

**SELECTED WRITINGS OF
COMRADE CHANDRA PULLA REDDY**

1

Central Committee

Communist Party of India (Marxist-Leninist)

JQ
298
.66
P85
1987
V.1

First impression ; May 1987

Price : Rs. 35-00

For Copies :

PRATHIGHATANA

H.No.6-1-90/34,
Bapujinagar,
Musheerabad,
Hyderabad - 500 048.

Good
LC-Delhi
1-29-02

CONTENTS

S.No.		Page
1.	What is resistance struggle ?	
2.	World communist movement and its lessons	
3.	On Principal Contradiction in India	
4.	Theoretical basis of political line of the Party	
5.	Separatist movements & agrarian revolution are incompatible	
6.	In defence of Mao & Mao Thought	
7.	Mao's Hunan report and its relevance to India	
8.	Studying principal contradiction	
9.	Agrarian Revolution - attitude of communist revolutionaries	
10.	CPC's struggle against wrong trends - Mao's lesson	
	Agrarian Revolution & Elections	
11.	Agrarian Revolution and elections	
12.	Agrarian Revolution and elections - some questions	
13.	Bourgeois election alliances—certain experiences from past	
14.	Attitude towards opposition bourgeois parties & elections	
	Political Analyses	
15.	Real face of August 15 'independence'	
16.	Our tasks in the present situation	
17.	Decisions of Special Congress on various controversial issues	
18.	Political gimmicks of all ruling class parties in India— certain common features	
19.	Political notes on National & International situation	
20.	Chinese Communist leaders' 'Creative Marxism' Their assessment and attitude towards India Their internal policies Attitude towards other third world countries	

FOREWORD

The Central Committee of the Communist Party of India (Leninist) is happy to bring out the first volume of the selected writings of comrade Chandra Pulla Reddy. Comrade C. P. as he is popularly known, died on November 9, 1984 after a long participation of 45 years in the Indian communist movement. He was a prolific writer. His writings were in a simple style and can be grasped by even ordinary persons. He practised what he preached and died as a true communist. Simple living and hard work among the masses while basing on the communist ideology made C. P. a champion of the toiling people. He wrote extensively on various national and international political events, theory, revolutionary practice and organisation. Two volumes in telugu have already come out. We have selected only a few of his numerous writings for this volume. This is not an english version of the first volume of his writings published in telugu. Some new articles have been added to this volume.

Most of the articles have been written by comrade C. P. in english, while some of them have been translated from telugu. His writings in the people's language expressed well through the usage of popular phrases and sayings. He believed that communist theory should not be esoteric knowledge confined only to intellectuals and therefore wrote in a simple form which can be easily understood by the peasants and girls (Adivasis) as he worked mainly among them.

This volume contains his writings on basic theory of the world, class, national, international political situations, economic analysis, on practice, on organisation, on elections, on the Agrarian Revolution in India, on the international communist movement. It also contains his assessments of the people's movements and lessons, of the semi-feudal, semi-colonial system and critique of various wrong trends among the communist revolutionaries. Some of his writings are already published in booklet form in telugu as well as in english. His famous work *The Great Heroic Telangana Armed Struggle and its lessons* is already before us. This book became the guiding source for building the Agrarian Resistance movement in the Godavari valley and Karimnagar in A. P. and elsewhere.

Comrade C. P. wrote under various pseudonyms, Suryam, Vijaya Ranga Rao, Rammohan, Ramana, Chandra Shekar, Praveen etc. This was an underground work for the last 17 years till his death. Some of his articles did not carry any name, when the party leadership decided not to publish the names of the writers. His articles were published in Janashakthi, Praj Yuuddham, Prajapantha, Vimochana (all telugu), New Democracy, For a New Democracy, Road to Liberation, March to Liberation (all english).

magazine of the party. Most of his writings were adopted by various committees and published as documents under the name of those committees. The documents published under the names of A. P. State Committee, State Secretariat, Central Committee carry most of his contributions. Thus through his writings, he emerged as the principal ideologue of the Party. We are not publishing here the documents carrying his contributions.

Struggle Against Alien Trends

(a) Revisionism of CPI & CPM.

Comrade C. P. joined the communist movement in the 1940s and has since been actively involved in the practical as well as political work of the Party. His writings of the period of the struggle against the revisionist leadership of CPI and CPM give an insight into his understanding of the various ideological issues. He emerged as a political analyst during this period and his writings were then published in the CPM organ. They show the making of a communist revolutionary. His writings rallied the rank and file of the Party (CPM) behind the revolutionary line. The CPM leadership betrayed the people's movements that swept the people throughout the length and breadth of the country in the late sixties. Comrade C. P. made great efforts to instill revolutionary politics into the cadres as against the revisionism peddled by the then leadership. He consistently fought against the incorrect politics of the leadership on issues like India-China war, Russia-China polemics, The Great Debate in the international communist movement as well as their attitude towards peoples' movements. He tactfully exposed the opportunistic political line pursued by CPM leadership even when he was in the CPM. Thereby he politically roused the cadres. These writings helped in the training of the cadre to put up a principled ideological struggle against the revisionism of the CPM leadership.

All those who took the revolutionary line during this period were jailed as the government took them as a potential threat. Comrade C.P. continued with his ideological education. He once again studied the works of Marx, Engels, Lenin, Stalin and Mao. Subsequently he wrote a series of articles in the party organ. During his incarceration he wrote the famous book *Lessons of the International Communist Movement*. This book in telugu is educative to one and all particularly the new generation. He played a prominent role along with comrades D. V. Rao, Nagi Reddy, Kolla Venkiah and others, in defeating the revisionist CPM's Madurai Document at the A. P. State plenum at Palakollu and at the All India Plenum at Burdwan. Comrade C. P. Reddy, the fighter of the working class, could be seen at his best in these sessions. He translated into telugu *The Great debate between the CPC and the CPSU, and Revisionism-Lenin*.

(b) The Emergence of Revolutionary Movement & Struggle Against Left Adventurism.

After breaking away from the revisionism of CPM leadership with the formation of Andhra Pradesh Revolutionary Communist Comm (APRCC), comrade C. P. Reddy went to work in the forest areas of Godavari Valley and the result is the emergence of resistance struggle part of the Agrarian Revolution. This is the unique and district agr movement as different from all other movements of the communist revolutionaries. Even while engaging himself on the practical field, comrade continued to contribute to the Party's magazines and books. His writings that time were mainly on two aspects (1) against CPM's revisionism (2) against the adventurist line of comrade Charu Mazumdar. In the struggle against revisionism, most of the communist revolutionaries went to the extremism. 'Annihilation of individual class enemies' was taken as the line. Armed struggle was declared as the only path. These wrong tendencies swayed the rank and file. CPC's open support strengthened these tendencies. But even then comrade C. P. remained firm and relentlessly fought against these wrong trends.

Comrade Charu later formed the All India Co-ordination Committee of communist revolutionaries. Comrade C. P. and many other comrades could not subscribe to the idea of Co-ordination Committee. The formation of co-ordination committee strengthens the existence of groups. The principles of democratic centralism and criticism and self-criticism essentials of building the revolutionary movement, are nullified by the co-ordination committees. Revolutionary movement develops under a party organisation based on the above principles and a correct political line. One political line demands one single monolithic party organisation. Comrade C. P. always gave importance to party building by relying on the masses.

(c) Further Deviations

Then came the deviations of comrades D. V. Rao and Nagi. They condemned the Godavari valley movement as an adventurist movement and declared that armed struggle should start after the distribution of the landlords' lands and not on partial struggles. They also declared that the ruling classes were united after the 1971 electoral sweep of Indira Gandhi and in such a situation they advocated that the struggle for civil liberties and democratic rights should be the primary one. But comrade C. P. stood on the ground. He defended the forest movement. His writings at that time and his trenchant criticism dealt severe blows to these wrong political theoretical deviations, and as a result the movement developed further from the forest to the plain areas.

True to the marxist tenet of party building, the Andhra Revolutionary Communist Committee held its State Conference in 1

the Party—APRCP emerged. Comrade C. P. along with comrades Neelam Ramachandraiah, P. Rama Narsaiah, and others was instrumental in building the party in A. P. The conference reviewed the movement, took stock of national and international situation and the principles of building agrarian revolutionary mass movement were adopted. These writings continue to be the basic understanding of the Party on various fundamental aspects of India Revolution. Comrade C. P. also gave importance to the unity of the communist revolutionaries but he firmly believed that unity can be achieved only on principles and thus opposed the opportunistic unity slogan.

(d) CPI (ML) and The Struggle Against The Right Deviation

CPI (ML) under the leadership of S.N. Singh rejected the left adventurist line advocated by comrade Charu and accepted the mass line. Thus APRCP merged with CPI (ML) and this Party developed in different states. The declaration of emergency rule and the brutal repression of Indira Gandhi government on the people's movement brought forth various deviations among the communist revolutionaries. The repeal of emergency, the victory of Janata Party and spurt on people's movement for civil liberties and democratic rights also gave rise to alien trends, particularly the right deviation. S. N. Singh, the then General Secretary of the Party took the line of class collaboration. The Party was sought to be tagged to one section of the ruling classes in India. He advocated an international united front against Russian Imperialism taking it as the only danger while joining hands with American Imperialism. In the domestic field, he advocated the line of united front with the pro-American ruling classes as against the pro-Russian ruling classes and S. N. Singh and his company were for the abandoning of the resistance movement that was being built in A. P. Comrade C. P. Reddy, being in the minority maintained the discipline of the Party. His criticism against the S. N. Singh's collaborationist line rallied the party's rank and file. The Party defeated this line and S. N. Singh and his friends could not even remain in the Party. They could not even face the Party Congress. The Special Congress of the Party defeated the line advocated by S. N. Singh and upheld the line advocated by comrade C. P. who was elected as the General Secretary.

History has proved the correctness of the line adopted in the 1980 Special Congress of our Party under the leadership of comrade C. P. Our party—the CPI (ML)—developed further and continued to expand with the help of the theoretical and political weapons handed down to us by comrade C. P. who applied Marxism-Leninism and Mao Thought to the concrete conditions of India and the contemporary international situation.

The Recent Distrusters: Baijee-Pyla-Chandram Clique

Some persons refuse to learn from history. Alien trends do emerge time and again in new forms as long as classes exist. Once again the Party

Fundamentals Of Marxism

What is resistance struggle ?

In the years 1968-70, a debate on ensued among the revolutionaries as to what is armed struggle. This debate went on when Charu's Left deviationist line came forward. This discussion took place when annihilation of class enemy came forward. Mainly this discussion took place when the Charu's programme of *annihilation of class enemy* came forward. This discussion continued during the days when Charu's left deviationist line had gained an upper hand.

In those days our State Committee and other states had opposed Charu's left adventurism. We opposed the view point that *annihilation of class enemy* was armed struggle. Our State Committee had clarified that in a backward country like India, armed struggle is nothing but armed guerilla struggle. We have clearly explained our opinion that armed guerilla struggle could be conducted only on the basis of Agrarian Revolutionary struggle. On the basis of this concept, we had tried our best to build movement. Though in the beginning we made some mistakes, on the whole we were able to take forward the mass movement and the revolutionary movement.

But, at that time Charu's Left adventurism had gained upper hand among the revolutionaries. That is why the majority of the revolutionaries had followed Charu's Left adventurist line in those days. Charu's Left adventurism took recourse to the activities which had nothing to do with the people and the level of people's consciousness. Mainly the militants had participated in those activities. Since they were adventurist actions which had no connection with the people, the upsurge of great mass struggle had been completely smashed. The mass struggles like Naxalbari, Mushahari, Midnapur, Srikakulam etc., had suffered a severe set back. The revolutionaries of these movements split into several groups. Most of them had split into petty-bourgeois groups and are still splitting.

On the other side, the peasant struggle of Godavari Valley, which was built up on the basis of mass line and opposed Charu's Left adventurism withstood and developed. The movements of other states, which had opposed Charu's Left adventurism also developed. In a process, all of them merged. In this process the present C. C. had been formed.

Today's Debate

Among today's revolutionaries, Right deviation has gained an upper hand. Attempts are being made to confine the Agrarian Revolutionary movement to legalism and economism. Some are opposing the principles

of *resistance struggle* formulated by our Party. Their attempts should be defeated. Earlier, when Charu's Left adventurism was opposed, this debate ensued. Now, in the context of opposing Right deviation, this discussion has come forward.

Now it is being questioned what is *resistance struggle*, and what is the relationship between the *resistance struggle* and the armed struggle. They are thinking that Party is saying that *resistance struggle* is armed struggle. They say that we are considering the existing forest squads as the squads of armed struggle. These are nothing but distortions born in their minds.

What is armed struggle? What is *resistance struggle*? What is the relationship between these two? How do we prepare the masses for them? These are the questions that are before us.

What is armed struggle?

People's war means the war waged by the people. There is no other meaning.

India is a backward country. Here, the armed struggle will be conducted only in the form of guerilla struggle. For this guerilla struggle Agrarian Revolutionary struggle will be the basis. Through such guerilla struggles, some Liberated Areas will be formed locally. Finally the towns will be liberated. Armed struggle in India means only the struggle that is conducted, based on Agrarian Revolutionary struggle.

What is Resistance struggle

The mass movement develops in different stages. In the beginning backward masses will be organised to agitate on their immediate demands. We will utilise some provisions of the legislations to organise these agitations. We will get them implemented. In this stage also some strikes will be conducted. Class struggles also will be conducted. But on the whole, the movement will not exceed the stage of general agitation, some strikes and class struggles in villages. Viewed as a whole, the movement will be within the confines of a legal agitation.

In the beginning, the mass agitation will continue in the form of legal agitation. But the landlords and dictatorial tyrants in the villages will not tolerate even this much of general agitation. They will oppose even these legal agitations. They even clash with the people on occasions. But it should not be construed as *resistance struggle* due to these factors.

In the process of conducting general agitation in an area, some mass base will be created. The basic issues of the masses cannot be resolved through general agitation. That is why the people will definitely search for alternate methods. As the strength of the mass organisation increases in an area, by its strength, the people themselves settle their demands. All sorts of problems arising out of feudal exploitation form the basis for this struggle. Issues are taken up one after another.

In the process of advancement of the movement, the question of distribution of the landlords' own lands also will come onto the agenda.

Thus in that area, people will resort to get their immediate demands settled. They will get them implemented. When the movement reaches this stage, the feudal landlords and the dictatorial tyrants will resort to oppression of the mass struggles and the class struggles of the exploited people. For this end they use their goondas they have hired and are maintaining. Through these goondas, they try to suppress the revolutionary movement. They resort to all sorts of atrocities. People are compelled to resist the atrocities of the goondas. Through the strength of their mass organisation, and through the volunteer squads they have formed, people should fight back these goondas. Only when they are able to fight back, they can protect the growing mass base. Then only the mass movement can develop. When the goondas are unable to face the organised strength of the mass movement, the state forces will be brought into the field. Police, reserve police, para-military forces and army—such repressive measures will be used by the government. It will resort to all kinds of atrocities on the people. It will bring into play all the relevant repressive laws and Acts.

What should be done when the state forces enter the scene? If the people are ready to defy the state forces, the revolutionaries should lead the revolt of the masses. Otherwise, some revolutionaries should remain with the masses. Some important comrades should go into underground.

Though they are in underground, their programme will be mainly to rally the masses for the Agrarian Revolution.

To resist the atrocities of the landlords, the people will mainly depend on the locally available weapons. At this stage, the questions like whether underground comrades should move about alone? Or in squads? Should the squads carry weapons? If yes, what sort of weapons? will be decided depending upon the strength of the movement, the preparedness of the masses, their level of consciousness, on the geographical conditions, and on the strength of the Party.

In this process, the revolutionary movement should be developed. By the method of *consolidation and expansion*, the area should be developed into an area of sustained resistance.

We are calling this kind of struggle as *resistance struggle* and such an area *resistance struggle area*. Our Party says that the Godavari valley struggle is *resistance struggle*. Here our movement has surpassed the general agitational level. Land struggles, anti-government demands, corruption, coolie rates and the like, are being settled by the people depending on their own strength. Our comrades are working amidst police camps. On one hand our squads are defending themselves from police and on the

other, they are mainly rallying the people for the Agrarian Revolution. There are also instances of the people en mass resisting the police. That is why we are calling this as *resistance struggle*. We say that the struggle being conducted in Karimnagar district of A. P. is also the *resistance struggle*. Here also the people, through the strength of their mass organisation, are having their demands conceded and implemented. They are able to resist the goondas of the landlords through the strength of their mass organisation. For the past 6 years they are fighting. Through the process—*consolidation and extension*, the movement which was started in 20 villages, has now extended to 400 villages. The movement which started in one taluk, has now extended to all taluks. That is why we say that this is *resistance struggle*.

Resistance struggle means 1. Anti landlord struggle, 2. Resistance to the atrocities of the goondas of the landlords, and 3 Extension of the movement withstanding the police repression.

Only when the movement of an area has acquired these three characteristics can it be called *resistance struggle*.

Principles of Resistance Struggle

These principles of *resistance struggle* are clearly enunciated in the document "Path of Peoples' War in India-Our Tasks". Note the following lines.

"Agrarian Revolution is the main content of the People's Democratic Revolution, i. e. the New Democratic Revolution, under the leadership of the working class. Armed Agrarian Revolutionary struggle is the main form of the struggle in the People's War.

Agrarian Revolution means an all round struggle against all forms of exploitation, oppression and suppression of the big landlords on the whole peasantry, on the whole population in the villages, in which distribution of private lands of the big landlords is the highest form of class struggle.

The exploitation of the landlords in our villages consists of various forms—exploitation of the agricultural labourers and farm servants, exploitation of the peasant tenants, forced labour, Nagu (usury through grain), usury, selling their surplus grain at exorbitant rates, communal and caste oppression and suppression and economic and political domination in the villages etc. Agrarian Revolution means a struggle against all these forms of exploitation, oppression and suppression practiced by the landlords.

But it is also true that landlord oppression and suppression cannot be ended unless the people are able to seize and distribute

among themselves the private lands of the landlords, the basis of landlord oppression and suppression.

So, while the peasants are mobilised for struggles against all forms of feudal exploitation, oppression and suppression, the people should be given the consciousness to seize the private lands of the landlords, which is the basis of landlord exploitation. All anti-feudal struggles should be consciously directed, step by step, towards seizure of the private lands of the landlords.

The land problem also presents itself in various forms in various parts of our country.

For example, government banjar lands, reserve and non-reserve forest lands, lands under religious institutions, banjar lands under the occupation of the landlords, uncultivated lands of the landlords, lands of the poor peasants forcibly occupied by the landlords, tank-beds, abandoned tanks and landlords' own lands. Unless the peasants occupy the landlords lands, feudalism will not be abolished and the socio-political exploitation of the landlords cannot be put an end to. Therefore, we must strive to prepare the peasants to occupy landlords' own lands by mobilising them for mass revolutionary struggles and thus our main aim is to organise armed Agrarian Revolution in the country."

In the peasant areas, the salient points of the Party's orientation is (1) selection of strategic areas, (2) selection of cadres, (3) surveying the conditions of the area, (4) formulation of the agitational and struggle slogans in consultation with the people and giving them wide propaganda, (5) linking this propagation with revolutionary politics, (6) in the process of this propaganda formation of Rytu Coolie Sanghams, (7) formation of volunteer squads, (8) resisting the atrocities of the landlords, goondas and the police, and (9) for this, arming the people against landlords with the locally available weapons from the beginning of the struggles.

In the process of this struggle, utilising the method of *consolidation and extension of the movement*, the movement has to be built up in the widest possible area. Thus it should be developed into an area of sustained struggle.

In the stage of anti landlord struggles also, the landlords, goondas and the police will resort to attacks to suppress the peasant movement. Our Party units should lead the people to resist this counter revolutionary atrocities. If the people are not yet prepared to put up such resistance, some cadres should remain with the masses and the remaining important cadres should protect themselves. They should work among the people either as individuals or as squads. They should work among the people with weapons or without weapons.

The form of defence depends on the level of the movement, the level of people's consciousness, people's cooperation, the dimensions of the area, the geographical conditions of the area, and the strength of the Party etc.

Though the armed squads are formed depending on the conditions of struggle, the main task of these squads will still be to rally the people for the armed Agrarian Revolution. But these squads should never resort to annihilation of class enemies.

These are the principles of *resistance struggle*. As the participation of the peasants in the anti landlord struggles increases, as the role of the volunteer squads increases, as the resistance to the atrocities of landlords, goondas increases, the desire among the people for changing this system increases. Depending upon the intensity of this desire, the consciousness of the people for the armed struggle increases. Growth of this consciousness is important. Then only can the guerilla struggle start. When should the guerilla struggle be launched? In what form? Under what circumstances will the Liberated Areas be formed? These matters are left for the future. At present, we have decided to work towards this aim.

It will be a mistake to apply Chinese experience in toto. The experience of Hunan peasants' struggle is important. In the present stage, such struggles are necessary. We strongly feel that our document of People's War path will come in handy in this regard.

That is why it is very essential to mobilise the people into anti landlord struggles. It is essential to resist the attacks of the landlords, goondas. It is essential that people should participate in these struggles. That is why it is nothing but a distortion to depict the activities of today's armed squads as the regular armed guerilla struggle. We consider them as part of *resistance struggle*.

When did we achieve clarity on this struggle programme ?

At the outset we did not have clarity on this struggle programme. We achieved it in the course of struggle.

Taking as a whole, this programme has taken a turn to the Right in the plain areas. Rallies, processions etc. were conducted on some immediate issues. But on the issues like occupation of banjar waste lands etc., this had taken the form of submitting memoranda to the government requesting for issue of pattas (ownership deeds). Such issues have gradually got bogged down in court litigations. This also was confined to certain areas only.

In the forest area it took a turn towards Left adventurism. At the outset, in the forest area, agitation was conducted on issues such as exploitation by forest contractors, exploitation by patels and patwaris, exploitation by forest officials, high rates of interests, 'nagu' exploitation, banjar waste-

lands problems, exploitation of the landlords, atrocities of the police etc. On these issues the cadres who went from outside stayed in the villages and organised. At the village level they had the cooperation of some girijans. Together they worked extensively among the people. On the immediate demands, they propagated among the masses, mobilised them. People had achieved many victories. On this basis, at village level, we formed village committees. Mass organisations were formed and began to function.

At this juncture, the landlords, patels, patwaris and the forest officials had conspired against us. They sent the landlords' goondas against us. They got the state forces into the forest.

Due to this, our movement had to undergo certain vicissitudes. '*Manthana action*', giving our weapons to squads, and the '*Pagideru action*', and after '*Pagideru action*' for several months, some more adventurist actions had taken place. All this is Left adventurism. These mistakes stemmed from lack of proper orientation in the Party, the declaration made in AP State Party Convention that the armed struggle would be launched in June, 1969, and the pressure of the Srikakulam movement.

Efforts had been initiated at first in Khammam area to rectify these mistakes. In May 1969, the Khammam Area Committee had taken measures to get rid of the Left adventurism that had made inroads into the movement. A programme was chalked out to extend the mass base.

Girijans must be mobilised to occupy the forest banjars which are adjacent to their fields.

People should be rallied to occupy available banjaras.

People should be rallied for enhancement of wage rates for the work done to the forest contractors.

In border villages, people should be mobilised for strikes for enhancement of wage rates of agricultural labour.

People should be rallied on the demand of right to enjoy the forest wealth freely.

People should be rallied to distribute among themselves the surplus paddy of the landlords.

In addition to the above economic demands, the total political line and People's War Path should be put into wide propagation.

Sending out forest officials from the forest, burning the records of patels and patwaris, thus paralysing the state administrative machinery.

Enrolling village militants, youths into squads, thereby increasing the number of squads and the areas of operation.

The police attacks on village, just like they do now, should not be allowed. Necessary steps should be taken to this end.

With these decisions, to a larger extent, the Left adventurism was rooted out. But traces of it still remained.

To say that we should not allow the forest officials to enter the forest had boomeranged on our people. This had resulted in stopping the work without providing alternate employment for the people. Therefore this was modified because of the pressure from the people.

—Ambushing: we had found out that at the present juncture, they are impractical.

In this process, the movement had started working on people's problems. The movement extended.

Meanwhile, majority of the state leadership had been arrested. The remaining leadership had started to consolidate the movement. A joint meeting of Warangal, Khammam Area Committees and the forest squads was held.

In this meeting, a document enunciating four principles of struggle for the forest movement was prepared. These principles are :

- A) Propagation of the politics of people's war,
- B) Rallying the people on their problems,
- C) Relevant measures against the enemies of the people, and
- D) Self-defence from the police.

This meeting took place in the forest area in September 1970. These are basically the principles of struggle pertaining to the forest area.

With this new programme the movement in the forest areas had extended. People's participation in the struggles for settlement of their numerous problems had increased. The occupation of banjar lands had increased. In villages, a consistent mass base was formed. The village committees have come into existence and started functioning.

New committees were formed in plain areas with the existing cadres. Class struggles were widespread. The struggles of agricultural labourers and the strikes of hired farmhands had taken place in large number. We were able to rally students. The activities of the students union had taken a clear shape. Meanwhile, we had to face the disruption of D.V. Rao. He had started to implement the policy of legalism and economism, which was previously existing in the plain areas. Now he had resorted to extend this

to forest areas. In the beginning he was full of praise for the movement of forest area. Later he was critical of the forest movement. In this process, he, along with some of his followers, had left the Party. With this, the danger of Right deviation, for the time being, was eliminated in the plain areas as well as in the forest areas. In both the areas the movement had extended. Class struggles had extended. In both the areas the revolutionary movement had developed and reached a stage where we were able to implement a common programme.

The anti-feudal struggles broke out massively in the plain areas. In the forest areas anti-government struggles have developed. We had to give a common programme for both these areas. This task was fulfilled by the State Conference in September 1973. The Conference had decided that all the following tasks should be combined and work should begin for implementing them.

“Propagation of the politics of armed revolution; anti-landlord struggles and anti-government struggles; building up of mass organisations and village volunteer squads, resistance to the attacks of landlords and police, and formation of people’s committees”. The Conference decided that these principles apply to the plain areas as well as forest areas. It had enunciated how they should be implemented.

Within a short time after the State Conference, our state unit had merged with the All India Central Committee.

After the conference, the tasks enunciated above have been implemented. In the forest areas the movement had further extended and the land struggles have developed as a people’s movement. The people had occupied 3 lakh acres of forest land. We were able to give appropriate forms of struggles for the people to fight against the atrocities of landlords, goondas and the police. In some places the people had taken up these forms of struggles. The squads were able to defend themselves effectively against the police. They had become proficient in this. A wide basis for the unity of revolutionaries had been formed. We were able to overcome the obstacles created by the Right deviation in our movement. The people’s movement had developed.

Thus the forest area had developed the form of resistance, it had developed as a movement for land. Thus from a small movement that started in Mulugu taluk in 1968 it has spread to Warangal, Karimnagar, Khammam and East Godavari districts and has developed as a movement encompassing the whole Godavari valley. The Party has created for itself a deep base among the people in Warangal, Karimnagar districts and in some area of the forest. It withstood politics of Right and Left deviations of all hues and also severe police repression.

In the years 1975-76, there developed a backward thinking in the minds of some Party leaders and ranks; seeing the growing fascist repression they tried to reverse the onward going movement. They tried to start a debate that the programme of squads was wrong and that the programme depends on the militants rather than on the people and people's consciousness. They had come to a conclusion that the squads could not survive there and that they should be sent to some other area. They argued that the village activists and Party members should join girijan associations organised by the Congress. The then State Committee had stated that all these arguments were wrong. It opposed them and defeated them. The Party had taken up and implemented the programme of repairs of tanks and started village schools. With this, the party had very much identified itself further with the masses. The party was able to create wide mass base for itself among the people. In the plain areas the movement had extended to Nalgonda, Nizamabad and Adilabad districts. The student movement had developed considerably in the state. Women's organisations had started developing. In this process, by 1978, the people's movement in Karimnagar district has surged forward in a big way.

Experiences of the People's Upsurge in Karimnagar district

After the movements of Srikakulam and Godavari valley, the great people's movement that has come forward in recent times is the Karimnagar district movement. During the emergency period itself, the foundation for this movement was laid; the movement had extended to about 20-30 villages in Sircilla taluk.

We had contested here in the 1978 Assembly elections and took the revolutionary politics extensively to the people. Several centres were selected in Sircilla taluk and organisers were allotted. They made a deep study of the conditions of the people and formulated the agitational slogans on the problems of agricultural labourers and poor peasants. Anti-feudal and anti-government struggle slogans were taken up. The problems of traditional craftsmen like washermen, barbers, potters and shepherds etc. in villages were taken up.

All the village poor were enrolled into Rytu Coolie Sangahams and agitations were conducted on the problems like banjar lands, wages of agricultural labourers, hired farm hands, lands under illegal occupation of landlords, forest banjars, exploitation by forest officials, Tendu (bidi) leaves problem, usury, collection of bribes by landlords, bonded labour etc. Strike struggles were conducted on the issues of bonded labour, bribes, bribes collected by forest officials. Along with these struggles, the problems of middle peasants and rich peasants were taken up and anti-government agitational slogans were given.

Thus all the people in the village were united against the village landlord. Struggles were conducted and successes were achieved. To suppress

these movements the landlords employed, their goondas and resorted to atrocities. Nevertheless, the landlords were beaten back.

Propagation of revolutionary politics, anti-feudal struggles and resistance to landlords, atrocities was done in several centres. Successes were achieved. The Rytu Coolie Sangham had gained upperhand in the villages. With this the villages in Sircilla taluk became conscious. A great commotion had started among the poor peasants and agricultural labourers. The hatred towards feudalism among these classes broke all the bounds. Rytu Coolie Sanghams were formed. In every village red flags fluttered aloft. The fluttering red flag has come to stay as a symbol of the anti feudal feelings of the masses.

In this process the atrocities of *white lord* Prabhakara Rao, a local tyrant, had come to light. Immediately the people assembled and took punitive action. They paraded him in the surrounding villages and finally handed him over to the police. The people started to rise against landlord's atrocities. The landlords were terrified of the people and fled to the towns and began to hatch conspiracies from there itself. All the fleeing landlords sought the protection of Congress ministers. They had given bribes. The government acted to protect the interests of the landlords. Sircilla and Jagityal taluks were declared as *Disturbed Areas*. Thousands of policemen were deployed in these taluks. Police camps were set up and raids on the villages had begun.

Whoever was named by the landlords, was beaten up by the police. Whomsoever they had shown, was arrested. The goondas of the landlords were given unfettered freedom to do as they liked. In village after village, destruction of the properties of the people, confiscating the crops by force, and molestation of women took place. Demonic vendetta reigned over the villages.

In such circumstances, the district committees adopted the following tactics, as instructed by the State Committee, to counter this brutal onslaught.

- Under no circumstances shall the important organisers be arrested. They should remain underground and organise.
- The people should be rallied to resist any arrests.
- All the comrades in jails should fight for their rights.
- The organisational network of the mass organisations and the Party organisation should be consolidated at the village level.
- Village volunteer squads should be organised. By rallying the people the atrocities of the landlords, goondas, and the police should be resisted.
- The open and the secret activities should be coordinated.

—Ostentatious propaganda methods should be discouraged and the people in the villages should be habituated to the method of secret meetings.

—The agitation for civil liberties should be intensified throughout the district.

—The movement throughout the state should be rallied in solidarity with the district movement.

—By allocating some organisers from Sircilla taluk to other taluks, the movement in other taluks should be extended.

Based on these suggestions and by adopting the policy of *consolidation and extension of the movement*, the movement had extended to all the taluks in that district.

—The problems of middle and rich peasants were taken up along with those of agricultural laborers and poor peasants and struggles were conducted demanding remunerative prices for agricultural produce, power supply and loans for agricultural purposes. Some successes were achieved.

—The issue of lands occupied by landlords under various pretexts, and other banjar lands had come forward as a people's movement. In many villages successes were achieved. The movement had been extending to the new villages.

—In resisting the atrocities of the landlords, social boycott had become a powerful weapon in the hands of the people. In many villages it was implemented with tremendous impact. It is still being used in making the landlords submit, it has become a useful and powerful weapon.

—The bribes exacted and appropriated by the landlords in the villages, are being calculated and the landlords are being forced to refund them. Thus in the last two years alone nearly Rs. 15 lakhs were refunded to the people.

—In villages the people are able to get higher rates for their traditional trades. In the villages where we have worked, giving sheep-gratis, to the landlords and 'vetti' (serfdom) has almost come to an end.

—Strikes are being conducted for an increase in the wage rates of agricultural work.

—People have chased and caught hold of the goondas who are committing thefts abetted by the landlords and the police. In many villages this tactic of the landlords and the police was defeated.

—The people are retaliating the attacks being made by the landlords, goondas in the name of 'radicals' and 'People's War group'.

—In the recent times the RSS goonda attacks are being retaliated with the support and cooperation of the people.

Throughout this period, barbaric repression was being let loose on our Party and on the people's movement. In spite of this, the people's movement is extending to the new areas. Thus the *resistance struggle* being conducted among the peasantry has taken a definite shape. It is evident that this is an anti-feudal struggle. It is clear that this is a movement which resists the atrocities of the goondas of the landlords. It is clear that in the present stage passive resistance has to be continued against the police.

The Party Congress held in 1980 had made unambiguous formulations on the *resistance struggle*.

The principles of the *resistance struggle* should be linked to the political struggle line of the party.

On the peasant front *resistance struggle* is primary. Our work in other fronts should contribute to the growth of this movement.

Struggle Against Alien Trends.

Thus we marched ahead with the tactics of *resistance struggle*. We were able to build up a struggle linked with extensive land struggle. In hundreds of villages we were able to build up a movement dependent on the people's participation in the anti feudal struggles. We were able to build up in the state, a movement which resists the landlords, and their goondas, atrocities.

We were able to build up strong Rytu Coolie Sanghams. Of all others, we had been able to build up stronger student unions. We had built up a strong trade union movement compared to other revolutionary groups. We had mobilised hundreds of wholetimers and parttimers into our Party.

For this we had paid dearly. In this struggle we had sacrificed valuable lives. The principles of *resistance struggle* were the result of these sacrifices of our comrades.

In the course of this struggle, during the last 16 years, we had faced many obstacles. We had defeated the four wrong trends opposed to the correct principles of struggle. After breaking away organisationally from revisionism, neo revisionism, and the parliamentary path, we had faced Charu's Left adventurism and defeated it.

The followers of Charu said that concentrating in the forests was wrong. They said that there was no necessity of mass organisations for the movement. They said that the line of *annihilation of class enemies*

should chiefly be resorted to. We rejected all these arguments. In the post - 1977 period, they had declared that they had rejected their slogan '*annihilation of class enemy*' as the only form of struggle. They said that *annihilation of class enemy* is one of the tactics of the struggle. We had rejected this argument also.

During 1966-70 we had faced com. Devulapalli Venkateshwar Rao's (DV's) disruption. The essence of their arguments is as follows.

The armed struggle should commence only when the people are prepared for the distribution of landlords' own lands. Contrary to this, he said, the armed struggle was started here with militants and as this goes against the principle, this was not an armed struggle. That was why, he said, the forest movement had fizzled out. He said that the squads had disintegrated. He called them roving bands. He said that the initiative had gone into the hands of the enemy. He said that limited self-defence without arms should be resorted to.

The essence of all these arguments is nothing but confining both the forest movement and the plains movement to legal limitations and to economism. That is why our Party had rejected all these arguments of D. V. Rao. We had defeated them and advanced.

During 1979-80, after a 10 year period, the Party had faced on All India level, the disruption of S. N. Singh, Nandi clique, which was toeing the class collaboration line. In those days, the supporters of SNS-Nandi clique in this state, had tried to misguide the forest movement. They had argued that during fascist repression the struggle for civil liberties would be primary and the Agrarian Revolutionary struggle secondary. But they were defeated. But at that time this clique in Andhra did not leave the Party.

In 1984 the disruptors in the Party have again raised their heads. The prominent among them had stated in 1979 itself that they were vexed with the forest movement. They had expressed the view that they could not work in forest. But later they had changed their minds. They pretended to support the Party line. They had occupied the Party positions.

But afterwards they had acted in contravention of the Party line. They had opposed the suggestion that the atrocities of the landlords should be resisted and in this resistance the people should be armed with the locally available weapons.

They rejected the suggestions that if the government resorts to assaults and the people were not prepared for revolt, some organisers should remain with the people openly and all others should go underground.

They are opposing on the aspects—whether those gone into U. G. should move alone ? Or in squads ? If they move in squads, should they be armed ? If yes, with what kind of weapons ? all such problems should be decided depending on the level of the movement, the strength of the movement, strength of the Party, preparedness of the people, the strength of the landlords, geographical picture, etc. To that extent, on all the above issues they had moved amendments in the plenum, but were defeated.

Now they are arguing that the squads should move about in plain clothes and that they should carry small arms. They are arguing that in the process of the growth of the people's movement, mass organisations, village committees and volunteer squads should be built up and the people should acquire consciousness to start armed struggles while fighting on their problems.

All these arguments clearly point out to only one thing. That they have decided to pursue legalism and economism. Asking in all innocence whether a person once gone into U. G. should continue to stay U. G. till death is not at all incidental.

Like this, our principles of *resistance struggle* have faced many obstacles in the Party. They were subjected to vicissitudes and have overcome all of them.

Principles of Resistance Struggle of our Party and the attitude of other Revolutionary Groups

The resistance struggle principles of our Party are completely different to those being pursued by other revolutionary groups.

In our state, the People's War group says that on one hand they will build mass organisations and on the other hand will implement the '*annihilation of class enemy*' line. In actuality they are implementing the programme of *annihilation of class enemy*.

It is true that a section of them are mass oriented. But they do not have clarity on *annihilation of class enemy* and are unable to continue their mass line. It is to be noted that they are time and again drifting into *annihilation of class enemy*.

Nevertheless they do not depend mainly on mass line but on the struggles which do not have people's participation.

On the other side, some of the revolutionaries have taken to the Right. In the name of united front they are confining themselves to general agitational programmes. They are sinking into the quagmire of legalism and economism and want a mass line without resistance.

Our resistance programme differs from these two. Our Party took up the task of co-ordinating both-*people and resistance*. These principles withstood the test of struggle over a period of 16 years. It has been proved this is the only correct way.

Controversy over name?

In the initial stages, a debate ensued on naming our struggle. After the *pagideru incident*, in the (party organ) Janasakti, published from outside the forest, it has been declared that the armed struggle has been launched in the forest area.

In later period, there are instances when we called it *armed struggle*, *self-defence armed struggle*, and *armed guerilla struggle*. Whatever may be its name, we have always explained the actuality. We had been explaining the situation of the movement. We said that even today the movement in the forest area has not attained military character and that the political character is primary. We made it clear that the primary task is to politically mobilise people into revolution. We made clear that D.V.'s ambush theory does not hold good. We made it clear that the primary task of the squads is only to defend themselves from police raids and on the other side mobilise people on their immediate issues and bring them towards revolutionary politics.

We achieved clarity on this after the Karimnagar movement came to the fore in 1978. Ever since, we are referring to it as *resistance struggle*.

We have explained principles of *resistance struggle*. We made it clear that this is a struggle which resists the atrocities of landlords, goondas, and the police. We made it clear that this *resistance struggle* should develop in a sustained area by the method of *consolidation and extension of the movement*. We made it clear that this is a struggle which marches ahead by joining *people and the resistance*.

It should be understood that none who took a different path have developed people's movement .

23-7-84

(This article by com. Chandra Pulla Reddy was published in *Vimochana* 1-8-84 issue, under the pseudonym VIJAY)

World Communist Movement and its lessons

Introduction

Comrades Marx and Engels have enunciated the tasks of the world proletariat in the *Manifesto of the Communist Party* published in 1848..

They had declared unequivocally that the establishment of socialist system alone, throwing out the capitalist system lock, stock and barrel, would pave the way for the emancipation of the working class.

The communists disdain to conceal their views and aims. They openly declare that their ends can be attained only by the forcible overthrow of all existing social conditions. Let the ruling classes tremble at a communist revolution. The proletarians have nothing to lose but their chains. They have a world to win.

“Workers of the world unite !”

This slogan was raised in 1848. Today it is resounding throughout the world. Of the world population, 100 crores have been liberated permanently from the capitalist system. It has started moving along the socialist path.

The imperialist system is collapsing.

Anti-colonial liberation struggles are surging forward like great hurricanes.

Under the leadership of the communist parties, the working class in capitalist countries is fighting heroically against the governments of the capitalist countries.

We are in the era when the world communist movement is in a position to achieve the final victory over the world imperialist system.

At this auspicious stage, serious differences have arisen in the world communist movement on the ideological issues concerning strategy and tactics to be adopted in today's context.

Today, every communist is giving a serious thought to the future of the world communist movement and about the forms of struggle, strategy and the tactics. A way could certainly be found for our problems of today

if the various events in the history of the world communist movement and the lessons drawn from it are carefully analysed.

The history of the world communist movement could be chronologically divided into five chapters and analysed.

1. The period from 1848 to 1871.
2. The period from 1871 Paris Commune to 1905 Russian Revolution.
3. The period from 1905 to 1917 Revolution.
4. The period from 1917 to 1949 Chinese Revolution.
5. The post - 1949 Chinese Revolution period.

Let us study in depth the successes that the communist movement achieved and the lessons to be drawn in all these five stages.

1. FIRST STAGE

The period from 1848 to 1871

In the 15th and 16th centuries many naval adventurers undertook sea voyages. They had discovered new continents and countries. New transport routes across the seas have come into existence. Trade and commerce developed tremendously. The development of science had laid the foundations for the development of heavy industries. Colonisation of the countries had earned the necessary capital for the industrial development of the West European countries. It laid the foundation for the industrial revolution in Western Europe.

In the middle of the 18th century the industrial revolution took place in England. Gradually it had extended to Europe.

The industrial revolution developed industries and commerce at a rapid pace. It created the modern bourgeoisie.

The bourgeoisie set out to smash the feudal system and its state machinery which had become an obstacle for the development of capitalism.

The bourgeois revolutions took place in 1649 in England, in 1776 in America, in 1789, 1830 and in 1848 and in France, Germany, Austria, Hungary and Italy.

As a consequence of these revolutions, capitalism had been finally established worldwide. In Europe modern bourgeois governments also had come into existence. With the advent of the industrial revolution, the industrial proletariat also had been created on a large scale.

The working class had revolted many times against the inhuman exploitation being perpetuated on it. Gradually it had started to build an organised trade union movement.

Chartist Movement

This laid the foundations for the first trade union movement in England. Between 1837-50, the British workers had conducted the Chartist movement which was mainly for the adult franchise of workers.

—Right to vote for men, constituencies with equal voting rights, convening of parliament annually, salaries for the members of parliament, secret ballot system, and cancellation of the condition of property as the pre-requisite for election to parliament.

On these demands a petition with 33 lakh signatures was submitted to the parliament which had rejected it. Strikes had taken place. In some places it had taken the form of armed struggle. Nevertheless it failed.

This was noted as the first political struggle waged by the British working class against capitalism. This has contributed tremendously to the onward march of the world working class movement.

1847 Communist League

Utopian socialist theories were much popular among the workers prior to the arrival of Marx and Engels onto the scene. These utopian socialist ideologues, without taking into consideration the class struggles and the principles inherent in the capitalist society, felt that the society could be changed by making the capitalists treat the workers with a liberal outlook without going to the extent of overthrowing capitalism. By the equitable distribution of profits to the workers and by running the industries in an ideal fashion—atleast by some industrialists, the utopian socialists had hoped that the entire bourgeoisie could be made to agree to this. They had dreamt that by this method the exploitation of the workers could be brought to an end.

In such a situation Marx and Engels had come onto the scene of working class movement. They had examined the principles of class struggle which has been continuously going in the capitalist society. They had arrived at the conclusion that the liberation of the exploited people could be achieved only by the overthrow of the capitalist system through class struggle by rallying all the exploited classes under the leadership of the working class.

Those were the days, when in western Europe bourgeois democratic revolutions were taking place against the feudal monarchistic and merchant classes. Those were the days when the revolutionaries who had participated in those revolutions were exiled from their countries by the governments. In 1847 all such revolutionaries assembled in England and founded the Communist League. On behalf of this League the **Manifesto of the Communist Party** written by Comrades Marx and Engels, was published.

—The Manifesto had declared that the history of the hitherto existing society is the history of class struggles.

—It has stated that the contradiction between the collective production and private appropriation and the contradiction between the means of production and the distribution of production in the capitalist system would inevitably lead to crises. It has reiterated that the contradiction between the bourgeoisie and the working class will get intensified and inevitably lead to the smashing of capitalist system and the triumph of the working class.

—It has sharply condemned the erroneous socialist theories hitherto in propagation among the working class.

The feudal socialism had criticised severely the decay and exploitation brought by capitalism into the society but it had stopped there itself. It had not shown the way for emancipation. It had tried to turn the thoughts of the people back towards the earlier feudal society. It had linked its propaganda with Christianity. It had consoled the workers that even if they undergo sufferings in this world, they would get bountiful happiness in the other world. The Manifesto has exposed the hollowness of this theory.

The petty bourgeois theory had reflected the demands of the peasantry and the middle classes. This theory also had roundly condemned the injustice in the capitalist society, but had not shown the way out. The aim of the protagonists of this theory was to ameliorate the conditions of the workers within the framework of the property relations of the existing society. The Manifesto has exposed the weaknesses of this theory.

The Manifesto has severely criticised all the liberal theories and other bourgeois theories which oppose class struggles.

It has given a call to the working class of the world to overthrow the world capitalist system.

1848 French Revolution

There was an upsurge in bourgeois revolutions all over Europe in 1848. Among them, the French revolution was of significance.

In 1847, a severe economic crisis had brought the industries to a grinding halt. Consequently, unemployment soared. The masses were subjected to untold sufferings.

The revolution of 1848 was a bourgeois democratic revolution conducted by the developing bourgeoisie, working class and the middle classes against the feudal, monarchic, and the merchant classes which were in power.

This revolution was started on 24th February, 1848. In Paris city, the working class had rebelled. The monarchic government was overthrown and an interim government was formed.

The working class had hoped that this interim government would settle their basic demands. But the bourgeoisie had frustrated the hopes of the working class. On seeing the working class revolutions, the bourgeoisie panicked and had compromised with the feudal classes. Both these classes together had suppressed the working class.

In the French bourgeois revolution of 1848, both the Marxian theory and the pre-Marxian bourgeois and petty bourgeois socialist theories were put to test. The role of different classes in accomplishing the bourgeois democratic revolution had become clear.

Comrade Marx had drawn valuable lessons for the working class from the failure of the 1848 French revolution.

Lessons

This was the first class struggle waged between the modern working class and the modern bourgeoisie.

In the revolutionary conditions, the role of each and every class had become clear.

—It had removed the illusions of the working class on the bourgeois parliamentary system.

—It was proved that in the event of a working class revolution, the bourgeoisie would abolish even the parliamentary system.

—It was proved that the emancipation of the working class and the other exploited masses would be possible only through the dictatorship of the proletariat.

—It made clear that the working class revolution would be successful only when there is unity between the workers and the peasantry.

—It had become clear that without the support of the working class, the middle classes cannot stand on their own.

—It was natural for the big bourgeoisie and the landlord classes to unite and oppose the working class. The contradiction between these two classes was a limited one.

—The success of the working class revolution in any country of the capitalist world depends on the world revolutionary situation.

It became clear that the working class alone would fight unswervingly for socialism.

Thus, in practice, through the experiences of the French revolutionary struggle, the Marxian theory on the historical role of the working class had triumphed over other bourgeois and petty-bourgeois theories.

On this subject, comrade Lenin says :

“The 1848 revolution had sounded a death knell to all the pre-Marxian mushroom theories.” (World Proletarian, Communist movement—Lenin, English Edition, p. 168).

Along with the French revolution, the German revolution and the other European bourgeois revolutions have failed owing to the betrayal of the bourgeoisie.

The Communist League as well as Marx and Engels had made serious efforts to make these revolutions successful. With the failure of these revolutions, severe repression was let loose on the activities of the League throughout Europe. On the other hand, factionalism had increased in the League. A temporary disillusionment had set in among the working class and as a result, the Communist League was wound up in 1852.

Comrades Marx and Engels nevertheless had written many classics which are essential for the working class movement during, this period.

1864-Formation of the First International

The bourgeois democratic revolutions of 1848 were not in vain. The bourgeoisie had gradually captured power. Industrial development had taken place. As a result, the working class had grown in numbers.

The working class in England, France, America and Germany etc., had again got organised to fight. The necessity of an international body of the working class to co-ordinate and take forward these struggles going on in different countries was recognised.

In these conditions, the First International was established in London on 28th September, 1864.

The First International was not a monolithic body based on a single political theory. Those groups which were opposed to Marxism and class struggle were also constituents of this body. During this period, the Marxist theory had fought against all the erroneous socialist theories to gain the leadership of the working class movement.

During the entire period of the First International, Marx and Engels fought against the British socialist theories which advocated building of non-political trade unions, against Blanqui's adventurist theories of conducting armed struggle without any strong trade union movement, against the theories of Proudhon and Lasseley, who advocated that socialism could be established through co-operative societies, and against Bakunin's anarchist theories. On this struggle Marx says,

The whole period of the First International was the period of relentless struggle conducted by the General Council against the conspiracies of the small groups which were against a real trade union movement. (Marx - Engles' letters, page 326).

During this period, the First International had made serious efforts to unify the world trade union movement and to educate it on the basis of Marxist ideology.

The First International had formulated the policy and tactics of the working class towards bourgeois governments, trade unions, co-operative societies, general elections, women's issue, peasants, problems and national problems.

The First International had placed before the working class of the world-tactics of struggle on immediate issues, the tactics of armed struggle which were necessary for the final revolution of the working class, and the task of establishment of proletarian dictatorship.

It had co-ordinated the trade union movements of different countries and had developed internationalism among them. It had consolidated the small trade union movements of different countries which were scattered into a strong international working class movement and made it a strong and contending force against world capitalism.

1871 Paris Commune :

In 1870, Louis Bonaparte's government was in power in France. The working class was getting ready for another revolutionary struggle. To divert this struggle the government was scheming for another war with Germany on a border dispute. The Bismarc government in Germany was also waiting for such an opportunity. Consequently, on 9th July 1870, war started between these two countries. On 2nd September, 1870, the French armies had surrendered unconditionally.

On 4th September, a new republican government was established, throwing out the Bonaparte's government in France. In this government also the leadership was that of the bourgeoisie lead by Theiers.

The government of Theiers, instead of continuing the war with Germany, had tried to compromise with the German government. The Paris working class, sensing the betrayal of the government, rebelled in Paris and on March 18, 1871 established the government of Paris Commune under the leadership of the working class.

The armies of Theiers and Bismarc had united and attacked jointly to overthrow the government of Paris Commune.

After three weeks of stiff resistance, the Commune government was defeated. On 28th of May, 1871 Paris Commune was smashed.

Marx had warned the working class even at the time of revolt that the time had not yet come for revolt. Yet, once the Commune was established, Marx and other leaders of the First International had tried their utmost to make the Commune a success.

Lessons of Paris Commune

Marx drew valuable lessons from the experience of the Paris Commune for the trade union and communist movements of the world.

In France, the process of development of capitalism was not yet completed. That was why, Marx said the Paris Commune had failed. He explained that since the working class had not rallied behind it the French peasantry completely, the Paris Commune had failed. He further explained that as the revolution started in Paris was not extended at once to other areas, it failed.

Paris Commune had provided the following lessons to the future trade union movement.

—Of all the exploited classes, it is the working class alone that has proved its capability for leadership.

—Without the unity of the workers and peasants no revolution can succeed.

—It has made clear how brutal the ruling classes could be to suppress the revolutions of the exploited people.

—Paris Commune has made clear that the bourgeoisie, being afraid of working class revolution, will be prepared even to sell away their motherland to alien countries.

—The working class could never utilise the old state apparatus for its liberation. It should be smashed completely and the government of proletarian dictatorship should be established.

—Paris Commune was the embryonic form of future proletarian dictatorship.

Though the Paris Commune was overthrown, it was the first ever victory, of the working class of the whole world. It was the first ever revolutionary action that had dealt a strong blow to the world capitalist system. It became a torch-bearer for the Russian revolution half a century later. The Russian revolution, which had made a breach in the fort of the world capitalist system, had drawn lessons from Paris Commune. "How ever many mistakes might have been committed, Paris Commune remains a historic blazing torch". (Lenin)

After the defeat of the Paris Commune, severe repression had been unleashed on the European working class movement. On the other hand,

a serious confrontation developed among the constituents of the First International between Bakunin's anarchist theory and Marxist class struggle theory. Under the leadership of Marx, the First International split into two. It had gradually become weak and in 1875 had come to an end.

Yet the struggles of this period had given the working class the revolutionary consciousness. Foundations were laid for a broad based trade union movement. In an embryonic form, working class parties and Social Democratic parties in different countries have sprouted.

Of all these developments, the most important was that Marx's theory of scientific socialism had triumphed over all other theories and had emerged as the only theory of the working class.

Com. Lenin explains these developments :

Marxist theory, in the modern society, makes the working class conscious and unites it. It makes clear the role of this class. It makes clear that in the process of economic development, the present society will be abolished and in its place a new society would definitely come into existence. But this theory, in the process of its development, have had to conduct serious struggle at each and every step against other opposing theories

Marxism had not established its position at once. In the first half of century (1840) Marxism has fought with the theories that fundamentally differed with it. In 1840 it has defeated the followers of Hegel, who have clung to philosophical idealism. After that, entering into the economic field by 1850 it has defeated the economic theories of Proudhon. In 1870s Marxism, from the realm of theory, has entered into the realm of practice in the working class. By defeating the theories of Bakunin, it has established its supremacy in practice. By 1890, Marxism has triumphed. The Second International, without any resistance, accepted the orientation of Marxism."

(Working class and communist movement of the world, Lenin, pp. 90-91).

2. SECOND STAGE

The period from 1871 Paris Commune to 1905

The First International came into being at the time when bourgeois democratic revolutions were taking place in Europe. With the 1871 Franco-German war, feudalism had collapsed in Europe and a new era of development of capitalist system had started.

During the period of 1871–1905 capitalism had developed to its zenith very rapidly. More over, by 1900, capitalism had developed into-full fledged imperialism which brought the entire world under its control. With this, gradually the era of downfall of the capitalist system also started.

Compared to the earlier period, the period from 1871–1905 could be said to be a peaceful period. In Europe by 1870, the bourgeois democratic revolutions were completed. In Asia, the bourgeois democratic revolutions were yet to start.

In these peaceful conditions, the Second International was formed in 1889 to lead the world trade union movement in the context of these new conditions.

During this period, the Marxist socialist theories were extensively propagated in the working class. On an independent basis, the socialist parties were formed in different countries. Utilising the bourgeois Parliamentary system, the socialist parties developed. They had established their own papers. They had developed broad mass-based trade unions and cooperative institutions. In many countries they had conducted militant strikes. To put it in a nutshell, during this period the trade union movement had developed into a mighty force. On this basis the socialist parties in various countries had developed into peoples' parties. Throughout this entire period, the German working class and the German socialist party had provided leadership to the Second International.

But during this period, a bad trend also had entered the trade union movement.

The bourgeoisie, from their super profits accruing mainly from the exploitation of their colonies, had been able to distance the upper strata of the working class by giving higher wages and turning it into its faithful agent. This upper strata, while remaining in the working class, had set out to divert it from the revolutionary path into reformist methods.

But these reformists in the working class could not put up open struggle against Marxism. As by that time Marxism had been accepted as the sole theory of the working class, these revisionists while accepting Marxism theoretically, had resorted in practice to take the path of opportunism. Seeing the development of capitalism at that time they had argued that socialism could be achieved without working class struggles.

We have to carefully observe the various trends introduced by revisionism in various fields.

—It had refuted Marxism in philosophy and made attempts to introduce bourgeois philosophy in its place.

—In the field of economics, the revisionists had introduced formulations opposed to basic Marxist tenets. They had refuted the theory of concentration of capital. They had started an argument that this does not hold good in agriculture. They had argued that the economic crises which are natural in the capitalist economy were gradually declining, and with the establishment of monopoly concerns the crises would eventually disappear. They had said that gradually the intensity of class antagonisms would be lessened.

On the political plane they had rejected the theory of class struggle. They had argued that as the opinion of the majority people would prevail in the bourgeois democracy, the idea that government is a symbol of class rule became obsolete. They had said that socialism can be achieved through parliament. They had said that the working class should not refuse to form a united front with the progressive bourgeois reformists.

That was why throughout the period of Second International, the international working class movement was divided between the genuine revolutionary Marxists and the pseudo Marxists. For the revisionists, all the leaders who were in responsible positions in the mass organisations and in parliament have become the main activists.

At this juncture, Lenin took the responsibility of opposing and resisting the revisionist path and safeguarding the purity of Marxism.

3. THIRD STAGE

From 1905 to 1917 Revolution

Lenin had torn into pieces the argument of the revisionists that Capitalism would be peacefully transformed into socialism. The peace that was visible in the capitalism, Lenin had said, was only ephemeral, Lenin further said that as capitalism had developed into imperialism, very soon class struggles and national struggles would definitely get intensified.

As Lenin predicted, the peace that was visible in the capitalist world was very soon shattered. Russia - Japan War in 1905, Russian revolution in 1905, and afterwards the burgeois democratic revolutions in Turkey, Russia and China had shaken the capitalist society. Commenting on the significance of these developments, Lenin says :

“80 crores of Asian people coming into the struggle front for the same ideals for which the European working class is fighting is a fact that should not discourage us but instead enthuse us. The Asian revolutions also are confirming the uselessness of bourgeois liberal theories. They are making clear the independent role of the democratic minded people, and the difference between the working class and

various types of bourgeois leaders. Even after the experience gained in both Asia and Europe, if anyone even now talks about classless politics and classless socialism, he should be put in a cage, beside the Australian Kangaroo and exhibited."

New Strategy : New Tactics

At the outset of this revolutionary phase Lenin arrived on to the scene of the international working class movement. He tore into pieces the arguments of the revisionists in the working class movement. By creatively developing the basic tenets of Marxism and applying them to imperialist stage, he had placed before the workers of the world a new strategy and new tactics necessary for the success of the proletarian revolutions.

Marx and Engels belonged to the period of developing capitalism. Lenin belonged to the imperialist stage and the era of revolutions. It was the responsibility of Lenin to implement Marxist tenets by applying them to the imperialist stage.

Marx had said that the proletarian revolutions would come first in the countries where capitalism is highly developed. Marx could see proletarian dictatorship in an embryonic form in Paris Commune. It was the task of Lenin to formulate the strategy and tactics to achieve proletarian dictatorship, establish it and build socialism. Marx had created the scientific theoretical base for the proletarian revolution, Lenin had to develop it creatively and successfully complete the proletarian revolution.

Stalin had said about Lenin's theories :

Leninism is Marxism of the era of imperialism and the proletarian revolution. To be more exact Leninism is the theory and tactics of the proletarian revolution in general, the theory and tactics of the dictatorship of the proletariat in particular. Marx and Engels pursued their activities in the pre-revolutionary period (we have the proletarian revolution in mind), when developed imperialism did not yet exist, in the period of the proletarians' preparation for revolution, in the period when the proletarian revolution was not yet an immediate practical inevitability. But Lenin, the disciple of Marx and Engels, pursued his activities in the period of developed imperialism, in the period of the unfolding proletarian revolution, when the proletarian revolution had already triumphed in one country, had smashed bourgeois democracy and had ushered in the era of proletarian democracy, the era of the Soviets. . . .

(Problems of Leninism : Stalin— page 3)

Against Kautsky and such other revisionists, Lenin had forged the organisation of a new Communist Party, which had complete unity, from top to bottom. He had formulated a principle that the working class should convert the imperialist war into a civil war.

He had analysed and asserted that Tsarist Russia was the weakest link in the world imperialist chain and hence the revolution would be successful there and he had utilised his time and energy to this end.

1905 Russian Revolution

As Lenin predicted, the bourgeois democratic revolution that had come in Russia in 1905, had shaken the capitalist society. It had cautioned that the time for socialist revolutions had come.

In order to divert the rising tide of people's discontent, the Tsar had entered into war with Japan on the Manchurian issue. In this war the armies of the Tsar had met with ignoble defeat. This war had contributed to the 1905 revolution in Russia. Under the leadership of Com. Lenin, the Bolsheviks led this revolution.

Owing to the intensification of struggle between Mensheviks who reflected the revisionist trends, and the Bolsheviks, who were the followers of Lenin and who were the strict adherents of basic Marxist tenets, the Russian Social Democratic Party split into two in 1903 itself. Under the leadership of Com. Lenin, the Bolsheviks had started to function as a separate party.

Two Tactics

In the revolution of 1905, the Mensheviks and the Bolsheviks had adopted two mutually opposed strategies and tactics.

—The Mensheviks had argued that since it was a bourgeois revolution, it should develop under the leadership of bourgeoisie and the working class should assist the bourgeoisie to overthrow the Tsarist government. The Bolsheviks had rejected this. They had said that this revolution could be successful only under the leadership of the working class.

—In the eyes of Mensheviks peasantry was not a revolutionary class. But the Bolsheviks were of the opinion that unless the unity of workers and peasants was achieved under the leadership of working class, the revolution could not succeed.

—Mensheviks had argued that after the success of bourgeois democratic revolution, for the full development of capitalism, the capitalist class, under the leadership of bourgeoisie should be given the necessary time. The Bolsheviks, while rejecting this, said that after the success of the bourgeois revolution, the struggle to achieve the socialist revolution should be launched immediately.

—When the Tsar, with a view to divert the revolution, had promised to form a parliament, the Mensheviks had argued that they should accept it and work in it. The Bolsheviks had rejected it and said that the Tsar should be overthrown through armed struggle.

On 9th January 1905 (bloody Sunday), when thousands of workers under the leadership of an archbishop went in a procession to submit a memorandum on their demands, the Tsar's troops ruthlessly opened fire on them. This incident triggered the 1905 revolution.

It gradually spread to all important towns. In many towns, the workers went on political strikes. The marines of the ship "Potemkin" had rebelled. From towns the revolution had spread to all the villages. The peasantry had started occupying the lands of the landlords. In December, 1905, the working class of Moscow had rebelled. Street fighting took place and barricades were erected. But this revolt was ruthlessly suppressed. Thus, with this, the 1905 revolution was finished.

After this, the Tsar had resorted to barbaric repression to crush the Russian revolution. The Bolsheviks, through guerilla struggle, safeguarded the revolution.

Reasons for the defeat

—Strong unity of workers and peasants was not achieved. Majority of the peasants were still having illusions on the Tsar.

—Though there were some revolts in the army, the majority of the army stood by the Tsar.

—Also, the entire working class had not come into the revolution at one time.

—The working class was divided between Bolsheviks and Mensheviks. Mensheviks had watered down the revolutionary struggle.

—The peace treaty between Russia and Japan, had helped the Tsar to brace himself internally.

—The difference of opinions between the Bolsheviks and Mensheviks on the forms of struggle, on tactics and strategy in Russia which came to the fore had started in the Second International also.

The internal contradictions in the imperialist system had become acute. The clash between the camps of imperialist countries for the re-division of the world had become intense. Consequently, in 1914, the First World War started between the two camps of imperialist powers i.e., Germany and its allies, and Britain and its allies.

As a result, the ideological differences in the Second International had come out as three distinct trends.

—Rightist group which constituted the majority-supported the reactionary governments.

—Centrist group—Kautsky and his followers—in practice helped the rightist group.

—Radical group—Lenin and his followers—said that the imperialist war should be converted into a civil war and worked for the overthrow of the capitalist government in their country.

With the outbreak of the first world war, the rightist group and the centrist group in the Second International which hitherto remained hidden, came out openly and in the name of defending their countries, started to support the imperialist war governments.

Lenin had rejected this policy and gave a call to convert the imperialist war into a civil war. He had said that throwing out the war governments and establishing the proletarian governments by the working class alone would pave way for world peace.

And with this, Com. Lenin and his followers came out of the Second International, which sold itself out to the capitalist class, and started separately organising revolutionary communist parties based on Marxist ideology.

November 7th, 1917 - Russian Revolution

In Russia, the Bolsheviks had launched serious efforts to turn the imperialist war into a civil war and overthrow the Tsar from power.

In February, 1917, the Tsar was thrown out of power. Under the leadership of bourgeoisie, the new government was formed.

This revolution was conducted against the feudal class represented by the Tsar. This revolution was conducted by the industrial capitalist class, working class, agricultural labourers and the peasantry.

Since the leadership of this revolution was in the hands of the bourgeoisie, power had passed into their hands. But at all places local soviets have been formed. As a result dual authority had come into existence in the country. In these soviets also, Mensheviks were in majority. The extremely petty bourgeois atmosphere existing in the country at that time, was responsible for this.

Lenin had cautioned the working class that the government formed in February was a bourgeois government, and that it was a government which would continue the war and not end it and hence the working class should not co-operate with it. He said that the working class should rally agricultural labourers, the poor and the middle peasantry and the middle classes under its leadership and overthrow the bourgeois government.

He had said that the socialist revolution should be achieved. Learning from their own experiences, the majority of the working class, peasantry, army and the majority of the soviets had swung toward Bolshevics.

On 7th November, 1917, the socialist revolution in Russia was successful. For the first time in history, the government of the proletarian dictatorship was established.

Reasons for the success of the revolution

The Russian bourgeoisie had become weak financially as well as politically. Since it continued the policy of war it had lost the sympathy of majority people.

—The working class which had revolutionary consciousness had lead the revolution. It was able to rally around it majority of the agricultural labourers and poor peasantry.

—The iron - disciplined Bolshevik Party had come forward as the leader of the working class.

—The world situation—with the imperialist countries fighting against one another contributed to the success of socialist revolution in Russia.

4. FOURTH STAGE

The period from 1917 Russian revolution to 1949 Chinese revolution

Though the proletarian revolution was successful in Russia, owing to the betrayal of revisionists and due to lack of strong communist movements, the proletarian revolutions had failed in the West European Countries.

As a result of the First World War and due to the establishment of socialist government, capitalism had entered into a stage of general crisis. This had made even more acute, all the contradictions in capitalism. To resolve the contradictions among the imperialists and to get out of the general crisis engulfing the entire capitalist system, the imperialists had resorted to attack on Soviet Russia.

The internal reactionary forces in Russia, with the help of the international imperialists, had set out to overthrow the Soviet socialist government.

In these conditions, it became imperative to save Soviet Union, its socialist government, both from the internal and the international reactionary forces and build socialist society.

While protecting the socialist government it had become necessary to spread throughout the world the revolutionary message of Soviet Union and also provide necessary theoretical, political and practical leadership to the international working class movement.

It had become necessary to provide leadership to the world communist movement, and help build strong communist parties.

Proletarian revolutions broke out in Germany, Bulgaria and Hungary etc, but owing to the betrayal of revisionists, those revolutions could not succeed.

In such a revolutionary situation, in the year 1919, the Third International was established to fulfill the above tasks.

The Third International had made serious efforts to build up communist parties based on Marxist ideology in different countries. It had provided necessary theoretical and organisational experience for 'fulfilling this task. At this stage, one left deviation section among the communists—when the revolutionary conditions were at a low ebb—argued that communists should not participate in trade union activities and in the parliament. Lenin has criticised this line very severely. During this stage, in colonial and in semi-colonial countries, communist parties have been formed and were functioning. National liberation struggles started sprouting. The communist parties in these countries had set out to intensify the national liberation struggles. In this effort, the Communist Party of China had achieved glorious successes and had emerged as a strong force.

The death of comrade Lenin occurred in 1924. Under the leadership of comrade Stalin, the Third International carried out these international tasks.

The thesis (on Colonial Countries) of the 6th Congress held in 1928, was of much help for developing the international communist movement.

The failure of all the West European revolutions in the post-First World War, gave time for capitalism to brace itself. With this, the bourgeois politicians and the revisionists have once again started an argument that there will be no more crisis in the capitalism and that the atmosphere for gradual development of capitalism has been created.

The Sixth Congress of the Third International held in 1928 has flayed all these wrong theories. It has cautioned that the imperialism has entered into the crisis and that crisis and revolutions are inevitable and ultimately capitalism will crumble. It has formulated relevant tactics for the world communist parties. Similarly, it has reviewed the situation in colonial countries and has formulated tactics for communist parties for furthering national struggles.

It had pointed out the different types of crises the capitalist system was undergoing while the socialist society in Soviet Russia was developing without any crisis. At this stage, three special events should be mentioned.

—In the Soviet Union, defeating the theories of Trotsky and Bukharin, the programme of five year plans for building socialist society was started under the leadership of com. Stalin.

—In western Europe, the working class had resorted to widespread struggle against the ill-effects of the economic crisis.

—In China, opposing the betrayal of Chiang Kai-shek, under the leadership of the Communist Party, Libertated Area was formed in southern China and the armed struggle was started. When the Liberated Area in southern China could not be defended, the Red Army in 1934, under the leadership of Communist Party, undertook a long march of 6000 miles, reached northern China, formed a Liberated Area and started its struggle.

Fascism

The crisis that started in 1929, had intensified the revolutionary situation in Germany. The Communist Party made serious efforts to divert the working class into the revolutionarty struggles. But majority of the working class was still under the influence of social democrats who, at each and every step, watered down the working class struggle and compromised with the bourgeoisie. The capitalist class helped the fascist clique of Hitler, dissolved the parliament and brought Hitler to power on 30th January, 1933.

The fascist government of Hitler had suppressed the democratic, working class and the communist movements in Germany and sent thousands of people to gallows. The government itself set on fire parliament building and foisted a conspiracy case on com. Dimitrov and other communist leaders. The world-wide agitation compelled the government to release com. Dimitrov.

Fight against fascism

All the imperialists of the world had conspired to incite the fascist governments of Hitler, Mussolini and the Japan governments to attack Russia.

In 1931, Japan had declared war on Manchuria and occupied it. In 1935, Italy declared war on Abissynia.

Hitler had intensified the preparations for a new war with deadly weapons. The governments of England, France and America had helped him in his attempts.

The world communist movement had taken up the task of rallying and preparing for struggles all the democratic forces against the growing fascism and against the new war efforts.

The 7th Congress of the Third International held in 1935 had made clear the class character of fascism and gave a call to unite all the democratic forces and to resist through united front tactics the war efforts.

In response to this call the communist parties of different countries had set to the building up of a strong democratic movement. Of this, the following historic events are worth mentioning.

—In 1936, in France, all the democratic forces have joined hands and a popular front government was formed. The communist party extended support to this government.

—In 1936, in Spain, a republican government was formed by all the democratic parties including the communist party. General Franco had declared a revolt to overthrow this government. The governments of Hitler and Mussolini stood in support of him. In the name of neutrality, the governments of France, England and America had betrayed the Spanish Republican government. The Soviet government and the international communist movement alone stood in support of the Spanish Republican government. The Spanish republic put up a lone, heroic fight but in vain. General Franco had come into power.

—The Chinese Communist Party had built up a powerful movement in the entire country demanding the cessation of civil war waged by the Kuomintang Party against it and resisting the Japanese aggression unitedly. Kuomintang Party was compelled to accept to resist the Japanese aggression together with the Communist Party.

—The fifth-columnists in Russia who were conspiring to disrupt the building up of socialist society and to pull down it, were wiped out by the Communist Party.

SECOND WORLD WAR

As a result of the contradiction between the imperialist camps second World War broke out in 1939. Since the European countries did not put up a united resistance to the war efforts of the fascist governments, Soviet Russia had reached a no-war-pact with Germany.

The Soviet Union had foiled the conspiracies of the imperialists who had desired to incite Hitler to attack Soviet Russia. Hitler had declared war on the other imperialist powers. With a short time he had occupied the entire Europe. The Soviet Union had liberated the eastern region of Poland, Basarenia region, and Latwin countries. It had strengthened its western frontiers. In 1940, Hitler declared war on Soviet Russia. England and America could not but join hands with Soviet Russia against Hitler.

The heroic resistance of Soviet people, the resistance of the people of Europe and the unity between America, England and the Soviet Russia had led to the defeat of Germany in 1944, and in 1945 of Japan. With the

defeat of the fascist governments, the East European countries had taken to the path of socialism. In western Europe a strong communist movement had emerged.

With the defeat of fascist governments and with the weakening of the imperialist countries, imperialism as a whole weakened.

In 1949, under the leadership of the Communist Party, 70 crore Chinese people have overthrown the Chiang Kai-shek government and had hoisted the red flag.

In totality, what were the victories achieved in this period ?

—In Soviet Russia the socialist society was successfully established. On the basis of collective system, agriculture was reconstructed. Soviet Union had emerged as a strong force.

—In various countries, strong communist parties, with broad mass base were formed.

—East European countries have taken to the socialist path.

—70 crore Chinese people had taken to the socialist path.

—World socialist system with 100 crores people had come into existence. During this period, in all the successes achieved by the international communist movement, com. Stalin had played a major role.

5. FIFTH STAGE

The post - 1949 Chinese revolution period

The defeat of fascist governments and the success of Soviet Union in the second World War, East European countries taking to the path of socialism, and the severe weakening of US & British imperialists—all these had weakened the imperialist system as a whole. National liberation struggles had surged forward.

The Chinese people under the leadership of Communist Party achieved complete success in the armed revolutionary struggle they were waging for 28 years. This victory achieved by China had led to the establishment of the communist governments in North Korea, North Vietnam and Cuba.

The importance of Chinese revolution

Chinese revolution was the first revolution that had come in colonial countries of Asia, Africa and Latin America. The Russian revolution had shaken the foundations of the world capitalist system. It had made the first breach. The Chinese revolution had struck a death blow to the

imperialist system. Its backbone was irreparably shattered. It will inevitably crumble quickly and no knight-errant can save it from the doom.

—The Chinese revolution was one that took place in a country of 70 crores people. With it a socialist world of 100 crores had come into being. The socialist world, which could stand on par with the capitalist world in all the fields has appeared on the world arena.

—Chinese revolution was a revolution, which had shown the path of liberation to the people of backward colonial and semi-colonial countries. It was a revolution, which proved that the exploited people with revolutionary spirit, by following the people's war path and by conducting a protracted struggle against the imperialists with all their deadly weapons, and their puppets, can achieve their liberation.

—It was a revolution, which had given a new struggle form—initially liberating the villages and gradually liberating the towns—to the exploited people of the colonial and semi-colonial countries.

It was a revolution, which had in practice, by implementing dil'gently Lenin's formulation on the conditions under which to unite with and to fight against national bourgeoisie in colonial and semi-colonial countries.

It was a revolution, which had given to the world New Democratic Revolution—a new form of the proletarian dictatorship government in backward countries.

It was a revolution, which has shown in practice how the socialist society should be established in the backward countries by smashing the existing exploiting system.

Present situation

With 1/3rd of the world transforming into socialist system, developing strong movements of working class and communist parties, and surging movements of national liberation struggles—all these have contributed to the complete weakening of imperialist system and its sliding down into a permanent crisis.

In such a situation the imperialism has no alternative except to get along by transforming the government into military apparatus and resort to aggressive wars. With the faster pace of the disintegration of imperialism, the national liberation movements surged. They are taking the form of armed struggle and also the role of the communist parties in these struggles is increasing

The weakened imperialist countries are unable to suppress these movements. That is why in the post-second World War conditions, many old colonial and semi-colonial countries have been able to achieve their

independence. India, Burma, Ceylon, Indonesia, Algeria, Egypt, other Arab countries and many African countries have declared their independence.

American imperialism has come forward as a champion, to prop up the collapsing imperialist system. It has established hundreds of military bases and piled them up with deadly destructive weapons against national liberation struggles and against the socialist countries. It has set out to acquire financial control over the under-developed countries as well as weak capitalist countries. In the countries where the forces of the people are strong enough, it is inciting civil wars. In some cases, it is directly resorting to armed intervention and drenching the national liberation movements in blood. The naked atrocities of American imperialism in South Vietnam, Congo, Dominican Republic, Ghana and Indonesia etc. are before us.

The national liberation movements and the communist parties are marching ahead resisting the deadly weapons of American imperialism—the common enemy of the people of the world.

SPLIT IN THE COMMUNIST MOVEMENT

In such an auspicious situation, the 20th Congress of the Soviet Communist Party, held in 1956, has sown confusion in the world communist movement. The 20th Congress of the Soviet Party had made brand new formulations that there are conditions where war can be permanently put off even while the imperialism exists; that socialism can be established through parliamentary means without the necessity of armed revolt; that Stalin had behaved like a dictator destroying the socialist democracy.

In order to rectify the revisionist trends implicit in these brand new formulations and to safeguard the purity of the basic Marxist tenets, efforts were made by the Conference of the International Communist Parties, held in 1957, and the conference of 81 communist parties held in 1960.

After reviewing the present day world conditions, they tried to formulate new strategy and tactics necessary for the world communist movement. But they are in vain as serious differences have come forward in the world communist movement on various problems related to today's strategy and tactics.

These difference of opinions are nothing but the struggle going on between the modern revisionist principles and Marxist-Leninist principles. We should carefully examine the long history of the world working class movement and the communist movement, the experiences they have provided in different stages, the various problems confronting the communist movement today and the solutions offered and the lessons they teach us.

Lessons

In the development of the proletarian revolutionary movement, by conducting serious struggle against capitalism only, the working class movement was able to develop from one stage to a higher stage. In all the stages-1871-1905-1917-1949 only by conducting bitter struggles against the capitalist system the working class communist movements were able to develop.

While conducting these serious struggles, many opportunist and revisionist trends latent in the communist movement had come out openly. Only since Marxism had fought bitter struggles against these alien trends and defeated them, the communist movement was able to advance.

That was why Engels said thus :

“Working class movement will definitely develop in different stages. At every stage one section the movement will try to go ahead. The rest refuses to join with it. That is why among different sections, a life and death struggle ensues and a higher level of working class unity and development will be achieved”.

The revisionist trends that arise every now and then in the communist movement have their roots in the objective conditions of those countries and in some characteristic features of the economic development of the capitalist countries.

Lenin had made clear that revisionism would often rises its ugly head in the working class movement due to the following factors.

New generations of cadres from different classes joining the movement. Progressive and reactionary trends manifest at different stages of the development of capitalism will give rise to the revisionist trends in the working class movement. In the backward countries, due to the uneven development of capitalism, some sections in the working class movement will be affected easily by revisionist trends.

The two tactics adopted by the bourgeoisie to suppress the working class movement, in some cases giving some perks to the workers and some times severe repression, will develop revisionist and adventurist trends in the working class movement. In the capitalist society people from middle classes and peasantry will be joining the ranks of the working class. They give rise to revisionist trends in the working class movements. Objective conditions in the capitalist society often give rise to revisionist deviations in the communist movement and therefore Marxists had to conduct serious struggles against all such alien trends. That was way continuous ideological struggle had to be conducted by Marx against Bakunin's theories during

First International, by Lenin against the theories of Kautsky during Second International and by Stalin against Trotsky's and Tito's theories during the Third International.

Today also it has become necessary for the Marxists-Leninists to fight against the modern revisionists to protect the Marxist theory of class struggle.

2. The centre of contradictions of the world capitalist imperialist system often changed from one country to another. As a result, the centre of world working class movement also changed.

In 1830, Chartist movement in England, 1848-71 revolutionary movements in France, the 1871-1905 working class movement in Germany, since 1905 to the later period of Second World War, the Russian working class—like this, at different stages, the leadership had been changing from one country to another.

Lenin had cautioned that the revolutionary centre also would change.

In the different stages of 19th century, just as the leadership of the working class movement belonged for some time to Britain, and later to the German working class, the leadership of the international working class movement has come to the Russian working class. But undoubtedly this leadership will remain in their hands only for a short period. (International working class and communist movement, Lenin, p. 292).

Due to complete weakening of imperialism after the Second World War, the national liberation movements in Asia, Africa and Latin American countries are in the upsurge.

They are fighting against the attempts of the American imperialists to drench these movements in blood and suppress them. Thus it appears that the centre of revolutionary movements has shifted to Asia, Africa, and Latin America region. But the international revisionist leadership of today is refusing to see this reality. By counterposing the fundamental contradiction between the socialist and capitalist systems to today's contradiction between national liberation movements and the imperialism, it is refusing to recognise the key role of the national liberation struggle in ending imperialism.

The post-Second World War, especially post-Chinese revolution world history is the history of the struggle between the national liberation struggles and the imperialism. The national liberation struggles going on even today are making it clear that the centre of the contradictions of imperialism has shifted to Asia, Africa and Latin America region.

3. The ideological and political struggle between Marxists and revisionists at different stages have steered Marxism and broadened it. In the struggle conducted at various stages, in the beginning, Marxists were in minority organisationally, compared to revisionists. But by bitter struggles Marxism defeated revisionism and was victorious. At various stages, Marxism, than revisionism, was able to adopt the correct strategy and tactics suitable to that particular stage and defeat revisionism and march ahead. In this struggle conducted at different stages, the Marxists had taken an uncompromising stand with revisionists. Marx, Engels, Lenin and Stalin while conducting struggle against revisionists, never went for opportunistic unity with them. While stating that unity with revisionists is impossible, Lenin says :

Leaving the theories aside and getting down into the mud-pond along with the revisionists cannot be called as unity. It means the working class joining the national bourgeoisie. It means bringing a division in the international working class movement.

He has stated further :

“Without making a clean break with the revisionists and without exposing their hollowness, unity of the working class and socialism cannot be achieved nationally as well as internationally”.

This is the contradiction between Marxists and revisionists in the international communist movement today. Serious struggle is going on between these two trends on the role of national liberation struggles, ways of revolutionary transformation, peaceful co-existence, war, peace and many other issues. In this struggle also Marxism will definitely defeat revisionism and achieve complete victory.

(This article was first published as a booklet in September 1967)

On The Principal Contradiction in India

A correct definition of the principal contradiction in our country at the present phase of the New Democratic Revolution of our country helps the Party to correctly identify the main enemies and the main allies of the Indian revolution.

Basic contradictions and the Principal contradiction

With the transfer of power in 1947 from the British imperialism to Congress representing the big bourgeois, big landlord classes, our country has changed from being colonial and semi-feudal country to being semi-colonial and semi-feudal country.

In our semi-colonial and semi-feudal society, four basic contradictions are at work. They are :

- The contradiction between the Nation and the imperialism.
- The contradiction between feudalism and the broad masses of the people.
- The contradiction between the bourgeoisie and the proletariat.
- The contradictions between different sections of the ruling classes.

These four are the basic contradictions influencing the course of the Indian revolution. But during the whole course of our New Democratic Revolution, all these basic contradictions will not have equal importance. Depending on various factors and changes in the political situation, one of the four basic contradictions, stated above, matures more than others and occupies the principal position. The solution of that matured contradiction paves the way for the solution of the secondary contradictions. Comrade Mao says :

There are many contradictions in the process of development of a complex thing and one of them is necessarily the principal contradiction whose existence and development determines or influences the existence and development of the other contradictions. (Mao: On Contradictions)

So we have to closely study the basic contradictions in our country at this particular phase of our semi-colonial and semi-feudal country. We

should correctly identify the principal contradiction. Such a determination helps to locate the principal enemies and the principal allies of the Indian revolution, at the present phase.

Past Struggles

In the past, after the transfer of power from British imperialism to the big bourgeois, big landlord Congress in 1947, the leadership of the communist movement in the country thoroughly failed to understand the nature of this transfer of power, our country changing from being a colony to being semi-colonial and semi-feudal country; the subservient role of the new ruling classes towards imperialism; the comprador nature of our ruling classes; the change from the direct rule of British imperialism to the indirect rule of imperialism.

It failed to properly study the basic contradictions of our semi-colonial and semi-feudal country and their inter-relations. In short, it failed to correctly identify the principal contradiction i. e. to correctly identify the main enemies and the main allies of the Indian revolution and the main form of struggle to accomplish the Indian revolution. Consequently the leadership committed many right and left deviations on these questions, revisionism being the long standing.

Even after the communist revolutionaries broke away ideologically and organisationally with revisionism and neo-revisionism, the controversy among them on the question of the principal contradiction in India did not end.

The CPI (ML) leadership, under the influence of Charu's line, subsequently decided that the principal contradiction in India is between the landlords and peasants and since the peasants in India were in majority, they said that the principal contradiction can be said to be between the landlords and the majority of the people. Later this was upheld by the Party Congress also. Charu's line did not even recognize the existence of national bourgeoisie and rich peasants and the necessity of winning them over in the struggle against imperialism and the big bourgeois, big landlord classes and since its strategic programme itself was wrong, it brought immense damage to the Indian revolution. Later the old C C identified the principal contradiction as one between feudalism and the broad masses of the people.

But the Andhra Committee, which was then outside the CPI (ML) at that time did not agree that the principal contradiction was between the landlords and the peasants.

At that time there were two distinct trends in the Andhra Committee on this question. While the DV group held that the principal contradiction is between feudalism and the broad masses of the people, some of the present leaders of the Andhra Committee held that the principal

contradiction is between the big bourgeois, big landlord classes on the one hand and the broad masses of the people. Though they noted the subservient role of the ruling classes towards imperialism, they did not specify the alliance of imperialism with the ruling classes in India. Consequently in their separate Provincial Party Conference in 1973, they declared that the principal contradiction in India is between feudalism and the broad masses of the Indian people.

This conception on the principal contradiction prevailed among majority of the communist revolutionaries in the country. But discussions have continued among them on this question. After the merger of the old C C and the Unity Committee, some of the leaders of Unity Committee proposed that the principal contradiction is between the alliance of imperialism, and feudalism on one hand and the broad masses of the people on the other. After discussions, the PCC, in its Draft Amended Programme (published in June 1978 issue of New Democracy) declared that the principal contradiction in India at this phase is between "Feudalism and the broad masses of the people". It has also explained that "feudalism is an ally and social basis of imperialism". It has further explained that "at certain stage of development of Indian revolution, the contradiction between the imperialism and the nation may become the principal contradiction, particularly when the revolutionary movement advances to a higher stage or when a single imperialist power becomes the principal enemy."

New definition of the principal contradiction by the PCC.

After further studying this question, and our own experiences in the country, the PCC (Provisional Central Committee) had declared that the principal contradiction is one between the alliance of imperialism, feudalism and comprador bureaucrat capitalism on one hand and the broad masses of the people on the other. It has further declared that.

"It is imperialism that sustains feudalism and comprador bureaucrat capitalism in order to carry out its economic, political and military objectives and is therefore predominant in the alliance. In the present conditions of world capitalism where two super powers are contending for world hegemony and hegemony over India, only one them will be the principal target of the Indian people in a particular period according to its economic, political and military predominance in our country. However, it must be borne in mind that at a certain state of development of Indian revolution, the contradiction between imperialism and the nation may become the principal contradiction, particularly when the revolutionary movement advances to a higher stage".

The amended programme (draft) while defining the principal contradiction is between feudalism and the broad masses of the people, has also correctly defined that the principal enemies of the revolution being imperi-

alism (including social imperialism), feudalism and comprador bureaucrat capitalism. It has defined that the principal allies of the revolution being the workers, peasants, urban middle classes, and the national bourgeoisie, to be united in a People's Democratic Front, under the leadership of the working class. It has defined that worker-peasant alliance as the core of this People's Democratic Front. It has also declared that the "Path of the Indian revolution will be essentially the Chinese Path to defeat the enemies of the Indian revolution i.e. the Path of Protracted People's War, with Agrarian Revolution as its axis since the peasantry is the main force of our democratic revolution led by the working class".

Now, the new amendment has declared that the principal contradiction is the between the alliance of imperialism, feudalism and comprador bureaucrat capitalism and the broad masses of the people. But it has not changed either the main enemies or the main allies of the revolution or the main form of struggle to achieve the Indian revolution.

If the new definition of the principal contradiction does not change the main enemies and the main allies of the Indian revolution or the path of the Indian revolution, why then this change in the definition of the principal contradiction.

It is to bring about (1) more correctly the role of imperialism in maintaining the present semi-colonial, semi-feudal society in our country, (2) its alliance with our big bourgeois, big landlord classes to maintain the present social set up and suppression of the revolutionary forces, and (3) to focus more clearly the necessity of utilising the contradictions of the various imperialist countries exploiting our country so that chief enemy among them could be identified for greater concentration.

The Role of imperialism

The amended Programme (draft) had correctly defined that of the four basic contradictions operating in our present society, the contradiction between imperialism and the nation and the contradiction between feudalism and the broad masses of the people are the two basic contradictions decisively influencing the course of the Indian revolution.

During the period of the direct rule, British imperialism used its military force to suppress the national liberation struggle. Even when forced to transfer power to the big bourgeois, big landlord classes, it divided the country into India and Pakistan; it incited communal riots between the Hindus and Muslims on a big scale to weaken both the countries and keep them under its control. It tried to create many independent states inside India and thus keep India weak and preserve its control and exploitation in our country.

Even with the transfer of power in 1947 to our big bourgeois, big landlord classes, India did not become a fully sovereign and independent

country. Our country got only formal political independence, but continued to be subjected to indirect control and exploitation of imperialism.

Our country being a semi-colonial, semi-feudal country, the comprador big bourgeois, big landlord classes have opened the gates of our country to further inflow of foreign capital from various imperialist powers like USA, Soviet social imperialism, Japan, West Germany etc. in the form of direct investments, loans, joint ventures etc. Thus we see that while, before 1947, it was British imperialism that dominated our country, today our country is being subjected to the exploitation of various other imperialist powers, particularly US imperialism and Soviet social imperialism.

Foreign exploitation and domination has actually grown in our country with the transfer of power in 1947. Our big bourgeois, big landlord classes in India are comprador in character, subservient to imperialism, have only 'freedom' to change their masters in the international market. In the beginning they mainly followed the British imperialists, later they submitted themselves to US imperialism and later still, they agreed to submit themselves to Soviet social imperialism also.

All this clearly shows how imperialism plays a dominant role in the exploitation and suppression of our country whether in the period of direct rule British imperialism before 1947, or in the period of indirect rule i. e. the present semi-colonial, semi-feudal status of our country.

Thus we see imperialism and social imperialism play a predominant role in maintaining the present semi-colonial semi-feudal status of our country and in the suppression of our New Democratic Revolution. Comrade Stalin says :

Imperialism, with all its financial and military might, is the force in China that supports, inspires, fosters and preserves the feudal survivals, together with their entire bureaucratic militarist super structure. (Stalin : On China)

Comrade Mao says :

"What are the chief targets or enemies at this stage of the Chinese Revolution? They are imperialism and feudalism, the bourgeoisie of the imperialist countries and the landlord class of our country. For it is these two that are the chief oppressors, the chief obstacles to the progress of Chinese society at the present stage. The two collude with each other in oppressing the Chinese people, and imperialism is the foremost and most ferocious enemy of the Chinese people, because national oppression by imperialism is the more onerous".

(p 315, Vol II, Mao Zedong) (underline mine)

So this clearly shows that the main edge of our New Democratic Revolution should be aimed against imperialism and social imperialism.

Imperialism in alliance with our ruling classes

Imperialism and social imperialism not only dominate the economic, political and military situation of our country, it is in alliance with our big bourgeois, big landlord classes for joint exploitation and suppression of our people and their revolutionary struggles.

The amended Programme (draft) itself has declared that imperialism (including social imperialism), feudalism and comprador bureaucrat capitalism are the main enemies of the Indian revolution.

But these elements are not separate elements. These main enemies are in an alliance for joint oppression and suppression of our country and the people have to fight against this alliance to achieve their New Democratic Revolution.

Imperialism is dependant on the comprador big bourgeoisie in India for its trade in India, its investments and joint ventures. The big bourgeoisie in India is dependant on imperialism for capital, machinery, and technical knowledge. This is the economic basis for an alliance between imperialism and big bourgeois class.

Imperialism is dependant on the landlords to keep the vast rural areas safe for selling its finished products and to get its necessary industrial raw materials. On the other hand, landlords, particularly the capitalist landlords, need the help of imperialism for the export of their surplus raw materials and for the supply of various inputs necessary for more agricultural production. This is the economic basis for an alliance between landlords and the imperialism. This is the reason why, of late, imperialism, particularly Soviet Union, is making greater efforts to penetrate Indian agriculture.

Similarly we can see a similar economic dependance between the big bourgeois and big landlord classes.

Politically imperialism needs the help of the big bourgeois, big landlord classes to keep the Indian people, particularly the workers and peasants, suppressed and thus make the country safe for its exploitation. Similarly the big bourgeois, big landlord classes need the help of imperialism—economic, political and military—in their suppression of the Indian people's struggles.

Thus we see that there is clear economic and political basis for an alliance between imperialism, feudalism and comprador bureaucrat capitalism.

Speaking about the direct and indirect intervention of imperialism in the colonial and semi-colonial countries, comrade Stalin says :

Intervention is by no means confined to the incursion of troops, and the incursion of troops by no means constitutes the principal feature of intervention. In the present day conditions of the revolutionary movement in the capitalist countries, when the direct incursion of foreign troops may give rise to protests and conflicts, intervention assumes more flexible and more camouflaged form. In the conditions prevailing today, imperialism prefers to intervene in a dependant country by organising civil war there, by financing counter revolutionary forces against the revolution, by giving moral and financial support to its Chinese agents against the revolution. (p. 7. Stalin: On Chinese Revolution)

There is another aspect to their alliance. The Indian ruling classes have expansionist ambitions towards their neighbours. They can achieve these expansionist ambitions only with the help of one imperialist power or the another. The imperialist powers also, particularly the Soviet Union, wants to make our country its base for its expansionist aims in Asia and the world. This is another basis for an alliance between imperialism and our own ruling classes.

This should not mean that there are no contradictions between the various constituents of this alliance. There are bound to be contradictions among them as to the share of each in their joint exploitation of our people, but they are not antagonistic contradictions, but contradictions which will be settled through discussions.

Thus we see clearly that in the present phase, principal contradiction is between the alliance of imperialism, feudalism and comprador bureaucrat capitalism on one hand, and the broad masses of our people on the other hand. Naturally because of its superior economic and military strength, imperialism is the leader of this alliance.

This means that at the present phase of the Indian revolution, when our country is semi-colonial, semi-feudal, the anti-imperialist tasks and the democratic tasks are inter-linked i. e., the struggle against imperialism and the struggle against our big bourgeois, big landlord classes are inter-linked.

Seeing the economic, political and military domination of imperialism and social imperialism in India, one thing is clear. We cannot defeat imperialism (including social imperialism) without defeating our own big bourgeois, big landlord classes, because they are the main props of imperialist oppression and suppression in India. Similarly we cannot defeat the big bourgeois, big landlord classes, without at the same time defeating imperialism (including Soviet social imperialism) because it is imperialism

that "supports, inspires, fosters and preserves the feudal survivals together with their entire bureaucratic militarist superstructure".

Comrade Mao says :

Unquestionably, the main tasks are to strike at these two enemies, to carry out a national revolution to overthrow foreign imperialist oppression and a democratic revolution to overthrow feudal landlord oppression, the primary and foremost task being national revolution to overthrow imperialism. These two great tasks are inter-related; unless imperialist rule is overthrown the rule of the feudal landlord class cannot be terminated, because imperialism is its main support. Conversely, unless help is given to the peasants in their struggle to overthrow the feudal landlord class, it will be impossible to build powerful revolutionary contingents to overthrow imperialist rule, because the feudal landlord class is the main social base of imperialist rule in China and peasantry is the main force in the Chinese revolution. Therefore, the two fundamental tasks, the national revolution and the democratic revolution are at once distinct and united.

(p. 318, Mao Zedong, Vol II)

Comrade Stalin says :

Thus, the present revolution in China is a continuation of two streams of the revolutionary movement, the movement against feudal survivals and the movement against imperialism. The bourgeois democratic revolution in China is a combination of the struggle against feudal survivals and the struggle against imperialism. (Stalin: On Chinese Revolution, p. 69.)

Differentiation of the Imperialist Powers

Since the leader of the alliance of imperialism, feudalism and comprador bureaucrat capitalism is imperialism, we should carefully consider the contradictions of the various imperialist powers and their supporters in the country, in order to utilise these contradictions in the struggle for People's Democratic Revolution, to identify the main enemy among them for concentrated attack.

Ours is a semi-colonial, semi-feudal country. So many imperialist powers—Soviet social imperialism, US imperialism, Britain, West Germany, Japan etc.—are investing their capital in India and are contending for their supremacy in India. But the main contention for the domination of our country is between Soviet social imperialism and US imperialism.

Soviet Union dominates our public sector which is the commanding heights of our economy; it monopolises the supply of military hardware

to our Army ; it has already got a military pact with our government in the name of the 'Friendship Treaty'. Because of these three factors, it is clear that Soviet Union has an edge over the other imperialist powers including US imperialism in exploiting and dominating our country. That is why the recent P. C. C. resolution "People's Democratic Revolution and our immediate tasks", has clearly said that Soviet Union is a greater enemy of the Indian people, both nationally and internationally. That means while exposing US imperialism, we should make still greater efforts to expose the predominant position of the Soviet Union in India

The recent visit of Kosygin to India, and the spate of new agreements between the Soviet Union and the present govt. still further increase the grip of the Soviet Union over India. This also proves that the pro-US Janata government is not in a position to prevent the growing predominant position of the Soviet Union in India, because of its general position in the country.

The communist revolutionaries in India should make use of the contradictions between the various imperialist powers, particularly those between Soviet social imperialism and US imperialism and the ruling section groups supporting them, to advance the revolutionary movement in the country. At present this should not lead to any general political alignment with any section of the ruling classes against the other section, but these contradictions should be utilised from issue to issue affecting the economic and political life of our people and our country. The possibility of a political united front between the working class and any section of the ruling class does exist when our country is directly invaded by a particular imperialist power or when one superpower imposes its exclusive hegemony over our country or when our country is converted into a neo-colony of any superpower.

Comrade Mao says :

The comprador bourgeoisie is always a running dog of imperialism and a target of the revolution. Different groups of the comprador bourgeoisie belong to the monopoly capitalist groups of different imperialist countries such as the United States, Britain, and France. In the struggle against the various comprador groups it is necessary to exploit the contradictions between imperialist countries, first coping with one of them and striking at the chief immediate enemy. (p. 327, Mao Zedong Vol. V)

Agrarian Revolution - the main form of struggle

Some critics express the fear that the acceptance of the principal contradiction (the one between the alliance of imperialism, feudalism and the comprador bureaucrat capitalism on the one hand and the broad

masses of the people on the other) will reduce the importance of Protracted People's War, with Agrarian Revolution as its axis.

The necessity of Protracted People's War, as the main form of struggle to achieve our New Democratic Revolution does not arise out of the principal contradiction, but by the semi-feudal status of our country, the uneven development of our country, by the fact that in our country the peasants are the main force of struggle against the present system to be organised under the leadership of the working class, and the necessity to gather necessary revolutionary forces to capture final power in the cities. That is why the Amended Programme itself says that "the main force of the democratic revolution led by the working class is the peasantry".

It has also declared that the path of Indian revolution will be essentially the Chinese path in order to defeat the enemies of the Indian revolution and to achieve this it has given the following three tasks to be fulfilled.

—A Party armed with Marxism–Leninism–Mao Zedong Thought.

—A People's Army under the leadership of the Party.

—A United Front of all revolutionary classes, with worker–peasant alliance as its core under the leadership of the proletariat.

It is only by doggedly pursuing the Path of Protracted People's War with Agrarian Revolution as its axis, that the Indian people can achieve success in their New Democratic Revolution. All other struggles help in advancing the Agrarian Revolution as its central task.

Comrade Mao says :

Unless help is given to the peasants in their struggle to overthrow the feudal landlord class, it will be impossible to build powerful revolutionary contingents to overthrow imperialist rule, because the feudal landlord class is the main social base of imperialist rule in China and the peasantry is the main force in the Chinese Revolution" (p. 318, Mao Zedong Vol. II.)

Comrade Stalin says :

What is agrarian revolution? It is indeed the basis and content of bourgeois democratic revolution.

He further said :

The opposition has forgotten that the revolutionary struggle of the Chinese people against imperialism is due first and foremost to the fact that imperialism in China is the

force that supports and inspires the immediate exploiters of the Chinese people—the feudal lords, militarists, capitalists, bureaucrats etc, and that Chinese workers and peasants cannot defeat their exploiters without at the same time waging a revolutionary struggle against imperialism.

(P. 96 Stalin: On Chinese Revolution)

He further says :

While the distinguishing feature of the first stage was that the spearhead of the revolution was turned mainly against foreign imperialism, the characteristic feature of the second stage is that the spearhead of the revolution is now turned mainly against the internal enemies, primarily against the feudal landlords, against the feudal regime. (same book, p. 137)

Thus it is clear that Protracted People's War with Agrarian Revolution as its axis is the main form of struggle to accomplish our New Democratic Revolution.

Lessons of the Chinese Revolution

This is borne out by the experience of the Chinese revolution itself. In all the phases of the Chinese revolution—the National Liberation struggle against imperialism and warlordism, the First Civil War against Chiang Kai-shek and his allies, the struggle against Japanese aggression, and the Second Civil War against Chiang Kai-shek and his allies—Agrarian Revolution was the main form of struggle adopted by the CPC in their struggle for New Democratic Revolution.

In all the writings and explanations of the Chinese comrades, including the writings of comrade Mao, it is clear that the CPC, while taking the Protracted People's War with Agrarian Revolution as its axis, as the main form of struggle, adopted the tactics of destruction of imperialism and weakening of feudalism during the period of anti-Japanese struggle, and adopted the tactics of complete destruction of imperialism and feudalism as a whole in all other phases of their revolution.

Explaining how the principal contradiction in China changed during the different phases of the Chinese Revolution, comrade Mao says :

In a semi-colonial country such as China, the relationship between the principal contradiction and the non-principal contradiction presents a complicated picture. When imperialism launches a war of aggression against such a country, all its various classes, except for some traitors, can temporarily unite in a National War against imperialism. At such a time the contradiction between imperialism and the country concerned becomes the principal contradiction (including what

was the principal contradiction between the feudal system and the great masses of the people) are temporarily relegated to a secondary and subordinate position.

(p. 331, Mao Zedong Vol. I)

Merely taking the words in brackets in the above sentence, some critics argue that comrade Mao held that before the aggression of Japanese imperialism in China, i.e., between 1927 to 1937, the principal contradiction in China was between feudalism and the broad masses of the Chinese people. Taking Mao's writings in isolation from his other writings leads one to wrong conclusions.

We must take this writing of Comrade Mao combined with the subsequent paragraphs in that very article (On Contradiction) wherein he says :

But in another situation, the contradictions change position. When imperialism carries on its oppression not by war, but by milder means—political, economic and cultural—the ruling classes in semi-colonial countries capitulate to imperialism and the two form an alliance for the joint oppression of the masses of the people. At such a time, the masses resort to civil war against the alliance of imperialism and the feudal classes, while imperialism often employs indirect methods rather than direct action in helping the reactionaries in semi-colonial countries to oppress the people and thus make the internal contradictions particularly sharp.

He further says :

When a revolutionary civil war develops to the point of threatening the very existence of imperialism and its running dogs, the domestic reactionaries, imperialism often adopts other methods in order to maintain its rule; it either tries to split the revolutionary front from within or sends armed forces to help the domestic reactionaries directly. At such a time, foreign imperialism and domestic reaction stand quite openly at one pole while the masses of the people stand at the other pole, thus forming the principal contradiction which determines or influences the development of the other contradictions.

(pp. 331-332, Mao Zedong Vol. I)

Thus it is clear that comrade Mao held that in the period of indirect rule, the period between 1927 to 1937, that the principal contradiction in China at that time was between the alliance of imperialism and the big bourgeois, big landlord classes on one side and the broad masses of China on the other side.

Describing the period between 1927 to 1937 in China, comrade Mao says:

As for China's big bourgeoisie, which is represented by the Kuomintang, all through the long period from 1927 to 1937, it nestled in the arms of imperialists and formed an alliance with the feudal forces against the revolutionary people. In 1927 and for some time afterwards, the Chinese national bourgeoisie also followed the counter-revolution.

(p. 349, Mao Zedong Vol. II)

Conclusions

From what has been described above, the following conclusions should be kept in mind :

1. Ours is a semi-colonial, semi-feudal country ; the stage of our revolution is People's Democratic Revolution under the leadership of the working class.
2. The main enemies of the revolution are imperialism, particularly Soviet social imperialism and US imperialism and the big bourgeois, landlord classes in the country. The main allies of the Revolution are workers, peasants, urban middle classes and the national bourgeoisie to be united in People's Democratic Front under the leadership of the working class. Worker-peasant alliance is the main base of this united front.
3. The principal contradiction is between the alliance of imperialism, feudalism and comprador bureaucrat capitalism and the broad masses of the people. Imperialism is the leader of this alliance.
4. The contradictions of various imperialist powers, particularly those between Soviet social imperialism and US imperialism contending for domination over India and the contradictions between the various sections of the ruling classes in India supporting these super powers should be utilised to advance the revolutionary struggle.

Taking the present situation in India, of all the imperialist powers including USA, Soviet social imperialism is the greater enemy of the Indian people both nationally and internationally.

Today these contradictions should be utilised from issue to issue, economic and political, affecting the life of our people and country to isolate and defeat the chief enemy on that particular issue and thus advance the revolutionary struggle.

5. The peasantry is the main force in our revolution and the working class is the leader of the revolution. Protracted People's War with Agrarian Revolution as its axis is the main path of Indian revolution and all other tasks must help in accomplishing this central task,

19-4-1979

The theoretical basis of the basic formulations of the Political line of the Party

IN the background of the general crisis of the world capitalist system and the growing economic and political crisis in the country, everywhere, including in our country, the class struggles are getting fiercer and fiercer.

This is reflected in the increased repression of the government on our Party—CPI (ML) and the political attacks of the bourgeois parties, the CPI—CPM leadership, and a section of the communist revolutionaries. The present stand of the CPC leadership and its having relations with the CPM is sowing confusion in the ranks of the Communist Revolutionaries in our country.

So far, our political line withstood all these attacks as our assessments, both national and international, and our basic political formulations have been proved to be broadly correct. Based on these, the people's movement under our leadership has advanced to certain extent in this period.

In the coming period, these attacks are bound to be far more serious. We should grasp the theoretical basis of the most important political formulations in our political resolution *Intensify the political struggles*.

International line

The international line of the Party is based on the theory of the Three Worlds propounded by com. Mao. The differences among the Communist Revolutionaries are centered on the attitude towards the two super powers, USA and Soviet Union.

Aggressors and non-aggressors

Some Communist Revolutionaries argue that Soviet social imperialism is the only aggressor, and USA and its allies are non-aggressors and they quote comrade Stalin in justification of such a line. Our Party rejects such an explanation.

Comrade Stalin made such a demarcation between the fascist powers—the aggressors, and the other imperialist powers—the non-aggressors, to expose the vile attempts of these non-aggressors, which was to incite the fascist powers for an attack on the socialist state and later dictate terms to both the exhausted combatants.

In the course of this struggles, Stalin made a non-aggression Pact with fascist Germany—the aggressor, and only when fascist Germany attacked the Soviet Union he united with the non-aggressors to defeat the common enemy.

Stalin's reference to *aggressors* and *non-aggressors* has no relevance to the present international situation, where both the super powers are committing aggression after aggression in various regions of the world, particularly against the third world countries, and are engaging in an arms race in their contention for world domination.

Therefore we treat both of them as aggressors and as such both should be treated as the common enemies of people of the world.

Strategically Soviet Union today is the greater danger. But making a distinction between the greater and lesser danger among your enemies does not mean that the working class should always unite with the lesser against the greater danger.

Our great Marxist-Leninist teachers have, at different times, adopted different methods to utilise the contradictions among the imperialist powers.

—They have utilised these contradictions to advance the revolutionary movement, without aligning themselves (as shown by Lenin during the Russian Revolution) with any of the imperialist powers.

—Uniting with the *lesser* enemy against the greater enemy during time of war (as shown by Stalin during the Second World War and by comrade Mao when Japan attacked China).

—Making temporary peace with one enemy to concentrate the struggles on the other (as shown by Lenin at the time of Brest Peace).

—While holding one of them to be a greater danger, exposing and opposing the aggressive actions of both the imperialist camps (as shown by com. Stalin before the Second World War).

Based on these international experiences, we firmly believe that in the present international situation, we should treat both the super powers as the common enemies of the world people and oppose them, and unite with all the forces that could be united to defeat a specific aggression of any one of the two super powers, and engulf them in the flames of national liberation struggles, and thus defeat their war schemes.

So we reject the slogan of united front with USA against Soviet Union which, in practice, harms the cause of national liberation struggles.

In support of this absurd slogan, some Communist Revolutionaries say that World War is 'imminent' and that we should unite with USA against Soviet Union. We firmly believe that the strategic preparations of both the super powers for new World War are not yet completed.

Experience of the earlier two World Wars confirm that the war blocs of imperialist powers prepared to throw everything into a World War are an absolute necessity before starting a new World War. Such war blocs led by the two super powers have not yet come into existence. Neither NATO or the Warsaw Pact bloc can be considered to be ready for an 'imminent' World War. Both these blocs are riddled with innumerable contradictions—economic, political and tactical.

In today's world, the two super powers do not have direct colonies to command men and material to fight their imperialist wars as happened in the earlier two World Wars. They cannot get such help either from the second world or from the third world countries, without first gaining domination over them, i. e. the creation of an intermediate zone.

So the immediate prospects are more and more regional wars engineered by the super powers. This is their strategic preparation for a new World War. It is not yet completed.

Of course. These regional wars increase the danger of a new World War. This is the period when one should mobilise the people to resist these regional wars, foil the war schemes of the two super powers, and thus postpone the danger of a new world war.

Whether the War leads to a revolution, or a revolution postpones a particular war, Marxist—Leninist truth still holds good.

We firmly believe that, today, Soviet Union is on the defensive within the strategic offense and USA is on the offensive within the strategic defense.

When this strategic situation will change and how, will be resolved by the future.

The international events have forced some of these Communist Revolutionaries to change such foolish slogans, but they have no guts to explain why they have changed them.

On the national situation

The political line of the Party on the national situation is mainly dependent on (1) its link with our strategic objectives, (2) Assessment of the present international situation, (3) Our attitude towards the ruling class

parties and how to utilise them, (4) Agrarian Revolution and the elections, (5) Our struggle to build the strategic New Democratic Front.

Let us see the serious differences between our Party and some Communist Revolutionaries on these important issues.

1. Link with the strategic objective

The political line of the Party is orientated towards achieving the strategic objectives—overthrow of the semi-colonial and semi-feudal system in our country through a People's War based on Agrarian Revolutionary struggle and the establishment of the New Democracy.

But even on these strategic objectives, some Communist Revolutionaries are putting forth certain objections which in essence reject these strategic objectives.

(a) Semi-colonialism and semi-feudalism Vs. 'Relative' independence

Semi-colonialism and semi-feudalism always mean formal political independence and real economic dependence on imperialist powers, indirect rule of the imperialist powers, greater inflow of finance capital from various imperialist powers for exploitation and domination, and the ruling classes—the big-bourgeois, big landlords, who are compradors—subservience to the imperialism.

This is what Marxism-Leninism has taught us so far. The abject dependence of our country on the imperialist powers, particularly the two super powers for finance, loans, machinery, technology and even for imports and exports only goes to prove the semi colonial and semi-feudal character of our country.

Even in the face of this reality while some Communist Revolutionaries say that this country is in the face of exclusive hegemony of the Soviet Union some others say that our country has *relative* or *marginal* independence.

The growing inflow of finance capital from imperialist countries and social imperialism, the recent Indian government's surrender to IMF terms to procure loans from it, Indian government's efforts to diversify its purchase of weaponry from various imperialist countries including the second world, and India's continuation in the Commonwealth which is dominated by the Great Britain, refute the theories of both these sections.

Now those Communist Revolutionaries who speak of *relative* or *marginal* independence have to answer certain theoretical questions.

Marxism-Leninism has always taught us that semi-colonialism and semi-feudalism mean formal independence and real economic dependence on the imperialist powers and nothing more.

Where from these Communist Revolutionaries found this *relative* or *marginal* independence in our ruling classes ?

Compradors are always compradors and the running dogs of imperialism. When did these Communist Revolutionaries find *relative* or *marginal* independence in our compradors ?

Whatever be their subjective intentions such a line is nothing but adopting the CPI-CPM line and in practice abandoning the Agrarian Revolutionary struggle.

These theoreticians, in support of their new discoveries, point out the example of the Indian government getting economic 'aid' from various imperialist powers.

But what is the truth ?

Today, the world imperialist system is getting weaker and weaker. Out of many imperialist powers, two superpowers have emerged and they are contending for domination over the world, including India.

The ruling classes wield control over the state apparatus in India.

Because of this situation, the ruling classes are able to bargain for a better share in the common loot of the people. Even this they are able to do only by depending on one imperialist power to bargain with the other and not on their own. This increased bargaining power of the ruling classes has nothing to do with '*relative*' or '*marginal*' independence.

(b) Sham democracy or '*relative*' democracy ?

Our Party firmly holds that the present bourgeois parliamentary democracy is nothing but sham, and that the Fundamental Rights in the present Constitution are nothing but a decoration meant only to deceive the people. This is the basis for our call for People's War.

Of course, sometimes out of their own necessity for deception, sometimes out of their own contradictions, at certain times, the ruling classes do permit certain democratic rights. But the moment people begin to exercise these democratic rights, the ruling classes resort to all sorts of fascist repression to suppress the just struggles of the people and that too with the same parliament's sanction.

Nehru's army's attack on the Heroic Telengana Movement (1948-51), emergency rule of Indira Gandhi (1975-76) the various Goonda Acts of the Janata, and the present NSA and ESMA of Indira Gandhi all have the parliament's sanctions under the very same Constitution.

In face of these facts of life, some Communist Revolutionaries say that there is '*relative*' or '*marginal*' democracy in our country !

But these are against Lenin's teachings on bourgeois democracy. He says :

.. Wage slavery is the lot of the people even in the most democratic republic.

Bourgeois states are most varied in form, but their essence is the same: all the states, whatever their form, in the final analysis are inevitably *the dictatorship of the bourgeoisie*.

And so, in capitalist society, we have a democracy, that is curtailed, wretched, false, a democracy only for the rich, for the minority. *(State and Revolution)*

If already *relative* or *marginal* democracy exists in our country, then where is the necessity of People's War at all ?

One should realise that in today's conditions, there is no place for effective reforms to better living conditions of our people and hence the need for people's War.

Whatever be their intention, such theories are bound to lead to the abandonment of the path of People's War.

Our Party rejects the path of parliamentarism peddled by the revisionists and the neo revisionists. We also reject the path of individual or squad terrorism in the name of annihilation of class enemies.

2. Assessment of the present internal situation

Objective situation

About the objective political situation in our country at present, our Party line says :

—Our country, being a semi-colonial and semi-feudal country, ruling classes and their successive governments have opened the gates of India for the inflow of foreign finance capital from various imperialist countries and social imperialist country.

—All these imperialist powers, particularly USA and the Soviet Union are severely contending for hegemony over India and the Soviet Union has an upper hand in this contention.

—The policies of the big bourgeois-big landlord governments, particularly the Congress government which ruled our country a long time since 1947, have brought our country into utter bankruptcy and abject dependence on the two super powers.

—Both these super powers are trying to convert our country into their neo colony and today this danger is greater from the Soviet Union.

—Both nationally and internationally, Soviet Union constitutes a greater danger and therefore is the greater enemy of our people.

—The imperialist powers, particularly the two super powers are creating their own lobbies among the ruling classes, national and regional, in support of their interests.

—But the Soviet forces are not automatically anti-American and the pro-American forces are not automatically anti-Soviet. While mainly depending on one super power, they, at the same time are for economic and friendly relations with the other super power.

—All the ruling class parties—either in power or in opposition—are only interested in preservation of the present semi colonial and semi feudal system.

The Indira Congress, the CPI-CPM and all other pro-Soviet forces constitute a greater danger and therefore are the greater enemies of our people.

The growing economic and political crisis in the country, the growing dissatisfaction of the masses, rising struggles of the people, and the rivalry of the two super powers in India have led to contradictions, conflicts and deep divisions among the ruling classes, and increased the instability of the ruling classes as a whole.

Faced with this situation, all the ruling class parties—national and regional—resort to various methods of fascist repression.

Subjective Forces

Our document on tactics has said that.

The deep going economic and political crisis, divisions, and conflicts among the ruling classes and their parties and the rising struggles of the various sections of the people reflect the growing revolutionary situation in the country but the subjective forces are lagging behind the objective revolutionary situation.

This is reflected in the following facts :

Majority of the people in our country are still behind the bourgeois parties, the revisionists and the neo revisionists.

Except for sporadic outbursts, the struggles of the people are confined to strikes, dharnas, demonstrations and hunger strikes. Mostly these struggles are confined to legalism and economism.

By and large, they still have illusions on reform and parliamentary system. They have not yet realised the necessity of overthrowing the

present system through a people's war and the necessity of their own direct participation in it.

The revolutionary forces under the leadership of the Communist Revolutionaries including our own Party, are weak except locally and are not yet in a position to effectively intervene in the political situation to change it in our favour at the state or at the All India level.

We are yet to overcome these negative factors, develop the positive factors and advance the revolutionary movement to a higher level.

It is out of this assessment, that the political resolution has given specific tasks in various fronts to mobilise the people for People's War.

The subsequent events have confirmed the correctness of these assessments, and to the extent we have implemented these tasks, the people's movement has advanced.

Our attitude towards contradictions and conflicts of the ruling class parties and how to utilise them

Before studying this subject deeply, let us first see the common features of all the ruling class parties, national and regional, and on what issues contradictions exist among them.

1. The common features

All of them belong to the big bourgeois-big landlord classes subservient to imperialism and social imperialism, interested in the preservation of the present semi-colonial and semi-feudal system in our country. The CPI-CPM are no exception to this.

All the ruling classes and their parties are expansionist by nature and want to dominate our neighbours. Taking the geographical situation, all of them depend more on SU—the rising power than on USA, the declining power and adopt the policy of chauvinism towards our neighbours. The CPI-CPM are no exception to this.

All of them are only interested in exploiting and suppressing the common people. Therefore all these parties are anti-people and anti-democratic to the core.

Communalism, casteism, regionalism and separatism have become the common weapons of all the ruling class parties to divert and disrupt the people's struggles. CPI-CPM are no exception to this.

All the ruling class parties, national and regional, are corrupt to the core, utilising govt. power to grab as much as they can while in power and distribute the loaves and fishes of the office to their friends and relatives in order to keep themselves in power, with the Indira Congress, the party in power, playing the leading role. CPI-CPM are no exception to this.

The rule of the Congress, the Janata, the Lok Dal and the various state governments of the opposition have adequately demonstrated the truth of the above said facts.

In addition to these, the regional ruling class parties have certain other common features. They play up local chauvinism, regionalism and religious chauvinism in order to deceive the people of particular regions and religions.

Thus the ruling class parties—national and regional—are reactionary by nature, anti-people and anti-democratic. Whichever of these parties comes to power in the states or the Centre, the people have nothing to gain. They are bound to pursue the very same policies of exploitation and suppression as Indira Congress.

2. Contradictions

Then, what are the contradictions between the ruling classes? They are as to the share each ruling class group should get from the common loot of the people. Hence the dog-fight among the various ruling class parties to come to power, since those in power get the lion's share from the common loot of the people.

There are also contradictions among them as to which imperialist power they should ally with at a particular time, to get the maximum benefit.

(a) Uniting with lesser danger against greater danger ?

In spite of these contradictions, the political line of the Party boldly states that the working class should not support one ruling class party against another in their power struggle as all of them pursue the same anti-people and anti-democratic policies.

Some Communist Revolutionaries attack this policy as sectarian and dogmatic, as a policy of fighting against all enemies at the same time, and that one should make a distinction between those in power and those in opposition and unite with the opposition against the Congress in power in the name of uniting with lesser danger against the greater danger etc. etc.

Our political resolution rejects all such absurd ideas as anti Marxist-Leninist.

In his *State and Revolution* comrade Lenin says :

A democratic republic is the best possible political shell for capitalism, and therefore, once capital has gained possession of this very best shell it establishes its power securely, so firmly *that no change of persons, institutions or parties in the bourgeois democratic republic can shake it.*

To decide once every few years which member of the ruling classes is to repress and crush the people through parliament—this is the real essence of bourgeois parliamentarism not only in parliamentary, constitutional monarchies, but also in the most democratic republics.

The Communist Revolutionaries who differ with us should say whether Lenin's teaching on this question are applicable to our country or not, and if not, why ?

(b) What is the basis for authoritarianism, autocracy or fascism ?

These Communist Revolutionaries say that only Indira and her Congress are the only representatives of *authoritarianism* or *autocracy* or *fascism* and on this basis they give such slogans as *patriotic and democratic front*, *anti-authoritarian front* or *anti-autocratic front* or simply *defeat the Congress*.

Some even go to the extent of equating the present dog-fight among the various ruling class parties with polarisation of the forces between the people and the enemy forces.

All such ideas are absurd and disruptive. Marxism-Leninism has taught us that it is the social system that determines the character of the state and so it is the semi-colonial and semi-feudal system in our country that is the basis for fascist repression in our country and without destroying this system, the seeds of authoritarianism, autocracy or even fascism will always remain.

In his '*State and Revolution*' Lenin states :

Take any parliamentary country, from America to Switzerland, from France to Britain, Norway and so forth, the real business of state is performed behind the scenes and is carried on by departments, Chancelleries, and General Staffs. Parliament is given up to talk for the special purpose of fooling the common people.

Hence the need for all bourgeois parties, even the most democratic and 'revolutionary democratic' among them, to intensify repressive measures against revolutionary proletariat to strengthen the apparatus of coercion i.e. the state machine.

The successive Congress govt.s, the Janata govt., the Charan Singh government, the various state governments under the opposition parties have all confirmed the correctness of this teaching of Lenin.

These Communist Revolutionaries should say whether this teaching of Lenin is applicable to India or not, and if not, why ?

(c) Ideological and political attack on the compromising bourgeois opposition or united front with it ?

We do hold that Indira Congress govt. in the Centre and the states is the target of the revolutionary struggle. At the same time, we hold that the bourgeois opposition, particularly CPI-CPM is a compromising one. The Party has to conduct serious ideological and political struggle against this compromising bourgeois opposition to completely isolate them from the people. Only then we could mobilise the people for a successful onslaught on the Indira Congress government.

Stalin says:

In the period of struggle against Tsarism, in the period of preparation for the bourgeois democratic revolution (1905-1917), the most dangerous social support of Tsarism was the liberal-monarchist-Party, the Cadet Party. Why? It was the compromising Party, the Party of compromise between Tsarism and the majority of the people, the peasantry as a whole. Naturally, the party at that time had to direct its main blow at the Cadets, for unless the Cadets were isolated, there could be no hope of a rupture between the peasantry and Tsarism and unless this rupture was ensured, there could be no hope of victory of the revolution. Many at that time did not understand this specific feature of Bolshevik strategy and accused the Bolsheviks of excessive 'cadetophobia' They asserted that with the Bolsheviks, the struggle against the Cadets 'overshadowed' the struggle against the principal enemy—Tsarism. But these accusations, for which there was no justification, revealed an utter failure to understand the Bolshevik strategy, which called for isolation of the compromising Party in order to facilitate to hasten the victory over the principal enemy.

As against this com. Stalin's teaching, these Communist Revolutionaries are advocating the policy of united front with the opposition.

(d) Alternative slogans, Intermediate slogans, their utility.

All CRs accept that our stage is New democratic Revolution and our strategic task is to build New Democratic Front to achieve New Democracy.

The New Democratic Revolution will pass through various phases and each phase is marked by a change in class relations of society, a change in friends and enemies, and a change in principal contradiction and the Party of the working class is bound to give new strategic slogans of united front and its corresponding government. This is a teaching of Marxism-Leninism.

But during a specific stage, the tactics of struggle may change many times but the strategy, the enemies and the friends, and the strategic united front and its government, do not change during that whole phase.

Intermediate slogans are tactical slogans of struggle depending on the ebb and flow of the movement.

Com. Stalin says :

Stages of the Revolution and strategy

Strategy is the determination of the direction of the main blow of the proletariat at a given *stage* of the revolution, the elaboration of the corresponding plan for the disposition of the revolutionary forces (main and secondary reserves), the fight to carry out this plan throughout the given stage of the revolution.

First stage, (1903-1917) objective to overthrow Tsarism and completely wipe out the survivals of medievalism.

(e) The flow and ebb of the movement and tactics

Tactics are the determination of the line of conduct of the proletariat in the comparatively short period of the flow or ebb of the movement, of the rise and decline of the revolution, the fight to carry out this line by means of replacing old forms of struggle and organisation by new ones, old slogans by new ones, by combining these forms etc. While the object of the strategy is to win the war against Tsarism, let us say, or against the bourgeoisie to carry through the struggle against Tsarism or against the bourgeoisie to its end, tactics pursue less important objects ; for their aim is not the winning of the war as a whole, but the winning of some particular engagements or some particular battles, the successful carrying through of some particular campaigns or actions corresponding to the concrete circumstances in the given period of rise or decline of the revolution. Tactics are part of the strategy, subordinate to it and serving it. (*Problems of Leninism*).

The experience of the Russian and Chinese Revolution proves this.

Even the slogan of provisional revolutionary govt. and the slogan of Constituent Assembly in 1905 given by comrade Lenin, it was conceived as a govt. of the bourgeoisie opposed to Tsarism, while arming the people in that Revolution.

The slogan of coalition government by com. Mao is no exception to this general rule.

Faced with the ardent desire of the people of China for peace, the all out preparations of traitors of Chiang Kai-shek clique, and the demand of international friends for peace in China, com. Mao conducted the Chungking negotiations and gave the slogan of coalition government to expose the reactionaries who were all-out for new round of civil war.

But even then, Mao took care that the programme of the coalition government was programme of New Democracy and nothing else.

These Communist Revolutionaries take the contradiction between the bourgeois democracy and bourgeois fascism as the principal contradiction in this phase itself and take the struggle for democratic rights as primary and the struggle for Agrarian Revolution as secondary and that is why all sorts of united front with opposition section of the bourgeoisie.

Even there they are theoretically wrong. Comrade Mao says :

"In capitalist society, the two forces in contradiction, the proletariat and the bourgeoisie, form the principal contradiction. The other contradictions such as those between the remnant feudal class and the bourgeoisie, between the non-monopoly capitalists and the monopoly capitalists, between bourgeois democracy and bourgeois fascism, among the capitalist countries, between imperialism and colonies, are all determined or influenced by this principal contradiction".

If this be so even for capitalist countries, what about a country like ours where fascist repression is a continuing process ?

All these united front slogans inevitably lead to abandoning the Agrarian Revolutionary struggle whatever may be their subjective intentions.

(f) Alternative to what ?

These Communist Revolutionaries say that their united front slogans are national alternative to the slogans given by the bourgeois opposition and the CPI-CPM combine.

The national alternative to the present semi-colonial and semi feudal society can only be the New Democratic Revolution.

The national alternative to the present big bourgeois, big landlord government can only be a New Democratic government of the democratic classes led by the working class.

The national alternative to parliamentarism peddled by the CPI-CPM and other ruling classes can only be the People's War.

Let us also remember that anti authoritarian front or anti autocratic front are also slogans of the bourgeois opposition and the CPI-CPM.

These united front slogans of these Communist Revolutionaries are not national alternative to the bourgeois opposition or the CPI-CPM. They are similar, only the label has changed.

Actually they are national alternative to the strategic slogan of the working class for this strategic period. Has anyone ever heard of such an absurdity at any time in the history of the international working class movement ?

(g) How to utilise these contradictions ?

Does this mean that our party refuses to have a united front with any section of the ruling classes at any time, under any circumstances ? No. We are always for utilising them. Only our methods differ from the methods of the disruptive united front slogans of these Communist Revolutionaries.

To forge a united front between the working class and any section of the ruling classes, these must be a common basis for political united front. Such common basis can arise only on specific occasions.

According to our political resolution, such specific occasions are when our country is the target of aggression, of any of the two super powers, or when our country becomes a neo-colony of any one of the two super powers, or again comes under emergency rule and bourgeois opposition also becomes the target of attack.

This is the international experience. Com. Mao says :

The Chinese big bourgeoisie which is comprador in character, is a class which directly serves imperialism and is fostered by it. Hence the Chinese bourgeoisie has always been a target of the revolution. However, different groups within this big bourgeoisie are backed by imperialist powers, so that, when contradictions among those powers become sharper, and when the edge of the revolution is mainly directed against a particular power, the big bourgeois groups dependent on the other powers may join the struggle against the particular imperialist power to a certain extent, for a certain time. (*Introducing the Communist*)

The conditions for a general political united front with any section of the ruling classes do not exist in India today.

Then how to utilise the contradictions between the ruling class parties ?

They have to be utilised on the immediate issues of the people, economic and political, national and international. The bourgeois parties in opposition have to pretend to be opposing the policies of the government.

Their opposition to the government, however vacillating, on certain issues, has got a wider appeal and we should utilise this opportunity to unite with the people behind them, join hands with the people for united struggles on the common issues of the people. This should be our approach even to the people behind the Congress, however limited they are now. Com. Dimitrov says :

How can fascism be prevented from coming to power and how can fascism be overthrown after it has been victorious? The first thing that must be done, the thing with which to commence, is to form a united front to establish unity of action of the workers in every factory, in every district, in every region, in every country and all over the world.

At present this is the only way to utilise the contradictions of the ruling class parties in the interests of the people's struggle.

4. Agrarian Revolutionary struggle and elections

Now about the sharp differences among the CRs as to the attitude to be adopted towards the parliamentary institutions in our country. While some call for the boycott of elections, others call for bourgeois election alliances. Our Party has rejected both these trends.

About the boycott of elections, we only want to say that Marxism-Leninism has always taught us that mere existence of a revolutionary situation is not sufficient to give the slogan of boycott. There should be a revolutionary upsurge among the masses, to go to higher forms of struggle make a direct war on the old system and not a mere passive boycott.

Even those who shout about boycott of elections are not objective. Their ranks and followers are participating in the elections and supporting one bourgeois party or the other.

Taking the level of the people's movement and their consciousness, our Party has decided to participate in the elections with definite aims of propogating the political line of the Party, propogating the revolutionary politics of Agrarian Revolution among the people, consolidating and extending the mass base of the Party and prepare the people for further struggles on their immediate issues after the elections.

This is based on the experience of the international working class movement and the teachings of Lenin.

By following this correct electoral line of the Party, we have been able to advance the mass base of the Party.

DISTORTIONS

These Communist Revolutionaries who differ from us on this question are distorting the meaning of Marxist-Leninist teachings from the experiences of international communist movement.

They quote Lenin as saying

Under a parliamentary system it is often necessary to support a more liberal Party against the less liberal one.

But they should remember that Lenin said this in 1902-1903 when the Cadet party has not been exposed to be a reactionary and compromising with Tsarism. When the Cadet party was exposed to be compromising with Tsarism, it was the prime target of political attack in order to successfully mobilise the people against it, isolate it from the people, mobilise them for a final onslaught on Tsarism.

The main purpose of Lenin's slogan in 1902-1903 was to utilise the contradictions of the bourgeoisie on the immediate issues of the people in the interests of the people's movement.

They often quote Lenin's directives on coming to agreements with opposition section, including the Cadets, to share seats in the indirect elections. But this was after the direct election campaign among the people and the main purpose here was to divide the petty bourgeois democrats from the reactionary elements in each of the opposition parties. And in this process, the question of sharing seats with the Cadets, even in the indirect election, never arose for Lenin.

Some quote from *Left-wing Communism*, to show Lenin's directives to the British communists at that time asking them to support the British Labour Party against the Conservatives.

But this was when a centralised Communist Party has not evolved, when the Labour Party has not yet been exposed as the party of labour imperialism. Even then he advised the British communist elements to have a preliminary, unofficial and friendly contest with the British Labour Party to find out who had the greater strength among the people in those particular constituences-which gives the British communists enough opportunity to take their politics among the people.

Some quote Dimitrov's report in support of their bourgeois election alliances. But Dimitrov report has called for such a step only on the basis of *a common platform of the anti-fascist united front* and not unilateral support to the bourgeois parties, as our Communist Revolutionaries are advocating.

Some show the experience of the communists in Western Europe of joining bourgeois and socialist parties in elections and forming united

front governments before the Second World War, and communists there joining the bourgeois governments after the War.

As for the joining of the communists in such united front governments before the Second World War, it should be remembered that these governments did not survive even for a few months even in France and Spain; the bourgeoisie and the socialists in those governments itself turned against the communists to start fascist repression on them.

As for the united front governments after the Second World War, it should be remembered that Stalin also did not draw any lessons from that experience and it was only Mao who flayed all such experiences.

It should be remembered that all those who cried for bourgeois election alliances in the past history of international communist movement never came back into revolutionary struggle.

The experience of the CPI-CPM, after their betrayal of the Heroic Telangana struggle, adequately confirms this international experience.

AGAINST POLITICAL AGREEMENTS, ALLIANCES AND BLOCS WITH THE BOURGEOISIE

These Communist Revolutionaries say that we should have election agreements with the bourgeoisie to defeat the main enemy.

But this is against the teachings of Lenin who said :

Remember this, gentlemen ! alliances and negotiations with the Cadets are worst forms of exercising pressure on them. In practice, it will mean blunting the struggle of the Social Democrats and not Social Democratic pressure on the Cadets.

The disruptive united front slogans of these Communist Revolutionaries are in no way different from the slogans of CPI-CPM. Such a path is bound to lead to parliamentarism, even if it is done under the banner of Mao Zedong Thought. That is why we say that bourgeois election alliances and Agrarian Revolution are irreconcilable.

5. Our struggle to build the strategic New Democratic Front.

Our Party is totally opposed to the various slogans of united front given by these Communist Revolutionaries.

But how is the Party striving to build the strategic New Democratic Front of the four democratic classes led by the working class?

Our efforts to utilise the contradictions of the various ruling class parties on the immediate issues of the people, issue by issue, economic and political, is part of the struggle to build the New Democratic Front.

(a) Our Party has been participating in all the calls for general strikes or bundhs called by the opposition including the CPI-CPM with our independent slogans.

Such an approach gives the opportunity of uniting with the people behind these parties for united struggles of the common people on the common issues against the common enemy.

While participating in such general agitations, we expose the reactionary nature of these parties from other platforms. This gives an opportunity to the people behind them to understand the difference between these parties and our Party and to learn politics of Agrarian Revolution of our Party.

We combine the participation in such general agitations with the class struggles under own leadership and our mass organisations — Which helps us to broaden and consolidate our own mass base.

(b) Such an approach gives an opportunity to the national bourgeoisie to understand the difference between our own Party and the parties of the ruling classes. As the economic and political crisis grows, as they realise that they cannot survive under imperialism and social imperialism and the ruling classes, and as they see the working class movement growing as an alternative to the present ruling classes, they are bound to break off from the ruling classes and join the democratic classes, since the contradiction between them and the present ruling classes is antagonistic.

(c) At present, we are consistently following the policy of uniting our basic classes against the common enemy.

At present, we are uniting all the exploited sections of the people against the landlords, taking the agricultural labourers and the poor peasantry as the primary classes.

At the same time, we mobilise agricultural labourers and poor peasants in support of the just demands of the middle and rich peasants against the government and the domination of the landlords, while mobilising the middle and rich peasants to support the just demands of the agricultural labourers and poor peasants, and thus isolating the landlords from all sections of the common people. At the same time we fight against all sorts of feudal exploitation of the rich peasants, keeping the question of unity with them in consideration.

In these struggles we consistently try to utilise the contradictions of the landlord groups, concentrating our struggle against the main enemy at

a particular time and at the same time we do not allow the landlords to utilise our movement in their factional interests.

In the working class centres we build our own trade unions where absolutely necessary, independent trade unions where the workers are not yet prepared to join our trade unions and also work as fraction of the trade unions under the leadership of the other parties and thus win them over for militant struggles and for Agrarian Revolution.

Among the students, our student organisations consistently follow the policy of uniting with other student organisations, particularly those under the leadership of Communist Revolutionaries for united struggles on the immediate issues of the people.

Among the middle class employees, working as a fraction in the unions under the leadership of others, we consistently support the struggles of these sections on their immediate issues, propogate the politics of Agrarian Revolution and thus politicise those struggles.

Among the progressive intellectuals, we take a positive attitude and draw them into literary organisations, cultural organisations and civil liberties organisations and slowly draw them into revolutionary movement.

Thus our approach is to build the unity of the basic classes against the class enemy. Such an approach alone will strengthen the class struggles under our own leadership.

(d) In the struggle against revisionism and neo-revisionism, our Party treats the CPI-CPM leadership as playing a fictitious opposition role towards Indira Gandhi government, and faithfully serving the interests of Soviet Union both here and abroad, as interested in the preservation of the present exploitative system and naturally as being a part of the ruling classes. Along with Indira Congress and other pro-Soviet forces they are greater danger today to our people.

Inspite of such principled opposition to the CPI-CPM, we take each and every opportunity to unite with their ranks and mass organisations for united struggles at the village, factory and educational institution level for united struggles at the immediate issues of the people.

(e) Even our struggle for united action of the Communist Revolutionaries and ultimately unite them in a single Party of Marxism-Leninism, is part of the struggle for building the New Democratic Front of the four democratic classes.

Our Party always takes the people's struggles, the *resistance struggles* and the struggle for united front as inter-dependent. These Communist

The Communist Revolutionaries should fulfill this two-fold task in order to isolate the national chauvinists in the advanced and backward nationalities, unite the common people of both the nationalities in their common struggle against exploiters of both the nationalities.

The right of self-determination of any particular nationality can only come after all these efforts fail and that particular nationality is determined to secede.

Right of self-determination of nationalities is a democratic demand and is a part of the New Democratic Revolution and it can be won only with the success of the New Democratic Revolution. So self-determination of nationalities is a part of the programme of the Agrarian Revolution and it can only be won on the basis of the success of the Agrarian Revolutionary struggle.

Keeping these theoretical concepts of Marxism-Leninism, and their practical application to the concrete situation in India today, Our Party has clearly declared in its programme, 'Unification of India and recognition of the right of self-determination to all nationalities and protection of rights of national and religious minorities'.

Keeping these teachings of Marxism-Leninism on the question of self-determination of nationalities in consideration, has there been any serious movement in India for the self-determination of any nationality ?

With all their failings, the Mizos and Nagas, for a long time fought with arms for their self-determination against the central government. Of late, many changes have come in that movement also and it has become increasingly difficult to know what is happening there.

Except for this, the separatist movements engineered by the ruling class parties in India have nothing to do with the self-determination of nationalities.

COMMON FEATURES OF ALL SEPARATIST MOVEMENTS

All these separatist movements have got certain common features.

—They are invariably led by the ruling class parties, always with an eye on the elections.

—They always end in compromises with the central government one way or the other.

—The leaders of these movements always use it as a pressure tactic against government and the moment some concessions are given, the compromise is made.

—During these movements, instead of struggling against the central government for justified demands, the people of one area are roused against the people of another area, the people of one community are roused against the people of another community thus the common people of one area or one community are made the chief targets of attack during these separatist movements.

—During these movements, grievances like economic backwardness and lack of employment are being utilised for separatist movements instead of a justified struggle against the system of exploitation.

—And finally, these separatist movements are disruptive in nature, primarily intended to divert the attention of the exploited classes from their real problems.

These common features of the separatist movements show that they have nothing to do with any genuine struggle for self-determination of nationalities. The real fact is separatist movements and the struggle for self-determination of nationalities are irreconcilable.

Now let us see whether the separatist movements have really advanced the struggle for self-determination of nationalities or have played a disruptive role in diverting the attention of the exploited people from their real problems.

TAMILNADU

During the late 1950s, and 1960s, under the leadership of DMK, an anti-Hindi movement developed in Tamilnadu culminating in the demand for Dravidasthan. But when the DMK emerged as the ruling party in Tamilnadu on the basis of anti-Hindi chauvinism, DMK has abandoned the struggle for Dravidasthan but is always bargaining with the central government for more central assistance.

During these days also, this demand for Dravidasthan by DMK was sought to be supported by some of the communists as progressive demand representing the right of self-determination. But the experience of the DMK proved otherwise.

Now also we see the strange spectacle of both DMK and AIDMK traising all sorts of demands pertaining to their area—but trying to woo the ruling party in the centre to each one's side in their power struggle in Tamilnadu. But we see the communist leaders of CPI and CPM calling both DMK And AIDMK as left democrats for electoral alliances with these parties,

The DMK or AIDMK use the genuine aspirations of the Tamil people against the imposition of Hindi to rouse anti-Hindi chauvinism as a vote-catching method to come to power and this demand has nothing to do with the self-determination of nationalities.

ANDHRA

Or take the example of the separatist movement in Andhra between 1968-70.

Here the main actors were the Congress leaders themselves. It is Chenna Reddy who first raised the demand of Telangana. Later the Andhra Congress leaders also slogan of division of Andhra.

On both these occasions, passions were roused based on regionalism and separation of Andhra was demanded.

On both these occasions, there were Communist Revolutionaries who supported the demand for the division of Andhra.

Even at that time we refused to support such demands. At the same time we did not take a negative attitude towards the movement.

We supported the just demands of the Telangana people as far as backwardness of Telangana and employment opportunities, but held the Congress government responsible for this. We exposed that the leaders of this separatist movements were equally responsible for this situation and called for the overthrow of the Congress government through an uncompromising Agrarian Revolutionary struggle.

Experience proved that these leaders of the separatist movement were only for a compromise and later they were all united again in the Congress, and Separate Telangana Movement was only a pressure tactic of certain Congress leaders in their power struggle.

ASSAM

Or take the example of the Assam agitation. It was a struggle of the people of Assam against backwardness, for better employment opportunities, and in defence of their own language. We supported the Assam movement on these issues and condemned the government's fascist repression on the people of Assam.

Even during this movement also we saw two trends among Communist Revolutionaries opposed to our own line. One trend was that which supported Bengali chauvinism and participated in the sham elections conducted by Indira Congress government and supported even the fascist repression on the Assam people. There was another trend which held the Assam struggle as a struggle for self-determination of Assami nationality and supported the extreme demands of Assam chauvinism. Life proved that both these were wrong both in theory and practice.

The leaders of the Assam agitation wanted to solve the Assam problem under the present constitution. They allowed Assami chauvinism to play with the movement which led to mass murders committed by one

tribe against the other. This only helped Indira Gandhi to impose an unrepresentative government on the people of Assam. Now we hear that secret negotiations are being held between central government and the leaders of the Assam agitation over the question of next elections.

Or take the example of Kashmir itself. Does anyone seriously think that the National Conference or Farook Abdulla are fighting for the self-determination of the Kashmir people? Absurd. Their whole game has been to rouse the separate sentiments of the Muslims, use such agitations as a pressure tactic against the central government for concessions and as a vote-catching device.

So these events are enough to show that the separatist movements led by the various ruling class parties play a disruptive role with regard to the Agrarian Revolutionary struggle.

Now let us look at the Punjab problem.

—The Sikh extremists have been raising the demand of Khalistan as a separate homeland for the Sikhs. We have been consistently opposed to this demand in principle. Religion can not be the basis for a nationality and we have refused to support the demand for a separate Sikh state.

To support the demand for Khalistan is the height of perversity in Marxist thinking.

In 1982 itself we traced the origin of this disruptive slogan. Com. Baldev Singh, in one of his articles titled, *Communal tensions in Punjab* (1982, Jan-Feb. Road to Liberation) has dealt with this question in depth. Analysing the forces behind the demand for Khalistan, com. Baldev Singh says:

The main supporters of this Khalistan are some Sikh businessmen settled abroad, a few elements of economically hard-pressed Sikh youth lured by the illusions of bright future in their own state, some orthodox and disgruntled Sikh leaders, some businessmen in cities who feel unable to compete with their Hindu counterparts, some politically victimised officers, and a small section of misguided intelligentsia. Except this they have no support base at all among the Sikh people.

This is the social base for the demand of Khalistan. It is to be noted that this demand was made only after the Akali party lost in 1980 elections. It is also significant to note that this demand for Khalistan is getting more support from Sikhs based in certain western countries, particularly USA. This only exposes the source of inspiration behind this Khalistan demand.

The demand for Khalistan is not a demand for any progressive or democratic cause. It is nothing but a reactionary demand to divert the attention of the people from their basic demand. This is intended mainly to rouse extreme chauvinistic demands among the Sikh youth to divert

them from other democratic struggles of the people. That is why we have been consistently opposed to this demand. The editorial of our central organ has correctly stated :

When handful of frustrated careerists, power hungry Sikh politicians raised the slogan of formation of Khalistan by seceding from India, we were the first to vehemently oppose it on principles.

Self-interested political parties were rousing extreme Hindu chauvinism and Sikh chauvinism and both these trends have been responsible for the worsening communal tension in Punjab and to an extent in Haryana also, culminating in communal murders and destruction of property.

In our campaign for unity between Sikhs and Hindus, our Party has been consistently and correctly exposing the Hindu extremists and the Sikh extremists responsible for the growing communal tensions in Punjab. In 1982 January, comrade Baldev Singh has warned :

“For the time being, the communal propoganda by fanatic leaders of both the communities, communal tension and uncertainty, insecurity and fear ensueing from it is dominating the minds of the people, especially in the cities”.

The Central Committee of our Party, in its resolution on Punjab in 1983, has clearly warned:

Another factor to be noted is the presence of an unwritten secret pact between Sikh communalism and Hindu communalism. Sikh communalism must understand that inflating their communalism not only helps them, but also helps Hindu communalism to consolidate. Hindu communalism must also understand that their communal consolidation not only helps them but also Sikh communalism. They are not adversaries but allies with an eye on the ballot box.

The CC of our Party in its resolution of March 1984, on the Punjab situation, has warned the country:

“Elements of Hindu community in Punjab and elements of Sikh community in Haryana have been caught in a fear psychosis of danger to their lives and property”.

Thus we have been warning the Punjab people and the people of the whole country about the growing communal tensions in Punjab.

It is to reduce the communal tensions in Punjab, we declared that Chandigarh should be given to Punjab, Haryana should be helped to build its own capital by the centre, disputes of river water or border disputes should be settled by an independent tribural as a democratic solution to

the present impasse. But nobody heeded our appeal. The forces that mattered were more interested in the prolongation of the crisis in Punjab to serve their election interests.

—The contradictions of the ruling class parties in Punjab—The Indira Congress, the Akalis and the BJP is the main cause for the prolongation of the crisis in Punjab culminating in the Army intervention on 6th of June this year.

This has been our consistent position throughout this period of crisis in Punjab.

In 1983 in our C.C. resolution, we have warned:

“Both the Congress (I) and the Akali Dal are interested in prolonging the agitation in order to maintain their base and if possible to extend to other states for their electoral purposes.” And that “the power struggle between the Congress (I) and the Akali Dal are the main cause for the prolongation of the agitation.”

The editorial of our central organ of 1983 Nov. Dec. issue declared:

All the parliamentary political parties representing the exploiting classes as well as revisionist communist parties are responsible for this situation. None can escape from such a blame. But basically Congress (I) and the Akali Dal must share responsibility for such unsavoury situation between themselves.

The ambitions of the various ruling class parties in Punjab has been clearly defined in the above said editorial:

Akali Dal is obviously communal organisation which safeguards the interests of Sikh landlords and Sikh capitalists by feigning itself as defender of Sikh rights. It wants to capture power in Punjab by spreading communalism. There is no doubt that for the situation that has precipitated in Punjab, the Akali Dal is no less responsible than the Congress (I) because it is engaged in the despicable act of spreading communal colour to come to power in the state.

About the role of BJP and its new ally Charan Singh, our editorial has warned in the end of 1983:

The existence of BJP or the erst-while Jana Sangh solely rests as the anti-thesis of Sikh communalism in Punjab. This party as the symbol of Hindu communalism has been responsible for Hindu-Sikh tension in Punjab.

We have also warned that

Its new ally Choudary Charan Singh has gone as far as to openly provoke and incite communal tensions.

About the Congress (I), our editorial of 1983 has warned:

In this backdrop it is clear as the day that despite its verbal proclamations to solve the problems in the right earnest, the political selfishness of the Congress (I) is one of the major factors for prolongation of the dispute and it is mainly responsible for the anarchy in Punjab.

The present editorial in our central organ has warned that the Congress (I) wants

To utilise the turmoil in Punjab to bag Hindu votes in the state, but it is aspiring to win the bulk of the votes in the entire Northern India.

—Our party is consistently opposed to the *Morcha* under the leadership of the Akali Dal. We have always held that this *Morcha* is means for the Akali Dal to spread Sikh communalism.

We have always held that extremism of Bhindrawala is the creation of Congress politics in Punjab. We have been consistently attacking Bhindrawala as such. This has been our consistent stand.

In a commentary on Punjab developments in 1982, Com. Baldev Singh had declared:

The Congress Party and its different groups, mainly those led by Chief Minister Darbara Singh and Union Home Minister Zail Singh started encouraging and protecting anti people moves of theocrats like Khalistan protagonists and and fundamentalists like Sant Jarnail Singh whom the Congress (I) is patting since long, and also is patting the power hungry politicians like Talwandi and Santokh Singh of Delhi even at the cost of communal harmony in the state and also with the purpose of weakening the opposition forces in general and the Akali Dal and BJP in particular.

He has also said:

Different factions of the Congress, mainly those being led by Darbara Singh and Mr. Zail Singh have been instigating and manipulating these theocratic and fundamentalist elements in order to seek the confidence of Hindu population, weakening the base of BJP in the cities and Akali Dal in the rural areas, and also to settle their own scores against each other in their game of power politics.

He also declared :

When Congress (I) was dislodged from power in 1977, it strove to drive a wedge between the coalition partners, especially Akali Dal and the Janata Party and to weaken the Akali Dal base by putting up the fundamentalist Sant Jarnail Singh. Indira Congress encouraged him, however tacitly, to adopt a hard line towards Nirankari sect.

In Nov. 1983, the editorial of our central organ has again warned the country:

“On the other hand, the fact that the so-called extremist Sikhs and Sant Bhindrawale are creation of the Congress itself, can also hardly be disputed. These elements, in the beginning, had been brought into existence and given encouragement by the Congress to drive the Akalis into a corner with their extremism and win the wholesale support of Hindus”.

With Bhindrawala and his brand of extreme fundamentalists ready to play her game in the Sikh politics, Indira Gandhi had all the weapons in her hands to turn the political situation in Punjab in her favour.

With the Congress (I) support and encouragement, Bhindrawale and his brand of extremists, particularly some misguided students and unemployed youth and certain lumpens, began to spread extreme Sikh communalism. They killed the Nirankari Chief and created the first division between Nirankaris and Akalis. He began giving extreme slogans of Sikh communalism and finally got the Akalis to support the Anandpur Sahib resolution. He forced the Akalis to support to launch the *Morcha* from the Golden Temple with the extreme Sikh communal slogan. All the subsequent efforts for negotiations failed because the Congress was not prepared to end the crisis in Punjab. Neither the Akalis, under pressure from the extremists, were prepared to end the crisis in Punjab.

Under the cover of this *Morcha*, Bhindrawale and his extremists took to individual terrorism against Hindus and destruction of property and mass murders of innocent persons including the old women and children. They even killed individual Sikhs opposed to the extremists, both in the Golden Temple and outside it.

This extreme terrorism of Sikh communalism brought forth the required resistance from the Hindu communalists also. With the encouragement of Congress men, the BJP-Lokdal alliance, the Hindu Suraksha Samiti took to extreme steps to counter Bhindrawale and his Sikh extremists and then there was whole-sale attack on Sikhs living in Haryana.

Thus deliberate attempts were made to make the the lives of minority Hindus in Punjab insecure and the lives of minority Sikhs living in Haryana insecure.

Indira government knew what was going on inside the Golden Temple complex. Certain criminals and wanted persons are hiding in the Golden Temple, procuring and hiding of illegal weapons and converting Golden Temple complex into a fortress for Sikh extremists.

Indira Gandhi knew all this. By design, she allowed Bhindrawale and his men to do these anti-social activities to scare the Hindus into supporting her, to force the opposition to support her and make general public in Punjab, particularly the Hindu middle classes, to welcome intervention of the Army to put down Bhindrawale and his extremists.

The whole drama was enacted by Indira Gandhi in such way that she is welcomed as the saviour of India from Pakistan's designs, that she is doing all this for the integration of India, that she is the defender of Hindu ideology in the whole of North India etc. All this was done with an eye on the ballot box.

Surely both the Indira Congress and Akalis have played their part. As our editorial has commented in 1983 November:

The Akalidal and Congress (I) in this state are waging a sheer struggle for power in the name of rights of the states and the integrity respectively.

But rights of the states raised by the Akalis or the integrity of the country raised by the Congress are mere slogans to cover up their real intentions, the sheer struggle for power that is the essence of the drama in Punjab, the design of the ruling class parties to exploit the miseries of the Punjab people in their power game.

How truly and correctly has our present editorial in May—June, 1984 *March to Liberation* has said that:

The extremist Sikh communalists, the extremist Hindu communalists and the central government have jointly drowned Punjab in blood.

The present editorial has also said :

The current happenings in Punjab are neither inadvertent nor incidental. In our opinion these are a part of an organised and planned conspiracy aimed at depriving Punjab of its legacy of glorious struggles against imperialism, exploiting feudal and capitalist classes and push it into the quagmire of communalism. The whole plot is to lead the people of Punjab astray from their struggles and involve them in irrelevant and extraneous issues.

All the political ambitions of Indira Gandhi have now been fulfilled in Punjab with army intervention. She thinks that she is now looked upon as

the saviour of Hindu population not only in Punjab but in the whole of North India. How correct com. Baldev have been in his remark in 1982 itself that "ideologically, the Indian ruling classes practice Hinduism in main".

The whole developments in Punjab, the role of Hindu and Sikh communalists, the role of Bhindrawale as a fundamentalist and Sikh communalist, and the support he got from the Congress in the beginning, and now the role of Indira Gandhi as the leader of Hindu communalism fully confirms the characterisation in our political resolution **Intensify the People's Struggles** which says:

The various groups in the Congress in various states and the centre are at the root of communalism, casteism and all sorts of separatist movements to divert the attention of the people in various parts of the country. These disruptionist movements have become the main weapons in the hands of these power-hungry Congress groups to disrupt the struggles of the people. It is significant to note that communalism, casteism and separatist movements have become the weapons of all the ruling class parties including the CPI-CPM, to disrupt the people's struggles.

In the face of these hard facts it is sheer foolishness on the part of some Communist Revolutionaries who regard the developments in Punjab as a struggle between local capitalism and the comprador bourgeoisie in the centre, or greeting Bhindrawale as a martyr.

Our Party has consistently campaigned for Hindu-Sikh unity. We have openly attacked Bhindrawale as the creation of Congress politics. We have opposed the *marcha* led by the Akali Dal under the leadership of Longowal. We have consistently opposed to Khalistan demand and sought the unity of Hindus and Sikhs on our intermediate slogans on Chandigarh, water and border disputes. We have also exposed the designs of Indira Gandhi's striving to appear as the saviour of Hindu ideology in the whole of North with an eye on the coming elections to parliament.

The events in Punjab have amply demonstrated the correctness of our position.

Now with Army's intervention there is only one way out of the present impasse in Punjab—withdrawal of Army from Punjab, withdrawal of all draconian laws, restoration of democratic rights and peaceful negotiations on Chandigarh, water and border disputes—all reflected correctly in the 11 demands of our present editorial. We will continue our struggle on the basis of these 11 demands, knowing fully well that the success of Agrarian Revolution alone will lead to the solution of all the basic problems of the Punjab people.

23-8-84

(This article was first published in Vimochana dated 1-9-84)

In defence of comrade Mao and Mao Zedong Thought

In 1980, the Special Congress of our Party passed a resolution. That resolution supported the general orientation of the CPC (Communist Party of China) the four modernisations to build socialism in China, its struggles against the two super powers, its support to the national liberation struggles and its continuation of the three world theory. At the same time our resolution demarcated itself from the CPC on its assessment of comrade Mao and Mao Zedong Thought, Liu Shaoqi and the Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution.

In spite of certain positive factors in the recent resolution of the CPC on "Questions of Party History" (hereafter called the *History Resolution*) passed by its Plenum on June 27, 1981, the CC resolution says that "our differences on certain questions of ideology still persist. The situation calls for a deeper explanation of their differences. Hence this resolution".

International background to the Cultural Revolution

The CC Resolution says:

"The whole History Resolution is significant for the omission of the international background of the Cultural Revolution."

"Our Party firmly believes that the Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution was an essential part of the struggle of the CPC and comrade Mao against modern revisionism from the 20th Congress of the CPSU in 1956."

The CC Resolution further says:

"The enormous growth of the national liberation movements, and these movements more and more taking to the path of armed struggle to achieve their independence, the polarisation in the ranks of the communists, more and more Marxists-Leninists standing up against revisionism, more and more third world countries coming into opposition to the two super powers—all indicate the correctness of the theoretical propositions of the *General Line of the International Communist Movement* and the *9 Commentaries* of the CPC and comrade Mao to be absolutely correct".

The CC Resolution further says :

"It is very significant to note that the History Resolution has completely left out Mao's great Marxist-Leninist struggle against modern

revisionism of the CPSU, in its review of the Cultural Revolution. it cannot be an accidental lapse. Only the CPC leadership can give a proper explanation for this important omission. But Marxists-Leninists cannot accept this omission."

"Not only that. Now the CPC leadership has unilaterally withdrawn the *General Line* and the *9 Commentaries*. They were an important contribution to the ideological struggle against modern revisionism, because they are based on the fundamental principles of Marxism-Leninism, Marxists-Leninists will always treasure them as guidance for their future struggles.

Criticising the characterisation of the CPC Resolution on the CPSU leadership as merely a deviation from Marxism-Leninism, the CC resolution asserts :

"We firmly believe that the CPSU leadership had completely betrayed Marxism and Leninism and this is nowhere reflected in the *History Resolution*. To the extent it says, it is only minimising the danger from modern revisionism and social imperialism to the whole world people."

After extensively quoting from the *9 Commentaries* and the *General line of the International Communist Movement* characterising the rise of Modern revisionism to power in the Soviet Union as restoration of capitalism in that country and later characterising the Soviet Union as a social imperialist country, the CC resolution says :

"These are the historic lessons that the CPC and comrade Mao drew for Socialist China from the phenomenon of the revisionist clique usurping Party and state power in the Soviet Union. Lets us remember that all the main leaders of the CPC, including some in the present leaders were closely associated with these lessons."

"These are the very issues that are involved in the Cultural Revolution of China in 1966. Now the *History Resolution* of the present leadership of the CPC has completely negated these lessons".

"But the *History Resolution* has not offered a single explanation for the revisionist clique coming to power in the Soviet Union. It has not even offered any explanation as to what is the social basis for hegemonism and big nation chauvinism in the Soviet Union about which the *History Resolution* speaks of."

"This is the international background in which the Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution in China was launched in 1966."

The CC Resolution says :

"Whoever wants to persist in the struggle against modern revisionism and social imperialism of the CPSU, cannot but support the ideological

issues involved in the Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution, initiated and led by comrade Mao was only a part of his struggle against modern revisionism throughout the world. This is one of the reasons why we supported and continue to support the correct ideological issues involved in the Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution."

National background of the Cultural Revolution

After tracing the various general policies of the CPC and comrade Mao during the period of Rehabilitation (1949-52), the period of Transition to Socialism (1952-56), Socialist Construction (1956-66) and the successes of these periods, the Resolution says :

"Comrade Mao had to wage this ideological struggle against the bourgeois rightists and reactionary intellectuals, against Party leaders like Liu Shaoqi and some of his friends. It is also significant to note that the ideological and political struggles on policy issues of this period had their origin in the earlier period itself—The period of transition from New Democracy to Socialism. It is also significant to note that this ideological struggle between the correct positions of comrade Mao and the wrong positions of others became sharp only after the 20th Congress of the CPSU and its wrong decisions and Khrushchev revisionist clique coming to power in 1955".

The CC Resolution further says :

"The continuing opposition of a section of the leadership represented by Liu Shaoqi against the correct General Line of the Party for Socialist Construction, the Great Leap and the Communes, the continuing resistance of the bourgeois rightists to socialism, their opposition to the struggle of the CPC and comrade Mao against modern revisionism, their formal acceptance of the CPC decisions but sabotage in practice, the strengthening of bureaucracy in the Party and government—this was the immediate cause for the Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution (GPCR) in 1966."

"Thus one could see that the Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution GPCR in 1966 was a struggle against modern revisionism both inside and outside China and to prevent restoration of capitalism in China, as it happened in the Soviet Union".

Class struggles and Principal contradiction in a Socialist Society

After extensively quoting from Marx, Engels, Lenin and Stalin on this subject, the CC resolution says :

"Mao's position on classes and class struggle in Socialist China, the struggle between the Socialist Road and the Capitalist Road is entirely based on the fundamental principles of Marxism-Leninism".

“That is why comrade Mao has taken class struggle as the key link in the struggle to build Socialism. But unfortunately the *History Resolution* rejects firmly the class struggle as the key link”.

“It is really surprising to see this argument of the *History Resolution*. We are Marxists-Leninists and as such, for us class struggle is the key link in all phases of our struggle. In China also comrade Mao based himself on class struggle as the key link in the struggle for New Democratic Revolution, in the Rehabilitation Period, Transition Period and in the Period of Socialist Construction”.

“In the Period of Socialist Construction also there is still the struggle against the remnants of the old reactionary exploiting classes, the emergence of new bourgeois elements, the question of eliminating capitalism and its roots in all spheres, the ideological struggle in the superstructure, and the struggle against international capital and modern revisionism. Of course, the class struggle in the Period of Socialist Construction is quite different from class struggle of the earlier period both in content and form. But it is still the class struggle and that is why comrade Mao advocated class struggle as the key link even during the period of socialist construction”.

“According to the *History Resolution*, the principal contradiction in a socialist society is between the growing material and cultural needs of the people and the backwardness of the productive forces. We cannot accept this formula.....Principal contradiction should be read as contradiction between various classes existing in a particular society...”

“The contradiction between the material and cultural needs of the people and the backwardness of the productive forces is common to all class societies.....”.

“It is true that the national bourgeoisie and the rich peasants having lost their economic base, accept socialism and the dictatorship of the proletariat. But their acceptance is only formal, some of them still try for the restoration of capitalism whenever an opportunity arises.....”.

“In addition, Tibet has been liberated very recently. Taiwan is yet to be liberated and the exploiting classes have got their own social contacts with the mainland China. Above all the danger of social imperialism and modern revisionism still exists.”

“Therefore it is too early to say that classes have already been eliminated in China or that landlords, rich peasants, capitalists and industrialists and businessmen have already transformed themselves into working people”.

Stating the teachings of Marx, Engels, and Lenin on class struggles and the danger of restoration of capitalism and differing with the CPC's History Resolution, the CC resolution says :

"If one accepts the line of reasoning of the *History Resolution*, every one of the fundamental principles of Marxism-Leninism can be rejected on the plea of inapplicability because of time and place. Revisionists of all hues and colours have been doing the very same throughout the history and throughout the world".

Positive and negative factors of the Cultural Revolution

The CC resolution says :

"Even the extent the *History Resolution* speaks of the achievements of China both internally and externally is enough to show that the general orientation of the Cultural Revolution initiated and led by comrade Mao was basically correct. The *History Resolution* itself says that:

"All these important facts are inseparable from the great role played by comrade Mao Zedong".

After this, for the *History Resolution* to say that none of these successes can be attributed to Cultural Revolution is a bit surprising. It cannot convince anybody.

"In spite of these positive achievements and positive factors of the Cultural Revolution, were there no negative factors during the Cultural Revolution? Certainly there were. In our opinion, as far as we have studied the Chinese literature, these negative factors are".

—"Excesses were committed in identifying the anti-socialist elements and removing them from positions of authority and power. It vitiated the atmosphere inside the Party and government to a certain extent".

—"In the name of fighting against the capitalist roaders, certain persons-like Lin Biao and the 'Gang of Four'-utilised the turbulent situation of the Cultural Revolution period to extend the struggle quite unreasonably, with ulterior motives, against old and certain veterans of long standing in the Chinese revolution".

—"In their game of power politics, factionalism, groupism and their lust for power, Lin Biao and the 'Gang of Four' utilised the turbulent situation of the Cultural Revolution to provoke constant quarrels among the people and cadres of the Party in order to get support from sections of the people and the cadres of the Party."

—"Lin Biao and the 'Gang' of Four utilised this turbulent situation to introduce equality in the distribution of goods, forgetting the state of the Chinese economy which is yet to observe the principle *from each according to his labour, to each according to his work*, to pose themselves as the real leftists and mislead the people."

Thus one could easily understand how Lin Biao and the 'Gang' of Four took the guideline of the Cultural Revolution to extremes thus

causing damage to the socialist cause in China to a certain extent. Their activities did damage the correct concept of the Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution initiated and led by comrade Mao and ultimately led to the dissatisfaction among a certain section of the people to certain extent.

These are the negative factors of the Cultural Revolution. But we firmly believe that the positive achievements of the Cultural Revolution are greater than the negative factors of this revolution.

Refutation of the accusations against comrade Mao

Refuting the allegations of the History Resolution against comrade Mao, the CC resolution declares :

“Having accepted the great contributions of comrade Mao and Mao Zedong Thought to the treasure house of Marxism-Leninism, the *History Resolution* levels very serious charges that comrade Mao became ‘smug’ about ‘successes’, ‘impatient for quick results’, and ‘overestimated the role of man’s subjective will and efforts’ and that the ‘gradually divorced himself from practice and from the masses, acted more and more arbitrarily and and subjectively and increasingly put himself above the Central Committee of the Party’. The *History Resolution* even accuses comrade Mao of having undermined ‘the principle of collective leadership and democratic centralism in the political life of the Party and country’ and this ‘phenomenon’ of a personality cult of comrade Mao, it appears, for the *History Resolution*, to be a product, of ‘century old feudal influence’.”

“These are not criticisms of any mistakes or errors. These are nothing but wild accusations against comrade Mao without any basis. They are not even worthy of any reply. We thoroughly reject them.”

“It is not our case that comrade Mao had not made any mistakes. Such an understanding is not even dialectical. Comrade Mao himself many times declared that he had committed mistakes.”

“When mistakes are committed, one should always analyse the nature of the mistakes, the ideological, political, organisational character of these mistakes, the circumstances in which these mistakes are committed whether they were unavoidable or avoidable under those circumstances etc.”

“The History Resolution has not tried any such explanation, any such analysis. It is only flinging wild accusations against comrade Mao... for the History Resolution to hurl such wild accusations against comrade Mao are unworthy of a great Party like the CPC and that too after his death, when he is no more to answer any of these wild accusations. Let us remember that the Khrushchov clique in Russia behaved in a similar way which the CPC itself had criticised in the earlier period”.

Universal character of Mao Zedong Thought

The CC resolution says that by implication, the History Resolution holds that "Mao Zedong was correct only during the period of New Democratic Revolution and Socialist Transformation. It can only mean that Mao Zedong Thought is having universal character only upto New Democratic Revolution and Socialist Transformation and afterwards i.e. after 1956 it has lost its validity.

"Anyhow whether the CPC accepts the universal character of Mao Zedong Thought or not, our Party, the CPI (ML) holds that the Mao Zedong Thought is a part and enrichment of Marxism-Leninism—and therefore we firmly hold Marxism—Leninism—Mao Zedong Thought is the guiding ideology of our Party."

Attitude towards the 'Gang' of Four

The CC resolution says :

"We have already stated how Lin Biao and the 'Gang' of Four took to extremities, committed many excesses and may 'left errors' thus causing serious damage to the cause of socialism in China and the world revolution".

"It is very correct on the part of the CPC to have characterised Lin Biao as a counter—revolutionary since he tried to kill comrade Mao."

"The CPC was correct when it removed the 'Gang' of Four from the Party and govt. and initiated an ideological and political struggle to eradicate their reactionary influence. At that time our Party fully supported the CPC in this struggle."

But still there is a nagging doubt in the minds of many throughout the world whether it was correct to have characterised them as counter—revolutionaries. The *History Resolution* also speaks of 'left' errors of the 'gang' of four. Can 'left' errors be called counter—revolutionary ?

Anyhow, the whole exercise of the trial of the 'gang' of four, we feel, was quite unnecessary. Of course the CPC and the Chinese govt. have repeatedly stated that they were being tried for contravening specific government decrees and laws.

Of course it is necessary to fight their left-errors and isolate them politically and ideologically from the people, but a criminal trial cannot achieve this objective.

Restoration of Liu Shaoqi

After giving various examples of Liu Shaoqi's opposition to comrade Mao's line, the CC resolution says :

“Liu Shaoqi was opposed to the General Line of the CPC and comrade Mao in all the phases of the struggle in China—Rehabilitation period, Transition period, Socialist Construction, Great Leap Forward and the Communes. It should be noted that Liu Shaoqi was opposed to the struggle against modern revisionism”.

“From the quotations given above, it is clear that there had been a running ideological struggle between the line of comrade Mao and that of Liu Shaoqi in all the phases.....”.

“It was only through serious ideological debate inside the Party comrade Mao won the Party and Chinese people to his lines concerning these periods, and Liu Shaoqi’s lines were defeated. The very successes of China during all these phases is a standing confirmation of the correctness of the lines of comrade Mao.”

“The History Resolution has not specifically discussed the line of Liu Shaoqi during the various phases of Chinese struggle for socialism.

But from the reasoning the History Resolution, they accept comrade Mao upto the transition period. Between 1956 to 76, in a way, they accept the positions of Liu Shaoqi and they have condemned Mao’s line between 1966–76 as anti-Marxist.”

“As we have explained earlier, we cannot accept this reasoning.”

“The verdict of the History Resolution on comrade Mao and Liu Shaoqi cannot be final.”

Conclusions

In conclusion, the CC resolution says :

“In spite of our differences with the CPC on their attitude to comrade Mao, Mao Zedong Thought and Cultural Revolution, we are strongly opposed to those who condemn China as a capitalist country.

China is a great socialist country with 100 crores of population. Proletarian internationalism demands us to support the four modernisations programme of the CPC to strengthen socialism in China. A strong socialist country alone can effectively help the world revolutionary movement. We firmly believe socialist China under the leadership of the CPC will act as a centre for world revolution.”

“Our Party fully supports the CPC in its support to the national liberation movements throughout the world and their three world theory and struggle against the conspiracies of the two Super power—US imperialism and social imperialism—taking the latter as a greater danger.

This general orientation of the CPC in the present day world is basically correct.”

“Proletarian internationalism does not mean blind obedience of one Party to the other. Proletarian internationalism means unity in the general orientation and mutual support. Even then there are bound to be certain differences”.

“We are very conscious of the fact that the ideological issues connected with the GPCR are the issues connected with Socialist Revolution and Socialist Construction”.

“The issues of socialism and socialist construction are not on the immediate agenda of our country and our Party. We are yet in the stage of the New Democratic Revolution.

But, the issues of the Cultural Revolution are the issues of Marxism Leninism—Mao Zedong Thought.

“In defending comrade Mao and Mao Zedong Thought we are defending the fundamental principles of Marxism—Leninism - Mao Zedong Thought—the guiding ideology of our Party.”

“In defending Mao Zedong Thought we are defending the struggle against modern revisionism represented by the revisionist clique in power in the Soviet Union”.

“In defending Mao and Mao Zedong Thought we are defending the correct concept of People’s War—which is of immediate importance for our country and Party”.

“We have full faith that the Chinese people under the leadership of the CPC will succeed in overcoming the present difficulties. While comrades Lenin and Stalin had to build socialism in a more advanced capitalist country, without any prior experience, comrade Mao and the CPC have to build socialism in a vast backward agricultural country, without any prior experience. Hence the present difficulties. We firmly believe that the Chinese people and the CPC will finally triumph in building socialism in their country.

17-3-82

Mao's Hunan Report and its Lessons

The Indian Revolution can only advance in the form of People's War. Our Revolution is bound to have the characteristics of Chinese Revolution and its path in the main. This is the decision of our Party Special Congress.

The key task in People's War is building up revolutionary bases in the rural areas. For this, the most important thing is developing, defending and extending specific areas of sustained resistance. This is also the decision of the Party Special Congress. For this, in certain selected areas we must mobilise the exploited people for class struggles, anti-landlord struggles leading to resistance struggle.

Comrade Mao's Hunan Report—its message and lessons is the guide for us. The Hunan Report is based on the direct experience of the revolutionary struggle of the peasants. The Report reminds us of the necessity of determining the main enemies and main allies of the revolution in a particular phase. The Report tells us of the necessity of combining anti-feudal struggle with people's resistance struggle. It tells of the necessity of combining the economic struggle with the political struggle, the latter being the key struggle. It tells us as to how and when the people's enemies are to be punished during the course of the revolutionary struggle. It tells us that we should take all the economic, political and social issues of the people—issues affecting their life in order to mobilise and prepare the people for revolutionary struggle. It tells us as to how the revolutionary struggle is to be based on mass line. This is why Hunan Report still remains our guide.

Period

Hunan Report was prepared by comrade Mao in 1927. It was a report based on his investigation of the Hunan peasant struggle.

At that time the Chinese National Revolution was advancing under the leadership of the Chinese bourgeoisie. The Kuomintang Party and the Communist Party of China were united in that National struggle at that time. The National Revolutionary Army was advancing against the warlords in the North and the imperialist powers supporting them.

At such a time there was a big peasant revolutionary upsurge in Hunan province. It shook the very foundations of landlordism. The

reactionaries in the Kuomintang and the rightists of the CPC represented by Chen Tu Shi opposed the Hunan peasant struggle. It was then that comrade Mao published this Hunan Report. He toured the peasant areas for a month. He analysed the movement from all angles. He drew correct lessons from that struggle. That was a report that laid the basis for the Chinese Revolution. It is a great Marxist-Leninist document. It gives us the most urgently needed lessons for our revolution.

Main enemies and allies

The Hunan struggle was a big peasant revolution. Its main targets of attack were imperialism, warlords, corrupt bureaucrats and the local evil and lawless gentry. In essence it was a struggle against imperialism and their puppets —warlords. Mao declared:

The main targets of attack by the peasants are the local tyrants, the evil gentry and the lawless landlords. As a result, the privileges which the feudal landlords enjoyed for thousands of years are being shattered to pieces. Every bit of the dignity and prestige built up by the landlords is being swept into the dust. (Vol. I p. 25)

Comrade Mao further said :

The patriarchal feudal class of local tyrants, evil gentry, and lawless landlords has formed the basis of autocratic government for thousands of years and is the corner stone of imperialism, warlordism and corrupt officialdom. (Vol. 1 —p. 27)

From the above, it is clear that the Hunan peasant revolution (1927) took place in the midst of the anti-imperialist struggle aimed against imperialism and their puppets—feudal landlords. That means that this struggle took place when the principal contradiction is between imperialism, its puppets and the whole Chinese nation.

Naturally, during the Hunan peasant struggle the distribution of the lands of the feudal landlords was not yet the key issue. It fought against all other exploitations of the feudal landlords.

When we discuss the lessons of the Hunan Report, this fact should be kept in mind. Today ours is not a colonial country. With the transfer of power in 1947, our country has become a semi-colonial and semi-feudal country. Today our country is in the stage of the Agrarian Revolution. Today, in our country, the contradiction between the alliance of imperialism, bureaucratic capitalism and big-landlords on one side and the overwhelming majority of the people on the other is the principal contradiction.

We should keep in mind this important difference between China of 1927 and India of today. In the present stage of our revolution, Agrarian Revolution is the key struggle. Distribution of the landlords, property is the key struggle in this period.

An analysis of the 14 big achievements mentioned in the Hunan Report, brings out the fact that they are based on four kinds of people's problems.

—It was a struggle against the exploitation of the landlords, their illegal collections, land rent, land taxes, illegal transport of landlord's surplus grain, cancellation or postponement of landlord's debts, against landlord violence, corrupt officialdom etc.

—Along with this anti-feudal struggle, the question of organising co-operative societies, building roads, tanks and schools were also taken up by the revolutionary movement.

—The revolutionary peasant struggle also worked to abolish gambling, opium-smoking, banditry etc.

—It also fought against clan authority and religious authority— as symbols of feudalism, against feudal traditions and for the democratic rights of women.

So, along with anti-landlord and other class struggles, the struggle for certain economic and social reforms, in short, the struggle for anti-landlord and anti-imperialist culture was also fought.

Struggle for Political authority

Now we have seen on what problems the Hunan peasant struggle was conducted. Comrade Mao declared that the economic struggle should be linked with the political struggle. He gave more importance to the political struggle. He called upon the exploited people to fight for political power. He hailed the Hunan peasant struggle, because it was advancing on that path.

Comrade Mao declared :

Once the peasants have their organisation, the first thing they do is smash the political prestige and power of the landlord class and especially of the local tyrants and evil gentry. That is, to pull down landlord authority and build up peasant authority in rural society. This is a most serious and vital struggle. It is the pivotal struggle in the second period, the period of revolutionary action. Without victory in this struggle, no victory is possible in the economic struggle to reduce rent and interest, to secure land and other means of production and so on. (Vol. 1 p. 35)

How finely comrade Mao has explained the link between the economic struggle and the political struggle in the rural areas. How clearly he has said that the people cannot achieve victory in the economic struggle without destroying the political authority of the landlords in the villages and establishing the political authority of the peasants.

That is why comrade Mao has repeatedly declared in the Hunan Report that "the fact is that the great peasant masses have risen to fulfil their historic mission and that the forces of rural democracy have risen to overthrow the forces of rural feudalism", that "the privileges which the feudal landlords enjoyed for thousands of years are being shattered to pieces".

In short, comrade Mao declared that the peasant associations are the instruments of power for the people. He explained how, during the course of Hunan peasant struggle, Magistrates and other local officials were forced to take orders from the peasants.

Forms of Struggle

The Hunan Report has also explained the forms of struggle against the political authority of the landlords. To force the landlords to pay back all that he had forcibly taken from individuals, to impose and collect fines for their crimes in the village, to collect funds from the landlords for the people's organisations, protest demonstrations for small wrong-doings by the landlords, big demonstrations against serious crimes of the landlords, parading the landlords in the streets with caps on their heads for more serious crimes, putting them in the county jail if necessary, even if temporarily, driving them away from the villages—these are some of the forms of struggle to be employed against the political authority of the landlords in the villages.

Com. Mao even declared that some among the cruel gentry have to be executed. He declared :

The execution of one such big landlord reverberates through a whole county and is very effective in erradicating the remaining evils of feudalism. Every county has these major tyrants, some as many as several dozens and others at least a few and the only effective way of suppressing the reactionaries is to execute at least a few in each county who are guilty of the most heinous crimes. (Vol. 1, p. 38).

Misinterpreting this teaching of comrade Mao, we have seen how some 'left' adventurists adopted "annihilation of class enemies". We have also seen how they said that this annihilation of individual landlords is the beginning stage of the guerilla struggle. Even now some say that they want to link mass line with annihilation of class enemies.

It is absurd to say that individual killings of these elements has anything to do with the lessons of the Hunan Report. What these elements are doing is nothing but individual terrorism. It is against the principles of Marxism-Leninism. That is why it brought such immense losses for the whole revolutionary movement in the country.

Comrade Mao's lessons are entirely different. He never said that it is a tactic of struggle. As a matter of fact, the whole Marxist-Leninist literature has nowhere recognised annihilation of class enemies as a form of revolutionary struggle.

When the revolutionary peasant movement advances to a higher level, some landlords have been killed by the peasants. As a matter of fact comrade Mao is bringing this fact to our notice. Landlords are killed at the hands of the peasants. This happens in all the phases of the peasant struggle—lower and higher.

In the Hunan Report also he had declared that people should participate in such executions. He said:

Execution. This is confined to the worst local tyrants and evil gentry and is carried out *by the peasants jointly with other sections of the people* (Vol. 1, p. 38).

Killing landlords individually is not the aim of Marxism-Leninism. Its struggle is against the system of exploitation. This basic teaching of comrade Mao, referred to many times in his writing, should not be forgotten.

Leadership of the Peasant Organisations Role of the various classes

In the Hunan Peasant struggle, Comrade Mao analysed the role of the different classes.

Imperialism, and its puppets—warlords, bureaucracy and evil gentry were the main enemies of the Chinese Revolution.

Along with the other people in the rural areas, rich peasants and the middle peasants had to be won over for the struggle. At the same time comrade Mao exposed the anti-people character of the rich peasants at certain times and the vacillating role of the middle peasants.

The peasant associations and the peasant movement developed through two different stages.

Beginning: In the absence of any Civil Liberties for the people, the peasant organisations developed secretly to organise the peasants in the peasant organisations (1926 January to September)

Even here, from 1926 January to June the peasant associations worked completely secretly. Between 1926 June-July, the National Revolutionaries were advancing against the Northern warlords through the Hunan Province. At this time, the peasant associations worked openly, and had a membership of about 3-4 lakhs. Their influence also covered upto 10 lakh people. Peasant associations were actively helping the National Revolutionary Army advancing towards the North.

Direct struggle : From 1926 October to 1927 January was the period of direct revolutionary action. The revolutionary peasants were directly storming the foundations of landlordism. They were directly attacking the houses of landlords. They were destroying the political authority of the landlords in the villages, and establishing the political authority of the peasants. Landlords, depending on their economic strength, were fleeing their villages and taking shelter in their Provincial, District or county towns. The remaining landlords in the villages were obeying the orders of the peasants.

During this period of revolutionary action, the movement of the peasant associations had grown by leaps and bounds. Their membership reached 20 lakhs and their influence to one crore people.

The attitude of the rich peasants and the Middle peasants was different in both the periods.

Rich Peasants

In the beginning of the formation of the peasants associations, the rich peasants did not care for the peasant associations. They not only refused to join but opposed them too.

But after the peasants took to active struggle against the landlords, when the people were parading the landlords in the streets for their crimes, that is, in the second period, the rich peasants were forced to change their attitude towards peasant associations. Only then they began to join the peasant associations. They paid more to get admissions in the peasant associations. They had to get the recommendations of others to join the peasant organisations.

Even then we have to see their anti-peoples character on certain issues. They were registering their names in the organisations in the name of the elders in the family. They were following this tactic to show that they have not joined them when the reactionaries return. We should also remember that some reactionaries among the rich peasants did not join the peasant associations. Even after their joining the associations, they did not do anything for them. Comrade Mao explained how the rich peasants did not do anything positive for the peasant associations during the whole period of revolutionary action.

Middle Peasants

Comrade Mao explained the vacillating role of the middle peasants in this struggle. In the beginning of the formation of the peasant associations, the middle peasants too did not come forward to join them. They took a 'wait and see' attitude.

But in the second period, when the peasant authority has been established, majority of the middle peasants joined these associations. In the organisation they played a more favourable role when compared with the rich peasants. But comrade Mao said that even then the middle peasants were not yet fully active in the struggle of the peasant associations. He said that one has to intensify the agitation among the peasants to the utmost to get the middle peasants to join the peasant associations.

Agricultural Labourers and Poor Peasants

Comrade Mao has explained that in the Hunan Peasant Struggle, the leadership was firmly in the hands of the poor peasants. He divided the poor peasants into two—the utterly destitute and the less destitute. That means the agricultural labourers and the poor peasants led the Hunan Peasant Struggle.

Comrade Mao said that in the Changsha county, 70% poor peasants, 20% middle peasants 10% landlords, and rich peasants—constituted the population in the villages.

It was the poor peasants—70% of the population—who were the backbone of the peasant struggle in both the periods. They were in the fore front of the struggle to overthrow the political authority of the landlords. The agricultural labourers and the poor peasants were the most revolutionary force in the villages. So they could lead the peasant associations. During both the periods, at the lower levels of the peasant associations, the poor peasants were a majority among the Presidents and committee members of the peasant associations. Mao said: "Leadership by the poor peasants is absolutely necessary. Without the poor peasants there would be no revolution". (Vol. 1, p.33)

Armed People

The Hunan Peasant Struggle destroyed the age-old landlordism. It established the political authority of the peasants in the villages. It was not a struggle confined to only certain economic problems. It was not a legal agitation.

It was a struggle for change of political authority. China was a country without any civil liberties from the very beginning. From the beginning the peasants had to wage a struggle against government violence and that of the bureaucratic landlords in the villages. In China, at that time

the warlords were having their private armies. So from the very beginning, the peasant struggle had to resist the violence and cruelty of the feudal landlords. That is why the peasants were armed from the very beginning and worked for it.

In the Hunan Peasant Struggle, the peasant associations procured arms from two sources.

First : At that time, in China, there were warlords, each one having a private army of his own. Seeing the great strength of the peasant struggle, a part of this army with the warlords of joined the peasant struggle with their arms. A section of it remained neutral. In a few centres, these armies of the warlords resisted the peasant struggle. The peasants defeated these armies in these struggle and seized their arms.

According to comrade Mao, during the Hunan Peasant Struggle, each county had about 600 rifles. 75 counties possessed about 45,000 rifles. Out of these armies that joined the peasant struggle, village volunteer squads were built up to defend the villages.

Second : Lakhs of people were armed with the locally available weapons. These armed peasants fought as volunteer force under the leadership of the peasant associations.

Arming of the people was the most important factor in the Hunan Peasant Struggle. That is why they could defeat the warlords, overthrow their political authority in the villages and establish the political authority of the peasants.

It is significant to note that in the Hunan Peasant Struggle, the three struggles—economic, political and resistance struggle—were combined. That is why it is a guide to us.

These are basic lessons of the Hunan Peasant Struggle for us. But here we should also remember certain differences between China of 1927 and India of today. As in China of 1927, today we do not have warlords with private armies. So our peasants in their struggle against the cruelties of the landlords and their government they have to depend entirely on their own strength. They have to depend on the locally available weapons.

China had no parliamentary institutions from the beginning. In our country, whatever be the limits, there are parliamentary institutions. Majority of our people still have illusions about these parliamentary institutions. Our Special Congress has decided to utilise these institutions to extensively propagate revolutionary politics among the people, to extend the people's movement. We should keep this difference in our mind.

To build the Agrarian Revolutionary movement in the villages—to build the resistance movement in the villages—this is the key task decided by the Special Congress of our Party.

To achieve this objective, the following are the tasks for the villages given by the Party Congress:

The main direction of the Party work should be consciously oriented towards building revolutionary peasant movement. Selection of strategic areas, concentration of cadres, formulation of fighting and agitational slogans after extensive discussions with the people of the areas, mobilising the peasants for struggle on those issues, building the peasant organisations, *arming the people with the locally available weapons in the anti-feudal struggles from the very beginning, organising of the village volunteer organisations, people's resistance to landlord-goonda-police violence and repression and thus, create develop and defend areas of sustained resistance, and thus advance to establish the base areas in the countryside.*

The Party Congress has given the following tasks for the towns :

In building the trade union movement *our main direction should be to build the revolutionary trade union movement, politicisation of the workers, ideological and political struggle against legalism and economism, worker-peasant unity, volunteer organisations to resist police-management goondaism and repression, and building of the secret party among workers. Only thus we can unite the workers and make it the conscious leader of the New Democratic Revolution. The main concentration should be in strategic areas and strategic industries.*

These are the most important decisions taken by the Party to build the resistance struggle among the peasants and the workers. The Party Congress has decided the tasks for the students and woman and other middle classes in line with this tactical struggle.

The main aim of the Political Line is to build the resistance struggle.

Our decision to build the Agrarian Revolutionary movement and to build the resistance struggle—these decisions of the Party Congress are based on the basic lessons of the Hunan Report. Today our comrades are implementing these tasks in various parts of the country. They are getting positive results in this struggle and the people's movement is advancing.

Today we are mobilising the people for various class struggles. Hunan Report should act as a guide for us in this task. Comrades should deeply study the Hunan Report based on Marxism-Leninism. Comrades should apply the lessons and the experiences of the Hunan to advancing the revolutionary struggle.

(This article was published in October 81 Road to Liberation)

Studying the Principal Contradiction

Note: While studying Mao's 'On Principal Contradiction', we draw the attention of the comrades to the following factors.

IN the 3rd paragraph, comrade Mao clearly says that 'in capitalist society, the two forces in production, the proletariat and the bourgeoisie, form the principal contradiction'.

This remains the principal contradiction throughout the period for socialist revolution in the capitalist countries. This will change only when any capitalist country is invaded by another imperialist country-into imperialism versus nation.

He has also said that the contradiction between bourgeois democracy and bourgeois fascism is a secondary contradiction which is 'influenced by this principal contradiction'.

Mao wrote this article 'On Contradiction', (the section 'On Principal Contradiction' is a part of it) in 1937, August, just when the European Communist Parties were fighting to build the anti-fascist front. It was in 1935 that Dimitrov's report gave the call for anti-fascist united front. The splitters and their associates and even some sincere comrades claim that Dimitrov's report treated the contradiction between fascism and bourgeois democracy as the principal contradiction, even though there is not a single reference to it in the whole of Dimitrov's report. Let us remember, the CPC was also a party to Dimitrov's report and the resolution on it. It is in 1937, two years after the appearance of Dimitrov's report that comrade Mao is treating the contradiction between the proletariat and the capitalists as the principal contradiction and that the contradiction between bourgeois democracy and bourgeois fascism as the secondary contradiction. This only proves the utter falsity of the position of the splitters and their associates that the contradiction between fascism and bourgeois democracy is the principal contradiction.

While studying the changes in principal contradiction in China look at the following factors.

He has noted the change of principal contradiction during the three periods—One, the period when Chinese society was a feudal society when the principal contradiction was between feudalism and the broad masses of the people. This changed, when imperialism invaded, into imperialism vs. nation. Second, during the period of semi-colonial and semi-feudal society, the principal contradiction was between the alliance of imperialism, bureaucratic capitalism and feudalism and the broad masses of people. This changed with Japanese invasion, into nation versus Japanese imperialism.

This is a complete refutation of the theory that the contradiction between bourgeois fascism and bourgeois democracy can be the principal contradiction.

Mao speaks of three definite periods when the principal contradiction changed in China—feudal society, semi-colonial and semi-feudal society, and the last period when imperialism with the help of its allies is almost in complete control. The PCC's understanding of our principal contradiction being between the alliance of imperialism, bureaucratic monopoly capitalism and feudalism on one hand and the broad masses of the people on the other is based on the teachings of comrade Mao. (22-5-1980)

[This article was published in June 1980, New Democracy.]

Agrarain Revolution Attitude of the Communist Revolutionaries

THE Communist Party of India (Marxist-Leninist) has adopted Marxism-Leninism and Mao Zedong Thought as its guiding ideology to implement its Programme. Our Party Programme aims at overthrowing the dictatorship of the comprador bureaucratic capitalism and feudalism which are agents of imperialism, and establish People's Democracy in our country.

Our aim is to unite the working class, peasantry, urban middle class, and the national bourgeoisie under the leadership of the working class, overthrow reactionary dictatorship of the big bourgeoisie and big land lords and establish People's Democracy.

Our Party's ultimate goal is to overthrow the present capitalist system where one exploits another and establish socialism and communism in India.

Our Party rejects the parliamentary path peddled by the revisionists, neo revisionists and other reactionary reformists in India. All these preach that the Indian parliamentary democracy is an organ which "reflects the people's aspirations" a "path to peaceful transition", and a "peaceful path to socialism".

The history of the struggles of the oppressed people through out the world highlight the fact that the exploiting classes keep the people's economic social and political lives in their grip and would never permit the oppressed people to come to power peacefully. The exploiting classes use the parliamentary democracy as an instrument to hoodwink the people. It is used as a cover to hoodwink people, disrupt the people's struggles, and drench the liberation movements in blood. The people are compelled to resist this barbaric repression.

These are the lessons of the world history.

The experiences of Indian people in their struggle for liberation do not differ from the experience of world history. In the parliamentary democracy also, the just struggles of the oppressed are met with barbaric repression. The ruling classes do not put up with—especially when they are

facing severe crisis—even general resistance to their anti-national, anti people policies.

But rejecting parliamentary path should not be misconstrued to be rejecting the parliamentary struggle. The Communist Party of India (Marxist-Leninist) is of the opinion that it would be wrong not to utilise parliamentary and other legal forms of struggle wherever possible.

The Party should utilise parliamentary and other legal forms of struggle as long as they contribute to the growth of the revolutionary movement.

The CPI(ML) rejects the killing of individuals in the name of annihilation of class enemy as preached practised by the pseudo leftists. This contributes only to distance the revolutionary leadership from the people and ultimately poses a threat to the revolution itself.

Our Party is of the opinion that the Indian revolutionaries should draw relevant lessons from the revolutionary experiences of Russia, China and other countries as well as from experiences of revolutionary struggles of the Indian people.

After making a deep analysis, we have come to the conclusion that in the present stage, the Indian revolution has the main characteristics of the Chinese revolution. But the Chinese revolutionary experiences should not be mechanically applied to the Indian conditions. Depending upon the concrete situation in India, appropriate policies and tactics have to be pursued.

The working class in India have to pursue the line of basing themselves on the peasantry and building revolutionary bases in rural areas, carry on a protracted struggle, and finally liberate the urban areas.

Revolutionary war means the war waged by the people. This people's war can be waged only by mobilising the people. Only when the broad masses are prepared for it and through their own experience, have recognised the need for revolution, we can launch the People's War. For this, we have to observe the main features of the present political situation. The level of people's movement, people's consciousness and the Party's organisational capabilities should be carefully assessed. Only then can correct tactics be formulated and people mobilised, prepared step by step and be turned toward armed struggle and People's War.

The strategic aim of the working class of seizing power can be achieved only through armed struggle. Armed struggle is the higher form of class struggle. To achieve its strategic objective of seizure of power, the working class has to utilise many forms of struggle. Which form of struggle is to be utilised in a given situation is a matter concerning tactics.

Therefore, different sections of oppressed masses should be mobilised into struggles on their economic and political issues ; mass organisations should be built up. We should learn to employ all forms of struggle and to turn these towards armed Agrarian Revolution. Thus the armed struggle will become the main form of struggle. (from the resolution of the Plenum, *Indian Revolution-Path of struggle*).

Our principal task is to achieve People's Democratic Revolution led by the working class through a protracted struggle.

In essence, the People's Democratic Revolution is Agrarian Revolution. In all its phases, led by the working class, the peasantry will be the main force. Agrarian Revolution alone can bring about radical changes in our country. People should be prepared gradually for the Agrarian Revolution. People should be mobilized to defend the areas of resistance struggle under our Party's leadership. People should be mobilised into partial struggles on their immediate economic and political demands, especially into anti feudal struggles. Taking as the basis the six-point-programme enunciated in the Party's Path (document), the peasantry and the working class should be rallied into anti feudal struggles and struggles against exploitation and oppression. The movement should be extended to strategic rural areas and strategic industrial centres. As enunciated in the Central Committee resolution, they should be orientated towards the growth of Agrarian Revolution. Our Party units in all states should concentrate on developing anti feudal struggles, and especially on mobilising agricultural labourers and poor peasants.

Thus our Party's base would be all the forces that could be united, with the main being the peasantry.

Some claim that our participation in elections is nothing but forsaking the path of Agrarian Revolution. This is nothing but a lie.

We have, through our practice, come to the decision to participate in the elections. Practice has brought to the fore the fact that the decision of the party to boycott elections is not in tune with the level of people's consciousness and the level of people's movement. So we have learnt through practice that Party's earlier decision to boycott elections goes against the principles of Marxism-Leninism. Participation in elections and boycott of elections serve the same task of advancing the revolutionary movement. It was proved in practice that the people are not prepared to boycott elections and take to a higher form of struggle.

We participated in the elections to prapogate our Party's programme extensively among the people as well as to focus the people's attention on immediate economic and political issues, isolate the principal enemy from the people and defeat him. We are participating in the elections mainly to take forward people's movement and not to get a few seats in Assemblies and the parliament by opportunist electoral alliances.

In the present phase, participating in the elections and advancing Agrarian Revolutionary struggle are not mutually opposed aspects. To advance the anti imperialist and anti feudal struggles we have to properly co-ordinate the parliamentary and non-parliamentary struggles.

The important task in the present stage is the struggle being waged for civil liberties and for the unconditional release of Communist Revolutionaries and other political prisoners.

At the same time we have to utilise all legal opportunities to take forward the peoples,—workers, peasantry's, students, and middle class employees,—struggles.

As the struggles spurt, the repression on the movement and the Party will increase. So we should not harbour any legal illusions.

So, the Party should utilise, at all levels, all forms of struggles. It should be prepared to face any eventuality, twists and turns in the situation. (From the Report to the Plenum of the Central Committee).

(This article was first published in 1-2-1978 Vimochana).



Chinese Communist Party's Struggle against Left and Right deviations – Mao's Lessons—Relevance to India

Under the leadership of com. Mao, Communist Party of China fought against the left & right deviations which raised their heads in the Party. This relentless struggle was conducted based on Marxism-Leninism. Only by conducting struggle against these trends could the Communist Party of China make success the Chinese revolution and build socialist society.

In China, during the 1927 bourgeois revolution, the rightist Chen Tu Shi leadership came forward with the arguments that the bourgeois democratic revolution was already completed in China, that the bourgeoisie achieved administrative stability and capitalism has attained prominent role in Chinese social set-up and is on the path of peaceful development, and therefore, all struggles for socialist revolution should be postponed. They argued that legal agitational programme should be taken up for convening of the National Congress. They depicted the Red Army movement as a rebellion of roving bands.

With the formation of anti-Japanese united front in 1937, the right trend again cropped up. The Communist Party of China and the Kuomintang Party formed an anti-Japanese united front, the rightists did not recognise the need to fight against the vacillations of the bourgeoisie while safe-guarding the united front and implementing the programme of anti-Japanese united front.

The defeat of the 1927 bourgeois revolution gave rise to left deviation in the Communist Party of China. This left deviation stemmed from the frustration with the line pursued by the rightists and the state repression. In the latter half of 1929, left deviation raised its head once again. This trend is the Li Li San line. For the third time, left deviation cropped up between 1931 and 1935. Led by comrade Mao, the Communist Party of China could defeat the right and left deviations.

Com. Mao has deeply analysed the right and left deviations in the Communist Party of China in his pamphlet *The present situation-our study* with special reference to the left deviation in the Communist Party of China,

He analysed the mistakes committed in the military, political and ideological aspect due to this left deviation. He analysed the social circumstances which gave rise to this left deviation and formulated tactics to combat it.

We, the Communist Revolutionaries fought against revisionsm and neo revisionism, separated ourselves from them and embarked upon the path of armed struggle. We took to people's war path based on Marxism-Leninism, Mao Zedong thought. At that time, the Charu group's adventurist politics caused immense damage to the path of people's war in India. The Communist Revolutionaries have to wage a serious ideological and political struggle against Charu Marumdar group's adventurist political line. The social base of their left adventurism has to be analysed and correct organisational methods to combat this should be adopted. In this respect, com. Mao's analysis of the left deviation in the Communist Party of China will be immensely useful for us.

Therefore, we are reproducing here briefly, the analysis of Mao on the left deviation in his pamphlet "Our study and observation".

The left deviation which raised its head in the Communist Party made severe mistakes in the political, military, and ideological aspects. Let us study them one by one.

1. Mistakes in Political aspects

Mao had made the following formulations in main, on the then political situation in China. China is a vast semi colonial, semi feudal country. The Chinese Revolution was taking place at a time when the socialist revolution in Russia, under the leadership of working class had been successful in the post-First World War period and when the Chinese working class have become politically conscious and have come into the battle field. Therefore, this revolution will be an anti feudal, anti imperialist revolution under the leadership of the proletariat. That is, the Chinese revolution will be a New Democratic Revolution under the leadership of the working class.

In China, different imperialist countries have joined hands with the local big bourgeois, big landlord classes to create their areas of influence and exploit. Therefore the development of China, economically and politically, will be uneven and so, the New Democratic Revolution in China will develop unevenly, necessitating a protracted struggle to acheive New Democracy.

The contradictions between different imperialist countries were reflected as the contradictions between different groups of China's ruling classes. Utilising these contradictions among the ruling classes, armed revolutionary bases can be built in the China's rural areas,

These correct formulations of Comrade Mao were rejected by both the right and the left deviationists. Especially the left deviationists opposed these correct formulations of Comrade Mao.

Comrade Mao gave these principal formulations regarding Chinese Revolution. China's New Democratic Revolution is an anti imperialist, anti feudal revolution. The main content of this revolution is the struggle for land.

China's New Democratic Revolution is the Agrarian Revolution for the working class. Only after clinching the New Democratic Revolution can China achieve socialist revolution.

After the failure of the revolution in urban areas, the importance of the Armed Agrarian Revolution in the rural areas increased. But without the leadership of the working class, this Armed Agrarian Revolution is bound to fail. In spite of the treachery of the big bourgeoisie to revolution, we should differentiate the liberal bourgeoisie and the comprador bourgeoisie. Some sections of the bourgeoisie will have anti imperialist character and non-partisan groups which do not join hands with any imperialists should be won-over as an ally of the revolution, or be made neutral. Likewise efforts should be made to win over the middle and rich peasants in the rural areas to the revolution.

But the left adventurists have rejected these correct formulations of Comrade Mao on Chinese Revolution. They have committed mistakes on several counts. On the political plane, the left deviationists made three mistakes.

Mistakes about the tasks of New Democratic Revolution and the Socialist revolution

The leftists have correctly pointed out some tasks of democratic nature but failed to distinguish between the tasks of the New Democratic Revolution and the socialist revolution. They set out to take up some tasks to be fulfilled in the socialist revolution during the New Democratic Revolution itself. They have under-estimated the decisive role of the anti feudal struggle of the peasantry in the New Democratic Revolution. They gave a call to fight against all sections of the bourgeoisie and the upper strata of the petty bourgeoisie, in the stage of the New Democratic Revolution.

They equated the struggle against the bourgeoisie with the anti feudal anti imperialist struggle. They refused to acknowledge the existence of a united front. They mainly over-stressed the need to fight against

ed to see the major change that came in the class relations society owing to the Japanese imperialist aggression on

China on September 18, 1931. Without making any attempts to strike friendship with the centrist group on the issue of resisting the Japanese aggression, they described this group as a very dangerous enemy.

At the same time the left adventurists have brought forward some tasks correctly. They said that Party should lead the peasant's struggle for land; that people's power should be established at different levels; that the Kuomintang government's onslaught should be met with armed resistance. In spite of identifying these correct tasks, due to their left deviation, they failed to see the Red Army movement as a peasant movement under the leadership of the working class.

They wrongly named the movement of the Red Army as 'Peasant capitalism, and 'the path of the rich peasants' and flayed it. They set out to achieve the tasks beyond the stage of New Democratic Revolution. They set out to remove the rich peasants completely from the national economy and to dislodge all sorts of exploiters from positions of political power. They adopted a parochial attitude towards the intellectuals. They said that only regular soliders from the enemy's army should be inducted into Red Army but not their officers. They were rash and hasty in erradicating the counter revolutionaries. Due to this line pursued by the left adventurists, the revolutionary forces were distanced from the people and the Red Army movement suffered severe setbacks. Due to the left line, the people's movements led by Party in the areas under Kuomintang government's control also suffered setbacks. The programme to bring all the anti-imperialist big bourgeois, big landlord, middle classes and centrist groups into an anti-Japanese front has met with failure.

2. On Guerilla warfare & revolutionary bases

The left adventurists rejected the Agrarian Revolutionary war and the building of revolutionary bases. But Mao's analysis of the Chinese society is as follows:

China is a semi feudal, semi colonial country. It is a vast country and a country with uneven economic and political development. It is divided into various areas of influence of different imperialist countries and the contradictions between different imperialists have created divisions among the Chinese ruling classes. This resulted in the frequent wars among the Chinese ruling classes. The country's economy is modelled on the economic self sufficiency of the villages. China is an agricultural country. There isn't even nominal democracy in the country.

In a country with such characteristics, armed struggle will be the main form of struggle. The main organisational form of this struggle will be the Red army consisting of the peasantry.

The revolutionary bases established in the rural areas by utilising contradictions among the ruling classes and the economic self sufficiency of villages, will serve as inspiring models for nationwide revolution.

The revolutionary bases will be established by first liberating the rural areas. Ultimately urban areas will be liberated. In the areas of Kuomintang rule, by utilising the legal opportunities, the Party should penetrate into the masses through underground activities. Movements should be built up on all issues and the programme of mobilising our forces in Kuomintang controlled towns also should be taken up.

Till the time the revolutionary forces are strong enough to launch an attack on the towns from the rural areas, people in towns should be mobilised and organised through underground activities. Till then we should be in a defensive stage in the towns. Till the time the revolutionary forces are strong enough to launch attack on the towns, we should pay more attention to rural areas.

These correct formulations of Mao were rejected by the left adventurists. They under-estimated the role of peasant guerillas. They did not recognise the need to build revolutionary bases. They called it 'Peasant's bigoted theory' and rejected it. They said that the working class should seize power in one or more states mainly through urban armed insurrection of workers, and then go on to complete the revolution nation-wide.

Consequently, the movement led by the Party in the urban areas as well as rural areas suffered severe setbacks due to this left adventurist line.

As result of the setbacks in urban areas, they shifted their bases to the rural areas. In spite of the failure of their line, they did not rectify their adventurist programme. They rejected the principles of guerilla struggle utilised by the Red Army and the principles of mobile warfare and implemented the principles of regular warfare in their place. By then, the Red Army has gained some practice in guerilla warfare and tactics.

The left adventurists opposed guerilla warfare and stressed more on the methods of positional warfare. Without taking into consideration the strength of the enemy and that of the revolutionary forces, and without taking care of conservation of the human and material resources of Red Army into consideration, they went for a head-on confrontation and decisive battles. As a result the Red Army suffered severe losses in rural areas.

3. On tactics of offense and defence

Com. Mao made the following correct formulations on the issues of offence and defence.

The question of offence or defence should be decided based on proper assessment of national situation. On the national level, the revolutionary forces are weak. After the failure of the revolution in 1927, the advance of the revolutionary forces lost momentum. In such a situation, adventurist tactics will further harm the movement. On the national level, the enemy's

forces are strong and the revolutionary forces weak. Therefore revolutionary bases should be created in the rural areas and the revolutionary movement throughout the country should be advanced.

Basing himself on these assessments, Com. Mao formulated the following tactics of offence and defence.

When the contradictions between the ruling classes become acute and situation becomes unstable, we should advance. We should adopt tactics for the offensive on the enemy. When the ruling classes achieve stability we have to adopt defensive tactics to withstand the enemy's assault. Taking into consideration the impact of revolution on different sections of enemy classes, we have to pursue different tactics towards different sections of enemy camp. We have to utilise the contradictions among the enemy classes, reduce the enemy camp as far as possible, divide the enemy, and strike. The majority should be won over to our side. In the areas of Kuomintang rule, especially in cities, we have to keep in consideration the enemy's strength and adopt defensive tactics.

In the areas of Kuomintang rule, people should be mobilised through legal activities. Our forces should be concentrated through building the underground party organisation. No adventurist struggles or decisive battles should be launched till the situation throughout the country is favourable to the revolutionary forces. The people's movement should be carried forward by taking up the problems in each area and giving slogans and struggle forms relevant to the level of people's consciousness in that particular area. If the people of a particular area come forward into struggle on an issue, we have to decide, taking into consideration the consciousness of the people in that area, and the national situation, whether to take the struggle to a higher level or keep it in low-key.

The left adventurists have failed to assess the post-1927 Revolution political situation correctly. They failed to assess the strength of the enemy and that of the revolutionary forces. They failed to see the contradictions among the ruling classes. They over-estimated the strength of the revolutionary forces and under-estimated that of the enemy forces and resorted to attacks on the enemy.

They took recourse to offensive when the situation necessitated defence, and defensive tactics when offensive was required. They went to the extent of assessing the whole situation basing on only one aspect of the whole.

They failed to see the difference between various regions and the uneven development throughout the country and consequently called for uniform tactics throughout the country. They utilised same tactics for both border and central areas of the revolutionary bases without making a distinction between them. Likewise, they failed to distinguish the rural

areas from the towns and took to adventurist activities in towns. They failed to make a distinction between Liberated Areas and Kuomintang areas and adopted similar tactics in both the areas.

Especially in the towns where the enemy was strong, instead of adopting defensive tactics they gave calls for struggle at inopportune times when victory was impossible. They started to build mass organisations not based on the people. It had been common to give calls for struggles—political strikes, general strikes, students' strikes, traders' strikes, police strikes, processions and even for armed struggle in which people would not participate. Such wrong tactics led to setbacks to the movement in urban as well as rural areas.

2. Mistakes in Military Aspects

Comrade Mao said that the political struggle in China takes the form of armed combat. He formulated a military line which was in consonance with the political line of the party. This military line is based on two principles.

The Red Army should be guided by proletarian ideology. It should contribute to the growth of people's movement and establishment of the revolutionary bases.

Depending upon the people, taking into consideration the enemy's strength and the weaknesses of the revolutionary movement and utilising the divisions in the enemies, the Red Army should protect itself from the enemy's onslaughts and develop.

To implement the first principle, the Red Army should implement the Party's programme. It should reject the pure military attitude and also the roving rebel bands theory.

The Red Army has to fulfill three main tasks—waging military war, continuing people's programmes, and collection of funds for War.

The Red Army should work as an agitator among the people on behalf of the party. It should strive to establish people's political power. It should assist the people's struggle for land. It should assist in the efforts to mobilise people's armed strength, to establish political power and to establish party organisations. It should respect organs of people's political power and mass organisations and raise their stature. It should maintain strict discipline and implement democracy to certain extent in the Red Army. Proper relationship should be maintained between the officers and the soldiers. Continuous efforts should be made to win over the enemy armies to our side.

To implement the second aspect principles of protracted war should be adopted. The main forms of struggle should be guerilla and mobile warfare. The main contingents for the Red Army should fight jointly with

the local armed units. The local armed units should join with the people and fight.

Small skirmishes which continue for a long time or major battles with decisive results should not be the Red Army's principle. On the contrary, Red Army should wage small battles which yield quick results and the protracted struggles for decisive struggles. The military tactic of splitting a part of enemy's army and concentrating large numbers of Red Army and annihilating it should be followed.

Red Army should follow the following guerilla tactics.

- While attacking the enemy our forces should be centralised; while propagating among people our forces should be decentralised.
- When the enemy advances, Red Army should retreat,
- When the enemy rests, Red Army should harass,
- When the enemy is tired, Red Army should attack,
- When the enemy retreats, Red Army should pursue.

But the left adventurists rejected these principles. In the first two stages when left adventurism raised its head, they did not have a clear cut military strategy. For the third time they formulated clearly some military tactics.

They confined the Red Army to the task of fighting only. They failed to establish proper relations between the soldiers and officers, the government and the Army, Army and the people.

They opposed the guerilla character of the Red Army and introduced the positional warfare methods more than needed: they opposed the guerilla mobile tactics and introduced positional warfare tactics. Without taking into consideration the weakness of the revolutionary forces and the strength of the enemy forces, they resorted to combats which yielded quick results and said that enemy should be attacked from all sides simultaneously. They opposed the tactic that when the Red Army is attacking superior enemy force, it should wait till the enemy forces enter the region favourable to us, and then strike. They proposed the positional warfare and dig-in-and-fight tactics for Red Army. The left adventurists implemented centralised military command principles. In sum, the left adventurists opposed the principles of Protracted People's War.

By adopting the positional warfare tactics during the Koumintang government's Fifth *encirclement and suppression* Campaign, they caused severe losses to Red Army.

3. Mistakes in Organisational Aspects

Comrade Mao formulated that "From the people, to the people" is the correct political line.

To put it into practice, close ties should be established not only with the people outside Party but also with the people within the Party-fold. This means higher committees forging closer ties with primary members of the party and with the cadres. Mao has developed the Party building into a concrete principle comprising of ideological and political aspects. He strove to establish the leadership of the proletarian ideology as opposed to pure military outlook, subjective individualism, egalitarianism which raise their heads in the Party.

He made efforts to inculcate democratic centralism in the Party. He fought against unnecessary restrictions on democracy in the Party and on centralism in the Party.

He implemented the principle that a part should be subordinate to the whole. He made efforts to establish proper relationship between old and new cadres, local and non-local cadres, between cadres working in the Army and the people and between the cadres working in different fronts.

He developed the principle that the truth is, at all times paramount and should be implemented. He implemented the principles that every member, every organisation should be subordinate to the party discipline.

He introduced proper organisational norms to achieve internal unity and carry on the inner party struggle as wrong political line leads to wrong organisational line. The left adventurists opposed Mao's correct political line and the correct organisational line formulated by him.

The left adventurists introduced sectarian organisational methods. This resulted in not only party being distanced from people but also in leadership organs being distanced from party members and cadres. They branded as "rightists" all those opposed to their erroneous political line and set out to take disciplinary action against them. They treated all these almost as criminals and enemies.

They utilised all the inner party struggles to boost the influence and image of left adventurists and to usurp the responsible committees.

They defied principles of democratic centralism and set aside the principles (democratic) of criticism, self-criticism. They encouraged the trend of blind followers.

They took narrow sectarian attitude towards the cadres. They implemented in a vulgar manner the principle that cadres from working class should be in leading positions, without taking into consideration other aspects. When the senior comrades who have been working in the party since a long time and who have made many sacrifices opposed their wrong line, the left adventurists attempted to remove all of them from the leadership positions and fill the committees with their new blind followers.

In the name of cleaning of the enemy agents, many loyal comrades were expelled from the party on false allegations.

Owing to such wrong organisational line, the Party has become splintered and factions have come into existence, and the Party has become isolated from the people.

4. Ideological mistakes

The political, organisation and the military line formulated by comrade Mao was based on Marxism and Leninism. The universal truth of Marxism and Leninism was applied to the concrete conditions of the Chinese revolution.

But the left ideologues depended on theory without practice and practice without theory. These left ideologues, preaching theory without practice never cared to study in depth, the concrete conditions of China and apply Marxist-Leninist principles to the concrete conditions in China. They banked on their superficial bookish knowledge and not on the concrete Chinese conditions.

They lifted a principle from here and a principle from there from the books but never cared to find out whether they are applicable to Chinese conditions or not. So their theories became theories divorced from reality. As a result, their line has become isolated from the people and caused immense damage to people's movement and the Party.

The ideologues without practice joined hands with ideologues without theory (empiricists). The empiricists are also dependent on subjective thinking. They did not recognise the importance of theory and depended only on the practice—that too only on their own practice, without taking other's practice into consideration.

They were indifferent to other's criticism and yet never cared to undergo self-criticism. They gave prominence to day to day functioning, and to activities which did not require serious thinking. Thus the ideologues without practice and the empiricists could unite. Both of them did not depend on the concrete Chinese conditions.

Both failed to apply the universal truth of Marxism-Leninism to the concrete conditions of Chinese Revolution.

Both took a path opposed to dialectics and historical materialism.

Both regarded the relative, partial truth as universal and comprehensive truth.

The theories of both were divorced from Chinese reality. Consequently, due to their left adventurism, many hard-won victories of people and

Party members in both Kuomintang areas as well as Liberated Areas were nullified.

Social base of left Sectarianism

The Social conditions in a society give rise to both left and right deviations in the Party.

The Capitalist society influences the rise of right deviation in the Party while the petty bourgeois social conditions give rise to left deviations.

In general, there is a danger of right deviation cropping up when the working class forms a united front with the bourgeoisie and of the left deviation when the working class goes into struggle against the bourgeoisie.

Both these wrong trends damage the Party. The correct line formulated by com. Mao is based on the proletarian ideology. The line formulated by the left deviationists is based on petty bourgeois concept of democracy.

China, a vast semi feudal semi colonial country, has large number of petty bourgeois population. As a result the Communist Party of China had to function amidst petty bourgeois social conditions. More over, a large number of the members of the Communist Party hail from the ranks of the petty bourgeoisie.

The firstever triumph of the proletarian revolution in Russia signalled the victory of Marxism-Leninism over all other theories, the world over all. As a result of this victory and due to political and social conditions in China, especially due to the growth of Communist Party of China and the Kuomintang Party, there was no chance for a petty bourgeois political party to develop. So, not only due to economic conditions but also due to social conditions there is a danger of the working class being influenced by petty bourgeois theories.

So it is not surprising that various petty bourgeois theories and trends have raised their heads in the Communist Party of China.

Apart from peasantry, China has a large number of petty bourgeois population in cities and towns. All of them are being exploited in many forms. All of them are yearning for emancipation from exploitation and for economic and political democracy.

The petty bourgeoisie is a class which is constantly changing. This class has two characteristics.

The majority of this petty bourgeoisie are of revolutionary temperament and can be influenced by the proletarian ideology and can join hands with the working class in the fight for democratic revolution.

On the other hand, they have some weaknesses which set them apart from working class. There is a risk of them going under the leadership of the liberal bourgeoisie or the big bourgeoisie in the absence of proper proletarian leadership.

Therefore the working class should adopt proper attitude towards petty bourgeoisie. The working class should work with perseverance and vigilance to form a united front with the petty bourgeoisie in the fight against the exploiting classes. On the other hand, it should resolutely oppose the petty bourgeois trends exhibited by the some members who joined the Communist Party. An ideological struggle should be carried out and we should work with perseverance to mould them into real communists committed to Marxism-Leninism.

If the Party does not carry out a resolute inner-Party ideological struggle against the petty bourgeois trends, there is a chance of the whole Party going into the hands of the petty bourgeoisie. The petty bourgeois thinking is reflected in three aspects.

1. Subjectivism

The petty bourgeois intellectuals base themselves on subjective thoughts which differ from reality. When they study an issue, they do not analyse it from all angles but basing on the aspect they desire, come to a conclusion and decide the whole programme. They base mainly not on the actual conditions and the strength of different classes in reality, but on their desires and subjective thinking. They do not have practice and experience but only bookish knowledge. They are the theoreticians who have neither practice nor direct connection with production.

2. Vacillation

Due to the nature of living conditions of the petty bourgeoisie, they vacillate between the leftists and rightists. Most of the petty bourgeois democrats yearn to conclude the revolution as quickly as possible to better their living conditions. Thereby, they are attracted by the revolutionary 'left' slogans. They do not have patience to carry out the protracted revolutionary struggle and frequently succumb to adventurist ideas and practice. When such ideas and trends are reflected in the Party, there is a danger of left deviation rising its ugly head in the Party.

While they themselves resort to adventurist actions, when the movement suffers severe setbacks and the revolutionary forces should make a planned retreat, they get frustrated and run away. In such situations they are even willing to become an appendage of the bourgeoisie.

3. Anti-organisational methods

The petty bourgeois intellectuals, due to their thinking and background, exhibit individualism in the organisational issues. As a result they get isolated from people and exhibit wrong traits such as bossism, abuse of disciplining powers, individual heroism, anarchism, liberalism and ultra-democracy. They are responsible for factionalism and disruption of the Party.

Ideologically, the petty bourgeois left adventurers exhibit subjectivism. Politically they swing between the left and the right. Organisationally they exhibit a tendency to form factions.

The Party has to wage a fierce ideological struggle against all such wrong trends. But while waging this inner-party struggle, attention should be paid to the following aspects.

1) More attention should be paid to the political and economic conditions which gave rise to wrong trends in the Party and to formulate appropriate forms to combat these alien trends but the role of the individuals who lead these tendencies should not be stressed much.

2) The inner-party struggle should be able to give clarity to the party members on the issues facing the Party, to draw lessons from the previous experiences and not repeat such mistakes in the future and unite the Party rank and file to achieve the aim of the collective struggle.

3) The Party should be prepared to encourage all the comrades who recognised their mistakes and are attempting to rectify them and unite with them and work. Even those who have not fully recognised their mistakes, and have not made serious attempts to rectify them, should unite with others who have not made such mistakes and work.

When fighting a wrong trend, while differentiating between the wrong line and correct line, we should see the agreeable point between those who are following a wrong line and the correct line.

4) Party unity can be developed only by intensifying the internal ideological struggle based on Marxism-Leninism and combating the right and left deviations which raise their ugly heads in the Party. At the same time, the Party should make serious attempts to clear the traits which hinder Party unity and also those which crop up between Party comrades and can cause misunderstandings.

5) Occasionally, the understanding and mutual respect between comrades in different fronts breaks down, giving rise to difference of opinion between Party members. The root of this lies in the fact that the comrades work in different regions and that the nature of programme varies. The Party should strive to remove these difference of opinions by proper political education.

6) Sometimes difference of opinion of another kind crops up between comrades.

Some comrades feel dejected when they make mistakes. Some others feel proud of the successes they achieved in their programme. Those who have little experience in struggle try to evade things while comrades who have long experience pose as if they know everything. Comrades from peasant and working class background feel proud of their class nature and look down on intellectuals. On the other hand, the intellectuals are proud of their smartness and look down on peasant and working class comrades. The comrades who gain expertise in a particular work look down on others. The youth look down on the older comrades and the older comrades feel superior due to their experience and look down at the new, inexperienced comrades.

By launching a critical struggle against such wrong trends alone, by giving proper political education alone can such wrong trends be eradicated in the Party members and full unity of the Party achieved.

Charu Mazumdar group's adventurism

In the above article, comrade Mao has made a deep analysis of the left mistakes in the Communist Party of China.

In India, the Communist Party was subjected, time and again, to left and right deviations. Mainly in the last 20 years, it was subjected to the mistakes of revisionism and neo-revisionism. It is only in the recent times that the Communist Revolutionaries have broken off from revisionism and neo-revisionism, based themselves on Marxism-Leninism. They started to organise the people for armed struggle through the People's War path. In some states the armed peasant struggles at different levels, are being conducted under the leadership of the Communist Revolutionaries. The frustration with revisionism in Party for many years, the frustration with the exploitation and repression of the big bourgeois big landlord Congress government were the root cause of the Charu Mazumdar group taking to left adventurist policies in applying the People's War path in India. This caused severe damage to the people's movements in some areas. Charu Mazumdar group adopted left adventurism in political, organisational issues and in struggle tactics. We have to deeply analyse Charu group's left adventurist line and draw appropriate lessons. Similarly, some left errors were committed in the armed peasant struggle also. We have to analyse them. We have mentioned clearly about the left errors committed in our movement in the document "Two Years of Armed Struggle—Our experiences".

We are of the opinion that the Charu Mazumdar group made the following mistakes in tactics of struggle and in organisational and political issues.

Political line

India is a neo colonial country serving as a base for neo colonial exploitation mainly of U.S. imperialism and Russian Social imperialism. At the same time the British imperialists are still continuing their neo colonial exploitation. In addition to these, the investments of Japan and Germany are increasing. The Charu Mazumdar group are noticing only the prominent neo colonial exploiters—U.S. & U.S.S.R., and not the British, Japanese, German imperialists and thus are not recognising the reality. That is they are failing to observe the growing contradictions among the imperialists on the question of exploiting India.

Though they stated in their documents that India is, at present, in the stage of People's Democratic Revolution, they are putting forth, in practice, at this stage only, some tasks which ought to be taken up in the stage of Socialist Revolution. They are pursuing adventurist, sectarian line towards the national bourgeoisie, minor landlords and the rich peasantry who should be united in our fight against the imperialism, big bourgeoisie and the big landlords. They are taking an uncompromising struggle line with these sections in the present stage itself. This group's criticism of this aspect in our immediate programme amply proves this.

Revolutionary bases

In words the Charu Mazumdar group has adopted the People's War path and the path of Protracted People's War, of establishing Liberated Areas in the rural areas through Armed Agrarian Revolutionary struggle, and gradually liberating rural areas first and finally liberating the towns. But in practice they made wrong formulations regarding the the importance of establishing revolutionary bases in rural areas.

Taking into consideration the level of the struggles in our country, the primary importance should be given to hilly terrains, forests and mountains which have natural protection, a weak administrative machinery and where the worst form of feudal exploitation is perpetuated. But they rejected this and came to a conclusion that from now itself Liberated Areas can be established anywhere in the plain areas. They ridiculed the correct perspective being put into practice by the Andhra Pradesh Revolutionary Communists as 'jungle theory'.

They abandoned the principle that only by mobilising the people for Armed Agrarian Revolution and by building a strong Red Army can the Liberated Areas be built in the rural areas. In practice, they have pursued the wrong policy that Liberated Area can be formed in a region by some militant youths forming armed squads and killing some landlords as individuals.

As the people's movements in rural areas suffered severe losses due to their adventurist actions, they left rural areas and took to open attacks in a metropolitan city like Calcutta. The programme of attacks in Calcutta city was nothing but the culmination of their adventurist actions.

The above points make clear how faulty their understanding of People's War path and Liberated Areas is.

Tactics of Struggle

India is world's second largest populated country. It is a vast semi feudal, semi colonial country. Due to the exploitative policies of big bourgeoisie and the imperialists, its development economically and politically, is uneven. Owing to this, the people's movements struggles in different areas are developing unevenly.

Though the people are discontented with the exploitative policies of the big bourgeois, big landlord governments in the country, though a revolutionary situation exists in the country, the people's movements, people's struggles, people's consciousness have not developed to such level where the people from different regions will today itself directly participate in the revolutionary struggle to overthrow the Congress government. In some regions the people's movements have highly developed and assumed the form of armed struggle. In some other regions, there are no people's movements. People from the majority areas in our country are still divided under the influence of bourgeois, petty bourgeois parties, the revisionists and neo revisionists. Taking into consideration these facts, the Communist Revolutionaries should adopt different tactics of struggle to mobilise people from different areas into Armed Agrarian Revolution.

But the Charu Mazumdar group did not take into consideration these realities. They refused to recognise the fact that the people's consciousness, movement and struggles are developing unevenly. They are unable to grasp the reality that we have to work with patience for people from different areas to directly participate in the armed struggle and for this end we have to apply different tactics of struggle for different areas. They are estimating as if all the areas in the country are prepared to respond to the call for an armed struggle. They are estimating as if the people are no longer under the influence of bourgeois, petty bourgeois and the two revisionist parties and as if these parties are already isolated from the people. Therefore, they are applying the same principle—attacks on individuals belonging to exploiting classes by squads consisting of militant youth in the name of annihilation of class enemies—to the people from all areas, towns as well as rural areas. As a consequence, the movements under their leadership in different areas have suffered severe losses.

Undoubtedly in India, the main form of struggle will be **armed struggle** and the main form of organisation will be **Red Army organisation**. At the same time, all mass agitational forms and mass organisations which contribute to the **armed struggle** should be linked up by the **Communist Revolutionaries**.

But Charu Mazumdar group rejected this basic principle. They formulated the attacks on the enemies by some individuals forming **armed squads** as the main form of struggle. They rejected people's agitations on immediate issues and formation of mass organisations.

They are labelling all those who advocate linking of **armed struggle** with political agitations as well as people's agitations on people's issues and building up of mass organisation as **revisionists** and **economicists**. They are wrongly claiming that in the prevailing conditions in India, there is no need for people's agitations on their issues and for mass organisations and that **armed squad's** actions on individuals will achieve everything.

People's War means the direct participation of people in the struggle. Only then will it be **people's war** in the real sense of the word. **Armed Agrarian Revolution** is the crux of our **People's War**. In the present stage, keeping in view the consciousness of the people, by propagating politics of **armed struggle** extensively among the people and by organising people into **anti feudal class struggles** alone, through their own concrete practice, can people be mobilised into the **Armed Agrarian Revolution**. The Charu group, refusing to see this reality, are obstinately contending that propagation of politics of **armed revolution** and the programme of **annihilation of class enemies** alone will mobilise people into the struggle.

Similarly they are refusing to see that the working class and the middle classes in the towns can be mobilised into path of **People's War** by mobilising them into **class struggles** against the exploitation of the big bourgeoisie along with propagation of politics of **armed struggle**. In the present phase of the struggle, the key task of the **Communist Revolutionaries** is to organise for **Armed Agrarian Revolution**, thereby make efforts to build **revolutionary bases** in the rural areas. By liberating the rural areas first and mobilising adequate strength, the towns should be liberated finally. Till the situation matures, the **Communist Revolutionaries** in towns should carry out the task of building an **underground Party apparatus**, mobilise people from different walks of life into **class struggles**, join the propagation of politics of **armed struggle** with these, make efforts to bring people towards **armed struggle** with great perseverance and determination. Till the **Communist Revolutionaries** gain strength to launch assault on the urban areas from rural areas, we have to work with perseverance, preserve ourselves and carry on **underground activities**. Till we gain such strength we should develop our skills to evade a **head-on confrontation** or **do-or-die battles** with the enemy.

But Charu Mazumdar group is rejecting this basic principle. Not only are they rejecting the task of mobilising urban masses into class struggles but also are giving more stress on attacks on the enemies. As a result they are suffering severe losses.

We have to correctly assess our strength and the enemy's strength always and adopt the correct tactics of 'offensive and defensive'. Only then can the Communist Revolutionaries become a mighty force from a small force. But the Charu Mazumdar group, rejecting this basic principle, are under-estimating the enemy's strength, over-estimating their strength and without any regard for 'defensive' tactics are obstinately implementing only the 'offensive' tactics in towns as well as in rural areas. Thus they have only taken to the path of "left" adventurism. As a result, the people's movement under their leadership, cannot but suffer severe losses.

All the above mentioned facts make it clear the path pursued by the Charu Mazumdar group is not the path of People's War but of individual terrorism.

Organisational Mistakes

As the line pursued by Charu Mazumdar group is politically, tactically wrong, the same is reflected in the organisational line.

In different states the Communist Revolutionary groups broke off from neo revisionism and are functioning based on Marxism - Leninism-Mao Thought. As the movements in different states are developing unevenly, and as the programme of applying People's War path to different areas is new, it is but natural for difference of opinions to crop up between Communist Revolutionary groups. So the Communist Revolutionary groups should patiently discuss their experiences, remove the differences, formulate the path of People's War as applicable to the whole of India. The unity between Communist Revolutionary groups should be forged through such discussions and practice oriented programmes. Only then can a communist party based on Marxism Leninism Mao Thought be built up. This is one of the key tasks of Communist Revolutionaries in the present stage.

But Charu Mazumdar group behaved in an irresponsible way towards this key task. They attempted to impose, without any discussions, their left adventurist line on other groups. They branded as revisionists and rightists all those opposed to their erroneous, left line. They attempted to expel from the party all, except those who blindly follow their wrong policies. The leadership of this group, from the beginning, abandoned the principles of democratic centralism and has been exhibiting factionalism. Consequently it failed to achieve unity of different groups

in the country; The subsequent events show that finally, as a result of the bossism (tyrannicism) and lack of democratic discussions, the Charu Mazumdar group broke into splinter groups.

Based on Mao's formulations on left deviation, we have to analyse the adventurist policies of Charu Mazumdar group, draw appropriate lessons and check the recurrence of these mistakes in the revolutionary movement.

The risk of left adventurism raising its ugly head time and again exists due to the petty bourgeois social conditions in India and due to the fact that many of the petty bourgeois individuals who joined Communist Revolutionaries are in leading positions. All party members should recognise that by properly educating the party members on Marxism-Leninism and Mao Thought and by giving deeper understanding of the path of People's War, and adopting proper organisational methods of democratic centralism and methods of criticism and self criticism alone can the left adventurist trends be defeated.

(This article was published in JANASHAKTI September 1972).

Agrarian Revolution and Elections

Agrarian Revolution and Elections

Applying the theory of Differentiation of the Three Worlds theory proposed by comrade Mao to both international and national situations, the latest Provisional Central Committee (PCC) *Our tasks in the present situation* of 30-1-80, has correctly characterised that "Soviet Union is a greater danger to our people, both internationally and nationally and therefore a greater enemy of the Indian people." The P.C.C. resolution has also correctly stated that :

Soviet Union and its allies, the present Indira Congress government, the leadership of the CPI and CPM, with their revisionism and support to Soviet Union and the pro-Soviet elements in other parties, should be taken as the greater danger. In the context of the present world situation, when the danger of a new world war from the Soviet Union is increasing, the presence of pro-Soviet Indira Congress govt. in the centre; and the CPM-CPI in the opposition faithfully serving the interests of the Soviet Union constitute the greater danger and are the greater enemies of the Indian people.

The Marxists-Leninists, all the revolutionary groups in India have rejected the path of parliamentarism and have adopted the path of People's War as the only path to achieve New Democratic Revolution under the leadership of the working class. The latest P.C.C. resolution has clearly stated that "in our country, Protracted People's War has to be conducted mainly in the form of Armed Agrarian Revolution".

To achieve this strategic objective, the PCC resolution has asked the Party to mobilise all the sections of the people—the workers, peasants, students and govt. employees on their immediate economic and political issues combined with the propagation of revolutionary politics of Agrarian Revolution to intensify the people's struggles.

The PCC resolution has clearly stated that the main direction of the party work should be consciously oriented towards building the revolutionary peasant movement.

Selection of strategic areas, concentration of cadres, formulation of fighting and agitational slogans with extensive discussions of the people of the area, mobilising the peasants

for struggles on those issues, building the peasant organisations, arming of the people from the beginning, with the locally available weapons in the anti-feudal struggles, organising of the village volunteer organisations, organising people's resistance to landlord - goonda-police violence and repression and thus create, develop and defend areas of sustained resistance and thus advance to establishing the base areas in the countryside.

The PCC resolution has also clearly stated that :

In building the trade union movement, our main direction should be to build revolutionary Trade Union movement i.e., concentrating chiefly on politicizing the workers, ideological and political struggle against legalism and economism, building of worker-peasant unity, volunteer organisations to resist police—management goondaism and repression, building of the secret Party among the workers *and thus* unite the working class and make it the conscious leader of the New Democratic Revolution.

Thus building of *areas of sustained resistance* in the rural areas, and building *revolutionary Trade Union movement* in the industrial centres have been taken as the most important tasks of the party in the present phase of the struggles, with work in the rural areas as the priority task.

In conducting the immediate economic and political struggles of the people, the Party units have been asked to :

Consciously and constantly follow the mass line, drawing the masses at every phase of the struggle in all our mass activities.

The PCC resolution has also said that:

In conducting these struggles, we must utilise the various contradictions between the two super powers and their allies,

that,

“These contradictions should be utilised from issue to issue, both economic and political, consistent with the general political line of the party, of taking the Soviet Union as the greater danger, both nationally and internationally, and Soviet Union and its allies in India wherever they are, whether in power or in opposition, as the greater danger.”

It has also stated that :

The main edge of these people's struggles, the struggle for United front should be directed against the economic, political, military domination of the Soviet Union in India since Soviet Social-Imperialism is the greater danger to our people both nationally and internationally and the Indira Congress Government, the CPI and CPM are the greater enemies of our people, since these forces are faithfully serving the interests of Soviet social-imperialism in India and the World.

These United front struggles should ultimately help the national bourgeoisie to break away from the big-bourgeois, big-landlord classes and should help in building the People's Democratic Front with the democratic sections under the leadership of the working class to lead the Armed Agrarian Revolution to success.

The PCC resolution has also noted that the possibilities of united front with pro-USA and pro-second world forces against Soviet domination have grown on such issue as civil liberties, on the immediate issues of the people—economic and political—and above all, against the predominance of the Soviet Union in India, against Soviet aggression wherever and whenever it raises its head, particularly now in Afghanistan, against all concessions to Soviet Union and the Soviet Union's efforts to convert our country into its neo-colony, and Indira Congress govt.'s connivance at these efforts and its plans for world war.

Thus one could see that the PCC resolution has laid emphasis that in conducting these struggles, the party units should firmly follow a policy of united front, uniting with all the forces that could be united on each issue—both economic and political, including the forces of the pro-USA and the pro-second world forces, even the forces of CPI and other mass organisations at the local level to defeat the main enemy on that particular issue.

In spite of this, the PCC resolution has clearly stated that it should participate in the elections on the basis of its own strength, not to support any other big-bourgeois big-landlord political party, the revisionists and the neo revisionists, not to have any election alliance or adjustment of seats with the opposition section of the big-bourgeois big-landlord parties or the CPI and CPM either at the national or at the regional level.

But some persons both inside and outside the Party are raising many questions on our attitude towards participation in elections and about election alliances. Some criticise our participation in the elections as revisionism while some others attack our policy of not having adjustment of seats or election alliances with other ruling class parties or revisionists and neo-revisionists as nothing but being 'neutral' between US imperialism

and Soviet Social-imperialism, between govt. and the opposition, between fascism and bourgeois democracy etc., which, in their opinion, is nothing but support to Soviet social-imperialism and the Indira Congress.

Let us discuss this subject a bit deeper.

Participation in the elections

All the Marxists-Leninists, all the Communist Revolutionary groups in India, including our Party have rejected the path of parliamentarism as a path for Indian revolution, and have accepted People's War as the only path for Indian Revolution to achieve the complete liberation of our people, to achieve our New Democratic Revolution.

But as a result of intense hatred towards the policy of parliamentarism so far pursued by the revisionists and the neo-revisionists, our party leadership adopted the policy of *boycott of elections* for the whole period of New Democratic Revolution, as a matter of strategy and adopted the method of *annihilation of class enemies* as the main form of struggle to mobilise the people for People's War. In practice this policy has proved to be very disastrous for the cause of Indian revolution.

From the beginning, the slogan of *boycott of elections* has never proved successful. Experience has proved that vast millions of our people still have parliamentary illusions, are participating in the elections and are not yet prepared for higher forms of struggle. In such conditions, boycott of elections means nothing but leaving the political field free for the ruling class parties, the revisionists and the neo-revisionists to deceive the people with deceptive slogans and promises.

With this experience and considering the level of the movements, our Party has decided to participate in the elections on the basis of its own Agrarian Revolution Programme. Also it has been decided that the "participation in elections, where and when, and in what form should be decided in each election".

To the extent that our Party has participated in the elections on the basis of its own Agrarian Revolution Programme, we have been able to widely propagate our programme among the people, extend the movement and prepare the people for further struggles.

It is wrong to think that mere participation in the elections is parliamentarism. Participation in the elections to widely propagate among the people our full programme for revolution, and thus prepare the ground for further struggles is entirely different from the path of parliamentarism which takes the parliamentary struggle as the main form of struggle for the salvation of our people.

While rejecting the path of parliamentarism, our Party also rejects the slogan of *boycott elections* as a negative and sectarian slogan which isolates our Party from the people.

Our participation in the elections, on the basis of our own strength, on the basis of our own Agrarian Revolution programme is entirely in keeping with the level of our movement at present, with the level of consciousness of our people at present.

It is entirely based on the teachings of Lenin on this subject. Lenin had taught us that we should participate in elections, as long as the people have parliamentary illusions, and boycott elections when the people have overcome their illusions about bourgeois parliamentary system and are prepared for higher forms of struggle.

Then the question arises : Having decided to participate in the elections, why does our Party refuse to have election adjustment of seats or election alliances with the CPI and CPM and with other opposition ruling class parties, national or regional ? Why not unite with the lesser against the greater danger ? Why do we refuse to support the present opposition parties in other constituencies, where our party does not contest ?

There are fundamental reasons for such a refusal.

Orientation

First of all, even while participating in the elections, we must stick to the general orientation of the Party.

Our general orientation of the Party should be to prepare the people for Protracted People's War, and convince the people that the present constitution is a big bourgeois-big landlord constitution meant only to preserve the present semi-colonial and semi-feudal system in our country, and elections under the present big bourgeois-big landlord constitution will not lead to any basic changes in our present semi-colonial and semi-feudal system.

Our participation in the elections should be in line with this general orientation of the Party. It should not increase the illusions of the people on the present bourgeois parliamentary institutions, but help the people disillusion themselves about these institutions, and thus prepare them step by step for higher forms of struggle. Having adjustment of seats, or election alliances or support to the opposition ruling class parties, and the revisionists and the neo-revisionists under one pretext or another is nothing but telling the people that something good can be achieved through the present big bourgeois - big landlord constitution, and that too in alliance with the very same parties who are wedded to preserve the present semi-colonial and semi-feudal system in our country.

That is why the PCC resolution has very clearly declared that the

Basic aim of our participation in elections should be to extensively propagate the politics of Agrarian Revolution and the political line of the Party among the people, to extend and consolidate our mass base among the people. If in this process of struggle, we win some seats in elections, we will utilise that position to achieve the same aims,

and that,

We must boldly tell the people that elections under the present big bourgeois-big landlord constitution will not lead to any basic changes in the present society and that only a Protracted People's War could lead to such basic changes in our society.

Attitude towards ruling class parties, and CPI - CPM in the present parliamentary system

Comrade Lenin had taught us that bourgeois parliamentary democracy is nothing but a mockery of democracy, that it is a democracy for the ruling and exploiting classes, and oppression and suppression for the overwhelming majority of the oppressed classes, that elections are held periodically to decide which section of the ruling classes are to rule the people for a particular period, that "in Parliament, this is just chatter for the special purpose of fooling the common people" (State and Revolution). He has also declared that the most free of bourgeois parliamentary democracy is nothing but bourgeois dictatorship.

Lenin has told us that in a bourgeois parliamentary democracy, the opposition sections of the ruling classes make all sorts of deceptive promises to the people, which they betray the moment they come to power.

Our experience in India has also proved this. The Congress in India has led this country for more than 30 years in the garb of parliamentary democracy side by side with bloody repression of all genuine people's struggles. Then the Janata came to power in 1977 with many deceptive promises, but suppressed the people's struggles, without taking any steps to effect any basic changes in the society. The CPI and CPM governments have come to power without bringing about basic changes in society.

The opposition section of the big bourgeois-big landlord class parties, national or regional had come to power in various states, revisionists or neo-revisionists are still in power in states like Tripura, West Bengal and Kerala. Practice has proved that these governments are all big bourgeois-big landlord governments which will not bring about any basic changes in our semi-colonial and semi-feudal state. Practice has also proved that the revisionists or the neo-revisionists will not bring about any basic changes in the present day society, that they are only interested in the

preservation of the present day semi-colonial and semi-feudal society, and that they also use bloody repression to suppress the genuine people's struggles.

Their opposition to the ruling class party—the Indira Congress is nothing but fictitious. Time and again they have declared that they are not for any confrontation with the centre.

It is in this situation that we are participating in the elections, to tell the people that all the ruling class parties, whether in power or in opposition, the revisionists and the neo-revisionists are all wedded to the preservation of the present semi-colonial and semi-feudal society, and their opposition to the ruling class party is nothing but fictitious.

Today our basic orientation is to mobilise the people for Protracted People's War, to mobilise people to build pockets of sustained resistance and build revolutionary trade union movement in the industrial centres as the most important task. We must expose the fictitious opposition of the opposition section of the ruling class parties, the revisionists and the neo-revisionists and win the people behind them to participate in the Agrarian Revolutionary struggles. This can only be achieved by a ceaseless exposure of the fictitious opposition of the opposition section of the ruling classes, the CPI and CPM.

Our support to, or adjustment of seats or election alliances with the opposition section of the ruling class parties, the CPI and CPM goes against this basic orientation of the Party towards these parties, that we should thoroughly expose their fictitious opposition, that they are only interested in the preservation of the present semi-colonial and semi-feudal society, and win the masses behind them for Agrarian Revolution.

Our support to, or adjustment of seats or election alliances with the opposition section of the ruling class parties, the CPI and CPM will only increase the illusions of the people in these parties, will only create the impression in the people that these parties are better than the ruling class Party, that something good can be achieved through the present big bourgeois - big landlord constitution through these parties in power. This is against the basic orientation of our Party.

In any bourgeois parliamentary system there are bound to be opposition sections of the ruling class parties, since contradiction among the ruling class parties is one of the fundamental contradictions of the capitalist society. There are bound to be revisionists and neo-revisionists inside the working class movement creating illusions about the parliamentary system. These opposition parties, the revisionists and the neo-revisionists will always be mouthing some liberal sentiments, to demarcate themselves from the ruling class parties, deceive the public to get their votes, and betray these promises the moment they come to power. This is

exactly what is happening with the opposition section of the ruling class parties, the CPI and CPM.

Support to, adjustment of seats or election alliances with any of these parties under some pretext or another, such as 'to defeat fascism', or 'to prevent fascism from coming to power', or 'to fight authoritarianism' or 'to break the monopoly of power' is nothing but permanently tying ourselves with these parties for election purposes, to get into the seats of power through their help.

Such an attitude should logically lead us to support these parties when they come to power. That means supporting these parties in their measures to preserve the present semi-colonial and semi-feudal society.

The representatives of these parties on many occasions change their labels, their parties, and even join the ruling class party.

The Shah Commission report and the Vaidyalingam report have thoroughly exposed how corrupt the leading figures are in all the big bourgeois big landlord ruling class parties.

Experience has proved that all the ruling class parties, CPI and CPM adopt bloody repression when in power to suppress all genuine people's struggles.

Our support to, adjustment of seats or election alliances with the opposition section of the ruling class parties, the CPI and CPM is nothing but taking moral and political responsibility upon us for their corruption, for their bloody repression on our people.

There is another aspect to their question. As the PCC resolution has stated, the ruling classes in India, being comprador, are already split into pro-Soviet, pro-USA and the pro-second world countries' groups.

Support to, election alliances or adjustment of seats with some of the opposition parties, like the Janata, which is mainly pro-USA is nothing but telling the people that US imperialism is better than Soviet social imperialism. This goes against the basic orientation of the Party of mobilising the people for the destruction of both US imperialism and Soviet Social-imperialism in India at present, taking the latter as the greater danger, thus creating illusions in the people that social imperialism can be defeated through the parliamentary system by aligning ourselves with the pro-US lobby. This is an absurd idea of defeating any imperialism through the parliamentary system.

Support to, adjustment of seats or election alliances with the CPI and CPM goes against the basic line of the Party of taking Soviet Union as a greater danger to our people both nationally and internationally. The CPI and CPM are the most faithful servants serving the interests of the Soviet Union both in India and abroad. Support to them in elections is

nothing but direct service to Soviet Social imperialism in India, direct service to its efforts to convert our country into its neo-colony and its efforts to create war bases in India for its aggression in Asia.

The 'heroes' who have been shouting so much about taking Soviet Union as the 'only' danger to India, of concentrating the people's struggles against the predominance of the Soviet Union in India, and 'thundering' about defeating the 'A' team (the Indira Congress) and 'B' team (the Charan Singh group which included the CPI and CPM) have no shame to support the very same CPM in Sreerampur parliamentary bye-elections, which exposes their rank opportunism in elections.

Support to, adjustment of seats or election alliances with the opposition section of the ruling classes, and CPI and CPM is nothing but conducting certain economic and legal struggles, political propaganda, and drawing the Party from one election to the other and permanently tying ourselves to certain big bourgeois-big landlord parties. This is nothing but wanting to come to power through the present parliamentary system. This goes against the basic orientation of the Party that the present system can be overthrown only through a Protracted People's War. That is why the PCC resolution has clearly stated that while participating in the elections, "we should not have any illusions that our Party could share power with any section of the ruling classes and their parties, regional or national, under the present big bourgeois-big landlord constitution".

The policy of support to, adjustment of seats and election alliances with the opposition section of the ruling class parties, CPI and CPM is nothing but following the parliamentary path of the CPI and CPM. Such a policy is nothing but abandoning the path of Agrarian Revolution, while the CPI and CPM, with their revisionism have made themselves the appendages of the big bourgeois-big landlord class in our country. Such an election policy is bound to make our Party the appendages of the CPI and CPM. The PCC is resolutely opposed to such a line of class collaboration.

General Political United Front

This question has to be looked at from another angle also. It is true that we should always differentiate among our enemies, find out the chief enemy among them and defeat our enemies one by one.

Does this mean that we should always unite with lesser enemies against the greater enemy? This is an absurd idea. There are specific occasions when we should have general political united front with the lesser enemies against the greater enemies on the basis of a minimum political programme. On the other hand there are occasions when we should utilise their contradictions on specific issues to intensify the people's struggles against the greater enemy, some times to neutralise the lesser enemy.

Comrade Mao in his 'Introduction to the Communist' had clearly stated that "different groups within the big bourgeoisie are backed by different imperialist powers, so that when contradictions among these powers become sharper and when the edge of the revolution is mainly directed against a particular power, the big bourgeois groups dependant on the other powers may join the struggle against that particular power *to certain extent and for certain time*. At such times, in order to weaken the enemy and add to its own reserves, the Chinese proletariat may form a united front with these groups and should maintain it as far as possible, provided it is advantageous to the revolution." (emphasis mine)

From this it is clear that we cannot unite always with the lesser against the greater enemy and we can have united front with them only on certain specific occasions, and that too if it is advantageous to the revolution.

Support to, adjustment of seats or election alliances with the opposition section of the ruling classes or CPI and CPM, is nothing but having a general political united front with these parties on the basis of a minimum of political programme. Does such a situation exist in India today when we are in the phase of Agrarian Revolutionary struggle? No section of the ruling class parties, CPI and CPM will join us for Agrarian Revolution. When does such a situation arise?

The PCC resolution is very specific on this question. It says "For unity between the working class party and section of the ruling classes there should be a common basis. Such a common basis will come, when any super power makes aggression on our country, or in the period of fascist repression, supported by any super power, as it happened during the period of Indira's emergency, or if our country is converted into a neo-colony. During such period there will be a common basis for general political united front between the working class party and that section of the ruling classes opposed to that particular super power to a certain period to a certain extent".

Any of the above conditions do not exist today in India. In such conditions to have seat adjustments or election alliances with any section of the ruling classes, the CPI and CPM is nothing but tailing behind them.

All talk of uniting with the opposition section of the ruling classes, the CPI and CPM in the name of preventing our country from becoming a neo-colony of the Soviet Union or preventing the fascism of Indira Gandhi is nothing but political support for big bourgeois-big landlord policies of these parties or to the path of revisionism and parliamentarism of the CPI and CPM.

At the same time the policy of the PCC of utilising the contradictions of the ruling party with the opposition section of the ruling

classes or the CPI and CPM on specific immediate issues, both economic and political, intensifies the people's struggles and we can advance the revolutionary movement in the country.

The Party should be clear that fascism, neo-colonialism or Soviet Social-imperialism can not be defeated through the parliament, but only by mobilising the people for People's War. Only Agrarian Revolution could be an alternative either to fascism or Soviet neo-colonialism.

The PCC resolution on utilising the contradictions of the various sections of the ruling classes, CPI and CPM helps to unite with their cadres at the lower levels on the immediate issues of the people, while trying for united front with their leaderships on specific issues of common interest.

Such a policy also lays the ground for general political united front with these sections when Soviet neo-colonialism or fascist dictatorship materialises.

Our united front tactics should keep advancing the Agrarian Revolution; it cannot be a united front to win seats in elections.

So our policy towards elections is very clear at present. We are against the boycott of elections. But we should participate in the elections on the basis of our own strength, support progressive and revolutionary candidates in other seats; we should not have any seat adjustments or election alliances with any of the ruling class parties, national or regional, or the CPI and CPM, should not have any illusions of sharing power with these parties under the present big bourgeois-big landlord constitution but should persevere in the path of Agrarian Revolution.

At present we should keep the strength of the Party in mind. We are not yet strong enough to influence the political situation in our favour either at the national or regional level. In such a situation any thought of seat adjustments or election alliances with the opposition of the ruling classes, and the CPI and CPM will lead only to one-sided support to these parties by our Party, which will make our Party a tail of these parties.

All the ravings of certain persons that this is nothing but being 'Soviet Naxalites' or being 'neutral' between US imperialism and Soviet Social imperialism, or being 'fifth column of Kremlin' (Third World Unity, No 26, Feb. 1980) will not swerve the Party from the path of Agrarian Revolution. We will only consider them to be the mad ravings of certain persons who want to betray the Agrarian Revolution, who have taken Agrarian Revolution as a mere intellectual exercise. 26-3-80

(This article was published in May, 1980 issue of New Democracy.)

Agrarian Revolution and Elections : Some Questions and Answers

From 1978, our Party has been participating in elections, both direct and indirect. Based on this experience, and coming Assembly elections, some questions are being raised both inside and outside the Party, on the relation between Agrarian Revolution and elections. Here we answer some of them.

1. Strategic aim of the Party

What is the strategic aim of the Party ?

It is to achieve People's Democratic Revolution and establish People's Democracy under the leadership of the working class. Only such a revolution can end the present semi-colonial and semi-feudal system in the country and liberate our people from all exploitation.

To achieve this strategic objective, our Party has rejected the path of individual annihilation of class enemies. That is nothing but individual terrorism.

Our Party has equally rejected the path of parliamentarism, peddled and practised by the revisionists and neo-revisionists of all hues and colours.

People's War based on Agrarian Revolution is the only path for achieving People's Democracy in the country. Agrarian Revolution is the main content of the New Democratic Revolution.

The Path of People's War means taking the Agrarian Revolutionary struggle as the principal form of struggle and combining it with all other forms of struggle.

Taking the present level of the people's movement and the people's consciousness, our Party has decided to create, develop and defend areas of sustained resistance to advance the Agrarian Revolutionary movement in the country. This is our main task.

So all our struggles, the immediate struggles of the people, economic and political, the partial struggles of the people, the struggle for the united

front and the struggle for civil liberties and democratic rights should be consciously directed towards building the areas of resistance in the rural areas.

2. "Boycott of elections"— Is it a strategic slogan ?

Certainly not. The question of boycott or participation in elections is always considered by the Marxist-Leninists as a question of tactics. The very fact that comrades Lenin and Stalin, in their struggle for revolution, have both boycotted and participated in the elections shows that this is a question of tactics and not a question of strategy at all.

As a principle, Marxist-Leninists boycott elections when the revolutionary movement is on the upsurge and the revolutionary people are surging forward for the final assault on the system of exploitation. At such a time, participation in elections diverts the people from the revolutionary struggle and hence we boycott the elections. When we boycott elections, the revolutionary struggle should advance. Otherwise the boycott has no meaning.

In other circumstances, when the revolutionary movement is not advancing, when the people have still illusions on the bourgeois parliamentary institutions, Marxist-Leninists have to participate in the elections to help the people, in practice, to overcome their illusions about the bourgeois parliamentary institutions and convince them about the necessity of People's War based on Agrarian Revolution as the only path for the complete liberation of our people.

We should remember one thing. Boycott or participation in elections on both occasions, one single aim remains—the aim of rousing and preparing the people for Agrarian Revolution.

That is why our Path document clearly says :

But participation in elections by the Communist Revolutionaries, and when the situation demands, depending on the level of the people's movement and the consciousness of the people, has nothing to do with the path of parliamentarism. Its aim should always be to dispel the illusions of the people and prepare (for People's War).

But some people question like this : Our Path document says that our path is the Path of People's War which carries with it the essential features of the Chinese revolution. Will not our participation in elections be at variance from the experience of the Chinese Revolution ?

Here we should remember the dissimilarities existing between India and China,

There was no parliamentary system and democratic rights to make use of in China. That was one of the factors why armed revolution in China faced armed counter-revolution from the very beginning. But in India, there is a bourgeois parliamentary system, no doubt imposed by British Imperialism on our people, and people still harbour illusions about these institutions. They are not yet prepared to directly participate in People's War based on Agrarian Revolution. We have yet to dispel the illusions of the people on these parliamentary institutions and prepare them for Agrarian Revolution.

Some others question like this: In India, the people are already dissatisfied with the present day conditions. Even during the elections, in various areas, 30 to 50 per cent of the people are not participating in elections. Is it not a sign to show that the people have begun to lose confidence in the present bourgeois parliamentary institutions ?

No doubt, in some areas sometimes 30 to 50 per cent of the people do not participate in elections. But this is due to many local reasons. It is wrong to assess this type of abstention in elections as their readiness to boycott elections and go for higher forms of struggle. While boycotting elections, alternatively people must be prepared for higher forms of struggle. Such a situation has not yet developed in our country.

Here we should also remember one thing. Participation in elections no doubt breeds some legal and parliamentary illusions among our people. Such tendencies have to be fought only by extensively propagating the revolutionary politics of the Party, through ideological and political education of our cadres and by intensifying the class struggles in the areas of participation after elections. If we do not do this, parliamentary illusions will get an ascendancy in our Party.

It is wrong to say that right thinking and right practice appear in our ranks only because of our participation in the elections. They are bound to be reflected even in class struggles from the formulation of demands and conducting class struggles on those [demands and leading them towards resistance struggle. As in other cases, we should fight parliamentary and legal illusions based on the correct ideology of Marxism-Leninism-Mao Zedong Thought and intensify the class struggles and lead them towards building areas of sustained resistance.

So we should always remember that participation in elections is not the primary point in our programme. Intensifying the class struggles of the people on their immediate issues combined with the propagation of revolutionary politics of our Party, consciously leading them towards mass resistance struggles and building the areas of sustained resistance—that is the main point in our Party Programme.

3. General Principles guiding our participation in Elections

It is to keep the Party steadfastly on the path of struggle and prevent the growth of parliamentary illusions growing inside our Party that our Political Resolution has clearly stated that where, when, and in what form we should participate in elections should be decided in each elections.

The political resolution *Our tasks in the present situation* has clearly laid down the general principles guiding our participation in elections. What are they ?

- To extensively propagate revolutionary politics of the Party and the political line of the Party among the people.
- To extend and consolidate the mass base among the people.
- To boldly tell the people that elections under the present big bourgeois—big landlord constitution will not lead to any basic changes in the present society and that only People's War can lead to such basic changes in our society.
- To dispel electoral illusions among the people.
- To prepare the people for further revolutionary struggles after the elections.
- We should participate in elections as a general principle, on the basis of our own strength.
- No election alliances or adjustment of seats with any ruling class party, national or regional, or the CPI and CPM.
- We can have alliance or seat adjustments with, or support only those who support our New Democratic Revolution.
- We should not have any illusions that our Party could share power with any section of the ruling classes and their parties under the present big bourgeois-big landlord constitution.

These are the general principles guiding our participation in elections.

What is the significance of these general principles ? These general principles at once demarcate our Party from those who want to boycott elections as a strategic slogan and from those who want to have election alliances with any section of the ruling classes, or with the CPI and CPM. They help us to maintain the independent line of the Party to extend and consolidate the mass base of the Party, to intensify the class struggles after the elections, and link these struggles with the resistance struggle of the Party.

For any exceptional cases, the guidelines of the Party provide that the Central Committee should take separate decisions in all exceptional cases.

Let us remember that there was a fierce ideological struggle inside our Party against the line of election alliances with opposition section of the ruling classes. The Special Congress and its political resolution were a victory over this wrong line

Why has the political resolution of the Party taken such an uncompromising stand against election alliances with opposition sections of the ruling classes, or the CPI and CPM ?

—During the period of struggle against semi-colonialism and semi-feudalism, the working class party cannot have any general political united front with any section of the ruling classes. Such occasions arise only when our country is subjected to foreign aggression by any one of the two super powers, or when our country becomes a neo-colonial country of any one of the two super powers. It can have united front with the opposition section of the ruling classes during the time of Emergency rule for civil liberties as it happened in the earlier period of Indira Gandhi rule

Conditions for a general political united front with opposition sections of the ruling classes do not exist in our country today, as explained in our Political Resolution.

Election alliances or seat adjustments with opposition section of the ruling classes can only be on the basis of a minimum political programme; and that can be nothing but having general political united front with them. It is this line that the political resolution has rejected theoretically and politically. Therefore our Party is against election alliances with opposition section of the ruling classes.

As with the CPI and CPM, this question does not arise at all. The Political Resolution of the Party has characterised that Soviet social imperialism is the greater danger to the Indian people, both nationally and internationally, that it dominates the economic, political and military affairs of our country, that for the Indian people today, Soviet social imperialism and its allies in India are the greater danger, that Indira Congress, other pro-Soviet elements in the ruling class parties and the CPI and CPM leaderships are the greater danger.

The Political Resolution has also said that the opposition of the CPI and CPM leadership to Indira govt. is fictitious, and that its aim is only to pressurise the Indira government to serve the interests of the Soviet Union better, both in India and abroad.

Since we consider the leadership of CPI and CPM to be the greater danger, the question of having general political united front, or election

alliances or seat adjustments does not arise at all. Such a course will go against the political line of the Party which says that in today's conditions Soviet Union and its allies constitute the greater danger to our people.

While rejecting the path of having a general political united front, or election alliances or seat adjustments with sections of the ruling classes, our political resolution has also said that the contradictions between the opposition section of the ruling classes, the CPI-CPM leadership with Indira government should be utilised to our advantage on the immediate issue of the people, economic and political, from issue to issue, to unleash anti-government struggles and consciously direct these struggles with our primary task of creating, developing and defending areas of sustained resistance and thus advance the Agrarian Revolutionary struggle in the country. Practice has proved that this is the only correct line.

Our Path document and our Programme have clearly stated that the present constitution is a big-bourgeois-big landlord constitution, meant to preserve the present semi-colonial and semi-feudal system in the country. These documents have said that the ruling classes always use various kinds of fascist repression to suppress the just struggles of the people. These documents have also said that People's War based on Agrarian Revolution is the only path for the complete liberation of our people from all kinds of exploitation.

Having election alliances or seat adjustments either with the opposition section of the ruling classes or the CPI-CPM, amounts to telling the people that some effective reforms could be achieved under the present constitution. That only breeds parliamentary illusions among the people, breeds illusions among the people about 'democratic' character of the opposition section of the ruling classes and the CPI and CPM. This goes against the basic line of the Party of dispelling illusions of the people on the bourgeois parliamentary institutions and preparing the people for Agrarian Revolution.

Experience has proved that all ruling class parties and the CPI and CPM do give populist slogans to deceive the people to get their votes and those who get elected, invariably forget and betray the people and take to all corrupt practices. Having election alliances or seat adjustments with these sections will only tarnish the image of our Party as a party working for Agrarian Revolution.

These are the reasons why our Political Resolution has taken an uncompromising stand on election alliances or seat adjustments with opposition section of the ruling classes and the CPI and CPM.

4. Indirect Elections

Some comrades ask: The general principles guiding our participation in elections are correct. But so far no such specific guiding principles for indirect elections or local elections have been given. Why?

At the time of the Party Congress, our Party had no representative in any Assembly in the country, and there were no elections to the Panchayats or Samithis. In these circumstances, it is true that the Political Resolution did not specify the guiding principles regarding indirect elections or local elections.

Now, with the experience gained so far, *the Central Committee, in its recent meeting, has decided that the general principles 'guiding our participation in the direct elections should apply to the indirect elections and local elections also.*

5. Attitude towards CPI and CPM

Specifically some people ask the question: Should we not make a distinction between the Indira Congress and the CPI, CPM in the indirect elections? Should we not support the CPI and CPM in indirect elections, taking them as the lesser danger in such indirect elections? Where our Party is the balancing force, should we not support the CPI and CPM in order to defeat the Congress? Otherwise wouldn't our Party be blamed for the victory of the Congress? Should we not support the [CPI—CPM in indirect elections, particularly in those areas where our movement has evolved out of the old common movement; where the common people are not yet able to distinguish the ideological and political differences between the CPI—CPM on the one hand and our Party—the CPI (ML) on the other ?

These questions raise the basic attitude of our Party towards the CPI and CPM.

As explained earlier, our Political Resolution has characterised the CPI and CPM as the greater danger today. So the question of having election alliances or seat adjustments or supporting them in any elections, either in indirect or direct elections, or local elections does not arise at all. Such a course will go against the political line of the Party which takes the CPI and CPM as faithfully serving the interests of Soviet social imperialism both in India and abroad, and thus constitute the greater danger today.

Even in our old areas where our movement has evolved out of the old common movements and the people are not yet able to distinguish our Party from the CPI and CPM, or even where we are the balancing force between Indira Congress and the CPI—CPM, we should pursue the policy of no election alliance or seat adjustments or supporting them either in direct or indirect elections or in any local elections. But in such cases, we should be extra vigilant. We should declare our readiness to support a common independent candidate, acceptable to us and the CPI—CPM in order to defeat the Congress inspite of our opposition to their politics. We should go directly to the people with our readiness to support an independent candidate. Either the CPI—CPM will be forced to accept our

proposal or if they refuse, their fictitious opposition to Indira Congress will be thoroughly exposed. In both the cases our Party will be in an advantageous position.

Today the CPI, CPM, while displaying a fictitious opposition to the Congress (I), while adopting a line of critical support to the Indira Congress, are accusing all other parties, particularly our Party, that by not supporting them, we are helping the victory of the Congress. This is nothing but a blackmail on their part towards other parties, particularly our Party. We should not submit to such blackmailing tactics of the CPI and CPM under any circumstances. On the other hand we should intensify our political campaign with correct tactics, to expose their fictitious opposition to the Indira Congress and their subservience to Soviet social imperialism.

While taking an irreconcilable opposition to their ideology and politics our Party should continue our efforts to draw their ranks and mass organisations into common struggles at the village, factory or at the educational institution level.

It is only such a course that will help their ranks to get themselves disillusioned about the revisionist ideologies and politics of their leaderships. On the other hand our support to CPI-CPM in any election, will only strengthen their illusions about their leadership.

Some people ask: Didn't our Party support CPM in election to the Council in 1978? Didn't we decide to support Janata also in 1978 in the Council elections? Were they correct?

They were wrong. These mistakes were committed under the influence of the right deviation line contained in the Central Committee resolution *New Situation and our tasks*. The recent *Basic lessons* document has criticised the right deviation line of that resolution and that means the above steps were also wrong.

6. The ensuing Assembly elections

Now the Assembly elections are again on the agenda in West Bengal, Kerala and also in other states

Do the general principles guiding our participation in the direct elections laid down in the political resolution *Our tasks in the present situation* apply to the present Assembly elections?

They do and should apply. That means we should contest where we have the mass base, on the basis of our own strength. We should have no election alliances or seat adjustments with the opposition section of the ruling classes or with the CPI-CPM. We will support only those who support our programme of *New Democratic Revolution*.

In those areas where we do not contest, we should not support any opposition section of the ruling classes or the CPI and CPM, but vigorously propagate the revolutionary politics of the Party, thoroughly expose the politics of the ruling class parties and the CPI-CPM.

In all the areas, our main effort should be to dispel the illusions of the people about bourgeois parliamentary institutions, and prepare them for Agrarian Revolution, extend and consolidate our mass base and prepare the ground for intensifying the class struggles after the elections.

Comrades,

The political line of the Party, as laid down in "Our tasks in the present situation" has been proved to be basically correct. By following this line, our Party has been able to utilise the contradictions of the various ruling class parties, and the contradictions of the CPI and CPM with the ruling party to strengthen the immediate struggles of the people. Our Party has been able to intensify the struggles of various sections of the people—the workers, peasants, employees and students—and has been able to extend the mass base of the Party. This shows the correctness of the political line of the Party as laid down in our political resolution.

Our Party opposed the "line of annihilation" and adopted the present line of mass resistance. Now also various organisations of Communist Revolutionaries are giving various slogans like "anti-Soviet front" "anti-authoritarian front", "anti-hegemonist front", "patriotic and democratic front" or "anti-autocratic front"—which invariably lead to general political united front with sections of the ruling classes and the CPI-CPM. All these political slogans are in variance with the political line of the Party. We are opposed to general political united front with any section of the ruling classes or the CPI and CPM. We are opposed to any election alliance or seat adjustments with these parties or support them in elections.

For us the struggle to build the areas of resistance is primary and our participation in elections should be linked with this primary task.

7-4-82

This article was published in March-April 1982 issue of Road to Liberation

Bourgeois election alliances: Certain experiences from Past History

What is the attitude of the Communist Revolutionaries towards elections? Can the Communist Revolutionaries have election alliances with opposition ruling class parties or the revisionist and the neo-revisionists? What is the relation between election work and Agrarian Revolution? These questions have come before the Communist Revolutionaries for discussions. It is true there are serious differences among them on all these questions. They are related to ideological conceptions, political assessments and tactics of struggle and practice.

Certain organisations of Communist Revolutionaries publicly say that they are still boycotting elections as a principle. Participation in elections is a question of tactics. When the revolutionary movement is on the upsurge, elections are boycotted. When the revolutionary movement is in the retreat, depending on the consciousness of the people and the movement, one should participate in the elections. These are Lenin's principles. But these comrades have nothing [to do with this ideology. They think that boycott of elections represents leftism. They wrongly think that this 'left' pose is useful for revolutionary struggle

But they are not able even to implement their slogan of boycott of elections in practice. At the village level, their cadres, ranks and sympathisers are actively participating in the elections and that too in all elections.

It is significant to note that some of these elements are having links with groups inside the Congress and support such groups which they think are favourable to them. They even secretly propagate in support of the Congress (1). Boycott of elections in the day time, but participating during the night time—this is the wonderful practice of some of them.

Formal declaration of boycott of election by their leadership but participation in the elections by their cadres and ranks at the lower levels—this is their practice. This is nothing but the degeneration of the slogan of boycott of elections.

There are other organisations of Communist Revolutionaries. These organisations are going to the other extreme. They contest certain seats.

In all other seats they are supporting opposition ruling class parties, the revisionists and the neo-revisionists. They claim to be doing this to defeat the Congress (1) in power, in the name of defeating Indira's autocracy or Indira's fascism or in the name of building the anti-fascist front.

Our Party opposes both these trends and resists them. We have decided to participate in the elections taking into consideration the consciousness of the people, and the level of the people's movement. But our Party has laid down the general principles for such participation. Extensive propagation of revolutionary politics among the people, political consolidation of existing people's movements, extension of the movement to new areas, organising the people for new struggles after the elections—these are the general principles guiding our participation in the elections.

We have clearly stated that our participation in the elections should not create any illusions among the people about the existing big-bourgeois big-landlord constitution. On the other hand, it should help the people to realise the necessity of Agrarian Revolution. We should tell the people that elections under the present Constitution will not bring any benefits to the people and that New Democratic Revolution is the only Path of Liberation for our people.

We have decided to participate in the elections on the basis of our own strength. We have decided not to have any election alliances either with the opposition ruling class parties, or with the revisionists and neo-revisionists. We will have election alliances only with those who support the New Democratic Revolution. Where we do not contest, we do not support either the opposition section of the ruling class parties or the CPI-CPM combine.

These are the general principles guiding our participation in the elections—direct and indirect.

Of course one has to analyse the ideological, political and tactical questions about the election alliances with the opposition section of the ruling classes or the CPI-CPM combine.

But first let us see the experiences of such election alliances from our past history in India, particularly from the experience in Andhra.

Betrayal of the Heroic Telengana struggle (1946-51) Entry into Parliamentary elections

In India, the Heroic Telengana Struggle (1946-51) was the first struggle for Agrarian Revolution. At that time, the Nehru government sent its army to crush this struggle. With this, the leadership of the united Communist Party betrayed the Telengana struggle, laid down arms and decided to participate in the elections.

But the ranks of the Telengana struggle refused to lay down their arms and give up the struggle. Both the revisionists and neo-revisionists had to invent many lies to convince them to lay down their arms. They even utilised the name of the great Stalin for this dirty purpose. Finally they resorted to the last weapon—deception. They said :

We laid down arms only temporarily. We will preserve the arms secretly. Our participation in the elections is only temporary. Now our forces are weakened. Let us gather some strength by participating in the elections and then take up arms again. So we participate in the elections, as a preparation for taking up arms again.

Only with such promises could the leadership force the fighters, the rank and file of the Telengana struggle to lay down their arms and take to the path of parliamentarism.

It is true that the 'Pandavas' preserved their arms secretly for one year. But after that one year, Pandavas took up their arms again, waged war against Kauravas and won back their kingdom.

But our Pandavas—the revisionists and the neo revisionists, followed a different path. They did not go into secret hiding. What they entered were only the open parliamentary institutions, what they practiced was only parliamentary tactics the path of bourgeois election alliances, winning seats and then power, that is, through elections. They have developed this as an 'art'. They have gained experience in this 'art'. They have forgotten the arms, which they say they have preserved secretly. They have become worshippers of the parliamentary path and created 'theories' of peaceful transition.

How did the revisionists and the neo-revisionists degenerate from the path of armed struggle to the path of parliamentarism? How did they change from secret Party life to mere legalism? How did they change from the path of Agrarian Revolution to the path of bourgeois election alliances?

This transformation did not come in a single day but happened step by step. First they started attacking the basic tenets of Marxism-Leninism itself. They began to say that some Marxist-Leninist tenets have become outdated. In the name of utilising the contradictions of the ruling classes they began the search of the 'good' and 'bad' in the Congress and began to call all those on friendly terms with the leaders as 'progressives' and began forming united front with them.

With this, the revisionists and the neo-revisionists abandoned the fundamental Marxist-Leninist principle of exposing the anti-people's character of all the ruling classes and their parties before the people. In practice the policy of uniting with the opposition section of the ruling

classes for election purposes began to be adopted. The slogan of united front with the opposition section of the ruling classes began to come into operation.

Marxism-Leninism is based on class struggle. The revisionists and the neo-revisionists abandoned this very principle itself. Under the pretext of united front with the middle and rich peasants, the struggle for the demands of the agricultural labourers was abandoned. The policy of agitating only on those demands of the agricultural labourers to which the middle and rich peasants agreed to, was put into practice.

It is time we should unite the agricultural labourers, the poor peasants, the middle and rich peasants against the landlords at the village level. For this, we must fight against the feudal exploitation, whoever practices it. For this we must fight for the demands of the agricultural labourers and poor peasants. At the same time, we must fight the demands of the middle and rich peasants. In this process we should build the united front with the middle and rich peasants against the landlords. The leadership betrayed this; their line helped only the landlords.

With the era of Khrushchev in the Soviet Union, the policy of peaceful transition was increasingly propagated in India, the policy that the present system of exploitation could be changed peacefully came to the forefront.

Of course, all these changes did not take place in a single day, but only gradually, step by step. One should carefully study this step by step transformation.

Abandonment of class struggle

In 1952 elections, the communists, both in Telengana and Andhra regions, won big victories. In both the areas the communists emerged as the biggest political force.

The revisionists and the neo-revisionists utilised the high prestige of heroic struggle of 1946-51, the sacrifices of the people, and the fighting heroes into their electoral gains. But in both the regions, the Congress, with the help of the 'independents' was able to retain its power.

With these electoral gains, the leadership began to propagate new theories. In Andhra today, tomorrow Kerala, then West Bengal and step by step capture of power through elections—began to be increasingly propagated among the ranks. Some openly did this, some began 'blissfully' to dream of such changes.

Between 1951-56 the Party worked under the guidance of 1951 Programme which has characterised our country as a semi-colonial and semi-feudal country with fake independence and bogus democracy. It

said that only Revolution could liberate our people. This remained on paper. In practice, this was betrayed.

At that time, it was undivided Madras State. Barren speech-making in the Assemblies and Parliament, public meetings, and exaggeration of our role in those institutions—became the general pattern of Party work.

In this period, discussions which have ideological importance took place.

First : Some senior comrades said that we are abandoning anti land-lord struggles at the village level, the struggle for waste lands, the struggles for agricultural labourers and demands of the poor peasants and giving more importance to our work in the Assemblies and Parliament. This was wrong. We must take the first task as the major task.

But in the course of the discussions, all these good points were relegated to the background. How to retain present Assembly and parliament seats we have already won? How to win new seats? The discussions centered around this.

Not only that. A new conception was brought in. It was said that it was wrong to fight only for the demands of the agricultural labourers. They cautioned that such a policy would alienate the middle and rich peasants from the Party. They cautioned the Party that the demands of the agricultural labourers and the poor peasants have to be settled peacefully.

These elements began to say that we should not only agitate for the demands of the agricultural labourers and the poor peasants, but our mass organisations should take the responsibility of making these sections do their work properly.

With this the call was given to the mass organisations that they should see that the agricultural labourers should work for 7-8 hours completely in the fields. With this, the hateful method of beating the drums signalling the agricultural labourers as to when they should start from their homes for work in the fields and when they should leave the fields for home, was started both in the mornings and the evenings.

Naturally this gladdened the hearts of the landlords in the villages. They were glad that these *communists* were working as their agents among the agricultural labourers. They began lavishly praising these *communists* and these *communists* were carried away by praises from the landlord elements. They began to defend their service to the landlords in the name of *united front* with the middle and rich peasants. In practice, the 'united front' never came into existence as a result of such tactics. Only it helped the landlords. With this, the leadership began to make friendship with the small landlords and rich peasants to get more votes and seats.

We must unite the agricultural labourers, poor, middle and rich peasants. What are their problems? How to co-ordinate these struggles? How to build united front against the landlords? These were never discussed. No programme was given for this. But the line of the leadership helped the landlords only.

Second: In 1952 elections the Congress had been severely defeated in the Circar districts. The Communists won greater number of seats in these districts. Because of this, the Congress leadership began rousing the regional passions of the people of one area against the people in another area—Rayalaseema against the Circar districts.

The aim of the Congress leadership was to divert the attention of the people from their class struggles and anti landlord struggles. For this, they began rousing the passions of the people of one area against the people of another area. For this they raised slogans like Kurnool as the capital the new Andhra state, the slogan of Krishna - Pennar Project, the high level canal of Thungabhadra to be constructed first, establishing Tirupathi University etc. to rouse Rayalaseema people against Circar districts.

It is the duty of the communists to defeat this conspiracy. But this could only be defeated by organising the exploited classes of all areas against the landlords and advance the revolutionary movement.

But the leadership of the united Communist Party did not adopt such a course. The attitude of the leadership on all the questions raised above, in practice only helped the Congress in diverting the attention of the people from the path of class struggles and anti-landlord struggles. This main failure of this period is to be noted.

Take one more example. Whose duty is it to repair the irrigation canals? It is the responsibility of the government. To agitate among the people and organise and force the government to implement these tasks, is the task of the communists. But what was the attitude of the leadership of the united communist movement with regard to repairs to the Krishna canals? They themselves began to dig the canals, to repair them. They mobilised the party ranks to do this job. They took photos of leaders participating in this manual labour and published in the Party organs. Of course this will show the 'love' of the Party for the interests of the people. But will work of such reformist nature rouse the class consciousness of the people? They were only hiding the abandonment of class struggle behind these reformist works.

1955 elections in Andhra—wrong lessons

Whatever it be, the struggle for power between the various Congress groups was useful for the united Communist Party leadership. The Prakasam ministry was defeated. Elections were again held for the Andhra

Assembly. The leadership of the united Communist Party announced an election manifesto for capture of power through the elections. But it fought the elections on the basis of its own strength.

Even by then, the struggle of the Heroic Telengana Struggle (1946-51) was still fresh in the minds of the people. So agricultural labourers, the poor peasants came forward in support of the Party in that elections on a big scale. The Congress leaders united all its groups and all landlords' groups to retain power. It spent lavishly on arrack and toddy to purchase votes. Where the landlords were stronger, they suppressed the voice of the poorer sections. They did not allow the poorer sections to vote, if they were suspected of having sympathies for the Communist Party.

With such dirty methods, the Congress won in that elections. The united Communist Party was decisively defeated. But the leadership refused to take proper lessons from this defeat. It took wrong lessons. In the period between 1952-55, with election illusions dominating the minds of the leadership, by and large, it has abandoned the path of class struggle and the anti-landlord struggle as its main task to advance the Agrarian Revolution. In the districts, when such issues were taken, it was due to the initiative of the district leadership. Even then, they did not go beyond the legal, economic and general political agitational level. The main work of the Party during this period was work in the Assemblies and Parliament, deputations to govt. offices, petitions to the govt. etc. Because of this, we failed to politically consolidate the enthusiasm of the masses shown in 1952 elections. We could not win the masses behind the Congress. In addition, in 1955 elections the Congress could penetrate our ranks and purchase votes. Thus we could see that because of our concentration on such issues like Capital, or regional issues; instead of concentrating on anti-landlord struggles and class struggles—this has resulted in the weakening of the revolutionary movement in Andhra. The leadership of the united Communist Party refused to take this lesson.

—By 1955, our movement in Andhra has been forced to depend more on the general political sympathies of the masses. In the name of overcoming this weakness, the leadership at all levels adopted the method of big public meetings and rallies. The leadership deluded itself into thinking that all people who attended those meetings would vote for the Party. With this, house to house and group propaganda work was abandoned. Propaganda through jeeps and mikes became the main feature. Above all, propaganda with the help of the cine artists dominated the election campaign. With such election propaganda, the Party failed to get any additional votes. The result was only debts running into lakhs of rupees for the District Committees and Provincial Committee, becoming an unbearable burden. The Party leadership failed to take proper lessons from this. This continued to be the main practice in the subsequent elections too.

Above all these things, was it correct on the part of the communists to try to come to power through elections? Will elections held under the present Constitution meant to preserve the present system of exploitation, bring about any basic changes in the conditions of the people? None in the leadership dared to discuss this basic question. We were terribly afraid even to raise such questions at that time.

Instead of putting these fundamental questions, and find true answers, it was decided that our defeat was due to lack of united front with other bourgeois parties. In addition, it was declared that it was wrong on the part of the Party to have included the programme of 'land to the tiller' in the election manifesto, which according to them, resulted in driving the middle and rich peasants into the lap of the landlords.

One should remember that these very wrong lessons formed the basis for bourgeois election alliances of the later period.

Shameful methods for the liquidation of the Party

With the defeat of the Party in these elections, some leaders in the united communist movement lost hopes for the future. They began advising their close followers and sympathisers to look after their own family affairs. They advised their followers like this: "We have tried to capture power through the Telengana armed struggle. But we failed. This time we have tried for the same through the elections. Now also we have failed. Now there is no question of our coming to power in the near future. It is better now to look after your own family affairs. You sell the small plots of lands in Krishna and Guntur districts and go to new project areas in backward districts, where you can purchase land cheaply and can improve the lot of your families". In actual practice, what they tried to do was the virtual liquidation of the Party in the most shameful manner.

Some persons took the cue from this. Hundreds of cadres from Party ranks from Krishna and Guntur districts were encouraged to migrate. In a planned way, they were all rehabilitated on the banks of Godavari river in Khammam and Warangal districts, along the K.C. canal and the High level and Low level canals of Tungabhadra. They purchased lands of the girijans and poor peasants cheaply. Now they have become rich. Actually some of them had become the landlords and village-bureaucrats exploiting the local people. When one remembers the sacrifices of some of these persons in the earlier struggles and their new role as exploiters, one gets disgusted. They are standing examples of the degeneration of the policies of the leadership of the united Communist Party.

United Front with dissident Congressmen

We have already seen how the leadership of the united Communist Party refused to draw proper lessons from the electoral defeat in 1955.

We have already seen how they drew the wrong lesson that the defeat was primarily due to absence of election alliances with the bourgeois groups.

This same process took another shape in the Telengana region. In order to deceive the people, the Congress government brought forward an Act for the 'protection' of Tenancy Rights of the peasants. The leadership of the Party lost no time in hailing it.

As a result of this Act, actually all the lands seized by the peasants during the heroic struggle were dragged to the courts, where the peasants lost greater part of these lands, because they had no land records in their favour. Only in those villages, where the peasants had strength in their mass organisations, they could retain some of these lands by compromising with the landlords. In the greater part of the Telengana area, the peasants lost majority of the lands seized during the Telengana struggle. Landlords were once again established in the villages of Telengana. The gains of the Heroic Telengana were lost one after the other. The leadership of united communist movement was satisfied with the Parliamentary work and deputations to the bureaucratic officials.

Thus, with the Parliamentary work, with Agrarian Revolution as aim class struggles have been abandoned by and large. The Party work was confined largely to legal, economic struggles and general political agitations. By 1957 Assembly and Parliament elections, the class basis and the support of the people been very much weakened. As in the past, the Party could not win seats on the basis of its own strength. With this, the hunt for the bourgeois 'friends' began.

But at this time, still there was no clear-cut bourgeois opposition to the Congress in Andhra. Factional struggles inside the Congress have started. A part of the Party leadership began to see 'progressives' within the Congress. These were the days when the Second Five Year Plan was launched. A part of the leadership began to see 'progressiveness' in this plan. These were the days of peaceful transition theories emanating from the Soviet Union with the rise of Khrushchev to power there.

In this political background, the process of befriending the dissident Congressmen by the leadership of the united Communist Party started. The process of having united front with those Congress men, who did not get Congress tickets, and 'independents' started. The arguments of the leadership in defence of such a line were strange to say the least!

We cannot win a seat in any particular constituency on our own strength. Our votes in another constituency are not sufficient to win a seat. Let us barter our votes in such constituencies with dissident Congressmen or 'independents' to take their votes in the other constituency in return and win these seats and thus strengthen ourselves in the Assemblies.

Do anything—but win the seat. That was the only motto! From this, the policy of united front with Congress dissidents became the policy of united Communist Party, from top to bottom, to be applied from the village panchayats to the Parliament. Thus the class struggle and the class issues were relegated into the background, weakening the anti-landlord struggles.

United Front with 'Progressives' inside the Congress.

Having taken to this policy, it did not stop there. It took its inevitable course. With the Second Five year Plan, the Soviet leadership, with its revisionist theories, began to enter India on a big scale. Condemnation of the great Stalin and praises for Nehru started. Defence of the 'progressive policies of Nehru, became the official line of the Party to advance towards socialism. The leadership of the united Communist Party took up this 'sacred' task of defending 'Nehru's progressivism'.

In the background of this new theory, the then Party in West Bengal made a united front with Ajoy Kumar Mukherjee, began supporting the Akalis under the leadership of Fateh Singh, began supporting Congress against the DMK in Madras. In Andhra, it took to worse forms. Let's look at a few examples.

There was a contest for Chief Ministership between Burgula Rama Krishna Rao and Venkata Ranga Reddy among the Congress legislators. The leadership of the Party immediately announced that Burgula Rama-Krishna Rao was a representative of the small landlords and he should be supported. Here one should remember it was the Congress legislators who were to elect their Chief Minister. So the support of the Party was only in the streets.

When the present Andhra State was formed, there was a contest for Chief Ministership between Sanjeeva Reddy and Gopala Reddy, the two Congress leaders. The leadership of the united Communist Party immediately announced that Sanjeeva Reddy was the representative of smaller landlords and that Gopal Reddy was the representative of the bigger landlords and they supported Sanjeeva Reddy. Where? In the streets and in the Party official organs. Whom did they really help? Only to bury the concept of class struggle and take to the path of class collaboration.

It did not stop with this. When there was a contest between the Congress and the Swathantra Party candidate Ranga, the Party leadership openly supported the Congress candidate as against the candidate of the Swathantra Party since the Congress was considered to be progressive. But unfortunately for them Ranga subsequently joined the Congress itself.

By 1962, the policy of class collaboration became more open; A proposal came before the State Committee that the united Party should publish the list of Congress candidates whom the Party would

support. Of course it was rejected. But it was this conception that led later to the CPI's support to the Indira Congress govt. and its emergency rule.

This policy of finding the 'progressives' inside the Congress played havoc with the District Committees leading to splits among them, each faction supporting one set of Congress groups in the district. For instance, in Khammam district, a section in the District Committee supported one section of Congress led by the notorious Vengal Rao, while the other section supported the another section of Congress men led by Siddha Reddy.

This policy did not materially change even with the formation of the CPM. It was only said that the Party should support the non-official Congress. Opposition to the Congress became united front with opposition section of the ruling parties. For instance, the Muslim League in Kerala became 'progressive' if it tied itself with the CPM. And the same Muslim League became 'reactionary' if it links with the Congress.

Now both the revisionists and the neo-revisionists have taken up this concept. It is this policy that has now become the policy of building the *Left and Democratic Front* propagated now by both of them. Its sole aim is united front with the opposition section of the ruling classes. That is why both of them are running after the Janata, Lok Dal, Akali Dal, DMK and AIDMK etc., all in the name of opposing the authoritarianism of Indira Gandhi !

Both the revisionists and the neo-revisionists have long abandoned the path of class struggle and resistance struggle. Step by step they were wedded to the path of parliamentarism. Winning of seats and capturing state ministries became their sole aim. Defence of these ministries has now become their sole concern. For this, they should win the sympathy of Indira Gandhi in the Centre. That is why both of them are now praising the 'non-aligned' and 'anti-imperialist' policies of Indira Gandhi to the skies. Now they have changed from fake opposition to critical support. They have paved the way from praising Nehru to praising Indira Gandhi. This is the culmination of their policies of class collaboration.

We should note the gradual change of the revisionists and the neo-revisionists from the position of Telengana armed struggle to the present path of parliamentarism.

Having betrayed the Telengana struggle, during 1952-55, the united Communist Party, by and large, participated in the election on its own strength. With the participation in elections, work in the Assemblies: legal, economic and general political agitations and deputations to bureaucratic officials became the main work of the Party. Class struggles were by and large abandoned. They later changed to united front with Congress dissidents and 'independents'. Later it became united front with the

'progressives' inside the Congress itself and support to Nehru's progressivism. Then it changed to support to India Congress rule and its Emergency rule by the CPI. Now 'left and democratic front' i.e., united front with all opposition sections of the ruling classes, and critical support to Indira Gandhi has now become the policy of the CPI and CPM.

Panchayat Raj—factional politics in the villages

We have seen above, how, after 1952 elections, the leadership of the united Communist Party abandoned class struggles and took to the path of class collaboration. The heinous features of this policy can be clearly seen in the programme of these parties in the villages.

In 1956, Nehru introduced Village Panchayat Raj. With this, the Samitis to be formed of the Presidents of the village Panchayats, and Zilla Parishads to be formed out of the Samithis came into practice. This was an effort on the part of the Congress govt. to keep the landlords in power from the village level to the Zilla Parishad level. To win power in these bodies became the sole aim of the CPI and CPM. The policies of class collaboration pursued by the CPI-CPM leadership helped their followers to acquire dominant positions in these bodies, particularly in the village Panchayats and Samithis in certain places.

By that time itself, all class struggles and anti-landlord struggles have been by and large abandoned at the village levels. During the first elections under the Panchayat Raj system, it was clear that it was difficult to acquire dominant position in these bodies merely by depending on the general sympathy of the people.

In order to win in these elections, the policy of united front with the landlord groups and Congress groups was initiated by the CPI-CPM leadership.

The revisionists and neo-revisionists began to adopt immoral methods being implemented by the Congress landlords. Purchasing of votes, use of arrack and toddy to get the poor people's votes, keeping unwilling or suspected voters under restrictions, getting votes through various pressure tactics, special camps for village Presidents under strict watch, taking the unwilling village Presidents and keeping them in confinement against their will—all immoral methods of the Congress landlords were adopted by the CPI-CPM leadership to win power in these bodies.

In some places these immoral methods were implemented by the CPI CPM leadership in co-operation with the Congress groups themselves.

—Large sums of money are necessary to win the elections in Panchayats, Samithis and Zilla Parishads. To get this money, the CPI leadership converted these institutions into instruments for corruption. Thus the

leaders of the CPI and CPM at the village level become arrack contractors and road contractors and became the worst corrupt bureaucrats in the villages.

—In this way, the cadres of the CPI and CPM, emerged as various types of contractors, as exploiters, as new landlords and bureaucrats in the villages.

Now a situation has arisen where, in the villages under the domination of CPI and CPM, the people have no civil rights. Other parties opposed to them have no right to hold public meetings, no right to distribute their pamphlets or put up wall-posters. These are the democratic rights for the people in the villages under their domination.

This is the culmination of the policies of class collaboration being pursued by the CPI and CPM.

Basic Lessons

What are the basic lessons one has to learn from the politics of Parliamentarism being pursued by the CPI-CPM leadership?

—When one abandons the class struggle and the resistance struggle, he is bound to take to the Path of Parliamentarism, whether he likes it or not. There is no other alternative.

—The policies of bourgeois election alliances, in whatever garb, are bound to lead to the policy of class collaboration, weaken and finally destroy the resistance struggle.

In 1952, the united Communist Party participated in the elections on the basis of its own strength. With the success in these elections, the leaders began to propagate the concept of achieving power through elections. With this they abandoned class struggles step by step, slipped into the policy of election alliances with the ruling class parties. The organisations of Communist Revolutionaries should take proper lessons from this sordid history of parliamentarism of the CPI-CPM.

We have the least doubt in saying that the politics of certain organisations and groups of Communist Revolutionaries are very dangerous to the revolutionary movement in the country. The slogans like 'anti-authoritarian front', 'anti-autocratic front', front against Indira's dictatorship, that the struggle against Indira's fascism is a transitional phase, that during this phase of struggle we should fight only for democratic rights—all these wrong slogans are bound to lead the working class Party into bourgeois election alliances and united front with the ruling class parties and destroy the resistance struggle. Our Party is determinedly opposed to all such policies.

15-7-1982

(This article was published in July-August '82, Road to Liberation.)

Attitude towards opposition bourgeois parties and bourgeois election alliances

Lessons from the history of the International Communist Movement

The attitude of the Communist Revolutionaries towards opposition section of the ruling classes, towards bourgeois parliamentary institutions and towards bourgeois election alliances have become important contentious issue affecting their unity.

Let us study this question deeply from the experiences of past history of the international communist movement and their lessons for the present.

For this, we must study the lessons from four historical periods :

1. Lenin's teachings, particularly between 1905 and 1912—the Duma period of Tsarist Russia.
2. Dimitrov's Report to the 7th Congress of the Third Communist International in 1935 and its implementation in Western Europe.
3. Experience of the West European Communist Parties in the post Second World War period.
4. The effect of the theory of Peaceful Transition to Socialism peddled by the modern revisionists headed by the CPSU from 1956 onwards.

Before we go into Lenin's teachings, let us recollect the main events of the Duma period of Russia.

The Russian Revolution of 1905—bourgeois democratic revolution—was a product of the defeat of Tsarist Russia in its war against Japan.

Commenting on the surrender of Port Arthur to Japan, Lenin said :

“Port Arthur has surrendered.....The moral power of the mighty empire is crumbling.....Sentence has been passed upon the entire political system.....Advancing Progressive Air has dealt backward and rea-

ctionary Europe an irreparable blow it signifies the collapse of our political system.....”(Lenin, Vol. 8)

In the background of these events, the Russian Revolution started with the events of January 9, 1905. Subsequently the workers and other sections of the people took to political strikes; peasant struggles broke out against the feudal landlords. It led to revolts in the Army and Navy, showing the readiness of the people for an uprising.

It was during this period that the Tsar announced the Bulygin Duma. The Bolsheviks boycotted it. Bulygin Duma never came into existence. It was swept away by the advance of the revolutionary tide.

Again in October 17, 1905, the Tsar was forced to announce another Duma, promising to extend the voting rights to broader sections of the people, to divert the people from the path to Revolution. But the Bolsheviks again called for the boycott of the elections and to continue the revolutionary struggle.

In the background of the defeat the December Uprising in Moscow in 1905, the first Duma was convened. But finding that the First Duma was not sufficiently submissive to the Tsar, and being afraid of the growing discontent of the people, the Tsar abolished the First Duma in the summer of 1906 and decided to call the Second Duma. The Bolsheviks did participate officially in the Second Duma in 1906, the Third Duma in 1907 and the fourth Duma in 1912.

This shows that the Bolsheviks boycotted the Duma in 1905 and part of 1906. They participated in the Duma from the Second Duma onwards.

Lenin's teachings of this period 1905-1912 the Duma period, were when the revolutionary forces—the workers, peasants and the army—were advancing towards an armed uprising. At that time Lenin correctly called for the boycott of the Bulygin Duma.

Lenin said that Bulygin Duma 'is in fact Tsarism's deal with the landlords and the big bourgeoisie', that the Constitutional Democratic Party is ready to run away from the revolution and make a deal with the Tsar to 'preserve the monarchy'. He further said :

“The only question is when and how this deal will take place. The task confronting the party of the proletariat is to delay conclusion of this deal for as long as possible, to split up the bourgeoisie as much as possible, to derive from the bourgeoisie's temporary appeals to the people the greater advantage for the revolution, and meanwhile prepare the forces of the revolutionary people (the proletariat and the peasantry) for the forcible overthrow of the autocracy and for the alienation, the neutralisation of the treacherous bourgeoisie.” (p. 180, Vol. 9) (Emphasis ours)

About the character of the Bulygin Duma, Lenin said :

“A consultative assembly of representatives of the landlords and the big bourgeoisie, elected under the supervision and with the assistance of autocratic government’s servants on the basis of an electoral system so indirect, so blatantly based on property and social estate qualifications, that it is sheer mockery of the idea of popular representation.” (Vol. 9, p. 179)

Lenin called for an active boycott, but not for a passive one. He declared :

“We must exert every effort to make the real use of boycott in extending and intensifying agitation, so that it shall not be reduced to mere passive abstention from voting. If we are not mistaken, this idea is already fairly widespread among the comrades working in Russia, who express it in the words : active boycott. As distinct from passive abstention, active boycott should imply increasing agitation ten-fold, organising meetings everywhere, taking advantage of election meetings, even if we have to force our way into them, holding demonstrations, political strikes and so on and so forth. It goes without saying that to further agitation and struggle in this connection, temporary agreements with various groups of revolutionary bourgeois democrats, generally permitted by a number of our Party resolutions, are especially expedient. But here we must, on the one hand, steadfastly preserve the class individuality of the Party of the proletariat, and must not for a single moment, abandon our Social-Democratic criticism of our bourgeois allies ; on the other hand, we should be failing in our duty as the party of the advanced class if in our agitation we failed to produce an advanced revolutionary slogan at the present stage of the democratic revolution.” (Vol. 9, p. 182)

What were the alternative slogans that Lenin gave along with the boycott of the Bulygin Duma ?

An “armed uprising”, setting up the provisional revolutionary government to call for a genuine Constituent Assembly based on universal franchise.

Lenin said :

“1. convocation of a popular constituent assembly 2. arming of the people 3. political freedom—immediate repeal of all laws that contradict it 4. complete cultural and political freedom for all oppressed and disfranchised nationalities 5. an eight hour working day 6. the establishment of peasant committees for the support and implementation of all democratic reforms, among them agrarian reforms upto, including the confiscation of the landlords’ land.” (Vol 9, p. 183)

What is the mood, consciousness and preparedness required for the success of the slogan of boycott of elections ?

Lenin declared :

“Boycott is a declaration of open war against the old regime, a direct attack upon it, Unless there is a board revolutionary upswing, unless there is mass unrest which overflows, as it were, the bounds of the old legality, there can be no question of boycott succeeding”. (Vol. 13, p. 25)

He explained that the boycott of 1905 succeeded because there was “a sweeping, powerful and rapid upswing of the revolution”.

(Vol 13, p 24)

With such a conception the Bolsheviks of Russia stubbornly worked to advance the revolutionary struggle and as a result of their struggle, there were many workers political strikes, peasant uprisings, revolts in the army and navy, finally leading to armed uprising in December 1905.

But the Revolution of 1905 did not succeed and the revolutionary upswing began to recede after the summer of 1906.

After the defeat of December Uprising in 1905, the First Duma met. At first the Bolsheviks called for the boycott of this Duma also. But because of the weakness of the revolutionary movement, this boycott was not successful and as per the decision of the Union Congress of the Social Democratic Labour Party (the than Communist Party), the Party formed a workers, group in the First Duma.

On this, Lenin says :

“In the State Duma there is a workers’ group of fifteen. How did these deputies get into the Duma ? They were not nominated by the workers, organisations. The Party did not authorise them to represent its interests in the Duma. Not a single local organisation of R. S. D. L. P. adopted a resolution (although in might have done) to nominate its members for the State Duma”.

“The worker deputies got into the Duma through non-party channels. Nearly all, or even all, got in by direct or indirect, tacit or avowed agreements with the Cadets. Many of them got into the Duma in such a way that it is difficult to tell whether they were elected as Constitutional Democrats or as Social Democrats. This is a fact, and a fact of enormous political importance. To hush it up, as many Social Democrats are doing today, is unpardonable and useless. Unpardonable, because it means keeping in the dark the electorate generally and the workers’ party in particular. Useless because the act is bound to come out in the course of events”.

“In declaring that the formation of a social democratic parliamentary group was desirable, the Unity Congress of the R. S. D. L. P. made a mistake by not taking this fact into account”. (Vol. 10, p. 402)

Principles guiding the participation in the Duma elections

In the Second Duma, the Bolsheviks did participate with definite political aims as laid down by Lenin :

“The principal objects of the Social-Democratic elections and Duma campaigns are : *firstly* to explain to the people the uselessness of the Duma as a means of satisfying the demands of the proletariat and the revolutionary petty bourgeoisie, especially the peasantry. *Secondly*, to explain to the people the impossibility of achieving political liberty by parliamentary methods as long as the real power remains in the hands of the Tsar’s government, and to explain the necessity of an armed uprising, of a provisional govt. and of a constituent assembly elected by universal, direct and equal suffrage by secret ballot. *Thirdly*, to criticise the First Duma and reveal the bankruptcy of Russian liberalism, and especially to show how dangerous and fatal it would be for the cause of the revolution if the liberal-monarchist Cadet Party were to play the predominant and leading role in the liberation movement.” (Vol 11, p. 300) (Emphasis ours)

“As the class party of the proletariat, the Social Democratic Party must remain absolutely independent throughout the election and Duma campaigns, and here too, must under no circumstances, merge its slogans or tactics with those of any other opposition or revolutionary party.

Therefore, at the first stage of the election campaign, i.e., before the masses, it must, as a general rule, come out absolutely independently and put forward only its own Party candidates.

Exceptions to this rule are permissible only in cases of extreme necessity and only in relation to parties that fully accept the main slogans of our immediate political struggle, i.e., those which recognise the necessity of an armed uprising and are fighting for a democratic republic. Such agreements, however, may only extend to the nomination of a joint list of candidates, without in any way restricting the independence of the political agitation carried on by the Social-Democrats.

In the workers’ curia, the Social Democratic Party must come out absolutely and refrain from entering into agreements with any other party”. (Vol 11, p. 300)

These were the guiding principles concerning the participation of Bolsheviks in all the subsequent Dumas.

Lenin further said :

“The attitude of the workers’ Party towards the masses is exactly the reverse. The important thing for us is not to get seats in the Duma by means of compromises; on the contrary, those seats are important only because and insofar as they can serve to develop the *political consciousness*

of the masses, to *raise* them to a higher political level, to *organise* them, **not** for the sake of philistine happiness, not for the sake of 'tranquility', or 'order' and 'peaceful (bourgeois) bliss', but for the *struggle*, the struggle for the complete emancipation of labour from all exploitation and all oppression. Only for this purpose, and only to the extent that they help as to achieve it, are seats in the Duma and the *whole* election campaign important for us". (Vol 11, p. 416)

According to Lenin, boycott or participation in elections, the aim is the same : to develop the political and revolutionary consciousness of the exploited masses and advance the revolutionary struggle depending on the consciousness of the people.

Describing the repressive conditions in which the Duma elections were being held in Russia at that time, Lenin said :

"The Duma election results demonstrate the physiognomy and strength of the various classes."

"The Franchise in Russia is neither direct not equal. In the first place, the peasants elect one delegate for ten households, elect a peasant delegate from among their number; the delegates so elected then elect a peasant elector, and the latter together with electors from other social estates, elect the deputies to the Duma. The system is the same for the land owner, urban and worker curias being fixed by law in the interests and the advantage of the upper classes, the landowners and the bourgeoisie. Furthermore, not only the revolutionary parties, but the opposition parties as well are subjected to the most barbarous, the most illegal police repression; then there is the complete absence of freedom of the press and assembly, arbitrary arrests and banishment, as well as the military courts operating in the greater part of Russia and the state of emergency connected with them". (Vol 12, p. 196)

Class approach towards political parties in the Duma

One of the striking features of the teachings of Lenin during this period is the class approach towards political parties in the Duma. Lenin says :

"No, gentlemen, the principal of class struggle is the very foundation of all Social-Democratic teachings and of all Social-Democratic policy. The proletarians, the peasants and the towns people are not such babes in arms that the ideas of representations can be dimmed in their minds by bitter disputes, or by the acute struggle between the classes. Our job is not to be sugary to them, but on the contrary, to teach them, from the Duma platform, to distinguish clearly between the parties and *understand their class roots which the sly bourgeoisie keep buried deep underground*". (p. 167, Vol. 12) (Emphasis ours)

With this approach, Lenin analysed the class character of the various political parties working in the Duma at that period. He divided all other parties into three sections—"Octobrists, the Cadets and the revolutionary or peasant democrats".

"We cannot of course expect the full and final consolidation of the parties of each type: the open entry of the various classes in Russian society into anything like a free political arena is too recent for that".

(Vol. 10, p. 455)

About the character of the Octobrists, Lenin said :

"The Octobrists are real class organisation of the landlords and the big capitalists. The counter-revolutionary (anti-revolutionary) character of this section of the bourgeoisie is perfectly obvious. It stands on the side of the government, although still haggling with it over the division of power. The Haydens and Co. sometimes even merge with the Cadets in opposition to the old authorities, but this does not make even the most credulous people, who are taken in by all sorts of 'opposition' forget the real nature of the Octobrist Party". (Vol. 10, p. 455)

About the character of the Cadets, Lenin said :

"The Cadets are the chief party of the second type. This party is not exclusively connected with any particular class in bourgeois society, but it is thoroughly bourgeois, none the less. Its ideal is a well-ordered bourgeois society, purged of feudal survivals and protected from the encroachments of the proletariat by institutions such as an Upper Chamber, a standing army, non-elected bureaucracy, draconian press laws, etc. The Cadets are a semi-landlord party. They want to ransom themselves from revolution. They long for a deal with the old authorities. They are afraid of independent revolutionary activity by the people. The more this party develops its public political activities, particularly in the Duma, the more marked become the inconsistency and instability. That is why the voices of shortsighted people, who are dazzled by momentary successes, in favour of supporting the Cadets, will never find wide support among the working class". (Vol. 10, pp. 455-456)

About the character of the Trudoviks, Lenin said :

"The third type of bourgeois party is the Trudoviks, i.e., the peasant deputies to the Duma, who issued their programme the other day. Revolutionary Social-Democrats have long been watching the rise of this type of political party in Russia. The Peasant Union was a nucleus of such a party. The radical unions of propertyless intellectuals gravitated towards it to some extent. The Socialist Revolutionaries developed in the same direction, growing out of the narrow shell that encased them as a group of intellectuals. The variety of types and shades of this trend fully corresponds to the variety of types and vast numbers of the 'toiling' petty

bourgeoisie in Russia. The main bulwark of this trend, of these parties, is the peasantry. Objective conditions compel the peasantry to wage a determined struggle against landlordism, against the power of the landlords and the whole of the old political system that is closely connected with it. These bourgeois democrats are *compelled* to become revolutionary, whereas the liberals, the Cadets and so forth, represent the bourgeoisie, whose conditions of existence *compel* it to seek a deal with the old authorities. It is natural also that the peasantry should clothe its aspirations in the mantle of utopias, i.e., unrealisable hopes, such as equalised land tenure under capitalism." (Vol. 10 p. 456.)

Lenin further explained :

"Next come the '*Trudoviks*'. The parties of this type, namely the petty-bourgeois and predominantly peasant parties, are divided into the *non-party* 'Trudovik group' (which held a congress recently), the Popular Socialists and the Socialist Revolutionaries (the Polish Socialist Party etc., correspond more or less to the Socialist Revolutionaries). The only more or less consistent and determined revolutionaries and republicans among them are the S.R.'s. The Popular Socialist are much worse opportunists than our Mensheviks; strictly speaking, they are semi-Cadets. The non-party 'Trudovik group' has, perhaps, more influence among the peasantry than the others; but the strength of its democratic convictions is difficult to determine, although it is undoubtedly far more Left than the Cadets, and evidently belongs to the camp of revolutionary democracy". (Vol. 11, p. 282).

He further said :

"It is clear that *real* party agreement with the Trudoviks is *impossible*. It is clear that we must not under any circumstances help to unite the opportunist popular socialists with the revolutionary S R's; on the contrary we must split them and counterpose one to the other. It is clear that the existence of a non-party Trudovik Group makes it more to our advantage in all respects to preserve complete independence in order to exert a really revolutionary influence upon them, than to tie our hands and blur the distinctions between the monarchists and the republicans etc. It is *absolutely impermissible* for Social Democrats to blur these distinctions; and for this reason alone, it is necessary to reject blocs altogether, once the *present* grouping of parties unites the non-Party Trudoviks, the Popular Socialists and the Socialist Revolutionaries." (Vol. 11, p. 282).

Irreconcilable struggle against the Cadets, the liberal bourgeoisie

Another significant feature of the activities of the Bolsheviks and teachings of Lenin concerning this period is the irreconcilable struggle against the Cadets, the representatives of the liberal bourgeoisie, as the compromising party of the bourgeoisie in the opposition "the Party of the centre", as Lenin has characterised them.

In spite of the Cadets working under '*opposition flag*', Lenin denounced them 'as chafferers, stockjobbers,' dashing from 'one belligerent to the other.'

turning 'to the right' while 'the popular masses turn to the left' 'pursuing a counter revolutionary path', 'deserting to the side of the landlords and Tsarism against the fighting peasants', committing 'unprecedented acts of funkism in the Duma'. He condemned the Cadets as 'a decaying corpse'. He further said:

"Therefore our Duma deputies and all our Party organisations must bear in mind that we cannot make a single serious step forward in Social Democratic propaganda and agitation about the Balkan events without revealing, *from the Duma rostrum*, in leaflets and at meetings—the connection between the reactionary policy of autocracy and the hypocritical opposition of the Cadets. We shall never be able to explain to the people how harmful and reactionary the policy of tsarist government is, unless we explain the Cadet foreign policy is *essentially the same*. We cannot combat chauvinism and the Black Hundred spirit in foreign policy unless we combat the phrase mongering, the posing, the mental reservations and dodges of the Cadets". (Vol. 15, p. 224).

These are enough to show the irreconcilable ideological and political battle that Lenin carried against the counter-revolutionary nature of the Cadets, inspite of their being in the opposition. This only shows that Lenin took their being in the opposition as nothing but fake.

Exposure of the bourgeois deception

Keeping in line with this irreconcilable struggle against the Cadet Party, the Bolsheviks and comrade Lenin sharply exposed the deception of the bourgeois liberals from the platform of the Duma, during this whole period.

—When the first Duma was set up with the Cadets having the majority, they raised the slogan of 'responsible cabinet' representing the majority in the Duma. Lenin stoutly opposed it. He said :

"Such a cabinet will be a Cadet Cabinet and on the very morrow of its appointment it will have to draw up penalties for abuses of freedom. At the present time, such a cabinet, when the Star Chamber* is still in power in the land, *such a cabinet can only serve as a liberal screen for old regime. At the present time such a cabinet will only serve as a clock to conceal these pogrom-mongers for a time. ... But we, the proletariat must not directly or indirectly avowedly or tacitly, assume slightest*

* The "Star Chamber" was the name given to the special high court in England for political and religious matters which was abolished by the English Revolution of the 17th century.

In the period 1905-1907 in Russia the name "Star Chamber" was applied to the Court clique of reactionary dignitaries representing the upper ranks of the feudal landlords and bureaucrats.

responsibility for this attempt to disguise the old regime
 whatever our intentions, owing to objective conditions of the present political situation, such a slogan will have to bear part of the responsibility for this disguise, for this deal between the bourgeoisie and the old regime. Such a slogan will indirectly imply approval of the 'Cadet bills'.
 (Vol. 11, p. 22) (Emphasis ours)

—Immediately after the dissolution of the First Duma, both the Mensheviks and the Cadets raised the slogan of "fight for the resumption of Duma sessions". Opposing this, Lenin said :

"The absurdity of this slogan is too obvious. It is not even opportunism. It is sheer non-sense". (Vol 11, p. 16)

The Central Committee of the Social Democratic Labour Party came forward with slogan "fight against the government in defence of the Duma for the purpose of convening the Constituent Assembly." While welcoming it as a step forward, still Lenin said :

"In short, this formula gives rise to a number of incorrect and harmful 'retrograde' ideas. What is correct in it is wholly and entirely embodied in the reasons for our decision to fight, in the explanation of why the dissolution of the Duma is considered a sufficiently important ground for fighting". (Vol. 11 p. 116).

He further said.

"No Duma is of any use *if the people do not have power*. But how to get power? By *overthrowing* the old regime and establishing a new one, popular, free and elected". (p. 117, Vol 11).

"As regards the content of the struggle, we have already shown that after two years of revolution it now centres on the overthrow of the old regime. The complete achievement of this aim is possible only by means of an armed uprising of the whole people". (Vol. 11, p. 118).

These were the alternative slogans given by Lenin in opposition to the demand of the Cadets and Mensheviks for the "resumption of Duma sessions".

—Calling upon the representatives of the party in the Duma not to vote for the Bills of the Cadets, but to move their own Bills independently, Lenin said.

"Legislative work *'must inevitably be placed in the hands of the Constitutional Democrats'*. Nothing of the sort. The Cadets, as leaders of the liberal 'Centre' in the Duma, have of a majority over the Black-Hundred-group, without our support. We must therefore table our own Social-Democratic Bills, not liberal and not petty-bourgeois Bills that are written in revolutionary language, not in official jargon, *and must put them to the*

vote. Let the Black Hundreds and the Cadets turn them down. We shall abstain from on the Cadet Bill as a whole, leaving the Cadets to defeat the Black Hundred thereby taking no responsibility on ourselves before the people for the poverty and worthlessness of Cadet pseudo-democracy". (Vol. 12, p. 183).

—Lenin asked the Party representatives not to depend on the Cadets even to put up bills or interpellations but "to count only on the support of the groups to the left of the Cadets". (Vol. 13, p. 132).

—When the Cadets brought a bill for the extension of the "budgetary powers of the (Third) Duma", the Party representative in the Duma declared: "*We support the proposal of the 40 because it tends towards an extension of the budgetary power of popular representative assembly*". (Third Duma).

Opposing this attitude, comrade Lenin declared :

"What was the object of this declaration of support for a proposal that was plainly lacking in principle, that was plainly inadequate, plainly signed by unprincipled people who were incapable of showing the slightest firmness—a proposal that was plainly and for all practical purposes worthless? This was not support for the militant bourgeoisie (a formula which many people like to justify their political spinelessness but support for the *wavering* liberal-*Octobrist* bourgeoisie". (p. 436, Vol 13)

Lenin called upon Party representatives in the Duma to "protect the honour of the socialist workers' Party! Do not allow yourselves to suffer failure by giving support to such liberalism!" (Vol. 13, p. 437)

—On the question of voting the budget, these were Lenin's instructions :

"On the question of the Budget, the Conference considers that in principle it is wrong to vote for the Budget as a whole.

It is also wrong to vote for items of the Budget of the class state which sanctions expenditure on instruments for the oppression of the masses (the armed forces, etc).

In voting for the reforms or for items of expenditure for cultural purposes, point of departure should be the principle of our programme, that Social Democrats reject reforms involving tutelage of the police and the bureaucracy over the working class.

Therefore the general rule should be to vote against the so-called reforms and items of expenditure for so-called cultural purposes introduced in the Duma.

In the special cases, where inspite of the general conditions, some improvement of the conditions of the working people is no more than probable, it is recommended that the deputies should abstain from voting and state their reasons for doing so.

Lastly, in exceptional cases, where there is no doubt that the workers will benefit, it is permissible to vote for a particular item, but it is recommended that the deputies should consult representatives of the Central Committee and the Party and trade union bodies.”
(Vol. 15, p. 329)

Against agreements and blocs with the opposition section of the ruling classes, as a general principle

Another very significant feature of the activities of the Bolsheviks and the teachings of Lenin in the whole period of Duma is refusal to have any agreements or blocs with any opposition section of the ruling classes for the sake of winning seats in the Duma. They followed a consistent stand of contesting the direct elections either in cities or rural areas on the basis of their own strength.

Welcoming the report about the success of Social-Democrats in Tiflis in 1906, comrade Lenin wrote :

“We welcome the successes of our comrades in the Caucasus. After the decision of the Unity Congress of our Party, the participation in the elections became obligatory, *on the condition, however, that the workers’ Party did not enter into any blocs, i. e., agreements with other parties.*”
(Vol. 10, p. 424) (Emphasis ours)

On various occasions, Lenin says :

“The Right wing Social Democrats directed all their efforts towards forming an alliance with the Cadets (support of the Duma as a whole, support of the demand for a Duma cabinet). The Revolutionary Social Democrats, on the contrary, directed their tactics towards winning over from the Cadets the revolutionary bourgeois democrats, towards liberating these elements from the yoke of the Cadets and uniting them with the proletariat for militant aims.” (Vol. 11, p. 153)

Throughout the Duma period the Mensheviks advocated support of the Duma as a whole, support of the Cadets (under the guise of supporting the demand for the appointment of a Duma Cabinet). The Bolsheviks did their utmost to split the Trudoviks from the Cadets and supported the idea of forming “an Executive Committee of the Left groups in the Duma”.
(Vol. 11, p. 163)

“The Mensheviks supported a Cadet ministry and Cadet policy in the First Duma, while the Bolsheviks, parallel with propaganda in favour of an “executive committee of the Left”, resolutely exposed constitutional

illusions and Cadet counter-revolutionarism". Further, the Bolsheviks worked for a left block in the Second Duma elections, while the Mensheviks called for a bloc with the Cadets and so on and so forth". (Vol. 13, p. 111)

It is important to note that it was during this period comrade Lenin wrote his famous and historical article on 'Marxism and Revisionism' where he categorically says :

"The experience of alliances, agreements and blocs with the social reform liberals in the West and with the liberal reformists (Cadets) in the Russian Revolution, has convincingly shown that these agreements only blunt the consciousness of the masses, that they do not enhance but weaken the actual significance of their struggle, by linking fighters with elements who are least capable of fighting and the most vacillating and teacherous. Millerandism in France—the biggest experiment in applying revisionist political tactics on a wide, a really national scale—has provided a practical appraisal of revisionism that will never be forgotten by the proletariat all over the world". (Vol. 15, p. 37.)

"Opportunists throughout the world favour the policy of a bloc with the liberals, now openly and outrightly proclaiming and implementing it, now advocating or justifying election agreements with the liberals, support of their slogans etc." (Vol. 16, p. 308.)

Lenin says :

"Remember this, gentlemen; alliances and negotiations with the Cadets are the worst way of exercising pressure on them. In practice, it will mean blunting the independent struggle of the Social-Democrats, and not Social-Democratic pressure on the Cadets. It is those who relentlessly expose every false step of the Cadets that are helping to revolutionise the Duma and are 'exercising pressure' on the Cadets. Refusal to support these false steps exerts far more pressure on the Cadet Duma than any negotiations with the Cadets with a view to supporting them." (Vol. 11, p. 59)

"Therefore, class independence throughout the election and Duma campaigns is our most important general task." (Vol. 11, p. 279)

"Liebknecht teaches us that a Social Democrat must be able to expose the dangerous aspects of every ally in the bourgeois camp and not conceal them. Our Mensheviks, however, cry out that we must fight not the Cadets but the Black Hundred danger! It would be useful for these people to ponder over the following words of Liebknecht: 'The stupid and cruel outrages perpetrated by the police, politicians, the encroachments of the Anti-Socialist Law, the draconian law, the law against parties that advocate revolution, may evoke feelings of contempt and pity; but the enemy who proffers us his hand for an electoral agreement and worms his

way into our ranks as a friend and brother is the enemy, *the only enemy we have to fear*". (Vol. 11, p. 402)

"Bebel has time and again exposed the sheer falsity, the sheer mendacity of this policy, and we can say without exaggeration that every Social-Democrat should know and remember his words.

'If I, as a Social Democrat, enter into a alliance with bourgeois parties, it is a thousand to one that the bourgeois parties will gain by it, not the Social Democrats. We shall be the losers. *It is a political law that wherever the Rights and Lefts enter an alliance, the Lefts lose, the Rights win*'

'If I enter into a political alliance with a party whose principles are hostile to mine, I must, of necessity modify my tactics, i. e., my methods of struggle, in order not to break this alliance. I can no longer criticise ruthlessly. I cannot fight for principles, because this would give offence to my allies; I have to keep quiet, cover up a lot of things, make excuses for inexcusable, gloss over matters that cannot be glossed over'.

Commenting on this statement of Bebel, comrade Lenin says :

"Opportunism is opportunism for the very reason that it sacrifices the 'fundamental' interests of the movement to momentary advantages or considerations based on the most short-sighted, superficial calculations". (Vol. 16, pp. 308, 390) (Emphasis ours)

While conducting his attack on all the ruling class parties whether in power or in opposition, Lenin at the same time advocated the method of utilising the contradictions of the enemy classes. He says :

"Somewhat greater and better use, perhaps, could be made of possible conflicts between various elements of the second majority between the Cadets, on the one hand, and the Octobrists and the government on the other. But here, too, the position is that, owing to objective conditions no less than to subjective moods and intentions these conflicts, both superficial and transient, are merely a means by which political hucksters will find it easier to make deals on terms outwardly more decorous but in essence opposed to the interests of democracy. Consequently, *while not refraining from utilising even such superficial and infrequent conflicts*, Social Democrats must wage a stubborn struggle for democratic and revolutionary aims not only against the government, the Black Hundreds, and Octobrists, but also against the Cadets". (Vol. 13 p. 128) (Emphasis ours)

On an other occasion, Lenin says :

"We revolutionary Social-Democrats favour joint actions by the party of the proletariat and the parties of the democratic petty bourgeoisie against the Black Hundreds and against the Cadets, as the party of treacherous liberalism. The Socialist Revolutionaries are so far from under-

standing this class foundation of the Russian revolution that, on the one hand, they talk about co-ordination of socialist and extreme Left groups in general i.e., about concealing the contradictions between the proletariat and the small producer; and, on the other hand, they talk about co-ordinated action by the revolutionary and socialist section of the Duma with the opposition, against the Black Hundreds.

No, gentlemen, we shall not even discuss permanent agreements, or co-ordinated actions in general. You must first agree with us on the policy of fighting both the Black Hundreds and the Cadets. Agree indeed! This is our ultimatum. You agree to oppose the Cadets? You have abandoned your Cadets? If that is actually so, if that is not a mere paper declaration, but something you prove in action, then and only then, will the Social-Democrats fight together with you in democratic action."

(Vol. 12, pp. 166, 167)

Distortion of Lenin

Some people, in their anxiety to get support from Lenin for their policy of bourgeois election alliances, quote the following passage of Lenin where he says :

"Under a parliamentary system, *it is often necessary, to support a more liberal party against the less liberal one.* But during a revolutionary struggle for a parliamentary system, it is treachery to support liberal turncoats who are 'reconciling' Trepov with the Revolution".

(Vol. 9, p. 383) (Emphasis ours)

It is absurd to suggest that this sentence proposes united front with any section of the bourgeoisie. One should read all the passages of Lenin against election alliances, agreements and blocs with the so-called liberal bourgeoisie.

This denotes Lenin's idea of utilising the contradictions of the enemy classes on certain issues and nothing more.

We must also remember that Lenin has said this when he was giving the call for the boycott of Duma elections in 1905 and 1906, and the Party was organising the masses for armed uprising, when the question of participation in the elections has not yet become a problem for the Russian Bolsheviks.

Another sentence of Lenin which is often mis-quoted is :

"At the higher stage of the election, i.e., at the assemblies of electors in the towns and of delegates and electors in the countryside, *partial agreements may be entered into exclusively for the purpose of distributing seats* proportionately to the number of votes for the parties entering the agreement. In this connection, the Social Democratic Party distinguishes the following main types of bourgeois parties according to the

consistency and determination of their democratic views : (a) the Socialist Revolutionaries, the Polish Socialist Party and similar republican parties (b) the Popular Socialists and the Trudoviks of a similar type (c) the Cadets." (Vol. 11, p. 300) (Emphasis ours)

As Lenin himself has clearly stated, this proposal is only for sharing of seats in the indirect elections. It was not unconditional political support to the Cadets. On the other hand it was during this period that the main political struggle has been concentrated to expose the counter revolutionary nature of the Cadets.

How often we hear from some of our critics that we should support the opposition section of the ruling classes and even the CPI-CPM combine in order to defeat Indira's 'autocracy' or 'authoritarianism', forgetting the repressive role of this present opposition while they themselves were in power in the Centre, or in the states administered by them. Refuting the fallacy of lesser or greater danger among the ruling classes, Lenin says :

"The Mensheviks' main argument is the Black Hundred danger. The first and fundamental flaw in this argument is that the Black Hundred danger cannot be combated by the Cadet tactics and a Cadet policy. The essence of this policy lies in *reconciliation* with tsarism *that is*, with the Black Hundred danger. The first Duma sufficiently demonstrated that the Cadets do not combat the Black Hundred danger but make incredibly despicable speeches about the innocence and blamelessness of the monarch, *the known leader of the Black Hundreds*. Therefore, by helping to elect Cadets to the Duma, the Mensheviks are not only failing to combat Black Danger, but are hoodwinking the people, are obscuring the real significance of the Black Hundred danger. Combating the Black danger by helping to elect the Cadets to the Duma is like combating pogroms by means of the speech delivered by the lackey Rodichev : '*It is presumption to hold the monarch responsible for the pogrom.*'" (Vol. 11, P. 313)

Lenin further said :

"In the elections to the Third Duma (if it is convoked after the Second Duma) it will be even more difficult for you to dissolve the bloc with the Cadets, will be still more entangled in unnatural relations with the betrayers of the revolution. *But the real Black-Hundred danger, we repeat, lies not in the Black Hundreds obtaining seats in the Duma, but in pogroms and military courts; and you are making it more difficult for the people to fight this real danger by putting Cadet blinkers on their eyes.*" (Vol. 11, P. 314) (Emphasis ours)

Opposing the Menshevik conception of a national opposition, Lenin says :

"In his concluding remarks Lenin dealt chiefly with the principal mistake of Menshevism—the idea of a 'national opposition'. The Russian

bourgeoisie was never revolutionary in the proper sense of the word, and for a quite understandable reason; owing to the position which the working class occupies in Russia and owing to the role of the working class in the revolution." (Vol. 13, p. 137)

Will our critics who have now become very vociferous in campaigning for the so called 'National Alternative', take any lessons from comrade Lenin's opposition to 'National Opposition' ?

Lenin's teachings in Left-Wing Communism-an infantile disorder

In *Left-Wing Communism-an infantile disorder*, Lenin categorically says :

"The whole history of Bolshevism both before and after the October Revolution is full of instances of manœuvring, temporising and compromising with other parties, bourgeois parties included !"

He further says :

"To refuse before hand to manœuvre, to utilise the conflict of interests (eventhough temporary) among one's enemies, to refuse to temporise and compromise with possible (eventhough temporary, unstable, vaccillating and conditional) allies, is not this ridiculous in the extreme ?" Explaining the experiences of the Russian Revolution, Lenin says :

"The Russian Revolutionary Social Democrats repeatedly utilised the services of the bourgeois liberals *prior to the downfall of tsardom, that is, they concluded numerous practical compromises with them*; and in 1901-1902, even prior to the appearance of Bolshevism, the old editorial Board of *Iskra* (consisting of Plekhanov, Axelrod, Zaslulich, Martov, Petrewsov and myself) concluded (not for long, it is true) a formal political alliance with Struve, the political leader of bourgeois liberalism, while at the same time it was able to wage an unremitting and most merciless ideological and political struggle against bourgeois liberalism and against the slightest manifestation of its influence in the working class movement. The Bolsheviks have always adhered to this policy. Beginning with 1905, they systematically advocated an alliance between the working class and the peasantry against the liberal bourgeoisie and Tsardom, never however, refusing to support the bourgeoisie against Tsardom (for instance, during the second round of elections, or during second ballot) and never ceasing their relentless ideological and political struggle against bourgeois revolutionary peasant Party, the 'Socialist Revolutionaries', exposing them as petty bourgeois democrats who falsely described themselves as socialists. During the Duma elections in 1907, the the Bolsheviks, for a brief period, entered into a formal political bloc with the 'Socialist Revolutionaries'. Between 1903 and 1911, there were periods of several years in which we were formally united with the Mensheviks in one Social Democratic Party; but we never ceased our ideological and

political struggle against them as opportunists and vehicles of bourgeois influence among the proletariat. During the War we concluded certain compromises with the 'Kautskyites', with the Left Mensheviks (Martov), and with a section of the 'Socialist Revolutionaries', (Chernov, and Natanson); we were together with them at Zimmerwald and Kienthal and issued joint manifestos; but we never ceased and never relapsed our ideological and political struggle against the 'Kautskyites.' (Emphasis ours)

Here we must note two factors.

About the alliance with the liberal bourgeoisie in 1900-1902, the liberal bourgeoisie has not yet been exposed as treacherous and counter-revolutionary. This was done during the course of the 1905 Revolution and from then it was an irreconcilable ideological and political struggle against the counter revolutionary Cadets pretending to be in the opposition.

On Great Britain

On Great Britain, at that time, in *Life-Wing Communism*, Lenin said :

"There is no Communist Part in Great Britain yet, but there is a fresh, broad, powerful and rapidly growing communist movement among the workers which justifies the brightest hopes. There are several political parties and organisations (the British Socialist Party, the Socialist Labour Party, the South Wales Socialist Society, the Workers' Socialist Federation) which desire to form a communist party."

"That the Hendersons, the Clynes, the Macdonalds and the Snowdens are hopelessly reactionary is true. It is equally true that they want to take power in their own hands (though they prefer a coalition with the bourgeoisie, that they want to 'rule' on the old bourgeois lines and that when they do get into power they will unfailingly behave like the Scheidmans and Noskes. All that is true. But it by no means follows that to support them is treachery to the revolution, but rather than that in the interests of the revolution the working class revolutionaries should give the gentlemen a certain amount of parliamentary support."

"I will put it more concretely. In my opinion, the British communists should unite their four (all very weak and some very very weak) parties and groups into a single Communist Party on the basis of the principles of the Third International and of *obligatory* participation in parliament. The Communist Party should propose a 'compromise' to the Hendersons and Snowdens, *an election agreement*: let us together fight the alliance of Lloyd George and the Conservatives, *let us divide the parliamentary seats in proportion to the number of votes cast by the workers for the Labour Party and for the Communist Party (not at the elections, but in a special vote)* and let us retain *complete liberty of agitation, propoganda and political activity*". (emphasis ours)

“If the Hendersons and the Snowdens consent to a bloc on these terms, we shall be the gainers, ... if the Hendersons and Snowdens reject a bloc with the Communists, the Communists will gain immediately as regards winning the sympathy of the masses... ”

“ In all constituencies where we have no candidates, we would urge the electors to vote for the Labour candidates and against the bourgeois candidate.”

Depending on these proposals of Lenin pertaining to Britain at that time some people interpret them to say that we should support the opposition, particularly the CPI and CPM combine in order to defeat Indira's authoritarianism.

Apart from their applicability to the Indian conditions of today, are these instructions of Lenin applicable to the present day conditions in Britain itself ?

—When comrade Lenin made these proposals for Britain, let us remember there was no Communist Party as such, which was only then in formation.

—The then Labour Party of Britain was playing the opposition role towards the Conservatives in Britain, they had not yet come to power and exposed themselves to be as reactionary as the Conservatives. In short, they have not exposed themselves to the masses of the workers as the labour imperialists. The British Labour Party first came to power in Britain only in 1935. The first MacDonalld labour government in practice has exposed itself as the labour imperialist government.

—Even then Lenin had cautioned that the support to the British Labour Party was not unconditional, but conditional on the basis of a common programme.

In spite of the temporary alliance between the liberal bourgeoisie and the Communists in Russia in 1901-1902, for a short period, when the counter revolutionary nature of the Cadets had not been exposed, or their sharing of votes with the Cadets in the second stage i.e., the indirect elections, what stands out most prominently and strikingly is Lenin's irreconcilable ideological and political struggle against the Cadets, the counter-revolutionary liberal bourgeoisie and against all bourgeois election alliances.

For combining legal and illegal activities

The whole Duma period was also a period of intensive people's struggles outside the Duma and the revolutionary movement had to face heavy repression of Tsarist government.

In March 1908, Lenin said :

“More than six months have passed since the reactionary coup of June 3, and beyond doubt this first half year has been marked by a considerable decline and weakening of all revolutionary organisations, including that of the Social Democrats. *Wavering, disunity and disintegration—such have been the general features of this half year. Indeed, it could not be otherwise, because of the extreme intensification of reaction and its temporary triumph, coupled with a slowing down in the direct class struggle, were bound to be accompanied by a crisis in the revolutionary Parties*”.

(Vol. 15, P. 17) (Emphasis ours)

He further said :

“A year of disintegration, a year of ideological and political disunity, a year of Party driftage lies behind us. The membership of all our party organisations has dropped. Some of them—namely those whose membership was least proletarian—have fallen to pieces. The Party’s semi-legal institutions created by the revolution have been broken up time after time. *Things reached a point when some elements within the party, under the impact of general break-up, began to ask whether it was necessary to preserve the old Social Democratic Party; whether it was necessary to continue its work, whether it was necessary to go ‘underground’ once more, and how this was to be done. And the extreme right (the liquidationist trend, so-called) answered this question in the sense that it was necessary to legalise ourselves at all costs, even at the price of an open renunciation of the Party programme, tactics and organisation. This was undoubtedly an ideological and political crisis as well as an organisational one.*”

(p. 345, Vol. 15) (Emphasis ours)

In face of this heavy repression, two wrong trends appeared among the ranks of the Social Democratic Labour Party of Russia. The trend of Oztovism among a section of the Bolshevik ranks and the trend of Liquidationism among the Menshevik ranks.

Lenin characterised Oztovism as a “germ of ideological liquidationism on the left”.

During the fag end of Third Duma, these Oztovists again called for the boycott of elections, recall of the Party representatives from the Third Duma and refused to work in the mass organisations. Lenin said :

“Oztovism is *not* Bolshevism, but the worst political travesty of Bolshevism its worst political enemy could invent. There must be *absolute clarity* on this point. We think that all Bolsheviks, down to the smallest circle, should be perfectly clear in their minds what Oztovism stands for; should study it thoroughly and ask themselves: Is this not obvious renunciation—under the flag of revolutionariness and ‘Leftism’—of the fine

traditions of the old Bolshevism, as it came into being in the period before the revolution and in the fire of the revolution ?” (p. 357-Vol. 15)

Attacking the trend of Liquidationism among the Menshevik ranks, Lenin declared :

“Liquidationism in the narrow sense of the world, the liquidationism of the Mensheviks, consists ideologically in negation of the revolutionary class struggle of the socialist proletariat in general and denial of the hegemony of the proletariat in our bourgeois-democratic revolution in particular”, (p. 454 Vol 15) He further said :

“In respect of organisation, liquidationism means denying the necessity for an illegal Social-Democratic Party, and consequently renouncing the Russian Social-Democratic Labour Party, leaving its ranks. It means fighting the Party in the columns of the legal press, in legal workers, organisations, in the trade unions and co-operative societies, at congresses attended by working class delegates, etc”, (p. 454 Vol. 15)

Fighting against both these trends. Bolsheviks persisted in combining both the legal and illegal activities; parliamentary and extra-parliamentary activities and struggled to preserve the secret organisation.

Ideological and political struggle against Menshevism and unity with the Menshevik ranks

One more very significant feature of the activities of the Bolsheviks and Lenin’s writings of the Duma period is the uncompromising ideological and political struggle against the Menshevik leadership and positive approach to win the ordinary ranks in the day today struggles and the struggle for Revolution.

On all issues of this period the Bolsheviks and the Mensheviks held diametrically opposite views.

While the Bolsheviks were for armed uprising in 1905–1906, the Menshevik leadership was against it. While the Bolsheviks were for the Boycott of the Duma in 1905–1906, the Mensheviks were for participation. While participating in the elections, the Bolsheviks were for participation on their own strength in the direct elections, with no election alliances with any liberal bourgeois opposition, the Menshevik leadership was for such bourgeois election agreements and blocs with the liberal bourgeoisie of various shades.

Thus we could see a running ideological and political struggle against the theories and policies of Menshevik leadership.

While conducting the ideological and political struggle against the Menshevik leadership—the revisionists, the Bolsheviks under Lenin’s

leadership consistently worked to draw the Menshevik ranks and their mass organisations in the day-to-day struggles of the people, and in the struggle for Revolution.

It was a very serious and complex struggle which started with the Third Congress of the Party till 1912. When the Mensheviks were finally expelled and the Bolsheviks formed themselves into a separate Party-CPSU (Bolsheviks).

The teachings of Lenin of the whole period from 1905 to 1912—on the question of boycott and participation in the elections, the principles guiding such participation, rejection of bourgeois election alliances, agreements, blocs with liberal bourgeois opposition, irreconcilable ideological and political struggle against the policies and tactics of the Mensheviks—the revisionists, are all basic lessons of Marxism-Leninism.

Their application will vary from country to country, but they are universal teachings binding on the communist revolutionaries throughout the world.

Dimitrov's Report in 1935

For all class collaborationists and all those who want united front with the opposition section of the ruling classes, and bourgeois election alliances, have been taking shelter under the Dimitrov's Report in 1935 to the 7th Congress of the Third International under the leadership of Stalin.

We are sorry to note that even some of the Communist Revolutionaries have been misusing Dimitrov's report in support of their theories of bourgeois election alliances, because comrade Stalin's name has been associated with this report.

But if one reads Dimitrov's Report carefully there is nothing to support the theories of class collaboration or the theories of those who want bourgeois election alliances.

What does Dimitrov's Report say ?

Class character of Fascism

Comrade Dimitrov says :

"fascism in power is the open terrorist dictatorship of the most reactionary, most chauvinistic and most imperialist elements of finance capital".

"The accession to power of fascism is not an ordinary succession of one bourgeois government but a substitution for one state form of class domination of the bourgeoisie — bourgeois democracy—of another form of open, terrorist dictatorship".

"Fascist dictatorship of the bourgeoisie is a ferocious power but an unstable one".

"The working class must be able to take advantage of the antagonisms and conflicts within the bourgeois camp, but it must not cherish the illusion that fascism will exhaust itself of its own accord. *Fascism will not collapse automatically.* It is only the revolutionary activity of the working class which can help to take advantage of the conflicts which inevitably arise within the bourgeois camp in order to undermine the fascist dictatorship *and to overthrow it*". (Emphasis ours)

How can fascism be prevented from coming to power and how can fascism be overthrown after it has been victorious ?

To this the Communist International replies : "The first thing that must be done, the thing with which to commence, is to form a united front, to establish unity of the action of the workers in every factory, in every district, in every region, in every country, all over the world. Unity of action of the proletariat on a national and international scale is the mighty weapon which renders the working class capable not only of successful defence but also of successful counter-offensive against fascism, against the class enemy."

"What is and ought to be the basic content of the united front at the present stage ? The defence of the immediate economic and political interests of the working class, the defence of the working class against fascism, must form the starting point, and main content of the united front in *all capitalist countries*".

"In the mobilisation of the toiling masses for the struggle against fascism, the formation of a broad people's anti-fascist front on the basis of the proletarian united front is a particularly important task. The success of the entire struggle of the proletariat is closely connected with the establishment of a fighting alliance and the basic mass of the urban petty bourgeoisie constituting the majority in the population of *even industrially developed countries*."

"Election campaigns must be utilised for the further development and strengthening of the united fighting front of the proletariat. While coming forward independently in the elections and unfolding the programme of the Communist Party before the masses, the communists must seek to establish a united front with the *Social Democratic Parties* and the *Trade Union* (also with the organisations of the toiling peasants, handicraftsmen etc.) and exert every effort to prevent the election of reactionary and fascist candidates. In the face of fascist danger, the communists *may*, while reserving for themselves freedom of political agitation and criticism, participate in election campaigns on *a common platform and with a common ticket of the anti-fascist front*, depending on the growth and success of the

united front movement, also depending on the electoral system in operation". (Emphasis ours)

When studying Dimitrov's Report, one should remember that it deals with advanced capitalist countries, and for the colonial countries, its call has been *for building the anti-imperialist front*.

The quotations given above from Dimitrov's Report are enough to show the absurdity of the theory of some of our critics that fascism is a society different from the capitalist society.

It also exposes the theory of those who propagate that under fascism the principal contradiction of the society changes.

It also refutes the theory of those who say that during the period of struggle, the struggle must be confined only to the struggle for democratic rights.

It also exposes the theory of those who propagate that we must support any section of the ruling classes without a common platform of struggle and a common ticket based on a concrete struggle against fascism.

Based on the directives of Dimitrov's Report, in some of the advanced capitalist countries, particularly in France and Spain, the communists did unite with the Socialists and certain elements of the radical bourgeoisie in order to fight the forces of fascism in those countries, participated in the elections in a united front with them and when this front got a majority in the parliaments, the communists even joined the Cabinets formed based on this united front election victories.

But historically, both of them could not survive for more than a few months. Some of the very forces with whom the communists united in those elections betrayed the communists, expelled them from the Cabinets, resorted to repression on them and paved the way for fascism.

In Spain, ultimately these events led to the civil war of 1936. In France, Hitler's war intervened and the whole western Europe's political situation changed.

What are the positive and negative experiences of the united front with socialists and radical bourgeois elements both in France and Spain? No communist leader of international stature like Stalin, had politicalised these experiences and gave both positive and negative lessons, perhaps because of the short duration of this exercise.

Here also one must remember this experience also relates to the experience of the advanced capitalist countries, and they do not apply to the colonial and semi-colonial countries.

3. Post Second World War period

During the Second World War, when Hitler's Germany occupied the whole of Europe, the communists of Europe under the inspiring leadership of Stalin, played a heroic role in this National Liberation War. Let us remember that the Communists became the mass force among their people only because of their heroic role in that National Liberation struggle against Hitler's occupation.

When the Second World War ended in 1955, the Communists in countries like France and Italy emerged with a big mass following and thousands of armed guerillas behind them.

After the war, on the demand of the other bourgeois parties, the Communist Parties agreed to disperse their armed forces, submit them to their respective bourgeois governments. They decided to participate in the elections.

In the background of united front struggle against Hitler's occupation, the communists, particularly in France and Italy joined the Cabinets of those countries, formed immediately after the ending of world war.

At that time the communists were a big force among the people, with a big representation in the Parliaments. The bourgeois parties manoeuvred again and again to make changes in the electoral laws to suit the bourgeoisie and reduce the representation of the communists. This happened particularly in France.

What is the content of the activities of the communists in Western Europe upto 1956 ?

The main content is — disbanding their armed forces, submitting their arms to the bourgeois governments, legal activities with Parliament as the main platform of struggle. In this period itself election agreements with other bourgeois parties and the socialists for the sole purpose of increasing their representation in the parliament, became the main feature in the activities of the communists in West Europe.

Is this orientation based on the principles of Marxism-Leninism as taught by Lenin on the question of elections ?

Here again unfortunately no Marxist-Leninist leader of international stature like Stalin, has left us anything on record. Later, when he took up the ideological struggle against modern revisionism of the CPSU leadership, comrade Mao had attacked this whole orientation. He criticised the disbandment of armed forces of the people and the parliamentary illusions.

4. After the theory of Peaceful Transition peddled by the CPSU leadership in 1956.

Even if there were any limitations or checks in the practice of West European Communists in their parliamentary work till 1956, with the theory of Peaceful Transition propagated by the Modern Revisionists led by the CPSU leadership in 1956, all these limitations and checks were swept away and all the gates were opened wide for their policies of class collaboration. The practice of bourgeois election alliances have been systematised. They have declared their confidence in the path of peaceful transition to socialism and that they can achieve it through changes in the capitalist constitutions themselves. Finally the theory of Euro-Communism has evolved out of these theories of peaceful transition.

Thus one can see that the theory of Euro-Communism is nothing but the theory of peaceful transition to Socialism. To call it a 'scientific' experiment, as some international friends call it, is nothing but a distortion of Marxism-Leninism.

It is under theory of bourgeois election alliances, that the practice of path of parliamentarism—the path of peaceful transition to socialism, being practiced by the revisionists and the neo-revisionists in India, has evolved. It is out of this, that their present slogan 'Left and Democratic front' has evolved. Practice has already proved that its main aim is to have bourgeois election alliances with all sorts of opposition sections of the ruling classes and even dissident sections of the ruling Party, the Indira Congress.

Experience of the international communist movement in the past and the basic teachings of Marxism-Leninism have taught us that bourgeois election alliances and the revolutionary struggle are diametrically opposed to each other and there can be no compromise between them.

5. Applicability to India

The teachings of Lenin on the question of elections, parliamentary institutions, bourgeois election alliances, when and why united front with sections of the ruling classes cannot be copied mechanically and applied to the Indian conditions.

We have to concretely study the socio-economic and political conditions in India at present and determine our own tactics of struggle based on the universal teachings of Marxism—Leninism.

One should remember that Lenin's teachings on the attitude of the working class towards the bourgeois parties are based on the experiences of revolution in Tsarist Russia—an imperialist country though economically weak.

India is not a capitalistically developed industrial country, but a semi-colonial and semi feudal country, ruled by the comprador big bourgeois

big landlord classes, subservient to imperialism and social imperialism at present.

The semi-colonial and semi-feudal character of our country shows that imperialism will dominate our country till the New Democratic Revolution under the leadership of the working class finally triumphs.

Because of its semi-colonial and semi-feudal character, our country has become the hunting ground for the imperialist powers to contend for domination, particularly the contention of the two super powers—US imperialism and Soviet social imperialism, as part of their rivalry for world hegemony.

Our ruling classes being comprador, they are tied to the various imperialist powers, USA, Soviet Union, and the second world countries, and therefore the contradictions of the imperialist powers are being reflected in the contradictions of the ruling classes in India.

Whether one likes it or not, bourgeois parliamentary institutions are a fact of life in India. Though imposed by the British, they objectively exist and the majority of the people in India still follow the various ruling class parties and the revisionists and neo-revisionists, showing the strong parliamentary and reformist illusions of our people.

Based on the concrete situation in India, under the guidance of Marxism-Leninism-Mao Zedong Thought, our Party has determined its own tactics of struggle.

Since our country is a semi-colonial and semi-feudal country, the experiences of the Chinese Revolution are more relevant to India than the experiences of the advanced capitalist countries.

Based on this fact, our Party has declared that Agrarian Revolution is the main form of struggle for the complete liberation of our country. Agrarian Revolutionary struggle is the main form of struggle in all phases of our struggle for New Democratic Revolution, combined with the struggle for united front, based on the concrete situation in each phase of the struggle. This demands that all the immediate struggles of the people, economic and political, national and international should be consciously oriented towards advancing the Agrarian revolutionary struggle.

Our country being a semi-colonial and semi-feudal country, there are certain occasions when the working class has to unite with sections of the ruling classes—on occasions like fighting foreign aggression against our country, our country becoming a neo-colony of any of the imperialist powers, and are uniting with sections of the ruling classes for democratic rights under conditions of the Emergency rule.

On all other occasions, there can be no general political united front between the working class and any section of the ruling classes on the basis of any common programme. But we should utilise the contradictions of the ruling classes and their parties on specific immediate issues, economic and political, to advance the revolutionary movement in the country.

Since we take Soviet social imperialism as greater danger to our people today both nationally and internationally, naturally, we take the pro-Soviet lobby, the Indira Congress, the CPI-CPM combine and other pro-Soviet forces in other parties to be a greater danger to our people today.

While we concentrate the peoples struggles on the Indira Congress government both in the Centre and the states, an irreconcilable ideological and political struggle should be conducted against the compromising policies of the CPI-CPM combine, who faithfully serve the interests of the Soviet Union, both in India and abroad.

While we conduct an irreconcilable ideological and political struggle against the compromising policies of the leaderships of the CPI-CPM combine, we pursue a consistent policy of uniting with their ranks and their mass organisations to conduct united struggles on the immediate issues of the people.

Our decision to participate in the elections depending on the level of the revolutionary movement and the consciousness of the people, the aims of our participation, our rejection of election agreements or adjustment of seats with the opposition section of the ruling classes, or the CPI-CPM, our decision to have such electoral agreements or adjustments of seats only with other communist revolutionary organisations or those who are for anti-imperialist struggles and the struggle for democratic rights, are all based on the teachings of Lenin, as quoted above.

Thus one can see that the programme, tactics of struggle and the political line of our Party are based on sound theoretical foundation based on the teachings of comrades Lenin and Mao.

We are sorry to note that the programme, tactics of struggle, and the political line of some of our critics are not based on any theoretical foundation of Marxism-Leninism. They are nothing but blind assertions.

It is because of the sound theoretical foundation based on the concrete situation in our country, the concentration of our comrades to implement this programme, that has helped our Party to advance the revolutionary movement in the country and we have already emerged as the biggest among the revolutionary organisations in the country. It is this fact that gives us confidence in our programme, tactics of struggle and the political line of our Party.

Advance on the path of Agrarian Revolution !

Long Live Marxism-Leninism-Mao Zedong Thought ! 3/9/1982.

Political Analyses

The Real Face of the August 15 'Independence'.

Once more August 15 is coming — the Thirty-fifth anniversary of the so-called Independence.

All the ruling class parties, both in power and opposition, regional and national, the revisionists and the neo-revisionists, all bourgeois papers will hail this day as the day of 'Independence' and deliverance from British imperialism.

But the experience of the last 35 years is amply proving that this is a total lie, that in the last 35 years, the exploitation of our country by the foreign imperialists has increased many times, that in the place of exploitation of British imperialism alone our country is now subjected to the exploitation of many other imperialist countries, that our country is today abjectively dependent on the two super powers — Soviet Union and the USA.

The truth is that even after the so-called Independence of August 15, foreign imperialism has continued to exploit our country unabated and it is becoming fiercer day by day.

Methods of Foreign exploitation

Even after the "August 15 Independence", the foreign imperialist powers have continued to exploit our country through the following methods :

—By direct capital investment to build certain industries of their own.

—By establishing joint industries in collaboration with the big bourgeoisie of our country.

—By granting loans to the government of India, to the financial institutions established by the government and to the private big bourgeoisie.

—Through imports and exports.

—Through Banking.

—Through the sale of technology.

Let us look at the heinous features of foreign exploitation of our country and its intensification in the last 35 years.

Ten-fold increase of foreign direct investments

When the British transferred power to the big bourgeois-big landlord Congress on August 15, 1947, the foreign direct investments in India amounted to about Rs. 300 crores, of which the British capital was the main.

Look at the growth of foreign direct investments in Indian industries since 1947.

Foreign Investment in India

(In crores of rupees).

Country	1955	1960	1968
Great Britain	376.8	446.5	625.5
USA	39.8	112.2	422.3
West Germany	2.5	6.8	100.2
Japan and other countries	37.0	124.4	394.8
Total	456.1	690.3	1542.8

(From India Mortgaged—By comrade Nagireddy)

Look at the growth of the foreign direct investments after 1947. Not only that. It is from 1956 that Soviet Union has begun to enter India on a big scale with the Second Five-Year Plan. Look at the rapid growth of capital investments from Western Germany and more particularly from USA.

Here comrade Nagireddy could provide us with figures only upto 1968. By then the foreign direct investments were about Rs. 1,500 crores. But by 1980, the foreign direct investments have already reached about Rs. 3,000 crores. Compared with 1947, the foreign direct investments by 1980 are already ten times bigger. This only shows that foreign exploitation has increased ten times after our 'Independence'.

The type of investments of the foreign imperialists now taking place in India is also shifting, and shifting rapidly too, from the one that prevailed at the time of 1947. They are now investing not in plantations and in mining as they used to do before 1947, but mainly in petroleum and manufacturing industries. In 1968 itself, when the total investments were Rs. 1,542 crores, the share of investments in petrol and manufacturing industries has come to about 65% of the total investments in India.

Exploitation through joint industries

The foreign imperialist international companies are having their subsidiaries and their branches working in India. They are registered in India for appearances, but actually they are foreign industries.

By 1966 itself the investment in Public and Private limited companies amounted to 26,895 crores. Of this, 252 companies, the bigger ones, have capital investment more than Rs. 5 crores each.

These 252 companies have capital of about 3,404 crores of rupees. Of this, 104 companies are either owned by foreign capital or controlled by them; Their capital comes to Rs. 1,829 crores, which is 58% of the capital of the bigger 252 companies. This shows the domination of foreign capital in our companies and the industries under their control. This only shows how it is foreign capital that dominates our manufacturing industries.

In addition to this, every year hundreds of joint industries are established in India by the foreign imperialists in collaboration with the big bourgeoisie of our country. In these joint industries, the imperialists are investing hundreds of crores of rupees as capital. Latest figures for these joint industries are not available, but they are already about 3,000. USA is dominating these joint industries.

In these joint industries, the foreign imperialists are exploiting our country through various methods :

—To hoodwink the people, the Indian government says that foreign imperialists control only 49% of the capital in these joint industries, whereas the Indian capital is 51%. But this is nothing but a deception.

Actually 49% of the capital belongs to one foreign company, whereas the 51% belongs to number of Indian collaborators, and the foreign collaborator can always get the required majority to control that joint industry.

It is the foreign company that supplies the machinery and the technology and the management, and this naturally gives the upper hand to the foreign company to dominate these joint industries.

Thus the truth of the joint industries is that, with 49% of capital, the foreign imperialists are able to dominate 51% of the Indian capital in these joint industries.

—The joint industries start with the agreement that the whole technology of that particular industry will be transferred to the Indian hands only after 15 or 20 years. Till then these joint industries are nothing but assembly plants, where all the parts are imported from the foreign imperialists, assembled in India and sold in India under the Indian Trade Mark. Thus one can see that under these joint industries our country becomes the market for the goods of the foreign imperialists.

—One more condition of these joint industries in the beginning itself is that the production from these joint industries should not be exported to those countries where the said foreign company is already trading.

One question arises : Why is it that foreign capital investments are so rapidly increasing through direct investments, their subsidiaries, and their joint industries ? For the simple fact, the foreign imperialists are able to utilise the cheap labour of our people and extract more profits in India than they can get in their own countries.

Exploitation through imports and exports

The foreign imperialists subject our country to increased exploitation through imports and exports.

—They import into our country their capital goods and machinery and all kinds of luxury goods that the rich in our country want, and they export from our country all the raw materials that are necessary for their industries. Thus while we import more capital goods, machinery and luxury goods, we mostly export our agricultural raw materials.

Everybody knows that capital goods, industrial machinery and luxury goods cost more than our agricultural raw materials. Moreover, the rates at which foreign imperialists sell to India capital goods and luxury goods are usually higher than the international market rates, and the rates at which they purchase our agricultural materials are lesser than the international prices, because our country is a debtor country.

—Because our country is a debtor country, India is forced to import and export only through shipping companies belonging to the international companies which charge exorbitant prices.

—While importing and exporting, the international companies, with the help of the corrupt bureaucrats, always give wrong figures for their imports and exports to evade the import and export duties of the Indian government and through these fraudulent ways, the Indian government loses hundreds of crores of rupees every year.

Because of these measures, our exports are far less than our imports, running into hundreds of crores of rupees of debt each year, causing a crisis in the balance of payments to the disadvantage of our country. And this deficit in our imports and exports is increasing by leaps and bounds.

Look at the following figures :

Imports and Exports

Year	(in crores of rupees)	
	Imports	Exports
1977-78	6,000	5,404
1980-81	12,330	6,704
1981-82	13,500	7,500 (estimated)

(From India Today—July, 1982)

Exploitation through loans

Because of the crisis of the balance of payments, the Indian govt. is forced to go for loans from foreign governments.

Starting as a creditor country with Rs. 1,600 crores Sterling balances in 1947, the country has now become a debtor country with a debt of foreign loans amounting to about Rs. 25,000 crores.

The country-wise loans to the foreign countries that India owes are as following :

India's foreign debt

Country	Debt (In Crores of rupees).
USA	5701
Great Britain	2401
West Germany	1838
Japan	1099
World Bank	7272
Soviet Union	957
East European countries	263
Others	5227
Total	24,758

[From India Today, July 82]

Now year by year the repayment of loans and the yearly interests have become an unbearable burden on the Indian economy. For instance, in 1980-80 itself, the repayment of loans and interest amounted to about Rs. 762 crores, according to government figures.

In addition to these loans, India is borrowing large sums of money from the international private capital markets (apart from the above said government to government loans) where the interest on loans is 20%. Last year itself these commercial loans amounted to Rs. 1600 crores whose interest charges alone come to Rs. 320 crores per year.

One report says that debt servicing charges will reach about Rs. 2000 crores soon, which is equal to the total exports of our country in 1972-73. One must face the ugly fact that debt servicing is already eating away nearly half of our exports and the balance of payments has already reached about Rs. 6,000 crores.

Where has all this money — the total debt amount of Rs. 25,000 crores—gone ? Has it gone into any production purposes so that we can

pay back the loans ? That is what the government. claims. But this is nothing but utter nonsense.

Between 1951-52 and 1980-81, there were only two years (1972-73 and 1976-1977) when there was a balance of trade in India's favour. In all other years, for about 28 years, the deficit in balance of trade has been galloping. From Rs. 80 crores in 1953-54, it has galloped to Rs. 5,600 crores in 1980-81 and the total deficits have amounted to Rs. 14,100 crores. This means that 3/4 th of our foreign loans have gone to cover up the huge trade deficits.

Only the rest 1/4 th of our loans have gone into so-called constructive purposes. Let us remember that these loans are government-to-government loans, but they are tied loans. That is, the government has to spend these loans for projects which the creditor countries have agreed to pay, and naturally they are meant to intensify the exploitation of our country by the said imperialist power.

In addition to these government - to - government loans, the foreign imperialists are giving large sums of money as loans to the various financial institutions set up by the Indian government. Look at the following statistics upto 1967-68 :

Source	Loan amount to the financial bodies in Crores of rupees
World Bank	119.95
USA	231.25
West Germany	32.82
France	3.80
Japan	2.92
Total	Rs. 390.74

(From India Mortgaged : T.N.)

Unfortunately, the statistics for loans to our financial institutions from 1968 are not yet available. But the figures given here show the trend whereby the imperialists are increasingly controlling the policies of the financial institutions set up by the Indian government.

In addition to this, the foreign imperialists and their financial institutions are giving large sums of money directly to the private business-to the Indian big bourgeoisie. Look at the following statistics up to 1967-68.

Source	Amount (in crores of rupees)
World Bank	172.25
Export-Import Bank	79.78
DLF/Aid loans	83.55
Coolie loans	70.49
Canada	2.42
West Germany	1.36
Japan	43.50
Netherlands	5.94
Total	459.49

(From: India Mortgaged-T.N.)

Unfortunately the statistics of loans to the private business after 1968 are not available. We can only imagine from the fact that the loans from the imperialists have grown enormously within the last 20 years. It will be no surprise that the imperialist loans to the financial institutions and private business have doubled after 1968.

In addition to this, the imperialists are exploiting our country through their banking system and the sale of technology. The yearly drain from our country through the growing deficit in our imports and exports, their profits and the repayment of loans and interest is really dreadfully burdensome.

Look at the following figures :

Year	In crores of rupees			
	Deficit in imports and exports	Repatriation of Profits	Repayment of loans and interest	Total
1960-61	475.2	61.9	37.6	547.7
1965-66	566.7	134.3	74.4	775.4
1966-67	806.3	203.9	129.0	1,139.2
1968-69	373.1	239.7	159.6	772.4
1969-70	168.4	251.6	180.8	600.8

(From: India Mortgaged)

One can imagine the drain from our country today when the trade deficit has reached about Rs. 6,000 crores, profits on private foreign imperialist capital on about Rs. 3,000 crores, which cannot be less than about Rs. 450 crores even at 15% rate of profit and the repayment of loans and interests on government loans and loans to the financial institutions and private business.

What is the yearly drain from our country ? Roughly it is this :

Trade deficit for 1981-82	Rs. 6,000 crores
Profits from private investments of Rs. 3,000 crores at the rate of 15%	Rs. 450 ..
Yearly repayment of loans and interest in 1980-81	Rs. 800 ..
<hr/>	
Total	Rs. 7,250 ..

One should remember that this amount does not include the repayment of loans and interests from the financial institutions and private business nor the money lost by wrong quotations in imports and exports. Let us remember that this burden is going to increase in the coming years. Can any economy sustain such huge drain of the wealth ? This drain is bound to increase in the coming years. The desperateness of the situation can be understood from the fact that during the last two years of Indian Gandhi's rule, the Indian government has contracted Rs. 3,000 crores of loans from the AID consortium countries for 1980-81, and this year the loan contracted from the same source is Rs. 3,300 crores, the IMF loan contracted is Rs. 5,000 crores, a loan of Rs. 1,400 crores from the Soviet Union for military supplies and another Rs. 500 crores from the Soviet Union for new 'economic aid' projects altogether come to Rs. 13,200 crores.

The desperateness of the balance of payments can be understood from our traditional exports of jute, jute goods, groundnut, sugar, iron ore etc. Today our country is forced to export such daily necessities which we need like onions, potatoes, mangoes, plantains and plantain leaves, fish, frogs etc. to meet foreign exchange crisis, thus shooting up the prices of these daily necessities beyond the purchasing capacity of the common man. If these exports are stopped, it is again the middle and rich peasants that are badly hit, because of the rapid fall in prices.

The truth is that today the Western imperialism, particularly U S imperialism dominates the private sector, the import export trade and the loans to the government financial institutions and private industry; and the Soviet social imperialism dominates the public sector industries, and supply of military hardware to the Indian army. Public sector being the commanding heights of our economy, the Soviet Union has acquired an upper hand in its competition with the western capital particularly the American capital.

The naked truth is that the Western capital, while maintaining its grip over the private industries and trades, is penetrating the public

sector. The Soviet Union, while maintaining its hold over the public sector, is entering the private sector.

The long rule of the Congress, the short-lived Janata rule and even the Charan Singh rule has only increased the grip of the foreign imperialists by giving concession after concession to the foreign imperialists — in the form of liberalisation of imports and exports, granting licences to establish their industries, allowing joint industries, giving tax concessions, freedom to repatriate all their profits from the country and above all suppressing the working class struggles for higher wages and trade union rights etc.

The naked truth is that the "August 15 Independence" has actually increased and intensified the exploitation of our country on a far bigger scale than in 1947.

"The August 15 Independence" has resulted in dependence on foreign capital, dependence on foreign technology, dependence on imports and exports. This is the truth. This is the real face of "August 15 Independence", which is nothing but abject dependence on the two super powers — USA and Soviet Union.

The growing grip of foreign capital on Indian economy has resulted in a total economic crisis—industrial and agricultural—which is beyond the capacity of this government to resolve.

The rule of the big bourgeois-big landlord classes, since "August 15 Independence" has benefitted only imperialism and social imperialism and the ruling classes in our country. This can be understood from the fact that the capital of Birlas and Tatas—the biggest exploiters in our country has grown from a petty Rs. 30 crores in 1950s, to about Rs. 3,300 crores now.

"August 15 Independence" has only resulted in increasing the misery of the common man—growing taxation, growing higher prices of all daily necessities, under-utilisation of installed capacity in the established industries, growing unemployment, continuous erosion of the purchasing capacity of the common man, where 60% of the people are already living below the poverty line—as fixed by the government itself—have become the lot of the common people.

This experience shows that "August 15 Independence" has only resulted in formal political independence but real economic dependence, establishing semi-colonial and semi-feudal character of our country ruled by the comprador big bourgeois-big landlord classes, subservient to imperialism and social imperialism.

The misery of our people can be ended only when the exploitation of imperialism and social imperialism and the big bourgeois-big landlord

classes is completely destroyed and this can be achieved only by the success of the New Democratic Revolution under the leadership of the working class.

Two Myths Exploded

Experience has proved that the claim of the CPI and CPM—the revisionists and the neo-revisionists—that Soviet help strengthens the independence of our country against Western imperialism, is nothing but total falsehood. On the other hand, Soviet Union has proved to be worse than the western imperialists in exploiting our country. How?

—Just like the western imperialists, the Soviet union is only helping to build certain infrastructure industries like steels electrical, manufacturing machinery, oil refinery, mining machinery etc. These industries are being utilised by both—the big bourgeoisie of our country and the foreign imperialists for their private industries. Thus, the more the entry of the Soviet capital into India, the more has been the entry of Western capital into India.

— Soviet Union has been utilising its aid to India as a means of selling its outmoded technology and industrial machinery at exorbitant prices and as a market for its crude oil and industrial machinery.

— Soviet Union is building public sector industries with the agreement that part of the goods produced by Soviet aided industries are to be sold to Soviet Union at fixed rates, without any reference to international market rates.

— Soviet Union is selling goods to India at about 20% above the international market rates and purchasing raw materials from India at rates 20% less than the international market rates, thus exploiting the country from both the ends.

— Just like the old imperialists, Soviet Union is building semi-processed industries where much of the human labour is involved in India and the whole production is shipped to the Soviet Union for finalisation. Here one should note that surplus produced by the Indian labour is also shipped to the Soviet Union.

— Finally the trade with the Soviet Union is based on rupee to rupee basis, i. e. we have to pay back the loans of Russia with our goods. This helps in no way in narrowing the huge gap between the imports and exports to the western imperialist countries. This gap increases year by year and taking of loans from the western imperialists increases by leaps and bounds finally leading to the surrender of the Indira government to the shameful terms of the IMF loans.

This only shows that Soviet aid does not have the character or the strength to resist the exploitation of western capital.

There is another myth that with pro-Soviet Indira Gandhi government established in the Centre in 1980, India has come under the exclusive hegemony of the Soviet Union. This is nothing but saying that India has become a neo-colony of the Soviet Union.

The experience of the last two years has also exploded this myth of the hardened class collaborationists. The huge amount of western capital in India in private industry, its domination of the import-export trade, its domination in loans to the govt. shows that Soviet capital has no physical strength to abolish this huge western capital in India. It also proves that Indian economy, as it has evolved, cannot dispense with western capital. Finally the abject surrender of the Indira government to the dictates of the IMF—placing its yearly budgets, its pricing and taxation policy, its loans system, its import-export trade, its anti-inflationary measures—whole economy to be placed for yearly scrutiny of the IMF bank officials, all this in spite of Soviet protests—shows that the Indira Congress government has not yet come under the exclusive hegemony of the Soviet Union.

Strange arguments of certain Communist Revolutionaries

While the CPI and CPM claim that our country has attained full "Independence" on August 15, 1947, it is strange to see some Communist Revolutionaries claiming that India has attained 'Political Independence' or 'marginal independence' or 'some independence'. They are opposed to our characterisation that India's independence is nothing but formal but its economic dependence is real.

These organisations of Communist Revolutionaries are giving far more stranger, but fantastic arguments in support of their 'marginal' independence theory. They say:

—Everybody agrees that power was transferred from British hands to Indian hands on August 15, 1947. Since power is economic and political, and since economic power is not transferred, it is certain that political power has been transferred and therefore India is a politically independent country.

—The second argument is that since India is able to get capital from so many countries like USA, West Germany, Japan, Soviet Union and East European countries, it means the Indian government is having political independence enabling it to carry on these transactions.

Refutation of these arguments

We are sorry to say that they have entirely wrongly understood the transfer of power from British hands to Indian hands—the big bourgeois-big landlord classes.

With the advance of the Chinese New Democratic Revolution under the leadership of the Communist Party of China, with the upsurge of the National Liberation struggles in Asia, Africa and Latin America, with the upsurge of anti-imperialist struggles in India itself, all after the Second World War — both British imperialism and the big bourgeois-big landlord Congress and Muslim League leadership were terrified at the prospect of the Indian people taking to the Chinese path and the result was the transfer of power from the British hands to the Indian hands, and the creation of Pakistan and India under the leadership of Muslim league and Congress respectively, representing the big bourgeois-big landlord classes who are comprador in character.

Thus the transfer of power is nothing but a conspiracy between British imperialism and the big bourgeois-big landlord classes both in Pakistan and India against genuine independence. These comrades are entirely missing this point. "The August 15 Independence" is nothing but formal, is a conspiracy against real independence.

Here these comrades forget the birth and role of the Congress in India. Congress was created by British to prevent the people from taking the revolutionary road. From that day, the policies of the Congress are the policies of the big bourgeois big landlord classes. The history of the Congress is the history of the comprador big bourgeois-big landlord classes. These two classes have never fought for real independence of our country, but utilised the national movement for compromise with British imperialism and have been deceiving the people by parading their semi-colonialism as real independence.

Here the transfer of power from British into Congress hands is to preserve the exploitation of imperialism, feudalism and comprador bourgeoisie, which the Congress has been faithfully doing ever since 1947. It is absurd to interpret this transfer of power as political independence.

The exploitation of our country by many imperialist powers in place of British imperialism alone is not an indication of its political independence. It only shows the semi colonial character of our country.

It is true that the Indian government is able to get the so-called economic aid from many imperialist countries. But the Indian government is able to do this only by depending on one imperialist power and bargaining with the other imperialist power. For instance, while depending on the Soviet Union, it bargains with the USA for certain 'aid', and vice versa. While bargaining with the two super powers it relies on the West European countries and Japan.

The truth is that in today's world situation, where imperialism, on a world scale, is getting weaker and weaker and two super powers have emerged for contention for the domination of the world, the Indian ruling

classes, having state power in their hands are able to increase their bargaining power to get more concessions from the various imperialist powers. It is the height of absurdity to characterise this bargaining power of our ruling classes as political 'independence' of our country.

Central Fundamental questions

In the beginning itself, we have given enough economic data to show how economic dependence of our country on imperialism and social imperialism has been increasing since 1947.

While accepting this economic dependence of our country, these theoreticians are able to see 'political' or 'marginal' independence. Then they have to answer certain fundamental theoretical question on this issue.

—Marxism - Leninism says that the economics is the foundation of politics. While economic dependence of our country is increasing, how are the Indian ruling classes able to retain political independence ?

—Marxism-Leninism says that external policy is a reflection of the internal policy. While internally the Indian economy is increasing its dependence on imperialism and social imperialism, how is it that the Indian ruling classes have got the political freedom in its external affairs ? If this is true, how do they explain the shameful support of the Indira Congress to Soviet aggression against Afghanistan and Soviet - backed Vietnamese aggression against Kampuchea ?

—Marxism-Leninism has taught us that imperialism and social imperialism export their finance capital to other countries in order to subjugate these countries economically, politically and militarily in order to control the markets in these countries. Now these comrades agree that both imperialism and social imperialism are exporting their finance capital to India to exploit our country. In the same breath they say that India is a politically independent country. Isn't the capital from imperialism and social imperialism finance capital itself ? And is it not the specific duty of this finance capital to economically, politically and militarily dominate India ?

—Lenin, Stalin and Mao have taught us again and again that after 1917 October Revolution in Russia, the bourgeoisie in any country in the world have no capacity to complete the bourgeois democratic revolution, which can only be achieved through New Democratic Revolution, under the leadership of the working class. But these theoreticians say that our country has got political independence under the leadership of the big bourgeois big landlord classes. Have the teachings of Lenin, Stalin and Mao become out-dated on this question?, if so, when and why ?

—Comrade Mao has again and again taught that the compradors are the running dogs of imperialism. Now these comrades agree that our ruling classes are comprador in nature but in the same breath they say that they have attained political independence of our country. What has political independence got to do with our comprador ruling classes— with our Tatas and Birlas? Since when did comrade Mao become out of date on the characterisation of the comprador classes, their subservience to imperialism and social imperialism? If so, why?

—Comrade Lenin has taught us that the imperialists do resort to the trick of setting up ostensibly independent governments, but really economically dependent upon them, with the help of the ruling classes in the dependent countries. But these comrades say that economic dependence of our country is real, but that the country has got “political” or “marginal” independence. Then since when, according to them, comrade Lenin has gone out of date on this question, and if so why?

—Comrade Mao has again and taught us that imperialism continues to dominate colonial and semi-colonial countries till New Democratic Revolution finally triumphs. Now these comrades say that our country is politically independent. Since when has comrade Mao gone out of date on this question, if so why?

Putting these very questions exposes the absurdity of those who argue about “political” or “marginal” independence.

These theoreticians should note the similarity of their arguments with the arguments of the CPI and CPM— the revisionists and neo-revisionists— who argue about full “independence” of our country in their faithful service to the ruling classes and soviet social imperialism.

It is really strange to see that the very comrades who used so say that our country is a neo colony of USA and Soviet Union at the time of Naxalbari Struggle, now speak of “political” or “marginal” independence. Well comrades, this is nothing but a turn to the Right.

17/7/1982.

(This article was published in July-August 1982, Road to Liberation.)

Our Tasks in the Present Situation

International

In the analysis of the present world situation, the Special Congress and its political resolution have been guided by the Theory of Three Worlds, first propounded by comrade Mao, the great teacher of the international proletariat.

1. Two Super powers are the common enemies of the world people.

Rejecting the theory of SN-Nandi that Soviet social imperialism is the only enemy of the world people, the political resolution has clearly declared :

“Both the super powers (Soviet Union and USA) are engaged in a frenzied arms race in air, seas and land and in all parts of the world and therefore are the common enemies of the world people, including the Indian people.”

Applying the theory of differentiation, the political resolution has declared that.

“Taking the world situation as a whole, Soviet Union is on the offensive and United States is on the defensive”, that “Soviet social imperialism is the chief source of war danger today” and that “Soviet Union is a greater danger to the world people including the Indian people, than US imperialism”.

How to combine both these tasks—the task of fighting against both the super powers and the task of defeating the conspiracies of the Soviet Union for third world war ?

The political resolution has proposed a three—point programme to achieve this. It says :

- Mobilise the people in support of all people’s struggles against colonialism, sem-colonialism, neo-colonialism, against imperialism and social imperialism, in particular against the hegemonism of the two super powers—Soviet Union and USA—the common enemies of the world people, taking the Soviet Union as the greater danger to the Indian people, both nationally and internationally.

- Taking Soviet Union as the chief source of war danger today, mobilise all the forces that could be united, including the forces of USA and Second World countries and their allies in India, to defeat specific Soviet aggression wherever and whenever it raises its head.
- Combine these two struggles, advance the revolutionary movement, step by step, and bring about an international united front against the Soviet Union, by uniting all the forces that could be united, including the forces of USA and the Second World countries and their allies in India and defeat Soviet social imperialism if it dares to start Third World War.”

This is how our Party has combined both tasks — the task of fighting both the two super powers, and the task of defeating the conspiracies of Soviet Union for World War. This three-point programme, distinguishes our Party from the position of some other revolutionary groups. While they recognise that both the super powers are the common enemies of the world people and Soviet Union is the greater danger, so far they are not specific as to how they will combine these two tasks. Even on specific issues of Soviet aggression, whenever and wherever it raises its head, they are not bold enough to say that the international proletariat should utilise the contradictions of the imperialist powers, particularly between the contradictions of the imperialist powers including USA to defeat specific acts of Soviet aggression, as in Kampuchea and Afghanistan. Our resolution is very specific on this question.

At the same time, the political resolution has rejected the concept of international united front with USA against social imperialism, here and now.

The political resolution has clearly stated that only by combining the first two tasks and developing the revolutionary movement in the world, step by step, an international united front including USA, can come into existence to defeat Soviet Social imperialism, if it dares to start Third World War. It will not come by begging US imperialism as SN-Nandi combine wants to do.

The three tasks of the Party on the international situation have been based on the experience of the International proletariat under the leadership of Stalin before the Second World War.

2. Fight against the appeasement policies of the West, including USA.

The political resolution has also noted how, even after Soviet aggression in Afghanistan, USA and the West European countries, par-

ticularly France and Germany, inspite of taking certain steps of strategic nature, are still in essence following a policy of appeasement towards Soviet aggression and how such a policy only helps in the war plans of the Soviet Union.

The political resolution has noted how "certain vaccillating and moderate elements in the National Liberation movements and certain reactionary elements in the Third World countries" are being used by Soviet social imperialism in its drive for world war and world hegemony.

The Party has called for a struggle against both these tendencies.

3. Attitude towards China

Assessing the possibilities of attack on People's Republic of China, the political resolution has declared :

"This is an imperialist era. In this era, war between imperialist powers is a definite possibility. Though the contradiction between Socialist China and Soviet Union is a basic contradiction, still Soviet Union cannot think of a direct attack on Socialist China now, before occupying or controlling the intermediate zone between Socialist China and Soviet Union. However, surprise attacks on Socialist China by the Soviet Union cannot be ruled out. Moreover, the two super powers are feverishly contending for world hegemony. So, for the Soviet Union, US imperialism has become the main and immediate enemy which it has to defeat in a new world war. It is also true that even if a new world war starts between the two super powers, ultimately the war will reach Socialist China because China is the basic opposition to Soviet ambitions for world domination".

Rejecting all lies and slanders against Socialist China, the political resolution has declared that "People's Republic of China, a base of world revolution, is supporting the National Liberation struggles of Asia, Africa and Latin America against both the super powers".

In another context, the Special Congress has declared "We are of the firm opinion that China is a socialist and a Third World country, a base for world revolution. It is the proletarian international duty of all Marxists-Leninists to defend Socialist China from all attacks".

It has further said :

"The CPC, founded and nurtured by comrade Mao is the vanguard of the present international communist movement. We firmly believe that the general orientation of the present CPC leadership is basically correct, particularly its upholding of the Three World Theory propounded

by comrade Mao. Their opposition to both the Super powers — US imperialism and Soviet social imperialism — taking Soviet social imperialism as the greater danger, their allout struggle for the preservation of world peace and postponement of a Third World War, taking Soviet Union as the chief source of war danger today, full support to National Liberation struggles of the Third World countries against all forms of imperialism, colonialism and neo-colonialism and forms of hegemonism, their struggle for building socialism on the basis of the four modernisations”.

It has also said :

“Proletarian Internationalism does not and should not mean blind obedience of one Party to the decisions of another of another Party. Proletarian internationalism means agreement on the general orientation of the international Marxist-Leninist movement, defending socialist countries from all attacks, and resolving all differences between fraternal parties on the basis of comradely discussions, at the same time avoiding all antagonistic polemical public debates.”

4. On Iran-Iraq War

On Iran — Iraq war, the political resolution has declared :

“The recent war between Iran and Iraq over their border conflict is very unfortunate and harmful to the struggle of the Arab and Palestinian people against Israeli aggression and social imperialism. The interests of the Third World countries demand immediate cease-fire by these two countries, immediate withdrawal of their troops to the original border and solving their disputes through negotiations. Any prolongation of this conflict widens the scope for interference in the internal affairs of these countries, in a strategic area by the two Super powers and a re-alignment of the forces in this area under the hegemony of the two super powers endangering the cause of the Arab and Palestinian people and the peace of the world”.

National situation

5. Role of the two super powers in India

Referring to the national situation in India, the political resolution has said that “the present international situation, the present crisis of world capitalism, the rivalry of the two super power for world hegemony and the struggle of the Third World countries against imperialism and social imperialism are having a great impact on the internal situation in our country”.

It has further said that “the policies of the successive big bourgeois-big landlord governments have led to an ever-growing and acute economic

crisis—both industrial and agricultural—in our country. They have reduced our country to an abject dependence on the Soviet Union and USA.”

It further says :

“Today Western imperialist powers, particularly USA, have a dominant position in private sector, import-export trade and loans to the government. At the same time, they are trying to penetrate into the public sector. The Soviet Union maintains a dominant position in the public sector. At the same time it is trying to penetrate into the private sector.”

“The Soviet Union controls the public sector, the commanding heights of our economy. It has acquired a near monopoly in the supply of military hardware to our Army. It has ‘Friendship’ Treaty – in essence a military, treaty with the Indian government.”

“These three factors have given to the Soviet Union a dominant and key position in the economic, political and military life of our country.”

6. Soviet Union is the greater danger.

Noting the strong economic and political strength of the two super powers in India, the political resolution says :

“US imperialism has got strong economic power in India to influence the internal and external policies of India to a certain extent” and that “it is certain that the rivalry between the two super powers for hegemony over India will further intensify, no matter what changes take place in India’s economic relations with either of them inspite of the pro-Soviet Indira Congress government coming to power in the Centre in the recent mid-term poll.”

The political resolution further states :

“While seeing the strong position on USA capital and that of the other Western imperialist countries, we should also see that Soviet Union, having dominance in the Public Sector, near monopoly of supply of military hardware to our Army and the Indo-Soviet Treaty and with the present pro-Soviet Indira Congress government in the Centre, has an upper hand over the other imperialist powers, including the USA.”

The political resolution has also said that the presence of large Soviet troops in Afghanistan is being utilised to pressurise the Indian government to better serve the Soviet line both internally and externally and that in today’s conditions, the danger of our country becoming the neo-colony of the Soviet Union is greater today.

Basing on this analysis, the resolution has stated that Soviet Union “is therefore a greater danger to our people, both nationally and internationally and a greater enemy of our people”.

7. Conflicts, contradictions and deep divisions among the ruling classes.

Noting the rivalry of the two super powers for hegemony over India, the political resolution says :

“This rivalry takes the form of greater investments of the Soviet Union and USA, greater economic, political and military penetration and thus establish their hegemony over our country. Both are trying to convert our country into their respective base against other countries in Asia. This danger is greater today from the Soviet Union with the pro-Soviet Indira Congress government coming to power in the centre in the mid-term poll.”

In further says: “Both the super powers are feverishly creating their own respective political lobbies in India in the various political parties in India, both regional and national, and try to get them to power and thus be in a better position to influence the internal and external policies of the country in its favour”.

“US imperialism, while mainly depending on Bharatiya Janata Party and certain powerful sections in the old Janata Party, is trying to create its own lobbies in other political organisations, both national and regional, particularly in the Indira Congress, Congress (U) and Lok Dal”.

“The Soviet Union, while mainly depending on Indira Congress, the CPI and CPM, is trying to create its own lobbies in all other big bourgeois, big landlord parties, both national and regional”.

“The Second World countries, particularly the West European countries are also trying to create their own lobbies in all the big bourgeois, big landlord parties, in order to protect their own interests in our country. Upto now they do not have any recognised political party, national or regional, which mainly represent their interests. These elements are to be found, at present, in the various big bourgeois, big landlord parties, at the national and to some extent in the regional parties too”.

Noting that this rivalry of the imperialist powers, particularly USA and Soviet Union, is leading to conflicts and contradictions of the ruling classes in India, the political resolution says.

“The growing economic and political crisis in the country, the growing dissatisfaction of the masses, the rising struggles of the various sections of the people, and above all the growing rivalry of the two super powers for hegemony over India, have intensified the contradictions and conflicts in each ruling class party and groups, leading to deep divisions in each of them continuously”.

The political resolution has also noted how the "Congress had already faced three major splits" and how, "the Janata Party too could not escape from the same fate."

Explaining the nature of the conflicts, contradictions and deep divisions in the ruling classes, the political resolution says.

"The pro-US lobby, particularly represented by the Bharatiya Janata Party, while depending mainly on USA to get to power in the country is also for friendly relations with the Soviet Union and is ready to give economic and political concessions to Soviet social imperialism as shown by its previous practice".

"The pro-Soviet lobby of the ruling classes, particularly represented by the Indira Congress, while mainly depending on the Soviet Union for maintaining its power, is also for friendly relations with USA and other Second World countries".

8. Attitude towards major ruling class parties

Describing the character of the various ruling class parties, the political resolution says.

"The Indira Congress, both by its internal and external policies, has again proved to be a pro-soviet government which has been giving more and more economic and political concessions to the Soviet Union. The agreement with the Soviet government for the purchase of armaments to the tune of Rs. 1,400 crores, the recognition of the puppet Heng Samrin government in Kampuchea, its repeated avowments that Soviet aggression in Afghanistan is only a response to outside interference in that country—all these confirm the pro-Soviet character of this government. The decision of USA government to continue to supply Uranium for the Tarapur plant also shows how this pro-Soviet government continues to maintain friendly relations with USA. The continuing change of this government towards events in Afghanistan also confirm that the contradiction between this government and the Soviet Union is only a friendly contradiction. It has refused to take any steps to improve its relations with Socialist China. On the other hand, its recognition of the puppet regime in Kampuchea only resulted in the worsening of this relationship".

"On the opposition side the Janata Party still further fragmented itself with the formation of the Bharatiya Janata Party dominated by the earlier Janasangh elements. The disintegration and continuous fragmentation of the old Janata Party only confirms the anti-people character of this party.

The Bharatiya Janata Party is dominated by the pro-USA sections, the Janata, Lokdal, Congress (U), consist of both the pro-USA and pro-Soviet and pro-Second World lobbies".

While noting that all these parties are ruling class parties, the big bourgeois, big landlord class parties, and that all of them are wedded "to the maintenance of the present semi-colonial and semi-feudal society in our country", the political resolution has seen the greater danger among them and declares :

"The Soviet Union and its allies, the present Indira Congress government, the leadership of the CPI and CPM with their revisionism, and support to Soviet Union, and the pro-soviet elements in other parties, should be taken as the greater danger. In the context of the present world situation, when the danger of a new world war from the Soviet Union is increasing, in the present context when the danger of our country becoming a neo-colony of the Soviet Union has grown, the presence of pro — Soviet Indira Congress government in the centre and in the majority states, and the CPM and CPI in [the opposition faithfully serving the interests of the Soviet Union, constitute the greater danger and are the greater enemies of the Indian people".

9. Attitude to revisionists and neo revisionists—the CPI and CPM

Why do we say that CPI and CPM should be treated as the greater enemies of the Indian people in the present situation ?

"The CPI and CPM with their revisionist leadership have proved themselves to be true to their salt. They have most shamelessly supported the fascist repression of Indira Gandhi against the just struggles of the people of Assam, Tripura and other North-Eastern states, thus paving the way for fascism. Both of them have again and again declared that they are not for any confrontation with the Indira Congress government at the centre. They shamelessly support Soviet aggression everywhere, including Afghanistan. Their opposition to the Indira Congress government is fictitious and are only trying to pressurise the Indira Congress government to serve the interests of the Soviet Union better. Their slogan of the so-called 'Left and Democratic Front' has turned out to be only a front of pro-Soviet forces, is nothing but a bourgeois alternative to Indira Congress to come to power in the Centre, with the support of the Soviet Union. The Soviet Union is encouraging this process of development to pressurise the Indira Congress government to further its own interests."

In spite of this characterisation, the political resolution clearly states :

"This means that while the edge of all people's struggles should be mainly directed against the Indira government both in the centre and the states, we should ideologically and politically expose the revisionist leadership of CPI and CPM and their subservience towards Soviet social

imperialism and thus win the masses behind them for Agrarian Revolution.”

Differentiating the leadership of the CPI and CPM and their followers, the political resolution clearly directs that “we should always seek to unite the activists and the mass organisations behind the pro-Soviet forces, particularly the revisionist and neo-revisionists at the village, factory and educational institution level, for united struggles of all the people concerned, on the immediate struggles—both economic and political, and thus win them over for struggles inspite of the opposition of these parties.”

10. Intensify the people’s struggles on the basis of united front.

While taking the pro-Soviet forces either in power or in opposition as the greater enemies of the Indian people, the political resolution has rejected the theory of a general political united front with the pro-USA and pro-Second World forces against the pro-Soviet forces, at present. The political resolution clearly states :

“For unity between the working class party and sections of the ruling classes, there should be a common basis. Such a common basis will come, when any super power makes aggression on our country, or in the period of fascist repression supported by one super power, as it happened during the period of Indira’s Emergency or when our country is converted into a neo-colony. During such periods, there will be common basis for general political united front between the working class party and that section of the ruling classes opposed to the particular super power to a certain period, and to a certain extent.”

The political resolution has warned :

“But today our struggle is for Protracted People’s War, for the destruction of imperialism, bureaucratic monopoly capitalism and feudalism. So any section of the ruling classes will not unite with our Party to build Agrarian Revolutionary movement”. Why ?

As the political resolution states :

“Both pro-USA and pro-Soviet big bourgeois, big landlord classes are all expansionist in general, particularly towards our neighbours”.

Because of this expansionist nature and the concrete situation existing in the Indian sub-continent, even “the pro-USA sections of ruling classes” are “for friendly relations with the Soviet Union, for maintaining the Indo-Soviet ‘Friendship’ Treaty” and are prone to give more and more economic and political concessions to the Soviet Union as proved by the actions of the Janata government while in power”.

"The pro-USA sections all follow anti-people policies, serving the interests of imperialism and social imperialism and adopt bloody repression to crush the people's struggles".

Thus while rejecting the general political united front with the pro-USA and pro-Second World forces in the country, peddled by SN-Nandi-Gurubaksh, the political resolution has also rejected the theory of certain revolutionary groups in the country, of being equi-distant between the pro-Soviet and the pro-USA and pro-Second World forces. The political resolution clearly states :

"But at the same time we should utilise the contradictions of the two super powers and those of the various ruling class parties and groups, the central government and the provincial governments, ruling class parties and revisionists, from issue to issue, both economic and political to advance the revolutionary movement, taking the Soviet Union and its allies as the greater danger."

How to utilise these contradictions of the ruling classes ? The political resolution says :

In conducting the immediate struggles of the people, economic and political, "we must utilise the various contradictions of the two super powers, and their allies. These contradictions should be utilised from issue to issue, both economic and political, consistent with the general political line of the Party, of taking Soviet Union as the greater danger, both nationally and internationally and Soviet Union and its allies in India as the greater danger, wherever they are, whether in power or in opposition",

What are the issues on which united front struggles could be conducted ? The political resolution says :

"In conducting these immediate struggles of the people, economic and political, we must utilise the present contradictions and conflicts of the pro-Soviet and pro-USA forces and Second World countries, and unite with pro-USA and pro-Second World countries who are now in opposition on such issues as civil liberties, on the immediate issues of the people, economic and political and above all against the predominance of the Soviet Union in India, against Soviet aggression wherever and whenever it raises its head, particularly now in Afghanistan, against all concessions to Soviet Union's efforts to convert our country into its neo-colony and Indira Congress government's connivance at these efforts and its plans for world war".

Explaining the basis for such united front struggles on various issues, the political resolution states that since the pro-USA and pro-Second World countries "are now in opposition" and so "the possibility of united front with pro-US and pro-Second World countries against Soviet Union's aggressive policies and its dominance in

India have grown and we should utilise these possibilities to advance the people's struggles and thus advance the revolutionary movement in the country".

The political resolution has explained how these united front struggles and our struggle for Agrarian Revolution will lead to the formation of People's Democratic Front under the leadership of the working class.

Warning the Party about the necessity of maintaining the independence of the Party in these united front struggles, the resolution states :

"In the states, while mobilising the people against government under the leadership of the pro-US lobby, we should warn the people against the danger of the pro-Soviet lobby coming to power in some label or other".

"While mobilising and uniting the people including the pro-US sections for struggle against government under the leadership of the pro-Soviet lobby, under whatever label, we should warn the people about the danger of Pro-US lobby coming to power."

"In conducting the immediate economic and political struggles of the people, we can unite with the pro-US sections against the pro-Soviet sections on certain issues. At the same time, at present, we cannot have general political united front with any section of the ruling classes.

"While uniting with pro-US sections against the pro-Soviet sections, we should expose the vacillating and subservient role of these sections towards US imperialism and their anti-people policies".

Thus one could see that on such important issues like the role of the two super powers, and their lobbies in India, while rejecting the concept of a general political united front with pro-USA sections against the pro-Soviet lobby at present, it also rejects the concept of trying to be equidistant between both the lobbies or treating them as equal enemies which is nothing but sectarian. The resolution has called for utilising the contradictions of the ruling classes on the immediate issues of the people, both economic and political, both national and international issues, from issue to issue, and thus intensify the people's struggles and utilise these struggles to advance the revolutionary movement in the country. This demarcates our Party from the position of some revolutionary groups in the country.

11. Agrarian Revolution and elections

The political resolution has rejected the concept of a general boycott of all elections, taking the level of the consciousness of the people and the

level of the revolutionary movement and has decided to "continue to participate in the elections". It has also said that "the question of participation in elections, where, when, and in what form should be decided in each election".

On the other hand it has also rejected the policy of election alliances with ruling class parties and others, which is bound to lead to a parliamentary path.

Basing itself on the teachings of Lenin, the political resolution explains the aims of our participation in elections "to extensively propagate the politics of Agrarian Revolution, and the political line of the Party among the people, to extend and consolidate our mass base among the people. If in this process of struggle, we win some seats in elections, we will utilise that position to achieve the same aims."

It has further said :

"Our participation in the elections should not lead to strengthening of election illusions in the people, but should help in dispelling the same. It should help in preparing the people for further revolutionary struggles after the elections."

While participating in the elections, we must boldly tell the people that elections under the present big bourgeois, big landlord constitution will not lead to any basic changes in the present society and that only People's War could lead to such basic changes in the society".

Rejecting the concept of election alliances with ruling class parties, the resolution clearly states :

"We should, as a general principle, participate in the elections on the basis of our own strength. We should not have any election alliance or adjustment of seats with any ruling class parties, national or regional, CPI and CPM. We can have alliance or seat adjustments with, or support only those who support our struggle for armed Agrarian Revolution or those who support our New Democratic Revolution".

"We should not have any illusions that our Party could share power with any section of the ruling classes and their parties, regional or national under the present big bourgeois, big landlord constitution."

12. Full support to the just struggle of the Assam people

Fully supporting the just struggle of the Assam people, the political resolution says :

"The Assam situation is a reflection of deep resentment of the Assam people with their economic backwardness which has been the result of the policies of the successive governments both at the Centre

and the states. It is significant to note that almost all the political parties in Assam, both national and regional, instead of leading the people for the destruction of the semi-colonial and semi-feudal system, which is the real source of economic backwardness, vied with one other in championing the regional demands and rousing chauvinism against the Bengali people. Some other organisations tried to rouse the Bengali chauvinism against the Assam people.

13. Fascism and the struggle for civil liberties

The political resolution clearly states :

“Fascist repression or parliamentary democracy as practised by the big bourgeois, big landlord class parties in our semi-colonial and semi-feudal society, at present, are two methods used by them to suppress the rising struggles of the people, as the crisis demands. It is the economic and political crisis of the semi-colonial and semi-feudal system that determines which method the ruling classes of our country will adopt—fascism or parliamentary democracy, as the situation demands.”

“Any ruling class party, Indira Congress, the Janata or the Lokdal alliance, faced with the growing economic and political crisis and internal dissidence and growing people’s struggles will not hesitate to resort to fascist repression as Indira Congress did in 1975. It is the semi-colonial and semi-feudal system which is the source of fascism and bloody repression and without destroying the present semi-colonial and semi-feudal system through a Protracted People’s War, we cannot destroy the source of fascism and bloody repression.”

At the same time it warns :

“This does not mean that there is no difference between bourgeois democracy and bourgeois fascism—the two methods of bourgeois rule”.

“There is a qualitative difference between these two methods of government rule in suppressing the people’s struggles”.

It has also said :

“Of course, we must struggle for the preservation and extension of civil liberties available under the bourgeois democracy. Under conditions of bourgeois democracy, we must utilise the contradictions of the ruling classes from issue to issue, economic and political, and advance the revolutionary movement”.

“Under conditions of fascism, we must unite with all those that could be united to conduct a political struggle for civil liberties. On the basis of struggle for civil liberties we must build the anti-fascist front consisting of all those subjected to fascist repression”.

“This struggle to build the anti-fascist front should be linked with the main forms of struggles — the armed Agrarian Revolutionary struggle and thus advance the whole revolutionary movement”.

“We must understand that our struggle against fascism is a part of the anti-imperialist struggle, aimed against the dominant imperialist power supporting that fascism”.

Noting the growing danger of fascism at present, the political resolution has warned:

“What we are now faced with is that the Indira Congress has come to power both in the Centre and the majority states. This is the government that has already tasted Emergency rule earlier. This government is already arming itself with all sorts of special repressive measures to suppress the growing people’s struggles in the country. Arrests, lathi charges, banning of public meetings, tortures of political opponents, destruction of people’s property, false cases, Disturbed Areas Act, Preventive Detention, mass shootings are again becoming the common features as it is happening in Andhra, Assam and all other North-Eastern States. On top of all this now comes the National Security Ordinance giving powers to the States to detain any person without charges, merely on suspicion. The last 9 months of Indira Congress rule indicate that it is invariably moving towards fascism again. With growing economic and political crisis in the country, with growing contradictions of the ruling class parties and groups, with growing dissidence inside Indira Congress itself, with the growing super power rivalry in the country, the Indira Congress is bound to resort to fascist dictatorship in some form or other. The situation demands that we should build a powerful people’s movement for civil liberties, here and now, uniting with all those that could be united and block the road towards fascism again”.

14. Link the people’s struggles with the struggle for People’s War

The Special Congress has rejected the path of individual terrorism or the so-called path of ‘annihilation of class enemies’. At the same time it has rejected all versions of policies of class collaboration. The Party has called for following the mass line in all struggles: It has said that “we must be more vigilant in adopting the mass line in conducting the immediate struggles of the people, drawing the people in all phases of the struggles and the resistance struggles, uniting with all the forces that could be united on each issue, both economic and political, including the forces of the pro-US and pro-Second World forces”.

It clearly states that struggles of the various sections of the people the workers, peasants, students and government employees, on their immediate economic and political issues should be combined with extensive propagation of revolutionary politics of Agrarian revolution.

The Special Congress has also called upon the Party to link the struggle against the two super powers, the struggle for Peace, the anti-imperialist and anti-feudal struggles, the immediate struggles of the people, the struggle for civil liberties, the participation in the elections and the struggle for united front, should be linked with the struggle for Armed Agrarian Revolution and People's War. This has been taken as the key task of the period.

Taking the peasant struggle as the main struggle, the political resolution has declared :

"The main direction of the party work should be consciously oriented towards building revolutionary peasant movement. Selection of strategic areas, concentration of cadres, formulation of fighting and agitational slogans with extensive discussions of the peoples of the area, mobilising the peasants for struggles on these issues, building the peasant organisations, arming of the people with the locally available weapons in the anti-feudal struggles from the very beginning, organising the village volunteer organisations, people's resistance to landlord-police-goonda violence and repression and thus create, develop and defend areas of sustained resistance and thus advance to the establishing of the base areas in the country side."

Detailing the tasks on the workers' front, the political resolution declared :

"In building the trade union movement, our main direction should be to build the revolutionary trade union movement i. e. politicalisation of the workers, ideological and political struggle against legalism and economism, worker-peasant unity, volunteer organisations to resist police-management goondaism and repression, and building of the secret party among the workers. Only thus we could unite the workers and make it the conscious leader of the New Democratic Revolution. The main concentration should be in strategic industries."

This orientation of our Party, based on the experience of the last 12 years of struggle is a demarcation from both class collaboration and sectarian policies, negative left adventurist policies of all types.

15. Struggle for the unity of the Communist Revolutionaries

Rejecting all negative, sectarian and factional attitude towards unifying all the Communist Revolutionaries, the political resolution says :

"Uniting all the Communist Revolutionaries in a single party, and People's War is still one of the important tasks of the Party.

We should unite with other revolutionary groups, on all immediate economic and political struggles of the people. Unite on those issues on which an agreement is possible, leaving the other issues for the future.

While uniting with other revolutionary groups on an agreed programme, we should consistently carry out a political and ideological but friendly struggle against their wrong policies and ideology on certain issues.

Taking a positive attitude towards other revolutionary groups, who accept Socialist China as a base of the world revolution, who accept Marxism-Leninism-Mao Zedong Thought and who accept the path of People's War, uniting with them on the immediate, issues of the people, friendly criticism against their wrong policies and advancing the Agrarian Revolutionary movement in the country should lead to the building of a single Party—the CPI (ML).

We must ceaselessly carry on a political and ideological struggle based on Marxism-Leninism-Mao Zedong Thought against both right and left deviations, both inside and outside the Party, taking the right deviation as the main danger at present”.

16. Build a strong CPI (ML) to face all twists and turns

The political resolution has warned the Party :

“The coming period is a period of growing economic and political crisis in the country, of growing people's struggles and growing repression. Today no ruling party in power either at the Centre or the states can rule this country without 'special' powers and police measures to suppress the people's struggles. In the coming period, repression on people's struggles is bound to increase”.

“So, while utiling the present legal opportunities to the maximum extent possible, while intensifying the struggle for civil liberties, the main orientation of the Party should be to build a Party that could meet all twists and turns of the situation”.

Fully confident of the future, the political resolution has declared:

“The coming period is a trying period for our people, our country and our Party. In spite of the elections, and the establishment of the present government, the economic and political crisis in the country is bound to get intensified. The super power rivalry for hegemony over India is bound to increase.

The contradictions and conflicts of the ruling class parties and groups are bound to get intensified. New re-alignment among the big bourgeois, big landlord parties, including the Indira Congress, are bound to take place — all leading to greater instability of the ruling classes again. The discontent of the various sections of the people

is bound to get intensified. We are on the eve of a big people's upsurge to change the semi-colonial and semi-feudal system in our country. The revolutionary situation is getting better both in our country and world."

"It is true that Indira Congress has come to power in the Centre and the majority states with a big majority. If the situation demands with the support of the Soviet Union, the Indira Congress is bound to resort to fascist dictatorship to suppress the rising tide of people's struggles. But the people too are now more experienced as to how to resist it. In particular, as far as our Party is concerned, our main people's base in the country has increased. Our cadres have greater experience in conducting people's struggles and in sustained resistance struggles. The Party cadres are politically and ideologically trained better to face the new situation, and with correct political line, by keeping to the mass line, and conducting people's struggles on the basis of the united front, we can advance the Agrarian Revolutionary movement in the new situation".

Rejection of all policies of class callaboration, rejection of all sectarian, negative and left adventurist concepts, a consistant application of the mass line are the specific features of the decisions of the Special Congress. A correct programme, a correct political resolution, a correct orientation towards Agrarian Revolution, a consistant struggle for united front on various issues ultimately leading to building the People's Democratic Front are the specific decisions of the Special Congress, which will go a long way in advancing the revolutionary movement in the country, in the present situation.

10/11/1980.

(This article was published New Democracy December '80 issue)

Decisions of the Special Congress

On various controversial issues of fundamental nature

1. Semi-Colonial and semi-feudal character of our present society :

After the transfer of power from the British to the big-bourgeois-big-landlord classes, there has been a continuous debate in the Communist movement in the country about the social, economic and political status of our country.

All the ruling class parties in India, either in power or in opposition hail this transfer of power in August 1947 as the achievement of full independence for the country.

The CPI and CPM—the revisionists and the neo-revisionists—also indulge in praising this transfer of power in August 1947 as the attainment of full Independence, thus covering up the comprador role of the ruling classes, and the abject dependence of our country on Soviet social imperialism and US imperialism.

Of late, SN-Nandi have brought forward the new theory that our country is under the exclusive hegemony of Social imperialism, which is nothing but declaring our country to be a neo-colony of the Soviet Union.

Some others also have come forward with the new and fantastic theory that our country has achieved 'some' political Independence and that it is wrong to say that our country has only achieved formal political Independence. Of late, we have been seeing that some revolutionary groups also have been writing that our country has got 'marginal' independence.

The Special Congress of the Party has rejected all these wrong formulations. It has declared that the transfer of power in 1947 August was nothing but a 'conspiracy and compromise' between British imperialism and our own ruling classes—the big-bourgeois big-landlord classes to 'disrupt and smash the National Liberation struggle.'

The Programme, accepted by Party Special Congress, has characterised the transfer of power in August 1947 as politically 'formal independence

and economic dependence on imperialism and social imperialism' and how 'economic dependence on imperialism (including social imperialism) renders our political independence into a formal one', and has declared that 'India is a vast semi-colonial and semi-feudal country'.

—The Programme has clearly stated that the ruling classes in India are big-bourgeois big landlord classes. They are subservient to imperialism and social imperialism and are comprador in nature.

Of late, some have tried to argue that feudalism is dying, though slowly, and comprador capitalism is growing, though slowly, and have tried to argue from this that big-bourgeoisie is the leader of the government. One could easily see the similarity between this argument and that of the CPM.

Our Programme has rejected all such arguments. It has categorically stated that "in the context of growing peasant struggles in the country, the so-called agrarian reforms, conceived and implemented by the ruling classes, are intended to serve the comprador big-bourgeoisie and big landlords as well as imperialists. Though capitalist methods of farming have developed to some extent in some areas in agriculture, semi-feudal land relations continue to dominate with some modification of form. They seek to perpetuate the semi-colonial and semi-feudal socio-economic setup of the country. Instead of breaking the fetters on our productive forces, they merely doom the peasants to the worst type of expropriation and bondage, while a handful of big landlords and a section of rich peasants prosper at the cost of the peasant masses".

That is why the Programme has asserted that the present govt. represents the big-bourgeois, big-landlord classes subservient to imperialism and social imperialism and are comprador in nature.

Our analysis that our country is semi-colonial and semi-feudal, ruled by the big bourgeois-big landlord classes subservient to imperialism and social imperialism and comprador in nature is based on the developments in our country, since the transfer of power in August, 1947, on the concrete situation existing in our country, guided by the teachings of Lenin, Stalin and Mao on this subject.

The political resolution of the Special Congress has also taken into consideration the changes that are taking place both in India and in the world as a whole. Taking these factors into consideration, the Special Congress, in its political resolution has declared "the general weakening of imperialism in the world, the increased rivalry between the two super powers for hegemony over our country and the world, has increased the bargaining capacity of our ruling classes to get more concessions from either of the two super powers. This should not be mistaken for increased independence of our ruling classes. They still remain comprador and subservient to either of the two super powers."

Based on this analysis, the Programme has clearly stated that the stage of our revolution is 'People's Democratic Revolution, the essence of which is Agrarian Revolution'.

2. Principal Contradiction

Having decided on the stage of our revolution as 'People's Democratic Revolution', the Programme has discussed and decided the principal contradiction in the present state of our revolution.

Here the Party had to contend with two wrong trends.

SN-Nandi combine have declared that our country is under the exclusive hegemony of Soviet Social imperialism and from this they have concluded that the contradiction between Soviet Social imperialism and its allies in India on one hand and the broad masses of the people on the other as the principal contradiction today. The Party Programme has outrightly rejected this fantastic theory since it treats our country as a neo-colony of the Soviet Union.

Then there is the other concept that the principal contradiction is between feudalism and the broad masses of the people. This concept is still being held by most of the revolutionary groups. Our Party too has propagated this idea for a very long time.

But after further study on this question, we have felt that this concept is inadequate. In the period of semi-colonial and semi-feudal society as ours, it does not show the political and economic connections between feudalism, imperialism (including social imperialism) and bureaucratic monopoly capitalism. It does not show that imperialism (including social imperialism) continues to dominate our country till the final victory of the New Democratic Revolution, with Agrarian Revolution as the main content.

So on the question of the principal contradiction the Programme has clearly stated :

"But of all the major contradictions existing in our country i. e. the contradiction between imperialism and the nation, between feudalism and the broad masses of the people, between bourgeoisie and proletariat, and between different sections of the ruling classes, two contradictions are the basic. They are the contradiction between imperialism and nation and contradiction between feudalism and the broad masses of the people. These two basic contradictions decisively influence the course of the Indian Revolution. The way these two basic contradictions express themselves in the period of semi-colonial and semi-feudal society made the contradiction between the alliance of imperialism, feudalism and comprador bureaucratic capitalism on one hand and the broad masses of the Indian people on the other the principal contradiction, and Agrarian Revolution the main content of the New Democratic Revolution".

3. Main enemies and the main friends of the Revolution

The Programme has clearly rejected the theory of CPI-CPM that only US imperialism is the main enemy of the Indian Revolution. It has

also rejected the theory of SN-Nandi Combine that only Soviet Social imperialism is the enemy of the Indian Revolution.

The Programme accepted by the Special Congress of the Party has clearly stated that 'the basic task of Indian Revolution is to eliminate social imperialism, imperialism, feudalism and comprador bureaucratic capitalism', and that 'imperialism, social imperialism, feudalism and comprador bureaucratic capitalism' are 'the four main enemies of the Indian Revolution'.

Rejecting the class collaborationist theory of SN-Nandi combine that sections of the ruling classes (according to them they are 'patriots and democrats') join the New Democratic Revolution, the Programme has clearly stated that the workers, peasants, middle classes and the national bourgeoisie are the main friends of the Indian Revolution. It has declared :

"The main force of the Democratic Revolution led by the working class is the peasantry. The working class fully relies on the landless and poor peasants, firmly unites with the middle peasants and even wins over a section of rich peasants while neutralising the rest. It will only be a section of the rich peasants that finally joins the enemies of the revolution. The urban petty-bourgeoisie and revolutionary intellectuals of our country are the revolutionary forces and are reliable allies in our revolution. The national bourgeoisie, though vacillating, is an ally to the People's Democratic Revolution, a minority section may desert to the counter-revolution.

In order to carry the Peoples's Democratic Revolution through to the end, it is necessary that a People's Democratic front of all revolutionary classes be built up with worker-peasant alliance as its core under the leadership of the working class. The Democratic Front is forged in the course of revolutionary struggle as a process from the very beginning of the revolution.

The working class will exercise its leadership over the People's Democratic Revolution through its political Party and by direct participation in revolutionary struggle".

4. People's War is the only path for Indian Revolution

Rejecting all theories of legalism, economism and parliamentary path peddled by CPI and CPM, and now being repeated by persons like SN-Nandi-Gurubux, the Programme of the Party has clearly stated:

"The Path of the Indian revolution will be essentially the Chinese path and in order to defeat the enemies of Indian revolution and achieve victory, the revolutionary people must forge three weapons as they are of paramount importance. These three weapons are as follows.

1. A Party armed with Marxism-Leninism-Mao Zedong Thought.
2. A People's Army under the leadership of Proletariat, and
3. A United Front of all the revolutionary classes, organisations and individuals with worker-peasant alliance as its core under the leadership of the proletariat.

Political Gimmicks of all Ruling Class Parties in India

Certain common features

As a result of the policies pursued by the various ruling class parties in India, particularly the long Congress rule, the Indian economy is caught in deep crisis.

The policies of the ruling classes and their parties have only helped the imperialists, the big capitalists and the big landlords in the country. They have only resulted in greater misery for our people.

In order to end the present economic crisis in the country, one should end the foreign exploitation in our country and the exploitation of the big capitalists and big landlords in our country. Only then the lot of the common man could be improved. But this could be achieved only through successful Agrarian Revolution.

But the ruling class parties in India, either in power or in opposition, national or regional belong to same comprador ruling classes, serving the interests of exploiting classes both foreign and national. They are opposed to the Agrarian Revolution, and are determined to preserve of the present system of exploitation.

That is why none of these parties raise their voice against imperialist exploitation or the exploitation of the big capitalists and landlords in our country. That is why none of them raise their voice for any basic change in the land relations or industrial relations in the interests of the peasants and agricultural labourers or the working class in the cities.

The truth is they are no more interested in moving the people into action against the government on any important issue of the people even as in the days of 1980, when they were speaking of Rasta-Roko, Rail-roko movements or General Bundhs.

Meek opposition in the parliament

Look at the way these opposition parties have behaved meekly in the recent session of the parliament.

The opposition parties welcomed Indira Gandhi's proposal for setting up a new Pay Commission. Her game was to postpone the

issue of raising the basic pay scales of the Central Government employees, which is against the interests of these employees. But the opposition meekly submitted to the government proposal. Why? They are not for any increase in the basic pay scales of the Central government employees.

Look at the way the opposition parties have welcomed Indira Gandhi's announcement to set up the Sarkaria Commission to go into the relations between the Centre and the States. They did not even wait to see the other members of the Commission, the points of reference to it, or the period in which the Commission is to submit its report. Why such a haste? The truth is that some of these opposition parties are not for any de centralisation of powers from the Centre to the States.

Or look at the behaviour of the opposition parties with regard to the proposal of Indira Government, permitting the nationals living abroad to purchase shares in the Indian based companies. The industrialists have raised a hue and cry saying that this is an attempt to take over the Indian companies by the foreign monopolies through the Indian nationals abroad. Faced with this the Indira Congress declared that the Indian nationals abroad will be permitted to purchase only 5% of the shares in the Indian companies. Have they banned the purchase above the 5%? No. It says over and above this percentage, they should get the permission of the Reserve Bank. It has also promised that the Government financial institutions will use their shares against the change in the managements of the Indian companies from going into the hands of the Indian nationals abroad. This is only a promise.

Here is an opportunity for the opposition to rouse the whole nation against the attempts of the Indira Congress government to sell the Indian companies to the foreign monopolies in the name of the Indian nationals abroad. But the opposition failed to do that. It did not go beyond verbal criticism. Why? They also belong to the same comprador ruling classes subservient to imperialism.

Mere verbal protests against the new taxation proposals

Finally take the new taxation proposals of the Indira Congress government amounting to about Rs. 2000 crores in one single year. This was coming in the wake of Congress defeats in Karnataka and Andhra. All the sections of the people were shocked at the new heavy tax burden on the common people.

If the opposition was really interested in replacing Indira Congress government, if they were really interested in mobilising the people against the Congress government, the opposition should have come forward with their own alternative economic programme, on the basis of which they could have asked the people to oppose the taxation proposals to beat back the Indira Congress government.

But the opposition parties in the Parliament did not go beyond verbal protests in Parliament, oral condemnation in the press and a few protest public meetings and demonstrations.

This only shows that the opposition ruling class parties are no more prepared to move the people into action on any immediate issue of the people even on their immediate issues. If the people move on one issue, they will move on other issues, ultimately to a struggle for a change in the system of exploitation. If the situation is in their power, they are no more prepared for any big movement of the people, even of the type of 1980.

There is another truth. There is not a single incident in the Parliamentary history of our country, or for that matter in the history of any capitalist country, where the opposition, when it comes to power, has withdrawn any taxation measure or economic measure, which they have opposed while in opposition.

The truth is that all these ruling class parties follow basically similar economic policies and taxation measures which in essence means "Tax the poor to pay the rich".

The experience of the Janata government the experience of the various state governments under the leadership of the opposition parties, the regional parties or the CPI-CPM led governments adequately confirm this truth. The taxation measures of the CPM led government in West Bengal are in no way different from those of the Central government of the Congress.

Their attitude to repressive measures

All the ruling class parties— national and regional—swear by democracy but in actual practice, all of them resort to various kinds of repressive measures to oppress and suppress the just struggles of the people.

The record of the Congress, the record of the earlier Janata government or the state governments under the leadership of the various opposition parties is a confirmation of this truth.

Look at the role of the AIDMK government in Tamilnadu. Its record of false encounters and wanton killings of arrested individuals in the name of putting down 'Naxalite' violence is beating the black-record of the Congress governments. Police torture of prisoners in police custody has become so horrible that recently the Supreme Court has given notice to the Tamilnadu government to submit a report about these tortures and deaths under police custody. The lathi charge on such Civil Liberties Agitation leaders like Tarkunde and Kannabhiran recently in that state has beaten the Congress record.

The record of the repression by the CPM led government in Tripura and West Bengal is no better than any other state government.

Let us remember that it was the CPM government in Tripura that sought more army help from the Central government to suppress the tribals. The recent Calcutta High Court's strictures on the jail administration—their food, clothing, medicines, treatment are an eloquent demonstration of its "progressivism". In the name of suppressing 'Naxalite' violence, the torture of arrested persons, arrest and harassment of the relatives of the arrested persons, adopted by the West Bengal government is in no way different from that of the record of the Congress government in Andhra.

The performance of the Telugu Desam government in Andhra, on the question of civil liberties is in no way different from other governments. It is continuing the same old Disturbed Areas Act in the tribal areas and Karimnagar district. No release of Communist Revolutionaries or withdrawal of pending arrest warrants against them, or withdrawal of false cases against them. The firing on the Tobacco farmers in Prakasam district, the lathi-charges on the students in Hyderabad city, the continuing arrests and beatings by the police in Karimnagar, Khammam and Warangal districts show which way the Telugu Desam government is moving. Faced with a demonstration of thousands of people on the question of civil liberties in Andhra, the Chief Minister had promised to settle the issue by April 23. But till now he is silent.

What is significant to note is that none of the opposition parties, except certain individuals among them, speak up against the continuation of Disturbed Areas Act in large parts of Andhra for such a long time. The CPM leadership, on the floor of the Assembly, most shamelessly demanded not only the continuation of the Disturbed Areas Act, but demanded more repression to suppress the people. What a fine example of 'Marxism-Leninism' of the CPM brand ! Out of the total opposition in the Andhra Assembly, it was left to Jaipal Reddy of the Janata to oppose the continuation of repression in Andhra.

The attitude of the opposition parties on the question of repression is too clear. Their opposition is nominal. When they come to power they do not withdraw a single repressive measure, but strengthen them. That is recorded history.

Separatism, Regionalism, Communalism, Casteism— the common weapons of all the ruling class parties

Another common feature of all the ruling class parties that is coming more to the forefront in the recent period is that all of them are now adopting separatism, regionalism, communalism and casteism, provoking riots among people, all for their selfish, narrow class interests to disrupt and destroy the united struggles of the common people.

The frequent quarrels over the language, border questions between states, River water distribution between states, or the question of Chattis-

garh, or Jarkhand in MP, or the so-called Utterkhand in UP, are only products of this policy.

The branches of these parties range themselves against each other and provoke bloody riots among the people, one against the other, one section against the other, one community or caste against another community or caste leading to bloody riots, resulting in wanton killings and burnings and destruction of properties. It is the Harijans, Moslims and the tribals that are often the worst sufferers in this holocaust, the very people that these parties claim to be defending.

The frequent Hindu-Moslim riots in North-India, the riots in Bihar, UP, Gujarat over the job reservations right from 1978, were all engineered by these ruling class parties for their own selfish and narrow class interests. The Congress, the Janata, the Lokdal, the BJP and RSS, the CPI-CPM and certain chauvinists in Assam itself, are all part of this game.

Look at the way how the Congress, the BJP and RSS or the CPM—are all vying with each other in creating and continuing the divisions between the immigrants and the Assam people, between Non-Assam and Assam people, between Hindus and Moslim people, between various tribes in Assam—all aimed at destroying the just struggles of the Assam people against economic backwardness and in defence of their language, and culture, instead of solving the problem of immigrants, which is the sole responsibility of the Central government.

Look at the way the Congress, the Akalis and the BJP are feverishly engaged in creating tensions between Hindus and Sikhs in punjab, leading to the present explosive situation, relegation all other important issues of the people—the workers, peasant, middle classes and students — to the background, all with an eye on the ballot box.

The problems of Punjab and Haryana should have been long ago solved by giving Chandigarh to Punjab and the Centre giving financial help to Haryana to build its own capital, which was the original agreement when Chandigarh was built as the joint capital of Punjab and Haryana. The disputes and division of river waters and border question could easily be settled by refering them to an independent Tribunal.

But such a simple and straight solution does not suit the election interests of these parties and hence the prolongation of the crisis.

Regional parties — certain common features

As the ruling class parties at the national level have begun to lose their glamour among the people, in various parts of the country, regional parties have emerged claiming to represent the particular interests of their regions, claiming to represent the particular religious traditions of a particular community or the language and cultural traditions of a particular nationality inhabiting that region

The National Conference in Jammu and Kashmir, the Akalis in Punjab, the AIDMK and AMK in Tamilnadu, the Telugu Desam in Andhra are all regional parties of this type. One should note certain common features which are inimical to the interests of the common people.

All these parties belong to the big bourgeois, big landlord classes of that region and are one with the other ruling class parties in preserving the present system of exploitation.

They raise extreme sectional slogans relating to their own regions or communities, not because they are really interested in the economic well-being, the religious and cultural traditions of the people of the region concerned, but only to create chauvinist feelings among the people to catch their votes and to separate the common people of that area from the united struggles of the common people in other states.

They have no policy quarrels with the existing ruling class parties at the national level. They are on friendly terms with all the ruling class parties. They are prepared to remain at peace with any ruling party that comes to power in the Centre. That is why all the ruling class parties run for electoral adjustment with these regional parties.

They raise extreme sectional demands of their particular region, not because they want to conduct any struggle with the Central government but to bring pressure on the Central government for more economic concessions.

The performance of the state governments under the leadership of these regional parties in the matter of economic policies, taxation measures or in the matter of repression are in no way different from those of the Congress government or other state governments under the leadership of the other opposition ruling class parties.

The performance of the AIDMK government or the Telugu Desam government in A. P. is no exception to this general rule, inspite of all their false claims. There are already reports in the press that both these parties are in consultation with Indira Gandhi for electoral adjustments in the next parliamentary elections. Just now Rama Rao has invited all opposition party leaders to attend his party Conference. The purpose seems to be for electoral agreement for the next parliamentary elections. Let us wait and see.

The counter-revolutionary role of the CPI-CPM

The role of the CPI-CPM combine in the present day political situation in our country is more exposing itself as counter revolutionary.

They have no alternative programme of struggle either against the Congress government in power or the other opposition ruling class parties.

Their praise for Indira Gandhi's foreign policy and pretention of opposition to the internal policies of Indira Gandhi's is exposing itself as nothing but critical support to Indira Gandhi, as shown in their support of fascist repression of Indira Gandhi against the Assam people and their support to the bogus elections she conducted there.

Having accepted that even basic changes in the society can be achieved through amendments to the present big bourgeoisie-big landlord constitution, they have reduced themselves to a party of status quo, to maintain the present system of exploitation.

Their slogan of 'left and democratic front' has exposed itself as nothing but united front with all ruling class parties—from united front with Indira Gandhi on international affairs, to united front with any opposition ruling class party or parties, which ever is convenient to them. Their 'left and democratic front' has become so elastic that they can unite with the Muslim League at one time and oppose it at other times, that they can change their support from DMK to AIDMK vice-versa, as it suits them.

This 'left-and democratic front' has reduced itself to nothing but opportunist political alliances with all sorts of ruling class parties, all for electoral gains.

The performance of the state governments led by the CPI-CPM combine have proved themselves to be in no way different either of the earlier Congress governments, or of the state government under the leadership of other bourgeois opposition parties or the regional parties.

They have thoroughly failed to effect any basic changes either in land relations or in industrial relations. They are following the same economic and taxation measures as of the other ruling class parties.

Even in Bengal, the present Agrarian Bill, which confers the right to a share in the produce, about which they are trumpeting so much, is a bill passed by the earlier Congress government and nothing more. It is not a bill giving land to the tiller. Even in implementing they are collaborating with the Jotedars, if they are prepared to support them. They are using the government machinery to confer even these limited rights only to those peasants who follow them.

Whenever they are in power, their slogans are in no way different from the slogans of Indira Gandhi. No strikes, no civil strife, more production, peace on the agricultural and industrial fronts, appeal to foreign monopolies to invest more in their states are in no way different from Indira Gandhi's appeals at the centre.

In the face of this performance in the states under their rule, all their pretensions of opposition to Indira Gandhi's economic policies or authoritarianism is being exposed as nothing but bogus.

Their whole political practice has proved itself to be nothing but economism and parliamentary path—exposing their revisionism and counter-revolutionary role in all its nakedness.

The CPI-CPM combine trumpet their electoral gains as a victory for their political struggle. Practice has proved that the Indian ruling classes and their parties are very happy with the performance of the CPI-CPM since it is binding the people of these states to reformism and not revolutionary struggle. CPI-CPM will be allowed to be in power in these states as long as it suits the ruling classes.

At present, that both the CPM and India Congress are in the best of terms, is no more a secrecy. Indira Gandhi wants the help of the CPM in suppressing the just struggle of the people of Assam and the whole North-East states. The CPM wants the help of the Indira Congress government and its army to suppress the tribals in Tripura and other North-East states. Both are at one in supporting the hegemonic policies of the Soviet Union both in India and abroad.

This growing friendship between Indira Congress and the CPM is reflected in the friendly relations between the Central government and the West Bengal state government.

Commenting on the recent Central government's financial help to the West Bengal, Inder Malhotra, in Times of India (May 5) writes :

“Now at last, the Centre has agreed to fork out another Rs. 90 crores—the state has no money—and hopefully the second Hoogly bridge will become a reality one of these days. This, one might add, is the only cheerful news to come out of Calcutta and it has wider implications than might appear at first sight. New Delhi's willingness to finance the completion of the second bridge is a measure of the improvement in the relations between the Centre and the Marxist ruled state...”

“At government to government level, there is reasonable cordiality between the two sides. In fact, Mr. Pranab Mukherjee's cosy chats with Mr. Jyoti Basu almost one every week, have become a major talking point on Calcutta's cocktail circuit. Even Mr. Ghani Khan Choudary is responsive to the CPM's requests for minor favours to West Bengal by the railways. ...”

Vague promises, Bogus social welfare schemes.

Having no programme to effect any basic changes either in the agricultural or industrial relations, having no will to implement the basic demands of the agricultural labourers, farm servants, poor and middle peasants or the working class in the cities, all the ruling class parties are now resorting to only vague promises about removing poverty in general, improving living conditions of the people in general, establishments of co-operatives, loans to farmers. They are so vague that they can be interpreted in any way and practice has provide that all these programmes are nothing but some variety of social welfare schemes. In practice, these welfare schemes have always benefitted the richer classes and not the poor. They do not even touch the fringe of the basic issues of the people—their land, growing debt, basic wage, food and shelter. In actual practice, they have reduced themselves to do nothing but the efforts of the ruling class parties to create their own dalals among the backward sections of the people.

All these parties speak very loudly about abolishing corruption in the administration. Can they remove it without destroying the present social system of exploitation? A pipe dream! That is why, inspite of their loud cries against it, corruption, blackmarket, and black money have continued to thrive, getting worse and worse.

Having no definite socio-economic and political programme to change the present system of exploitation, the leaders of all these parties are resorting to all sorts of political gimmicks to deceive the people.

Attending religious centres of worship with fanfare well advertised in the papers, performing well-advertised Yagnas, swearing by Puranas and Bhagavad Gæta, all to demonstrate to the innocent people about their 'faith' in 'god'—this has now become the common methods of the leaders of all these parties, with Indira Gandhi in the leading van, just to appeal to the backward and religious sentiments of the people with an eye on the ballot box.

Rama Rao, the Chief Minister of AP, has now beaten them all in these political gimmicks. Now he says that he has renounced this world and he has become a Sanyasi, going about in Kashaya vastram (Saffron robes) and Rudhraksha mala.

But will such political gimmicks save Rama Rao from the wrath of the common people when they understand his failures to fulfill the demands of the people, to fulfill the election promises he made?

Another political gimmick is the Padayatra, imiting Gandhiji, Vinobha Bhave, Jayaprakash Narain etc.

Look at the way how Rajiv Gandhi flew from Delhi to Bombay to participate in a well-advertised Padayatra to walk a few kilometres in the bastees of Bombay. Can such feats bring any succour to the hungry bastees people ?

Look at the way how Chief Minister of Tamilnadu conducted a well advertised fast for a few hours to get more food grains to the people of Tamilnadu from the central government.

Lastly, look at the press-build up for the well-advertised padayatra of Chandra Sekhar, the President of the Janata Party, from Kanayakumari to New Delhi, as if earlier he did not understand the miseries of the rural people, and that he is learning them only now through this padayatra. But notice how he has been avoiding any alternative programme to the ruling Congress party except vague promises.

All these are nothing but political gimmicks of the ruling class parties to win the sympathy of the people with vague promises all with an eye on the ballot box.

Thus one could see the common features of all the ruling class parties, national and regional.

They all belong to the same ruling classes comprador big bourgeois-big landlord classes, subservient to imperialism.

They all speak of 'patriotism' and 'independence', but in actual practice, faithfully serve the interests of imperialism and social imperialism.

They all speak about the removal of poverty, but in actual practice follow similar economic and political policies that serve the interests of the big capitalists and big and landlords.

Separatism, regionalism, communalism and casteism - have become the common weapons of all the ruling class parties-national and regional-to divide, disrupt and destroy the united struggles of the common people to serve their own class interests.

They all speak in the name of 'democracy', but when they come to power, they resort to various repressive measures suppress the just struggles of the people.

These are the common features of all the ruling class parties either in power or in opposition.

Then, what is the difference among them ?

The difference is that while some depend more on one super power, the Soviet Union, the others depend more on the other super power, USA.

Their difference is about the share in the common loot of the common people.

Their difference is while Indira Gandhi depends on the divisions of the opposition parties and their failures to retain her power, the opposition parties depend on the failures of Indira Congress and the growing divisions in the ruling class party, to come back to power.

These divisions and splits in the ruling class parties are bound to be there and they will get intensified in the coming period. It is these divisions among the ruling classes and their parties leading to the present instability for the ruling classes as a whole.

While utilising the divisions among the ruling classes to advance people's struggle we should see the reactionary common features of all these ruling class parties.

This is the basis of our rejection of 'left and democratic front' peddled by the CPI-CPM or the so-called 'anti-authoritarian and 'anti-autocratic' front, which mean nothing but general political united front with sections of the ruling classes. Such fronts are incompatible with the struggle for Agrarian Revolution.

The people are getting disgusted with all the ruling class parties. Their opposition is being shown in defeating these parties in power, and supporting some opposition party, from election to election. This is so because the people have not yet shed their election illusions. This is so because they have not realised the necessity of Agrarian Revolution to change the present system of exploitation and their own direct role in it. This situation also shows the weakness of the Agrarian revolutionary movement which can galvanise the dissatisfaction of the masses towards sustained revolutionary struggle.

So it is the duty of the communist revolutionaries to utilise the contradictions of the ruling class parties on the immediate issues of the people, however weak they are, and step by step advance the people's struggles towards Agrarian Revolution.

[This article was published in March to Liberation Jan 83 issue]

Political Notes

Now that both the international situation and the national situation are heating up, let us look at some of the new factors that are emerging in both the fields.

International

The two super powers—USA and the Soviet Union—are imperialist powers fiercely contending with each other for supremacy in the world—USA to defend its supremacy and SU to wrest this supremacy from it. Europe is still the focus of this contention.

But faced with parity of strength in Europe, the two super powers are now concentrating all their efforts in the Third World countries, to control and dominate the sources of raw materials and strategic resources in order to encircle Europe before they start the final onslaught.

As a result of this policy, regional wars have been taking place one after another, in various parts of the world. The continuing crisis in the Middle East, the Lebanon war, various local wars in the African continent, the present troubles in Central America, the troubles in the Korean peninsula, the war between Iran and Iraq, now threatening to become a new war in the Gulf. Vietnam's invasion of Kampuchea and Soviet invasion of Afghanistan are a result of the rivalry of the super powers for world supremacy.

Why Super power concentration in the Third World ?

Right from the defeat of US imperialism in the Indo-China War in 1960s, US has been concentrating in Asia and the Pacific region, in the Middle East and Third World countries in the challenge to USA and the other Western countries.

For instance, in Asia and Pacific region alone, Soviet Union has dispatched its Pacific fleet into South East Asia and South China Sea.

It has concentrated half of its land forces in the Far East, particularly on the borders of China, directly threatening it.

It has introduced nuclear submarines into this area.

It has considerably increased its air-force in this area,

Its military presence in the four Northern Islands of Japan has been increased, and is in a position to directly threaten that country.

It is rapidly increasing its medium range SS missiles in the Far East.

This shows Soviet's increased military presence in Asia and Pacific region. Similarly it is concentrating in the Middle East and the African continent and Latin American countries too. But why ?

The Third World countries have become the easy targets for the Soviet Union to economically penetrate them in the name of support to public sector which it is now using as a means to control their economies and consequently their politics also.

It is easy for it to gain the sympathies of the people of these countries by posing itself as an opponent to old imperialist powers, particularly USA, against whom the people of these countries have been fighting for long for their complete liberation.

It wants to get control of sources of raw materials and oil which are abundant in the Third World countries.

It wants to get control of strategic Straits and consequently strategic sea-routes, thus encircle Europe for the final assault.

It is in pursuance of these aims that it is supporting Vietnam's invasion of Kampuchea and its own invasion of Afghanistan, and its direct interference in the affairs of the Middle East and the African continent.

Similar shift in the policies of USA can also be seen.

For instance, after Vietnam's invasion of Kampuchea and Soviet Union's invasion of Afghanistan, USA is concentrating in Asia and the Pacific region and taking a tougher attitude to Soviet's expansionism in the Third World countries. This has been more so after Reagan became the President of USA.

It has increased its Seventh Fleet with nuclear-powered aircraft carriers and submarines equipped with cruise missiles. It is also building new naval bases as in Diego Garcia. It has also increased its military personnel and increasing Rapid Deployment Forces as a means to quickly intervene in various parts of the world. Similar military concentration by USA in the M E., Africa and Latin America can be seen. But why ?

The political aims of USA are similar to that of the SU—to maintain its present domination in the third world countries, its trade economic interests, to maintain control of the sources of raw materials and strategic sea routes, to prevent SU from encircling Europe, and as a means of economic recovery of the Western economies from the present world economic crisis.

With this aim, it is increasing its economic and military cooperation with the ASEAN countries, with Australia and New Zealand with Japan in particular, with South Korea, with the moderate state of the Middle East and military dictatorships in the Latin American countries. With this tough policy, USA has gained certain temporary gains as against Soviet Union in certain parts of the Third World countries.

The two super powers are at the root the present trouble in the Gulf crisis. Both are supplying deadly arms to combatants, through their intermediaries. Now with the decision of USA to send its intermediate missiles to the Gulf countries, the danger of a new war in the Gulf is greater.

Emergence of new factors

All this is nothing but the effects of contention of both the super powers for control and domination of the intermediate zone as a preparation for a new world war. This continued contention and collusion of the two super powers in the ambition of the world domination, new factors are emerging in various parts of the world which are not favourable, some times to one of them and sometimes to both of them.

For instance, inspite of their military victory in the recent war in Lebanon, both USA and Israel are facing crisis after crisis. The American Secretary of State had to resign. Begin in Israel had to go, special envoys of USA in the ME had to be changed, The 'Peace' keeping forces of USA Britain, France and Italy had to be withdrawn, and finally the Sepcial Treaty that America manouvered between Israel and Lebanon had to be scrapped by the President of Lebanon himself. Why? Because SU had supplied and is still supplying more powerful weapons to enables Syria and other Muslim fractions in Lebanon to counter attack on its behalf, in order to maintain its position in the Middle East.

Because USA is mainly dependent on Israel for its Middle East policy, even the Moderate states in this region and the PLO led by Arafat, are turning more and more to the West European countries in their struggle against Israeli expansionism. This is a set back for USA in the Middle East.

In the Latin American states, inspite of direct intervention of USA and greater economic and military aid to the reactionary military dictatorships, the struggle of the people of these countries against the exploitation and for democracy is sweeping this continent and more and more Latin American countries, even those more dependent on USA are raising their voice against American intervention and even the American public opinion is turning against Reagan's policies.

In this background, the talks between USA and Nicaragua, likely to take place in the coming period, as a decision of both the countries, are significant. This is nothing but a setback for USA.

Similarly, in Southern Africa, both Mozambique and Angola have come to an agreement with South African racist government to stop their border clashes and have set up a committee to supervise the proper implementation of this agreement.

This agreement has come about with the active intervention of USA, the main supporter of South African government but both Mozambique and Angola are having Friendship Treaties with the Soviet Union. But they still opted for a settlement with South Africa, instead of depending on SU or Cuba in the struggle against white racist government. This is a set back for the SU in this region. But the main current of National Liberation Struggle of the African people against white racism and American imperialism is bound to continue, whatever be the meaning of these agreements.

Vietnam is bogged down in Kampuchea. She has failed to break the support of the ASEAN countries to the struggle of the Kampuchean people. She has failed to create divisions among the ASEAN countries. Similarly Soviet Union is bogged down in Afghanistan.

All these are setbacks for the policy of expansionism of the Soviet Union.

In Europe, both in the West and the East, their struggle for their own independence from both the super powers is asserting more and more.

Here is also new factors are emerging.

With the strengthening of their own economies, the West European countries are seriously discussing a new idea of establishing an independent West European defence system, based on France and Federal Republic of Germany. This cannot be to the liking of either of the two super powers.

Another new idea that is emerging is greater co-operation between the Balkan countries—Bulgaria, Romania, Turkey, Yugoslavia and Greece. The officials of these countries are frequently meeting as a preparation for a meeting of the heads of these states, where they want to finalise their plans for mutual co-operation.

Turkey and Greece belong to NATO, while other belong to the WARSAW Pact; In the midst of growing confrontation between these blocks, how far mutual co-operation between countries belonging to both the blocks succeeds, is yet to be seen. But the emergence of this idea itself is significant and cannot be to the liking of either of the two super powers.

What is significant to note is that at present both the super powers are trying to woo China to its side, with some trade and economic concessions and some of transfer of technology. But China wants to utilise the contradictions of both the super powers to get some political concessions on Taiwan from USA; and on military concentration on its borders, and on the question of Kampuchea and Afghanistan from the SU. But inspite

of continuous talks between China and high delegations from USA, including that of Reagan's visit to China, or discussion between China and the SU, China has not gained any political concession from any of the two super powers. It only shows that today China does not have enough strength to force any one of the two super powers to give any political concessions to it. For instance, the recent visit of Reagan to People's Republic of China was a political flop, inspite of some economic, and trade agreements and transfer of technology or financial aid to build nuclear reactors in China. On the other hand, it served only Reagan to deceive the American public by saying that he is improving American's relations with China.

What is surprising is why should SU cancell its high level delegation to China just one day before the scheduled date? Why does SU want to publicly humiliate China just at this time?

Is it dissatisfied with the trade and economic agreements that China has made with USA at the time of Reagan's visit? Or is it under the pressure of Vietnam which does not naturally want improvement of relations between China and Russia? Time will tell us.

In this connection one has to note that while China is proclaiming its opposition to the hegemonism of both the super powers, China itself is saying that its economic, trade and financial relations with both the super powers are increasing. The meaning of these developments one has to deeply study.

It is also significant to note that immediately after the meeting between the General Secretary of CPC and the Head of State of North Korea, Kim II Sung gone to Moscow for talks. Is this meeting between North Korea and Russia only to be confined to their bilateral relations or is he going to play a mediatory role between China and Russia, or, is he carrying any secret message from China to Russia? Only time can answer these questions

Whatever be the result of these behind the scene negotiations what is certain is that the two super powers are still carrying on their policies of contention and collusion in their drive for world domination. They are engineering one regional war after another, all in the third world countries and carrying on a feverish arms race behind the facade of detente.

The contradictions between the two super powers and the contradiction between the world people, on the one hand, and the two super powers, on the other, will decide the course of world events in the coming period. In spite of the right deviation getting the upper hand in the CPC leadership, it cannot stop the advance of the National Liberation Struggles of the third world people against imperialism, particularly their struggle against the two super powers.

It is the duty of the world people to oppose any war of intervention by any one of the two super powers, wherever and whenever it raises its head, by uniting with all that could be united against that specific intervention, and combine that struggle with the exposure of the conspiracies of the two super powers to unleash a third world war and thus preserve the peace of the world. Only such a policy will lay the basis for the complete destruction of imperialism and final elimination of war from the face of the earth.

Gimmicks of Indira Gandhi

When such is the reality, it is foolish to think that the recent appeal of Indira Gandhi (jointly made together with Heads of other States, belonging to both the second and third world countries) directly to the super powers to voluntarily decrease their nuclear arsenals, could have any effect on them.

First of all, she is not non-aligned as she claims to be. She is on record for supporting every aggressive action of the SU. She is on a record for having openly supported all the deceptive disarmament proposals of the SU, which are meant only to preserve its superiority in nuclear arms.

She is mainly dependent on the SU for remaining in power, while she is heavily dependent on USA also for its loans. Such a person cannot be expected to take any step that goes against the interests of the two super powers, particularly the SU.

It is really foolish to think that a person who is responsible for the mass murders in Assam and other parts of the country is really worried of the disastrous consequences of nuclear war.

It is a joke to think that a person like Indira Gandhi, who is not able to prevent the eruption of riots in our country, can do anything to prevent a nuclear war.

This is nothing but a political gimmick of Indira Gandhi meant only for home consumption to divert the attention of the people from the misdeeds of her own government.

National

Let us also look at some of the important factors that are emerging in the present political situation in our country.

1. Communalism is the main weapon of all the ruling class parties

Nearly two years ago, our Party has declared that communalism, casteism, separatism and regionalism have become the main weapons of all

the ruling class parties, national and regional, those in power and in opposition, to disrupt and destroy the rising struggles of the people and the growing revolutionary movement in our country, to preserve the system of exploitation. The ruling Congress, being in power, is playing the leading role in the game of division and disruption.

The continuing communal tension and communal killings in Punjab engineered by the Congress, the BJP and the Akalis, the frequent eruptions of Hindu-Muslim riots in Northern cities, the frequent riots in the South engineered by various regional parties on the issues of language, border issues, division of water, local employment, industrial projects etc., the controversies and communal riots over the reservation issue, are all further confirmation of the correctness of our contention. In all these riots, the upper classes are the beneficiaries while the common poor of all the communities are the worst sufferers.

Bombay communal riots

Now the ghastly communal riots in Bombay and its suburbs, are a standing example for the correctness of our contention.

The present communal riots in Bombay have resulted in hundreds of deaths, mass lynchings of innocent persons, including women and children, burning of thousands of bustee huts, destruction and lootings of crores of rupees worth of property and mass rapings.

While Muslims have been the main sufferers, Hindu poor have also suffered heavily.

Who are the main culprits who engineered such a situation in Bombay?

The big smugglers-cum-builders, the powerloom owners, politicians of all the ruling class parties, some regional and communal organisations, the dissidents opposed to the present Congress ministry, the leaders of various goonda elements, and even the corrupt police are the main culprits in enacting this ghastly drama for their own class and political interests.

It is really very surprising to see Indira Gandhi, the Prime Minister paying a flying visit to Bhiwandi, shed crocodile tears for the suffering Muslims, fly back to Patna and declare that the rights of the majority can not be forgotten. It is really shameful for the Prime Minister to speak in terms of 'majority' and 'minority' communities.

What are the demands of the minorities living in India or in various states?—the right to live, the right to work, the right to employment, the right to better living conditions. How are these demands incompatible with the demands of the common people belonging to the majority communities? One statement in Bombay, another in Patna — she alone is capable of such a performance.

There is no shortcut to remove the seeds of communalism, casteism, separatism and regionalism, which have now become the main weapon of all the ruling class interests. Only a prolonged struggle, raising the class consciousness of the working people, building the class unity of the exploited people, defeating the conspiracies of the ruling class parties and destroying the present system of exploitation, can save our people from the scourge of communalism.

The people are bound to take this path through the hard way of their own experience, through their own sufferings

2. Government's failure to solve any problem or crisis

Since more than one year, the Indira Congress government has completely failed to solve any single problem of crisis created by her own economic and political policies.

(a) Last year, Indira Congress government itself created fictitious tensions with all our neighbours. But it has completely failed to solve any problem between our country and our neighbours.

It was last year that Indira Gandhi raised a hue and cry against Pakistan, warning the people of an imminent invasion of our country by Pakistan. No such war has taken place. Nor has peace been established with that country.

What news are we now getting is — One day 'Peace' talks with Pakistan and the very next day about manouvres of Pakistan army on our borders. i.e., a war of nerves.

—It was last year that Indira Congress government had announced its decision to build a wire-fence along the border with Bangladesh in the name of preventing immigration of people from that country into ours all to deceive the Assam people.

Naturally, this drew protests from Bangladesh, and when Indira government started to build the wire-fence, it only resulted in border clashes between the armies of both the sides. As a result, the Indira government stopped the fencing itself. When it came to practice, it was also found the division of the border on the map is not similar to the division of the border on land. Now the government has no other solution except put up a brave face. What is significant to note is that some of the pro-Soviet and pro-Indira parties of Bangladesh are also condemning this fencing method of Indira government!

—It was Indira Congress government that tried to threaten Sri Lanka, a small country, into submission over the question of Indian nationals who are staying there to serve the interests of Tamilnadu chauvi-

nists. But again she did not succeed in getting the problem solved except a few meetings between her Secretary and government leaders there. The problem continues, resulting in mutual recriminations against each other. Sri Lanka, a small country could defy Indira government because of the backing of USA.

All this shows the failure of Indira Congress government to solve any of the problems she herself has created through fictitious tensions. It is so because the tensions between India and her neighbours are a product of the conspiracies of the two super powers and they are not under her control. Neither her main dependence on Soviets nor her bargaining with USA could solve these problems. Only a genuine policy of peace with our neighbours and opposition to both the super powers can help in solving these problems and Indira Gandhi has no such policy.

(b) Inside the country none of the problems created by Indira Congress government have been solved. They continue to get intensified.

The problem of Assam continues to defy a solution, inspite of her bogus elections. Sikkim which was under Congress rule, has gone under President's rule, with division in the Congress and the emergence of a regional party with majority in the Legislature, and the refusal of the Central government to allow the new regional party to form a new ministry. This only exposes the bogus nature of the present parliamentary democracy by which all bourgeois parties swear. The whole North Eastern states continue to be in turmoil.

Regional parties are more reactionary and more unprincipled

The regional and separatist parties are proving themselves, by their deeds, to be more reactionary and more unprincipled than the national parties in their power game.

They have shown that they are more reactionary than the national parties by resorting to more repressive measures to suppress the just struggles of the people, as shown by TDP in A. P. and AIDMK in Tamilnadu, and National Conference in J&K.

These regionalists and separatists have also shown that they are more unprincipled in uniting with any national party including the Congress-I for their electoral gains.

As the general elections approach nearer and nearer, these regional parties are raising more and more chauvinist demands of their areas to gain the sympathy of the people and cover up their own failures.

The recent conference of TDP and its demands are an illustration of it. Its declaration that it will do everything to defeat the Congress in the

Centre is nothing but the ambition of the leader to become the next Prime Minister, utilising the present contradictions among the ruling class parties at the national level.

It is really shameful for the CPI-CPM combine to run offer these parties in the name of 'left and democratic front'. Last time they united with AIDMK under this plea. Now they are uniting with DMK under the very same plea. This only exposes their opportunism.

Emergence of right deviation among the CRs

Just at a time when it is absolutely necessary to consistently pursue the path of Agrarian Revolutionary struggle, definite right deviation has emerged among a section of Communist Revolutionaries, with their slogans of united front and election alliances with the opposition parties, including the CPI-CPM combine. Today they are getting ideological inspiration from the right trend in the present CPC leadership.

Knowingly or unknowingly, with these slogans, they are only opting for legalism and economism and parliamentarism, which only serves the interests of the ruling classes.

In short this is the present situation in our country.

The economic and political crisis in the country is getting intensified. The ruling classes and their parties have no solution for this. The dissatisfaction of the masses with the present system of exploitation is increasing, and they have begun to fight for their immediate demands. The ruling classes parties are riddled with insolvable contradictions, and the ruling classes are faced with increasing instability.

It is in this background of allround crisis, growing instability of the ruling classes as a whole that one has to see the Army presence in Punjab. It shows the determination of Indira Gandhi to take some decisive military action in Punjab, and show that she is the only effective leader of Hindu communalism, that she alone can restore 'peace' in Punjab, that she is the only leader who can save the integrity of the country and thus restore stability of the ruling classes.

It also shows that Indira Congress and Indira Gandhi are in a desperate situation, forced to take desperate steps. It also shows that the ruling classes are not in a position to rule as in the past. It is not a sign of her strength but a sign of political weakness.

The opposition bourgeois parties are also in a desperate situation with divisions growing them and they have been forced to support the Army action in Punjab.

The CPI and CPM while playing a fictitious role of opposition are really interested in having a united front with Indira on all international issues, and supporting her on all key internal issues.

We must also note one factor.

The ruling classes and their parties have been at the root of communal tensions in our country. Now Indira Gandhi in using the very communal tensions, as in Punjab and Bombay, to strengthen repressive organs of the government. She has already organised a separate National Security Guard (NSG) consisting of para military force under army command, in the name of putting down terrorism. This is going to be one more instrument of repression in the hands of Indira Gandhi and other ruling class parties to suppress the just struggles of the people and the growing revolutionary movement.

It is this period of growing repression in the country that a section of the CRs have taken to the path of Right deviation, causing further damage to revolutionary movement.

Today the country is faced with a complex situation, full of contradictions.

The people are bound to learn through their own experience, the correct path for eliminating the present system of exploitation. It is all the more necessary for the Party to pursue the path of Agrarian Revolutionary struggle, the mass line of the Party, the political line of the Party, and the path of Resistance Struggle to advance the revolutionary struggle.

(This article was published March to Liberation July '84)

Chinese Communist Leaders 'Creative Marxism' Their Assessment and Attitude towards India

The present Communist leaders of China, under the inspiration of Dengsiao Ping, have been giving up Maozedung Thought on many national and international issues. Now they have been giving the results of their study of various Third World Countries based on their "Creative Marxism" both in "People's Daily" and "Peking Review" of China. Now their number is increasing, one must take note of them. China is a large country with 100 crores of population and one must pay attention to know the direction Chinese leaders are moving.

Last year Chinese Communist leaders have announced their assessment of the international role of Indira Congress government. They announced that India is a politically independent country, that Indira Gandhi was genuinely 'non-aligned' and that she was following an 'Independent role' in international politics. Our Party sharply reacted and demarcated ourselves from the position of the Chinese on these issues. We clearly declared that our country continues to be a semi-colonial and semi-feudal country, ruled by the comprador ruling classes dependent on imperialism and social imperialism, particularly on social imperialism.

Now the Chinese Communist leaders have come out with an article on the internal situation in India.

In a despatch of K. V. Narayan published in August 20 issue of The Hindu, he has sent certain important portions of an article from People's Daily—the official organ of the Communist Party of China.

Ofcourse one has to patiently wait for the full article. But the article seems to be so atrocious that it demands an immediate reply.

According to the despatch, the said People's Daily article says : "when the Congress (I) Party returned to power in the general elections in early 1980, it was faced with a grave economic situation. In 1979, drought brought about a fall of 15.5 percent in agricultural production, the article, said. Under the impact of the international oil crisis. India's oil bill in 1979 was more than the total earnings from export, and inflation was 23%."

“Among the measures to shake up the economy by the Prime Minister, Mrs. Indira Gandhi, were the easing of restrictions on private Enterprise”, “permissions to private firms to compete in five sectors including steel industry, and encouragement of export-oriented factories. The government made great efforts to seek foreign assistance, absorb foreign capital, allow foreign business men to invest in automobiles and telecommunication industries and introduce advanced technology and equipment. It gave state owned enterprises greater autonomy in management with stress on economic results, the daily said.”

“The article said that in the Sixth Five Year Plan, the Indian government switched the priority in the national economy to agriculture which was one of the two weak economic sectors. Investment in agricultural products during the plan amounted to 40% of the country's expenditure. As a result, grain yield in the 1983-84 crop year reached 144 million tonnes which was only five million tons short of the target set for 1985, the final year of the plan.”

“The Oil industry, the other weak sector, got 28% of the total spending in the Sixth Plan. With foreign technological assistance, oil output went up steadily and is expected to reach 30 million tons this year, which accounts for about 70% of the domestic demand.”

“As a result of the Governments policies, other industries including electricity, Coal and Cement began to make profits after suffering years of production losses.”

“Nevertheless, inspite of these achievements, India still faces problems the article said. One of them was the concentration of the capital. It cited statistics showing that 92 private financial groups, each with a capital of Rs. 60 crores and more, possess more than half of the total private capital while about half of the population are living below the poverty line.”

“The article said other problems included soaring prices, mounting unemployment, rising foreign debts. In addition, agriculture still heavily dependent on weather conditions is vulnerable to natural disasters ”

“The progress made by India in industrial and agricultural production the better financial situation and the growing economic stability have been recorded by People's Daily. All these indicated that India's economy had embarked on stable development after tiding over great difficulties.”

What is the meaning of this article? It is a clean chit to Indira Gandhi Congress government. It shows that the various steps of Indira Congress government—greater concessions to private capital, greater inflow of foreign investments and loans, growth of export oriented industries, priority allocations to agriculture and oil industry—all have resulted in economic stability and India is embarked on stable development.

This whole piece on the economic situation in India and the 'miracle' that Indira Gandhi has launched on stable development has nothing to do with the Indian reality. It is nothing but subjective thinking, to suit the political thinking of the present Chinese Communist leadership.

As opposed to the present thinking of the CPC leadership, our Political Resolution, "Intensify the People's struggles" clearly says :

'India is a Semi-colonial and semi-feudal country.'

"Our country has been reduced to abject dependence on Soviet Union and USA."

"Soviet Union has an edge over other imperialist powers in India."

The Indira Congress government has been continuously giving concession after concession to imperialist countries and their multinational companies in the matter of new licences, to set up their own factories, joint collaboration companies, exports and imports and repatriation of profits from this country.

The policies of Indira Congress have led to "a growing economic and political crisis in the country—thus increasing the instability of the ruling classes as a whole."

Thus our Party's analysis of the Indian economy is totally opposed to that of the present Chinese Communist leaders.

While our Party holds that the policies of all the ruling class parties particularly Indira Congress "is leading the country to a growing economic and political crisis in the country" and growing 'instability of the ruling classes as a whole', the Chinese Communist leaders are speaking of 'economic stability' and 'stable development' under the leadership of Indira Gandhi. Let us study this subject more in detail.

About Statistics

The authors of the People's Daily article have depended on the statistics given by the government to show the 'economic stability' and stable economic growth under the leadership of Indira Government.

But one should remember that the statistical data of a capitalist government should always be taken with a pinch of salt. Now, this year being an election year, the Indian Government is interested in putting out statistical data in such a way as to present that economic performance of the Indira Congress government is tremendous and is on the way to take a big leap forward. The authors of the People Daily article, without a critical eye, have simply caught hold of the Government statistics to show its tremendous advance since 1979.

According to this article, Indira Congress, after coming to power in 1980, was faced with a terrible economic situation because of the drought conditions of 1979 and the oil crisis in the international market.

But in the subsequent years the monsoons have been fairly good, inspite of certain vagaries, and have enabled the agricultural front in India to put up a better performance. Everybody knows that Indian agriculture is mainly dependant on good monsoons as they themselves admit. So the better performance of agriculture after Indira Gandhi's advent to power is mainly due to good monsoons, and not due to the economic policies of Indira Gandhi.

Similarly, with regard to the oil crisis which is due to the increase in price of oil in the international market. Because of the manipulation of the imperialists, and the international oil companies, a glut has been created in the international oil market, and today we find the oil exporting countries themselves reducing the price of oil.

So the glut in the oil market the reduced price of oil and to an extent the growth in the production of crude oil at Bombay have been responsible for the easing of the situation on the oil front.

The authors of the People's Daily article have not taken into consideration, the good monsoons after 1980, and the reduction of oil prices due to glut in the oil market. They have been entirely taken in by Indian government's statistics to sing praises for 'economic stability' and 'stable economic development'.

It is so with their praise for Indira Congress government for marginal improvements in steel, coal, cement and energy.

For instance, with regard to steel, one of the All India Trade Unions, in one of its resolutions has announced that half of the installed capacity of steel industry is still unutilised. Large amounts of steel is for export. Many of the alloyed steel components are being imported.

Similar is the condition of the coal industry. The Government statistics do give a good picture of the coal industry. But the workers at the pits give a different picture. The statistics of the government are all manipulated to show improved production, whereas the reality is that there is actually lesser production.

The picture is similar in cement and energy. Actually there is a crisis in energy production. Energy is always lagging behind industrial needs of the country. The frequent load shedding—spreading from Calcutta to every part of the country, particularly in summer season, and the low storage of water, the crisis in energy production is very serious.

So whatever improvement there are in oil, steel coal, cement and energy production, these improvements are only marginal and temporary.

The basic weaknesses of the infrastructure continue to operate and sooner or later they are bound to be faced with another round of crisis. For the authors of the "People's Daily", to speak of 'economic stability' and 'stable economic development' is simply absurd.

It is absurd for any Marxist - Leninist to depend on government's statistics. They are manipulated to suit the convenience of those in power and in this case to suit the election needs of the Indira Gandhi.

It is the duty of Marxist - Leninists, to see the reality behind the manipulated statistics of the Indira Congress, to see the interconnections the various factors of the Indian economy. Then they are bound to get an entirely different picture—the picture of deepgoing crisis in the Indian economy than the rosy picture of economic stability in India.

Every Marxist - Leninist should consider whether the economic crisis is part of the general crisis of the world capitalist system, the role of finance capital from imperialism and social imperialism in creating an economic crisis in India, whether there could be economic stability without changing the present system in India—The relationship between economic crisis and political crisis, the rootcause of growing repression etc. The CPC leaders are praising 'stable economic development' under Indira Congress government.

1. India is a part of world capitalist economy

India, being a semi-colonial and semi-feudal country, is part of the world capitalist system. As everybody knows, the world capitalist system is passing through a general crisis.

After two world wars, the defeat of the fascist powers, the weakening of the other imperialist powers in Europe, some of the East European countries and the great Chinese people going out of the world capitalist system, the upsurge in the National Liberation struggles in Asia, Africa and Latin America have all lead to the general crisis of the world capitalist system.

Indian economy is part of this world capitalist system. There is shrinking of world capitalist market. There is intense rivalry of the imperialist powers, particularly USA and Soviet Union, for the possession of these shrinking markets. These imperialist powers are only exporting their crisis to the third world countries.

The general crisis of the world capitalist system is world-wide, drawing every part of the capitalist system. India, by its very nature is part of this world capitalist system and naturally its economy is caught in the net of this world capitalist crisis.

As part of the world capitalist crisis, the Indian economy is passing through a deep-going economic crisis. There is no escape from this.

But the new Peking leaders see no connection between the Indian economy and general crisis of the world capitalist system and consequently they see 'economic stability' in India.

Not only with regard to India but the new Peking leaders are doing the same with all other third world countries except their own.

As in India, they depend on the manipulated statistics of bourgeois governments in power. They even say that the rate of national growth in the Third World countries is higher than the rates of national growth in the developed countries—i.e. in the capitalist countries. But in reality this is absurd. The economy of all Third World Countries—except the socialist countries, are subjected to various types of imperialist pressures and consequently are passing through a severe economic crises—stagnant economies, the crisis in their imports and exports, low prices for their agricultural production, and higher cost of imported materials, the growing debt burden—all this leading to the breakdown in their economies.

But all this has no meaning for the new Peking leaders. They have conveniently detached the Third World capitalist economies from the world capitalist system and its crisis. That is why they are able to discover 'economic stability' under Indira Congress government.

But this method has nothing to do with the basic teachings of Marxism-Leninism. It is only the result of the new 'creative' thinking of the present Peking leaders which sees growing 'economic stability' under Indira Gandhi. This is the way the new Peking leaders are trying to integrate themselves with the struggle of the Third World countries—not with the struggling people in the Third World countries but with the bourgeois governments like the Indira Gandhi government that are in power, This is the meaning of their discovery of 'economic stability' under Indira Gandhi.

2. Export of Finance Capital to semi-Colonial and Semi-Feudal Countries

India is a semi-colonial and semi-feudal country since August 15, 1947. On that day the British imperialists transferred power into the hands of big bourgeois, big landlords—the new ruling classes in India. They themselves have gone behind the curtain allowing the Indian ruling classes to parade their independence. But the Indian new ruling class have proved themselves to be nothing but compradors entirely dependant on the imperialism and social imperialism.

The history of India since August 15, 1947 as amply proved this. Look at the following facts :

The foreign direct investments in India since 1947—which stood at Rs. 300 crores, have now reached Rs. 3,000 crores. That means foreign direct investments are ten times more than it was in 1947.

Foreign capital is now entering India through growing number of joint Industries jointly run by foreign capitalists and the Comprador bourgeoisie. These joint industries have now reached about 6,500. It is significant to note that these joint industries are now concentrating in the manufacturing industries.

The following figures indicate how the main capitalist countries are increasing the number of joint companies.

Country	1970	1980
France	7	24
Italy	8	25
Japan	15	34
Switzerland	15	38
Britain	39	110
America	39	125

Source: Kothari's Economic and Industrial Guide of India, 1982-83.

The repatriation of profits, dividends, sale of technology, Royalties and interest—all put together have been steadily increasing.

1960-61	1970-71	1977-78	in Rs. Crores 1978-79
41.6	96.5	148.4	118.6

The growing gap between our imports and exports clearly indicate the clear imbalance in our trade and our dependence on the imperialists to cover up this gap.

Year	in Rs. Crores Trade gap
1978-79	1843
1979-80	2563
1980-81	5756
1981-82	5500

Now this Trade gap has reached Rs. 6,000 crores this year.

Every year this government is showing figures to show increase in our exports. But this increase in exports is not due to the increase in our volume of exports but due to higher value of exports. To cover up this

Trade gap, the Indian Government is mainly dependent on loans from the imperialist countries.

As a result of this increasing loans, the debt burden on our country has already reached Rs. 30,000 crores and our repayment towards debt servicing per year have already reached Rs. 850 crores.

The debt burden has reached a stage where the government is forced to go for fresh loans to repay our old debts.

Every year the government has to get loans of about Rs. 2,000 crores from the imperialists and their international agencies.

This growing debt burden has forced the Indian Government to submit to most humiliating terms to get the IMF loans.

All the important sectors of our economy—manufacturing, heavy machinery, electricity producing industry, the oil refineries—all are under the control of foreign imperialists, their control ranging from 50 to 80%.

During the last five years of Indira Gandhi's rule, she has contracted foreign loans more than the loans taken during the last decade earlier to 1980.

Our Public sector is under the control of the Russian social imperialists while the private sector is under the domination of the western imperialists, particularly US imperialists.

Our foreign loans are under the control of US imperialism while our defence needs are under the control of Soviet Union thus reducing our country to abject dependence on US imperialism and Soviet Social imperialism.

The economic weakness of the Indian government and its economic dependence which forces it to give concessions to foreign imperialists in licensing, investments, in repatriation of profits and dividends, imports and exports.

Today the Indian economy is dependent on foreign imperialists for industrial machinery, spare parts, imports to technology, and imports and exports and for loans. Because of this dependence, our country has been reduced to insolvency.

These facts are enough to show the semi-colonial and semi-feudal nature of our country—where instead of British imperialism alone, today all the imperialist Countries particularly USA and the Soviet Union are contending with one another for supremacy.

Forgetting all these facts, the Peking leaders see political independence in India. They have abandoned Lenin's teaching that the imperialists are sometimes forced to grant 'independence' to their colonies. But these

colonies are ostensibly independent, but in reality economically dependent i.e. nominally political independence and really economic dependence.

The development of India as a semi-colonial and a semi-feudal country is a confirmation of Lenin's teachings.

The general weakening of imperialism as a whole due to two world wars, the emergence of two super powers in the place of the rivalry of several imperialist powers—contending and colluding for world supremacy—enables the ruling classes in India with state power in their hands, to bargain with the imperialist powers for a greater share in the common loot of its own people. The new Peking leaders are calling this increased bargaining power as 'political independence'. But this new bargaining power itself shows dependence on one imperialism to bargain with the other.

There can be no genuine political independence without genuine economic independence. This is a Marxist-Leninist teaching.

But the new Peking leaders conveniently want to forget what they themselves said in March 1983. They then said :

"Thus it is clear that following their political independence the third world countries must gradually achieve economic independence by developing their national economies in order to become *truly independent*". (stress ours)

At that time the Peking leaders were suggesting that many of the third world countries were yet to become 'truly independent' by achieving their economic independence.

But within 1½ years have abandoned such a position and began calling India a politically independent country while in reality it is abjectly dependent on imperialism and social imperialism, particularly USA and the Soviet Union.

Role of Finance Capital

Not only that today the new Peking leaders conveniently want to forget the role of Finance Capital in the countries to which it is exported by the imperialist countries.

The figures we have given above clearly show a great inflow of Finance Capital from the main developed countries, particularly USA and the Soviet Union.

Export of Finance capital from the developed capitalist countries to the backward countries like India has got a specific purpose to dominate the economy of these countries, to politically and militarily dominate them, to subject them to rapacious exploitation and lead them to economic crisis.

The rapid in-flow of foreign capital into India since 1947 August 15, has led to greater penetration of the Indian economy by it, to greater

exploitation of our country by imperialists, greater misery of the Indian people—ultimately landing our country in a deep growing economic crisis.

But the new Peking leaders have conveniently forgotten all these real facts. They want to conveniently forget what they themselves taught in March 1983. At that time they have said :

“The importance of economic dependence is based on the fact that although the struggles of the oppressed people have forced the imperialists to give up their political domination and make *political concessions*, still they try as hard as possible to *preserve the old economic order* in the third world through the *practice of neo-colonialism* consequently many third world nations still remain subordinate to their colonial powers and are still burdened by the vestiges of colonial or semi-colonial era.”

(Stress theirs)

They further said,

“With the stepped up rivalry for global hegemony between super powers, many third world countries have also become targets of super power attempts to enlarge their spheres of influence. Economic penetration, control and exploitation are the major means by which the two super powers try to manipulate and rob the developing countries.”

They further said :

“What is more, as third world countries become increasingly embroiled in the old international economic order, these third world countries which have not yet achieved economic independence will inevitably fall victims to fluctuations in world economic conditions and become targets of developed countries for *exporting their economic crisis*. Even those countries that have taken the first steps towards economic independence cannot be wholly exempt from such adverse impacts. As a result *economic troubles will provide a hotbed for social unrest and political turbulence*.”

(Stress ours)

But all this is over now. Within 1½ years, the Peking leaders have completely changed. The role of Finance Capital is entirely forgotten.

For them, the rapacious nature of Finance Capital from western imperialist countries and Soviet Union is entirely non existent. In the place of exploiting Finance Capital, now they see ‘international economic aid’ helping the Third World Countries like India to achieve ‘economic stability’.

For them, the rapacious nature of Finance Capital from western imperialist countries and Soviet Union is entirely non existent. In the place of exploiting Finance Capital, now they see ‘international economic aid’ helping the Third World Countries like India to achieve ‘economic stability’.

That is why in India, in the place of deep going economic crists they are able to see 'economic stability'.

In the place of pressure, 'economic penetration, control and exploitation' of the two super powers 'exporting cirsis' they see both the super powers 'aiding' India to achieve stable economic growth under Indira Congress Government and Indira Congress controlling the Foreign Capital.

3. Five Year Plans And Their Results

The so-called Five Year Plans and their 'planned' development are nothing but bogus, meant only to deceive the people. They have become a cover for intensified exploitation of our common people, meant only to serve foreign imperialists and social imperialists and the native ruling classes—the big bourgeois, big landlord classes.

Without going into any details of the various Five Year Plans, one can draw certain general conclusions without any fear of controversies.

The Five Year Plans are dependent heavily on imperialism and social imperialism. Their share in the various Five Year Plans has been steadily increasing with each plan; not only with regard to the Public Sector but even the fulfilment of its aims in private sector.

The Public sector is mainly meant to build the infrastructure industries like steel, heavy machinery, oil and energy production. It is dominated by Soviet capital.

The Private sector is dominated by the imperialists and the native big bourgeois comprador classes are enabled to reap the benefits of this Infrastructure in the manufacturing Industry.

The Private Sector is not drawing any private capital from the comprador bourgeoisie. It is actually Government money given to the private capitalists through Government loans and financial institutions at concessional rates of interest for long periods of repayment.

The economic targets, industrial and agricultural, public and private sectors have never been realised in any single Five Year Plan. They always fall short of the targets.

Even the rate of growth, either the GNP (Gross National Product) or the per capita income have always fallen short of targets in every plan. The rate of growth of the National Product during the first three Five Year Plans had been like the following :—

1951-56	1956-61	1961-66
3.5%	3.9%	2.8%

This has been so during the subsequent 5th, and 6th Five Year Plans.

For instance, in every plan the GNP has always been placed at 5%. But the combined growth rate from 1956 to 1983 is only 3.5.

No single project is finished in time. Both industrial and irrigation projects always take longer periods. This has invariably resulted in increased expenditure on every project. This has also resulted in locking up huge capital without giving any benefits to the people. During some Five Year Plans, they have revised the original targets, reduced them and comparing the results with the reduced targets, they said the plan had achieved results.

The Public sector industries are always run on huge losses.

These are enough to show the failure of Five Years Plans for any planned development.

Agricultural Front

Now a few words about the agricultural front since the Chinese leaders have landed Indira Gandhi for giving priority to Agriculture in the Sixth Plan.

The point is that Indian economy has always been mainly dependent on agriculture.

While concentrating on Indian agriculture, what have been its achievement ?

After pouring crores of Rupees in various irrigation projects, electric motors, tractors, fertilizers and pesticides, what is their achievement ?

In spite of all their tall claims, the fact is that irrigated land, even after implementing 6 Five Year Plans has not gone beyond 20% of the cultivated land in our country. But of this, leaving aside the irrigated land through certain old projects and various tanks, the achievement in this field is not significant.

For instance, out of 20% irrigated land only 8.10% of this is covered by perennial sources. This also covers some projects built during the British period and the portion under electric motors, is far less than that.

The rest of the vast cultivated area is still dependent on the vagaries of monsoons and natural disasters which even the present CPC leadership has been forced to admit.

Because of this dependence, the share of the agricultural front in our national income has always been fluctuating between 50 to 55%. With all the claims of the Indian Government this position has not changed.

These irrigated lands - lands under motor pumps have remained as many specks among the vast cultivated land dependent on the vagaries of the monsoons.

From the period of the so-called Green Revolution, the government has been pumping huge amounts of money in the form of Fertilisers, various pesticides and even tractors. Now with the abnormal increase in the prices of fertilisers, pesticides the poor and middle peasants have been forced to reduce the purchases of these inputs. Now the Government has been forced to give concessions and large loans to purchase them. But these concessions in the form of subsidies and loans go only to the rich peasants and landlords and they never reach the large sections of middle and poor peasants.

It is certain sections of rich peasants and landlords who are enjoying the full benefits of irrigation subsidies and loans from the Government. It is these landlords and certain rich peasants who have got surplus production which is the basis for the government stocks and even for exports.

Now the imperialists and social imperialists, unable to find new avenues for their investments in industry, because of the continuing stagnation in Industry, imperialists and social imperialists have also begun to invade this sector. They have been encouraging the Indian Government to continue its present irrigation policies to get a new market for their fertilisers and pesticides and tractors and pump sets.

But the Green Revolution has already reached the dead end, with the present high cost of production, the peasants have run into debts. In many places the tractors and water pumps and remaining idle, for the poor and middle peasants have reduced their purchases of fertilisers and pesticides; and motor pump sets are beyond their capacity.

The whole peasantry is up in arms with their demands for getting reasonable prices for their produce and market facilities. With all their claims of taking Agricultural front as the priority, with all their irrigation projects and Green Revolution, the availability of Food grains has been stagnant.

Year		Per capita availability of food grains
1977-78	—	450 grams per head
1979	—	480 " " "
1980	—	410 " " "
1981	—	466 " " "

This expresses the stagnat nature of the Agricultural economy.

While this is the actual situation on the agricultural front, it is really surprising for the present CPC leaders to sing praises for Indira Gandhi's policies in this sector.

4. Who Benefits from these Five Year Plans ? Who pays for these plans ?

Which are the sections that have been benefitted by these Five Year Plans ?

First is the imperialists and social imperialists particularly USA and Soviet Union. Apart from their direct investments joint industries, through imports and exports sale of technology and sale of industrial goods and loans, the imperialists and social imperialists particularly USA and Soviet Union have used these Five Year Plans for their contention for the Indian market with 60 crores of population. The two super powers have used these Five Year Plans for their imperialist penetration, exploitation and control of the Indian economy. With their economic penetration now the two super powers are seriously contending and colluding to dominate India and the whole of South Asia, both politically and militarily.

The native big bourgeoisie are the next beneficiaries of these plans. With every plan their profits have been soaring high.

The Chinese leaders themselves admit that 90 big industrial families with Rs. 20 crores capital own half of the Capital in India.

If you take only the richest 20 big families their properties which were only Rs. 648 crores in 1950 have grown to Rs. 5524 crores by 1978 itself.

Tatas have grown from Rs. 30 crores in 1950 to Rs. 1100 crores, while the Birlas have grown from Rs. 30 crores in 1950 to Rs. 1171 crores today.

The landlords have been the next beneficiaries of these plans. Some of them have become landlords cum industrialists and getting every benefit from the irrigation policies of this Government.

So it is imperialism and social imperialism particularly USA and Soviet Union who are the main beneficiaries of this 'planned development'. It is the native big capitalists and big landlords who have been the next big beneficiaries of this 'planned development'.

It is the bureaucracy particularly the higher echelons of this bureaucracy the managers, the directors and the high salaried officials in each department who have been the main beneficiaries.

It is the smugglers and speculators and big contractors who have been thriving under this 'planned development' with their innumerable connections with all corrupt politicians who are to be found among all the present parliamentary parties. These elements evading all taxation have produced black money which has resulted in the parallel economy in the

country. The black money according to some estimations, has now reached Rs. 70,000 crores.

So imperialists and social imperialists, the big capitalists and big landlords, the higher bureaucracy and the smugglers, speculators and big contractors are the real beneficiaries of our Five Year Plans. It is absurd to call them Five Year Plans of development, but Five Year Plans for the common loot of our country and the over whelming majority of our common people.

Who pays for this plans ?

Foreign direct investments, foreign and internal loans, taxation particularly indirect taxation, increasing the prices of goods produced by the public sector industries—these are the common methods used by the Governments to get the capital for the implementation of these plans. All this has invariably led to growing inflation and deficit budgets.

It is the workers who produce for the rich the peasants for the rich to export. The middle class employees have also in addition to bear the burden of deficit budgets, higher taxation growing prices and the high rates of inflation. Fleece the common man to pay for the rich. This has been the policy of the Government in implementing the Plans.

For instance, a part from earlier years, inflation has already reached 12% this year. The value of the rupee has terribly gone down. The value of rupee which was 103 paise in 1960 has now reached 17 paise by 1984 March. The purchasing capacity of the common people is terribly going down. Half the population is below the poverty line. Internal market is shrinking and the orientation of the Government is for exports—exports of agricultural produce, our commercial crops—even fish, mutton, onion potatoes and even mangoes and plantains.

Even according to the statistics of the World Bank, India is considered to be 105th country among 125 countries as far as poverty is considered. It occupies 170th place among 184 countries with regard to GNP.

After implementing 6 Five Year Plans, there is no practical change in the per capital income in our country.

1978-79	Rs. 728
1980	„ 680
1981	„ 690
1982	„ 710

What is the value of this per capita income when value of Rupee is continuously going down ? This low per capita income is the stagnation in our economy and not a sign of its strength.

This is the reality of the Indian Economy. While the rich are becoming richer, the poor are becoming poorer. The present CPC leaders are conveniently forgetting this ugly reality.

It is not the business of Marxists Leninists to look at merely production results. Every year any bourgeois Government will show some production results in its favour. The Indian ruling classes are not different from others in this respect.

It is the duty of the Marxists Leninists to see who pays for the plans and who benefits from these plans, and whether these plans have brought about any improvement in the living conditions of the common people, particularly in the matter of food, shelter and clothing.

The CPC leaders have forgotten this basic duty of Marxists Leninists and forgetting the misery of the common man are singing praises for stable economic development' under Indira Congress Government.

5. The Relation Between Economic Crisis and Political Crisis

With exploitation of the imperialists and social imperialists and native big bourgeois big landlord classes, the whole Indian economy is passing through deep going crisis. It has led to an industrial crisis, exchange crisis, import-export crisis, an agricultural crisis, a monetary crisis, and financial crisis.

No amount of pumping foreign imperialist capital is going to change this economic crisis. The more the penetration of imperialist finance capital, the greater the economic crisis. Imperialist finance capital and stable economic development are incompatible. The role of imperialist Finance capital is to produce an economic crisis because imperialists can only thrive on the growing misery of the Third World.

As long as the big capitalists and big landlords are in control of the state machinery, they, in alliance with the imperialism, social imperialism, are bound to lead the country to a deep going economic crisis.

The present deep growing economic crisis has already led to a deep going political crisis.

The economic and political crisis in the country, the rivalry of the two super powers for domination over India, the contradictions of the various ruling classes and the dissatisfaction of the masses have all resulted in a dog fight among the ruling class groups for power. This power struggle among the various ruling class groups has led to repeated splits among the various ruling class parties. All this has led to repeated splits among the ruling classes and their political parties resulting in growing instability for the ruling classes as a whole, and for the ruling class parties themselves. This is the basis for our saying that there is a growing revolutionary situation in our Country.

The present CPC leadership conveniently does not want to see either the economic crisis or the political crisis.

Even if they don't want to see the economic crisis or political crisis in their anxiety to discover stable economic development under Indira Gandhi let us look at the following political developments of recent origin - the police strike in Bombay and Haryana, the communal riots in Bombay resulting in Army intervention, the Assam developments leading to mass murders and Army's intervention, the Punjab developments leading to Army intervention, the dismissal of Farooq ministry, and now the crisis in Andhra, the frequent change of ministries even under Congress rule.

Are not all these developments signs of growing political crisis in the country? What lies behind all these political developments in India. It is the economic crisis in India.

It is during this period of 'planned development', that successive Governments both at the centre and the states, that repressive machinery has been strengthened, particularly under Indira Congress rule it has taken the form of NSA, ESMA, National Security Guards Act, the Terrorism Act the Disturbed Areas Act, special police camps, the prosecution of Communist Revolutionaries, lathi charges and shootings and inhuman repression on all struggling people. All this is a sign of deep going economic and political crisis and not the sign of stable development.

Now the CPC leaders conveniently want to forget all these developments. But forced by reality, the CPC leaders have to admit concentration of capital in a few hands, the growing misery of people where half of them are below the poverty line and growing inflation. But why these developments? The very developments influx of foreign capital, its Five Year plans, its export orientation have led to these adverse developments. But the CPC leaders are praising these steps as helping for stable economic development: But is this compatible with Marxist Leninist teachings?

6. Old Order And 'Stable Economic Development'.

The old colonial order or semi-colonial and semi feudal order or neo-colonialism can never be the basis for stable economic development. The old order has to be destroyed totally to lay the basis for stable economic order. That is what Marxism Leninism and Maozedung. Thought have always taught us. The chinese people under the leadership of Maozedung and CPC had to conduct a glorious struggle for the success of their revolution, destroy the old order and lay the basis for stable economic development. The present CPC leaders want to forget their own experience of the part when it comes to the present conditions in India.

In 1947 the ruling classes have simply taken over the old order, with marginal changes to suit their ambitions of semi colonial and semi feudal order and have been preserving and strengthening that order.

Foreign economic domination and exploitation still continue. Comprador bourgeoisie dominates the industrial front. Landlordism continues to dominate, though their forms of exploitation have changed in certain areas to a certain extent.

There is no land to the tiller. There is no thorough going land reforms to destroy the domination of landlords in the rural areas.

Without the peasants becoming the masters of the land, without the workers becoming the masters—without the peasants and workers becoming the masters of the means of the production there can be no planned development or stable economic development. It is the height of stupidity for anyone to make such a suggestion.

To achieve this, we, the Indian people have to destroy the present semi-colonial and semi-feudal order and imperialism and social imperialist exploitation of our country, end the exploitation of native big capitalists and big landlords, whatever be the new 'creative' teaching of the present CPC leaders.

7. Why this new stance of the CPC Leaders?

Against all reality in India, why the CPC leaders have taken such an absurd position?

At present the CPC leaders want to entirely depend on Indira Congress Government and CPM for political support to solve the present border dispute between India and China. They have been already praising the independent foreign policy of her Government and calling India as having achieved political independence. They have been making friendship with all mass organisations of the Congress.

Now on internal policies also they have come out in support of her and her "stable economic development", just at a time when Indira Gandhi is facing a very difficult situation all to curry the favour of Indira Gandhi.

More important, the Chinese leaders are themselves taking all these measures opening the Chinese gates wide open for foreign finance capital into their country by giving all possible concessions in the name of their modernisation, importing foreign technology, giving more and more concessions to their own capitalists, introducing material incentive to increase production, giving more powers for their managers of establishments—industrial and agricultural—and giving priority to agriculture etc.

In support of their policies, they are praising the experience of India which is similar to China.

8. What is meaning of these teachings of CPC Leaders?

What is the meaning of the new 'creative Marxism' of the present CPC leaders? What is the meaning of this 'new discovery' of stable economic development under Indira Congress Government?

It means, there is no economic crisis or political crisis in India or instability of the ruling classes. It means there is not necessity of a new democratic revolution for India. It is just a call for support to Indira Congress Government, because of stable economic development. This is the essence of their message.

Of course their new message finds an echo in the thinking of CPM leaders in India. While Jyoti Basu was recently in America, he openly and shamelessly announced that India does not need a Stalin or a Mao for her revolution that India does not need a new revolution but certain changes in the present constitution - which is a Magna Carta for them CPI leaders have been dittoing the CPM line.

The present attitude of CPI leaders towards India is similar to that of the CPSU leaders.

The creative Marxism of CPI leaders is nothing but distortion and falsification of facts to suit the political convenience and subjective thinking of the present CPC leaders.

Stubborn struggle for Agrarian Revolution

We have been the consistent supporters of Maozedung. Thought. We have great respect for the great Chinese people and Chinese Revolution. In spite of certain differences with regard to their specific features, we have always been telling the Indian people that the Indian Revolution will have the main characteristics of the Chinese Revolution.

In spite of this, we have been always demarcating ourselves from the Chinese leaders, wherever we differed with them.

When the CPC leaders were over estimating the revolutionary situation in India, and treating every act of terrorism as a sign of revolutionary outburst our Party-the CPI (ML) - was bold enough to say that such an assessment was an over estimation.

When the Chinese leaders were giving whole hearted support to Charu's annihilation line and presenting individual terrorism of his followers as spreading of agrarian Revolution, our Party boldly came out against the individual terrorism of Charu and his followers.

Now the present Chinese leaders have turned to the other end, similar to that CPI-CPM combine. We assert our line, and persist in the struggle for the cause of Agrarian Revolution—the only reliable path of the Indian Revolution.

The 'creative' Marxism of the CPC leaders has nothing to do with Marxism—Leninism. It is sheer opportunism. A conspiracy against Indian Revolution.

Indian Revolution has to be made by the Indian people themselves. It is not dependent on the sweet mercies of Soviet leaders or Chinese leaders. It is mainly dependent on the intensification of the basic contradictions in our society and the international contradictions.

The 'creative' Marxism of the CPC leaders is rather becoming more and more peculiar. Today we can see more clearly that their new policies both internally and externally are against the basic principles of Marxism—Leninism—Mao—Zedung Thought. Let us see some of them.

1. Internal policies

The drive of the CPC leaders internally can be said to be Modernisation of their main branches of economy (industry, Agriculture, Science and defence). Its aim is to increase the industrial and agricultural production four times the present value. The sole aim of this Modernisation is "Quicker Production, and Construction, a greater variety of Commodities and increased economic efficiency."

To achieve this aim of Modernisation i.e. to quadruple the industrial and agricultural production, China is mainly dependent on material incentives to the people both in industry and agriculture, necessary structural changes in the administration of industry and agriculture, increased private marketing, and greater and greater inflow of foreign Capital, and greater and greater concessions to foreign capital.

Let us see some of the measures in these directions.

Material Incentives

Increased wages - decrease in the prices of consumer articles - and bonus as the main weapon to encourage workers for greater production these have been the main features of the material incentives in the industrial field.

For instance, in the month of May, 1984, the Chinese Government has enacted a New Bonus Act, where by the earlier Act, which restricted annual Bonus to two months' salary has been abolished. It has also stipulated that those enterprises which have fulfilled or over-fulfilled all quotas of the state plan and paid more taxes and earned more profits may increase the bonus to the workers to any extent. Enterprises which have failed to fulfil their quotas and paid less taxes and earned less profits must reduce or stop Bonus or even withhold portions of their employees' wages.

With this new discovery of New Bonus system, the CPC leaders are so elated at their success as to declare "Bonus is a socialist Bonus system and not a capitalist one". They should remember that the system of bonus existed in the capitalist society long before the Socialist System was born.

Com. Stalin developed the Stakhnov movement in all fields to develop the initiative of the workers for increased production.

Com. Mao, introduced the system of honouring the "Socialist Heroes of Labour" to encourage the workers for greater production. He also mainly depended on marxist ideology to make the workers feel that they should produce more for the betterment of the whole society and to meet their international obligations.

At the same time he never practiced egalitarianism but introduced various grades of wage system taking care that the difference between the lowest and highest wages remains under certain limitations.

But the present CPC leaders have abandoned all this, and discovered 'bonus' as a socialist principle to achieve greater production. This is bound to result in great disparities in the income of the workers-the workers and the intelligentsia and a section of the high salaried workers. Whether one likes it or not such a policy is bound to result in class differentiations and building up a bureaucracy.

With these various material incentives the workers are enabled to have greater money in their hands to purchase various luxury articles like T. V., Vedeos, watches, cosmetics etc. and even purchase houses built by the Govt or the industrial establishments.

While satisfying the workers with these material incentives the Govt. has brought back the National Capitalists by paying back their interests in lieu of their Nationalised Industries.

Is it not really surprising to see a Socialist Country to bring back the National Capitalists by paying the deferred interests on their nationalised industries after 35 years of existance as a socialist state ?

It is not really surprising to see the present CPC leaders taking such a step when they are claiming that or the over whelming majority of exploiters are changed into labourers who earn their own living (Peking Review No. 49-P 18.) This is nothing but opening the gates of Socialist China for Capitalism.

Com. Mao has always said that under socialism and during the period of transition the policy should be one of restricting, controlling and finally eliminating capitalism. But the present CPC Leaders of China, long after the period of transition, have just reversed this policy and are giving encouragement for re-establishing the very same Capitalists.

Changes in the rural economy

Not only that, the present CPC leaders, under the grab of material incentives to the workers, are giving all power to the director or manager, of an Industrial establishment to fulfill the production quotas, in the matter

of recruitment and dismissal of workers, their payment collection of raw material through bi-lateral agreement with communes and other agencies including foreign business.

Apart from many other change in the rural economy. The most important changes are the changes in the commune system during Mao's days, step by step, through lower grade co-operatives and higher grade co-operatives and then the commune system the whole level and the rural population have been brought under the commune system. Now the present CPC leaders have changed this system and brought out changes which weaken the present commune system the base of socialist society.

In the name of responsibility they have increased individual holdings from 7% to 15% of the cultivated lands owned by the Commune-doubled their individual plots of land. Apart from reducing the cultivated land under the commune, now the commune members spared more time in their own individual holdings than earlier and reducing their own hours of work in the lands under the commune. As against the earlier practice at the lowest level of the production units. Each peasant or family is given certain plots of land and given the responsibility of cultivating that particular land. Not only that, that particular land is now leased out for 15 years.

As against the earlier method, now the richer and well to do peasants are encouraged to purchase and own various modern agricultural implements like tractors, harvestors, transport vehicles etc. to boost up agricultural production.

Today Chinese peasants own 2.12 million tractors. By the end of 1983, 11% more than last year; 89,000 individually owned trucks for agricultural use 72,000 more than last year, 124,000 walking tractors, 25 4% more than last year. (1984 No. 24 P8 Peking review).

What is the meaning of all this? This is nothing but weakening of the commune system and encouragement to rich farming and encouragement to the peasants in general to grow rich quicker.

Com. Stalin established State Tractor stations to help the Collective farms. Khrushchev destroyed them and gave them to the Collective forms. Com. Mao criticised this as retrogradship. Now the CPC leaders are directly selling Tractors etc. to individual peasants.

The present CPC leaders are again introducing small scale farming under the commune system itself which Lenin held to be the basis for the growth of Capitalism.

Penetration by imperialist finance capital

Today in China under the scheme of Modernisation within a short span of 3-4 years billions and billions of US dollars are pumped into industries and agriculture in oil exploration of South China sea in special economic zones in 14 coastal cities, in the defence departments, in the

production of nuclear Energy Hotels etc. This shows that foreign imperialist capital is entering every segment of production in China.

More foreign finance capital is entering in the form of direct investments found ventures and sale foreign advanced technology.

Foreign imperialist finance is entering China from USA, Soviet Union, Britain, France, West Germany and Japan—chiefly from USA and Soviet Union—the two super powers, particularly from USA (and to a lesser extent from second world countries).

Now China has adopted a new Act to give protection to foreign imperialist finance capital from nationalisation, protection to their profits, protection to repatriate their profits. All this foreign capital is coming to China on the basis of high rates of interest on the basis of repayment in 10–15 years.

The present CPC leaders are now taking loans from all financial institutions of the West, the World Bank, the International Monetary Fund and even short-term loans from individual countries at high interest rates.

The present CPC leaders can no more fool anybody by saying that their foreign loans constitute only a small percentage of the gross national product. But when compared with the investments in their Five Year Plans, the share of foreign Finance Capital in the five year plans is significant.

The present CPC leaders cannot fool anybody by saying that they are utilising foreign finance capital and foreign technology as experiments in specified priority industries to learn them and use them for multiplication. Today foreign finance capital is entering every segment of production on a very large scale even such fields as Hotel industry.

In Gansu province alone, there are 60 projects with foreign capital involving light industry, textiles, chemistry metallurgy, building materials, machinery, electronics, coal, energy, communications, medicine, animal husbandry, tourism, commerce, education and other trades.

If this is the state of things in one zone, what the situation is in the other special economic zones one can only imagine. This policy has nothing to do with the policy of self-reliance.

Peking Review, July 2, 1984 says: "These are diverse forms of co-operation enterprises with exclusive outside investments, joint ventures contracting enterprises or providing loans, equipment, and technology.

The present CPC leaders are giving protection to this foreign capital. The same journal says.

“Investors who build enterprises with their own exclusive funds may manage their own businesses independently with all after-tax profits at their own disposal. Joint ventures may also be run exclusively by outside partners. The profits will be divided on the basis of proportion of investment, with due consideration given to the interests of the outside partners”.

This is enough to show that these concessions given to foreign finance capital are in no way different from those given by other third world countries including India.

In Agriculture, foreign finance capital is allowed to penetrate agriculture in such fields as “Satellite photographs, transfer of frozen milch cow embryo, huge land reclamation projects, comprehensive transformation of barren farm lands and an increase in urban milk supplies”.

China has already made “91 agreements or contracts on aid and 20 to 50 year favourable loans with United Nations Organisations, international financial institutions and friendly countries amounting to Rs. 600 millions in grants”.

The role of imperialist finance capital as an agent of exploitation as an instrument of economic and political domination of the receiving country cannot change simply because China is a Socialist Country. It cannot become international economic aid under any circumstances.

The International Finance Capital as an instrument of the exporter of economic crisis from the capitalist countries the third world countries will not change under any circumstances. Penetration of international imperialist Finance Capital is meant only to keep the third world countries economically backward.

Private Marketing

From the period of Stalin and Mao, it has been the practice of socialist countries to abolish private marketing as a principle and adopt State Trading and co-operative trading as the main sources of distribution.

Now the leaders of CPC, after the death of Com. Mao, have introduced Private Marketing as a subsidiary channel of distribution to compete with State Trading and co-operative trading.

Communes have been allowed, after paying their quotas and taxes to the State, to sell their surplus products in the private market. Individual peasants are allowed to sell their surplus in the private markets. Let us remember that it is only the rich and well-to-do peasants that usually have surplus in the open markets.

Similarly in the cities persons engaged in various sideline operations are allowed to sell their goods in the open market. In all aspects of

production and distribution profit motive is the driving force under the direction of the present CPC leaders and not Stalin's saying that the aim of production under a socialist society should be maximum satisfaction of the needs of the people.

What is the meaning of the various changes that the present leaders of CPC have brought about in their internal policies after the death of Com. Mao ?

The profit motive, the introduction of material incentives the resurrection and encouragement to native capitalists, the weakening of the Commune system through their responsibility system, the allowing of private marketing to thrive and finally the open door policy towards imperialist finance - capital all these are nothing but the characteristics of a bourgeois society. These measures have nothing to do with the strengthening of socialism but weakening it and lay the basis for capitalism.

Certain negative features of these measures have already appeared in China today. The open door policy towards imperialist finance capital is bound to lead to the penetration of this finance capital into every important segment of its production industrial and agricultural. The growing strength of imperialist finance capital will force China to serve its interests.

Already, the nascent ship building industry in China is being forced to build ships for export. For instance, the Shanghai Ship Building Corporation has built and delivered 49 vessels for export including such big ships at 12000 ton container ships.

Now the China ship building corporation is receiving orders from Hongkong, Singapore, United States, West Germany, Italy, Norway and others for various sizes of ships including big ones.

(Peking Review July 16, 1984)

This is enough to show the ship building industry of China, instead of building its own shipping, for its own use, is forced to serve the ship building needs of USA and certain other second world countries.

The continuous of pumping money into the hands of individuals under the scheme of material incentives and the pumping of imperialist finance capital will only lead to create and strengthen inflationary trends in Chinese economy. This has already appeared in Chinese economy and the Chinese govt. has been forced to take certain anti inflationary measures, which was entirely absent under the direction of Com. Mao's policies of self reliance, against the reemergence of Capitalism, against material incentives, against weakening of Communes and against free marketing.

The introduction of material incentives, strengthening of native capitalism and rich peasant economy, renewal of upper and lower limits of grades of wage system, unlimited bonus and finally free marketing are bound to result in greater and greater differentiation among the people.

This has already appeared in the present day Chinese society. For instance in 1982, 2.4% of the peasants received less than 100 yuan, 24.4% received between 100 and 200 yuan, 37% between 200 and 300 yuan, 29.5% between 300 and 500 yuan and 6.7% over 500 yuan. (Peking Review April 30-1984).

The same journal says further "But then still exist differences in incomes, sometimes very wide ones. Annual family incomes can be as high as tens of thousands of yuan or more".

The same journal says that in socialist China there are certain peasant families which annually earn 1,00,000 yuan.

This is the result of the policies of allowing "different factors of production . . . free flow of workers, capital and technology".

These capitalist measures are leading to class differentiation among the Chinese people. This class differentiation is bound to lead to new type of bureaucracy and its naturally corruption in the top bureaucracy.

This is no more a guess. This is already taking place in the present day Chinese Society. Look at the following examples. Peking Journal of June 18, 1984 says: "some leading Cadres of the County Party Committee built six two storied houses for themselves each one covering 119 square metres".

Peking Journal of November 30, 1981 says :

"Lin Xingue, Director of the Bureau of Animal Husbandry and Aquatic Products in Hunan Provinces, Yueyang County squandered 2550 yuan from state appropriations for developing livestock and fish breeding and to hold feasts or buy gifts".

Peking Review of July 9, 1984 says :

"Before he was arrested, Tian Shunjiang was a canteen purchasing agent for Hobei Province's Xingtai Collery. In two years he pocketed 100000 yuan from selling large quantities of grain and edible oil he had embezzled."

Just when new type of bureaucracy and capitalist corruption have begun to appear in Chinese society, the present leaders of CPC have signed an agreement with Britain to maintain the present capitalist system and administration of Hongkong for the next 50 years after 1997. They are making similar offers to Taiwan for its unification with mainland China.

With this class differentiation among the Chinese population and the strengthening of capitalist forces are bound to get a new lease of life. It is the policy of abandoning the policy of taking the 'class struggle as the key link' that is mainly responsible for such situation.

Of course the Chinese leaders will defend their measures by saying that they are punishing severely all corrupt bureaucrats. They will not succeed. What measures have led to such a situation? It is the policy of encouragement to the growth of capitalist forces both in industry and agriculture and the open policy of China without revising these policies, more punishment of a few officials can never stem this trend.

Such punishments to a few officials is always resorted to even in bourgeois societies. They are only used as mere scape-goats to cover up the decadence of bourgeois society. Only the abolition of the capitalist forces and the involvement of the whole people in such a struggle can stem this growing trend. This was what com. Mao tried to achieve through the Cultural Revolution.

In the absence of such involvement of the people, all the claims of Chinese leaders of educating the masses will be reduced to mere sophistries, empty appeals for a change of heart among the bureaucracy and corrupt officials.

It is significant that in the recent period, the present CPC leaders have called for a reform movement to fight bourgeois culture that is coming along with foreign capital and technology. Without taking steps to prevent foreign capital and foreign technology on such a large scale, what is the use of mere appeals to fight against bourgeois culture?

II. Attitude towards other Third World Countries

Most of the Third World Countries, inspite of their political independence continue to be subjected to varying degrees of imperialist pressure and control and there is no change in the old order. Even those third world countries ruled by national bourgeoisie it is also with an alliance with feudalism and semifeudalism and imperialism. In general, except in the socialist countries, their old order of societies continue to exist and continue their dependance on the imperialist countries.

Because of this continued dependence on imperialism and feudalism or semi-feudalism, the third world countries, in general, to suffer from all the evils of imperialism and feudalism or semi-feudalism.

They continue to suffer from slower pace of development. The rate of development has been continuously going down from 1960.

The annual rate of development between 1960 and 1973, was 6%. But later this growth rate has been continuously going down. In 1979 it has been reduced to 5.1%, it has been reduced to 3.0% in 1980, 2% in 1981 and 1.9 per cent in 1982. In 1983 there has been negative growth rate of 0.6 per cent.

2. Because of their continued dependence on imperialism and social imperialism and unfavourable balance of payments, the debt-burden has been sky-rocketing since 1979 in all the Third World Countries.

3. The imperialist countries and Social imperialism particularly USA and Soviet Union are chiefly engaged in provoking conflicts between various third world countries in all the continents and are using their conflicts as a pretext to sell deadly arms to the combatants to provoke regional wars and draw them into their nets of military co-operation. The two super powers are trying to convert various third world countries into their respective bases and using them as spring boards for further aggression.

So any one like China, which wants to integrate itself with the struggles of the third world countries will call for complete break with imperialism and social imperialism, their growing dependence on imperialism and social imperialism and a basic change in feudal and semi-feudal order of things, and call for unity of the third world countries to break conspiracies of the two super powers.

But the present CPC leaders are completely silent on the struggle against imperialism and social imperialism and basic changes in their feudal or semi-feudal systems.

In 1981, in an article "Economic development problems facing African Countries" appearing in two Peking Reviews (No. 47 and No. 48) said that "many African Countries today have regained their independence and some of their economic rights, but the forces of colonialism and racism still have a grip on this huge continent. African Countries are still the victims of various forms of economic exploitation, the unequal economic relationship between the developing countries of Africa and the developed countries still exists.

This is the principle obstacles holding back the economic development of these countries attaining genuine independence." (1981-No. 47).

It even noted that first of all plunder and exploitation by imp. and colonialism over the Countries are the basic factors behind Africa's poverty and backwardness. (No. 48-1981).

In this article the CPC leaders see that the African countries are yet to get "independence" meaning that the African countries have got only formal political independence and real economic dependence. Even then it does not call for the ending of this colonial domination and dependence on imp. It is also significant to note that China does not call for a change in the feudal or semi-feudal system in these countries.

But in 1984, the CPC Leaders are now singing a new song. They say, "Naturally in the midst of the current difficulties, securing foreign aid

is a vital concern to the developing African countries". This means that in the present conditions, they approve of the continued dependence on imperialism and social imperialism.

It even praises the efforts of certain African countries "to maintain and develop economic relations with the west" for adopting "open policy regarding foreign funds and introduced other flexible methods", for giving protection to imperialist finance capital by ensuring the rights, interests and legal incomes of foreign investors, assuring "foreign companies not nationalise them" etc. (1984 No. 28).

It welcomes the various measures that the Third World Countries are taking to meet the present crisis. They are (a) reduction in the scale of capital construction (b) greater importance to agricultural production (c) Re-organisation of state enterprises and improving their management (d) a greater role to private business (e) the slowing down of nationalisation. (1984-No. 28)

The CPC leaders are now praising the measures of Third World Countries such as economic readjustment, cutting administrative expenditure, balancing budgets, controlling inflation, reducing imports, boosting exports, restructuring management and improving economic policies (No. 13-1984).

All these measures in essence are nothing but fleecing its own people to pay for the imperialism and native exploiters, increasing prices, greater tax burden greater inflation and greater unemployment.

It is similar with the Latin American countries. They are mainly tied with American imp. Because of their continued dependence on imp. and social imp. particularly the former and preservation of the old feudal or semi-feudal system the Latin American countries are in deep economic crisis. They are faced with a foreign debt of 350,000 crores US dollars-half of the total debt of all the Third World Countries (No. 27-1985) and 56% of last year's total annual Latin American gross domestic production (GDP) of these 11 countries (Mexico, Brazil, Argentina, Colombia, Equador, Venezuela, Peru, Chile, Bolivia, Uruguay, Dominica) account for 90% of foreign debt of all Latin American countries.

Today the people of the Latin American countries, particularly in Central America are waging a heroic battle against imperialist plunder and their own feudal or semi-feudal systems in these countries.

The CPC Leaders do not go beyond supporting internal measures, and negotiations with the creditor countries to meet the present debt crisis forcing Latin America.

Even when Bolivia and Columbia have suspended repayments of debts, the Chinese leaders do not go beyond calling upon the industrial

countries to take steps to reduce the present debt burden with the plea that "today all the world economies have become interdependent" (No. 25-1984)

For instance, Mexico is being praised for its economic policies that its "economic crisis under control, production in some industries have begun to rise" "inflation has subsided somewhat" that it has "trade surplus" that "public spending has decreased" and that "international payments are balanced".

Let us remember that Mexico is an oil exporting country and its economy in a better position than other Latin American countries. In spite of it "is caught in a deep economic crisis". Why? Because of imperialist plunder and feudal or semi-feudal order of things.

Without ending these, there can be no real progress for its people or for the people of all the Third World Countries. Instead of supporting the Third World people's struggles to end imperialist plunder, feudal or semi-feudal order, the present CPC Leaders are identifying themselves with the govts. of the Third World Countries who are fleecing their own people to meet the present crisis and is satisfied in supporting the Third world Countries call for North-South Dialogue and South-South co-operation.

What is significant to note is the measures of the CPC leaders in its internal policies re-adjustment new encouragement to capitalist forces-its profit motive and material incentives and its open door policy towards imp. finance capital are in line with the policies of the Third World Countries and the enthusiastically support them.

III. China's International Policy.

China's International Policy is only a reflection of its internal policies. Let us see how this is happening.

Now China says that it is opposed to the hegemonism of USA and the Soviet Union-the two super powers.

While welcoming this statement one cannot escape from the fact that China is avoiding to speak of imperialist and social imperialism aggressions of USA and Soviet Union. It is satisfied with naming them as hegemonists forgetting Lenin's teachings that hegemonism is the character of imperialism. So now-a-days USA and Soviet Union are merely referred as super powers with hegemonic ambitions and not as US imperialism and Soviet Social imperialism.

Why this change? Is this not connected with the anxiety of the present chinese leaders not to offend their USA or Soviet Union-since she depend on foreign loans, equipment and foreign technology? One has to consider this point.

Now China says that it is opposed to the hegemonism of the both the super powers, while at the same time it claims that its friendly relations with both of them are step by step improving.

How is this possible? Opposition to hegemonism of the two super powers and growing friendly relations with both of them?

Does not this position reflect nominal opposition to the hegemonism of the two super powers which does not go beyond UNO debates and moral sympathy with those subjected to aggressions of USA and Soviet Union and greater concentration on improving friendly relations with both the super powers? One has to consider this point.

Today the present CPC leaders, in the name of identifying with the struggles of the people of the Third World Countries have abandoned the call for ending depending on imperialism and imperialist capital and are actually identifying themselves with many reactionary governments and support of their policies of welcoming imperialist of capital, greater concessions to the native exploiters. This policy is clearly seen in the hailing of Indira Gandhi as having achieved a stable economic development against all reality. It has now given up the call for ending imp. and social imp. plunder and a change in the feudal or semi-feudal systems—the basis imperialist plunder. Why such a change of its earlier positions?

Does not this reflect the fear of the CPC leaders to appear to be the champions of struggle of the people against imperialism and feudalism? Does not this reflect their desire not to provoke imp. and social imp. and even the reactionary government in the Third World Countries? One has to deeply consider this point.

Any how one thing is certain today. The present CPC leaders are not bothered about the complex problems that the present day world is facing. The present CPC leaders are primarily concerned with Hongkong or Taiwan. Even with Soviets its only concern is the withdrawal of Soviet occupation of Afghanistan on its Western flank and Vietnam's occupation of Kampucheu on its Southern border.

This means that today's leaders of China are only concerned with their own border and the countries on its own border. This is against the principles of proletarian internationalism of a socialist country.

Thus both internally and externally the present leaders of CPC have abandoned the policies and practices of Mao and Maozedong Thought. Thus their "Creative" Marxism has nothing to do with the basic points of Marxism Leninism Maozedong Thought. It is nothing but opportunism to serve the convenience of the present rulers of China.

(This article was published in March to Liberation March '85)