

They assert that People's China is gloriously carrying on its shoulders *the world liberating mission*. We do not know since when these critics of ours have allotted the mission exclusively to the PRC, excluding the world proletariat and the world socialist camp.

They reprimand the C.C. for its total failure to understand that People's China as *actually acting as the base of world revolution*.

They demand of our C.C. to bow before the "*CPC as the leading detachment of the world communist movement*" and without question accept its attacks and denunciations as fraternal criticism to help correct our mistakes. They demand this because they believe that the "CPC is essentially correct on all these points and it has discharged its international duty".

What is the sum total of these assertions and statements of our critics?

First, the crucial point of the global struggle between the forces of world socialism and world capitalism centres round the struggle between People's China on the one hand, and the U.S. imperialists and their Soviet revisionist allies on the other.

Second, it follows from their arguments that the contradiction between People's China on the one hand and the U.S.-Soviet alliance on the other is the principal contradiction of our times and everything else should be subordinated to this.

Third, there exists a global strategy of the U.S. and its Soviet allies, and against it there is another counter-global strategy presented by the CPC which we should accept and follow, if we wish to be in the camp of Marxist-Leninists.

Fourth, People's China is the world base of liberation, and is discharging this glorious mission of world liberation, hence if we are interested in our liberation we must depend upon it and join hands with it in that mission.

Fifth, it is the leading world communist detachment, with Mao Tse-tung's thought which is Marxism-Leninism of the present epoch, and we should owe allegiance and loyalty to it.

At any rate this thesis of theirs is frightening! It negates the basic analysis and assessment of the 1957 Declaration and 1960 Statement and of the General Line presented by the CPC in its June 14th letter. Hence we totally reject this entire thesis as dangerous left-infantilism and liquidationism.

We do not consider that the authoritative exposition of the General Line as contained in the June 14th letter of the Chinese Communist Party lends any support to such a line and thesis. For example:

Does the Chinese Communist Party accept the thesis of a leader party and follower party in the world communist movement? Does it accept the thesis that one or the other socialist state is the destined liberator of the world?

Where did it say that the PRC has become the base of world revolution, supplanting the world socialist camp and the world proletarian revolutionary movement?

Do the following categorical statements of the CPC support the views of our critics?

The CPC, while refuting the accusation of the Soviet revisionist leaders that it is attempting to snatch away the leadership of the world communist movement from their hands, states:

"It is not at all clever of you to make this slander. The way you put it, it would seem that some people are contending with you for some such thing as 'leadership'. Is this not tantamount to shamelessly claiming that some sort of 'leadership' exists in the international communist movement and that you have this 'leadership'? It is a very, very bad habit of yours thus to put on the airs of a patriarchal party. It is entirely illegitimate. The 1957 Declaration and the 1960 Statement clearly state that all Communist Parties are independent and equal. According to this principle, the relations among fraternal Parties should under no circumstances be like the relations between a leading party and the led, and much less like the relations between a patriarchal father and his son. We have always opposed any one Party commanding other fraternal Parties, and it has never occurred to us that we ourselves should command other fraternal Parties, and so the ques-

tion of contending of leadership simply does not arise. What confronts the international communist movement now is not whether this or that party should assume leadership, but whether to respond to the baton of revisionism or to uphold the revolutionary principles of the Declaration and the Statement and persevere in the revolutionary line of Marxism-Leninism. Our criticism of the leadership of the CPSU concerns its attempt to lord it over fraternal Parties and to impose its line of revisionism and splittism on them. What we desire is merely the independent and equal status of the fraternal Parties stipulated in the Declaration and the Statement and their unity on the basis of Marxism-Leninism and proletarian internationalism." (*The Polemic on the General Line of the International Communist Movement, Peking, 1965, Pp. 102 and 103*)

Further, the CPC maintains:

"At one period in the history of the international communist movement, the Communist International gave centralised leadership to the Communist Parties of the world. It played a great historic role in promoting the establishment and growth of Communist Parties in many countries. But when the Communist Parties matured and the situation of the international communist movement grew more complicated, centralised leadership on the part of the Communist International ceased to be either feasible or necessary. In 1943 the Presidium of the Executive Committee of the Communist International stated in a resolution proposing to dissolve the Comintern:

'...to the extent that the internal as well as the international situation of individual countries became more complicated the solution of the problems of the movement of each country through the medium of some international centre would meet with insuperable obstacles'.

"Events have shown that this resolution corresponded to reality and was correct.

"In the present international communist movement, the question of who has the right to lead whom simply does not arise. Fraternal Parties should be independent and completely equal, and at the same time they should be united. On questions of common concern they should reach unanimity of views through consultation, and they

should concert their actions in the struggle for the common goal. These principles guiding relations among fraternal Parties are clearly stipulated in the Declaration of 1957 and Statement of 1960." (*The Polemic on the General Line of the International Communist Movement*, Peking, 1965, Pp. 333 and 334)

No further explanation or elaboration is needed for these statements of the CPC and our critics cannot have any legs left to stand on that basis.

Our critics speak of Marxism-Leninism and Marxism-Leninism of the new epoch and attack the C.C. for its lack of Marxism-Leninism. In this connection, we would like to cite a passage from Comrade Mao Tse-tung which puts the matter in proper light :

"Being Marxists, Communists are internationalists, but we can put Marxism into practice only when it is integrated with the specific characteristics of our country and acquires a definite form. The great strength of Marxism-Leninism lies precisely in its integration with the concrete revolutionary practice of all countries. For the Chinese Communist Party, it is a matter of learning to apply the theory of Marxism-Leninism to the specific circumstances of China. For the Chinese Communists who are part of the great Chinese nation, flesh of its flesh and blood of its blood, any talk of Marxism in isolation from China's characteristics is merely Marxism in the abstract, Marxism in a vacuum. Hence to apply Marxism concretely in China so that its very manifestation has an indubitably Chinese character, i.e., to apply Marxism in the light of China's specific characteristics, becomes a problem which it is urgent for the whole Party to understand and solve. Foreign stereotypes must be abolished, there must be less signing of empty, abstract tunes, and dogmatism must be laid to rest ; they must be replaced by the fresh, lively Chinese style and spirit which the common people of China love. To separate internationalist content from national form is the practice of those who do not understand the first thing about internationalism. We, on the contrary, must link the two closely. In this matter there are serious errors in our ranks which should be conscientiously overcome." (Mao Tse-tung, *Selected Works*, Vol. II, Page 209)

We wish to abide by Marxism-Leninism and strictly adhere to the guide-lines aptly described above by Comrade Mao Tse-tung and do not wish to become victims of stereotype.

Do our critics think that there is a Marxism-Leninism of the new epoch for us which does not integrate it with Indian conditions ?

Similarly, our critics talk of proletarian internationalism and charge the C.C. with violating it since it is not uncritically rallying behind one Party or the other. Here is what the great Lenin says about internationalism :

"There is one, and only one, kind of internationalism indeed. Working wholeheartedly for the development of the revolutionary movement and the revolutionary struggles *in one's own country*, and supporting (by propaganda, sympathy and material aid) *such a struggle*, such, *and only such* a line in *every* country without exception.

"Everything else is deception and Manilovism".

We do cherish proletarian internationalism and strictly adhere to the directives of Comrade Lenin. Is it the contention of our critics that proletarian internationalism means lining up behind one Party or another in the name of "global strategy", "world liberation", etc., giving up working wholeheartedly to fulfil our tasks for the revolutionary proletarian movement in our own country ?

NATIONAL LIBERATION MOVEMENT

These comrades make an erroneous and ill-informed criticism of the CC. document on this point and commit mistakes in formulation and understanding, adopt a wrong attitude towards the role of the socialist camp in relation to the national liberation movement and in effect adopt a bourgeois-nationalist standpoint on this question. They think they are talking high revolutionary stuff ; but in reality they wander into the morass of bourgeois-nationalism and liquidate the role of the socialist camp. In the bargain they make hopelessly contradictory statements. They state, "It is the imperative duty of the international working class movement to give all its support to the national liberation movement. It is the sacred duty of the socialist countries