

# NAXALBARI

**Journal of CPI(ML) NAXALBARI**

**No: 2, JUNE 2003**

## **Contents**

The Drama Unfolds	page 2
The Fight to Establish Maoism – ajith	page 6
Maoist Perspective on People’s War – bhavin	page 13

**The Drama Unfolds– New World Order 2**  
**Vs**  
**New Wave of World Proletarian Revolution.**

The New world Order 2 was offing since mid Nineties. But it got a real push with Bush wrestling his way, through manipulation, to the Presidential Office. The arena left open after the fall of Soviet Social Imperialism was to be grabbed and the US monster put up its stake. Most of the other imperialist forces were swept aside by the swaggering tail of the monster unleashed. As for the crawling insects –the third world regimes- they were left with two choices, either get out of the way or get trampled. Afghanistan, Iraq were crushed. All in a span of 3 years.

The imperialism in its driven by the greed for super profits wants to control everything's. The markets, natural resources, production, labour power, culture, technology-including what we should think and how we should live, everything, everything under the sun. The self proclaimed policeman of the world-the US- dreams to be the unchallenged emperor of the world. This is the fairy tale version of the US crusade.

The imperialism in its deathbed is becoming vicious day by day. As the keeps growing the competition among the imperialists keeps intensifying. Now there is no room for fair playing sharing the loot US wants to grab the lion's share, leave the rest for those imperialists who support them. Of course the crumbs are meant for the comprador puppets of the III World. The new world order which started with WTO Globalisation, was supposed to be an open competition among the imperialists to deepen their hold and exploitation of the third world market. The colonisation of Iraq with sheer military strength against a hopeless and extremely weak country with disregard even to their own façade of democratic norms and values-ushers the New World Order-2, the American variety. Henceforth their word will be the final word, their decisions the law, their decree the justice.

Last few months we saw feeble opposition of Franco- German clique, to the US's Middle East and Gulf oil it means US controls the supply of oil to Europe. It also means end of their stakes in Iraq and Gulf. Yet they could not dare flex their muscles. Because, America is far, far more powerful than the entire imperialist lot who opposed the Iraq War. America's capability to deploy huge number of troops along with tanks and heavy armaments in short notice anywhere in the world, there technical superiority in air and missile strike, advanced technology, strong defensive mechanism to thwart any challenges and to mention their huge nuclear arsenal, backed by evergrowing extraordinarily high defence beget-makes them highly invincible in conventional warfare. Infact Russia, France Germany unashamedly expressed their inner feeling-that in event of war with Iraq-US must win. This meek submission to US established the dialectical nature of imperialist contradiction ,collusion and contention. It also explains why the British ruling class is stooping so low. Blair is reduced to the level of mere member of Bush cabinet.

UN- the instrument and the democratic mask of the imperialists has out grown its utility in the present world order. It could not stop US aggression of Afghanistan and Iraq. It has now legitimised US colonisation of Iraq. Iran, Korea, Syria are in firing line of US. US senate has approved an increase in budget by 50 billion dollars for the next year. Top US officials do not shy away in boasting US fighting capacity at various war fronts throughout the world simultaneously. 'Imperialism means war'- Lenin said, and they can't do away with it. The entire imperialist empire of hegemony and domination, their edifice of loot and exploitation, is based on their armed strength. Nine of the other imperialists have political and economic hold over the III world countries as strong as America. All these together puts America way ahead of the rest combined. Hence they are dictating terms. They have asked Mushraff and Vajpayee to settle differences and they are abiding like obedient servants. LTTE has bowed down and agreed for talks principally due to pressure from US. This is just the start of the New World order<sup>2</sup>.

America knew it very well that its aggression is bound to meet with stiff resistance. But then, imperialism is known to lift the biggest rock to drop it on its own feet. Their arrogance has added fuel to the fire, and this fire is going to take the form of a prairie fire, which Mao has often talked about. In past 10 months we have seen the growth of 'hate US imperialism' wave. Crores of people from all walks of life have protested against US terrorism. On Feb. 15<sup>th</sup> alone more than 1.5 crore took to the streets in various cities throughout the world. This is unprecedented in history. Even in the turbulent 60's we didn't see such an Anti-war. US outrage. The puppet regimes of US too have found it difficult to openly support US and they had to circumvent ways to indirectly support US; succumbing to the people's pressure and probable loss of face. The die hard rightists, RSS, who had in the 60's demonstrated in support of US war in Vietnam, had to keep their excitement in control. Though Togadia made a comment in calling this war as a just war on communal lines, he had to retract from his position as soon as the entire Sangh Parivar washed their hands off, by saying it was his personal opinion. The entire reactionary press too was solent in showing any indication of support to this war overtly. In fact since Afganistan war the press is forced to write about US highhandedness, their human rights violation records, their rule through arm-twisting and greater details of how Osama and Saddam were their own creation. The globalised world of hitech communication had made it easier for people in far off places to communicate their voice of dissent. All this favours greatly the emerging new wave of World Proletarian Revolution. It has been taking shape in the form of various, armed and unarmed, people's resistances and struggles throughout the world. Every WTO meet since Seatele has witnessed higher and higher resistance, so much so that even recently, in Evian and Geneva, the authorities had to open fire at the protestors and resort to ruthless lathi charge.

Similarly each country has witnessed growing dissent and instability, with the basic needs of jobs, food, shelter, healthcare, water, clean environment slipping away from the millions of toiling masses. Peoples' discontent is getting organised and expressed through various forms of struggles, like nationality, ethnic, caste, race or religion and are refusing to die out easily. Though most of these struggles are led by chauvinists and rightists and directly or indirectly become the pawn in the imperialist and reactionary game plan-yet it has brought forward to the masses the necessity to raise arms. We know very well that the leadership of these struggles are surely going to ditch the masses, but as the revolutionary option will come forth, glaringly polarisation will take place and the masses will choose the right path.

The much political stability for the imperialist and the reactionaries is getting far from their reach. The people of Iraq have already started their resistance against US occupation. While Palestine, the bone in US throat, just refuses to be cowed down; even in an extreme repressive situation where unarmed women and children are facing an advanced and vicious Israeli military.

In this situation of chaos we see 3 specific anti-imperialist trends developing. One, of Ngo's, Socialists Democrats, Liberals, Greens, Humanists etc., getting organised as World Social Forum. Its Asian chapter was very consciously held in Hyderabad recently. They are the one who are playing the lead role in organising the anti-globalisation struggles and demonstrating in front of every WTO meet, throughout the world. But that is the extent they can go, peaceful demonstration, voluntary boycotts, social empowerment programmes, alternative technologies, etc, programmes funded by the imperialist institutions. They oppose armed struggle and expect Gandhian form of struggles to be the weapon of the masses to fight the bloodthirsty monsters and their conscience-less local reactionary puppets, their terror machinery, their draconian laws. They are cherishing impossible dreams that with people boycott of MNC products alone, they can run the giant multinationals 'out of business'. These day dreams are intoxicants in progressive wrappings and in more than one way it helps the imperialists and their rivalry. Already a new trend backed by French and Germans are making rounds that there are good MNCs-with intentions of uplifting the poverty levels, are environment friendly and more humans-and there are bad MNCs swindlers exploiters, environmental abusers (like Enrons, Monsanto-of course all American MNCs). They are also developing their theories. Presently there is a talk about emergence of another superpower challenging the US superpower and that is-voice of the people of the world. This is a perverted version of the strength of the masses. They provide illusions of power called 'empowerment' and never speak of real political power to the masses. They oppose all kinds of violence-reactionary violence as well as violence of the struggling masses. These propagators of peace are in fact delaying the total onslaught of the masses on this repressive system and thereby serving imperialism But masses will not be cheated for long by these people. The emerging wave will sweep them aside.

The other trend that has developed is that of the Islamists. The radical Islam will be on the rise and more attacks on imperialism is to follow. But the ideology of Islam like any other reactionary ideology serves the ruling class and imperialists. It lacks the capacity to unite the entire masses against the common enemy. In fact they cannot unite their own sects which are diametrically opposed and are killing each other. Most of the Islamist leaders and organisations have been built and nurtured by CIAs like Saddam, Osama, Mullah Omar, etc The Islamic states in Iran under Taliban, and Khomeini, Khatami, Afghanistan under Taliban, and the Arab countries the Kings were and are worst reactionary regimes. The people in Iran are waging fierce struggle against the draconian laws and repression of the theocratic state.

Though Islamist organisations have taken up arms and practice self-sacrifice in the name of fighting for god-'jihad' they can't and will not root out imperialism due to their inherent reactionary class nature. Saddam Hussein who was been looked upon as an anti-imperialist hero, who vowed to die fighting on the Iraqi soil, back stabbed the brave resistance put up by Iraqi people. The leaders, the elite Republican Guard commanders and officers, all sought safe havens for themselves leaving the people in lurch to face the enemy. The political-economical structure of any Islamic state is no different from any other reactionary semi feudal, semi-colonial state. Their jihad is against non-believers of Islam, hence they don't see any difference

between masses and rulers. No wonder they have not been able to punish a single reactionary leader. Their victims throughout the world had been ordinary people.

The third and most important, promising emerging trend is that of the Maoist revolution. In Nepal, Peru, Philippines, Turkey, India the Maoist People's War is advancing and giving a hard time for the imperialist and reactionaries. In a short period of seven years CPN(M) in Nepal could transform the countryside into shining trenches of world revolution. The formation of Co-ordination Committee of Maoist Parties and Organisations of South Asia (CCOMPOSA) is the sign of growing unity and co-ordination among the Maoist Parties to fight the common enemy and advance the revolutionary Peoples War in South Asia. The Revolutionary Internationalist Movement (RIM), as an embryonic centre of Maoist, synthesizes positive negative experience of the movements and guides the movements through debates on various questions, developing the level and coming to a common understanding. RIM played an important role in establishing Maoism as the third and higher stage of proletarian ideology as a weapon to deal with the neo-revisionists and opportunists. RIM has correctly declared the principal contradiction in the world today is between the imperialist and the oppressed masses and countries and that revolution is the main trend. It aims at forming a communist international of a new type. Efforts of RIM has helped various organisations within it to grasp Maoism and rectify their understanding and line. Formation of new Maoist parties, mCP(Italy), CPN(MLM)(Iran), have strengthened RIM as the leading International Maoist organisation. Recent Congress of MKP {Party of Turkey and North Kurdistan, earlier TKP[ML]} has made thorough summations of 30 years of armed struggle and plans were drawn up to surge ahead based on the advanced experience of Peru/Nepal.

Distinction between genuine revolutionaries and revisionists is getting clearer and polarisation taking place accordingly, with a speeding up of unity process. Firm anti-feudal, anti-imperialist stand, a political programme to root out the reactionary ruling class and destroy its system and establish the new state under the dictatorship of the proletariat and march on by continuing class struggle right up to communism comes from Marxism-Leninism-Maoism. It is the only liberating scientific ideology which can unite the entire toiling masses against the enemy class- it is the only hope of the wretched of the earth.

The drama has begun- The new wave of World Proletarian Revolution is progressing, emerging advanced and scientific as against the New World Order which is the struggle of a dying-decaying imperialist system to survive. Decks are getting cleared for final assault on the Maoists. (Present pressure on Com. Jose Mario Sison of CCP (Philippines) and threats to CPN(M) are some of the indication.) Maoists are getting ready to defeat it by trying to mobilise the struggling masses throughout the world to unite and get organised under the banner of Maoism. This new wave of World Revolution alone can challenge the new world order. All the tech technological might, and advanced fire power will bite the dust once the masses rise in torrents. China, Vietnam, Korea are the glaring examples in history where peasants and workers under the leadership of Communist Party-armed with Maoist theory of People' War-could destroy and humiliate the warring imperialists. Saddam's and Osama's can't even think of it. The new wave of World Proletarian Revolution is growing. It is our responsibility to accelerate its pace.

Our responsibility lies principally in advancing the revolutionary process in our country by launching a new wave of People's War in India much higher than the first wave experienced in the 60s under CM's leadership. The situation now demands an all out effort to start the

destruction of this parasitic repressive state. For centuries the masses, burdened by the feudal ruling class and later by imperialist colonisers and comprador bureaucrat capitalist ruling class, are craving to be organised and led scientifically. 56 years of bogus freedom is enough for the masses to realise the futility of this system. Only a small section of the educated, job holding urbanites have faith and hope in this decomposed dead corpse which only serves the parasites and maggots.

The ruling classes are visualizing this danger. Hence, enactment of POTA, carrying out genocides, false encounters, repressions, malicious campaigns, telling blatant lies and covering up with bogus judicial inquiries-whenver and wherever the people are voicing dissent. Only by uniting our strengths, on correct lines, can we, not only thwart their repression and terror but also give decisive blows to this ailing system.

---

## **The Fight to Establish Maoism**

**ajith**

It is now more than 20 years since the Communist Party of Peru adopted Marxism-Leninism-Maoism (MLM) and almost 10 years since it was adopted by the Revolutionary Internationalist Movement (RIM). The initial decade was one of struggle and steady advance within the ranks of the RIM. Following the adoption of MLM by the RIM in 1993, the worldwide struggle to establish it acquired a powerful thrust. Since then, Maoist Parties engaged in People's War, but outside the ranks of the RIM, have also adopted MLM. This has further sharpened the lines of ideological demarcation and strengthened the struggle to establish Marxism-Leninism-Maoism as the commander and guide of the world proletarian revolution. In a related development, the RIM was further strengthened when the Maoist Communist Centre [at present Maoist Communist Centre India (MCCI)], a party with a decades long history of waging People's War, joined it. The adoption of MLM has further propelled its participant members to make leaps. The most significant among them was the historic initiation of the People's War in Nepal by the Communist Party of Nepal (Maoist) [CPN (M)] and its rapid advance. New leaps were also seen through the foundation of the Maoist Communist Party, Italy and the Communist Party of Iran (MLM) as well as in the successful 1<sup>st</sup> Congress of the Maoist Communist Party (of Turkey and North Kurdistan, earlier TKP [ML]), which has made significant progress in the line of the party. The advances made by our party in summing up the past, developing an outline perspective on the military line and tackling the tasks of completing preparations is also a direct product of the struggle to uphold, defend and apply Marxism-Leninism-Maoism, particularly Maoism.

MLM emerged through struggle and continues to advance through struggle against various rightist trends. In India, the CPI(ML) Red Flag (RF) tried to brand RIM's position on MLM as Lin Piaoism. Unable to put up any substantial argument, it tried to confuse the issue by raising the false charge that RIM was defining Maoism as the Marxism-Leninism of the new era. The fact is that RIM's document 'Long Live Marxism-Leninism-Maoism' clearly states: "...Lenin

described the era in which we live as the era of imperialism and proletarian revolution.” (A World To Win, No: 20, page 6, emphasis added.) This fraudulent attack of the RF was quite in keeping with the fraudulent tactics it employed to justify its slide to parliamentarianism. It will be useful to examine the ideological approach guiding these tactics.

The essence of the tactics employed by the RF consists in pitting the initial positions of the international communist movement (ICM) against its advanced grasp achieved later on. Thus the RF tried to hide its parliamentarist revisionism by taking refuge in one sentence of the 1963 General Line Proposal, which speaks about mastering all forms of struggle. (The explicit stand of this document on the necessity of waging armed struggle to seize political power was conveniently kept aside.) More importantly, the RF went on to reject the clarity achieved later on by the Maoist movement, when it firmly established the path of protracted People’s War (or the Chinese path) as the sole path of revolution in semi-colonial, semi-feudal countries. For the RF this was yet another Lin Piaoist sectarian deviation. What we see here is how revisionism handles the development of ideology. It studies the past not to shed light on the present ideological tasks, but to negate the advance of ideology. This approach often appears in various forms in the struggle to establish the new and it is worth paying attention to it.

The RF was well on its way to abandoning the revolutionary road when it tried to attack Maoism. But, significantly enough, we see a similarity between its conclusions and those of the Nepal Communist Party (Mashal) [NCP (Mashal)] or of the section, which was expelled from the MCCI in 2001. In both these cases the era question was sought to be used to obstruct the adoption of Maoism. The argument was that since the era had not changed there could not be any new ‘ism’, or overall development of ideology, after Leninism. One can speak of an overall development of proletarian ideology when it is developed in all the three components of philosophy, political economy and scientific socialism. But, as Mao pointed out, “*The basis is social science, class struggle.*” (Talks on Philosophy) That is, developments in all the three components have taken place through the continuing role of Marxism in guiding class struggle. If one keeps in mind the ups and downs and the advances made by the ICM since Lenin’s time, one would have no difficulty in grasping that this reality had thrown up the necessity of an overall ideological leap. This is what Mao Tsetung achieved.

Refuting the NCP (Mashal) the Committee of the RIM pointed out, “To maintain that Leninism covers all the contradictions of the era of imperialism and the building of socialism is to ignore the reality and replace it with some preconceived idea in one’s brain. It proceeds from formed definitions, not material developments, and as a result earthshaking events are treated as trivial and not requiring major effort to develop our understanding. This is subjective idealism, not Leninism.” (A World To Win, No: 20, pages 46-47.)

This qualification is equally applicable to the section expelled from the MCCI. They argued that, “As there are two stages of developments of capitalism, no third stage is there, so in case of Marxism there cannot be any third stage of its development.” (Quoted in the MCCI’s article “Take a Correct Position in the Debate on Maoism”, page 1.) In this case, the development of ideology is linked solely to economic stages!

Yet another common feature of both the NCP (Mashal) and this section is their so-called defense of Stalin. Both of them reject Mao’s criticisms on Stalin. They argue that his contributions are nothing more than a continuation of Stalin’s positions. Finally, both of them

conclude that Mao's contributions are only equal to Stalin's. Thus, they have ended up negating their own previous position of considering Mao Tsetung Thought as a new stage! Or rather, they have only succeeded in exposing that their earlier adherence to Mao Tsetung Thought was really covering up deep-rooted revisionism. One sees here yet another variant of the revisionist tactics of pitting the old against the new. Beyond that, their attack on Maoism, quite close to Enver Hoxha's attack, raises an important question. How should we grasp the rupture/continuity dialectic in the development of proletarian ideology?

Mao Tsetung no doubt inherited and applied the contributions of Stalin. We particularly stress Stalin's contributions in the struggle against anti-Leninist currents on international questions, building socialism and specific questions of the Chinese revolution. Moreover, he played a leading role in the ICM in the struggle to defend Stalin from the vile attacks of Krushchevite revisionists. But, and this was the key aspect, he did this by rupturing from outmoded ideas as well as real errors of Stalin. The continuity with Stalin's revolutionary legacy, or more broadly with the Marxist-Leninist legacy, was possible precisely because of this rupture. This is what paved the way for the development of the new, higher and third stage of proletarian ideology. On the other hand, in the name of defending Stalin, Enver Hoxha clung to his errors and ended up as a renegade. This has also been the inevitable trajectory followed by the NCP (Mashal). The section expelled from the MCCI can be expected to trail it, especially since they have taken to slandering the People's Wars in Peru and Nepal as 'left' adventurism; a regular refrain of the RF and the NCP (Mashal). This discussion helps us to understand how their metaphysics complements their idealism in the question of ideology.

For a long time before its expulsion from the RIM, while claiming to uphold Mao Tsetung Thought, the NCP (Mashal) had nursed a line, which was essentially rightist. Maoists accept the theory of People's War as an all round development of proletarian military science. But, for the NCP (Mashal) it was mere tactics. While Mao talks about continuous revolutionary situation existing in semi-colonial countries, the NCP (Mashal) was keen on imposing Lenin's analysis of revolutionary situation related to capitalist countries. All of these were, for long, essential aspects of the NCP (Mashal)'s line. Sharp exposure of these rightist positions took place only after the CPN (Maoist) [then NCP (Unity Centre)] adopted MLM and developed the revolutionary line. In fact, this rupture from the longstanding rightism within the Maoist movement of Nepal paved the way for the People's War and its rapid advance. On the other hand, despite its legacy of standing up against Teng revisionism, the NCP (Mashal)'s attack on Maoism rapidly opened the doors for its degeneration into a tool of the reactionaries.

These experiences bring us to an important question raised by the struggle to establish Maoism. Apparently, the adoption of Maoism is only a matter of terminology. Yet, in the two instances seen above, it led to much stirring up and brought out the revisionist sludge hiding behind the banner of Marxism-Leninism-Mao Tsetung Thought. It revealed sharp differences, within the RIM, the Nepali movement and the MCCI, over what exactly is understood as the universality of Mao's contributions. It posed sharp questions over what is grasped by claiming them to be a new or higher stage. Inevitably, these differences were of a vital nature affecting all aspects of a Party's line and practice. What was apparently a mere question of change in terminology turned out to be something of great ideological significance. If this is not grasped as such, the adoption of Maoism will remain a mere formality. Let us not forget that the



sharpening of the battle against revisionism can never be the automatic product of a new term in itself.

It is true that a formal checklist comparing Mao Tsetung Thought and Maoism will not reveal anything new. But that is hardly the point and we must be alert to avoid this trap of formalism held out by the opponents of Maoism. Mao Tsetung Thought and Maoism are not the same. There is something new here. Something new of great ideological importance is achieved by adopting Maoism. And this newness is not so much in the word as such. It resides in the rupture from an incomplete or fractured understanding of the universality of Mao's contributions taken as a whole and in the leap to a qualitatively higher, better, deeper grasp of our ideology. Evidently, any reasoning, which harps on emphasising that nothing new is added, will fail to mobilise the whole Party and lead it in carrying out this rupture. The task of actualising this grand potential for a vigorous ideological rectification, for achieving a better grasp of MLM, will be done in a partial manner. Even worse, it will be left to spontaneity.

One of the strengths of the RIM's 1993 document on MLM is that it addresses this squarely. The RIM had emerged from the consistent worldwide ideological struggle against Teng-Hua revisionism and Enver Hoxha's dogmato-revisionism. Its 1984 Declaration had correctly stressed Mao Tsetung's qualitative development of Marxism-Leninism and affirmed that he had raised it to a new stage. Yet, despite these advanced ideological positions, it was quite clear that the adoption of MLM was not a mere matter of changing terms. The experience of parties in the RIM, which had adopted MLM, clearly pointed out the ideological significance of this change. This was summed up in the following words, "... the use of the term 'Mao Tsetung Thought' in our Declaration reflected a still incomplete understanding of this new stage. In the last nine years our movement has been engaged in a long, rich and thoroughgoing discussion and struggle to more fully grasp Mao Tsetung's development of Marxism. During this same period the parties and organisations of our Movement and RIM as a whole have been engaged in revolutionary struggle against imperialism and reaction. Most important has been the advanced experience of the People's War led by the Communist Party of Peru, which has succeeded in mobilising the masses in their millions, sweeping aside the state in many parts of the country and establishing the power of the workers and peasants in these areas. These advances, in theory and practice, have enabled us to further deepen our grasp of proletarian ideology and on that basis take a far-reaching step, the recognition of Marxism-Leninism-Maoism as the new, third and higher stage of Marxism." (A World To Win, No: 20, page 4, emphasis added.) Yes, this further deepening of our grasp of proletarian ideology is exactly the key issue in adopting Maoism. It must be adopted on that basis and on that basis alone if it is to illuminate the way forward and defeat revisionism.

The struggle for Maoism has once again thrown up a longstanding issue within the ICM. Are 'ism' and Thought one and the same? Is the difference between them merely a matter of better expression? And how do they relate to line and the lessons of a specific revolution? The debate on such questions is only shaping up. So the views offered below are necessarily preliminary.

The 7<sup>th</sup> Congress of the Communist Party of China (CPC), held in 1945, stated that Marxism-Leninism and the Thought of Mao Tsetung was its guiding ideology. It also said that this Thought is specific to China. But even a quick survey shows us that many major

contributions of what is now established as Maoism had already been developed and tested over long years of revolutionary practice. The theory of New Democratic revolution, People's War, concept of bureaucrat capitalism, mass line, development of party concept, united front theory and ideological rectification, apart from Mao's philosophical contributions, are some among them. All of these were developed through struggle against right and 'left' opportunism, Trotskyism and dogmatism. In particular, Mao's creative application of Marxism-Leninism was closely related to a bitter struggle against mechanical copying of Russian experiences. And we know that the international sources of this deviation were the Comintern and Stalin. This raised a complex problem. Quite rightly, Stalin was considered as the authoritative international leader in that historical period. Some of the basic views put forward by this leadership on the world revolution in general and the Chinese revolution in particular were correct and had to be upheld. At the same time, there was also some wrong thinking and views, which had to be rectified. Hence, it wouldn't be wrong to assume that the term 'Thought of Mao Tsetung' emerged from the necessity faced by the CPC to draw attention to and clearly establish the distinct ideas guiding it, as compared to the prevailing, accepted, thinking dominating in the ICM. Whatever that may be, what is more important is the nature of Mao's contributions at that time itself. They were already having a universal character. In fact, they represented, and still represent, the one and only correct Marxist understanding about the path of revolution in colonial, semi-colonial countries. (The ICM acknowledged this only 4 years later.) Moreover, Mao's contributions already represented an advance in the Marxist-Leninist understanding on party, party building, united front and mass line. All of these are valid for both types of countries, that is imperialist and oppressed nations. (As we know, this was established in the ICM only after the Maoist revolt against Khrushchevite revisionism in the 1960's.) Thus, when the CPC used 'Thought' in 1945 and said that it is specific for China, this already represented a substantial qualitative development of Marxism-Leninism, tested through practice and having universal significance.

However, its further development was not mere addition. In the course of leading socialist revolution and the struggle against modern revisionism Mao Tsetung took proletarian ideology to new heights. In particular, it achieved an all-round development and made a grand leap through the Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution (GPCR). The GPCR itself gave a powerful push and paved the way for declaring this through the 9<sup>th</sup> Congress of the CPC. A major part of the Congress report is a systematic exposition explaining what is new in Mao Tsetung's theory of continuing the revolution under the dictatorship of the proletariat. The term 'Thought' was retained. But its universality, its role in achieving the third milestone in the development of proletarian ideology, had to be proclaimed and established. The 9<sup>th</sup> Congress report declared that Mao Tsetung had brought Marxism-Leninism to a higher and completely new stage. It sanctioned the term Marxism-Leninism-Mao Tsetung Thought. The process by which the 'Thought' of 1945 attained the heights of a completely new stage by 1969 is clear enough. Also clear is the difference between the 'Thought' of 1945 and that of 1969. Even though Mao Tsetung's contributions had achieved a universal character by 1945, this was far surpassed by the heights attained through the GPCR. It really merited the term Maoism. This much is evident from its contents and the role it played in advancing the ICM. One can only surmise that the CPC refrained from adopting Maoism due to the particular situation existing in the ICM at that time. Some have tried to use the 1973 10<sup>th</sup> Congress report's clarifications on the

era and Leninism to argue that the term ‘Thought’ was retained precisely for these reasons. But this logic goes against the recognition of the completely new stage, sanctioned by the 9<sup>th</sup> Congress and maintained later on.

This review leads us to conclude that ‘ism’ and ‘Thought’ must be distinguished from each other. While ‘Thought’ is also universal, ‘ism’ should be understood as an all round development of ideology, which takes it to a new stage. The difference is not one of more or less universality, but of more or less all round development that marks the leap to a new stage. Aided by this understanding we can proceed to examine the process by which the application of a revolutionary line gives rise to development of proletarian ideology.

‘Line’ is specific to a country and party. It is a particularity. But, if it is formulated through creative and correct application of MLM, this particularity contains the universality of MLM. It reflects this universality. In the course of its formulation, application, testing through practice and development it will give rise to a new grasp of MLM. It may also generate new concepts or contributions. The laws of revolution expressed by MLM are universal. But, as Lenin pointed out, every law ‘freezes’ reality. It is incomplete, relative. Therefore, the application of MLM laws or principles to chart out the course of revolution in any country also calls for enriching, developing, the conceptual understanding of those laws. Otherwise it would be cutting the feet to suit the ‘shoe’ of laws. This is the point about creative application. In fact, creative application of MLM precisely calls for such conceptual leaps in grasping the universal laws established by MLM. And thus, through its application in unraveling and handling the specific laws of a particular revolution, the universal laws of MLM themselves become more complete, more capable of grasping the complex, contradictory, motion of the whole human society. Even if the development of a revolution only gives rise to a new grasp of MLM, this still would be a qualitative development. It would still hold out lessons for every contingent of the ICM. Some revolutions may achieve even more and generate new concepts or contributions. But, the point to stress, is that all of this is possible even while there is only a ‘line’ and not yet a ‘Thought’. Or, in other words, a new ‘Thought’ is not a necessary condition for new contributions that enrich our ideology.

As stated at the beginning of this discussion on ‘ism’, ‘Thought’ and line, these views are quite preliminary. More study and debate is necessary to clinch the issue. At any rate, this whole debate holds out the promise of the ICM arriving at a deeper grasp of the whole process of development of proletarian ideology. This won’t be merely a matter of definitions or criteria to judge ‘ism’ from ‘Thought’ or line. It will give a tremendous boost to the contingents of the ICM in carrying out their tasks through creative application of MLM.

Earlier, we had mentioned the all round development and grand leap achieved through the GPCR. To be more precise, “...it was in the crucible of the Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution that our ideology took a leap and the third great milestone, Marxism-Leninism-Maoism, fully emerged.” (Quoted from RIM’s document on MLM, A World To Win, No: 20, page 9.) This is worth stressing and grasping deeply, especially in the context of vicious revisionist attacks on the GPCR. It is also necessary in view of the continuing confusion spread by neo-revisionists like the NCP (Mashal) who present the GPCR as nothing more than a matter of continuing class struggle in socialist society, go on to argue that this was already conceived by the great leaders of the proletariat and thus negate the ‘new’ in the GPCR. In the

quotation cited above the key words are 'leap' and 'fully emerged'. The GPCR was no doubt a continuation of class struggle in socialist society. But more than that it was the highest pinnacle achieved by world proletarian revolution. And this came out of some new, path breaking study made by Mao Tsetung on the contradictory character of socialist society. Taking lessons from the experiences of the Soviet Union, he came to the clear conclusion that the question of 'who has won' (the proletariat or the bourgeoisie) has not yet been settled. He went on to identify who the bourgeoisie is in socialist society, their roots and the center of their power. He also worked out how to fight them and uproot them. This was the cutting edge of the leap in ideology in all its three components. A comparison of the summation made in the 9<sup>th</sup> Congress report with further heights attained through the struggle against Lin Piao and Teng's rightist wind makes it amply evident that this leap took shape over the whole course of the GPCR, right up till the death of Mao Tsetung and the capitalist coup. This is why it is necessary and correct to say that this leap 'fully emerged' through the GPCR. It reminds us of the need to take up a deep study of the whole of Maoism as it developed through the GPCR and warns us against lowering our sights.

In this context it is necessary to insist that this leap also contains the outstanding analysis of the diverse aspects of class struggle in socialist China, made by Mao Tsetung's genuine followers. Among them, the sharp exposition of the material roots of capitalist restoration seen in the works of Chang Chun Chiao and Yao Wen Yuan merit special attention. (*'On Exercising All-round Dictatorship Over the Bourgeoisie'* by Chang Chun Chiao and *'On the Social Basis of the Lin Piao Anti-party Clique'* by Yao Wen Yuan. Though Yao later capitulated his work remains as an important contribution.) Mao Tsetung had observed *"...China is a socialist country. Before liberation, she was much the same as a capitalist country. Even now she practices an eight-grade wage system, distribution according to work and exchange through money, and in all this differs very little from the old society. What is different is that the system of ownership has changed."* (And Mao Makes Five, Page 211). He also said, *"Our country at present practices a commodity system, the wage system is unequal, too, as in the eight-grade wage scale, and so forth. Under the dictatorship of the proletariat such things can only be restricted. Therefore, if people like Lin Piao come to power, it will be quite easy for them to rig up the capitalist system. That is why we should do more reading of Marxist-Leninist works."* (Ibid, page 209). Starting from this, Chang Chun Chiao and Yao Wen Yuan went on to pinpoint how the continued existence of bourgeois right provides the soil for engendering the new bourgeoisie, why this soil has to be continuously dug away and why this has to continue all the way uptill communism since bourgeois right can only be restricted during socialism. These expositions armed the Maoists with a deep insight into the danger of capitalist restoration and were of immense help in quickly understanding what was happening in China after the coup. Furthermore, the struggle led by comrade Chiang Ching against Hua Kua Feng's line of pushing modernisation (as opposed to class struggle) as the key to advance the socialisation of agriculture also needs mention, since Hua is still considered by some as a genuine, if weak, element.

In the '60s, Comrade Charu Mazumdar wrote, *"...today, when we have got the brilliant Thought of Chairman Mao Tsetung, the highest stage of the development of Marxism-Leninism, to guide us, it is imperative for us to judge everything anew in the light of Mao Tsetung*

*Thought and build a completely new road along which to press ahead.*” (‘Party’s Call to Students and Youth,’ from The Historic Turning Point, Volume 2, Page 36, emphasis added.)

This crucial direction is again seen in the 1993 document of the RIM where it says: “From the higher plane of Marxism-Leninism-Maoism the revolutionary communists could grasp the teaching of the previous great leaders even more powerfully and even Mao Tsetung’s earlier contributions took on deeper significance. Today, without Maoism there can be no Marxism-Leninism. Indeed, to negate Maoism is to negate Marxism-Leninism itself.” (A World To Win, No: 20, Page 9, emphasis added.)

Yes, today the key to grasping proletarian ideology is grasping Maoism firmly. To say this does not in anyway separate it from the integral whole of Marxism-Leninism-Maoism. Rather, it is imperative to put stress on Maoism in order to sharpen the struggle against revisionism and all other alien thinking. We must uphold, defend and apply Marxism-Leninism-Maoism, particularly Maoism.

---

## **Maoist Perspective on People’s War**

BHAVIN

### ***Complexities of developing People’s War in India***

India is a vast country with huge population. The reactionary ruling classes are presently tied up with the lone superpower, the US. With their blessing they are pursuing expansionist dreams and have become the hated villain in South Asia. They have en-massed a huge defense system (4th largest in the world). Along with this they have a strong police, paramilitary, and espionage network, which makes it look almost invincible to defeat.

The other challenge faced by the revolutionaries is the sharp unevenness spread throughout the country’s length and breadth. Disparities in the socio-economic situation tend from highly feudal States like Bihar, UP, AP, Rajasthan to the pseudo-developed states like Kerala, Punjab, and parts of Maharashtra and Gujarat. Same is true of the consciousness of the masses, which is inseparably linked to the history of struggle in the States. If Rajasthan, MP, UP and Gujarat are very much under the control of fascist reactionaries and are backward, Kerala and Bengal, due to their long history of communist movement can be termed as advanced in comparison, though long hold of revisionists have muddled the views of the masses there. Different languages, nationality problems, cultures, castes, creeds and religion also divide the revolutionary classes. Hence a common formula for the entire country cannot be adopted.

The other serious question faced by the revolutionaries in India is to demarcate Maoist People’s War from the mire of various armed activities going on in India - nationalist wars, Islamist armed activities, Hindu fundamentalist genocides, Mafia clashes, warlordism and also various state sponsored terrorist activities. Imperialists and reactionaries brand any armed

dissent as 'terrorist' to isolate it from the masses and crack down on them. Hence we not only need to demarcate from this but also bring out the strength of Maoist war, which alone can dilute enemy propaganda, fight back attempts to isolate us and face up to the enemy onslaught.

But fissures and cracks are widening just under the thin veil of stability and unity. The ruling classes are preoccupied fighting various contradictions. Nationality problems have translated into fierce armed struggles in Kashmir and North East and continue to bleed the state. Expansionist and dominating attitude of the Indian ruling classes has strained relationship with all its neighbors. Poverty, unemployment, natural disasters, and failure of the system to provide basic necessities cannot be just wiped off by hollow speeches on India's progress and development. Globalisation, Liberalisation and Privatisation have started taking their toll, in the rural and urban areas alike. Small businesses are being swallowed up and the process of declassing is speeding up. Anger and discontent is widespread. Even the exposed parliamentary parties and reformist are forced to mobilise the masses for militant struggles. Masses have lost faith in the system, its bogus parliament, corrupt judiciary, and administration, and they hate the terror machinery. The objective conditions had never been so ripe for revolution. As the masses crave to be organised and led, the subjective forces, the revolutionaries are yet to unite and establish an All India Maoist vanguard party capable of giving leadership to the masses throughout the country.

Apart from these stark realities there are characteristics, which stand as advantages for revolution in India. The enemy's armed strength is duly engaged in fighting nationalist wars in Kashmir and North East and can't afford to leave the borders. The so-called unity of the army got a major jolt after the Blue Star Operation in Amritsar. Desertion and revolts are taking place in the army and its morale too is down in the wake of Tehelka and coffin scandals. The contradictions among the ruling classes are serious too, though not sharp. This is bound to aggravate with deteriorating situation.

The revolutionary situation is much more favourable than in CM's time, nationally and internationally. The anti-US, anti-war, anti-globalisation fervour is increasing rapidly. Ideological differences have been sorted out to a great extent and polarisation between revisionists and revolutionary forces are growing. We have the great experience of the armed struggle in AP, Bihar and Dandakaranya which has proved that armed struggles can be sustained over long periods. Moreover they are the pillars of our revolution.

It is in this background that we have to study the war question. Just crying over the unfavorable aspects will not do. As Maoists we have to weigh the positive and negative aspects judiciously, utilise the favourable aspects to change the unfavourable. As Mao reminded, **"Know your enemy and know yourself and you can fight hundred wars"**. Maoists in each country will have to study the specific laws of development of revolutionary war, learn from experiences of one another and develop methods of applying Marxism-Leninism-Maoism (MLM) creatively to the concrete conditions to unleash the revolutionary potential of the masses and bring about a nationwide high tide.

### ***Concept of Total War***

Objectively the task of waging protracted People's War to seize political power is already on the agenda in a semi-feudal, semi-colonial country like ours. Hence war must be made the

center of gravity of all our party work right from the beginning. Mao says **“Before the outbreak of war all organisations and struggles are in preparation of war... After the war breaks out, all organisations and struggles are coordinated with war directly or indirectly...”** (*Problems of War and Strategy*) Here it is clear that all organisations and struggles come under the purview of war or are centered on the war question before and after launching of war. This aspect of Maoist People’s War theory is well grasped by CPN(Maoist) and PCP. The application of this aspect is expressed in their concept of Total War. The plans they formulated also took into account the role of mass organisation and mass struggle. The political content of mass struggles too was defined in the plans. The brilliant usage of both forms of struggles alternatively in accordance with the requirements and tasks of particular sub-stages and specific campaigns is the creative application of this aspect, which is worth learning.

Mao says **“Victory in war is not just the sum total of victories in battles”**. We have to view this from the strategic point. There is a big difference between sporadic actions, armed struggles, and total war. Total war is a declaration: enough is enough and now we stand firmly to root out the system. It is carried out simultaneously in the rural areas as well as cities, with cities as complementary. Only with an all out effort, putting in all our strength to push the war through as planned for seizure of political power, will the full revolutionary potential of the masses be fully unleashed. (**“As the thoroughness of the historic action increases, the magnitude of the masses whose cause it represents will also increase.”** Marx-Engles.) Only then can we draw the line of demarcation with the enemy and deepen polarisation among various classes; not by war for resisting the enemy repression or for retaliation. Only then, through our own efforts, can we bring about a revolutionary high tide in the country and not wait for it to come on its own. In order to push through our People’s War and create a momentum of its own, which is of course linked with the principle of drawing in the masses, we have to select proper actions. Actions based on plans for each stage and sub-stage that will carry our political message. Actions striking at the symbols of the exploitative system, repression and imperialism and serving the establishment of the political power -dreamt for long time by the masses. This will differentiate the Maoist war from the various armed struggles and armed activities being carried out in the country. Only then can we come to the center stage at the national level.

We have to remember we have not been able to make much of a dent on the political agenda of the reactionaries. We have only reacted after every anti-people programme and policies have been successfully carried out by the reactionaries. The point to be stressed is that with our war we have force the ruling classes to take guard openly. We have to force them to change their tracks and to react to our war. This can be done only and only if we forcefully carry out our agenda in a planned manner and become the central threat to the enemy. This is what Mao means in **“... to draw a line of demarcation with the enemy.”** around which polarisation takes place. This is possible only when we really grasp the concept of total war, importance of strategic planning and accordingly push the People’s War through campaigns, stage by stage, developing it through leaps.

To think that the enemy will not carry out total war from the beginning itself, just because they won’t deploy the army, is to be naïve. They always employ proportionately higher force than our subjective strength and carry out total war – militarily, politically, ideologically, economically, emotionally, culturally and with malicious propaganda campaigns – with everything at their disposal. So limiting our war as a war of resistance, as a reaction to the

enemy, only serves to confuse the masses, who are actually supposed to take the struggles to higher levels in gigantic waves. Roles and tasks that the masses should take up don't come out clearly to them and thus the energies are not fully channelised. Unlike vanguard cadres and leaders who learn from study of classics, history, national and international experiences and synthesizing the party's experience, the masses mainly learn through experience. It is only when things become distinctly clear that the masses take up the struggle of self-sacrifice to emancipate themselves with full confidence. Apart from Nepal and Peru, experiences of Naxalbari distinctly stand out as an example of this approach. Though Naxalbari employed only one form of struggle, annihilation, for starting as compared to Peru and Nepal, which utilized all the four forms, the political content of going all out for seizure of power was loud and clear. That is why it could create a wave of revolutionary struggle. It is high time that a new wave of revolutionary People's War is launched and hence it is necessary to grasp the finer details of Maoist People's War theory in its entirety and apply it creatively.

### ***Question of strategic planning***

No work can be developed without planning, may it be of any level, a small action or a big operation. Mao said that though there are uncertainties in war it is possible to have a relatively stable plan. Plans can be made at various levels. For tactical plans or plans for battles, i.e. particular actions, the degree of uncertainty is much higher as they have smaller targets, smaller formation, swift movement, shorter duration and depend a lot on enemy movement. But still we have to plan for these actions meticulously keeping all eventualities in mind and, if the situation changes, change or abandon the plan accordingly. The plan for a campaign, which comprises of a number of battles and actions, done with a larger formation and for a longer period, generally can be more stable. But within it partially, or at times entirely, plans will have to be changed. Similarly the strategic plan is applicable to the whole strategic stage, i.e. strategic defensive, strategic equilibrium and strategic offensive, and has to be changed with the change in stage. (As explained in '*On Protracted War*', point 88, Military Writings of Mao Tsetung, page 245) In the same paragraph Mao stressed, **"The making and changing of tactical, campaign and strategic plans in accordance to scope and circumstance is the key factor in directing war."** There are two points worth noting. One, he spoke of directing a war, 'not just carrying out armed struggles'; directing it towards our final goal of country-wide seizure of power. The other important point is the need for making plans, especially strategic plans. Mao didn't point out conditions for drawing plans, like "only if All China big party is formed, then..." or "enemy faces stiff struggles on various fronts and are forced to disperse the army and the conditions become favourable, then ..." etc. But he stressed according to the scope and circumstances and that is the key factor. This means preparing ourselves for a bigger drama and not just local games. Hence, to achieve this, to be capable of directing a war, we need a strategic plan based on the stage and also by studying the development of war through the sub-stages in it in a broader perspective.

Furthermore he explained, **"War plans are the concrete application of strategy and tactics, and must be flexible so that they can be adapted to the circumstances of war. We should always seek to transform our inferiority into superiority and our passivity into initiative so as to change the situation as between the enemy and ourselves."** Here Mao mentioned about the conscious role in transforming our subjective strength to achieve a change in objective reality.



It is only through our initiative in war that we can direct the war in a proper direction and bring about a change in the situation and not wait for external developments to change the situation. Changes in nature and society take place in leaps. Hence we can deduce that through strategic war plans that are flexible, we consciously gain initiative in war and achieve leaps in our subjective strength and continuously change the objective situation in our favour.

In understanding the situation at a broader level, which Mao termed as “**war situation as a whole**”, we have to grasp that whenever we start a war a war situation develops. When we start a total war with the aim of areawise seizure of power, we have to think in terms of war situation at all India level. Unless we develop thinking in this manner within the entire party, there is a fair chance of the war slipping into localism and gradualism. Unlike Nepal and Peru we are a big country and the war will take place at different places simultaneously though unevenly. But it is a must that it takes place as a part of single war. This can be successfully achieved only with a Strategic War Plan. Gradualism in war denies the development of revolutionary process in leaps and seeks linear development ‘inch by inch’ as against the Maoist understanding of ‘development in waves’. It is necessary to establish this firmly among the cadres and commanders.

Strategic thinking evolves from studying the science of strategy. Mao, in his *Problems of Strategy in China’s Revolutionary War* deals with this at length. He defined, “**The task of science of strategy is to study the laws for directing a war that govern a war situation as a whole. The task of the science of campaigns and the science of tactics is to study the laws for directing a war that govern a partial situation.**” He further explained why it is necessary for the commander of a campaign or tactical operation (i.e. specific battles, actions) to understand the laws of strategy, at least to some degree. “**Because an understanding of the whole facilitates handling of the part and because the part is subordinate to the whole.**” It means to have a strategic plan, outlook, and based on it tactical plans and campaign plans should be made. Mao identified people who deny planning and called them relativists. Relatively stable plans for the whole stage and sub-stages in it, keeping the war situation as a whole in mind, is a necessity. Based on it we have to draw out plans for campaigns for sub-stages and plans for battles and actions for each campaign.

After the Chinese revolution led by CPC under the leadership of Mao, it is only in Peru and Nepal that we see the concrete application of strategic planning and that too in a creative manner. Based on this understanding PCP Chairman Gonzalo established the axes, sub-axes, and the directions and lines of movement, so as to maintain the strategic direction of war. This was done after a thorough study of history of social relations, past wars, political, military and economic conditions, terrain etc. Next on the basis of this National Military Plan was formulated, which was strategically centralised and tactically decentralised guided by the Maoist understanding “*every plan is an ideology and must reflect reality in all its complexity.*” Then, linking strategy and tactics, strategic operational plans were formulated. Every committee below it formulated their own strategic operational plans based on the strategic operational plan followed by the entire party. All military plans are based on thorough reconnaissance and careful study of the situation of the enemy and our forces, and are guided by the political strategy and the military strategy. (From PCP Base Document,p43) The strategic centralisation and tactical decentralisation gives full play to the lower committees to decide specific struggles to be carried out in their area, based on the guidelines and the necessities of

the area. The Strategic Operational Plan followed by the whole party gives the political content of each campaign, the organisational leap in the form of increase in the number of party units, drawing in the masses and develop new areas of struggles with the aim of seizure of political power or building new people's power. The military content spells out the targets of leap to be achieved. On this the regional committees decide the number of actions, form of actions, propaganda, struggles etc. They put forward the objectives - how much is the party going to grow? How much is the People's War going to grow? How much is the people's power going to grow? How much is the PGA going to grow? - of a specific campaign. At the end of the campaign thorough summation is carried out and new campaign is launched without any delay. The contents of every campaign is different each time and not mere repetition. They have made it a rule to increase the scale of war to a higher level each time, since the situation becomes more complex and fighting must be more intense.

Here we see the conscious attempt by the party to heighten the tempo of war and push the objective situation in favor of revolution. This creative application was devised by Com. Gonzalo and studied and adapted by CPN(M) in their situation. The situation in Nepal was quite different. The party for a long time had been only in peaceful struggles and reformist style of work was dominating. They had to take up the task of transforming themselves into a war party, a task added and so different from PCP. They had to bring about an ideological consolidation as a part of preparation for launching.

### ***Areawise Seizure of Power Our Main Target***

Areawise seizure of power or formation of base areas is the essence of protracted People's War. Com. Charu Mazumdar identified this and the necessity to go all out for it. *"Yes, comrades, today we have to speak out courageously in a bold voice before the people that it is the areawise seizure power that is our path. We have to make the bourgeoisie tremble by striking hardest at it weakest spots."* said CM and we find similar formulations throughout his writings. He grasped the fact that only when the peasantry breaks free from ages of subjugation and realises the taste of power- no matter how small the area and how short the time period be - will the revolutionary potential be fully released. It is in accordance with Mao's understanding **"...accelerate the nationwide revolutionary hightide through consolidation and expansion of Red Political Power"**. People's War is the strategy of the proletariat –only by destruction of old state will the simultaneous construction of the new state begin –not by bargaining. Formation of base areas is not merely a question of military tactic but a matter of vital political importance.

Without a clear-cut line directing the process of forcefully pushing ahead ceaselessly towards areawise seizure of power, establishing base areas and sustaining them, all other work will be meaningless exercises. Any pull back attitude towards forming base areas is a reflection of ambiguity and distorted understanding of Maoism and is a form of phase theory. Mao put it very distinctly, **"A revolution or revolutionary war in its emergence and growth from a small force to a big force, from the absence of political power to the seizure of political power, from the absence of a Red Army to the creation of a Red Army and from the absence of revolutionary base area to their establishment, must be on the offensive and cannot be conservative, and tendencies towards conservatism must be opposed."**

Apart from the strategic importance of base area, of relying on it to carry out strategic tasks as a rear to our forces, it stands out as a challenge to the existing system, puts the central question of areawise seizure of power for resolving contradictions as top priority in national politics and enthuses the masses as they see the results of their struggles and firmly establishes faith in the party as genuine vanguard. *“We struggle for political power for the proletariat and people not for personal power. We are against the outlook of roving-rebel bands and their understanding of base areas. The new state is built in the midst of the People’s War and follows a specific course of development. In our case it is built first in the countryside until it surrounds the cities and is established countrywide; the old state is destroyed through this process, as the contradiction old state/new state finds expression, until the reaction’s political and military plans are thwarted and masses are drawn in.”* (PCP Base Documents, p53). The formation of a new state as a challenge to the old state unleashes the masses revolutionary vigour and raises their hopes steadily.

When we launch People’s War in the strategic areas we will face stiff challenge from the reactionary forces (not the army in the initial stages). This is the toughest phase in the early periods (the 1st stages of strategic defensive) where we are weak and the enemy is much stronger. By consciously pushing the war with the aim of driving out the enemy from the area, we will gain in strength and transform the operational zone into guerrilla zone. This is the period where neither side has total control over the area. These guerrilla zones are to be creatively transformed into base areas and it is an arduous task. **“...transformation of a guerilla zone into a base area is an arduous creative process, and its accomplishment depends on the extent to which the enemy is destroyed and masses are aroused.”** (Problems of Strategy in Guerrilla War, MMW, p172) Mao talks of three conditions for building base areas; they are existence of revolutionary armed forces, inflicting defeats on the enemy and mobilising the masses. The important aspect in advancing the process for building base areas is identifying the transitory nature of guerrilla zone. Absence of a plan to proceed to base area formation or delaying it for years under any pretext means no all out effort to drive the enemy out of guerrilla zones. Hence enemy forces and our forces reside side by side for prolonged periods. We strive to maintain status quo while enemy contends for regaining power. As they can’t contend militarily they employ all possible means at their disposal to win over the masses and reduce our support base. Infiltrations, politics of incentives and developmental programmes create divisions amongst the masses. We are forced to carry out counter programmes and activities thereby leaving room for economism. Mao cites a specific kind of guerilla zone, which will remain a guerrilla zone for a long time. But they are a ‘specific kind’ and for specific reasons – this cannot be taken as a general rule. **“Examples of this kind are to be found in enemy occupied regions, along the railway lines, in the plains.”** (Problems of Strategy in Guerrilla War, MMW, p172)

Hence the principal question is that of establishing people’s power, because only this will give an alternative to the discontent of the oppressed masses – it will give hope to the hopeless and raise the revolutionary torrent to new heights. We have to creatively employ our resources, utilise armed struggle and mass struggle to maximum benefit for the revolution and push the enemy out politically, ideologically and militarily.

It is this creative application of Maoist principle by PCP and CPN(M) that signifies distinction from other revolutionary struggles led by Maoists in the world. In Peru and Nepal

the forceful and all out launching of People's War drove the enemies out of the guerrilla zones within 2 years.

### *City Work*

This is one department that needs immediate attention. To look upon the cities only as means of raising funds, to develop intellectuals and carry out peaceful propaganda and agitation is a seriously mistaken line. Now where in CM's writings do we see such a pathetic understanding of city work. It is not only possible to develop party and people's resistance movements but also possible to carry out guerrilla warfare. Our own historical experience in Kolkatta after Naxalbari is a glaring example of what potential is at store. On the other hand CM was able to utilize the favourable situation to draw in the militant youth into the movement with his inspiring writings to scale the heights. Though we see the lack of planned work in the cities, he had no apprehensions about the role of city work in advancing the revolutionary high tide.

PCP and CPN(M) have proved through practice that the immense potential of city work can be utilized in favour of revolution by conscious and planned effort. In relation to the line on city work PCP says, *"People's War which in our case takes the specific form of a unified People's War in which the countryside is principal and the city complementary."* (PCP Base Document). They have no plans of building base areas in the city, as it is impossible. *"The difference is that in the cities what is built is not the new political power, base areas, but rather a front concretised in Peoples Revolutionary Defense Movement, with resistance centers that wage peoples war and prepare the future insurrection that will take place when the forces in the countryside storm the cities in combination with the insurrection from within."* (PCP Base Document). Every plan and campaign has its city component, as to what work, propaganda, guerrilla actions has to be done within it. Thus we see a comprehensive line of development of work in the urban areas. After the experience of Naxalbari city work got neglected mainly due to the absence of a line. Though at times some mass movements and trade union struggles continued, but with no clear-cut approach as to its direction of development, it stagnated. The trade union work is muddled in the mire of economism and the fighting spirit of the working class is entangled in legalism. It has failed to develop revolutionary movement among the working class, to politicise them and develop the advanced section as vanguards. This again has its roots in gradualism, expecting external causes to boost the revolutionary high tide, not seeing the potential and most important lack of strategic thinking and planning. As result city work has become the domain of petty bourgeois activity and token passive response.

No doubt due to the heavy presence of the state machinery city work has to be qualitatively different, but we can't afford to loose sight of developing the movement and prepare our organisation accordingly. Especially now and in the coming years the cities are going to face severe problems. Rich-poor divide is widening, opportunities are dwindling; high cost of living, unemployment, lockouts, draconian laws, insensitive and brutal state machinery, corruption - people are fed up with this system. The stories and pictures of the international

struggles of the masses against globalisation, war etc. flashed now and then, prepare them mentally. The possibilities of developing and sustaining resistance movement are very high. There is a material basis for developing urban guerrilla warfare. We have to develop our thinking in this regard, carryout investigations, develop links with the masses, built up sound underground structure, mass work etc. We will have to build up the movement by showing some level of creativity to have an impact over the masses till they gain confidence.

### *Advanced Experience of International Communist Movement*

Agreed Peru and Nepal are very small countries, both have weak ruling classes and states as compared to India; but quite strong and fierce in their own countries. Impact of even small actions can be nationwide. Poor infrastructure and advantageous terrain make it easier to sustain bases for longer periods. This has enhanced the efforts of CPN (M) and PCP in utilising favourable conditions. But apart from just talking about their advantages it is necessary to grasp the fineness with which they have implemented MLM in the given context. How we apply Marxism to the given concrete reality is where the creativity comes and for this deeper grasp of the universal ideology of Marxism-Leninism-Maoism is essential. Inspiring developments in Peru and Nepal show advanced grasp of Maoism. As communists we have the responsibility to learn from this. Mao said, **“In this era, any revolution will definitely end in defeat if it lacks, or run counter to, the leadership of the proletariat and the communist party. Of all the social strata and political groupings, the proletariat and communist party are most free from narrow mindedness and selfishness, are politically the most far sighted, the best organised and readiest to learn with an open mind from the experiences of the vanguard class, the proletariat, and its political party throughout the world and to make use of this experience in their own cause.”**

In every sub topic of this article we have shown how Nepal and Peru People’s Wars are experiences of the advanced grasp of Maoism creatively applied to their concrete reality. This is exactly what we have to learn -- learn to creatively apply Maoism to the concrete conditions here. Mere imitations of Peru and Nepal are of no use. The primary thing in grasping laws of People’s War is to acknowledge the dynamism of war. The basic principle as Mao pointed out is **“...to strive to the utmost to preserve our own strength and destroy that of the enemy.”** Here Mao clearly stated that in order to protect our strength we have to destroy the enemy-conservative ideas emerging from thoughts of our destruction pegs the all out flow of People’s War. Any form of limiting the war, i.e. not going all out to wipe the enemy out of struggle areas - in order to avoid provocation of the enemy - only leads to ‘phase theory’. It denies leaps in the development of war and follows gradualism. This is in fact violation of the dynamics of war. Viewing leaps as qualitative transformation that comes after a series of quantitative additions alone, neglects the conscious role of the vanguard in propelling the war to higher level and advancing in waves. The basic principle of “preserve oneself and destroy the other” applies to both the revolutionary forces as well as the reactionary forces. Either we kick them out or they push us out. Things will not remain stagnant for long - where we can sustain, naturally the enemy’s armed might has to be sufficiently smashed. It calls for a leap from guerrilla zones to

actual seizure of power and establishment of new people's power. If not, eventually we face setbacks.

Any idealist understanding of base areas too will hamper the leap from guerrilla zone to base area. To consider base areas as highly impregnable and most safe is a wrong understanding of Maoism. In the uncertainty of war it is possible that we might have to abandon some base areas. The crux of the matter is to seize power no matter how small the area and however short the duration.

These advances in grasping Maoism, especially in relation to its application to the People's War was first conceived and tested through practice by the PCP led by com. Gonzalo. Only after struggle and debate now it is getting recognition. Launching of People's War in Nepal and its continuous advancement has helped in establishing it firmly. All those who had apprehensions about this are now forced to rethink. RIM played a vital role in its propagation and achieving further clarity on it. The parties within RIM have started taking this seriously and this will be developing as an advanced international trend. It will further enhance the emerging 'New Wave of World Proletarian Revolution.' Maoist Communist Party [MPK](Turkey and North Kurdistan, formerly TKP[ML]), a party engaged in armed struggle for around 30 years, and a member of RIM, recently held its 1st Congress. It is important to note their Congress document's observations on People's War in Nepal and Peru, *"Our first Congress has challenged spontaneity, which is contrary to the spirit of People's War, and learnt from the experiences of Nepal and Peru, which reflect a great application of the ideological and political contributions of Mao in practice. It has pointed out the Tactic of Advancing with Deliberation, with a Strategic War Plan."* (AWTW-No.29, p60) In India further debate is necessary to make this advancement a part of the general line of the serious Maoist Parties.

---