

*Towards*

**AN UNDERSTANDING  
OF  
THE STATEMENT  
OF  
81 Communist & Workers Parties  
—Nagarjun**

**“Clarity Clara ! Clarity ! !**

**Again Clarity ! ! !”**

**—Lenin**

Four Annas

**Towards**  
**An Understanding**  
**o f**  
**The Statement**  
**o f**  
**81 Communist & Workers' Party**

---

In November 1960, a conference of representatives of 81 Communist and Workers' Parties was held in Moscow in which a statement was adopted unanimously. Along with *Cap-* the statement the *r* was an appeal to the peoples of the *Sm-* World.

The statement has the following six chapters, (1) Main content of our epoch, (2) New stage in development of Socialist system, (3) on struggle for peace and peaceful *Cap-* co-existence, (4) victories of National liberation movements, *Cap | Sm* (5) new opportunities in the new period and (6) unity and *Cap |* consolidation of World Communist movement.

The appeal is an appeal for peace demanding (1) the immediate prohibition of the testing, manufacture and use of nuclear weapons and all other weapons of mass annihilation *af* and (2) immediate conclusion of a treaty on general, complete and controlled disarmament.

The entire statement reverberates with the all-embracing theme of an urgent need of PEACE. So far, good. But the statement introduces a lot of other things which demand a scientific examination.

For the first time a communist statement has introduced a new theoretical item called as "National Democracy". Upto now we knew two types of democracy, (1) Bourgeois Democracy and (2) Proletarian Democracy. Now we have a third type of Democracy according to the signatories of the statement, termed as "National Democracy".

It has always been a practice in the World of Philosophers or Theoreticians to define a term whenever a new term is introduced in the World of thought. But that has not been done in the case of "National Democracy". The reader is left to give it a meaning. In the absence of any terminological meaning, it is but proper to take the pure literal meaning reached with the help of a dictionary.

But this popular approach may land us in a situation which, may be the signatories never visualised. Because offhand or outright or straightway, the implication would be that other democracies like Bourgeois democracy and Proletarian democracy, are something not national or non-national or the worst, anti-national. This will be an absurd proposition. Because, there may be some Bourgeois democracies which are working in anti-national way, but one of the Proletarian democracies could be so termed by the signatories. Thus most probably by the word "National Democracy" the signatories mean a type of Bourgeois democracy which is advancing national interest.

But the difficulty is that according to prevalent understanding of Marxism-Leninism and its theory about state, the state power is always in the hands of a class. In modern

world, this class is either the Capitalists or the workers. In the first instance, it is a Bourgeois democracy. In the second instance, it is a Proletarian democracy. There is no scope of an all-class, or a multi-class or a supra-class state and therefore naturally of a democracy which again is nothing but a form of state power. Naturally therefore, according to the tenets of Marxism-Leninism, the conception of "National Democracy" is a confusion of thought.

This approach may be dubbed as doctrinaire or dogmatic or mechanical, as that is the only effective way practised by authoritarians to suppress freedom of thought, questioning and discussions.

Thus it will be found that to be true to their declarations the signatories by implication have done away with the Marxist-Leninist theory of state and in the name of creative Marxism have introduced a serious confusion of thought in the World of Marxism-Leninism.

It is true that all the Capitalist states in the World have not sub-ordinated themselves to the great command of British Imperialism or Anglo-American, or Anglo-French or Franco-German Imperialism or Imperialism of any other variety. It is true that the Indonesian Govt. are struggling hard to be completely sovereign by liberating those parts of Indonesia which are still under Dutch Imperialism, for example, the west Irian. It is further true that the United Arab Republic under Col. Naser, or Iraq under Gen. Kassem or India under Pandit Neheru are making strenuous efforts to build up an independent national economy to protect and guarantee the freedom and sovereignty recently earned. So on and so forth. But inspite of all these the form of state power is either a Capitalist democracy as in India or capitalist dictatorship as in others like United Arab Republic, Iraq and Indonesia. Are these the types of the Govt. which

the signatories imply by "National Democracy"? In that case why should they leave out the biggest democratic practice in the world, the British democracy or the French democracy? Would it not be wrong to think that so far as the form of democratic Govt. is concerned, American democracy or British democracy guarantees much more rights and liberties to the people as a whole than the guided democracy of Indonesia or the Military democracy of United Arab Republic or Iraq?

It is very difficult to understand theoretically this new proposition of "National democracy" or a particular fancy for the same and naturally the corollary, hostility or opposition towards others. There cannot be any theoretical justification for the same.

Practical justification for attachment or friendliness towards some and opposition towards others may be conceded from the stand point of expediency. But that is another thing. For example, the present leadership of the Soviet Union may be correct in their friendly attitude towards the Kennedy administration of America. Mr. Kennedy may serve the cause of peace better than his predecessors. Wonders may happen in world politics. Like the new Brazilian President, Mr. Kennedy may want Peoples China to be a member of U. N. O. Naturally that would change the attitudes of the leaders of Soviet Union and Peoples China towards the U. S. Govt. But would that make the Govt. of U. S. A. and its state structure, a "National Democracy"?

The statement declares the inevitability of the complete triumph of socialism, that the principle characteristic of our time is that the World socialist system is becoming the decisive factor in the development of society, that the peoples are rising with growing determination to fight impe-

rialism, that the great forces of our time the peoples who are building socialism and communism, the revolutionary movement of the working class in the capitalist countries, the National liberation struggle of the oppressed peoples and the general democratic movement, are merging into one powerful current that undermines and destroys the World imperialist system.

In the present epoch the United States remains the main economic, financial and military force of modern imperialism, although its share in capitalist economy is diminishing. Contradictions are created by the British and French imperialists making stubborn efforts to uphold their positions, the monopolies of West Germany and Japan closely linked with U. S. monopolies, stepping up expansion and the West German monopolies seeking more and more to exploit the under-developed countries. An interesting feature of the epoch is that the dominant monopoly Bourgeoisie in the more developed capitalist countries has allied itself with U. S. imperialism and sacrifices the sovereignty of their countries hoping to crush the revolutionary liberation forces with the support of U. S. imperialism. Thus military political alliances under U. S. leadership are formed, these countries become involved in the arms race, in a policy of preparing new wars of aggression and subversion against socialist and neutral countries but all these are of no avail.

But in the first chapter the document of the World parties gives no directives but only describes the developing World situation. That is the novelty of the document—*description only and no direction*. An honest student of Marxism would compare this chapter I of the document with Marx's thesis on Fauerbach "Philosophers upto now have interpreted the World. Our task is to change it."



The second chapter is more or less like the first chapter of document describing what is happening in the socialist countries, that the Soviet Union is successfully carrying on the full scale construction of a communist society, other countries of the socialist camp are successfully laying the foundations of socialism and some of them have already entered the period of construction of developed socialist society, etc. etc.

The second chapter is full of generalities and contains claims and counter claims. For example, a perusal of the documents issued from Peoples China would inform the readers that by successful organisation of communes, Peoples China has been making tremendous strides towards the building up of a Communist society. But according to this document peoples revolution in China has within a historically short period made remarkable progress in socialist construction only like Albania, the democratic republic of Vietnam, Mongolia, Poland etc. To a minute reader, the declaration in the first para of Chapter II to the effect that "the Soviet Union is successfully carrying on the full scale construction of Communist society," collides with the statement in third para of the same chapter to the effect that the Soviet people are rapidly building up "a material and technical basis for Communism."

Further on, the statement is a declaration of the unity of the socialist camp, of the strengthening of the fraternal alliance of workers and peasants led by the working class in each country of the camp, of the unbreakable alliance of working people of all nationalities in multi-national socialist states, of the successes achieved by socialist ideology in peoples' democracies, of the growth of the productive forces and prosperity of the socialist society etc. etc.

The document attempts to maintain a balance between disregard of national peculiarities and undue emphasis on the role of national peculiarities.

The chapter ends with the declaration that the socialist states have, by forming a World system, become an International force exerting a powerful influence on World development. There are now real opportunities of solving cardinal problems of modern times in a *new way*, in the interests of peace, democracy and socialism.

This chapter embodies good directives about educating the working people in a spirit of Internationalism and patriotism, and waging a resolute struggle to eliminate the survivals of Bourgeois nationalism and Chauvinism.

But the reader will struggle in vain to find out any concretisation of the "*new way*" to which the chapter leads. A communist document has never been so in the past.

Secondly while the chapter has emphasised in the very opening paragraph the "successfully carrying on the full scale construction of a Communist society" in the Soviet Union, it has been nowhere scientifically explained as to how the claim of "full scale construction of a Communist Society" is justified on the basis of the existence of wide wage-differentials sometimes the difference of earning between the unskilled worker and the highest technician being one and twentyfour *i. e.* two hundred and fifty roubles on one side and six thousand roubles on the other. Communism in our understanding is a stage of human development when there will be no difference between manual labour and mental labour. With such wide differences in earnings between two sectors of labour how can one be convinced about the declaration that Soviet Union is successfully carrying on the full scale construction of a Communist society? Of course in passing

the document tries to explain by drawing the name of great Lenin and stating strict observance of the Leninist principle of providing "material incentives."

When such serious questions are tackled they should be done in a scientific way. To do that appropriate quotation from Lenin should be cited. Only Lenin's name is of no help for correct understanding. In our knowledge Lenin's material incentives are meant for the socialist period and not for the communist stage of society.

Pardon us to submit that herein is *an effort to amend communism itself* from the backdoor. This is the least expected from such a serious document.

Abolition of landlordism and capitalism is necessary for socialism and communism. But mere negation of capitalism is not socialism. The communist society is the highest stage of development of Socialist society wherein the equality of man and man is attained (1) by the liquidation of the differences of manual labour and mental labour by the development of science and specially by the all-round use of electricity in everyday life of man, of course by the use of the new energy now unfolded—atomic energy and (2) by a co-operative organisation of the forces of production and distribution. Any effort to dilute the objective would seriously affect the constructive energy and vigilance of productive forces to reach the goal and would be simply dis-service to communism.

### III

The opening sentence of Chapter three of the statement well summarises the entire chapter in the apt sentence, "the problem of war and peace is the most burning problem of our time".

"War is a constant companion of capitalism ... .. Imperialism has already inflicted two devastating World wars on mankind. Imperialism spells grave danger to the whole of mankind and now threatens to plunge it into an even more terrible catastrophe." In this game the U. S, imperialist are the leader. Their accomplices are imperialist Britain, France and West Germany and those countries who have been drawn into NATO, CENTO, SEATO and other military blocks. "The Bon state has become the chief enemy of peaceful co-existence, disarmament and relaxation of tension in Europe." The U. S. military treaty with Japan similarly is the worst dangerpoint in the Far East.

Further, "the U. S. imperialists are stock-piling unclear weapons ; the French ruling circles are testing and manufacturing atomic weapons. The U. S. ruling circles have wrecked the Paris meeting of the heads of Govt. of the Four great powers. The war menace has grown. "

"But real forces have appeared that are capable of foiling imperialist plans of aggression. War is not fatalistically inevitable". "Experience shows that it is possible to effectively combat local wars started by imperialists and to stamp out successfully the hot-beds of such wars". Concious and vigorous actions of all the forces of peace can safeguard the peace and prevent a new war. So on and so forth runs on the statement establishing the new thesis of peacefull co-existence of two opposite systems, of capitalism and socialism, without negating imperialism. The statement boldly directs, "ideological and political disputes between states must not be settled through war".

Lest some one charges the signatories with efforts of revising the cardinal and basic principles of Marxism—class-war, the signatories come out with an attack in the classical

way "peaceful co-existence of states does not imply renunciation of the class struggle as the revisionists claim. The co-existence of states with different social systems is a form of class struggle between socialism and capitalism". Further, "on the contrary, it implies intensification of the struggle of the working class, of all the Communist parties for the triumph of socialist ideas".

But HOW? The signatories are silent on the point. Should class war be intensified in capitalist country? The World Communist leaders failed to direct.

That peace is good and war is bad, nobody does dispute. Peace has ever been cherished by humanity. But in spite of all the efforts of the Apostles of peace, Buddha or Christ, Tolostoy or Mahatma Gandhi, humanity has been huddled into war by monstrous forces in society moving like avalanche. It was Marxism only which researched out the real cause of war and ordered "to end war, end imperialism". Of course to end imperialism there should be united action of the proletariat. But it is the task of the leaders of the parties of the Proletariat to decide what form and on what issues those actions should be organised and intensified. It must be boldly stated that mere demonstration of peoples under the slogan "no war, peace" is not enough to check-mate the onrush of the forces engulfing the world in a world war. Ceaseless struggles of the proletariat should be carried on their own issues, economic, political and social, in states after states engaging the forces of war in their own lands engulfing them in the fire of class war and dethorning them from the positions they are occupying to-day and from where they are conspiring and unleashing forces of war. Mass war and wars of national liberation.

The signatories to the document are fighting shy to face this all important task of world forces of peace. To be candid, their new form of struggle is a struggle of ideas and to be consistent to their declaration will transform them from active revolutionaries to preachers of ideas like the great Buddha or great son of God who got himself crucified for the emancipation of souls.

The document, of course, brings out boldly the revisionism of Marxism practised in the twentieth party congress of the Communist Party of Soviet Union in the following declaration, "in these conditions real possibility will have arise to exclude war from the life of society even before socialism achieves complete victory on earth, with capitalism still existing in a part of the world."

Revisionism will be patent from the questions "Have these conditions emerged"? According to you, these conditions would be still in the womb of future—that is the preceding portion of your statement in the same paragraph. Why then, do you rush with the conclusion, without the fulfilment of these conditions?

#### IV

The fourth chapter of statement enunciates the tasks of Communists in colonial countries before liberation and after Liberation with the rider that "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

in tasks detail list the following among others:—(1) Agrarian reform, (2) Restriction of foreign monopolies and their expulsion from the national economy, (3) Improvement of living standard, (4) democratisation of social life and (5) an independent, peaceful foreign policy.

Further the statement declares that “in the present historical situation, favourable domestic and international conditions arise in many countries for the establishment of an independent, national democracy”. The communist parties are working actively for the establishment of national democracy and for a consistent completion of the anti-imperialist, antifeudal, democratic revolution.

Thus in a country like India, though not specifically mentioned but still it can safely be deduced, the tasks of the communists will be to strengthen the national democratic government though they will “firmly oppose anti-democratic anti-popular acts and those measures of the ruling circles which endanger national independence, will expose attempts by the reactionary sections of the bourgeoisie to represent its selfish, narrow class interests as those of the entire nation will expose the demagogic use by the bourgeois politicians of socialist slogans”. So far their role will be a negative role of a liberal, opposition party. Positively, they will work for a genuine democratisation of social life and rally all the progressive forces to combat despotic regimes or curb tendencies towards setting up such regimes”. In simple word, it means *will not fight for civil liberty. Positive and negative roles taken together, the task of communists remain the tasks of bourgeois liberals.* *of*

A big question arises, “With these tasks why the Party should still be called a Communist Party and why the membership of the Party should be restricted to Communists alone?”

Everyone knows how the Communists work. They never go beyond what is scheduled. Under the circumstances even preaching for socialism will be a taboo. Congress will at least talk for socialism and the Praja Socialist Party *of* and the Socialist Party will canvass for Socialist transformation of Society through parliamentary means and Satyagraha respectively while Bharatiya Biplabi Communist Party will work for socialist revolution. Where will the Communist Party of India stand then? To the right or to the left?

## V

The fifth chapter is the most interesting chapter.

“The restoration of unity in the Trade Union movement in countries where it is split, as well as on the international scale, is essential for heightening the role of the working class in political life and for the successful defence of its interests,” —is a very essential step for the good of the workers as well as the welfare of our country provided the Indian signatories take the necessary steps and do not repeat their earlier performances which have led to the present vivi-section of the trade union movement in India. It is aptly stated that “the split in the ranks of the working class, which the ruling classes, the Right-wing Social-Democratic leadership and reactionary trade-union leaders are interested to maintain on a national and international scale, remains the principal obstacle to the accomplishment of the working class”. But the statement instead of becoming self-critical about the causes of the split in the trade-union movement, particularly in India, where the Communist Party of India, brought about the split in the A. I. T. U. C., it tries to cover up with a blatantly incorrect statement of facts by stating *of*



“Communists work resolutely to eliminate this split”. This is a very bad augury for unification of the Trade Union movement.

It is good that the statement declares “it is safe to say that on overcoming the split in the ranks, on achieving unity of action of all its contingents, the working class of many capitalist countries could deliver a staggering blow to the policy of the ruling circles in the capitalist countries and make them stop preparing a new war, repel the offensive of monopoly capital, and have its daily vital and democratic demands met.” But the statement does not clearly state the steps that the signatories are going to adopt for unifying the trade-union movement. On the other hand, the paragraphs preceding the above quotation make one very much sceptic. The apprehension is that there may be repetition of useless steps like “unity from below” or “unity through joint action” etc. etc. which will take the movement nowhere and create much more bitterness and delay unity so urgently needed.

Criticism of right-wing opportunism is very good. But for everything there is time, place and occasion. More over our experiences in the past have shown that the criticisms are more subjective than objective and therefore become self-negatory. Then there is the question of the right to criticise. A political entity that wants to criticise right-wing opportunism must itself not practice—~~the~~ same and must practise leftism—socialism.

Let us be more concrete. The signatories declare that “the working class and its vanguard—the Marxist—Leninist Party seek to achieve the socialist revolution by peaceful means”.

Further “to<sup>ward</sup> in a number of capitalist countries the working class, headed by its vanguard has the opportunity, given a united working class and popular front or other workable forms of agreement and political co-operation between the different parties and public organisations, to unite a majority of the people, win state power without civil war and ensure transfer of the basic means of production to the hands of the people. Relying on the majority of the people and resolutely rebuffing the opportunist elements incapable of relinquishing the policy of compromise with the capitalists and landlords, the working class can defeat the reactionary, anti-popular forces, secure a firm majority in parliament, transform parliament from an instrument serving the class interests of the bourgeoisie into an instrument serving the working people; launch an extra-parliamentary mass struggle, smash the resistance of the reactionary forces and create the necessary conditions for peaceful realisation of the socialist revolution.”

After these declarations, in reality, there remains no difference in method for achieving socialism between the Communist and the Socialist Party. There may be still persons in both the parties who may work as underlings of the Bourgeoisie. Naturally they will be tackled democratically by the parties themselves. It would be idle to suggest that the agents of capitalists penetrate and entrench themselves in the leadership of the Socialist Parties only. The history of the purges of the Communist Parties demonstrates the same incidence. Of course this assumption is based on the correctness of the allegations made during purges. About the class composition of the parties, in European countries workers predominate in number in socialist and labour parties.

Thus it will be found that all these talks of exposing right-wing opportunism of Socialist parties by the Communist

parties after the adoption of the declaration are off the mark and carry us nowhere. Declaration of difference after agreement with the programme, the objective and the method, is nothing but carrying feuds onward and will be un-scientific and un-Marxian. *Only those who believe in class struggle intensification of class struggle and seizure of political power by revolution have a right to differ with right-wing opportunism.*



The sixth chapter states about the unity and consolidation of world communist movement, So far, good, But one fails to understand why the document started attacking the Yugoslav league of communists as revisionists and betrayers of Marxism—Leninism. The statement declares, "Further exposure of the leaders of Yugoslav revisionists and active struggle to safeguard the Communist movement and the working-class movement from the anti-Leninist ideas of the Yugoslav revisionists, remains an essential task of the Marxist-Leninist Parties."

This takes us nowhere. It is queer that when the signatories are trying to achieve unity with Socialist parties, when they declare "Communists regard social democrats among the working-people as their class brothers" when according to a further declaration "both in the struggle for the improvement of the living conditions of working people, the extension and preservation of their democratic rights, the achievement and defence of national independence, for peace among nations, and also in the struggle to win power and build socialism, the Communist Parties advocate co-operation with the Socialist Parties, "there remains little justification for

this attack against Yugoslav Communists. One should be a whole-hogger. This attack against Yugoslav Communists only proves the old saying that the Communists regard their nearest as the worst enemy.

Either carry on the classical Marxist line or be true to your declared principle <sup>of the</sup> twentieth Party congress of the Communist Party of Soviet Union,—“there are various roads to socialism”. In the name of creative Marxism if the signatories have a right to revise almost all the basic principles of Marxism including the theory about the state as they have done, it is surprising as to why they should deny the same right to Yugoslav Communists to practise decentralised socialism and independence of a National Party and Socialist state to the extreme. Otherwise we have neither revolution nor maximum unification. Instead of isolating the enemy you isolate yourselves from each other without any scientific justification. Once begun at home, the practice spreads and becomes universal.

*Kindly attend to some of our publications :—*

**(1) Socialism Under Capitalism**

[ Eng. , Beng. & Hindi ] —By Nagarjun

u/- **(2) A Critique of CPI Draft Programme**

(English, Bengali, Hindi, & Oriya)

—By B. N. Dubey

o | of s | **(3) The Congress Madras And The Way Out**

(English & Hindi)

—By B. N. Dubey

**(4) Revolution and India**

(English, Hindi & Bengali)

—By B. N. Dubey

97, Hazra Road,  
Calcutta-26,  
Phone : 472878

**BINA DUBEY,**  
*Secretary*  
Progressive Literature  
Publishing House