

**Workers of the World— Unite!**



**Three Documents on  
Purba Banglar Sarbahara Party  
(PBSP)**

(1984 - 1985)

**Mofakkhar Chowdhury**

Published by  
**Communist Party of East Bengal (Maoist)**



**Comrade Mofakkhar Chowdhury**  
(1940 - 16 December 2004)

Martyred Leader and Secretary of  
the Communist Party of East Bengal (M-L)

# Foreword

In the 1980s, these writings were composed by martyred Comrade Mofakkhar Chowdhury on behalf of the Communist Party of East Bengal (Marxist–Leninist) as replies to letters from the Purba Banglar Sarbahara Party (SRC). They were written primarily in the context of the struggle against the autocratic regime of Hussain Muhammad Ershad.

Within these texts, the author addresses a range of critical questions of that period, including the identification of the principal contradiction and the necessity of forging a united anti-imperialist movement. Beyond responding to immediate political debates, the writings situate those debates within the broader strategic framework of revolutionary transformation.

For those seeking to understand the Maoist movement and struggle in East Bengal—particularly the trajectory of protracted people's war—and for those committed to developing a people's democratic revolution oriented toward socialism and communism, with agrarian revolution at its core, these three writings carry considerable historical and political significance.

**Central Organizing Committee  
Communist Party of East Bengal (Maoist)**

04 March 2026

## **Contents**

**In Response to the First Letter of Purba Banglar Sarbahara Party ..... 05**

**The Politics of SRC ..... 08**

**In Response to the Second Letter of Purba Banglar Sarbahara Party ..... 10**

# In Response to the First Letter of Purba Banglar Sarbahara Party

To—

The Supreme Revolutionary Council,  
Purba Banglar Sarbahara Party (PBSP)

Respected comrades,

We received your letter dated 7-10-84 on 17-11-84. In response to your letter, we feel compelled to present our position before you.

Firstly. **We build a party of a class— not of a nation. Our goal is to establish our class as the nation itself, not to obscure the class by raising the national question.** The "tide" you refer to is a counter-revolutionary tide. Communists must firmly adhere to the Marxist practice of moving against such a counter-revolutionary tide through independent and autonomous work. They can only do so by practicing the Marxist method of class perspective, class line, and reliance on the class. The tone that emerges from your letter reflects, in our view, a deviation from Marxism— an expression of having lost faith in one's own class and seeking allies from other classes. You have attributed the lack of unity among patriotic revolutionaries to the absence of mutual understanding among us (the organizations to whom your letter was addressed). In contrast, we believe that the lack of unity among patriotic revolutionaries stems from a failure to practice class reliance.

Secondly, We believe in area-based seizure of power— not in seizing central power through an insurrection. Using insurrection as a tool to make area-based seizure of power successful is one thing; but planning to seize central power through an insurrection is another matter altogether. As far as we know, you support

area-based seizure of power (your documents at least say so). But your letter clearly reflects the imprint of insurrection-based seizure of central power. **On the question of area-based seizure of power, guerrilla warfare is the strategy— and only guerrilla warfare can unite the broad masses against the enemy.** In contrast to this Marxist truth, you suggest that unity among patriotic revolutionaries can be achieved through compromise with various anti-Mao organizations.

Thirdly, we have a fundamental difference of viewpoint with you regarding mass organizations and mass movements. This difference is a clash between two worldviews— the revolutionary proletarian worldview versus the counter-revolutionary bourgeois worldview. In short, it is the difference between Marxism and revisionism. We consider your current position and practice on mass organizations and movements to be revisionist. The source of your letter lies in this revisionist perspective on mass organizations and movements.

Fourthly, we are in favor of boycotting elections. You are as well. But even so, we do not believe we can engage in any joint program with you on the question of election boycott. This is because you consider the election boycott a partial political stance, while we consider it a comprehensive political line. Therefore, failing to present our overall political message through the election boycott amounts to compromise with bourgeois ideology.

Fifthly, in your letter, you have invited several so-called communist organizations— who are anti-Mao— to unite. You regard the question of uniting with them as a tactical one. **We believe that any kind of unity with anti-Mao so-called communists today is not a tactical question, but a principled one. In this era, no true communist can unite with anti-Mao so-called communists on any question from a principled standpoint.**

Finally, we want to note that there is a difference in our and your perspectives on the comprehension of Mao Zedong Thought. Due to this difference, we are unable to reach an agreement on identifying the principal contradiction at the current stage of societal development in East Bengal. We believe that before discussing any other matter with you, it is absolutely necessary to discuss and resolve this crucial question. Let us initiate a formal dialogue between us to assist each other on this immensely important issue. We hope to hear your views on this as soon as possible.

6 December 1984

## The Politics of SRC

On November 17, 1984, we received a letter from the Purba Banglar Sarbahara Party (SRC), dated 7-10-84. We wrote our response on December 6, 1984. In reply to this December letter, they presented us in January 1985 with a 31-page ideological document. They stated that they would circulate this debate with us throughout all levels of their Party. Their first letter and our reply were initially published in their Party organ *Sfulingo*. The May 1985 issue of *Sfulingo* published an excerpt of their second letter, the ideological document. They pledged to publish the remaining portions in upcoming issues. They titled their debate with us “*Against Revisionism*”— that is, from their perspective, we are the revisionists. On this matter, we can only say: *when one is drunk, even the lamppost appears to be drunk.*

In any specific national context, there is only one correct political line. That correct line is the Marxist line. It is the first and foremost duty of every Marxist to identify any incorrect line in the light of the Marxist line and label it as revisionist. Is the line of the Purba Banglar Sarbahara Party (SRC) correct? Is it a Marxist line?

The SRC believes that in the current situation of East Bengal, the principal contradiction is *the national contradiction*. That is, they believe that East Bengal is presently in the stage of a national revolutionary war. This position is a false theory, contradictory to Mao Zedong Thought. Based on this incorrect theory, they have determined their political line. Therefore, their line is bound to be incorrect. *From our perspective, their line is not a Marxist line— it is a revisionist line.* That they are on the side of revisionism will be made clearer in our discussion on the

principal contradiction in the upcoming issues of Purba Bangla.

In the current issue, we have published together their first letter and our reply, as well as their second letter and our reply.

30 July 1985

## **In Response to the Second Letter of Purba Banglar Sarbahara Party**

To—

The Supreme Revolutionary Council,  
Purba Banglar Sarbahara Party (PBSP)

Esteemed comrades,

We received your letter dated 30 December 1984 in January. However, due to the necessary pre- and post-plenum engagements surrounding the Party Plenum held from 7–10 April, our response was delayed. We sincerely regret this delay.

We are fully conscious that there exist differences of opinion between us on various questions. And although you may deny it, we cannot deny the Marxist truth that the source of these differences lies in our disagreement over the determination of the principal contradiction. Communists do not engage in discussion for discussion's sake. Communists engage in discussion in order to arrive at a definite objective—to accelerate the work of the revolution. If we are sincere about resolving our differences, then what should the discussion be about? From where should we begin in a Marxist manner? Once again, we assert that it is Marxist to first resolve the question of the principal contradiction (even if this does not appear correct to you). Chairman Mao said: *“In the study of any complex process in which there are two or more contradictions, we must devote every effort to finding its principal contradiction. Once this principal contradiction is grasped, all problems can be readily solved. Marx taught us this method in his study of capitalist society. Lenin and Stalin likewise taught us this method.”*

We request you to reread the essay in order to understand whether this quotation is irrelevant or taken out of context.

Our principal contradiction with you concerns precisely the question of the principal contradiction. Therefore, we reiterate that differences in determining the principal contradiction are the source of all our other differences. Consequently, **attempts to resolve other differences while setting aside efforts to resolve differences over the principal contradiction are tantamount to cutting the roots of a tree and watering its branches instead.** Judging by your long-winded, expansive speeches, it appears that you are quite well enriched by practical experience in cutting the roots and watering the branches. Even though we did not ask, you have nevertheless presented your views on the united front. Do you have any understanding of the difference between a united front at the stage of civil war and a united front at the stage of national war? From your statements, it appears that you do not. You have referred to the united front pursued by the Chinese Party— but even that from an incorrect standpoint. Based on your arbitrary and subjective notions, you have attempted to portray us as opponents of the united front. We are not opposed to the united front. We firmly believe that among the three principal weapons for successfully carrying out the national democratic revolution, the united front is one of the most important. **We believe that the foundation of the united front rests on three things: armed struggle, worker-peasant unity, and the independence and self-reliance of the Communist Party. The united front means a temporary alliance between two ideologies— namely, the ideology of the working class and the ideology of the bourgeoisie.** The programme of the democratic revolution is the maximum programme of the bourgeois democrats and the minimum programme of the Communists; the maximum programme

of the Communists is socialism and communism. The national democratic revolution has two aspects: one national and the other democratic. When the democratic aspect predominates, Communists unite with the bourgeois democrats to make armed struggle against feudalism the principal task, in order to realize their minimum programme. When the national aspect predominates, Communists unite all patriots to make armed struggle against imperialism the principal task. The Chinese Party formed a united front twice— first during the civil war of 1924–27, and second during the national revolutionary war of 1937–45. In China, the bourgeois democratic revolution was initiated in 1911 under the leadership of Sun Yat-sen. In the course of this revolution, the Kuomintang government came to power under Sun Yat-sen's leadership. However, before the bourgeois-led democratic revolution in China could be completed, the historical era of bourgeois-led democratic revolutions came to an end with the rise of Soviet Russia in 1917. Sun Yat-sen, the representative of the national bourgeoisie in China, was able to grasp this truth. Therefore, the bourgeois democrats under Sun Yat-sen relinquished the leading role in the democratic revolution and assumed a role of cooperation. Sun Yat-sen proclaimed his famous Three New Policies, one of which was cooperation with the Communists. In this context, cooperation between the Kuomintang and the Communists against the northern warlord landlords became possible. Through this cooperation, the Communist Party gained the opportunity to train a large number of its cadres in military affairs. However, under the leadership of Chen Duxiu, the Communist Party abandoned the principle of independent and self-reliant work and adopted a liquidationist line of capitulation at that time. As a result, after Sun Yat-sen's death, Chiang Kai-shek betrayed the

alliance and broke the united front. Subsequently, through armed struggle, independent and self-reliant work, and the building of worker-peasant unity, the Communist Party laid the foundation for forming the next united front.

The second United Front was formed in December 1936. In 1931, Japan invaded China and occupied parts of it. By around 1934, Japan intensified its aggression. Over five years, Japan successively occupied various regions of China. Chiang Kai-shek essentially pursued a line of capitulation to Japan, while internally continuing the encirclement and suppression of the Communists. As a result, the Chinese Party had to wage war primarily against Chiang's forces alongside fighting Japanese imperialism. The Chinese Party characterized this stage of war as the stage of civil war. Through the famous Xi'an Incident of 1936, Chiang was compelled to unite with the Chinese Communist Party to resist Japanese imperialism, and as a consequence the anti-Japanese United Front was formed. The Chinese Party described this stage of war as the stage of national war. It was on this basis that Mao wrote an important portion of the essay "On Contradiction."

In class terms, the national bourgeoisie in our country is an extremely weak class. They are tightly bound to the comprador bourgeoisie. There is no political organization of the national bourgeoisie in our country, nor is there any prospect of one emerging in the future. Therefore, where are the bourgeois democrats with whom a front could be formed at the stage of civil war? Our country has never had a Sun Yat-sen, and does not have one today. Hence, there are no bourgeois democrats under the leadership of a Sun Yat-sen in our country. Consequently, **the front that will be formed in our country at the stage of civil war in the democratic revolution will be a front of workers, peasants, and students. And this front can be built by the Communist**

**Party through the armed form of class struggle. Therefore, at the present stage, our perspective on the front is to unite workers with peasants— with workers as the leaders— for the purpose of eliminating class enemies, and to unite students with peasants in order to make them good revolutionaries.**

Which stage of the United Front are you speaking of? The civil war stage or the national war stage? In your discussion of the United Front, you have said many unnecessary things, but you have omitted the necessary point— namely, which stage of the United Front you are referring to. In other words, you are reluctant to directly state what the principal contradiction is. Is this a mere omission, or is it your ignorance? We believe it is certainly your ignorance.

You have divided your discussions into many sections and subsections, and many of these discussions repeatedly touch on the same issues. For example, although at the end of section 1(b) you address the question of compromise with anti-Mao organizations, you again discuss it at length in section 5. We will attempt to select the core issues raised by you and discuss those in essence.

While discussing question no. 1, in section (a) you stated that the question of whether the party is a “class party” or a “national party” is “unnecessary,” and claimed that the concrete problem is how to unite patriots and revolutionaries. We firmly believe that deciding whether the party is a class party or a national party is a question of the very existence of the Communist Party, and that it can never become unnecessary at any time. **Whether a civil war or a national war is being conducted, the Communist Party remains a class party and firmly adheres to the class line.** It should be noted that when the national contradiction becomes principal, the class contradiction

becomes subordinate to it. In such a case, the national struggle is fundamentally a form of class struggle. Uniting patriots into a United Front is considered one of the primary tasks at the stage of national war. Therefore, at the stage of national war, if other classes (which were antagonistic during the civil war) agree to participate in the national revolutionary war or resistance, then granting concessions to retain them— or proposing concessions to bring them into resistance— is a tactical matter. **At the stage of civil war, uniting with so-called patriots depends on whether they accept the program of the democratic revolution; in our country's concrete conditions, they do not.** This was also proven in China as early as 1927.

Without resolving whether a United Front should be formed at all— and if so, which stage of United Front it should be (a question related to determining the principal contradiction)— you have proceeded to discuss the process of forming a United Front and have characterized our work (which relates to the process of civil war) as one-sided and mechanical. This is laughable.

In section (b), you have produced much theorizing around our statement “only guerrilla warfare...,” branding it with various “isms,” and treating the word “only” as poisonous and to be discarded— while deliberately maintaining silence about the first part of the statement: “the guerrilla warfare strategy in the question of seizing area-based power.” What do we mean by the guerrilla warfare strategy? By this we mean that the initiation and development of guerrilla warfare brings to the fore every aspect related to revolution: party-armed struggle, United Front, mass movements, mass organizations, and so on. It is the proper resolution of these issues, in light of a dialectical materialist perspective, that advances the progress of the revolution. It is in this sense that it is said that only guerrilla

warfare can unite the broad masses of the people against the enemy.

Therefore, hear our statement once again: “*Only guerrilla warfare can mobilize and apply the total strength of the people against the enemy.*” We firmly believe this. By the word “only,” we do not negate other forms; rather, we designate guerrilla warfare as the principal and central task. **In our country, the principal theoretical danger facing Communists is revisionism, and defeating revisionism today is directly related to whether Communists will be able to seize power or not. By removing the word “only” and emphasizing the indispensable importance of “other” forms of struggle, a path is opened for revisionists to negate or weaken the principal form.** That is why we repeatedly insist on saying: “only guerrilla warfare...,” no matter how much intellectual hair-splitting or pedantic nitpicking you may engage in over literal meanings.

You have stated that the assertion “only guerrilla warfare...” is clearly opposed to Mao Zedong Thought. If that is so, whom do you intend to accuse of opposing Mao Zedong Thought— us, or the great, glorious, and correct Chinese Communist Party under the leadership of Chairman Mao? In fact, this statement was propagated by the Chinese Communist Party under Chairman Mao's leadership; we have merely quoted it from the widely circulated book *Long Live the Victory of People's War*, published by the Party under Chairman Mao's leadership. You may say that the book was written by the traitor Lin Biao. But even if it was written by Lin Biao, Chairman Mao and his close comrades— the Four Revolutionaries— did not oppose the politics contained in the book after Lin's downfall. It is the book's politics that the so-called “great revolutionary” Deng is opposing today, because the book analyzes the thought established by Chairman Mao.

Despite this statement being supported and propagated by the Chinese Party under Chairman Mao's leadership, arguing that it is anti-Mao Zedong Thought is precisely the kind of argument that the Deng clique has been tirelessly spreading in recent times. We are opponents of those who claim to be "great revolutionaries." We are sincerely saddened to see the similarity between your arguments and theirs, because in our country and globally, those who want to eliminate this word "only" are precisely the followers of the Deng clique.

In the discussion under section (c), while acknowledging that the main cause of disunity among patriotic revolutionaries exists, you nonetheless argue that in order to strengthen the Party, alongside the class line it is necessary to adopt separate activities specifically aimed at uniting patriotic revolutionaries. You present this as an important line question for strengthening the Party and as a question of correctly following the line of the front.

First: the meaning of the term "patriot" is related to the principal contradiction. **In the face of foreign aggression or after occupation, those who stand against foreign attack or occupation— regardless of class— are patriots of a resistance war or liberation war. At the stage of civil war, those who are called patriots are those who stand with or cooperate with the Communist Party in opposition to imperialism and feudalism and who express a willingness to complete the democratic revolution.** You must clearly state which type of patriots you are referring to.

Second: as far as we know, at present you consider the contradiction between U.S. imperialism and our country to be the principal contradiction, and consequently regard the present stage of revolution as the stage of national war— something that is entirely inconsistent with Mao Zedong Thought. We demand that

you analyze, in the light of Mao Zedong Thought, when and under what conditions the national contradiction becomes principal in a country. In contrast to you, we have correctly determined, on the basis of Mao Zedong Thought, that at present the principal contradiction is between feudalism and the peasantry and the broad masses, and consequently the present stage of the revolution is the stage of civil war. Therefore, standing at the stage of civil war, and in light of the kind of "patriots" whose unity you advocate in your letter, is it illogical to say this: "The tone that emerges from your letter reflects a Marxism-opposed tone of losing confidence in one's own class and seeking allies from other classes"? One noteworthy issue here is that you have simplified the language of our letter according to your own wishes (a tendency present throughout your entire second article). Rephrasing another's argument in one's own words can be good— but if it distorts the meaning, it becomes an unforgivable offense. For example, you wrote: "These things are forcing you to say that we have lost confidence in our own class and are seeking allies from other classes." Whether you are seeking such allies or not is not something we discussed in our letter. What we said was that in your particular letter, "the tone that emerges reflects an opposing line."

**Every movement is an external expression of class contradictions. Participants join movements under the influence of different contradictions and engage in struggle— this is a general characteristic of the oppressed masses. For this reason, any movement will, to a greater or lesser extent, attract the masses. That is why people are temporarily misled into believing they will benefit. The duty of Communists to support movements does not mean that Communists must support every movement. There is no question of supporting movements that, instead of moving**

**toward the destruction of imperialism, social-imperialism, expansionism, feudalism, and bureaucratic comprador capitalism, instead strengthen them even slightly or attempt to do so. Therefore, the criterion for Communist support of any movement should not be the level of mass participation, but how much the movement weakens imperialism and feudalism. Mass participation in different movements only shows that the masses are ready and that the objective material base for revolution is maturing. The duty of Communists is, on the basis of independent and self-reliant work— that is, firm practice of the class line and class struggle— to unite with the militant aspect of the masses and guide them toward the goal of genuine liberation. This method applies not only to movements initiated by reactionaries and those that exceed the limits of reactionary objectives, but also to spontaneous movements of the masses. If Communists fail to keep this in mind, they will sometimes play the role of assistants to reactionaries, and at other times engage in the worship of spontaneity. The goal of Communists should be to generate spontaneity through the practice of the class line and class struggle, and to link the broad masses to the revolution.**

In the above paragraph, we have briefly outlined our perspective on mass movements. From this, you should reconsider your imagined comment discussed in section (b), where you believe that we think “the current wave of mass movements is a counter-revolutionary wave.” In your first letter, the wave created by the 22-party alliance—which you enthusiastically praised as the “prudent” unity of reactionaries— we described as a counter-revolutionary wave, not the wave of the masses. You may consider the wave generated by the Six-Point Movement in the 1970 election and the so-called “independence wave” created by Mujib in 1971 to be revolutionary waves,

but we regard them as counter-revolutionary waves. Our writing may have been brief, but what we intended to say was expressed throughout the entire paragraph. Why then did you extract one line, strip it of context, and distort its meaning? Or are you attempting to master the revisionist habit of calling white black? You wrote, "We believe that such an evaluation of yours has been published." Seeing the level of such claims and assumptions, we find it amusing.

While discussing section (b), you further stated: "At present, the contradiction between the Ershad government and the broad oppressed masses (this contradiction being a combined expression of several fundamental class and national contradictions)..." This statement is unclear to us. Do you consider this to be the principal contradiction at present? Or do you believe that while the principal contradiction is something else, this is nevertheless one of the contradictions requiring special attention? When you embarked on such a lengthy discussion, should you not have discussed what the principal contradiction actually is? You deliberately avoided this issue. At one time, Haq, Twaha, Matin, Alauddin and others lacked the understanding that among multiple contradictions one must determine the principal contradiction. That is why your leader, Siraj Sikder, once labeled them revisionists. If Siraj Sikder were alive today, what would he label you?

The Ershad government is not a class; it is a representative of a class. **Concealing the class and focusing on its representative is the essence of bourgeois politics.** We have no difficulty understanding why the 22-party alliance and Jamaat-e-Islami oppose Ershad while concealing the class he represents. When you say "the contradiction between the Ershad government and the masses (a combined expression...)," we want to know: if

this is not an attempt to conceal the class and foreground its representative, then what is it? The class character of the 22-party alliance, Jamaat-e-Islami, and Ershad is one and the same. Therefore, it is natural for them to conceal Ershad's class character. But you claim to represent the proletariat— then why do you want to conceal Ershad's class? Those who, behind the signboard of the proletariat, conceal Ershad's class while supporting movements led by Khaleda against Ershad— we call them, in the light of Mao Zedong Thought, outright revisionists.

Now let us turn to the discussion of what you wrote under the heading of Question No. 2. In reply to your first letter, we stated: "The imprint of an insurrection-based, centrally organized seizure of power is clearly visible in your letter." We did not explain in that letter how this was clear. Within the limits of a short letter, that was not possible. What we intended was to touch upon our differences with you and attempt, through discussion, to resolve them so that we might arrive at ideological unity. We are aware that your first letter, based on the principal contradiction as you have determined it, raised the question of a front (even though some of the statements had an ideological basis). But in our reply, what we sought to raise was whether it is possible to bring forward the question of ideological unity. Why should Communist revolutionaries unite in a front? We have already discussed when and how fronts are formed, and in light of that discussion we reiterate: **Communist revolutionaries do not unite in a front; they unite ideologically in a party.** Your assessment is that we are at the stage of national war. Therefore, you naturally take the formation of a national-war-stage united front as an absolutely necessary task. But since your assessment is incorrect— since the stage is civil war— you have called upon parties that merely bear the name "Communist" to form a front (we are not calling ourselves

name-bearers). Is this not an expression of your theoretical bankruptcy? Every party that claims to be a Communist Party has a clear position and considers itself to be the leading party. To think that a front can be formed with them on an issue-by-issue basis is nothing but foolishness. Therefore, our position is to sincerely strive to establish ideological unity with revolutionary-minded individuals, groups, and party name-bearers.

Now let us discuss why we said, "The imprint of an insurrection-based seizure of power is clearly visible." In your first letter, did you mention even once rural-based guerrilla warfare? Did you speak of forming a counter-army and, on that basis, raise the question of seizing state power? You did not even go near these issues. What you did say was to pull the people out of the electoral dead-end and build a mass movement aimed at overthrowing the military rulers. If this is not insurrection-based thinking, then we do not know what is. Even so, prior to making that statement we noted: "You are in favor of area-based seizure of power (at least your documents say so)."

After receiving your second letter, we came to understand the extent of your grasp of what is meant by "area-based seizure of power." By area-based seizure of power, we understand Jinggangshan. In your second letter, you expressed this view and, referring to the struggle organized in Atrai under our Party's leadership in 1972, stated that "your Party, under the leadership of Comrade Siraj Sikder, opposed it at the time," and went on to say what should have been done, adding that if one were to "follow the line of area-based seizure of power as in 1972," you would oppose it.

First: there are two paths to the seizure of power before Communists— one is insurrection-based, the other area-based. This does not mean that in an insurrection-based path there will be no elements of area-based

seizure of power, or that in an area-based path insurrection will not be utilized. The question is which is principal and fundamental— that is what matters. You wrote: “If one merely says ‘area-based seizure of power,’ we cannot, in one word, support or oppose it.” We believe that it is precisely because it is area-based seizure of power that we support it. But if someone distorts the meaning of the phrase “area-based seizure of power,” applies it in a distorted way, or uses it to deny concrete reality, then we oppose it.

Second: your evaluation of Atrai is entirely concocted. We did not consider it Jinggangshan, nor do we believe that Jinggangshan can be mechanically repeated. Yet you opposed it. When workers and peasants in a locality revolt, throw off exploitation and repression, and move toward establishing their own state power, is it revolutionary to block their path, stand behind them making faces, and oppose them— no matter how many weaknesses that struggle may have had? **Generally, reactionaries directly attempt to crush any struggle by workers and peasants to seize state power through repression, while revisionists— the lackeys of reactionaries— begin propagating that “this is not the correct way to struggle.” If reactionaries succeed temporarily in suppressing the struggle, revisionists then jump up and say, “We told you so from the beginning.” This is the experience of revolutionaries throughout the world.** Therefore, consciously or unconsciously opposing any struggle for the liberation of workers, peasants, and the toiling masses only strengthens the hand of reaction. What Communists must do is utilize experience— correct the negative aspects of struggle and develop its positive aspects. Revisionists want to struggle with a guarantee of success; Communists follow Comrade Mao Zedong’s principle: “Struggle, fail, struggle again... until victory.” The

Atrai struggle enriched the Party with both successes and failures, and the Party presented these experiences in its report on the armed struggle in Atrai.

Third: under the leadership of Siraj Sikder, your Party opposed the Atrai struggle not on the question of whether area-based seizure of power was correct or incorrect, but on the basis of the theory that East Bengal was a colony of India— a theory which, according to you, later turned into U.S. neo-colonialism after being seized by the Americans through the 1975 coup, and in which the principal contradiction today is between the entire people and the United States. At that time, however, we were struggling on the basis that East Bengal was semi-colonial and semi-feudal, with the feudal contradiction being principal. On the basis of this colonial theory, Siraj Sikder opposed it.

Another noteworthy issue is that you wrote: "In building bases in the countryside, we also have fundamental differences from China... likewise, we believe there are fundamental differences between building a base in one isolated area in a single leap and sustaining and developing it, and the question of urban mass movements and mass insurrections."

Was building a base in one isolated area in a single leap the principal form of base-building in the Chinese Revolution? Only one such base emerged in China—Jinggangshan— and its context should not be unfamiliar. But were all other bases formed in the same way as Jinggangshan? As for the question of urban mass movements and mass insurrection, we do not understand what you are trying to say. In the Chinese Revolution, urban mass movements and mass insurrections were given serious consideration and, as complements to rural armed struggle, the revolutionary movements of broad sections of intellectuals and workers in the cities were linked with the overall struggle in the countryside. This is a universally

known experience of the Chinese Revolution. Even so, you raise the issue of “fundamental differences” and “basic divergence.” The word “fundamental” needs to be examined carefully. What the Chinese Party said was that from now on, countries of this type would fundamentally follow the Chinese path.

In our first letter, when we stated “You are in favor of area-based seizure of power (at least your documents say so),” we meant that fundamentally there is convergence between us regarding the process of seizing power. But based on your statements in your second letter, we now see that there are also many differences between us in terms of knowledge and understanding. This, we believe, should now be clear to you from the discussion above.

In point no. 3, you discussed our statement from the first letter— “your perspective on the question of mass movement and mass organization is revisionist”— and asked why we said so. You have also presented what you think about this matter. Here too, our differences are quite clear, and your second letter proves this even more sharply.

Every movement has a specific objective, and once that objective is achieved, the functional relevance of the movement comes to an end. If the leadership of a movement remains in place without setting new objectives and continues to cling to the old objective as its goal, then the revolutionary character of that leadership also comes to an end. There was a time when forming trade unions itself was considered revolutionary work— when trade unions were banned. Today, observing the movement of the 23-party alliance, which has been licensed by the current military rulers for conducting an anti-martial law movement, and seeing your own thinking about forming a front to build an anti-martial law movement by drawing attention to the unity of the 22

parties— what kind of perspective does this reflect? If this perspective is not revisionist, then what should it be called? Revolutionary? We are sorry.

**Any mass movement that operates within the limits recognized by the ruling class, or even indirectly sanctioned by them, ultimately serves the interests of the ruling–exploiting classes. Therefore, communists must build mass movements and mass organizations by challenging all legal frameworks, and as a complement to the armed struggle for state power— not by being “tempered” by the unity of the 22 parties or the movements generated by them. Chairman Mao demonstrated that mass organizations and mass struggles function, prior to the outbreak of war, to prepare for war, and after the war begins, to advance it.** Despite having clearly presented our perspective on mass organizations and mass movements in writing back in 1976, we are compelled to revisit the issue once again due to your convoluted arguments. Your claim that we do not attach importance to mass movements and mass organizations is entirely fabricated and divorced from reality.

**We know that, from the standpoint of the development of consciousness, the masses are always divided into three strata: the active, the intermediate, and the inactive. At the initial stage of struggle, the intermediate strata advance by relying on the active section; to bring the backward or inactive sections into struggle, mass organizations and mass movements are indispensable. Revisionists believe that there is no mass line in guerrilla warfare. In contrast, we believe that guerrilla warfare— that is, the barrel of the gun— opens the path for mass organizations and mass movements. The organizational form of such mass organization will be revolutionary peasant committees, and the form of mass movement will be the seizure of landlords’ land and crops.**

Another noteworthy point here is this: based on whatever writings of your leader, Mr. Siraj Sikder, on mass movements and mass organizations we have read, it is clear to us that your present perspective on mass movements and mass organizations is fundamentally different from that of Siraj Sikder. The type of mass movements and mass organizations you are now carrying out were precisely the kinds against which Siraj Sikder was vocally opposed.

In the discussion under point no. 4, you have identified election boycott as your strategy, and characterized unity with those who tactically boycott elections as our tactic. You believe that election boycott constitutes partial politics, whereas we believe it constitutes comprehensive politics. Accordingly, you attempted to refute our statement— “to fail to present our comprehensive political line through election boycott amounts to a compromise with bourgeois ideology”— by claiming: “your erroneous perspective and line regarding urban mass movements compel you to fail to understand the importance of this tactical line.”

**In our country, election boycott is not only strategically correct but tactically correct as well. Therefore, merely advocating election boycott without building armed struggle as its antithesis carries no significance. Unity based solely on election boycott, divorced from politics or ideology, is equally meaningless.**

We do not view election boycott separately from comprehensive politics (the building of the people's army and the seizure of state power through armed struggle). You do— and that is why you have reduced election boycott to an issue-based movement. Election boycott is not an issue; it is a specific component of comprehensive politics. Yet you have presented it as a condition for issue-based unity, not on the basis of comprehensive politics.

This is precisely why we said that you view election boycott as partial politics— and this perspective is undoubtedly a compromise with bourgeois ideology. As for your erroneous views on mass movements, we have already refuted them earlier.

Let us now turn to the discussion under point no. 5. You have treated the question of uniting with “these forces” (i.e., Mao-opponents— author’s note) as a tactical question. We believe that, today, uniting with any Mao-opposing so-called communists on any question is not a tactical issue— it is a principled issue. In the present era, no communist can, on principle, unite with Mao-opposing so-called communists on any question whatsoever. The context of this statement was your assertion in the first letter: “Yet, on the contrary, there is a lack of importance given to understanding and unity among genuine revolutionary and patriotic forces. It is true that due to recent ideological debates within the international communist movement, intense debates have taken place and continue to take place among various parties in this country, and this struggle cannot be abandoned or underestimated. Nevertheless, despite this, there exist certain areas of agreement among such parties in the domestic context—”

First: who are “genuine revolutionaries and patriots”? Can anyone other than communists be so? Apart from communists, others can be revolutionary or patriotic only within a limited context. For example, in the face of foreign aggression, many may play a patriotic role; in the overthrow of feudalism, the bourgeoisie may play a revolutionary role— but they all have limitations. Therefore, in today’s era, the genuine patriots and revolutionaries are communists. By using the word “genuine” in your writing, you intended to imply that all those to whom you sent the letter are communists. Second: while acknowledging the

recent ideological disputes within the international communist movement, your attempt to foreground unity among “genuine” patriots and revolutionaries by highlighting supposed domestic commonalities is laughable.

If any communist believes that Mao-opponents are communists, then that individual, group, or party forfeits the right to stand in the ranks of communists. Therefore, if you consider unity with so-called communists to be unity among genuine revolutionaries and patriots, we oppose it.

In your second letter, you proposed unity with Mao-opposing so-called communists based on two points: (1) whether they oppose the five-point election demand and desire a movement to overthrow Ershad's autocracy through force, and (2) whether they want to overthrow all imperialism including the U.S. and Russia, Indian expansionism, comprador bourgeoisie, and feudalism. And by placing these two points forward, you claimed that the question of being Maoist or anti-Maoist does not arise.

This claim of yours is utterly childish. Because you believe— and therefore argue for unity— that Mao-opposing individuals wearing the communist label can conduct a movement to overthrow U.S. and Soviet imperialism, Indian expansionism, comprador bourgeoisie, and feudalism through force (which necessarily raises the question of building an army). This is an unjust demand placed upon Mao-opponents— like asking a hibiscus flower from a jute plant.

In the second letter, you also wrote: “Your position is that there can be no unity on any question with Mao-opposing so-called communists,” and then, taking this distorted version of our position as your basis, you presented numerous arguments that are laughable. As before, we once again draw your attention to our

complete position as stated in our first letter and reiterated earlier in this one— a position you yourself briefly touched upon near the end of your discussion under point no. 5. If you understood it, then was there any need for five or six pages of bombast based on a distorted version of our argument? We have clearly stated: **on principle, no communist can today unite with Mao-opposing so-called communists on any question.** Do you want further analysis of why we said this? Then listen— there is a saying: singing Shiva's hymns while pounding rice. That is exactly what you have done in trying to prove that unity with Mao-opposing so-called communists is correct. Are Mao-opposing so-called communists revisionists? If they are revisionists, are they allied forces in the national democratic revolution? Can any issue be found to carry out a united movement with the revisionist Mani Singh? Without addressing these questions, you have deafened us with empty rhetoric and even cited Mao's united front with Chiang Kai-shek. One can only marvel at the depth of your knowledge and research. So listen once again to our position: "On principle, no communist can today unite with Mao-opposing so-called communists on any question whatsoever." Add to this our further position: "In the national democratic revolution, communists unite with the bourgeoisie on principle for the realization of the bourgeoisie's maximum program and the communists' minimum program." We have previously stated that **one of the essential conditions for forming a front is the party's independence and autonomy. A party preserves its independence and autonomy not by compromising with revisionism, but by waging a firm and uncompromising struggle against it.** In our country's national democratic revolution, the party's policy toward the bourgeoisie is unity–struggle–unity. Toward revisionists, the party's policy must always be struggle— never unity. Do you not

consider Mao-opposing so-called communists to be revisionists? In the present national and international situation, are they not loyal and newly emerging agents of U.S. imperialism and Soviet social-imperialism for suppressing revolution? If one accepts Mao Zedong Thought as the highest developed form in the present era, then these Mao-opposing so-called communists must be identified as revisionists and their “revolutionary” mask must be torn off. If one accepts the lessons of the Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution, one must also accept that without intense and uncompromising struggle against Mao-opposing so-called communists on every question, the revolutionary movement cannot advance even a single step. Conversely, it can be said that any movement that unites with Mao-opposing so-called communists today contains not a shred of revolutionary content. To view a part as an independent totality rather than as subordinate to the whole is one-sidedness and mechanical thinking. You are judging the anti-Ershad movement not in the light of the national democratic revolution, but as a separate, self-contained movement. Thus, it is not we who suffer from one-sidedness and mechanical thinking—it is you. You search for elements of election boycott within Mao-opposing so-called communists, and seek temporary unity with them without judging their class character—and not within the framework of the national democratic revolutionary program. You evaluate them not as a totality, but by isolating a part from the whole—forgetting that the part is subordinate to the whole. Recently, Deng Xiaoping and his ilk have been using precisely this method in evaluating individuals. **According to the laws of development of matter, revisionists certainly contain some good elements—but these are so negligible that, in overall assessment, they can bring no benefit to the people.**

**Similarly, communist revolutionaries also contain negative elements— but in overall assessment, these do not harm the people.** According to your logic, searching for good elements within Mao-opposing so-called communists is akin to searching for whole chickpeas in excrement in a famine-stricken region. Finally, we wish to note this: even if you fail to understand the distinction between Mao-opposing so-called communists and Mao-opposing bourgeoisie, we understand it clearly. We have explicitly referred to Mao-opposing communists. Your attempt to drag Mao-opposing bourgeoisie into the discussion is nothing but a bourgeois trick to muddy the waters through verbal gymnastics, combined with a pedantic urge to “educate” the masses.

In the context of the above discussion, if you are sincere on the question of revolution, it should become clear to you that, despite the existence of other differences between us, determining the principal contradiction first is itself the primary task; once that is done, all other problems can be resolved with relative ease. You have repeatedly attempted to portray our party line as one-sided, mechanical, and sectarian. You have done so on the basis of the theory that “national war is primary.” If a stage of national war indeed exists in East Bengal, then our party line would certainly be right-opportunist— i.e., revisionist— concealed beneath leftist phrase-mongering. In that case, the labels you have applied would be essentially correct. However, if our determination of the principal contradiction is correct— that is, if a stage of civil war exists here— then your party line is unquestionably a revisionist line afflicted with the disease of right opportunism. We believe your line to be revisionist. If you remain firm in your line, then we expect you to advance your arguments in favor of the national contradiction and propagate them at all levels, both

within the party and outside it. We are mentally prepared to engage in discussion on all questions— taking the principal contradiction as the principal— with all individuals, groups, or party-named organizations that sincerely possess a revolutionary disposition. If the relationship between you and us is to develop to the stage of being brought under the same party banner, we believe that both the drafting of documents and discussions at the central level are of great importance. Alongside this, there exists the necessity of being motivated by deep sincerity and a sense of moral seriousness on the questions of revolution and ideology.

Finally, we welcome your decision to circulate the polemical correspondence between our two parties at all levels. We have adopted the same course.

30 July 1985