces are ruling the neocolonies such smuggling is not difficult for the MNCs through numerous manipulations.

So the anti-imperialist political forces along with peasant organisations should intensify struggles to compel the government to strengthen seed laws and to implement quarantine systems. These struggles should be linked to the anti-imperialist movements to throw out the MNCs. ●

Experience of Chinese Revolution Continue to Inspire World Proletariat

Not only the Long March, but the Chinese Revolution itself was an "Odyssey unequalled in modern times". On the occasion of the 50th anniversary of this great revolution, which along with the October Revolution of 1917 charged the course of history in this century, Communists should take up the difficult task of evaluating the experience of Chinese revolution and drawing correct lessons from it.

The People's Democratic or New Democratic Revolution (NDR) of China has a unique history of its own conforming to the concrete conditions of that country. It is a glorious history of how the CPC led by Mao guided it through various twists and turns, ups and downs as a contingent of Communist International, always relying on the people. China was a feudal society under different dynasties for a very long time. After the *Opium War* of 1840 it had gradually started charging into a semi-colonial, semi-feudal society with its Pacific coast colonised by different Imperialist countries. In 1911 the Sun Yat-Sen led Kuomintang revolution overthrew Manchu dynasty and initiated efforts to unify and transform China into a republic. The CPC had a modest beginning in 1921 in this situation.

In 1923 Sun Yat-Sen took the help of Communists and started reorganising Kuomintang. Communists were given membership in Kuomintang. The first National Congress of Kuomintang in 1924 adopted the *three policies* of alliance with Soviet Union, co-operation with the Communist Party, and assistance to peasants and workers. Mao and others were elected to its leading committees.

Immediately after its formation CPC set about organising the railway workers. In 1922-23 party led strikes in all trunk lines. For freedom to organise a general trade union, general strike was called on the Peking Hankow Railway in 1923. But on February 7 the Northern Warlords supported by British Imperialists butchered the workers and put down the strike. Party took active part in the Hunan peasant movement involving millions of peasants also.

Against the massacre of Chinese people by British police in Shanghai on 30th May, 1925 nation-wide anti-imperialist movement started. Earlier in May major strikes had broken out in Japanese owned textile mills in many cities which were brutally suppressed. Communists led the movement with the slogan "Down with Imperialism". There were countrywide demonstrations and strikes by workers, students and shopkeepers. That is, even while co-operating with Kuomintang in its struggle against the Northern Warlords and to unify China, the CPC was spearheading numerous peasant uprisings and militant trade union struggles during these years. With the death of Sun Yat-Sen and successful completion of Northern Expedition the situation changed sharply.

Chiang Kai-shek who took over as the leader of Kuomintang took an openly anti-Communist stand collaborating with the Imperialists. In a counter revolutionary coup in 1927 utilising the services of all reactionary forces he started brutal suppression against forces of revolution. With the great *autumn uprising* Communist Party totally broke relations with Kuomintang and started its revolutionary war. In January 1929 Mao led the main force of the Fourth Army of the Red Army, constituted with sections coming out of Kuomintang Army, from Chingkeng Mountains to southern Kiangsi and western Fukien setting up revolutionary base areas. Mao has well explained why these base areas could be built up in the concrete conditions of China. More sections of Kuomintang Army and new recruits increased Red Army's strength to one lakh, and membership of the CPC built on Bolshevik lines rose to 3 lakhs by 1933. Overcoming the encirclement and suppression campaigns of Chiang Kai-shek led forces, Red Army embarked on epic *Long March* and reached northern China by October 1935, spearheading the offensive against Japanese imperialists who had colonised Manchuria by that time.

During these period of breath-taking struggles, in the base areas CPC started implementing land reforms and agrarian programme to consolidate its influence among the

peasantry. CPC spread its activities to all mass fronts. During the Second World War years while intensifying the war against Japanese imperialist forces, CPC was spreading its organisational influence to all parts of China. When Japanese surrendered in 1945, the CPC-led forces were the strongest in China. As Kuomintang refused to realise this reality and launched yet another counter-revolutionary offensive with US imperialist support, another phase of civil war, more intensified this time, started which culminated in the total victory of the NDR led by the CPC in 1949. As Mao repeatedly pointed out during this revolutionary war, this NDR was part of the world proletarian socialist revolution as it resolutely opposed imperialism and overthrew the comprador regime opening the road to democratisation and socialism. It was a historic revolution carried out basing on the concrete analysis of concrete conditions in China. Communists all over the world have a lot to study from its rich experience.

But, as Mao stressed completion of NDR was only the first step in the long long march towards socialism and communism. A quarter of humanity set out to build a socialist society without exploitation and imperialist domination. Mass campaigns were launched to implement land reforms and end feudal exploitation, to wipe out illiteracy, drug addiction, infectious diseases, and to provide employment for all by developing industry and agriculture. In the next quarter of a century standard of living of the people greatly improved, life expectancy rose from under 30 in 1949 to 65, gross agricultural production increased rapidly, industries started growing to 10 percent per year, and socialist transformation in the fields of means of production and distribution speeded up. All basic needs of the people were solved. The "iron-rice-bowl" became its symbol. China was a revolutionary alternative before the people of all oppressed countries, as well as to people of imperialist countries.

These achievements were made possible first by maintaining close relations with socialist Soviet Union, and then by uncompromisingly fighting against the Khrushchovite revisionist line that had started degenerating socialist Soviet Union to capitalist path through its theory of class-collaboration. This ideological struggle was put forward in the documents of CPC during the *Great Debate* once again, explaining the *General Line* of the international communist

movement in line with the teachings of *Communist International*. In continuation to this Mao launched the *Cultural Revolution* to continue class struggle under the dictatorship of the proletariat in China in order to combat the capitalist path.

The successful completion of the NDR, the socialist construction during the next quarter of a century and the theoretical contributions of the CPC guided by Mao have strengthened the struggle for socialism and transformed China greatly. The world proletariat and revolutionary forces have much to study from their rich experience. Today when Communists all over the world are observing the 50th anniversary of Chinese Revolution they are once again trying to draw lessons from this experience in order to carry forward the revolution in their own countries. At the same time they are also trying to expose the erroneous lines that emerged from the 1969 Ninth Congress of the CPC, and the capitalist restoration that has taken place there in the post-Mao period under the sign-board of *market socialism*.

In the course of the Cultural Revolution, during the bitter struggle against the capitalist roaders, a powerful sectarian trend started dominating the CPC. By the time of the Ninth Congress of CPC in 1969 this trend had dominated it so much that it succeeded in stating in the Party constitution that Lin Biao will be the heir to Mao. This anti-Marxist decision snatching feudal characteristics was taken along with the totally erroneous evaluation that the era of imperialism and proletarian revolution has changed to the era of total collapse of imperialism and world-wide victory of socialism. It put petty-bourgeois anarchist tendencies in domination within CPC and in the Marxist Leninist parties all over the world emerged during this period in the struggle against Khrushchovite revisionism. In the name of quick victory, adventurous positions were taken and the teachings of Communist International and Great Debate were rejected. This soon led to severe setbacks to all ML parties all over the world, and to the emergence of capitalist roaders once again within CPC in the name of fighting against this sectarian trend. And these Dengist forces succeeded in capturing power immediately after Mao's death, and in degenerating China to capitalist path in the name of market socialism. Today Jiang Zemin regime has surrendered China to imperialist globalisation and integrated it with global market system.

RED STARThrissur-680 322,
Kerala, India.

November 1999

Price Rs. 5.00

Reg. No. D 2. 9359/99

Postal Reg. KL/TC 206/99

Posted at Thrissur RMS/2 on 1 November'99

The Jiang Zemin regime and the revisionists all over the world are celebrating the last quarter century of capitalist restoration in China. They try to depict that the first quarter century of socialist transformation was a period of disaster, and the period of market socialism is one of economic miracle, transforming China in to a mighty economic power. Imperialist ideologues and economists are propagating this pack of lies. Amartya Sen like comprador economists and intellectuals are also repeating these lies. For all of them socialism is a disaster, and capitalism is the democratic heaven.

But the facts speak otherwise. The gains in China cannot be traced to period of market reforms. In the socialist period not only the share of investment in income raised greatly and a diversified industrial base established, but there was sharp increase in longevity of life and fall in infant mortality rate. Illiteracy was almost wiped out. Land reforms and promotion of agriculture sharply increased living standard of the vast rural masses. There was socialisation of property, collective welfare measures, and egalitarian distribution policies. Unlike in other Afro-Asian, Latin American countries where imperialist globalisation-liberalisation policies are imposed and as a result most of them are facing increasing economic crisis, Chinese economy could withstand the global crisis and show substantial economic gains because it could inherit a solid economy and infrastructure from the socialist period. In this context, Amartya Sen's writings and speeches vilifying the gains of socialist period, and reporting large scale deaths during it are contrary to all available data and part of his comprador effort to attack socialism. However hard all the imperialist and comprador ideologues may try to sell the *virtues of market*, they cannot conceal the intensifying general crisis confronting imperialist system repeatedly and the transfer of its burden to the people of neocolonies, and that socialism is the only alternative which makes life of the masses better in all respects. Nobody can obliterate the achievements and lessons of revolutions and socialist construction that the world witnessed in Soviet Union, China and elsewhere. The *end of history* propaganda of imperialists already stands exposed.

When the world is at the threshold of a new century, the achievements and lessons of Paris Commune, October Revolution and Chinese Revolution are torchbearers for the tolling masses everywhere. It is certain that the coming decades shall witness the rectification of past mistakes and regrouping by the Communists in all countries. Once again powerful Communist parties shall emerge leading the NDRs in the neocolonies and SRs in the imperialist countries to victory. Neither the Dengists in China nor the revisionists and reformists who chant the 'mantra' of market socialism shall be able to hoodwink the masses for long. After October and Chinese revolutions, the next chapter of revolutions shall burst forth soon, once again changing the world. Nobody can prevent this onward march of history. The experience of Chinese Revolution prove this. ●

(From P. 2)

being made meaningless through privatisation and market system. So reservation can be protected and its provisions can be defended only as a part of the struggle against the privatisation and market system.

But the political parties and organisations who talk about social justice and who claim to stand for socially oppressed sections have at the same time are either advocating the very same privatisation policies or maintain silence about them. They show one upmanship only in protesting against the Supreme Court ruling on promoters, while keeping silence about the whole reservation being made meaningless through privatisation. It is an opportunist stand.

Today even the latest ruling of the Supreme Court can be challenged only as a part of the struggle against privatisation and market system. We appeal to all progressive democratic forces and all organisations and individuals standing for SC/ST and other socially oppressed sections to join the struggle against the globalisation-liberalisation-privatisation policies and against the very market philosophy on which they are based, in order to effectively carry forward the struggle against the various challenges faced by the reservation from all vested interests.

New Delhi,
31 October, 1999All India Secretary
C. P. I (M. L.) Red Flag

Printed and Published by P. J. Baby from Comrade Printers,
Thrissur-680 322, Phone: 0487-355175. Editor: M. M. Somasekharan.