

## **Indian Revolution And Proletarian Internationalism**

The month of October is significant in that two world-shaking events took place which have changed the correlation of forces in favour of world revolution including revolution in our own country. They are : October Revolution (1917) in Russia, which resulted in establishing the first proletarian state in a western country; successful Chinese revolution (1949), which resulted in establishing a New Democratic State in China. They have given a severe blow to imperialism to such an extent, that it has ceased to be a decisive force in international affairs, as it once was.

Indian revolution, when it is completed, will be a more or less final death-blow because India will no longer be a hunting-ground for imperialism of all hues. Therefore a successful revolution is necessary to usher in freedom and prosperity to our people. Added to this, it will have international significance of the order of successful Russian and Chinese revolutions. Therefore communist revolutionaries attach utmost importance to it. By leading the revolution to a success they are carrying on not only national tasks, but international tasks as well. To put it in other words, there is no international task more important for them than leading revolution in our country to a success. This is how proletarian internationalism is cherished and practised by communist revolutionaries. They are aware of other proletarian international tasks as well.

### **I**

Marxism-Leninism enjoins all communist revolutionaries to be real proletarian internationalists, i.e., to work for peace, to defend socialist countries etc. This does not mean renouncing the task of revolution in one's own country or slowing it down. Working for revolution in one's own country is the real proletarian internationalism because the revolution strikes at the roots of imperialism itself. A

country which drives away imperialism from its soil can play an important role and sometimes a decisive role in preventing a world war, a war of aggression against a socialist country, and in achieving peace. Therefore, it is primary task of communist revolutionaries to work for a successful revolution in one's own country. All other tasks, even if they are related to proletarian internationalism, are linked with this task. Therefore, proletarian internationalism never demands that task of revolution in one's own country should be subordinated to other tasks in a given situation.

## II

CPI, when it was united, adopted a line of class-collaboration, during the period of anti-fascist war, when Russia was attacked by Nazi Germany (June 1941). As a result it has renounced the line of overthrowing the British imperialism through an armed revolution. It was said that India would have liberation automatically and peacefully once fascism was defeated. The war was characterised as 'people's war, simply because it was so for Russia. In the name of defending Russia it had supported British imperialism, which was an ally of Russia during that war. All this was done in the name of proletarian internationalism.

Socialist Russia at the time was waging a people's war in order to defend itself, and all that CPI was expected was to support socialist Russia in that war. For this there was no need to change its programme and tactics of building the mass revolutionary movement to overthrow the British colonial regime. The national and international situation obtaining during anti-fascist war did not warrant to say that it can be liquidated peacefully immediately after war. Therefore the tactics to be adopted at the time should have been one of class struggle and not class-collaborationist. By fighting British imperialism the party would not weaken its role as supporter and defender of anti-fascist war. On the other hand it would have strengthened it.

In Burma, Malaya (presently Malaysia), Indonesia etc., the communist parties carried on armed struggles against fascist Japanese occupation and did not allow the colonial powers to stage a comeback. With the help of this policy, they were leading revolutions in their respective countries, together with their carrying on international tasks of fighting an anti-fascist war.

In China, though the Communist Party had advanced the slogan

of coalition government, it refused to surrender its armies and liberated bases to Chiang Kai-shek, because such a step would amount to liquidation of revolution.

The experiences of Second World War show that a good number of communist parties in colonial and semi-colonial countries had proved themselves to be best proletarian internationalists by carrying on armed struggle against fascist aggressors. They had their best allies in genuine nationalists who were opposed to the respective colonial powers as well as fascism.

Experiences in Telangana, more so in Nalgonda District, had shown that, by adopting revolutionary tactics and building revolutionary peasant movement against feudalism, the party in this district had proved to be revolutionary as well as proletarian international. It had in no way hampered anti-fascist-war. It should be known that the feudalism against which the party had fought was an ally of British imperialism, which again was an ally of Soviet Union in its war against fascism. We can not compare the armed struggle in Telangana with those of Burma, Malaya, Indonesia etc., either in the level or in the extent, yet it was a revolutionary movement and an armed struggle. Though it was directed against Nizam to begin with it was in essence against the British imperialism, until power was transferred to big bourgeoisie and landlords.

## III

For some years, after 1946 onwards, the question before the party was: armed revolution or a peaceful parliamentary path?--against ruling classes, i.e., British imperialism to begin with, collaborationist big bourgeoisie and landlords subsequently. By 1950, the issue of the danger of Third World War and struggle for peace was before the party. Nehru posed himself as opposing war and supporter of peace. He was also in friendly terms with Russia. The dominant trend at the time was to renounce revolution in favour of a struggle for peace and against war danger from USA. It continues till this day in the two communist parties, CPI and CPI (M).

US imperialism is a super power. It was the same for the last four decades and more. There has been a danger of Third World War all these years. In our country, there have been governments which claim that they are opposing such a war, are opposing US imperialism, and want peace. Does this mean that communist revolutionaries renounce revolution or postpone it

indefinitely till the expected World War is over, while limiting their activities to the struggle for peace? Does this mean that we should support the government which claims to be opposing Third World War? No, certainly not. Present government, and the governments in the past, while claiming opposition to war and support to peace, have been supporting wars of aggression which are taking place in one region or the other. For example, the present government supports the Russian war of aggression against Afghanistan. It also supports the Vietnamese war of aggression against Kampuchea and its occupation. Therefore it is not genuine in saying that it is opposed to a war and is for peace. Of course these are not World Wars. Whether they will become part of Third World War is a matter to be decided by the course of events, because they become so only when a Third World War takes place.

There is a danger of war as long as there is imperialism. As a super power, US dominates most of the countries in the world. This means that a struggle for peace to prevent the Third World War should continue. This point is indisputable. But it should not be counterposed to the development of the revolution in a given country, because its aim is to change the society basically and it is directed against the ruling classes. Mrs. Gandhi, being an ally of Soviet Union in its bid for hegemony, is opposing USA in certain respects of its foreign policy, i.e., its policies for world hegemony. But this does not mean that her opposition is to US imperialism as a whole. She is importing US capital on a massive scale. In fact US is the biggest exporter of capital to our country. Indian big business wants to import more US capital and technical knowhow in preference to other industrialised countries. US is exporting its capital with an eye on our country to rob and plunder it. This being so, Mrs. Gandhi and her regime can not be treated as a consistent fighter against US imperialism, more so, as a fighter for peace opposing third world war. Being too weak, they are not in a position to prevent US waging a third world war or initiating a third world war, in case it does.

US warmongers are facing world public opinion against third world war. Whether such an opinion can prevent it or not is a point for future observation. Experience of the last so many years has shown that, such a public opinion could prevent it for the time being, i.e., for the last three decades and more. But we can not say that it can prevent it indefinitely and for all time to come,

because as long as imperialism is there, there is bound to be a third world war. This is the fact of the situation. In view of this, people should not rely on the government which is importing US capital on a massive scale and is dependent on it economically. Therefore, people of our country should take initiative in their hands and fight for peace. This is only the guarantee for defending peace.

A peace movement can not bring about a revolution to change the present society. In our country, it has a limited purpose, and has nothing to do with basic changes in the structure of the society, that is a change from a semi-colonial and semi-feudal society to one of new democratic society. Therefore there should be a continuous struggle against ruling classes to make the revolution a success.

But some of those who claim to be Marxist-Leninist and to be opposing US imperialism say that there should be no revolution because it becomes main obstacle towards their efforts for peace and against the third world war. The fact of the matter is that a successful revolution and a revolutionary movement towards that end guarantees a stable peace than the existence of the present-day government together with reactionary forces supporting it. This being so, there is no point in saying that the main and fundamental task of the present-day is to prevent the third world war and support Mrs. Gandhi's regime, so that a third world war may be prevented, meaning that revolution should be either postponed indefinitely or renounced.

#### IV

The other force is Russia which is also a super power. There are forces in our country who believe that Russia is a genuinely socialist country which is struggling for peace. These forces do not have any explanation to the wars of aggression it has been waging and the wars it has been helping. Afghanistan has been a standing example in that Russia has committed an aggression against a weak country. Russia has helped, and is still helping, Vietnamese aggression against Kampuchea. Still they claim or they believe that Russia is a socialist power.

This being so, their attitude towards Russia is that of blind worshipping, though they may claim that they are critical about it. They think that such aggressions are for the good of the concerned country or to help and complete the revolution in those countries. There is no evidence to show that these Russian forces in Afghanistan

or Vietnamese forces in Kampuchea are helping revolution in any way whatsoever. A revolution forced on the people with the help of a powerful country like Russia, can not be a genuine revolution. It is a fake revolution created by getting the support of a section of natives for aggressors and nothing more.

These pro-Soviet forces, mainly the CPI and CPM, think that Russia, being a socialist country, has the right to commit aggression or to help to commit aggression to export revolutions to other countries. It is these forces who, in the name of opposing US imperialism, extend their support to aggressions and plans for world hegemony. They do not have any explanation that Marxism-Leninism is opposed to wars of aggression, and any country which claims to adhere to Marxism-Leninism can not commit aggression. Once an aggression is committed, it amounts that party and government of such country have renounced Marxism-Leninism. In our country, the government of the comprador (collaborationist) big bourgeoisie and landlords is an ally of Russia. This alliance is not meant for the country's development, as it is claimed. It is aimed at reducing India to become partner in Russian drive for world hegemony to replace US imperialism.

## V

We communist revolutionaries treat Russia as social imperialism because it committed and abetted aggressions by renouncing Marxism-Leninism. Therefore any war between Russia and US, no matter who strikes first, will be treated as imperialist war meant for world hegemonism, and therefore, we have nothing to choose between the two. It will be an imperialist war if and when it takes place, but not a war between imperialism and socialism. Even when government of India supports Russia in its war against US, it cannot be treated as taking the side of progressive forces or anti-imperialist forces. Obviously it will be taking sides with one imperialist power as against the other. This being so, communist revolutionaries in India will fight against both the forces, US and Russia as well.

Therefore the question of support to the government in case of a war does not arise. Proletarian internationalism demands that communist revolutionaries should not take the side of government of India simply because it takes the side of Russia which is opposed to US. For those who treated it as a socialist country, such a war will be an anti-imperialist war headed by a socialist Russia. As

such they want to support both Russia and government of India which takes sides with Russia. Added to this, they (CPI and CPM) have renounced the task of building revolutionary movement directed against the government simply because it happens to be an ally of Russia. The class collaborationist policy which was in vogue during anti-fascist war is again being repeated even when there is no world war. This is being done in the name of fighting the danger of third world war.

## VI

Over a long time there was a discussion, which is still going on, whether proletarian internationalism means merely supporting and defending a socialist country in relation to its policies and activities.

In this connection, the Communist Party of the Soviet Union (CPSU) and Communist Party of China (CPC) have been the points of controversy. CPSU has been the ruling party of Soviet Union ever since the proletarian revolution in that country was a success; subsequently the CPC has been the ruling party of China ever since the revolution in that country had succeeded (i.e. from 1949). At the time, there was the Communist International. Though CPSU was formally its member, it had played a leading role throughout.

The programme and policies of the Communist international were expected to be implemented by its affiliates and Communist Party of India was one of them. Violation of that policy was supposed to be an act opposed to proletarian internationalism. Obviously this understanding was wrong. Implementation of the line needs, besides having programme etc., a correct application and independent interpretation of Marxism-Leninism. In the absence of this, the leadership was a spoon-fed baby throughout.

Subsequently, Comintern was dissolved in 1942. Every party was supposed to be independent and sovereign in its own country. Though there was no such guidance which was binding, because of the influence that CPSU carried in the international communist movement, something said or written by various journals of CPSU or its leaders was supposed to be an authoritative international guidance which was binding on the concerned parties in other countries. Communist Party of India, when it was united, did suffer with such ideas which came in the way of correct application and independent interpretation of Marxism-Leninism. The Communist

Party in India, when it was united, did not draw correct lessons from the revolutionary experience it had in our country, of various struggles, more so of peasant struggles which took higher forms, especially the form of armed struggle. It had to rely on revolutionary experiences of our country and the struggles the party had led together with other struggles.

Proletarian internationalism demands that the party should fight for peace and oppose imperialist wars and support a socialist country when it is attacked; oppose the manoeuvres or designs directed against a socialist country, liberation movements and proletarian revolutionary movements in respective countries. This aspect combined with the basic question of working for revolution in one's own country should be characterised as proletarian internationalism. Those who do not work for revolution in their own country, and who at the same time talk about proletarian internationalism and international duties etc., are not Marxist-Leninists in the real sense of the term. This is because proletarian internationalism is part of Marxism-Leninism which enjoins that communists should work for revolution in their own country. The CPI and the CPM do not work for revolution in our country on the plea that Indian government is an ally of Russia. They are supporting it in such a way that there is no question of overthrowing it by armed revolution. The parliamentary path they have adopted provides a guarantee to retain one pro-Soviet government or other in power, while they are satisfied with sharing it at state level. Therefore we can safely say that they have abandoned their task of working for revolution in our country. Recognition by CPSU and CPC does not make them revolutionary once they abandoned this task.

## VII

More or less the same is the case with those who claim that they are not only Marxist-Leninist but adhere to Mao Zedong Thought as well. They say that the present-day CPC leadership is revisionist and taking a capitalist road. For them defending Mao's Thought means carrying on a virulent campaign against the present Chinese leadership in the name of fighting against its revisionism. They have nothing to contribute so far as Indian revolution is concerned. They concentrate their efforts on slandering Chinese leadership. At home their policies and activities are revisionist and right opportunist, and on international sphere, they indulge in "left" phrase-mongering. As such by not working for Indian revolution, they have abandoned

Marxism-Leninism and Mao Zedong Thought. By resorting to such campaign, they are joining the band-wagon of anti-China forces; they are diverting the attention of revolutionary ranks and the people from the revolution and its tasks. This being so, some of those elements who claim that they are not only adherents of Marxism-Leninism but Mao Zedong Thought also, and who oppose the present Chinese leadership as being revisionist or capitalist roaders, are blind enough not to see that it adheres to Mao Zedong Thought. CPC is practising Mao's Thought in a way they think correct. The leadership also says that it is correcting certain mistakes which are incorporated in Mao's theories, i.e., the theory of cultural revolution. This being so, they should have accepted it if they are genuine towards Mao's Thought.

## VIII

We communist revolutionaries support or appreciate CPC not because it is opposed to CPSU, but because it is for Indian revolution and world revolution. We oppose CPSU not because it is opposed to CPC, but because it is opposed to Indian revolution. Its activities in our country for the last so many years are standing examples to prove this contention. Therefore whether one is pro-Russia (CPSU) or pro-China (CPC) is not the deciding factor to treat a person, a group or a party to be revolutionary. On the contrary, it is their attitude towards Indian revolution which is the criterion to decide this question. Whether one works for our revolution or not is the criterion to treat whether one is revolutionary or not. Talking about revolution and working against it, has become a common feature among a section of those who claim that they adhere to Marxism-Leninism.

Therefore communist revolutionaries work for Indian revolution and they treat it as their primary task which is international as well. A successful revolution in our country will be decisive contribution to world peace. As such Indian revolution will have an international significance. Therefore it is also the international duty of communist revolutionaries to make the revolution a success. We communist revolutionaries think that the best way of observing proletarian internationalism is to work for revolution in our country. Our attitude towards other parties, groups and individuals who claim that they are adhering to Marxism-Leninism and Mao Zedong Thought is decided by whether they are working for Indian revolution or not. This is the criterion that we adopt.

Those parties which support the present Indian regime as against Indian revolution cannot be treated as fraternal parties because, by this act, they are opposing Indian revolution. These parties (Communist) which support it even though their regime may have friendly relations with the Indian Government, will be treated as fraternal parties because State-to-State relations are different from party-to-party relations. This must be the criterion to treat the communist party in a given country, whether it is a fraternal party or not.

There may be differences with others regarding international questions but supporting our revolution will be the basis in deciding our attitude towards other parties. Therefore discussion about proletarian internationalism in relation to supporting Russian or Chinese Parties without any relevance to Indian revolution is diversionist.

There may be differences on this and that aspect of the situation. They can be resolved in course of time. We are firmly of opinion that not working for revolution, at the same time, talking about proletarian internationalism cannot go together. Communist revolutionaries do not accept this type of proletarian internationalism as genuine.

#### IX

Here comes the question of parliamentary path. They [CPI and CPI (M)] talk of revolution endlessly. At the same time, they practise parliamentary path which means renouncing revolution, which again means renouncing proletarian internationalism. What they observe is opportunist internationalism.

There are parties which talk of Marxism-Leninism and Mao Zedong Thought and at the same time they adopt parliamentary path. Some parties may claim that they are opposing this Government. But when they adopt parliamentary path, they can not be treated as accepting and practising Mao Zedong Thought because the parliamentary path itself goes against Mao Zedong Thought.

We donot treat those forces who adopt parliamentary path as proletarian internationalists. They are at best opportunist internationalists. This being so, communist revolutionaries are real proletarian internationalists because they are working for Indian revolution while at the same time they fight for world peace, and against the third world war. Our revolution must advance in conditions of world war and when there is no war.

Communist revolutionaries, while opposing world war, continue to work for revolution and do not support the government which is an ally of this or that super power, more so of Russia. It can not be relaxed or postponed either in the name of struggle against US imperialism or Russian imperialism.

This being so, proletarian internationalism, in the real sense of the term, never comes in the way of organising revolution or revolutionary movement, whatever the national and international situation may be.

In view of the above explanation, we are firmly of opinion that there is no proletarian internationalism than working for the success of the Indian revolution. This is what Marxism-Leninism teaches us.

(20-9-1983)