

NATIONAL LIBERATION AND NATIONAL DEMOCRACY

The section of the Moscow Statement dealing with the national liberation movement and national democracy has the greatest value and significance for us for the purpose of understanding the developments in India after the Second World War as also for chalking out our path for the future.

This section gives us a brilliant and concrete analysis of how the revolutionary national liberation movement is breaking up the colonial system and achieving national independence in the new conditions of the growing superiority of the socialist system over the capitalist system, under conditions of peaceful coexistence and peaceful competition between the two. It also works out the strategical-tactical line for the further advance of the movement through national democracy and the non-capitalist path to socialism.

Two points should be disposed of at the very beginning for they crop up again and again in all Chinese writings.

First, the collapse of the colonial system is the result of the powerful blows showered on it by the people of the oppressed nations. National independence has to be secured and has been secured, by means of the heroic and extremely self-sacrificing struggles of people of the oppressed countries themselves. The further advance from political independence to complete social and economic emancipation also has to be brought about through unflagging struggle. There is no question of imperialism or internal reaction bestowing freedom and prosperity on the people of the oppressed or newly independent countries.

Second, while the forces of world socialism have contri-

buted decisively to the struggle of the colonial and dependent peoples for national liberation, the national liberation movement has also assisted the cause of socialism, the socialist countries, and the working class movement in advanced capitalist countries, by weakening and undermining imperialism. Similarly, if the struggle for peaceful coexistence and peaceful competition has created favourable conditions for the struggle for national independence, the successes of the latter, in their turn, have made a valuable contribution to the cause of peace. There is no question of a contraposition between the two, nor of "substituting" peaceful competition for the revolutionary struggles of the oppressed nations.

Having stated this, the fact remains, and that is what calls for concrete study and examination, that the process of colonial disintegration and national liberation after the Second World War, the varieties of independent states that it has thrown up, their further development along the path of socio-economic advance, the class differentiations and alliances that have emerged, etc., unquestionably display various new features and open up new vistas of advance that did not exist, and were not anticipated, before the Second World War.

This is an extremely complex and complicated problem on which rigid, sweeping or oversimplified generalisations must certainly be avoided. The pace and actual course of development vary from country to country. The composition and patterns of the emergent states are characterised by different varieties and transitions. No formula can substitute the necessity and responsibility of every communist party to study the peculiarities of its own country. At the same time, the new phenomena have to be faced and reckoned with. There can be no justification for closing one's eyes to them or denying them in the name of the purity of Marxism or by raising the ghost of revisionism.

The analysis and conclusions of the 81-Parties' Confer-

ence on this question were not arrived at in a hurry. They were the results of years of patient study and observation. At the Conference itself, the communist parties of the newly-independent countries took an active part in formulating the conclusions embodied in the Statement.

In certain respects, this issue also goes back to the 20th Congress of the CPSU. And its investigation and elaboration were by no means concluded at the Moscow Conference. Studied articles enriching the thesis of the Conference in respect of this or that country continue to appear in the *World Marxist Review*. The 22nd Congress of the CPSU also dealt with it.

Coming to our own Party, Com. Ajoy Ghosh, reporting on the 20th Congress of the CPSU to the Palghat Congress in 1956, said:

The growing strength of socialism helps the disintegration of the colonial system. This is a very big factor in world politics. Marxism-Leninism had predicted the inevitable collapse of the colonial system. But the collapse is not proceeding everywhere in the same way as was predicted. This has got to be clearly seen. We thought that it would proceed in only one way, namely, conquest of power by the masses led by the working class, establishment of the democratic dictatorship of the working class and the peasantry, and the revolutionary overthrow of imperialist rule. This has happened in a number of countries—China, Vietnam, etc.—though there also, there have been modifications in the state forms. But today the disintegration of the colonial system is proceeding in a different way also. That is, in that disintegration, the strength of the socialist world has played a major role. (*Typed Minutes*, pp. 34-35)

He then referred to "the strength of the mass movement in India which the imperialists found it difficult to suppress" and continued.

We have to take into account the development that has taken place in India and in a number of colonial countries. In India, at the end of the Second World War, power was transferred into the hands of the bourgeoisie... Power was transferred in countries like Burma and Ceylon... The leadership of the mass movements in these countries was in the hands of the bourgeoisie.

Further,

The imperialists thought that they could strike a bargain with it (the national bourgeoisie) and thus maintain their rule intact. Have the imperialists' hopes materialised? To a certain extent, in the sense that in many of these countries, their economy still continues powerful. They also hoped that their military strategy, political domination, etc., would also continue and that they would be able to use the man-power and resources of these countries for their predatory purposes. This has not happened and I need not go into how we today find that countries like India, Burma, Indonesia, have won freedom and what has happened recently in Ceylon. (p. 35)

Thus, as early as in 1956, Comrade Ajoy Ghosh drew attention to three new features of the colonial liberation struggle. He also traced their roots to the growing strength of the socialist camp, the developing crisis of imperialism and the new might of the colonial liberation upsurge.

First, whereas formerly we held that national independence could not be achieved without the bourgeoisie being dislodged from the leadership of the independence movement and the working class coming to head it, in the new situation, many national freedom movements led by the national bourgeoisie had achieved national freedom.

Second, whereas formerly we held that such freedom, even if secured, would remain formal and unreal, with imperialism still retaining real power in its hands, this was not how things had actually turned out. The task of up-

rooting imperialist strongholds in the national economy remained and had to be fulfilled, but that did not make national independence unreal.

Third, whereas formerly we held that national independence would come only through a revolutionary overthrow of imperialist rule, in the new situation the people of a number of colonial countries had won independence (to use the expression later used by the Moscow Statement) "both by armed struggle and by non-military methods, depending on the specific conditions in the country concerned." Our own country is an outstanding example.

We must frankly recognise that it was our failure to see precisely these three factors that led to the main formulations of the thesis adopted by our Second Party Congress in 1948. That thesis tells us that "Britain's domination has not ended but the form of domination has changed." Indian independence "is fake, not real." "The state it (the bourgeoisie) has won is dependent on imperialism, and is a satellite state." (pp. 39, 40, 49) The Indian bourgeoisie is also described as "having crowned the process of bourgeois vacillation with final capitulation." (p. 39)

The Programme of our Party, adopted at our all-India Party Conference in 1951, is no different in this respect. It also speaks of the "people of India being led to believe that foreign imperialist rule was at an end" and of "this government hanging on to the will of the British imperialists," "a government pledged to the protection and preservation of the landlords, princes and foreign British capital." (pp. 1 and 7)

Already at the Third Congress of our Party at Madurai in January 1954, we had come to the conclusion that the characterisation of India's foreign policy as made in the Party Programme of 1951 was wrong. Hence at that Congress we deleted the qualifications referring to India's foreign policy as "a suspicious play between the two camps" and "flirting with the USA thus facilitating the

struggle of the aggressors against peace-loving countries."

At Palghat, in 1956 we ceased to consider the Indian government as one of the collaborationist big bourgeois and landlords, subservient to imperialism. We clearly recognised India's national independence. We characterised it as a "bourgeois-landlord government in which the bourgeoisie is the leading force." (*Political Resolution*, p. 21)

The vacillating and compromising policies of the government towards imperialism and the landlords were clearly stated. Its anti-people policies were criticised. The limitations of its policies in solving India's basic problems were brought out. The role and necessity of mass struggles in bringing about a shift in the situation were highlighted.

But at the same time, the Palghat resolution clearly placed India among the newly-independent countries and in the world peace camp, pursuing an anti-colonial, anti-imperialist foreign policy based on non-alignment.

Similarly, the fact that the government not only could but was building an independent capitalist economy in India based on industrialisation was recognised. The role of the public sector in building such an economy was accepted. It was clearly stated that this was possible due to the disinterested and generous aid of the Soviet Union and other socialist countries. Thus, one more of our earlier positions, that in a formerly colonial country, an independent national economy could only be built by a people's democratic government headed by the working class was given up.

At the Amritsar Congress, in 1958, we noted the emergence of the "anti-national forces of right reaction", openly demanding a pro-Western, anti-socialist-countries, and viciously anti-popular orientation to the policies of the government. It was pointed out that these forces grow because of the halting and anti-people policies of the government itself and that, besides the right reactionary political parties that represented them, they had their

representatives in the Congress as well. At the same time, a distinction between the policies of the government as a whole and those advocated by right reaction was clearly made. As pointed out earlier, at Amritsar we also accepted the prospect of a peaceful transition in India.

At the Vijayawada Congress of our Party in 1961, in his speech at the Congress which was formally adopted by the Congress, Comrade Ajoy Ghosh gave a resume of the economic and political developments in the country after independence, where also he referred to many of our earlier positions and evaluations. The resume needs to be quoted:

A number of important developments have taken place in the economic sphere during the last three years. These have been dealt with at some length in the Political Resolution and need not, therefore, be elaborated.

At the same time, it is necessary to pose certain questions sharply and answer them.

One of the most important of these questions is as follows:

Taking the last 13 years as a whole, i.e., since the advent of freedom, has the contradiction between imperialism on one hand and the entire Indian people, including the national bourgeoisie, on the other, sharpened or weakened? And further, what has been the outcome of that contradiction?

This is no mere academic question. It has vital bearing on the strategy as well as immediate tactics of our Party. As we all know, the old Programme of our Party adopted in October 1951 and also at the Madurai Congress in January, 1954 had been hailed by the world communist movement as a document of great importance and a work of creative Marxism. It played a big and positive role in unifying our Party. However, soon after Madurai, a series of events forced us to come to the conclusion that

the Programme suffered from serious defects. And even in June 1955, in the Political Resolution adopted by our Central Committee, we gave up some of the major formulations of the Programme. Such formulations as, 'this government hanging on to the will of the British Commonwealth', the schemes of reconstruction 'all floundering except such as feed war purposes,' the government of India 'essentially carries out the foreign policy of British imperialism' were in conflict with living reality. They could not explain Bandung, they could not explain the Panch Sheel, they could not explain the Second Five-Year Plan. We had to make substantial and radical changes in these formulations in June 1955, i.e., within 18 months after Madurai and still further changes at Palghat in April 1956.

This became necessary because, although the old Programme contained many correct statements, it missed certain essential factors in the new situation. They were:

- (1) The contradiction between the *national bourgeoisie* on one hand and imperialism on the other.
- (2) The role that mass urge for consolidation and strengthening of national freedom and national economy could play.
- (3) And above all, the vast and decisive significance of the emergence of socialism as a world system, its impact on the course of development in our country.

Instead of the over-simplified and one-sided formulations of the Programme, which almost made out that the government of India was a satellite government which carried out the dictates of imperialism and under which practically no advance could be made, Palghat gave us a new and richer understanding. The dual role of the national bourgeoisie was brought out clearly. While not minimising the compromising role of the bourgeoisie, Palghat recognised the growth of 'conflict and contradictions' between 'imperialism and feudalism on one

hand and the needs of India's economic development on the other', which was 'reflected also in the growth of conflicts and contradictions between the government of India and imperialism.'

Has that contradiction vanished? Has it subsided? Our answer to this question is: No, it has not. It has sharpened. Further, as the result of the sharpening of contradiction between imperialism and the entire people, including the national bourgeoisie, our national independence rests today on a firmer economic foundation than before. A number of industries of great strategic importance have been built. The public sector has become an important factor in the development of such industries.

There are many negative features that should cause concern to all patriots but they do not obliterate the big reality — the strengthening of the economic base of our national freedom. (*New Situation and Our Tasks*, pp. 13-14)

This brief review of our Party's positions since 1948 has not been made with the intention of tracing the history of our Party policy since the end of the Second World War. That is a big task outside the scope of this document, nor is it necessary for our purpose here.

The purpose of this brief narration is to point out that, through our own experience and study, as also from the lessons of the international communist movement, we were ourselves advancing towards the conclusions which were later summed up, in a comprehensive and scientific manner, by the 81-Parties' Conference and Statement. What is more, the Moscow Statement also indicated the course of further advance and development.

It has to be noted, in fact it must be emphasised, that the Moscow Statement makes no effort to pigeonhole the newly-independent states born out of the revolutionary national liberation movement into different clear-cut cate-

gories. This omission is not accidental. It is deliberate and correct, and expresses the scientific and revolutionary approach of the Moscow Statement to the problem under consideration. That is the problem of the transition of the national-democratic revolutionary movement from the achievement of national independence to the threshold of socialism. This transition involves the question of the correlation of class forces that achieves national independence, the tasks to be achieved for advancing from national independence to social liberation, the correlation of forces within the newly-independent state that carries out those tasks, and inevitably, the shifts in the correlation of forces that take place *within that state in the very process of advancing from national independence to socialism.*

It is not only not possible but wrong to attempt to categorise the forms of the state in such a transition into watertight compartments. Only a broad and flexible indication has to be given. The decisive factor that determines their nature is the sweep of the revolutionary movement, its breadth, intensity and pace.

For the same reason also, the Moscow Statement does not treat the non-capitalist path which is inseparably linked up with the preceding question, as though it were a clear-cut, stable type of economy, which it is not. There is a colonial economy, a capitalist economy, a socialist economy. There is no such thing as a non-capitalist economy. Hence, what is meant by the non-capitalist path is a variety, a series of *transitional* economic measures which, after the attainment of national independence, restrict the development of the national economy in accordance with the laws of capitalism, and divert it towards the ultimate goal of the social ownership and management of the means of production and distribution. When and how these measures can and should be adopted in any particular country would naturally be decided by the strength and sweep of the revolutionary movement and the development of the

productive forces in the country.

It should also be clarified that the class import of such transitional measures is not identical in all circumstances. It is related to the class character of the state that adopts the measure in question. For instance, in the case of a newly-independent, bourgeois-democratic state such as India, the state ownership of heavy industry, banks, etc., has certainly an anti-imperialist and anti-monopoly character. State trading in imports and exports has also the same content, for it should enable India to restrict one of the biggest sources of foreign loot, viz., unequal terms of exchange with colonial and the newly independent countries. State trading in grain based on the payment of economic prices to the peasant will surely hit at monopoly trading profits in food. Besides, it would give a distinct impetus to increased agricultural production by ridding Indian agriculture of the biggest single means of rural exploitation, viz., private trading in grains, which makes it an uneconomic occupation today.

In brief, nationalisation today has a definitely progressive value. But it would not be correct to characterise such measures, in our existing circumstances, as non-capitalist measures.

But in a different historical context, backed by a powerful mass movement that enables the working class and its main ally the peasantry, to secure a powerful voice in the state itself, (though not yet a decisive voice), such measures would develop a non-capitalist import, in so far as they would help to bridge the transition to socialism.

Lenin once pointed out that under a bourgeois regime, the expropriation of feudal landownership and the distribution of land to the tillers opens out the path for capitalist development in agriculture. The same measure, under a government headed by the working class, opens out the path to socialist agriculture, and, in that sense, becomes a socialist measure.

Even in today's situation, nationalisation in India has the added significance that it helps forward the struggle for the non-capitalist path by giving greater opportunity for parliamentary intervention (including the intervention of progressive opposition parties) in state managed undertakings, and by teaching the people, through actual experience, that the full social purpose of nationalisation can only be achieved by relentlessly pressing forward to a genuinely popular control of the government and the country's economy.

Subject to these clarifications, it can be stated that the post-Second World War period presents us with four types of newly-independent states that were formerly colonial or semi-colonial and dependent. The first is the people's democracies that have already begun the construction of socialism. Then we have countries like India, independent, bourgeois-democratic, and pursuing a peaceful and anti-colonial policy. We have certain African states which are also independent, anti-colonial and peaceful, but which were more or less in tribal conditions when they achieved independence. And we have the countries with dictatorial regimes which have joined the imperialist military blocs, thereby substantially losing their independence in the bargain.

Besides, there are the countries which are still fighting to overthrow colonial rule. And there are the South American countries, semi-colonial and held down by the stooges of American imperialism.

Reading the Eighty-one Parties' Statement, it is clear that the slogan of national democracy is meant for all these peoples and states, except, of course, the first category which has already taken the road to socialism.

The Statement defines "an independent national democracy" as under:

In the present historical situation, favourable domestic and international conditions arise in many countries for

the establishment of an independent national democracy, that is, a state which consistently upholds its political and economic independence, fights against imperialism and its military blocs, against military bases on its territory; a state which fights against the new forms of colonialism and the penetration of imperialist capital; a state which rejects dictatorial and despotic methods of government; a state in which the people are ensured broad democratic rights and freedoms (freedom of speech, press, assembly, demonstrations, establishment of political parties and social organisations), the opportunity to work for the enactment of an agrarian reform and other democratic and social changes, and for participation in shaping government policy. The formation and consolidation of national democracies enables the countries concerned to make rapid social progress and play an active part in the people's struggle for peace, against the aggressive policies of the imperialist camp, for the complete abolition of colonial yoke.

The Communist Parties are working actively for a consistent completion of the anti-imperialist, anti-feudal, democratic revolution for the establishment of national democracies, for a radical improvement in the living standard of the people. (Statement, pp. 30-31)

Concretely, what tasks does a national democracy carry out? These have been described as the "urgent tasks of national rebirth," and elaborated as quoted below:

The urgent tasks of national rebirth facing the countries that have shaken off the colonial yoke cannot be effectively accomplished unless a determined struggle is waged against imperialism and the remnants of feudalism by all the patriotic forces of the nation united in a single national-democratic front. The national democratic tasks on the basis of which the progressive forces of the nation can and do unite in the countries which

have won their freedom, are: the consolidation of political independence, the carrying out of agrarian reforms in the interest of the peasantry, elimination of the survivals of feudalism, the uprooting of imperialist economic domination, the restriction of foreign monopolies and their expulsion from the national economy, the creation and development of a national industry, improvement of the living standard, the democratisation of social life, the pursuance of an independent and peaceful foreign policy, and the development of economic cultural cooperation with the socialist and other friendly countries.

The working class, which has played an outstanding role in the fight for national liberation, demands the complete and consistent accomplishment of the tasks of the national, anti-imperialist, democratic revolution and resists reactionary attempts to check social progress. (*ibid*, pp. 28-29)

One thing is absolutely clear from these statements, viz., that national democracies are the instrument of the thorough-going and consistent completion of the national, anti-imperialist, anti-feudal, democratic revolution and that they bridge the transition to the non-capitalist path of development towards socialism.

Naturally, the question arises here: Why a national democracy? Why not a people's democracy as we have demanded in the past?

Part of the reply to this question is that in a number of countries of Africa very little bourgeois development has taken place and hence the proletariat is very small in numbers and organisation or non-existent. And since a people's democracy, even in its first stage, is headed by the working class, we cannot correctly speak of a people's democracy in such countries. They have to advance to socialism through a national democracy.

But this can only be a part of the reply. For, the Moscow Statement speaks of national democracies generally for all newly-independent and backward countries and those which are still fighting for independence, not merely for those which have hardly advanced beyond the tribal stage.

So, does the question of national democracy arise in such countries also? It certainly does.

It arises in this way — that the new historical conditions are mainly determined by the superiority of the socialist system over the capitalist system and the new stage of the crisis of imperialism. Socialist ideas have a far wider appeal now. Valuable aid from socialist countries enables the patriotic sections of the bourgeoisie to pursue firmer anti-imperialist policies.*

Under these conditions opportunities do arise in which the tasks of the national, anti-imperialist, anti-feudal, democratic revolution can be carried out by a fighting alliance of the working class, the peasantry and the patriotic sections of the bourgeoisie, in which the working class plays a very important role but has not yet achieved leadership. The working class shares power with the patriotic bourgeoisie in the state. The struggle for working class leadership and for the non-capitalist path goes on, not merely in the sphere of the leadership of mass struggles for

*The Soviet Union alone is helping to build 32 big industrial projects in India, some of them have already been completed and gone into production. Among them are the Bhilai Steel Plant, the Heavy Machine-Building Plant at Ranchi, the thermal power station at Neyveli, the oil refinery at Barauni, etc. In the newly independent countries of Asia, Africa and Latin America about 500 industrial plants are being built by the Soviet Union and over 400 by the other socialist states. Socialist aid is qualitatively different from imperialist 'aid', not only in this that there is not the remotest element of exploitation in it, but also in this that it concentrates on helping the newly-independent countries to build basic industries which strengthen their economic and political independence. Hence, too, the emphasis of the socialist countries on helping to build the public sector. Growing trade with socialist countries also helps the newly-independent countries to weaken the imperialist hold over their economy.

the execution of the programme of the national democratic revolution and moving further, *but also within the state structure*. The correlation of class forces goes on changing, has to be changed, in the state as well. Such a state, broadly speaking, is a national democracy.

National democracy can only arise in the context of a revolutionary popular struggle in which the working class succeeds in securing the alliance of the peasantry, the middle classes *and also* the anti-imperialist, anti-feudal, anti-monopoly sections of the bourgeoisie. It arises in the context of a profound crisis within the national bourgeoisie as a whole and a sharp conflict between its reactionary and progressive sections. Mass struggles for economic and general democratic demands are the most powerful lever of intensifying this conflict.

In Indian conditions, according to our Party Constitution adopted at Amritsar, the transformation of Parliament into an instrument of the people's will that will carry out basic social and democratic reforms can be brought about by peaceful means and the Communist Party has to strive to make the transition peaceful. The prospects of such a peaceful transition are also related, mainly, to the prospect of the working class being able to broaden the anti-imperialist, anti-feudal, anti-monopoly front by securing the alliance of the patriotic sections of the bourgeoisie. This again, is related to the character of the new epoch of world history.

However, whether the transition from bourgeois parliamentary democracy to national democracy takes place by peaceful or non-peaceful means, *in any case, it is a revolutionary transformation* and a transformation based on an alliance of the working class, the peasantry, the middle classes and the patriotic sections of the bourgeoisie against imperialism, the feudals and the monopolists.

This implies two things. First, that while the prospects of peaceful transition are closely linked with the working

class being able to secure the patriotic national bourgeoisie as an ally, the validity of the slogan of national democracy is not necessarily linked with the peaceful path. Even in the event of a monopoly-feudal alliance backed by imperialism making a peaceful transition impossible, the conflict between such an alliance and the patriotic sections of the bourgeoisie can and should grow. Thus the slogan of national democracy would still remain valid.

Secondly, since national democracy emerges through a revolutionary struggle, it cannot and should not be confused with some progressive popular coalition government, including or not including communists, which may arise in economic and political conditions not radically different from such as exist in our country today.

That such a problem had arisen, or was arising before certain communist parties was the reason why the Moscow Conference took cognisance of it and came forward with its solution in its Statement.

Will such a situation arise in India? No one can make a categorical prediction. But can it arise? Is it most likely to arise? To this, on the basis of our own experience of the post-independence period, we can definitely reply in the affirmative.

The bourgeoisie in India, as in the other newly-independent countries, has a vacillating, dual role. That is clear and out of question. But it is also in evidence in recent years that with the sharpening of the social contradictions in the country, with the growth of the mass movement, with the growth of monopoly within the country, with the increasingly evident limitations of the path of capitalist development for bringing about a rapid economic development and solving the problems of unemployment, food shortages, rising prices, etc., the contradictions and differentiation within the bourgeoisie are increasing. The monopoly sections and the landlords are becoming increasingly vehement in demanding pro-Western political and econo-

mic policies, an unbridled freedom for the private sector, a reactionary modification of even such land legislation as has been enacted, and more stringent repressive measures against the popular movement and progressive, democratic forces.

On the other hand, certain others are becoming increasingly critical and vociferous against such reactionary pressures, and calling, not for a watering down of progressive economic measures, but for firmer and more advanced measures in that direction. The questions of the nationalisation of banks, state-trading in foodgrains, vigorous implementation of land reforms, taking action against hoarding, blackmarketeering and monopoly profits, democratic liberties, etc., have been taken up by elements far broader than the traditional left.

This, in fact, is the deeper meaning and significance of the growing emergence and threat of the forces of right reaction of which we first took note at our Amritsar Party Congress in 1958. It explains the growing conflict between progressive Congressmen and the forces of reaction entrenched within the Congress, as also the growing collusion of the reactionary forces outside and inside the Congress.

All this, including the economic and political significance of the growth of the Swatantra Party, was brought out by our Vijayawada Political Resolution as also Comrade Ajoy Ghosh's speech at the Vijayawada Congress. The general elections of 1962 still further highlighted the same process, the latest and most significant reflection of which was seen at the Bhubaneswar session of the Indian National Congress.

How far this process will go will depend mainly on the development of the militant mass movement and the activities of the Communist Party, the trade unions, the kisan sabha, the organisations of students, youth and women, and the left and democratic forces inside and outside the Congress. It will depend on our capacity to forge a broad national democratic front of all these

elements taken together. That the situation, the opportunity and the pressing need are there, is clear for anyone who wants to see. Our Vijayawada Congress resolution gave a clear call for building precisely such a front. That aim has to be achieved in practice.

More proof is not necessary to prove that the slogan of national democracy, and the struggle to build a national democratic front for the achievement of national democracy are valid and correct for India.

Comrade N. S. Khrushchov, in his report to the 22nd Congress of the CPSU, said:

The countries that have gained their freedom from colonial oppression have entered a new phase of development. The struggle for political independence united all the national forces that suffered under the colonialists and shared common interests. Now that the time has come to tear up the roots of imperialism and introduce agrarian and other urgent social reforms, the differences in class interests are coming more and more into the open. Broad sections of the working people and also that considerable section of the national bourgeoisie interested in the accomplishment of the basic tasks of the anti-imperialist, anti-feudal revolution, want to go further in strengthening independence and effecting social and economic reforms. Within the ruling circles of those countries, however, there are forces that are afraid to go further in their collaboration with the democratic, progressive strata of the nation. They would like to appropriate the fruits of the people's struggle and hamper the further development of the national revolution. These forces compromise with imperialism outside the country and feudalism within, and resort to dictatorial methods. (*The Road to Communism*, pp. 31-32)

The issue could not be formulated more simply and better.

What has the CPC leadership to tell us about the *new* problems of the colonial liberation upsurge and of the newly-independent countries that have been thrown up by the course of historical development after the Second World War?

Nothing, literally nothing, beyond certain contributions which it had made on the question during its own revolutionary struggle which led up to the foundation of the PRC. There is no doubt that the Chinese leadership did make a valuable contribution to the theory and practice of the colonial liberation movement between the two world wars. It built up a broad united front based on a worker-peasant alliance, led by the working class, and including the patriotic sections of the bourgeoisie. It conducted an exemplary armed struggle, while, at the same time, utilising all other forms of struggle. It was the first communist party to concretely work out the concept of New Democracy, in which a patriotic section of the bourgeoisie would be included and which, led by the working class, would pave the way to socialism. It established such a democracy in actual life. The international communist movement has paid due tributes to the CPC for all these achievements.

But a parrot-like repetition of its earlier contribution and experiences does not help in the solution of the new problems posed by history. What is worse, the insistence of the CPC leadership on imposing its views and tactics drawn exclusively from its own experience, on the communist parties and mass movements in other countries, is harmful and positively objectionable.

On the question of the struggle of the colonial peoples for national independence, the CPC is explicit that it has got to be an armed struggle led by the working class for people's democracy. So the fact of a number of Asian and African countries—among them, India—having achieved national independence without armed struggle and under

bourgeois leadership has no lessons and deserves no consideration whatever in the eyes of the CPC leaders.

But what is even more amazing is its treatment of the subject of the countries that have newly achieved independence.

The Moscow Statement, as pointed out earlier, is at pains to point out how the newly-independent countries and the socialist countries constitute the new peace zone. It emphasises the anti-imperialist, anti-colonial significance of their neutralist, peaceful foreign policy. It emphasises that the key to the strengthening and consolidating of their political independence lies in their independent economic development, in eliminating the imperialist stranglehold over their economy, in land reforms, and in rapid industrialisation, primarily of basic industries. The socialist countries are called upon to give them all possible aid in the achievement of this task. All this is there in black and white.

The further development of the newly-independent countries is, of course, a political struggle. It is an anti-imperialist struggle. Wherever the imperialists threaten or actually resort to armed intervention in these states, such threats have to be rebuffed militarily, for which task also the socialist countries have to give them all the necessary help, which they have invariably done.

But the CPC has nothing to say about the new camp of peace, or about the key role of the independent economic development of the young states in undermining imperialism. All that is revisionism and worse, that is an apologia for neo-colonialism. And far from recognising the fact that in every single instance of imperialist military intervention against the new states, the Soviet Union has boldly, unhesitatingly and effectively rushed to their aid, the CPC leaders accuse the Soviet Union of joining hands with the imperialists in opposing national liberation and independence.

In fact, just as the CPC leadership contraposes the struggle for peaceful coexistence to the duty of the socialist countries to give armed support to peaceloving countries when they are subjected to imperialist aggression, similarly it makes a dichotomy of the economic development of the newly-independent countries and their anti-imperialist political struggle. It either fails to see or denies the relationship between the two.

And thus we are told that

it is important for the newly independent countries to develop their independent economy. *But* this task must never be separated from the struggle against imperialism, old and new colonialism and their lackeys. (*Hongqi and People's Daily*, October 22, 1963, p. 7.)

Why "but"? Why this refusal to recognise the anti-imperialist political significance of the independent economic development of the newly-independent countries?

Proceeding from such a dichotomy, we are also told that the

struggles in all these spheres still find their most concentrated expression in political struggle, which often unavoidably develops into armed struggle when the imperialists resort to direct or indirect armed suppression. (*ibid.*, p. 7.)

What utter confusion is this? Armed struggle by a subject people fighting for independence, the armed defence of a country which has already achieved independence, and the question of the forms of struggle within a newly-independent country, do not all these questions demand distinct and different consideration? Or are they to be jumbled up just because the use of guns and rifles is common in the first instance, unavoidable in the second instance, and possible in the third? Are not the *political* problems of using arms against foreign invasion and using them for the internal struggle for power not distinct and different?

But the CPC must doggedly refuse to separate these questions. No wonder! For otherwise, what will happen to the "open sesame" of armed struggle which is its universal panacea for all problems under the sun?

No wonder, too, that national democracy is like a red rag to the bull for the CPC leadership. The question of national democracy arises precisely because of the complications of the new stage of the disintegration of colonialism and the advance of the colonial people to political independence and social liberation. To pose these problems, to face the zig-zags and diversities of the new roads of advance, to discuss the new transitional forms of state, as the CPC leaders see it, is nothing but a cover and excuse for revisionism, for a betrayal of the colonial liberation movement.

That is why, in all its writings, it religiously sticks to the traditional formulae of a people's front composed of the workers, peasants and national bourgeoisie led by the working class, a revolutionary overthrow of imperialism by armed struggle, and the establishment of a people's democracy as the one and the only path to national independence and socialism for the colonial people and the oppressed nations.