

Some Problems Relating To Socialist Revolution In China

The Chinese Revolution (1949) was a New Democratic Revolution under the leadership of the proletariat, in an Asiatic country with semi-colonial and semi-feudal society. Therefore it was first of its kind also. It is quite natural that our people who were fighting against British imperialism were interested to know the experiences of this revolution so that they may apply them in their struggle, keeping the specific conditions of the country in view. The then Communist Party, the vanguard of the proletariat, has failed in this task. At certain stage (1949), a major section of the leadership of the Party had the audacity to question the correct theories which the Chinese Communists had developed by summing up the experiences of the revolution. It was wrong to expect this (learning from others) from a leadership which did not learn anything even from the experiences of revolutionary movement in our own country.

But the influence of the onward march of Chinese Revolution especially during anti-Japanese war, on the revolutionary national movement in our country was heavy. It began to take a definite shape when a medical mission led by Dr. Kotnis was sent to China by the National Congress, in spite of its having a reformist leadership. Though its purpose was to provide medical help to the revolutionary people of China, it was an expression of solidarity between the anti-British national movement of our country and the national liberation struggle of China against Japan.

There was another aspect of the influence which was deeper and more significant, which was on the revolutionary movement led by the then Communists. They were inspired by the victories of People's Liberation Army and the meagre Chinese Marxist literature that trickled into our country. Notable was Mao's *New Democracy* which explains all out-standing problems of Chinese revolution. The explanation applies to the revolutions of colonial and semi-colonial countries as well. The main problems are: The United Front, armed struggle, and the Communist Party which can lead them. The armed

struggle in Telangana was heavily influenced by it. At one stage, the leadership of the Andhra Provincial Committee proposed (1948) this line, as it was applied to the revolution of our country, which was rejected by the then Central leadership (the Polit-Buro). It was the beginning of the major rift in the Communist movement of our country which had widened as years passed resulting in the present CPI, CPI (M). Communist revolutionaries and the groups of various hues. In a sense, the division is between those who advocate the above line and those who oppose it. We, Communist revolutionaries, have worked out a general line basing on this strategy and are building the revolutionary movement according to it.

Almost all the groups who claim to be revolutionary and are said to have accepted Mao Zedong Thought, have differences on all outstanding problems facing Indian revolution. Though the struggle started for its correct application as long back as 1948, it could not last long. It was discontinued sooner (1951) only to start again in 1967-68. The struggle is going on for a decade and more and it will continue. We are confident that the struggle will result in resolving all out-standing problems facing the Indian revolution. Whether there were any individuals and sections of the Communists who were outside CPI and CPI(M) and at the same time worked for teachings of Mao is a point to be considered, because there are claims to this effect. It should be noted that not all revolutionaries inside the CPI had abandoned the teachings of Mao after 1951. In fact a good number of them who left CPI were those who followed the teachings of Mao. But there was no systematic and organised struggle to apply them to the practice of Indian revolution. Those who came out of CPI(M) were unanimous in their acceptance of Mao Zedong Thought.

2

The controversies regarding out-standing problems of Indian revolution are one thing. As we have said earlier, they are related to the application of Marxism-Leninism-Mao Zedong Thought in general and Communist revolutionaries in particular. A discussion is going on and the problems will be settled sooner or later. There are others who reject Mao Zedong Thought as such. They are outside the framework of Communist revolutionaries. A struggle is going on by way of settling accounts with them. This is another aspect of the problem.

There is another aspect, which is related to Chinese revolution in its two stages, the New Democratic and Socialist, CPC and its leadership role in the two stages and various periods. This is not the place where we can explain the gamut of controversies. Suffice it to say that the entire question was controversial ever since 1948 when it assumed a unique significance in that it was a successful revolution, first of its kind in a colonial and semi-colonial country which demanded a closer and careful study and application to our revolutionary practice, though our own experience will be the basis for it. In the recent past the controversy was related to the events which took place immediately after Mao's death (1976) till today. While the trend of the events was becoming clear every passing day the *Resolution on Certain Questions in the History of Our Party Since the Founding of the People's Republic of China* of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of China sets at rest most of the controversies if not all.

Let us go into some of the controversies which are connected with Cultural Revolution including Cultural Revolution itself. They were inside the CPC which were recently settled by its CC itself. Those who characterise the present CPC leadership as revisionist have already taken their positions in these controversies by defending Cultural Revolution and all the theories connected with it. Our own breakaway groups, past and present, have more or less identical views though some of them were having in the form of doubts and reservations. Therefore the controversies are not CPC's internal affair alone. They extend to Communist Revolutionaries and others in our country who accept Mao Zedong Thought. Hence their importance.

3

In China, the dictatorship of all revolutionary classes was established when the power was seized by the Communist Party and the People's Liberation Army on October 1, 1949. The national bourgeoisie was one of them. Com. Mao had to say the following about it:

".....There remain the national bourgeoisie; at the present stage, we can already do a good deal of suitable educational work with many of them. When the time comes to realise socialism, that is, to nationalise private enterprise, we shall carry the work of educating and remoulding them a step further. The people have

a powerful state apparatus in their hands -- there is no need to fear rebellion by the national bourgeoisie." (*On the People's Democratic Dictatorship*).

Instead of forcible elimination, Mao advocated educating and remoulding the national bourgeoisie. And it was done accordingly, during a long period of more than one and a half decade, till 1966. There is nothing to show that the work of education and remoulding of national bourgeoisie had ended in a failure. On the contrary, Mao had approvingly stated that such work was done even by 1949.

Mao had explained this phenomenon in relation to the theory of contradictions also. He said:

*"In our Country, the contradiction between the working class and the national bourgeoisie comes under the category of contradictions among the people. By and large the class struggle between the two is a class struggle within the ranks of the people, because the Chinese national bourgeoisie has a dual character in the period of the bourgeois-democratic revolution. It had both a revolutionary and a conciliationist side to its character. In the period of socialist revolution, exploitation of working class for profit constitutes one side of the character of the national bourgeoisie while its support to the Constitution and its willingness to accept socialist transformation constitute the other. The national bourgeoisie differs from the imperialists the landlords and the bureaucratic capitalists. The contradiction between the national bourgeoisie and the working class is one between the exploiter and the exploited and is by nature antagonistic. But in the concrete conditions of China, this antagonistic contradiction between the two classes, if properly handled, can be transformed into a non-antagonistic one and be resolved by peaceful methods. However, the contradiction between the working class and the national bourgeoisie will change into a contradiction between ourselves and the enemy if we do not handle it properly and do not follow the policy of uniting with, criticising, and educating the national bourgeoisie, or if the national bourgeoisie does not accept this policy of ours (*On the Correct Handling of Contradictions Among the People: Mao*).*

Mao was clear in stating that contradictions among the people are different from those between people and the enemy. While the former are non-antagonistic, the latter are antagonistic. Therefore, they can and should be resolved by peaceful means, i.e., by education

and remoulding. This was what he stated earlier in 1949 in his article, *On People's Democratic Dictatorship*. Nine years of experience (1949-57) had proved that the national bourgeoisie can be educated and remoulded. That is why Mao had confirmed that this policy was correct by characterising the contradiction between the working class and the national bourgeoisie as being non-antagonistic. The policy continued and non-antagonistic relations also continued till recently when the national bourgeoisie was eliminated as a class. He was clear that it should not be equated with the imperialists, the landlords and the bureaucrat capitalists with whom the people have antagonistic contradictions. The national bourgeoisie accepted the policy of education and remoulding, which was not changed so that the contradictions did not turn into antagonistic.

Mao, after mentioning about contradictions in a capitalist society, said the following about those in socialist society:

".....The case is quite different with contradictions in socialist society; on the contrary they are not antagonistic and can be ceaselessly resolved by the socialist system itself.

*"In socialist society the basic contradictions are still those between the relations of production and the productive forces and between the super structure and the economic base.....In saying that the socialist relations of production correspond better to the character of the productive forces than did the old relations of production, we mean that they allow the productive forces to develop at a speed unattainable in the old society. So that production can expand steadily and increasingly meet the constantly growing needs of the people (*On the Correct Handling of Contradictions Among the People*).*

Mao gives examples from the Chinese experience to explain these formulations, which we are not repeating. All this goes to show that the basic contradiction in the Chinese socialist society is between the relations of production and productive forces. And the contradictions are not antagonistic contradiction because antagonism is one form, but not the only one form of the struggle of the opposites.

"In human history, antagonism between classes exists as a particular manifestation of the struggle of opposites. Consider the contradiction between the exploiting and the exploited classes. Such contradictory classes coexist for a long time in the same society,

be it slave society feudal society or capitalist society, and they struggle with each other; but it is not until the contradiction between the two classes develops to a certain stage that it assumes the form of open antagonism and develops into revolution....."

(Mao : On Contradiction).

In a class society there exists a basic contradiction between the two opposing classes. For example; a slave-owner and a slave; feudal and a serf; capitalist and a worker. In the course of existence of these class societies there was a period in which there was no antagonism and the opposing classes lived more or less peacefully. There was a time when antagonism developed and revolutions and revolutionary upheavals took place. Under imperialism there were less peaceful conditions and more of antagonisms leading to revolutions and revolutionary movements.

Under conditions of socialism, we don't have a class society like that of capitalist etc. since the national bourgeoisie, an exploiting class, was educated and remoulded to be eliminated. Even while it was an exploiting class, the working class being in power, the contradiction between the national bourgeoisie and the working class, even though basic, was non-antagonistic because it was part and parcel of the people. Therefore the basic contradictions in the socialist society are between production relations and the productive forces and between the super structure and the economic base. They can be resolved peacefully.

In this connection Mao has said:

"With overthrow of bureaucrat-capitalist class, the contradiction between the working class and the national bourgeoisie has become the principal contradiction in China: therefore, the national bourgeoisie should no longer be defined as an intermediate class". (Selected Works - Vol.V. p.77).

This was written in 1952 as a note by way of correcting an error found in a document. This formulation is related to the period of transition and the principal contradiction at the time was between working class and the national bourgeoisie. In spite of being the principal contradiction, it was handled properly and correctly by the People's Democratic State and the party. Therefore it did not take an antagonistic form even in that period.

The Chinese working class had overthrown the landlord and bureaucrat-capitalist classes to seize power from them and not from the national bourgeoisie which was an ally during the stage of New Democratic Revolution. The CPC allowed it to continue as one among the people during the stage of socialist revolution and eliminated it peacefully, as a class by education and remoulding. In China, there is a danger of war of aggression from Soviet social imperialism. But the war is not imminent. Therefore, the principal contradiction is between production relations and productive forces though the contradiction between socialism and imperialism remains as ever. The given comment is not clear whether the contradiction is antagonistic or not antagonistic with the elimination of national bourgeoisie as an intermediary class. In view of this, there is no basis whatsoever to say that the contradiction between the working class and the national bourgeoisie is antagonistic and it is correct to say that in Socialist China, the basic contradictions are between production relations and productive forces and between the super structure and the economic base.

4

Once we are clear about basic contradictions and the principal contradiction in Chinese socialist society, it is not difficult to find out the direction of the class struggle under conditions of socialism. When the Chiang Kai-shek clique was overthrown and the dictatorship of people's democracy was established after a prolonged armed struggle, the ruling classes were revolutionary classes headed by the proletariat. And the national bourgeoisie was one of them. The class struggle at the time took an antagonistic form between the remnants of overthrown classes, i.e., imperialism, landlords, and bureaucratic capitalists (counter-revolutionaries etc.) on one hand and the revolutionary classes who established their dictatorship. There was a class struggle between the working class and the national bourgeoisie which took the non-antagonistic form due to the policy of educating and remoulding which CPC adopted.

The class struggle took the same non-antagonistic form between other classes, i.e., working class and peasantry etc.

During stage of socialist revolution which is continuing now and will continue for a long time to come there is a dictatorship of the proletariat which is getting consolidated every passing day. There has been a controversy that: Since the national bourgeoisie, true

to its class nature, is opposed to socialism, the class struggle between the working class and the national bourgeoisie should take antagonistic form. It was adopted as the policy for one decade from 1966 to 1976 till Mao's death. This is the period of Cultural Revolution as it is called. The experience has proved that the theory and practice of class struggle between the working class and the national bourgeoisie taking antagonistic form was wrong because the bourgeoisie could be eliminated as a class through education and remoulding and the resistance from it was little or negligible. This is quite in accordance with what Mao said on the subject:

"Today, matters stand as follows: The large scale turbulent class struggles of the masses, characteristic of times of revolution, have in the main come to an end, but class struggle is by no means entirely over" (Mao: 'On Correct Handling of Contradictions Among People').

Mao explained further why the "class struggle is by no means entirely over" and adds: "In other words, time is needed for our socialist system to become established and consolidated for the masses to become accustomed to the new system and for government personnel to learn and acquire experience". Mao had made it clear beyond doubt that there will be class struggle under conditions of socialism, under conditions of dictatorship of proletariat. But it is of a different nature than that of a revolution when it is intense and turbulent. The class struggle which goes on during this stage takes a non-antagonistic form because it takes place between working class and its allies. This can happen because China was a semi-feudal country where the New Democratic Revolution was successful under the leadership of the Chinese proletariat. The dictatorship of people's democracy which was established as a result of this took the path of socialism. The New Democratic China transformed into Socialist China without a second revolution of new democratic type. At the same time it is a revolution. We call it continuous revolution in this sense.

Mao was also the author of the theory that bourgeoisie is a class against which the class struggle would be of an intense and turbulent nature, which goes against his earlier theory Socialist construction had to pay a heavy price by its practice because the target of intense class struggle was widened to hit the national bourgeoisie, which was uncalled for and which was undergoing a transformation by the policy of education and remoulding, and on the verge of being

eliminated as a class. That there could be resistance from incorrigible elements is obvious. But they could be dealt with in accordance with law.

In this connection, let us understand what Lenin has said in relation to this subject when there was a dictatorship of the proletariat in Russia:

"In Russia, the dictatorship of the proletariat must inevitably differ in certain particulars from what it would be in the advanced countries owing to the very great backwardness and petty-bourgeois character of our country. But the basic forces - and the basic forms of social economy-are the same in Russia as in any capitalist country so that the peculiarities can apply only to what is of lesser importance".(Economics and Politics of the Era of Dictatorship of Proletariat).

Here he compares and contrasts Russia with more advanced countries where there was no socialism as yet. But he did not extend it to the semi-colonial and semi-feudal countries of the East (Asia). He mentions certain particulars of Russia, being a backward country. Semi-colonial and semi-feudal country like China was not only more backward than Russia but differed fundamentally from it in that, it was a country oppressed by imperialism. Therefore the national bourgeoisie bore a different character than that of Russia, with a dual role, revolutionary as well as conciliationist. In Russia, bourgeoisie was counter-revolutionary during the state of bourgeois democratic revolution. With these characteristics and the proletarian policy of education and remoulding, the bourgeoisie is not the same as that of Russia. Therefore what Lenin said about peculiarities to be applied to what is of lesser importance assumed more importance than ever regarding China simply because it was a semi-colonial and semi-feudal country where socialism is being built.

Lenin says further:

"Socialism means the abolition of classes. The dictatorship of the proletariat has done all it could to abolish classes. But classes can not be abolished at one stroke.

And the classes still remain and will remain in the era of dictatorship of the proletariat. The dictatorship will become unnecessary when the classes disappear. Without the dictatorship of the proletariat, they will not disappear.

"Classes have remained, but in the era of the dictatorship of the proletariat, every class has undergone a change and the relations between the classes have also changed. The class struggle does not disappear under the dictatorship of the proletariat. It merely assumes different forms" (Emphasis by Lenin).*

Lenin emphasised that there will be classes in the era of dictatorship of the proletariat. He also emphasises that every class undergoes a change. This should apply to the classes in Chinese society where there is a dictatorship of the proletariat. He also speaks of different forms of class struggle which obviously include non-antagonistic (He had in mind working peasant etc.) because antagonism, according to Mao, is only a form but not the only form.

Lenin has something to say about the exploiters and their resistance as following:

"Having over-thrown the bourgeoisie and conquered political power, the proletariat has become the ruling class; it wields state power, it exercises control over means of production already socialised; it guides the wavering and intermediary elements and classes; it crushes the increasingly stubborn resistance of the exploiters. All these are specific tasks of the class struggle -- tasks which the proletariat formerly did not, and could not have, set itself".

Here Lenin speaks of a different role of the proletariat as a ruling class, which was not there when it was struggling for power. The tasks mentioned here are hard to perform for a class which is new to power. Lenin also speaks of intermediary elements and classes. Finally, he speaks of stubborn resistance of exploiting classes and the need to crush it by the dictatorship of the proletariat. In China, CPC and Mao adopted a policy of education and remoulding of the exploiters, i.e., the national bourgeoisie and the rich peasants with success. This is a policy of class struggle of a non-antagonistic form. There were those who were not amenable to this policy. They were dealt in accordance with the prevailing law. There was no need to developing a turbulent class struggle for this purpose.

Then we have the following from Lenin which was mis-interpreted and wrongly applied to conditions in China:

"The class of exploiters, the land owners and capitalists has not disappeared and can not disappear all at once under the

*See Lenin *On Concessions* in the Appendix.

dictatorship of the proletariat. The exploiters have been smashed but not destroyed. They still have an international base in the form of international capital of which they are a branch. They still retain certain means of production in part, they still have money, they still have vast social connections. Because they have been defeated, the energy of their resistance has increased a hundred and a thousand fold.....:

(All these extracts are taken from the **Economics and Politics of the Era of the Dictatorship of the Proletariat**. Collected Works.....Vol.30)

What Lenin said about the dictatorship of the proletariat in Russia applies to China as well with a difference which is the result of peculiarities of Chinese revolution. China consists of not only the mainland but Taiwan also. Taken together, we can have a comprehensive understanding of what Lenin said and what has happened in China. Taiwan has been the centre of Chiang Kai-shek's counter-revolution and US imperialism ever since the revolution ended in victory. It continues even today. The class of exploiters and their international base is there in Taiwan which is a part of China. Once it was strong and today it is too weak to pose a danger. It should be noted that China has been trying for a peaceful unification with Taiwan all along in spite of its being a centre of counter-revolution and US imperialism. Inside mainland they retained certain means of production in part; they have money; they still have vast social connections inside mainland as well, as Lenin said. Though they were deprived of means of production, the money and social relations are playing counter-revolutionary role, which is being handled firmly according to the law. This is going on today when there is socialism and dictatorship of proletariat. Though a small section of national bourgeoisie or its individuals have joined the counter-revolutionaries, by and large, the entire bourgeoisie was eliminated as a class through education and remoulding. It is one of the forms of class struggle. Therefore, the bitterest part of the struggle waged by overthrown classes can be seen from authorities in Taiwan and, to some extent, in mainland itself.

Therefore, there is no reason to contend that the entire bourgeoisie (national) had gone counter revolutionary in China under conditions of dictatorship of proletariat. In the same way, there is no point in the argument that the dictatorship of the proletariat should have used the same measure of force as was done in Russia.

The Cultural Revolution started by Com. Mao was the result of wrong theories which are inconsistent and opposed to his own theories on contradictions and class struggle though there was the question of assessment of internal situation of the CPC also. Treating the national bourgeoisie under conditions of dictatorship of the proletariat on par with overthrown classes by New Democratic Revolution was one of them. Secondly, the nature and content of the class struggle was treated to be the same as directed against those classes.

Com. Mao's earlier theories bore a different meaning than what was imparted to the Cultural Revolution of 1966-76. It was: Cultural Revolution was a revolution directed against imperialist and feudal culture; it is part of New Democratic Revolution and subordinated to it. During the stage of Socialist Revolution it is directed against bourgeois culture; it is a part of Socialist Revolution and subordinated to it. But the Cultural Revolution which was started in 1966 had nothing in common with this theory, with the result, it had given a serious blow to the building of socialism. Since it lasted for about 10 years, the harm done by it was more than what it would have been by committing small mistakes.

Here is what Com. Mao says about the New Democratic Culture:

".....New Democratic Culture is the proletarian-led, anti-imperialist and anti-feudal culture of the broad masses."

Mao defines Cultural Revolution as following:

*"A cultural revolution is the ideological reflection of the political and economic revolution and is in their service. In China there is a united front in the cultural as well as in the political revolution.
(On New Democracy)*

It is clear that just like new democratic culture is anti-feudal and anti-imperialist, socialist culture is proletarian culture which is opposed to bourgeois culture. In the same way, the proletarian cultural revolution is directed against bourgeois culture and the remnants of imperialist and feudal culture.

But the Cultural Revolution which was started in 1966 had a different connotation. Here is what the Resolution of the Central Committee, CPC (August 1966) says:

Although the bourgeoisie has been overthrown, it is still trying to use the old ideas, culture, customs and habits of the exploiting classes to corrupt the masses, capture their minds and endeavour to stage a come-back. The proletariat must do just the opposite: it must meet head on every challenge of the bourgeoisie in the ideological field and use the new ideas, culture, customs and habits of the proletariat to change the mental outlook of the whole society.

Here the starting point itself took a wrong direction. The bourgeoisie (national) was not overthrown in China when the stage of socialist revolution had begun. Instead it was educated and remoulded and eliminated as a class, as is explained earlier. On the contrary, imperialism, landlords and bureaucratic capitalists were overthrown. They were trying to stage a come-back during the stage of socialist revolution also. It is quite natural that a section of the bourgeoisie refused to get remoulded and joined the enemy camp. But it did not make any fundamental difference in the role of the bourgeoisie. Therefore by treating bourgeoisie on par with already overthrown classes, the target of the attack was widened and got diverted. At the same time, it is still necessary to carry on struggle against bourgeois ideology, which is one of the chief tasks of the dictatorship of proletariat. But the struggle takes a non-antagonistic form.

The resolution further says:

At present our objective is to struggle against and crush those persons in authority who are taking the capitalist road, to criticise and repudiate the bourgeois academic authorities.....

Here the Cultural Revolution crossed its limits and passed on into the realm of political revolution. If there were deviations which lead to capitalist road, a struggle could be carried on to eliminate them, in accordance with the principles of party organisation. There was no need to seek other ways to crush them than the party and legal channels available to dictatorship of the proletariat. If the parts of the super structure -- education, literature, arts etc., -- do not correspond with the socialist economic base, they can be changed accordingly, to facilitate the consolidation and development of socialist system. But the cultural revolution took a different course.

The resolution further says:

Since the cultural revolution is a revolution, it inevitably meets

with a resistance. This resistance comes from those in authority who have wormed their way into the party and are taking the capitalist road.

The attempts at restoration of capitalism have to be fought on two fronts: It has to be fought inside the party. It is likely that there were differences on the policy to be adopted in this respect. Building socialism in a former semi-colonial and semi-feudal country like China is a new experience and there are likely to be differences on the policies to be adopted. Instead of seeing them as differences, perhaps serious also, they were treated as attempts at restoration and the advocates of the line were branded as Capitalist Roaders. It must be noted that most of the comrades who differed with the policies of cultural revolution were not new comers. They were veterans belonging to the period of Long March. How can they worm their way into the Party (CPC) when they themselves were established as leaders?

There is a difference between resistance and resistance. One may take antagonistic form and another may take a non-antagonistic form. While educating and remoulding the national bourgeoisie, the proletariat is bound to meet with resistance from it before it transformed itself so as to get eliminated. By and large, this is mostly non-antagonistic form of resistance. A few of them put up stiff resistance which was put down by the dictatorship of the proletariat. This policy will continue as long as there are counter-revolutionaries putting up resistance.

Russian communists had to meet a different type of resistance in the form of civil war waged by the overthrown classes for about three years. Lenin had said the following in this context:

"The dictatorship of proletariat means a persistent struggle, bloody and bloodless, violent and peaceful, military and economic, educational and administrative -- against the forces and traditions of the old society. The force of habit, of habit in millions and tens of millions, is a most formidable force....." (*"Left"-wing Communism -- An Infantile Disorder*).

That there will be a continuous struggle as long as there is a dictatorship of the proletariat is obvious. Sometimes it takes the form of the bloody struggle and some other times bloodless. The same is the case with violent and peaceful forms. Unless there is a war which is bloody and violent, the struggle takes the bloodless

and peaceful form, once the counter-revolution is crushed. Lenin speaks of military and economic, educational and administrative fields but not political. Whereas Cultural Revolution was developed into a political revolution for which there was no theoretical or objective basis whatsoever. China had to face intense resistance both at home and abroad when it was encircled by both U S imperialism and Soviet Social imperialism (upto 1971). But when the encirclement was broken and relations with US were normalised, situation had improved to a greater extent, though the problem of Taiwan continued to exist in a different form.

The Chinese revolution had undergone civil war and anti-Japanese national war for about more than two decades. Therefore, some of the tasks of New Democratic Revolution, including Cultural Revolution, were completed in a major part of China, by the time the dictatorship of people's democracy was established. The rest of them were completed by the dictatorship itself. This was not the case with Russia, where all the tasks were completed only after the proletariat had seized power. Therefore, the amount of resistance was more in Russia than what it was in China, though Taiwan is a monument of such resistance in varying degrees, for the last three decades and more. Added to this, there is Dalai Lama, the representative of Tibetan counter-revolution, who staged an unsuccessful revolt in Tibet and who is now taking shelter in India, carrying on his counter-revolutionary activities. He is having the patronage and protection of Indian reaction.

Therefore it is inobjective and wrong to say that the national bourgeoisie which was re-educated and remoulded played a counter-revolutionary role and men in "authority" were its representatives. The fact of the matter was, there are others who are counter-revolutionaries (imperialists, landlords, bureaucratic capitalists) who are to be treated as such. Therefore the class struggle was off the mark, widening the target was wrong and disruptive. The Cultural Revolution which was conducted as a political revolution was wrong. Instead there were possibilities of working out ways and means so as to allow the people to participate and implement mass line to carry on Cultural Revolution as a part of socialist revolution. Mao did not adopt such a course. Instead, he adopted the course of political revolution which had disastrous effects on socialism in China. Linbiao affair and the activities of the "Gang of Four" are only the extreme cases.

These are the main points to be understood about the recent developments in China in the recent past (1966-76).

6

These developments in China are a much-talked subject in our country. For that matter, it was the case with every phase of Chinese revolution. We can not say that the discussion will come to an end with the CPC leadership adopting a resolution on the subject (*Resolution on Certain Questions in the History of Our Party Since the Founding of the People's Republic of China*). There will be differences on the Resolution also. So the discussion will continue. We have come across persons who claim to be revolutionaries and who go on discussing about China endlessly, not bothering what is happening around them. That apart, there are some parties, groups and individuals who were waiting for a day when the present leadership of the CPC would denounce Mao Zedong Thought outright. But to their disappointment it did not materialise. Therefore they are busy working out their own theories -- wrong theories at that -- that the present leadership's adherence to the Marxism-Leninism-Mao Zedong Thought is not genuine. There is no basis for such a contention.

We in our country have been supporting Cultural Revolution in all its aspects with the understanding that a struggle is going on against non-proletarian ideologies, more so against reactionary ones with participation of the masses of the people, which is necessary to build socialism. We thought that it is new to the Marxism-Leninism and it is essential to the socialist countries to have it. We understood the excesses within this frame-work alone. At the same time we had our own opinions of Charu Majumdar's application of it to Indian Revolution. We had never reconciled with it and carried on struggle against it. (See: *The Left Trend Among Indian Revolutionaries*)* Therefore it was not difficult for us to understand the struggle which was going on inside CPC and China, though we had our own limitations. It is but natural that the communist revolutionaries who are busy with building a mass revolutionary movement and a revolutionary organisation to lead it are in a better position to understand the nature and content of the struggle which has been going on in China, than those who are isolated from the people.

*An extract from this work is published in p.33.

We are firmly of opinion that the resolution adopted by the Central Committee of CPC is basically a correct appraisal of the developments ever since the founding of the People's Republic of China. It is necessary that the communist revolutionaries in our country review our own work, and learn from our experiences so that we may advance further.

On the occasion of 32nd anniversary of founding the People's Republic of China, we are greeting the CPC, and the people of China, together with its leadership, and wish its success in building socialism.

Long Live Chinese Socialist Revolution.

Long Live Marxism-Leninism-Mao Zedong Thought.

(17-10-1981)