

# Historical and Polemical Documents of the Communist Movement in India

---

**Vol. II**  
**(1964-1972)**

---



**TARIMELA NAGIREDDY MEMORIAL TRUST**  
**VIJAYAWADA**

## **Tarimela Nagi Reddy**

was a patriot. He joined the movement for National Independence and freedom at a very young age. He defied all hardships and pressures in the course. He was moved by the sufferings of the proletarian and peasant masses and did not rest till he understood their root causes. Vast study and experience of life led him into the fold of Marxism. Marxism became his philosophical world outlook and guide to action for the entire life. Till the last moment of his life he tirelessly worked to build the party and to educate, organise and lead the proletarian, other toiling and oppressed masses and in championing their cause in various forms. He departed on July 28, 1976 because of ill health in the dark days of emergency while carrying on work in UG .

*(Continued on next page)*

**HISTORICAL AND POLEMICAL  
DOCUMENTS OF THE  
COMMUNIST MOVEMENT  
IN INDIA**

**VOL.II**

**(1964-72)**



**TARIMELA NAGI REDDY  
MEMORIAL TRUST**

**VIJAYAWADA**

**HISTORICAL AND POLEMICAL  
DOCUMENTS OF THE  
COMMUNIST MOVEMENT IN INDIA**

**First Edition : May, 2008**

**Price : Rs.500/-**

**Sole Distributor :**

**Mythry Book House**

**Jaleel Street, Arundalpet**

**VIJAYAWADA - 520 002**

**E.mail: mythrybs@yahoo.co.in**

**For Details :**

**P.JASWANTHA RAO,**

**Secretary,**

**T.N.Memorial Trust,**

**32-13-26/1, B.M.RAO ROAD,**

**Mogalrajpuram,**

**VIJAYAWADA-10, AP**

**Printed at:**

**Vanaja Graphics**

**Vijayawada-4**



# Foreword

The decision of T.N. Memorial Trust to publish few volumes of documents of Communist Movement in India is a great task. It needs careful selection of documents which will correctly and objectively reflect the course of developments and the two line struggles inside the Communist Movement.

It must be understood that in India the ideas of communism developed under the impact of Great October Revolution. After October Revolution contacts between various centres of Indian revolutionaries in exile and Soviet Union were established in 1918. This paved the way for the dissemination of Marxist ideology amongst the national revolutionaries in the early period. Indian revolutionaries who visited Russia between 1918-22 were deeply impressed by their meetings with Lenin and other Soviet leaders and their observation in Moscow, Petrograd, Tashkent and Baku. Among them Moulana Barakatulla had written a book in Persian called 'Bolshevism and the Islamic Nations'. This book was translated into different Asian languages. This book played an important role in India. Inspired by this book about 200 Mahajirs crossed at Soviet border in 1920. In the later period some of them had come back to India and 30 of them stayed in Tashkent who formed Tashkent branch of Indian Revolutionary Association. MPBT Acharya had represented this association in the Second congress of Comintern in 1920. At the same time, in Baku a group was formed and it published a paper called *Azad Hindustan Akbar*. The representation from this organization also took part in the Congress of the Oppressed People of the East in 1920.

In exile M.N. Roy played an important role in spreading the ideas of Marxism. He joined the Communist party of Mexico and had come to Moscow in 1920 as a delegate to the congress of CI and he was elected to executive committee of CI.

On October 17<sup>th</sup> 1920 CPI was formed in Tashkent with 10 members. First Secretary of this party was Md Shafiq.

During this period Communist group came in to existence in Bombay under the leadership of S.A Dange, S.V. Ghate and R.S. Nambikar. Another Group was formed in Benaras under the leadership of Shaikat Usmani. Communist groups were formed in Lahore, Calcutta by Muzaffar Ahmed and in Madras Singaravelu Chettiar.

Since 1920, Many attempts were made to bring various groups under one All India Communist Party. These attempts included the formation of a legal Indian Communist Party in 1924 by Satyabhakta. (which had no connection with CI). In 1925 December, from 26-30 a Conference was held under the chairmanship of Singaravelu chettiar of Madras where a resolution was passed for the formation of CPI with its head quarters in Bombay. Central Executive Committee with J.P. Bagerhatta and S.V. Ghate as secretaries was announced. These were some of the important attempts. Later on due to differences, this centre also ceased to exist. Another effort was made in 1925 through the formation of Workes and Peasant Party as an open platform.

All these attempts, however, failed. At the same time, under the leadership of various Communist groups kisan sabha organization started coming up and gained firm ground among the peasants by leading their struggles in various parts of the country. So also the workers movement started developing in various parts which resulted in the formation of 200 trade unions with 0.3 million membership under the leadership of AITUC.

Finally, seeing state of party organization in India, CPC, CPGB and CP Germany had sent an open letter to the Indian Communist groups (published in the IMPRECOR-the organ of CI on May 12, 1932.) The letter observed *"The general situation of the communist movement is not satisfactory. But on the otherside the tremendous development of the working class and peasant movement which is unprecedented in the past. On the other hand, the communist party as yet consist of small number of weak groups and isolated from the masses".* The letter also observed that *"instead of a struggle for united all India CP, localism, provincialism, self-isolation from masses are mainly existing".*

Letter further stated, *"The conversion of the proletariat from an active political force into the leading force with the hegemony of the people's movement can be brought about at the present time by the exposure of the bourgeois National Congress and its "left wing" Bose, Kandalkar, Ray etc as the betrayers of the struggle for independence and can be realized only if the C.P. takes a most energetic part in the struggle for independence on the basis of irreconcilable struggle against national reformists."*

*"However while struggling against "left" national reformism, it is incorrect to separate ourselves from the mass movement of the people under the leadership of National congress. A distinction must be made between the bourgeois congress leadership and those sections of the workers, peasants and revolutionary elements"*.

Though this letter was written in the name of three Parties, all the suggestions made by it had the approval of CI.

After this the CPC has sent another open letter to the Indian communists on July 16, 1933 appreciating the moves of the Indian communists towards the formation of "All India Communist Party". In 1933 the most of Meerut prisoners were released. In December 1933 an All India Congress was held in Calcutta where a provisional Central Committee was formed which adopted a Political Thesis and a draft Constitution. They were subsequently published in IMPRECOR, the organ of CI.

In real sense the CPI came into being with a proper centre, a Programme and CC in December 1933 in Calcutta and this CPI got affiliation to the CI. Since 1933 the CPI continued to function as All India Party. This All India Party had convened its first Party Congress in Bombay from 23 May to 1<sup>st</sup> June 1943. Membership at the time was 15,563.

Second congress was held in Calcutta in 1948. Subsequently, Third Party Congress was held in 1954, in Madurai, Forth congress was held in 1956 in Palghat (2 months after 20<sup>th</sup> Congress of CPSU), Fifth Special Congress was held in 1958 April in Amritsar. During this period Great Debate on the Ideological Questions of International Communist Movement started. Fifth congress was held after the 61 parties met in Moscow which adopted a Declaration, which was

published in the name of 12 parties. Sixth congress was held in Vijayawada in 1961. Inner party struggles continued. CPI (M) came into existence through 7<sup>th</sup> congress held in Calcutta in December 1964. The formation of CPI (M) in 1964 was a culmination of bitter and prolonged inner party struggles. Fed up with the revisionist policies and practice, overwhelming majority of rank and file rallied with the CPI (M) with the hope that Party would adopt a revolutionary line. But due to neo revisionist orientation of majority of the leadership these hopes were belied and the inner party struggle was betrayed. Since 1964, as earlier, again the inner party struggle started developing inside CPI (M) which resulted in split in 1967 after Naxalbari Revolt and consequently the formation of AICCCR

The Communist Movement in India suffered enormously from one or the other wrong trend which dominated for a greater part of its life as on 1964. Consequently, the proletariat could not emerge itself as the leader of Indian Revolution in the period of National Liberation Movement as well as in the subsequent period. At the same time, the Communist Movement is a rich and invaluable treasure-house of experiences in leading the workers, peasants, youth, students, women, middle classes and other oppressed people in glorious struggles and movements. It led many a peasant struggles and revolutionary movements. Telangana peasant armed struggle providing a shining example of them. It established best example of ideological and political struggle and communist qualities. The documents published in the First as well as present volume would give an idea of these struggles and experiences.

The period 1964-67 was marked by four important aspects. a) Neo-revisionist leadership exposed its real ugly face. b) Along with carrying inner party struggles against revisionist politics, party cadres took up the responsibility of initiating and advancing class struggle and peasant movement to expose the revisionist leadership, c) the struggles within CPI (M) got intensified, d) the inner party struggle started at different level in India. CPI (M) finally decided to hold plenum to settle the ideological issues and as a result in April 1968 Burdwan Central Plenum was held. Final split was completed immediately after the Burdwan plenum. Majority membership of CPI (M) in A.P.

under the leadership of T.Nagi Reddy and D.V.Rao had come out from the CPI (M) and formed APCCCR and joined AICCCR.

After the split of CPI (M) in 1967, the Communist Revolutionary movement witnessed various trends, practices and divisions before all the Communist Revolutionaries could unite in a common platform. It has gone through various courses of inner party struggle with many permutations and combinations and developments. There came into existence various formations under different names. Several formations are existing today A single all India Communist Party is yet to come into existence.

With this historical background **T.N. Memorial Trust** had undertaken the task of bringning out relevant important documents.

Volume one has covered the period between 1943-1951. The documents published in it deal with a very important part of Communist Movement in India. During this time, debates on the question of stage, strategy and tactics of Indian revolution took important turns. They are rich in their ideological and political content; sharp and systematic was the clash of ideas and rich in experiences based on practice. The documents of Andhra leadership; line of BTR; the documents of New CC formed in 1950; the documents of 'Three Ps' and the documents of 1951 CC throw light on the lines and practices that were in lead as well as clash in this short but turbulent period in the Communist Movement in India. Thus this Volume gives an objective picture and help the readers to judge the whole course of developments objectively and correctly. The **Trust** has undertaken this task knowing well that some had already published some volumes of documents of Communist Movement. The Trust found that some publications are not available in the market. The rates of some publications are prohibitive (for instance, each Volume published by the CPI (M) is priced at Rs.1000/-) or they had deliberately did not include certain documents in their publication (for instance, CPI(M)'s publications does not include the documents of Andhra Secretariat (1948-49) which are a most important part of Communist Movement reading of which is essential to understand the Communist Movement objectively and correctly.

The Second Volume covers the period from 1964-72. Documents published in this volume on differences and struggle inside the CPI (M) will give clear picture of the ideological -political and organizational nature of differences and struggle. This struggle was carried on not only as individuals or groups but also in committees and other internal fora from local to all India level, not only on some specific questions but also on the path of Indian revolution and the ideological -political line of International Communist Movement. The document '*On the Ideological issues in the International Communist Movement*' by D.V.Rao, *the Resolution and Documents of Andhra State Plenum on Madurai ideological draft, Open letter to party Members* by T.Nagi Reddy, D.V.Rao, Kolla Venkayya and C.P. Reddy will give an inspiring and clear idea of the ideological and political content of the debate and struggles carried on by the Andhra Comrades under the leadership of T.Nagi Reddy and D.V.Rao. These documents will be of useful reference material to understand the inner party struggles and its nature. At the same-time ideological debates were also going in different states. Document on the "*Present Situation and Task*" by Committee for struggle against Revisionism (W.B) in 1966 is an the important document.

We are also publishing the *Eight documents* by Charu Majumdar (Darjeeling) written in the period between 1965-67 to understand the nature of struggle and its political ideological content.

During this period, the neo revisionist leadership too intensified its own ideological, political and organizational offensive to counter the growing trend of opposition. The documents of Volume -II will give an idea of such efforts.

The peasant revolutionary movements which had come up in some parts of the Country, more significantly the workers and peasant uprising of Naxalbari added strength and momentum to these ideological and political struggles and had taken them to new heights. These struggles had finally culminated in the break of CRs from the CPI (M). Immediately after Naxalbari uprising *Naxalbari -O- Krishak Sangram Sahayak Committee* was formed under the chairmanship of Promod Sengupta. Document of Naxalabari -O-Krishak

Sangram Sahayak Committee is an important step forward towards the unification of CRs inside and outside the party - CPI (M).

With the initiative of W.Bengal comrades *All India Coordination Committee of Communist Revolutionaries of CPI (M)* was formed on November 13, 1967. AICCCR was a historic event. Differences have cropped up inside the AICCCR as well as between the leadership of AICCCR and the CRs outside the AICCCR. AICCCR faced divisions. These differences are of serious nature. APCCCR and many comrades like Parimal Dasgupta and his Organisation, Com. Promod Sengupta, Asit Sen, Ban Bihari Chakrabarty, Shyamal Nandi and many others started opposing the line of Charu Majumdar. The Documents, Declaration (Nov 13, 1967) of the Revolutionaries in CPI (M), Declaration of AICCCR; (May 14, 1968), AICCCR's Resolutions on Elections and Work in TU Front; Feb 7, 1969, Resolution of AICCCR on APCCCR; Resolution on APCCCR, Resolution (Feb 8, 1969) on the need to form Party; April 22, 1969 Communiqué of AICCCR and various documents of APCCCR (1968-69); Asit Sen's Document, '*Another Dangerous Line*' and Promod Sengupta's document, '*Whither Revolution*', etc. abundantly reveal the nature of differences.

Large sections of CRs were outside the AICCCR when those who remained in the AICCCR led by Charu Majumdar decided to form a new party CPI (ML) and announced its formation in 1962, 22<sup>nd</sup> April in Calcutta. Those including APCCCR the largest section which came out from CPI (M) -was left out.

The documents show how and under which conditions the struggles had developed after 1964 within the ranks of CRS.

After the formation CPI (ML) on the basis of "*Resolution of Party Organisation*" and '*Political Resolution*' the COC, CPI (ML) led by C.M. had convened Party Congress in May 1970 where the documents, CPI (ML)'s Party Programme, and Political Organizational Report presented by Charu Majumdar were adopted.

Immediately after the CPI (ML) Congress differences within CPI (ML) took a serious turn. Bihar State Committee came out with a document called "Problems of the Indian Revolution and Neo Trotskyite to Diversions, criticising various



positions of CM and his followers. In November, 1970 Sushital Roychoudhury made a sharp criticism of left adventurism in document called *Problems and crises of Indian Revolution* and appealed the ranks to *Resist the Ultra-adventurist trend Raising its Head in Our Party*. Almost all the leading comrades from Bihar to Bengal, UP to Punjab opposed CM's line. Subsequently the struggling comrades from Bihar, Debra, Mashahari have summed up their experiences. As a result several CPI (ML) groups emerged during 1971-72. The present volume has selected the document of various sides to give a proper representation of facts and situation.

By April 12, 1969, the APCCCR consolidated itself as APRCC through a State Convention. This convention adopted the programme of NDR; Agrarian revolutionary programme with the perspective of path of people's war as applied to concrete conditions and practice. It reviewed its ideological, political organizational and movement work, the problems and trends it encountered in the course of guiding the girijan peasant movement in Srikakulam. Later the APRCC moved ahead carrying out the revolutionary mass line. It continued the struggle against wrong trends as well as the efforts to unite the CRs based on a correct revolutionary mass line. The Documents of APRCC published in this volume will give an idea of these efforts and struggle.

Similarly group led by Asit Sen formed West Bengal Unity and Co-ordination Committee on the basis of their struggle and started to bring out a journal called *Liberation War* (1971) in english and *Murktiyudh* in Bengali (1969-70); They formed RYSF and Krishak Sangram Samittee.

Under the leadership of Parimal Dasgupta CCR of W.B. had come into existence with its own documents. They organized state wide trade union too.

WBCCR led by Moni Guha had come into existence with the close contact with APCCCR.

In Northern Zone, N.Z.C. RCUC (ML) had come in to existence with three documents- *Draft Programme, organizational Draft, Method of work*.

Along with this CPI (ML) led by S.N. on the basis of *Self Critical Report* had come into being.

Similarly CPI (ML) led M.M and CPI (ML) led by Johar had also emerged by 1972.

By 1972 majority of CR leadership was in jail. Six leading Comrades released an *Open Letter* from Vishakhapatnam Jail. Kanu Sanyal wrote a document called *More About Naxalbari*(1973) throwing more light on the course of development of Naxalbari struggle as well as the struggle between the trends manifested in Naxalbari.

All these documents and writings from different formations during the period of 1964-72 are valuable for serious communist activists, sympathizers, serious research workers to understand the historical facts concerning the course of developments, trends, practices and the nature of inner party struggle in the Communist Movement and to arrive at objective and correct conclusions. This will also be useful as reference materials.

Present selection is no doubt a difficult task. It can not be comprehensive one because there exist many more documents which are yet to be found.

In conclusion we express our thanks to those friends who helped us in collecting these documents for the present volume.

**T.N.M.Trust** expects criticism, suggestions and active co-operation from readers and friends for future efforts.

**-Editorial Committee  
For Publishing the Documents**

## *Publisher's Note*

Here is Vol.II of THE HISTORICAL AND POLEMICAL DOCUMENTS OF THE COMMUNIST MOVEMENT IN INDIA FOR 1964-72. We undertook this publication with the strong urge to provide the readers with the documents, material and facts connected to the communist and revolutionary movements to help to objectively study and arrive at proper conclusions on the problems and experiences in the concerned period and make their own contributions for their further advance. The tremendous affection towards Com. T. Nagi Reddy and strong urge to hold high the great cause for which he dedicated his entire life shown by the friends and comrades by extending help and co-operation in various forms is a source of an immense strength and inspiration for us in this endeavour. We are thankful to all of them. We hope and wish this to continue so that we would carry the aims of the Trust forward.

Vijayawada,  
22-4-2008.

P.JASWANTHA RAO,  
Secretary,  
T.N.Memorial Trust.

## Acknowledgement

T.N.Memorial Trust expresses its gratitude to the members of the Editorial Committee for the publication of the *Historical and Polemical Documents of the Communist Movement in India*,  
**Com Subodh Mitra, Com Madhu Com P.Jaswantha Rao.**

Its also expresses its thanks to all the friends and comrades to have extended their help in publication of this volume.



# INDEX

## I

<b>DIFFERENCES AND STRUGGLES INSIDE THE CPI(M)</b>	... 20-233
1. The Present Situation and Tasks-Committee For Struggle Against Revisionism (West Bengal), 25-12-1966.	... 20
2. On the Ideological Issues in the International Communist Movement - D.Venkateswara Rao, 28-10-1967.	... 37
3. Documents of Andhra Communist Plenum	
a) Resolution of the Andhra Communist Plenum - 13-1-1968.	... 78
b) Resolution submitted by T. Nagi Reddy and C. Pulla Reddy	... 81
c) Resolution submitted by Kolla Venkayya to the Andhra Plenum	... 124
4. Letter to Andhra Comrades - Polit Bureau, CC, CPI(M)	... 157
5. Open Letter to Party Members - Tarimela Nagi Reddy, Devulapalli Venkateswara Rao, Kolla Venkayya and Chandra Pulla Reddy	... 184
6. Resolutions of the <i>Naxalbari - O- Krishak Sangram Sahayak Committee</i>	
a) Defend and protect Naxalbari and Peasant Struggle, - June 14, 1967	... 202
b) On Food Crisis - Sept 2, 1967.	... 204
7. Eight Documents - Charu Mazumdar (1965-67)	... 206

## II

<b>DOCUMENTS OF THE ALL INDIA CO-ORDINATION COMMITTEE OF COMMUNIST REVOLUTIONARIES</b>	... 235-249
1. First Declaration - Nov. 13, 1967.	... 235
2. Second Declaration - May 14, 1968.	... 238
3. Resolution on Elections - May 14, 1968.	... 241
4. Resolution about Activities in the Trade Union Front	... 242
5. Resolution on APCCCR - Feb. 7, 1969.	... 245
6. Resolution on Party Formation - Feb 8, 1969.	... 246
7. Communiqué - April 22, 1969.	... 249

### III

<b>DOCUMENTS OF THE APCCCR (196 8-69)</b>	....	251-311
1. Tarimela Nagi Reddy's Interviews to		
a) A. Raghavan, BLITZ Correspondent - August 15, 1968.	....	251
b) Sweedish Journalists - March, 1969.	....	254
c) Narayana Murthy - Sept 20, 1969.	....	257
2. Lay Foundations For A Struggle-oriented Mass Movement -Document - Sept.1,1968.	....	260
3. T.Nagi Reddy's Speech on his Resignation to AP State Assembly - March 16,1969.	....	272
. Documents of State Convention of APCCCR - April 10-12, 1969		
a) Immediate Programme	....	280
b)On Some Problems Connected with Srikakulam Girijan Movement	....	293

### IV

<b>DOCUMENTS OF CPI(ML)</b>	....	313-342
1. Political Resolution - COC - April 22, 1969.	....	313
2. Resolution on Party Organisation - COC- April 22, 1969.	....	321
3. Documents of May 1970 Party Congress		
a) CPI(ML)'s Programme	....	328
b) Political - Organisational Report	....	335
c) On Political - Organisational Report - Charu Mazumdar	....	339

### V

<b>DIFFERENCES WITHIN THE CPI(ML)</b>	....	344-366
1. R.N.Upadhyaya in 1970 May Party Congress.	....	344
2. A Critique of Political Resolution - Howrah DC, CPI(ML)-June 1969.	....	346
3. The General Line in Colonial Revolution - Utpal Dutt - Oct.18,1969.	....	347
4. Problems and Crises of Indian Revolution - Sushital Roychoudhury- Nov.1970.	....	353



## VI

### CERTAIN IMPORTANT ARTICLES FROM THE LIBERATION .... 368-401

1. Articles of Charu Mazumdar
  - a) March Onward By Summing up the Experience Of the Peasant Revolutionary Struggle of India - Dec, 1969. .... 368
  - b) Make 'The 1970s' The Decade of Liberation - Feb. 1970. .... 376
  - c) A Few Words About Guerilla Actions - Feb, 1970. .... 380
  - d) On Party Work in Urban & Rural Areas .... 384
  - e) Forge Closer Unity With Peasants' Armed Struggle - Aug.1970. .... 385
  - f) March Onward, Day of Victory is Near - Sep/Dec, 1970. .... 389
  - g) It is the People's Interest That is the Party's Interest. .... 392
2. To Win Victory In Revolution We Must Establish Revolutionary Authority - Souren Bose- Feb, 1970. .... 394
3. CM's Last Letter .... 401

## VII

### ON DIFFERENCES IN THE COMMUNIST REVOLUTIONARY MOVEMENT .... 403-661

1. Our Co-ordination and Unity with the AICCCR; Unity among the CRs in Andhra and India -APRCC'S Document .... 403
2. Indian Maoism - Two Shades- Mallikarjun Rao - July 4, 1970. .... 415
3. A Few Words About CPI(ML)- Liberation War, Vol I, No 5, 1971. .... 420
4. Left Trend Among Indian Revolutionaries - AP Revolutionary Communist Committee's Document - Nov, 1970. .... 422
5. Two Deaths - S.Roy - March 20, 1971. .... 495
6. Politics of Nagi Reddy - A Critique of the Immediate Programme- Dec. 1969. .... 497
7. APRCC's Reply to the Criticism on the Immediate Programme- Dec.1969. .... 503

<b>8. An Approach To Naxalbari - Historical Perspective</b>	
- Asit Sen.	.... 518
<b>9. Whither Revolution (Marxism or Terrorism)?</b>	
- Promode Sengupta.- May 1, 1970.	.... 538
<b>10. Naxalbari and After - An Appraisal</b>	
- Prabhat Jana - May 12-19,1973.	.... 616
<b>11. Documents of North Zonal Committee, RCUC(ML) :</b>	
a) Political Draft (Amended Version)	.... 625
b) Organisation Draft	.... 633
c) On Method of Work.	.... 638

## VIII

<b>REVIEWS AND REPORTS OF REVOLUTIONARY MOVEMENTS</b>	.... 663-877
<b>1. Report on the Peasant Movement in the Terai Region</b>	
- Kanu Sanyal - Oct. 24, 1968.	.... 663
<b>2. Build up Broad United Front in Rural Area</b>	
- Krishak Sangram Samiti, Birbhum District - Oct 1970.	.... 678
<b>3. Statement of UPRSF - March 1971</b>	.... 682
<b>4. Birbhum Report - March, 1972.</b>	.... 685
<b>5. Experiences And Lessons of Our Movement in South Orissa-Gananath Patra - April 1975.</b>	.... 699
<b>6. An Analysis of the Debra Peasant Movement- Gunadhar Murmu , Bhabadeb Mandal</b>	.... 736
<b>7. Communist Revolutionary Movement in Kerala</b>	
- Jose Abraham	.... 746
<b>8. A Report of Kondamodalu (EG -AP)Girijan Peasant Movement -Simhadri Subba Reddy -Dec 1970.</b>	.... 750
<b>9. Self Critical Report of the CC,CPI(ML)</b>	
- Satya Narayan Sinha	.... 775
<b>10. Chou En Lai's Talk with Souren Bose- October 1970.</b>	.... 841
<b>11. More About Naxalbari- Kanu Sanyal - April 1973.</b>	.... 861
<b>12. Open Letter of Six Comrades -November 1972.</b>	.... 875

I

**DIFFERENCES AND  
STRUGGLES  
INSIDE THE CPI(M)**

# PRESENT SITUATION AND TASKS

*[A Draft for discussion circulated among the Party members and sympathisers by "THE COMMITTEE FOR STRUGGLE AGAINST REVISIONISM" under the caption FIGHT AGAINST REVISIONISM as Bulletin No. I- E.C.]*

## The Pledge given at the Seventh Congress and the Present Leadership

The Seventh Party Congress was held in Calcutta from Oct. 31st to Nov. 7th in 1964 against the background of the intense ideological struggle against revisionism waged by the members and sympathisers of the Party during 1963. The Congress resolved and pledged to build up the Party as a genuine Marxist Leninist Party and rid party policy and organisation completely of revisionist ideas and practices. But the present leaders of the party are still lying stuck in the mire of revisionist politics; they are violating one of the major conditions of building a genuine Marxist Leninist party by denying inner party democracy and the right of party members to raise questions on different policies and practices and to have inner party discussions on such matters, in this way they are keeping intact the character of the party with revisionist politics. They are refusing to circulate among the general ranks for their opinion any views or statements placed before them for discussion and also to provide any forum for inner party discussions. Further, they are subtly spreading slanders and columnies against those who criticise their views and practices and they are having recourse to expulsion on false charges of comrades with views other than their own. This leadership has thus become a great stumbling block to the development of the Party on Bolshevik lines.

We know-though this is not the subject matter of our discussion -that some comrades have submitted their views on certain matters in the shape of formal documents for inner party discussions, but they are lying bound up in the files in the Secretariat of the West Bengal party. The present leadership is absolutely reluctant to present for serious consideration and analysis before the general body of party members any kind of new ideas and views. The reason is that these leaders are just a fraction of the old leadership in a new garb. The only difference being that they are anti-Dange.

In the past the Dange clique has called us pro-Chinese and by circulating this in public had strengthened the hands of Mr. Nanda, the Union Home Minister

recently in the name of conducting so-called ideological struggle in the public organs of the party the Secretariat of our party in West Bengal has through its mouth-piece -Ashok Mukherjee- very clearly drawn the attention of the Govt., Intelligence Branch and Home Department to a section of the party members.

One of the charges brought by the present leaders against the Dange clique was that the later has seized the party leadership and destroyed inner party democracy. By the irony of history our leaders are also following the same course. Marx said "what is antiquated tries to re-establish itself and maintain its position within in the newly acquired form." (Marx's letter to F.Bolt in 1871-SWs of Marx-Engels, page 291). This is the historic truth about the present leadership of the party. We will show gradually and demonstrate that the present party leadership very cleverly preserving revisionist ideas and practices inside the party even after its reorganisation in the Seventh Party Congress and under the cover of revolutionary phraseology, devoid of the revolutionary essence of Marxism in persevering the party as an extreme left nationalist party. For the present we are inviting the attention of our Comrades to one aspect of the craftiness of those people and asking them to ponder over deeply its significance. We are dealing this because the matter presented in our document is closely connected with this aspect.

The present leadership of the party flourishing with great swagger the programme adopted at the Seventh Congress, making repeated and boastful claim being 'revolutionaries' and trying to keep everybody hypnotised by the pompacity of its claim. The present leaders of our party are repeating the same trick as was resorted to by the former leadership of the Communist Party of the documents of different Party Congresses.

### **The Tradition of Marxist Outlook towards Party Programme**

There can be no two opinions about the great importance of a correct Party Programme. But Marxism never teaches that a Party Programme is a divine something towards which we cannot maintain any kind of critical attitude, our only duty is to stand before it in speechless worship and with bowed head.

*" The elaboration of a common programme for the party should not, ofcourse, put an end to polemics, it will firmly establish those basic views on the character, the aims and tasks of our movement which serve as the banner of fighting party, a party that remains consolidated despite partial differences of opinion among its members on the partial question." (Lenin CWs Vol.4, page.231 )*

Lenin did not hesitate to uphold the same outlook on the Party Programme during the days of revolution of 1905 even after the formulation of the Party Programme of the Russian Social Democratic Party. It said:

*" We have firmly established the Party Programme which is officially recognised by all Social Democrats and the fundamental propositions of which have not given rise to any criticism." ( Lenin, CWs Vol.10, p.31 )*

Lenin is based on the tradition of the outlook towards the Party Programme of Marx-Engels. Marx said:

*" Every step of real movement is more important than dozen programmes." ( Marx-Engels Selected Correspondence, p. 257 )*

Engels said:

*" In general the official Programme of a party is of less importance than what the party does. " ( Letter to Bebel, 1875, p.255)*

Marx and Engels have always laid special emphasis on the importance of the Party Programme; but at the same time they have attached importance on the day to day programme of the party on the attitude towards movement and on what it does in actual practice.

What is the importance of Party Programme in party life? What is the factor of its importance ? On this question, the following observations of Lenin are of great significance:

*" Without Programme a party cannot be an integral political organism capable of pursuing its line whatever turn the events may take; without tactical line based on an appraisal of the current political situation and providing explicit answers to the "vexed problems" of our times, we have circle of theoreticians but not a functioning political entity; without an appraisal of the 'active', current or 'fashionable' ideological and political trends, the programme and tactics may degenerate into dead 'clauses' which can by no stretch of the imagination be put into effect or applied to the thousands of detailed, particular, and highly specific questions of practical activity with the necessary understanding of essentials, with an understanding of 'what is what'. " (CWs Vol. 17, p.280 )*

What was the tradition of the teachings of the great teachers of Marxism Leninism on Party Programme is clear from the extracts quoted above. Equally clear is the difference between this outlook and the outlook of our party leaders. Our leaders regard only their views and thoughts as true and the views and criticisms of others is a crime; they regard discussions on questions of principle as absolutely impermissible; and above all they consider it quite proper to conduct the party through threats and commands. To get just a glimpse of the kind of attitude that our party leaders have, we would ask you to have a look at the product of collective wisdom of the pundits of the West Bengal Secretariat served under the spokespersonship of Ashok Mukherjee... The attitude referred to above has been revealed in that article. We will evaluate later the main source of the capabilities of these people, is evidenced in the 'gems' they have collected from the great treasure-house of Marxism. For the present we want to point out that the attitude of the party leadership that has been expressed in all its writings is that of stepping any discussion of questions which have not been debated and thrashed out inside the party and the fight against the policy of revisionism in the West Bengal party or within themselves on the cunning pretext of fighting the left adventurism.

However, those who do not want to deceive others by false arguments would derive from the quoted extracts of the classical exponents of Marxism the following lessons on party programme:

1. A correct programme is certainly one of the most necessary and indispensable things for a revolutionary party;

2. Marxism has never laid down that once a programme has been formulated, all controversies should and must come to an end; a correct programme will establish basic views on the character, the aim and tasks of the revolutionary movement, it is not crime to have partial differences on partial issues and they are necessary in a live party.

3. While agreeing on these formulations on party programme, it should be remembered that 'every step of real movement is more important than dozen of programmes.'

4. Without a tactical line providing correct answers to the varied questions of our time, the programme may become useless and dead clauses. In this connection it should be clearly remembered that the concept of a tactical line, formulated by the great teachers of Marxism is not that of tactical line, only to day to day or short-term activities or movements. The importance of the tactical line rises from the programme itself. Lenin said, *"there is a range of questions which the programme comes close to or actually one with tactics."* That is to say, this tactical line, the importance of which is derived from the programme, indicated the direction and perspective of the revolutionary movement. But according to the thinking current in our party, this tactical line may serve as the guide line for the entire revolution. For the Communists in 1946-51 there arose the question what should be the path of Indian revolution, Russian or Chinese? Here, the tactical line which is in accordance with the concept taught by the teachers of Marxism lays down this path clearly. Unless the perspective of the movement is clearly kept in view the day to day practical activities will inevitably be bogged down in Marxism terminology known as economics.

It should be recalled here that in the entire history of the Communist Party of India it was only once that such tactical line was formulated. This was done at the time of formulating the Programme in 1951. At that time Com. Stalin helped in the formulation of both the programme and the tactical line with the advice based on his wide international experiences. But the then leadership which included among others many of the present leaders of our party suppressed this tactical line. They did not even make it an agenda for discussion to blunt the revolutionary edge and render it useless.

It should be recalled further that the suppression of this tactical line document and the emergence of revisionism happened almost at the same time. This coincidence is of great significance. The present leaders of our party, who are paralytical in their thinking have not prepared any tactical document corresponding to the programme adopted in the Seventh Congress, because they do not want to face questions of basic principles of the Programme. They have adopted the attitude



of running the party on the basis of their subjective thinking without adopting any clearly defined tactical line; it suits them, therefore, to be vague and confused in every thing. Basically this is the way of revisionism. A further point to be noted in this connection is that the present leadership of the party has postponed the discussion on ideological issues inside the party and has taken a centrist position on the ideological issues of the international communist movement. This attitude is clearly manifested in the resolution on the 'ideological discussions' adopted at the last meeting of the party Central Committee at Tenali on June 12-19. This means that the present leadership is abandoning the basis of its struggle against the Dangeites on ideological questions. This, in fact, is nothing but an attempt to preserve revisionism.

### **The Present Situation and Our Tasks**

Let us now come down to the main issue of our document. We are presenting for discussion by the Comrades our general idea of the present situation, our tasks therein and arising from the discussion of these issues, our general idea of the perspective or path of Indian revolution. This is so fundamental issue. It is indispensable for a revolutionary party to have a clear idea on this issue and a corresponding programme of action.

The recent mass movements are pointing indisputably to the fact our country has stepped into the period of an approaching revolutionary upsurge. The temper of the people is becoming more and more revolutionary every day. Repeated outbursts of massive social unrest are making the atmosphere of the Country surcharged with excitement. The causes behind these outbursts are as numerous as the hitherto unimaginable experience that these causes lead to such explosions. It is also seen that these explosions occur without any fore-thought behind them even an instant the movement of their occurrence, i.e., they are spontaneous. There has been not a single month, so to say, during the current year when there had been no reports in the news papers of clashes between the police and one section or other of the people in some place or other. These outbursts are, ofcourse, of a primary character, but their frequency shows unmistakably that they are stirrings of the approaching tide of revolution.

Moreover, the mass movement during this period reveal the following features :

1. Any movement on partial demand or some particular rights is being confronted with a hard and unflexible attitude from the ruling class. Even for the realisation of simple demands severe struggles are becoming inevitable. On more occasions than not, the movements are being confronted with the organised power of the ruling class.

2. The consciousness of the necessity of struggle against the entire system is developing fast. There is developing though not class consciousness, a feeling of the need for a change among even the backward sections of the masses, a section whose participation in a movement is a measure of its sweep and depth.

3. The tradition of general strike- the traditional weapon of the struggle of the working class for the realisation of their demands for awakening the masses, for uniting them and for drawing them into struggle - is becoming popular.

4. During the time of these united movements of the masses, of the broadening of general democratic movements and especially of hartals and general strikes, there appear hundreds and hundreds of agitators, for they have close links with the masses.

5. Reference has already been made to the act of clashes between the police and the people at the time of movements. A very important feature, which has been noticed during these clashes and conflicts, is the firm determination displayed by the people to carry the movement forward immediately after they have dealt with the brutal attacks of the police, they do not surrender easily. The people also display a great inventiveness in devising varieties of methods of reducing the strength of enemy, while retaliating against police attacks. For mass struggles, this is very significant development. These actions are, ofcourse, of a very primary level, their manifestations are an objective fact. A second feature of importance about these developments is that in many cases the character of a regular civil war is foreshadowed in them. This is markedly seen in the case of West Bengal, where the ruling class in order to oppose the democratic movements on the one hand relied especially on its police and on the other organisations of all kinds of reactionaries of its own class for violence against the people.

In the situation described above, the question is: Will the tremendous social upheaval all over the Country gain gradually increasing momentum become a sweeping tide? The only way to get a clear answer to this question is to study carefully the social contradictions in the present situation and understand the fundamental aspects of these contradictions, the development of which results in creating the objective background for the transformation of the social unrest, already referred to, into a revolutionary tide.

The period after World War II marked an intensification of the contradictions among the imperialist powers within the frame-work of a concentrated and crisis-ridden world capitalism, and of contradictions between the interests of the working class and those of imperialism within the imperialist states. On the other hand, the national liberation movements swept with irresistible force against the imperialist powers. In order to resolve all these contradictions the imperialist powers resorted to a policy of preserving the colonial exploitation and of intensifying it through neo colonialism. In consequence, the contradiction between imperialism and the national liberation movements has been intensified and has become the foremost of the contradictions of the world today.

In the situation of our Country the period 1945-46 was the period of great sharpening of contradictions and clashes between the people and imperialism. In this situation, fearing revolution, the big bourgeoisie ( representing the monopoly and big capital ) of the Country established Congress rule in 1947 on the basis of collaboration with imperialism so as to preserve in tact the interests of imperialism and to exploit jointly with imperialism Indian labour and resources. Since then they have adopted the policy of resolving the contradiction between imperialism and the national liberation movement at the cost of Indian people. The tremendous

increase in tax burden on the Indian people is the outcome of intensified exploitation jointly by imperialism and Indian finance capital and of the attempts to resolve the contradiction at the cost of the Indian people. This is further manifested in the unequal price of agricultural commodities maintained through a permanent blackmarket and inflation. With these contradictions has become connected and is operating the contradictions which arise from not releasing the productive forces in the rural areas through the reform of the feudal land system and changing the land relation in favour of the peasantry. Besides, there is a further contradiction, arising from the unresolved problem of the right of self-determination of nationalities in a multi-national State like India.

In this situation described above the economy of the country reached a phase of tremendous crisis. The Indian ruling class again sought to resolve it in a new way at the cost of the Indian people, engineered the India-China border clash and used it as a pretext for transforming the economy of the country into war-economy. This means that by raising extreme national-chauvinistic slogans, they intensified further the exploitation of the masses.

This re-organisation of the economy towards war-economy created tremendous pressure on the backward economy of India and all the contradictions entered a new level of sharpening. From the time of India-China border conflict the economic and political situation of the country underwent a qualitative transformation. The character of the entire situation become as follows: The conditions of wide sections of the peasantry and the urban poor became intolerable; the workers' burden of exploitation rose to the highest level. There was an extreme deterioration in the living conditions of the middle class wageearners; uncertainty and insecurity in different aspects of social life, crisis in education because of curtailment of expenditure; contradiction of employment opportunities, and chronic and increasing unemployment; and, above all, growing mistrust and hatred among the masses against the government.

Once the character of the situation and the contradictions, mentioned previously, is grasped it becomes easy to see that all those contradictions will become more sharp and carry the social unrest to the level of an upsurge. The objective conditions are growing. This is the main thing.

*"The revolutionary upsurge will inevitably arise".* We are quoting the words used by Mao-Tse-Tung in explaining this idea, *"A Marxist is not fortune-teller of future development and changes. He should and can only point out the general direction. He should do this."* *"My statement that the revolutionary upsurge will arise soon emphatically does not refer to something utterly devoid of significance in section. This means that the revolutionary tide will rise soon"*. This analysis and understanding presents a completely new outlook and the need for a new style of work in regard to entire situation.

But it will not do to think only of the revolutionary tide; we must think also of an organisation pattern suitable to it, because political work and organisational work are inseparably bound up with each other. We are in the peoples democratic stage of revolution not in the socialistic stage. The aim of revolution in the present

stage is to eradicate imperialism, native big and monopoly finance-capital. To reach this objective, our immediate task is to end Congress rule through a real democratic revolution to be brought out by intense mass struggles under the leadership of the working class. The main condition for the establishment of a people's democratic revolution is the firm alliance of the working class and the peasantry. Hence, what is necessary is to arrange and concentrate all our plan of work in keeping with this perspective. To achieve this objective, it is urgently necessary for us to win over as quickly as possible the masses in both urban and rural areas in support of revolution through systematic revolutionary plan of action, not to stage all-India uprisings. But the key to victory in a revolution is the leadership of the proletariat. It is, therefore, our task to establish party bases among workers and in working class organisation, in all the main industrial centres, in transport, postal and telegraph services etc., and also the party's proletarian basis and character, founded on militant and tested worker-cadre. We must also build up powerful working class movements and organisations.

But along with this, we must keep in sight the fundamental aspect of struggles in the urban areas and accelerating the pace of revolution all over the country is to develop the struggles of the peasants for land-which is the real struggle of the peasant masses in the rural areas. We must, therefore, give serious attention to this task. But this does not mean that we should abandon struggles in the urban areas or belittle their role. Again, it would be a fatal mistake to neglect in any way the task of building up real struggles and militant bases by building up broad based peasant organisations, especially, of landless labour, poor baragdars and poor peasants.

We believe that given real class consciousness, it will be difficult for the party in its present state to solve the problems of these two types of organisational work; but to achieve this what is needed is conscious effort, revolutionary enterprise and proper leadership.

While pursuing these two types of organisational work, we must recall afresh the fundamental Marxist approach, which was explained by Lenin in the following manner :

*"Our principal and fundamental task is to facilitate the political development and political organisation of the working class. Those who push this task into the background, who refuse to subordinate all the special tasks and particular methods of struggle are following a false path causing serious harm to the movement."*

Who are those who follow these two false tasks? In pointing them out, Lenin said :

*"And it is being pushed into the background, firstly by those who call upon revolutionaries to deploy only the forces of conspirational circles out of the working class movements in the struggle against the Government. It is being pushed into the background, secondly, by those who restrict the content and scope of*

*political propaganda, agitation and organisation; who think it proper to treat the workers to politics at exceptional moments of life, who too solicitously substitute demands for partial concessions from the autocracy for the political struggle against the autocracy; who do not go to sufficient lengths, that those demands for partial concessions are raised to the status of a systematic, employable struggle of the revolutionary working class party against autocracy.” (CWs Vol.4, p.369)*

### **Emergence of New Element in the Mass Movements in India**

While ceaselessly endeavouring under the inspiration of the ideas -to develop on both sides the organisational and militant programmes, referred to above we should pay serious attention to the new element which is appearing repeatedly like startling flashes of lightning in the scene of the mass movements in India and then is fading out but during its brief period of existence it is galvanising the entire atmosphere of the Country. We have to grasp its significance and its revolutionary potentialities in relation to the plan of action referred to above. This element is a signal to us to get rid off conventional frame-work of thought and action.

The mass movements are marked by clashes between the people and the organised force of the government and, in some cases, are suddenly assuming the character of civil war. These are the features we are speaking of. Revolutionaries with social sense must see the essence of the aspirations of the people which are reflected at the time of these clashes and of the resistance which they spontaneously put up in many cases. There can be no doubt that they are in an embryonic form nothing but the struggle which revolutionaries look forward to and which mark the highest stage of struggle. It is true that the clashes have taken place in the past. But the frequency of these struggles and the way people are acting during them show beyond any doubt that they are qualitatively different from the past struggles. The struggles in the recent period are in an embryonic form struggles which are necessary to bring about a radical transformation of society. It, is therefore, our immediate duty to attend to them and to nurture them in order to ensure the healthy and natural growth of this embryo within the womb of mass movements so that it can attain its fullest development. This development will bring about the people's democratic revolution. Hence, to ignore the task of generalisation of this element will be a deviation from Marxism of the most extreme kind. Without this our movements are bound to remain bogged down in the stage of reformist movements bereft of any revolutionary essence, pay attention to this. In view of this what is required totally is a new outlook, new policy and tactics towards movements, and to create a revolutionary tradition.

### **The Revisionist Party Leadership**

In spite of the aforesaid situation, the present leadership of the Party, while indulging in vociferously in tall talk, is maintaining without the slightest deviation, in real revisionist fashion, the tradition of old outlook and ways of work in respect of movements. They shout, “We will return blow for blow. Remember attacks will

not remain one-sided" etc. But they and place of this new element among the multiple features of mass movements, of making varied and prompt organisational preparations, involving hard labour, for the natural development of this embryo, of studying this phenomenon in the Marxist way, and making the party members conscious about it etc. Yet these are the duties of the leadership.

On the contrary, when such subjects are raised, the present leadership of the party, like the revisionist Dange-clique, dubs these publicly as sectarianism, adventurism etc. and strengthen the hands of the home minister of the government of India because, in their thinking and practices, they also are steeped in revisionism and are reluctant to carry forward the aforesaid new element. They refuse to learn any thing from the character and direction of the national liberation movements in different parts of the world, to take warning from the recent situation in Indonesia and the consequences of the mobilisation of reactionary forces in that country.

Why are we making this accusation? We have already discussed their sectarian, one-sided and revisionist outlook about programme.

We have to remember that revisionism manifests itself in numerous forms. Some times it takes the form of an open demand for revision of Marxism, sometimes, as Lenin said,

*"it is merely a cowardly and furtive renunciation, often defended on the ground of 'practical', mainly only allegedly, practical consideration?"* ( Collected Works of Lenin, Vol 17. pp 398-99 )

In the success of the national liberation movement in China and India Lenin had dreamt of the worldwide triumph of socialism. But India is lagging behind politically in the stage of class-struggle of the most backward kind. What is the cause of this situation? Is it due to any specific element in the Indian situation? Or due to any inherent weakness in the character of the Indian people?

But we do not think so. There is no doubt that the Gandhian philosophy of non-violence influenced Indian politics, but even during the epoch of Gandhism such instances were not rare that prove that the influence of this impotent philosophy of Gandhism could not become all-pervasive. Then what is the cause of this rut? We think that the cause lies in the ideological weakness from which the Communist Party is suffering from the hour of its birth. In the history of this ideological weakness within the party have remained the roots of this revisionism. This weakness had and still has main subject of our discussion is as follows.

Marx said:

*" Force is the midwife of the old society pregnant with the new "*.

This statement of principle is one of the fundamental principles of Marxism. Revisionism was born out of the attempt to abolish this principle and render it useless.

Of course, the principle has been stated very plainly. It is the duty of the Communists to give it life and to define it clearly. This cannot be done without giving definite answers to the following questions:

At what definite stage of the Communist movement, shall the party attend to the cultivation of this force? What should be the way to achieve it? The creators of Marxism and various experiences of international communist movement have given the answer to this question and indicated one of the duties of party.

In the chapter entitled 'party and military education: of Anti-Duhring Engels wrote:

*"In considering the struggle for existence and Duhring's declaration against struggle and arms it should be emphasised that a revolutionary party must know how to struggle. It will have to make revolution, possibly some day in near future.... to safeguard the laws issued by the bourgeoisie itself the Party may be compelled to take revolutionary measure against the bourgeoisie state which will supersede the present state. Hence, the universal conscription of our time should be taken advantage of by all to learn how to fight, but particularly by those whose education entitled them to acquire the training of an officer in one year' voluntary service" ( Anti- Duhring, Foreign Language Publishing House, pp 485 -6 ).*

Elsewhere Engels has said:

*"From the very moment a party will stand up on its own legs, it will be most necessary for the party to pay its attention to this work."*

Thus from one of the founders of Marxism we have got the answer to one of the two questions regarding the time and way for devoting attention to the work of acquisition of force: (1) From the moment of the party shall stand upon its own legs, it shall attend to the work of acquisition of force; (2) Hence, the party shall take full advantage of even the opportunities given by the existing state administration.

Let us now consult international experience.

The Bolshevik party in Russia was founded in 1903. We find the Bolshevik party advancing from the very moment of its foundation to set up party nucleus in the army and the Navy. During the entire period of the Russian revolution, through all its sharp vicissitudes, the party leadership used to maintain regular contact with the aforesaid party nucleus and took great care to develop it. Besides, the party also taught how to make bold use of the flexible policy of struggle on the one hand and revolutionary fraternisation on the other in the midst of clashes in course of mass movements. The Chinese experience shows that the party had to attend to the building up of its own Army due to specific condition in the development of the revolution in the country and the party, under the leadership of Mao Tse-tung further developed Lenin's theory of people's militia and people's war and set up the example of building its own strength through the policy of people's War. If we study the character and direction of the national liberation movements after World War II, we will realise that it is absolutely necessary for a revolutionary force to build up its own force. We become further convinced what is its necessity when we look at the instances of mobilisation of reactionary forces through military dictatorship.



But what does our Party history reflect? This important matter is outside the Party's thinking. Our Party has never assumed - as a real Bolshevik party should have - any duty and responsibility in this matter; for the Party has always been running itself like a bourgeois Party. But by Engel's touchstone we have long been acquired the status of a party which can stand upon its own legs. The glamour of being the second biggest Party has been ours for a long time; we have penetrated into many sections of society. But we have kept our eyes shut towards this important matter, though opportunities for expansion of work have appeared before the Party at different times. Our Party has systematically avoided the task of acquiring the revolutionary essence of Marxism. This serious weakness has remained along with various ideological weaknesses. In the present situation it is criminal not to attend to the duty of removing this weakness. But the party leadership is still avoiding this duty on the pretext of the backward level of mass consciousness, special characteristics of the country and of 'practicability', because of the trend of their political thinking is in the opposite direction i.e., steeped in revisionism.

We have already pointed out that this statement is not a call for an immediate, country-wide insurrection-the attempt to provoke premature insurrection is the height of stupidity.

Now our question is what the proper method of work should be in order to raise the Party's style to the revolutionary level and so that we can enter the revolutionary stage of the Indian democratic movement. What method should we adopt to facilitate and extend-all over the country - the revolutionary tide the murmur of which can be undoubtedly heard? About this, we can say in general that we should organise mass struggles and campaigns on popular grievances and political issues and extend them further. What is further required in order to give support to and extend movements is organisation and more organisation.

There is, ofcourse, nothing new about this statement. The question is, what kind of organisation? What should be the method of work in the organisation? What perspective for advance inspires it? There is no doubt about our duty to build up the organisation (party), trade unions, kisan sabhas and other mass organisations. But we should kindle into the party organisation and organisations under our exclusive control the consciousness that they should be fit to carry the struggle for the seizure and retention of power, i.e., an organisation for revolution when the situation calls for it.

The problem of perspective for the Indian revolution comes before us fully when we have to consider the question of seizure of power. We have already said that this statement of ours is not a call for the seizure of power at centre at one blow through Country wide insurrection; because that is not the perspective for the Indian revolution. The Indian revolution will not be a brief affair. It will be a very severe and protracted revolution. This perspective arises from the character of the revolution in the present stage. In the present age the revolution will never assume the character of the government and state power on the one hand and the people on the other. Instead, it will assume the character of struggle between two

sections (i.e., -progress and reaction) of the people, of civil war. For, in the course of advance of revolution, the people belonging to the ruling classes and all kinds of reactionary elements will gather inevitably behind the government and the state machinery. Before the seizure of power there will occur big clashes and comparatively long intervals and in between the big clashes there will inevitably nurebous clashes of comparatively small scale. The party should make not only adequate preparations for such big clashes but also be capable of participating in the small clashes. The party should organise itself capable not only of taking part in these clashes but also of leading them, as a party capable of taking part in a war. The party should advance from defensive to determined offensive. The party should be organised so that it can become a party capable of seizing power even during small clashes and of making requisite arrangements for the extention of power. Such clashes may break out in both towns and villages; but in both cases the aim should be to extend it to the rural areas. The period of retention of power may be brief and the power may pass into the hands of the enemy. But such tactics should be adopted and will inevitably create such incidents through out the country, deal mortal blows at the nerves of the enemy, establish and deepen a new tradition of revolutionary struggles. Without a revolutionary tradition no big revolutionary struggle can ever develop. What should be the mode of building up the strength for this will be available from the usual activities of state administration. A cleverly thought out attitude towards this must be adopted. And the countless new militants; reference to whom has been made before, who will appear in course of different struggles will have to be consolidated, to be educated politically and by creating small local clashes, necessary strength for entering the stage of revolution is to be built up. Solution of this problem of building up strength will come through.

We want to make it clear again that we are discussing here the general perspective and direction of the Indian revolution. We are not giving a call for any special kind of action. Only workers and Party organisations having active connections with popular movements in different parts of the country are fit to decide in a particular objective situation the place and time for special action. The outlook referred to in the programme of action implies active efforts to initiate this action and along with this knowledge of the tactics of revolutionary people's war.

### **The Role of Parliamentary Work**

What should be the place and role of parliamentary work in the political and organisational programme of action, which we have been discussing so long?

We should not forget for a single moment that the bourgeois democratic state structure, which the bourgeoisie calls 'republican democratic' despite the recognition of the right of universal franchise, is in its essence and can be nothing but the dictatorship of capital. *Lenin* has said, "*The more highly (bourgeois) democracy is developed, the more the bourgeois parliaments are subjected by the stock exchange and the bankers*" (*Proletarian Revolution and Renegade Kautsky*). It is, therefore, madness to think that the dictatorship of capital could be abolished

through votes in a state structure, the essence of which is the dictatorship of capital and the people's distress could be promptly eradicated under bourgeois administration through election and parliament. To create such illusion among the masses is for a Marxist nothing short of betrayal; that is to say politics based solely on Parliamentarism is the opposite of Marxist politics. Lenin has said that Communist will not remain in parliament just for the sake of being '*an opposition party*' ... *which is abandoning the task of making preparations for the democratic revolution.* ( *Lenin, Left-wing Communism - An infantile Disorder* ) On another occasion, while greeting the Indian, French and German Communists, *Lenin* said, "*only scoundrels or simpletons can think that the proletariat must win the majority in elections carried out under the yoke of the bourgeoisie, under the yoke of wage slavery and that only after this it must win power. This is the height of foolishness or hypocrisy it is substituting voting under the old system and with the old power for class struggle and revolution*". ( '*Contemporary Problems of Leninism*' - "*More on Togliatti*" )

Parliamentary work, therefore, is for Communists, not a goal in itself, it is auxiliary to the work of revolution in different situations, the main aim being organisation of a revolution. The tactics and outlook of Communist politics should be to employ the parliamentary work for the purpose of revolution. Hence, participation in parliament elections, etc., depends on different objective situations, stage of movement and class struggle, the level of consciousness of the militant classes and the general masses. No straight ( 'Yes' or 'No' ) answer is possible to it. At different stages of the Russian revolution Lenin gave the slogan, sometimes, of boycotting the Duma, sometimes, of participation in it. The main consideration was whether by boycotting the Duma or by participating in it, the cause of the revolution was being furthered in reference to the objective situation. Examined from both these angles, it appears that the leadership of the Communist Party of India has for long years been running the party along the path of parliamentary opportunism. The present leadership of the party is also pursuing the same political line though they are using apparently revolutionary language. It is difficult task to eradicate the tradition of parliamentary opportunism which has struck deep roots inside different sections of the leadership and restore Communist tradition and outlook. An opportunist coterie seekers of seats in parliament and the Assembly has firmly entrenched itself in the party and as a very strong group is influencing the party in numerous ways. The Party leadership is nursing these people, because the roots of this kind of politics and outlook are there inside the Party leadership. The manifestation of this politics and outlook is seen in the political slogans like 'government of democratic unity'. The Kerala way ( after the formation of our government there). "alternative govt," etc., and activities corresponding to these slogans.

The question arises whether we should boycott the parliament and the elections under the present situation or, as our leadership poses it, since the masses want

elections, we should take part in them. To view this problem or present it in this manner is against Communist method of analysis. The points that should be really considered are: (a) What is the direction, character and state of Indian Parliament and Democracy? (b) What is the form and character of the mass movements and what is the attitude of the masses; and (c) in what direction is the revolution moving?

The Indian parliament and democracy, it can be said, is an expanded addition of what was introduced by British Imperialism. The Indian Constitution and the division of powers to persuade the masses to boycott the election, if conscious efforts were made to bring to its natural culmination the form which the mass movements displayed in different states, especially in West Bengal, and to raise the movements to a higher stage. But without making any attempts towards this the movement was terminated- under the slogan of a bigger movement- in the 48-hour strike and hartal and now that the elections are due all thinking has been concentrated on pretext of the election mindedness of the people. This is dangerous opportunism. The real thing is the bankruptcy of our present leadership, which is blind to or refuses to see the new content of the mass movements in the contemporary period, and as a result the entire outlook of the party leadership has got election-oriented and its political tactics have been reduced to election tactics. Our main tasks to enrich this new character of the mass movement and to make organisational and agitational preparations for this purpose. The elections should be made complimentary to this aim. Ours is the main responsibility to present fundamental issues and matters among the masses. We have to alert the people about the attacks of power- reaction in the days after the election and to make them conscious about the need for making necessary preparations to counter them. The present leadership of the party is once again keeping the larger section of the men in charge of the highest bodies in the party bogged down to parliamentary and Assembly politics and is strengthening the organisational structure of the party in keeping with this attitude. This is the natural culmination of their political thinking and outlook. So whenever any one opposes their policy and programme of action, he is dubbed as adventurist; sectarian, etc., hence there has arisen the conflict of principles within the party.

We believe that the application in practice of the political and organisational programme we have discussed in this document will lead to the successful realisation of the "new democratic revolution". All party members and sympathisers should go forward with enterprise, to accomplish this aim within it have maintained the main character of the constitutions introduced and proposed by British imperialism. Moreover, out of the fear of the mass movements the present ruling classes have in numerous ways restricted the constitutional rights of the citizens and reduced to a mockery the democracy, by naked terrorism. Further, in the matter of practical politics the policy of the government is in many ways dependent on the diplomacy of imperialism. Its dependence on American imperialism is more manifest at present. Hence, economic crisis created by the bourgeois rule, deepens further will democracy and the democratic setup collapses. In the period after

World War II, the colonial bourgeoisie abandoned the path or struggle. This was the inevitable outcome of the compromise they had made with imperialism to come to power. Besides, bourgeois democracy can no longer flourish as it did in the 19th Century. So, in connection with the elections we should pay special attention to this effect and it should also be marked that from their experience of the way parliament, assembly, etc., have functioned and run for the last 20 years under Congress rule, the illusion of the masses for the said institutions has worn off comparatively. Class war is the best weapon to complete the disillusionment of the masses. Hence it is the sacred duty for every Communist to sharpen class war and to raise it from the economic to political stage; for the Communists are the most conscious vanguards of the working class. Communists never tail behind the masses. Standing in the vanguard of the people they constantly endeavour to raise the political consciousness of the people to higher and higher level. So, to remain bogged down at the level of mass consciousness on the pretext that the masses are thinking in this line, instead of actively carrying forward the struggle is nothing but opposition to Marxism.

We have discussed above the mass movements in India and the direction of the Indian revolution. The entire matter for the serious consideration whether the present elections would actually have been held or whether it would have been possible. We know the present leadership of the party will attack us, brand us with various labels and resort to slanders against us. But we know that many 'famous' and 'formidable' Marxists have fled from the arena of Marxism under the blows of ideological war. Hence, we have faith that the revisionism within our present party and the leadership which is its agent and continuator will be judged by history, exposed in all its nakedness and discarded by revolutionary Marxist. The party members and sympathisers today are faced with the struggle needed for this.

### **Our Obligations and Tasks**

Hence in the present period it is our obligation and task;

- 1) To study with due emphasis the new features of the democratic movement and the militant trend of the people's struggles, adopt new tactic of struggle and to set up appropriate organisations for this purpose.
- 2) To remove the revisionist leadership and to replace it by revolutionary leadership; to put leaders, tested in movements, at different levels of party organisation.
- 3) To root out bureaucratism from party organisation, to extend the scope of discussion and debate on party policy and tactics and there-by to revive Bolshevik life within the party.
- 4) To rid the party of illusions of parliamentary politics. To carry on systematic campaign and to make efforts through mass movements to achieve this aim.
- 5) To introduce bold tactics of struggle in working class and peasant movements.

6) To attach special emphasis on the mobilisation of strength in the rural areas.

7) To take initiative to act up organisations in important places and enterprises.

8) To take appropriate steps for struggle against reaction and to make organisational arrangements for that purpose.

9) To adopt a firm attitude towards international revisionism and reinforce the struggle against revisionism on both national and international levels.

Above all it is necessary to consolidate politically the militant trend of the grievances among different sections of party members and sympathisers against the present policy, tactics and outlook of the Party leadership. The necessity of presenting collective instead of scattered statements and acting collectively has arisen now. It is urgent for all party members and sympathisers to transform only into a real Bolshevik -Party. We present this document for general discussion with the hope that it will facilitate the process.

25-12-1966.

With Greetings.  
**The Committee For Struggle  
Against Revisionism.(WB)**



# ON THE IDEOLOGICAL ISSUES IN THE INTERNATIONAL COMMUNIST MOVEMENT

D.VENKATESWARA RAO

*[In 1967, the APSC of CPI(M) rejected (by majority) the document of CC (popularly known as Madhurai document) on the Ideological questions concerning the International Communist Movement. It requested the CC for permission to submit an alternative document and also demanded the opportunity to express views on the questions of debate in both committees when a comrade happens to be a member of two committees. D.Venkateswara Rao, the CCM has sent his alternative document ( which is published here) to the CC with a demand to circulate the same among the party members as part of inner-party debate on Ideological Questions. CC rejected this demand and imposed the condition that he must not express his views down below. The AP State Plenum has adopted this document together with two other documents critical of neo revisionist ideological positions by an overwhelming majority. This document was presented and widely circulated in the Burdwan Central Plenum by the comrades opposed to the official document of the C.C.-EC.]*

We, the Communists in India, had to conduct a series of inner party struggles against revisionism of the right opportunist leadership on a number of ideological, political questions, relating to Indian revolution.

This leadership tried from 1953 onwards to take the Indian Communist Movement into right opportunist channels. After the Second Five Year Plan, with its promise of the so-called Public Sector, building of an independent economy, and its readiness to take economic aid from the Socialist camp, the revisionist leadership tried to make the Indian Communist Movement support the economic and political policies of the Nehru Government, both nationally and internationally.

True, Communists basing themselves on their own experience applying Marxism-Leninism to the Indian conditions, tried to resist the right opportunist policies of this leadership.

From the 20th Congress of the CPSU in 1956, taking inspiration from the new revisionist theoretical propositions put forward by the present leadership, the revisionist leadership tried more doggedly to impose their right opportunist policy on the Communist Party.

They were greatly aided in this effort by the attitude of the revisionist leadership of the CPSU. The CPSU leadership openly and completely supported the reactionary policies of the Nehru Government and helped in the consolidation of the Dange clique at their collaborationist line.

The glorious CPC took up an open ideological battle against modern revisionism represented by the CPSU leadership. In the process of this great debate against revisionism, ideological, programme and tactical methods being adopted by various parties in the world were exposed as anti-Marxist. It came out sharply against the collaborationist policies of the revisionist leadership of our party. On the basis of Marxism-Leninism, it openly came out to debunk the revisionist characterisation of the Indian Government and its policies. It pointed out the reactionary class character and the reactionary policies of the Nehru Government, both internally and externally, and mercilessly exposed the right opportunist policy of the Dange Clique.

This international debate against modern revisionism represented by the CPSU leadership and the surrender policy of the Dange clique, further opened the eyes of our party members as to the danger of modern revisionism and helped totally the majority of our Party members against the class collaboration policies of the Dange clique.

Finally our seventh Party Congress adopted the Party programme and political organisational report and its own constitution.

This Congress laid the basis for our break with revisionism of the Dange clique and it is the beginning of the consolidation of our party.

Yet we have to conduct patient and dispassionate discussions inside our Party to further improve our Party Programme, to evolve a correct tactical line for the accomplishment of the Indian revolution, for the proper understanding of the various issues dividing the international communist movement. Such patient discussions, based on our own experience, based on the experience of the world events, alone will lead to the complete ideological and political unification of our Party at all levels.

Our own experience has demonstratively proved that the main danger to the international communist movement comes from modern revisionism.

An irreconcilable ideological fight against modern revisionism alone will help the further advance of the world communist movement both nationally and internationally.

The history of the world communist movement simply proves that whenever the class struggle between the proletariat and the bourgeoisie gets fiercer, this class struggle is reflected in the ranks of the world communist movement in the form of the struggle of Marxism - Leninism against revisionism and opportunism.



Each time the struggle against revisionism and opportunism carried the international working class movement forward to a new and higher stage.

Today also the world communist movement is facing a similar situation.

### **New Epoch**

With the successful completion of the Chinese People's Revolution a formidable socialist camp has come into existence and a new epoch of all-round people's struggles against decaying imperialism are unfolding throughout the world.

This is a new epoch—an epoch of transition from capitalism to socialism, an epoch when the international socialist system is becoming the decisive factor determining the course of world development, an epoch of national liberation and socialist revolution, an epoch of rapid decay and disintegration of colonialism.

But imperialism has not given up the battle for the preservation of the imperialist system.

Imperialist powers headed by American imperialism are conducting last ditch battles to drown the revolutionary struggles in blood and thus save the imperialist system from its inevitable doom.

It is significant to note that, when the imperialist system is on the verge of complete collapse, when the world socialist forces are on the verge of complete success, when the forces are on the verge of complete success, when the forces of the international working class movement are conducting titanic class struggles against the dying forces of capitalism, modern revisionism advocated and practiced by the present leadership of C P S U, has raised its ugly head within the ranks of the international working class movement, to abolish Marxism-Leninism at one stroke, to disrupt the revolutionary movement, to liquidate the revolutionary struggles of the oppressed peoples and nations and thus save the imperialists and the reactionaries of the various countries from their final doom.

The CPSU leadership, while paying lip-service to the new epoch is deliberately defining the new epoch as an epoch of peaceful transition to socialism and giving peaceful solutions to all the fundamental contradictions of the times.

In the name of the 'peaceful' nature of the present epoch, the C P S U leadership and modern revisionists are advocating the grossest class collaborationist theories on a number of questions facing the world communist movement today.

The fundamental contradiction of our epoch, the place and role of the national liberation movements, the concept of peaceful coexistence of states with different social systems, the forms of transition to socialism, the assessment of the role of Stalin, the substitution of the concept of People's State and a Party of the whole people in place of the dictatorship of the proletariat and the party of the working class in the Soviet Union, the introduction of a host of measures which objectively help in the restoration of capitalism in the socialist society.

The consolidation and further rapid advance of the world communist movement to accomplish the tasks of the new epoch is inconceivable without

waging a principled and determined fight against this menace of modern revisionism as advocated and practiced by the present C P S U leadership.

We must analyse the class collaborationist theories of the present revisionist leadership of the C P S U on various questions facing the international communist movement, their pernicious manifestations in practice, and fight the treacherous betrayal of revolutionary class struggles by the present C P S U leadership and modern revisionists.

Such an irreconcilable ideological political struggle against modern revisionism represented by the C P S U leadership alone will help in the international consolidation of all true communists on the basis of Marxism-Leninism, on the basis of revolutionary class struggles.

### **On Contradictions**

History of society is the history of class struggles. Struggles between the various contradictions is the moving force of history.

A study of the concrete class analysis of world politics and economics as a whole, and of actual analysis of world conditions, that is to say, of the fundamental contradictions of the present epoch is absolutely necessary to determine the general direction of the world communist movement.

The fundamental contradictions of the contemporary world are:

- the contradiction between the socialist camp and the imperialist camp,
- the contradiction between the proletariat and the bourgeoisie in the capitalist countries;
- the contradiction between the oppressed nations and imperialism;
- the contradictions among the imperialist countries and among monopoly capitalist groups.

We must note that the basic contradiction of the present epoch is the contradiction between the socialist camp and the imperialist camp.

These contradictions and the struggles to which they give rise are inter related and influence each other.

In spite of the basic contradiction of an epoch, the fundamental contradictions operate in such a way as to influence each other, interact upon each other, and in course of this, push forward one or the other fundamental contradiction to the forefront for solution.

Analysing the class contradictions in the epoch of imperialism, Lenin, while holding the contradiction between the world bourgeoisie and the world proletariat as the basic contradiction of the epoch, clearly pointed out the contradiction of the imperialist groups for the division of the world was the fundamental contradiction at that time, and that Russia was the focus of all the fundamental contradictions.

As predicted by Lenin, the inter-imperialist contradiction led to the First World War of 1914 and which in turn led to the victory of the socialist revolution in Russia, to the establishment of First Socialist State.

Between the two world wars, Stalin and the international communist movement, while holding the contradiction between the socialist state and the

imperialist states as the basic contradiction, still pointed out that the inter-imperialist contradiction was the fundamental contradiction of the time, was the driving force of history; Stalin successfully utilised these inter-imperialist contradictions for the successful construction of socialism in the Soviet Union, for the successful defence of the Soviet Union against Hitler's fascism.

As predicted by Stalin these inter-imperialist contradictions led to the Second World War, which in turn led to the establishment of a formidable socialist system in place of a single socialist state.

With the establishment of the People's Republic of China, with the establishment of a powerful socialist camp, with the enormous growth of worldwide communist movement, with the rapid disintegration of the colonial system, with the deepening of the general crisis of capitalism which has reached the third and final stage, with the sharpening of the inter-imperialist contradictions, a veritable storm of national liberation struggles is taking place in the continents of Asia, Africa and Latin America.

These national liberation struggles, are bursting in country after country, taking to the course of armed struggle, inspite of the bloody counter-revolutionary force let loose by the imperialists.

That is why Marxist -Leninists hold that the fundamental contradiction between the oppressed people and nations of Asia, Africa and Latin America and imperialism has come to the forefront for an immediate solution.

At the present time, gigantic class battles are being waged in this area which will decide the future of the whole world.

Under the influence of the basic contradiction itself, the contradiction between the oppressed nations of Asia, Africa and Latin America is the fundamental contradiction of this epoch, and the various types of contradictions in the contemporary world are concentrated in these vast areas. At the present time, these are the most vulnerable areas under imperialist rule and the storm centers of world revolution dealing direct blows at imperialism. That is why Marxist - Leninists hold that the *'whole cause of the world revolution hinges on the outcome of the revolutionary struggles of the people of these areas, who constitute the overwhelming majority of the world's population.'*

It is the duty of the whole socialist camp, the international working class movement to do everything for the success of these national liberation struggles, for the final destruction of imperialism, for the final success of the world socialist revolution.

Modern revisionists and the leaders of CPSU have rejected this Marxist - Leninist analysis of the contradictions of the present epoch. They are dogmatically asserting that basic contradiction between socialism and imperialism is almost the only contradiction which determines the course of world development, while the other fundamental contradictions play a very minor role in the development of world history.

With their anti-Marxist understanding of the present epoch as an epoch of peaceful transition to socialism, the revisionist leadership of C P S U is propagating

the view that the basic contradiction between the socialist camp and the imperialist camp can be resolved peacefully through peaceful economic competition and that a peaceful resolution of the basic contradiction will lead to a peaceful resolution of all the other fundamental contradictions of the epoch.

According to the CPSU revisionist leadership, peaceful coexistence, peaceful economic competition, peaceful transition to socialism are a panacea for the resolution of all the fundamental contradictions of the present epoch.

This is nothing but negation of all revolutions-negation of proletarian revolutions in capitalist countries and negation of national liberation revolutions of the oppressed people.

This is against the understanding of Marxist -Leninists who hold that the contradiction between the socialist camp and the imperialist camp is resolved through world socialist revolutions the contradiction between colonialism and anti-colonialism is resolved through national liberation revolutions, the contradiction between the proletariat and the bourgeoisie of various countries through socialist revolutions.

Another controversy between Marxist - Leninists and modern revisionists presented by the CPSU leadership on the issue of contradictions manifests self on the role of the inter-imperialist contradictions in the present epoch.

U.S. imperialism, the strongest of the imperialist powers, after the second world war, has stepped into the shoes of the defeated fascist powers, and is trying to erect a huge world empire such as has never been known before. The strategic objectives of U.S. imperialism have been to enslave and dominate the intermediate zone lying between the United States and the Socialist camp, to put down the revolutions of the oppressed people and nations and to proceed to destroy the Socialist countries and thus subject all the people and countries of the world, including its allies, to domination and enslavement by U.S. monopoly capital.

The other imperialist powers are forced, in their own selfish interests, to resist this domination and enslavement by U.S. monopoly capital.

France is challenging the American leadership in Europe, Germany and Japan have entered the field of economic competition with American imperialism and Anglo-American contradictions are continuing in various spheres.

Thus the world capitalist system is rent with insoluble inter-imperialist contradictions which still further facilitate the growth of the National Liberation struggles.

People's Republic of China has been utilising these inter-imperialist contradictions, has been developing economic and political relations with other imperialist powers, and with countries like Pakistan, to break its isolation sought to be imposed by U.S. imperialism and in turn isolate the U.S. imperialism itself.

These efforts of P. R. C. have helped France to resist American domination in Europe and have helped Pakistan to resist American pressures.

The revisionist leadership of CPSU viciously attacks this approach of People's Republic of China as an attempt on its part to unite with imperialist powers against the socialist countries.

The C P S U leadership questioned in particular the relationship of P. R. C. with France and Pakistan.

But life disproved the false accusation of the C P S U leadership. It has to eat its own words and today we see its special efforts to cultivate friendship with France and Pakistan for its own ulterior objectives.

The anti-imperialist revolutionary struggle of the people in Asia, Africa, Latin America is definitely not merely a matter of regional significance, but one of overall importance for the whole cause of proletarian world revolution.

Contrary to this, the understanding of C P S U on the issue of the fundamental contradictions of the present epoch is an effort to cover up the growing contradiction between the oppressed nations and imperialism and to negate the decisive role of the national liberation struggles in deciding the success of the world socialist revolution. This understanding serves the interests of imperialism in the present-day world.

### **National Liberation Movements**

Lenin said:

*"National wars waged by colonial and semi-colonial countries are not only possible but inevitable in the epoch of imperialism. The colonies, semi-colonies have a population of nearly one billion, i.e., more than half the population of the earth. In these countries the movements for national liberation are either very strong already or are growing and maturing. Every war is continuation of policies by other means. The national liberation policies of the colonies will inevitably be continued by national wars of the colonies against imperialism."*

How truly the post-Second World War history has testified to the correctness of this Lenin's prophecy.

While revolutions in the colonies and semi-colonies suffered serious setbacks after World War I owing to the suppression by imperialism and its lackeys, the situation after World War II is fundamentally different.

The victory of the Chinese People's revolutionary war breached the imperialist front in the East, brought a great change in the world balance of forces, and accelerated the revolutionary movement among the people of all countries. From then on the national liberation movement in Asia, Africa, and Latin America entered a new historical period. China, North Korea, North Vietnam, Cuba have taken to the road of socialism.

The imperialists are no longer able to extinguish the prairie fire of national liberation. This old colonial system is fast disintegrating. Their rear has become a front of raging, anti-imperialist struggles. Imperialist rule has been overthrown in many colonial and dependent countries and in others it has suffered heavy blows and is tottering. This inevitably weakens and shakes the rule of imperialism in the metropolitan countries themselves.

But the imperialist powers have not given up the battle for the preservation of the colonial order. They are more and more taking to the methods of neo-colonialism to save their imperialist structure.

American imperialism, the strongest imperialist power, striving for world domination, taking upon itself the responsibility for the preservation of the imperialist order, has created a huge war machine, has established more than 2,000 military bases throughout the world, has concentrated half of its military strength armed with atomic weapons in these military bases, has stationed its 6th and 7th Fleet in the Mediterranean and Pacific Oceans -has created reactionary military pacts like SEATO, CENTO-all with the intention of suppression of rising national liberation struggles. It is provoking civil wars, or setting up puppet governments in many colonial countries for the suppression of these struggles. Through its economic aid, American imperialism is penetrating many independent countries and trying to get them under its control.

Thus American imperialism has become the main prop of the imperialist system and is conducting ferocious, last ditch battles to save the crumbling imperialist system of exploitation.

Because of this, the national liberation struggles in all the backward countries have not only to fight the local counter revolutionary forces, but also the armed might of the old and neo-imperialist powers, in particular, the military might of American imperialism, in order to achieve victory in the liberation struggles.

Faced with the armed might of the American imperialism and other imperialist powers, faced with armed counter revolution, the national liberation struggles in Asia, Africa, Latin America are taking more and more to the methods of People's War taking the inspiration from the experience of the Chinese Revolution.

Marxist-Leninists in these countries are faced with the tasks of building broad United National Front, or People's Democratic Front, as the case may be, under the leadership of the working class and with the worker-peasant alliance as the axis of the Front. They are faced with the urgent task of heading these national liberation struggles against old and new imperialist powers and their lackeys. They are faced with the urgent task of organising and leading armed people's war against armed counter-revolution. Marxist - Leninists are valiantly struggling and making great sacrifices in the discharge of these arduous tasks.

Lenin has enjoined upon the international working class movement to lend resolute support to the national liberation struggles for the final burial of imperialism.

He has especially enjoined upon the socialist states to act as the base of the world socialist revolution, and support the national liberation struggles through all means. He said:

*"If we do not want to betray socialism every rebellion against our main enemy, the bourgeoisie of the big states, should be supported, provided it is not the rebellion of a reactionary class. By refusing to support rebellions of annexed territories we objectively become*

*annexationists. Precisely 'in the era of imperialism', which is the era of incipient social revolution, the proletariat makes special efforts to support the rebellion of annexed territories today, in order that tomorrow, or simultaneously with the rebellion, it may attack the bourgeoisie of the 'Great' power which is weakened by that rebellion."*

People's republic of China has taken this behest of Lenin, and acting as the base of the world revolution, is giving every support-ideological, economic, political, diplomatic and military, to the national liberation struggles. It is in the forefront of the struggle against wars of aggression against oppressed nations let loose by U.S. imperialism.

The storm of people's revolution in Asia, Africa and Latin America requires every political force in the world to take a stand.

An important line of demarcation between the Marxist - Leninists and modern Revisionists including the revisionist leadership of CPSU is the attitude taken towards this extremely sharp issue of contemporary world politics.

Marxist - Leninists, firmly adhering to the behests of Lenin, are actively supporting, organising and leading the national liberation struggles. But modern Revisionists, the revisionist leaders of the CPSU, through a host of revisionist theories and practices, while pretending to support the national liberation struggles are, in actual practice, discouraging, disarming and disrupting the national liberation struggles and thus facilitating the imperialist oppression against oppressed nations and objectively helping in the bloody suppression of the national liberation struggles by imperialism.

An analysis of the various theories of the revisionist leadership of CPSU on imperialism and the task of the national liberation struggle will be sufficient to prove this fact.

The CPSU leadership says that imperialism is already a dead force, and the majority of the world population is already out of the grip of imperialism, that 'mere fragments remain of what were once vast empires', that 'today less than one per cent remain under it.'

This understanding of imperialism is a complete negation of historical facts.

Imperialism has no doubt changed from direct to indirect rule. Many countries have declared their independence. But many of the countries have not completely shaken off imperialism and colonial control and enslavement and remain objects of imperialist plunder and aggression as well as areas of contention between the old and new colonialists and in others the old colonialism is being replaced by the new, powerful, and more dangerous U.S. colonialism. The people of Asia, Africa, Latin America are seriously menaced by the tentacles of neo-colonialism, represented by U.S. imperialism.

Thus, the new theory of the CPSU leadership is only a cover for the neo-colonialist aggressions of the imperialists, the American imperialists in particular, against the national liberation struggles.

The present leaders of the CPSU propagate the view that the overwhelming majority of the oppressed nations, having gained political independence, are faced with economic reconstruction, the economic struggle being 'the central task, the basic link in the further development of the revolution.'

This is an utter anti-Marxist view of the existing situation in all backward countries that have declared their independence. The primary and most urgent task facing those countries is still the further development of the struggle against imperialism, old and new, and their lackeys. This struggle is still being waged fiercely in the political, economic, military, cultural ideological and other spheres.

This new theory of the CPSU leadership is only an attempt on the part of the C P S U leadership to divert the people of these countries from their struggles against imperialism.

The leaders of CPSU hold the view that the governments of the newly independent countries are revolutionary, anti-imperialist and anti-war; that these governments are introducing basic social reforms and are taking the path of non capitalist path of development.

This again is another travesty of truth. Many of these newly independent countries have collaborationist bourgeois landlord governments who try to build their economy in collaboration with imperialism. The experience of India is in complete refutation of this theory of the C P S U leadership.

This theory of the CPSU leaders is merely an attempt on their part to buttress reactionary governments in those countries, to create illusions in the labouring masses of these countries about the reactionary bourgeoisie of these countries and thus disrupt their revolutionary struggles.

CPSU leaders extol the bourgeois leaders of the newly independent countries as having socialist views. Suslov says:

*"Capitalism has discredited itself in the eyes of the people and the appeal of socialism in the newly free countries is so strong, that the advanced forces, and the national leaders of many countries advocate taking the socialist path, and are actually taking steps in this direction, counting with good reason on the support from the socialist countries and the Marxist- Leninist parties."*

Only those who have discarded Marxism - Leninism completely, and have embraced bourgeois ideology could praise the bourgeois leaders like Nehru having socialist views.

Having characterised the bourgeois leaders as revolutionary democratic who 'can act as the key factor of social progress' the revisionist leaders of C P S U advocate 'unity and fraternal co-operation between the Communists and revolutionary democrats in the interests of the people, in the interests of national liberation struggle', and that the 'ideological differences is no obstacle to joint participation of the Communists and revolutionary democrats in the practical implementation of the programme of social progress, in a joint struggle for the socialist future of the newly independent countries', and they even shamelessly declare that 'the struggle for the general democratic programme does not require a new revolution.'



Herein lies that the utter bankruptcy, the utter anti-Marxist-Leninist theories of the revisionist leadership of the C P S U. They have completely distorted the Marxist - Leninist teachings on the national liberation struggles. They distorted Lenin's teachings on the stages of revolution for the colonial and semi-colonial countries. They have replaced Lenin's teachings on the working class hegemony over the national liberation movement with bourgeois hegemony over the same. They have replaced Lenin's teachings on the worker-peasant alliance as the basis of the democratic front with an alliance of the working class and bourgeoisie. They have replaced Lenin's teachings on the dual nature of national bourgeoisie in the colonial and semi-colonial countries and the necessity of 'unity and struggle' with regard to the national bourgeoisie with all-round co-operation with the national bourgeoisie. They have replaced Lenin's teachings on the necessity of an uncompromising ideological struggle against bourgeois ideology with the adoption of bourgeois ideology itself as Marxist ideology. They have replaced Lenin's behest that the first socialist state should act as the base of the world socialist revolution and help the national liberation struggles economically, politically and militarily with the sole economic aid to reactionary governments of the newly independent countries.

All these anti- Marxist - Leninist propositions are being practiced by the revisionist leadership of the CPSU in the name of non-capitalist path and national democracy.

It is true that *Lenin* declared at the *Second Congress of the Third International* in 1920:

*" The Communist International should advance and theoretically substantiate the proposition that those backward countries can, with the aid of the proletariat of the advanced countries, go over to the Soviet system and through definite stages of development, to Communism, without having to pass through the capitalist stage. "*

But Lenin never said that this non-capitalist path is possible for almost all the newly liberated countries of the world as the present revisionist leadership of the CPSU is advocating.

Lenin entirely depended on the struggles of the labouring masses of these countries and the help that the socialist states give to these labouring masses for the success of this non-capitalist path.

Without the nationalisation of imperialist capital, without abolition of feudalism, any amount of economic aid to the Governments of the newly independent countries will not help in building an independent economy in these countries; it will only result in helping the reactionary Governments to save the colonial and semi-colonial order, and make them more and more dependent on imperialist economic aid.

But the present revisionist leadership of the C P S U have distorted this Lenin's behest on the support the Soviet Government has to give to the labouring masses, and have taken to the path of economic aid to the bourgeois Governments.

India is a classical example to show how Soviet economic aid is being utilised to build monopoly capitalism.

The present revisionist leadership of C P S U has extolled the public sector in India as an instrument to industrialise the country and to build an independent economy, and they have lavishly helped the Indian public sector with large funds and machinery to build certain heavy industries.

But we know from our experience that the public sector in India in the hands of the big business- landlord Government is an instrument for exploitation of the Indian people by monopoly capitalists and the imperialists.

Not only that. Having taken to an all-round class collaborationist policy, the revisionist leadership of the C P S U is using its economic aid to the bourgeoisie of the backward countries as a lever to create its own spheres of influence, to get those Governments under its control.

The revisionist leadership of the C P S U does not make any attempt to distinguish between the pro-imperialist collaborationist Governments and the anti-imperialist Governments when giving any economic aid.

They do not make a distinction in their military aid to the countries, which use that aid to fight imperialism and to countries which use the very same aid to fight fraternal socialist countries and to suppress the people's struggles in those countries.

The present revisionist leadership of the CPSU is not supporting the national liberation struggles with all the means at its command; it is prescribing such methods for the success of the NLM which in practice obstruct and sabotage those struggles.

They say that successful building of socialism and communism in the socialist countries and the economic aid it renders to those backward countries is a guarantee for the success of those struggles.

Marxist - Leninists always hold that the development of society is a product of the struggle of the internal contradictions of society; Marxist - Leninists hold that the revolutionary forces in any given country should mainly depend on their own internal strength for the success of their revolution and outside help can only play a secondary role. Marxist - Leninists hold that building of socialism and communism in socialist countries and its economic aid to the backward countries can never replace the necessity of people's revolutionary struggles for the success of their revolution.

Thus we see that this theory of the revisionist leadership of the C P S U is only an attempt on its part to create illusions in the revolutionary masses about a peaceful path and disarm them politically and make them abandon the path of revolutionary struggle.

The present leadership of the CPSU is so enamoured of the economic aid as a lever for the completion of the democratic revolution in the backward countries, that they even advocate imperialist aid as a lever for economic development of the backward countries.

Khrushchov shamelessly declared:

*"Your and our economic successes will be hailed by the whole world, which expects our two great powers to help the peoples who are centuries behind in their economic development to get on their feet more quickly."*

The present CPSU leaders, following in the footsteps of Khrushchov, revise Lenin's teachings on the exploiting nature of imperialist capital and extend imperialist economic aid as a lever to build an independent economy in the backward countries.

The CPSU leaders have become shameless advocates for the penetration of imperialist capital into the backward countries.

Modern revisionists and the revisionist leaders of the C P S U are stubbornly opposed to the people of the backward countries taking to the path of revolutionary struggles and declare that *"local wars in our time are very dangerous"*, that *"even a tiny spark can cause a world conflagration"* and further declare *"we will work hard to put out the sparks that may set off the flames of war."*

Here we see an attempt on the part of the C P S U leadership not to make a distinction between just and unjust wars, between wars of aggression by the imperialists and liberation wars of the oppressed people against the oppression.

Everybody knows that the present UNO is an instrument in the hands of the imperialists particularly the American imperialists for wars of aggression against the oppressed nations.

But the revisionist leadership of the CPSU, who are opposed to the armed struggles of the oppressed people against their oppression, ask these backward countries to pin their confidence in this very same UNO to achieve their liberation.

The CPSU leadership is actively helping the imperialism to use UNO as the instrument of aggression against other people.

Sometimes, modern revisionists and the revisionist leadership of the C P S U pretend to be supporting the national liberation struggles and sometimes they do give some limited help to justify themselves as Communists in the eyes of the world public.

But if we go into the essence of the matter, if we scrutinise their practical steps, we see that the C P S U leadership is betraying the national liberation struggles one by one.

They betrayed the Congolese people's struggle by voting with the imperialists for the intervention of U N O.

They voted with the imperialists in the U N O for a mere boycott of Rhodesian white lords which did not do any harm to them.

While pretending to be supporting the national liberation struggle of the Vietnamese people against American imperialism, on all the key issues of the day they are allying and collaborating with American imperialists.

While pretending to be supporting the national liberation struggles of Latin American people they are giving economic aid to the reactionary regimes in these countries to suppress those very struggles.

While pretending to be condemning the butchery the Indonesian fascist militarists perpetrated on the Indonesian Communists, they have begun to give economic concessions to the very same butchers.

And the betrayal of the Arab people's struggles against American-inspired Israeli aggression is the final act of betrayal of the national liberation struggles by the CPSU leadership.

What does all this show?

Modern revisionists and the revisionist leadership of the CPSU with its theories and practices on the national liberation struggle have disarmed and disrupted the national liberation struggles.

The heroes of the Second International, Bernstein and Kautsky, served the interests of the old imperialists. But the modern revisionists, the revisionist leaders of CPSU, serve the interests of neo-colonialists.

Thus the policy of Marxist-Leninists on the question of the national liberation struggles is diametrically opposed to that of the modern revisionists and the revisionist leadership of the CPSU.

And it is the sacred duty of the Marxist-Leninists to resolutely fight modern revisionism within the ranks of NLM, and eradicate its influence within the ranks of NLM, in order to achieve victory in their struggle against imperialism, for modern revisionists act as the hidden agents of imperialism within the ranks of the international working class movement, and *Lenin* rightly said, "*the fight against imperialism is sham and humbug unless it is inseparably bound up with the fight against opportunism.*"

### **War and Peace**

Modern war is born of imperialism. Already imperialism has plunged the world into two destructive world wars resulting in colossal destruction of man and material. Even after the Second World War, the imperialist powers have been conducting innumerable wars against the people of the oppressed nations to impose colonial or neo-colonial slavery upon them.

Today the imperialists are once again feverishly preparing to plunge the world into another global war with the most destructive atomic and hydrogen weapons.

Today, American imperialism, leader of the imperialist camp with its huge military machine, possessing the deadliest nuclear weapons, with its world-wide military bases, thirsting for world domination, is feverishly preparing for another world war.

Thus we see America is the source of the Third World War-the number one enemy of the people of the whole world.

But today the balance of forces is in favour of the peace forces. The existence of the mighty socialist camp, growing national liberation struggles, the growing international working class and communist movement, the existence of a number of independent countries which are genuinely interested in the preservation of world peace-innumerable peace forces throughout the world vigorously working for the preservation of world peace, if these forces are united and determined to expose and resist the war plans of the imperialists, a new world war can be prevented.

Marxist-Leninists hold that *"the menace of war by the imperialists still exists, the possibility of a Third World War still exists. But the forces thwarting the danger of war and preventing a Third World War are rapidly developing and the political consciousness of the masses of the people of the world is rising. A new world war can be prevented, provided the Communist Parties of the world keep on uniting and strengthening all the forces of peace and democracy that can be united."* Stalin said:

*"Peace will be preserved and consolidated if the people will take the cause of preserving peace into their own hands and defend it to the end. War may become inevitable if the warmongers succeed in entangling the masses of the people in lies, in deceiving them and drawing them into a new world war."*

What are the tasks that Marxist-Leninists have to carry out if this behest of Stalin is to be put into practice?

- Strengthen the unity, the political, economic and military weight of the socialist camp.
- Strengthen the national liberation struggles with all the means at the command of the socialist states.
- Relentless exposure of the war plans of the imperialists, and thus raise the vigilance of the world people.
- Resolutely oppose and resist the export of counter-revolution that the imperialists constantly carry out throughout the world.
- While propagating for the general disarmament, breed no illusions about its immediate possibility and strengthen the military might of the socialist states including the atomic weapons to match the atomic weapons of the imperialists.

Marxist-Leninists everywhere are vigorously struggling to carry out the above tasks. The glorious PRC resolutely exposing the war plans of the American imperialists, helping the NIM with all the means at its command, strengthening its own military weight, trying to unite all the peace forces, is acting as the bastion of peace.

Today the raging national liberation struggles in Asia, Africa, Latin America are giving hammer blows on the war plans of the American imperialists and they are meeting with defeat after defeat.

Just at this time, when the war plans of the American imperialists are meeting with defeat after defeat, modern revisionists and the revisionist leaders of C P S U have come forward with a host of revisionist theories on war and peace which in practice create illusions about peace intentions of the imperialists, lull the vigilance of the peace forces against the war plans and thus serve the war plans of the imperialists.

From the time of the 20th Congress of the C P S U, the revisionist leadership of C P S U has been advocating that Lenin's teachings on imperialism and war, his theory that "Wars are inevitable as long as imperialism exists," have become

outmoded, and since imperialism has ceased to be the all-embracing world system and because strong political social forces opposed to war have emerged and are in a position to compel the imperialists to renounce wars, they advance the new thesis that today *'war is not fatalistically inevitable'* and that war can be abolished from society altogether even though imperialism still exists in a part of the world.

The world capitalist and imperialist social order is still in existence over 3/4ths of the globe's surface, all the traditional imperialist states like America, Britain, West Germany, France, Italy, Japan, etc., are feverishly arming themselves. In the face of these facts, for the modern revisionists to say that war can be abolished even if imperialists exist in a part of the world is utterly anti-Marxist - Leninist. This new theory of the CPSU leadership is only intended to create illusions in the fighting masses about the possibility of peace without struggle.

Not only that, the CPSU leadership is talking about preventing a future war like the imperialists have been continuously waging wars of aggression against the struggling oppressed nations. It only shows that they do not recognise the wars of aggression that the imperialists are carrying against the peoples of Asia, Africa, Latin America as real wars, but they recognise wars only when they occur between themselves and the imperialists. But *Lenin* recognised them as wars and condemned those who do not recognise them as wars, He said:

*"Peace prevailed in Europe but continued because the European people's domination over hundreds of millions of colonial inhabitants was affected by constant uninterrupted never-ending wars which, we, Europeans, do not consider to be wars but the most brutal slaughter extermination of unarmed people."*

It is true that if the peace forces are united, if they are vigilant and resolutely oppose wars they can prevent a particular war.

But to say that war can be abolished completely in today's circumstances is utter pacifist illusion.

*Stalin* said:

*"to eliminate the inevitability of war it is necessary to abolish imperialism."*

Marxist - Leninists hold that world peace can be won only by the struggles of the people of the world and not by begging the imperialist for it.

But CPSU leadership refuses to rely on the world people's struggles for the preservation of peace but by making peace with the imperialists by coming to agreements with them, by giving them costly concessions. In the last analysis they are striving their utmost to make peace with American imperialists, enemy number one of the world people.

To achieve this they are never tired of praising the peace nature of the rulers of America; Whenever they succeeded in getting the signature of the imperialists on an empty call for peace, they praised that call as a great event which will lead to a relaxation of tension in the world.

But the whole world knows that these very war-mongering rulers of America while paying lip service to peace have created a huge war machinery, have been

continuously conducting wars of aggression against oppressed nations, have been continuously conspiring against the Socialist States. It is on such war-mongers that the CPSU leaders have been lavishing praises for their 'dedication to peace'.

They forget Lenin's behest that the imperialists either in war or in peace pursue the same policies of plunder of the weaker nations.

This effort on the part of the C P S U leadership is only an attempt on their part to cover the aggressive nature of the imperialists to create pacifist illusions among the people about the peace intentions of the imperialists.

Marxist - Leninists hold that national liberation wars are powerful weapons in thwarting the war plans of the imperialists. The war of resistance in Korea, the liberation war in Vietnam, the various liberation struggles have dealt powerful blows in defeating the war plans of the imperialists.

Marxist - Leninists firmly hold that the export of the counter revolution by the imperialists must be resolutely resisted by revolutionary wars, that the people must wage tit for tat struggle against the war plans of the imperialists.

But the revisionist leadership of C P S U opposes such a tit for tat struggle, opposes national liberation struggle, as such wars they claim would lead to a world war.

While they do not raise a single finger to resist the import of counter-revolution by the imperialists to the various parts of the world, they resolutely oppose the national liberation struggles.

This reasoning of the revisionist leadership of the C P S U is akin to the teachings of *Kautsky* who said:

*'.... the danger to world peace from imperialists is only slight. The great danger appears to come from the national strivings in the East and various dictatorships.'*

### **Disarmament and the Banning of Nuclear Weapons:**

In the face of growing danger of the Third World War the peace forces and the International Communist Movement should mobilise the world public opinion for a general disarmament to expose the war intentions of the imperialists and also to compel the imperialists either to restrain their arms drive or even to accept some partial agreements.

But Communists should have no illusions or create illusions among the people that the imperialists would accept general disarmament and agree to abandon their arms drive and military build up.

But the modern revisionists and the CPSU leadership carry on disarmament campaign in so pacifist a manner as to breed worst illusions about the imperialists, they paint the picture of the total and general disarmament being an immediate and practical possibility, that certain sections, the ruling classes of the imperialist states are willing to accept disarmament etc.

It is a pacifist utopia to expect the imperialists to willingly accept total and general disarmament. Lenin always warned against pacifist illusions about disarmament and said that arming of the people is only way to disarm the bourgeoisie.

In the face of the ever-growing menace of arms drive of the imperialists, the socialist states must develop their armed might including nuclear weapons to defend the socialist states, to defend the cause of world socialist revolution and peace.

But the CPSU viciously attacked this policy of PRC as war policy, tore off the agreement with it to provide it with atomic technical know-how and rushed to conclude the partial test ban treaty with America and Britain.

Thus the C P S U leadership disrupted the socialist camp in its eagerness to come to an agreement with the American imperialists.

Subsequent events have proved that this Test Ban Treaty is only intended to save the supremacy of the USSR and USA in atomic weapons.

And how both USSR and USA are proceeding to conclude so-called non-proliferation treaty which nakedly proves their desire to keep the atomic secrets to themselves and keep all the other countries at their mercy for protection.

The policy of USSR under the present leadership with regard to atomic weapons coincides with those of the American imperialists.

Instead of rousing the consciousness of the people, the revisionist leaders of the CPSU inculcate fears among the people that war between the two opposite systems will lead to nuclear war, would lead to the destruction of the whole world, that atom bomb does not distinguish between the imperialists and the working people, that 'millions of workers would be destroyed per one monopolist' and that it would be useless to think of what society could be built on the ruins of human civilisation.

This reasoning is entirely against historical experience. War always demands heavy sacrifices from the people.

Marxist - Leninists have no use of war as a means to create socialist revolution. But at the same time they are not afraid of war. Basing themselves on the past experience they boldly declare that if the imperialists should succeed in launching a Third World War many more hundreds of millions of people will turn to socialism, that the imperialists will then have little room left on the globe and it is possible that the whole structure of imperialism will collapse.

This is the Marxist - Leninist way of rousing the consciousness of the people, of instilling confidence in the people about this future and prepare them politically, ideologically for heavy sacrifices that are necessary to defeat imperialism.

But CPSU leadership which has abandoned Marxism - Leninism is trying to inculcate the worst fears among the people about the war, destroy their will to resist imperialist aggression, make them bow before imperialist aggression and thus facilitate the aggressive war of the imperialists.

Having taken to the line of collaboration with the imperialists the revisionist leadership of the C P S U is propagating that nuclear weapons have changed the character of war, have changed the old notions about war, that atom bomb does not adhere to the class principle.



This is an utter anti - Marxist - Leninist proposition. Imperialists have always been introducing new military techniques in war but they did not change the character of war.

The emergence of nuclear weapons can neither arrest the progress of the human history nor save the imperialist system from its doom any more than the emergence of the new technique could save the old system from their doom in the past.

The emergence of nuclear weapons does not and cannot resolve the fundamental contradictions in the contemporary world, does not and cannot alter the law of class struggle, does not and cannot change the nature of imperialism and reaction.

Marxist- Leninists never hold the view that the superiority in arms will decide the fate of war. They believe in Lenin saying that every victory is conditioned in the final analysis by the spiritual state of those masses who shed their blood on the battlefield. This comprehension by the masses of the aims and reasons of the war has an immense significance and guarantee of victory.

Thus it is clear that the main purpose of the CPSU leaders is to discourage and disorganise the people against the atomic blackmail of U.S. imperialists and this facilitates their war plans.

Of late, the CPSU leadership has almost stopped exposing the American imperialism as the source of Third World War, as the enemy No. 1 of the people of the whole world. On the other hand more and more the CPSU leadership is hurling the worst slanders against the great PRC accusing it as "*adversaries of the policy of peace,*" as a country which wants "*to preserve and intensify the international tensions,*" as a country which wants war to give a "*push*" to revolutions, as a country manoeuvring for a nuclear war between USA and USSR working for Asian domination, that its policy is a threat to the independence of the other Asian countries.

While making efforts to come to an agreement with the mightiest imperialists plunderers, the CPSU leadership is doing everything to isolate the PRC.

The degeneration of the CPSU leadership has gone to such lengths that Humphrey, the U.S. Vice-president, who openly declared in 1966, "*the Soviet is attempting to build a containment wall, so to speak, around Communist China*" and that "*the Government of the Soviet Union is much more concerned today about its relations throughout the entire world, vis-a-vis Communist China than it is over anything the United States may be doing in any part of the world.*" It is significant to note the C P S U leadership has not refused this claim of the US imperialist.

Warm friendship with No. 1 enemy of the whole world, cold war attitude towards the mighty socialist state, the staunchest friend of the oppressed people- this is the cruel logic of the modern revisionism.

To sum up, while the Marxist - Leninists want to strengthen the unity of the socialist camp as a reliable guarantee of the world peace, the policy of the

C P S U leadership disrupts the unity of the socialist camp and thus paves the way for the war plans of the imperialists.

While the policy of the Marxist - Leninists is to strengthen the national liberation struggles as a powerful weapon to thwart the war plans of the imperialists the policy of the C P S U leadership disrupts the NLM and thus paves the way for war plans of the imperialists.

While the policy of the Marxist - Leninists is to smash the nuclear blackmail practiced by the U.S. imperialists, the policy of the CPSU leadership helps the nuclear blackmail of the U.S. imperialists.

While the policy of the Marxist - Leninists takes into account all the available factors, including the inter- imperialist contradictions and is directed to isolate the American warmongers, the policy of the CPSU leadership is directed not against the American imperialists, the enemy of world peace, but is directed against the socialist camp, against the peace camp.

While the policy of the Marxist - Leninists is directed against the "global strategy" of the U.S. imperialists, the policy of the CPSU leadership is intended to serve the interests of the 'global strategy' of the U.S. imperialists.

Thus we see the policy of the Marxist - Leninists on the question of War and Peace is in diametrical opposition to the policy of the modern revisionists represented by the C P S U leadership.

### **Peaceful Co-existence**

With the first socialist state in Russia in 1917, the concept of peaceful co-existence between capitalist and socialist states arose.

Lenin visualised, within a certain period of time, socialist countries would exist side by side with capitalist or pre-capitalist countries.

Because the socialist state is faced with the encirclement of capitalist states, Lenin and Stalin made the policy of peaceful co-existence obligatory on the socialist states.

But Lenin had no illusion about the imperialist states that they would abandon their efforts to destroy the socialist states.

He never visualised permanent peace between socialist and capitalist states. He said:

*"..... The existence of the Soviet Republic side by side with imperialist states for a long time is unthinkable. One or the other must triumph in the end. And before that end supervenes a series of frightful collisions between the Soviet Republic and the bourgeois states will be inevitable."*

Therefore he enjoined upon the socialist states, while practicing the policy of peaceful co-existence with capitalist states to be ever vigilant against the conspiracies of the imperialist states against the socialist states, and always to be in a state of military preparedness to meet any military threat from the imperialist states.

That is why we said that the socialist states could win their right to peaceful co-existence with the capitalist states only through incessant struggle with them in the political, economic and ideological spheres.

In carrying out the policy of peaceful co-existence, Lenin adopted different principles with regard to the different types of countries in the capitalist world.

Lenin tried to establish friendly relations with all those capitalist nations which are bullied and oppressed by imperialist states.

While practicing peaceful co-existence Lenin said that the first the socialist state should do everything to promote socialist revolutions in the capitalist states. He regarded the first state as the base of the world socialist revolution and enjoined upon the socialist state to do everything in its power to make the revolution of the oppressed nations and oppressed classes a success. He never viewed peaceful co-existence as the 'general line' or the 'essential' part of the foreign policy of the socialist state. On the other hand support to the revolutions of the oppressed nations and oppressed classes was made the fundamental principle of the foreign policy of the socialist state. He said:

*"Alliance with the revolutionaries of the advanced countries and with all the oppressed people against any and all the imperialists—such is the external policy of the Russian Revolution."*

Thus we see Lenin laid down four cardinal principles of the foreign policy of the socialist state—peaceful co-existence with capitalist states, struggle against the imperialist states in the political, economic, ideological spheres, friendship with oppressed bourgeois states, support to the revolutionary struggles of the oppressed nations and oppressed classes to complete the world socialist revolution.

Lenin and Stalin successfully implemented these principles of foreign policy of the first socialist state.

Lenin and Stalin practicing peaceful co-existence with imperialist states, at the same time conducted incessant class struggles against the imperialism in all spheres, defended the Soviet Union against all attacks of the imperialist states, and at the same time resolutely supported the revolutionary struggles of all the oppressed nations and classes.

Steadfastly adhering to Marxism - Leninism, the PRC is struggling hard to execute the foreign policy of the socialist states. But the CPSU leadership which has betrayed Marxism - Leninism is adopting the worst collaborationist policy in its foreign policy.

They have betrayed Lenin's teachings on the foreign policy of the socialist state and declare that peaceful co-existence between states with different social systems is the general line of the foreign policy of the Soviet Union and the countries of the socialist camp.

Thus we see they have abandoned Lenin's behest that the socialist state should resolutely struggle with the imperialist states in all spheres, should resist the imperialist wars of aggression and should help the revolutionary struggles of the oppressed nations and oppressed classes for the completion of the world

socialist revolution. They have reduced the foreign policy of the socialist state to a policy of permanent peace with the imperialist states.

They not only practice peaceful co-existence with imperialist states, but they advocate peaceful co-existence as a panacea to solve all the fundamental contradictions of the contemporary world. They shamelessly declare that peaceful co-existence is the highest form of class struggle, that *'peaceful co-existence alone is the best and sole way to solve the vitally important problem confronting society.'*

They forget that peaceful co-existence cannot replace the revolutionary struggles of the people for their social emancipation.

Disregarding this elementary truth of present-day history the CPSU leaders falsely claim that it is their policy of peaceful co-existence that achieved independence of many countries, thus negating the role of liberation struggles.

Having abandoned the role of liberation struggles against imperialism, the revisionist leadership of the CPSU have developed an all round peace policy with the American imperialists. Instead of vigilance against the war plans of the American imperialists, instead of constantly exposing war plans of the imperialists they are propagating that the ruling circles of America are sincerely interested in peaceful co-existence.

As a matter of fact, friendship with America is the heart and soul of the peaceful co-existence policy of CPSU leadership. They are not making a secret of this policy. They openly declare:

*"Each of these two powers is leading a large group of nations, the Soviet Union leading the socialist system and the United States the capitalist camp."*

*"If there is agreement between N.S.Khrushchov, the head of Soviet Government, and J.Kennedy, the President of the United States, there will be a solution of international problems on which mankind's destinies depend."*

Therefore not active opposition to American imperialism, but co-operation and collaboration with American imperialism-that is the essence of the policy of peaceful co-existence as practiced by the CPSU leadership.

In order to achieve peace with America, they have begun to abandon one revolutionary post after another-Congo, Rhodesia, Dominican Republic and now the Middle East.

While doing everything to appease America to purchase peaceful co-existence with it, CPSU leadership is at the same time maintaining a 'cold war' relationship with socialist states like China and Albania, maligning and slandering them as enemies of peace, breaking even economic relations with them, and joining hands with all the reactionaries against Socialist China.

In their pursuit of U.S.-Soviet collaboration, the CPSU leadership has sabotaged national liberation struggles and by prevailing social reformist, they are sapping the revolutionary fighting will of the world proletariat.

On the other hand, People's Republic of China strictly adhering to the Marxist-Leninist principles of the "foreign policy of Lenin, working as the base of the world revolution, is resolutely supporting the revolutionary struggles of oppressed nations and classes throughout the world, firmly resisting the American imperialist

wars of aggression, is standing in the forefront of the anti-imperialist struggles and is standing as a bulwark against expansionist war plans of the American imperialists in the East.

That is why the reactionaries throughout the world, the American imperialism, in particular, are vilifying China with wildest slanders, and ceaselessly conspiring to destroy socialist China.

It is the international duty of every Communist to valiantly support China in its struggle against all reactionaries, in its struggle against American imperialism, and beat back all the slanders and vilifications against China and stand by it in its struggle to win the right of peaceful co-existence.

### **Forms of Transition to Socialism**

The attention of the proletarian revolutionaries has always been engaged on the forms of transition to socialism.

The founders of Marxism - Leninism have scientifically analysed the question of state and revolution and laid down clear laws for the forms of transition to socialism.

State is an organ of power, an instrument of suppression of one class by another. Bourgeois state is an organ of the exploiting classes for the suppression of the exploited class, is an organ to maintain their class rule.

Army and the police are the chief instruments of class rule in the hands of the bourgeoisie.

Parliamentary democracy is only an ornament to cover the class rule of the bourgeoisie, the best possible political shell for capitalism.

Every Marxist - Leninist knows that bourgeois states, whatever their forms, are in essence bourgeois dictatorships and proletarian states, whatever their forms, are, in essence, proletarian dictatorships and that *"Wage slavery is the lot of the people even in the most democratic bourgeois state."*

The exploited classes in their struggle for social emancipation are inevitably faced with the violence of the bourgeois state and destruction of bureaucratic military state machine is the 'pre-condition for every real people's revolution.'

According to the teachings of Marxism - Leninism the key question in every revolution is that of the state power. And the key question in the proletarian revolution is that of the seizure of state power and the smashing of the bourgeois state machine by violence, the establishment of the proletarian dictatorship and the replacement of the bourgeois state by the proletarian state.

Proletariat, while striving to achieve its emancipation through peaceful means, should have no illusions about bourgeois democracy and organise revolutionary force against counter-revolutionary force.

The bourgeoisie will not step down from the stage of history voluntarily. This is universal law of class struggle.

It is true that Marx expected a peaceful revolution in countries like England and America in the 19th century when militarism had not developed to the present

level. Even then Marx treated it as an exception. But Lenin, analysing the situation in the imperialist era, said that the proletariat could not achieve its emancipation except through violent revolution even in those countries.

After the February Revolution in Russia in 1917, Lenin visualised the possibility of a peaceful transition to socialism up to July. But he depended for his analysis on the dual state power, on the arms in the hands of the people.

But the experience of the whole history of international working class movement, the history of all the real people's revolution, has shown that the exploited classes had to face the brutal force of the bourgeois classes, that they had to smash the repressive machine of the bourgeois state in order to achieve their social emancipation; countless revolutionaries had to sacrifice their lives at the altar of revolution.

There is no single example in the whole world history where a peaceful revolution has taken place.

The entire history of the working class movement tells us that violent revolution is a universal law of proletarian revolution, that it is absolutely necessary to smash the bourgeois state machine for the establishment of the dictatorship of the proletariat.

This has been the teaching of Marxism - Leninism. This has been the experience of the international working class movement.

Attitude to violent proletarian revolution, attitude to the smashing of the bourgeois state machine, establishment of the dictatorship of the proletariat, is the watershed between Marxism - Leninism and all forms of revisionism, between all proletarian revolutionaries and all renegades from the proletariat.

Modern revisionists and the revisionist leaders of the CPSU, who betrayed every tenet of Marxism - Leninism, have now come forward to declare that this universal law of violent revolution, this Marxist- Leninist theory has become outmoded.

From 20th congress of CPSU, the CPSU leaders are propagating that, in view of the changed correlation of forces in favour of socialism, both nationally and internationally, in view of the ever increasing influence of the ideas of socialism on the minds of the masses, universal law of violent revolution has become outmoded and parliamentary road to socialism has opened to the proletariat of many countries.

Marxist - Leninists hold that universal franchise is a measure to gauge public opinion and it cannot transfer real power into the hands of the exploited classes.

But the revisionist leadership of the CPSU says that the proletariat by winning majority in Parliament, could effect transfer of power into its hands and this tantamounts to the breaking of the bourgeois repressive state machine.

In the present day situation when all the means of propaganda, all the means of wealth are concentrated in the hands of the exploiting classes wielding state power, the revolutionary proletariat will not be allowed to get a majority, or even if they get it, will not be allowed to rule. Experience of many countries proves this.

These new teachings of the modern revisionists have been merely copies from Kautsky who said:

*"Parliamentary Republic-with a monarchy on the English model or without - is to my mind the base out of which proletarian dictatorship and socialist state grow."*

CPSU leadership even makes bold to say that 'basic shifts in favour of socialism in the relationship of forces in the international arena' now create the possibility of 'paralysing the intervention of international reaction' and that 'this lessens possibilities for the unleashing of civil war by the bourgeoisie.'

The experience of Indonesia, Ghana, Congo, Vietnam etc., where gigantic class battles are being waged against the intervention of the American imperialists growing militarisation of all West, all the capitalist states, exposes the falsehood of CPSU leadership on this account.

Marxist-Leninists always hold the view that while conducting partial struggles, while working in Parliament to achieve certain democratic reforms, they should always keep before the people the alternate goal, capture of power through revolutionary means.

It is wrong to refuse to use Parliamentary and other legal forms of struggle when they can and should be used.

However, if a Marxist - Leninist Party falls into legalism or parliamentary cretinism, confining the struggle within the limits permitted by the bourgeoisie, this will inevitably lead to renouncing the proletarian revolution and the dictatorship of the proletariat.

While working in parliament we should organise the revolutionary forces for the ultimate goal. This attitude to the ultimate goal, the seizure of power through revolutionary means, must demarcate our Party from other social democratic parties and other bourgeois, liberal parties.

While preparing for a peaceful development, the Marxist - Leninist Party must fully prepare for a non- peaceful development. But we should never over- emphasise the chances of peaceful development as that will only reduce the revolutionary consciousness of the people.

Not able to show a single incident in history to prove its theory of peaceful transition to socialism, the CPSU leadership has begun to falsify history. They are citing 1919 Hungary revolution, establishment of People's Democracies in East Europe after the Second World War as examples of peaceful transition. Everybody knows that these are merely falsehoods.

Thus we see that C P S U leadership and modern revisionists have abandoned the path of proletarian revolution, have taken to the path of bourgeois democracy. All their new theories are intended to lull the revolutionary consciousness of the masses and thus maintain the present status quo in the capitalist states. And to achieve this end they have taken to utter falsehoods. Lenin said:

*"Kautsky had to resort to all these subterfuges, sophistries, and fraudulent falsifications only in order to dissociate himself from violent revolution, and to conceal his renunciation of it, his desertion to the liberal labour policy i.e., to the bourgeoisie."*

The present C P S U leadership has exactly taken to this course, has deserted to the bourgeoisie.

The policy of Marxist - Leninists on the forms of transition to Socialism is diametrically opposed to that of the modern revisionists. The revolutionary working class movement has to eradicate this hated revisionism from its ranks in order to make a successful revolution.

### **Evaluation of the Role of Stalin**

After Lenin's death, Stalin became not only the leader of the Party and the Government of the Soviet Union but the acknowledged leader of the international communist movement as well. For thirty years he led the Soviet state and the international communist movement.

Stalin led the CPSU and the Soviet people after Lenin's death in resolutely fighting both internal and external foes, and in safeguarding and consolidating the first socialist state in the world.

Stalin upheld the line of socialist industrialisation and agricultural collectivisation and in achieving great success in the socialist transformation and socialist construction. He led the CPSU and the Soviet people and the Soviet Red Army to the great victory in the anti-fascist war.

He defended and developed Marxism-Leninism in the fight against various kinds of opportunism, against the enemies of Leninism, the Trotskyites, revisionists, Bukharinists and Titoites.

He led the Soviet state in pursuing a foreign policy which was in keeping with proletarian internationalism and in greatly assisting the revolutionary struggles of all people.

He stood in the forefront of the tide of history leading the struggle, and was an irreconcilable enemy of the imperialists and all reactionaries.

He made an indelible contribution to the international communist movement in a number of theoretical writings which are immortal Marxist-Leninist works.

In his arduous struggles against all kinds of enemies, he might have committed certain mistakes, some subjective and some unavoidable in the then existing circumstances.

But his work taken as a whole, Stalin was a great Marxist-Leninist, a great proletarian revolutionary.

But the C P S U leadership in a secret report at the 20th Congress and then again at the 22nd Congress, and in various writings viciously attacked the work and role of Stalin, all in the name of correcting the personality cult.

In all these writings, instead of critically analysing the work of Stalin and drawing proper lessons for the future, they completely disregarded the life of Stalin.

They accused Stalin of weakening the struggle against fascism by his resolute struggle against social democracy with his slogan 'social democracy is social fascism' and his fighting slogan 'class against class'.

They accused Stalin of not adequately preparing the country for defence against Hitler's invasion.



They accused Stalin of violating Socialist democracy and employing ruthless repression against suspects and even innocent persons.

They denounced Stalin's great work Dialectical and Historical Materialism..

Thus we see the revisionist leadership of the CPSU attacking the whole life of Stalin.

In their hatred for Stalin the CPSU leadership went to the extent of falsifying CPSU history to place Stalin in a wrong position.

In their hatred for Stalin, they described Stalin as a '*murderer*', '*criminal*', '*gambler*', '*despot of the type of Ivan the Terrible*', '*greatest dictator in Russian history*', '*fool*', '*idiot*', etc.

Thus we see the evaluation of the role of Stalin by the present leadership of the C P S U has nothing to do with Marxism.

Their hatred for Stalin reached such low depths as to bury his dead body.

Safe burial for the dead body of Stalin, Marxist - Leninist and television show for the dead body of Kennedy, the imperialist.

Marxist - Leninist Stalin a murderer.

The imperialist rulers of America - peace lovers.

This is the cruel logic of the revisionism of the C P S U leadership.

They attacked Stalin because they wanted to destroy his image as a great Marxist - Leninist, as an uncompromising anti-imperialist.

The attack of the C P S U leadership on Stalin is closely linked with their betrayal of Marxism - Leninism and it was done with a purpose.

It is significant to note that the vicious attacks of the C P S U leadership on Stalin were fully utilised by the reactionaries throughout the world to undermine confidence in Socialist democracy, in the Socialist system, in the whole international communist movement.

Thus we see the attack on Stalin by the C P S U leadership did great damage to the international communist movement; it served the interests of the imperialists.

### **Building of Communism in the Soviet Union:**

#### **The state of the whole people, party of the entire people**

The C P S U leadership has declared at its 22nd Congress that it will build Communism in the Soviet Union within 20 years, that their state is no more a state of the dictatorship of the proletariat, but a state of the whole people, and that the great C P S U is not a party of the working class but a party of the whole people.

These issues have aroused serious controversy within the international communist movement.

#### **Building of Communism in U. S. S. R**

With the great October Revolution the First Socialist state was established and the Soviet people began the task of building socialism in the U. S. S. R.

The replacement of capitalist society by socialist society is a great advance in the historical development of human society. Socialist society covers the historical period of transition from class to classless society. It is by going through socialist society that mankind will enter communist society.

However, one cannot but see that socialist society is a society born out of capitalism and is only the first phase of communism. It is not yet a fully mature communist society in the economic and other fields. It is inevitably stamped with the birth-marks of capitalist society.

The practice of the socialist states teaches us that socialist society covers a very long historical period. Throughout this historical period the class struggle between the bourgeoisie and the proletariat continues and the question of 'who will win'-the capitalist road or the socialist road- remains. Thus, till society enters the period of communism, the danger of restoration of capitalism persists.

The dictatorship of the proletariat has to put down the resistance of the overthrown capitalist classes, prevent the emergence of new capitalist elements, firmly deal with the political degenerates in the Government and party apparatus, struggle to replace the capitalist encirclement with the encirclement of socialist states, create abundance of wealth through socialisation of the industry and collectivisation of agriculture, and thus prepare the ground to go over from '*each according to work*' to '*each according to needs*', remould human element and create a new man who will habitually work for the good of society, remove difference between physical and mental labour, difference between town and country and thus build a classless society when the state itself withers away.

These are the prescriptions of Marx and Lenin to build communism.

But the revisionist leadership of the C P S U which has betrayed Marxism - Leninism has arbitrarily fixed the first 10-year period to build the industrial prerequisite for communism and the next 10-year period to build full-scale communism.

It is significant to note that the plan of the C P S U leadership to build communism is not related to the eradication of difference between mental and physical labour, the difference between town and country, the building of a new way, but is related to the level of production with the American imperialists.

Classes still exist in Soviet society. Corrupt elements frequently appear both in Government and party apparatus in the Soviet Union. And the Soviet State is still threatened with the threat of intervention from the imperialist states. When such is the situation internally and externally, for the Soviet leadership to think of building communism is either an utopia or deception practiced by the C P S U leadership on the Soviet people and the world public.

If we look closely at some of the measures that the present leadership of the C P S U is taking, we will see that these measures are not intended to build communism but aimed at the restoration of capitalism in the Soviet Union.

Lenin and Stalin visualised greater and greater centralisation of industries for the completion of building socialism and going over to communism. But recently the C P S U leadership has begun to decentralise industries, has removed certain industries from its planned economy, and allow their production to be based on the purchase and sale in the open market.

Stalin visualised state trading to cover all fields of economy to advance to communism. But recently the C P S U leadership has allowed the purchase and sale of individual peasants' [farm products] in the open market.

Stalin visualised the conversion of collective farms into state farms to advance to communism. But recently the C P S U leadership disbanded the government tractor and machine stations and sold them to individual collective farms.

Stalin visualised the abolition of commodity production to advance to communism but the present leadership of CPSU is actually increasing commodity production as the above measures suggest.

Marx and Lenin visualised the building of a new man inspired with high ideals *'capable of working without remuneration in the interest of society'*, to advance to communism. But the CPSU leadership has introduced profit, bonus, substituted material incentives for the socialist principle *'from each according to his ability, to each according to his work'*, which only when [the difference in] the income of various sections of Soviet people, which will only increase motives for personal profit and selfish interests.

Thus we see all the above measures weaken socialism and in the process help in the restoration of capitalism in the Soviet Union.

The present CPSU leadership, instead of inspiring the people with revolutionary ideology, with proletarian culture, with proletarian internationalism is peddling bourgeois ideology, bourgeois liberty, equality, fraternity and humanity, inculcating bourgeois idealism, and metaphysics, and the reactionary ideas of bourgeois individualism, humanism, pacifism among the Soviet people and debasing socialist morality. Rotten bourgeois culture of the West is becoming fashionable in the Soviet Union.

Thus the CPSU leadership, through its various measures, is helping new capitalist elements to grow in the town and rich peasant elements to grow in the countryside.

It is significant to note that many of these measures were advanced and practiced for a very long time by Yugoslav Tito clique.

Recently, a very dangerous phenomenon has appeared in East European states. Many of them are building industries with foreign collaboration. Even the Soviet Union is negotiating with the Japanese imperialists for the joint exploitation of Siberian mineral wealth.

Thus we see that while shouting that it is building communism in the Soviet Union the C P S U leadership is actually taking steps to restore capitalism.

That is the reason why the bourgeois world, instead of being afraid of the construction of 'communism' in the Soviet Union are showering praises on the C P S U leadership for its new measures. This should open the eyes of all Marxist-Leninists as to the nature of 'communism' being built in the Soviet Union.

### **State of the Whole People-Party of Entire People**

State is an organ of suppression of one class by another.

Dictatorship of the proletariat has to suppress the resistance of the overthrown classes, prevent the rise of the new capitalist elements, resist the threat of imperialist intervention, build socialism, abolish the classes and build communism and when classes disappear, dictatorship of the proletariat disappears .

Lenin observed:

*"The essence of Marx's teaching on the State has been mastered only by those who understand that the dictatorship of a single class is necessary not only for every class society in general, not only for the proletariat which has overthrown the bourgeoisie but also for the entire historical period, which separates capitalism from classless society, from communism."*

Thus it is clear that proletarian dictatorship is necessary for the working class for the entire period of building socialism and advancing to communism.

But the CPSU leadership has no use for this teaching of Lenin. They declared at the 22nd Congress that since socialism has finally, irrevocably, triumphed in the Soviet Union, antagonistic class contradictions have disappeared in the Soviet Union; that since the entire Soviet people accept the goal of communism, dictatorship of the proletariat is no longer necessary for the Soviet people, and *'transformed the state of the proletarian dictatorship into the state of the whole people.'*

Since all the people in the Soviet Union accept the party programme, the party cannot be a party of a single class, working class, but the party of the entire people.

Since class contradictions still exist in the Soviet society and since the external threat from the imperialist powers still exist, it is betrayal of the Soviet people on the part of the CPSU leadership to abolish proletarian dictatorship and transform it into the State of the whole people.

State can always be a representative of a particular class or classes, there cannot be a supra class state, the so-called people's state. It is only the bourgeoisie who camouflage their state with the name People's State to cover up their class rule.

Engles said:

*" 'free people's state' was a programme demand and a catchword current among the German social democrats in the seventies. This catchword is devoid of all political content except that it describes the concept of democracy in a pompous philistine fashion."*

Exactly the present CPSU leadership is using the 'People's State' to cover up the bourgeois state it is trying to build.

Similarly, a political party can represent a single class and there can be no supra class party. People's party is a bourgeois term intended to cover the class nature of bourgeois parties.

As long as proletarian dictatorship exists there must be communist party of the proletariat to head this state and accomplish its historical mission of building communism.

But the revisionist leadership of CPSU is converting the great CPSU into a bourgeois party and it is using 'People's Party' to cover up this betrayal.

Even at the time of the 19th Party Congress of CPSU, Stalin noted degeneration and corruption that appeared in certain party and state organs. He warned of the *'corrupt elements setting their group interests higher than the interests of the party and the State', who 'forget that the enterprises entrusted to their charge are state enterprises, and try to turn them into their own private domain'*, people who 'instead of safeguarding the common husbandry of the collective farms' engage in filching collective farm property.

The C P S U headed by Stalin adhered to the dictatorship of the proletariat and the road of socialism and waged a staunch struggle against such forces of capitalism.

During the time of Khrushchov, and the present leadership, there has been a fundamental change in the state of the class struggle in the Soviet Union.

They have carried a series of policies serving which have given rise to new type of capitalistic elements in the town, and the rich peasant in the countryside.

The new bourgeois elements, who have usurped the leadership of the party and the state step by step and have formed a privileged stratum in Soviet society.

This privileged stratum is the principal component of the bourgeoisie in the Soviet Union today and the main social basis of the revisionists. The present revisionist leaders are the political representatives of the new Soviet bourgeois elements, particularly of its privileged stratum.

Members of this privileged stratum who have betrayed the revolutionary traditions of the Bolshevik Party, discarded the lofty ideals of the Soviet working class. They betray revolution and forbid others to make revolution. The sole concern is to consolidate their economic and political rule.

The old and new bourgeois elements, the old and new rich peasants and the degenerate elements of all sorts constitute the social basis of revisionism and they use every possible means to find agents within the Communist Party. The existence of bourgeois influence is the internal source of revisionism and collaboration with the imperialists is its external source.

The Soviet privileged stratum represented by the revisionists constitute only a small per cent of the Soviet population. Among the Soviet cadres, its numbers are also small. It stands diametrically opposed to the Soviet people, who constitute more than 90 percent of the Soviet population and to the great majority of Soviet people and Communists. The contradiction between the Soviet people and this privileged stratum is now the principal contradiction in the Soviet Union and it is an antagonistic contradiction.

We must not confuse the revisionist leadership of the CPSU and the privileged stratum taking to the capitalist road with the Soviet people and communist Party members. We are confident that the Soviet people, with the glorious tradition of revolutionary struggles will restore the Marxist concepts of the proletarian state and party.

## **CPSU Leadership -**

### **Ally of U.S. Imperialism for World Domination**

What does the discussion of the great debate between Marxist - Leninists and modern revisionists represented by the C P S U leadership reveal?

Marxist - Leninists firmly adhering to the principles of Marxism - Leninism are valiantly fighting for the accomplishment of the tasks of the present epoch, advancing the cause of the national liberation struggles of the oppressed nations, advancing the cause of the revolutionary class struggles throughout the world, resolutely opposing the wars of aggression by the imperialists, the American imperialists in particular thus to achieve victory in the world socialist revolution.

Modern revisionists, represented by the C P S U leadership, have betrayed Marxism- Leninism, have betrayed the revolutionary struggles of the oppressed nations and classes and have taken to a class collaborationist policy all along the line serving the interests of the imperialists.

Unity with imperialists and opposition to the socialist camp;

Unity with the reactionaries and the imperialists in the backward countries and active opposition to the national liberation struggles;

Alliance with American imperialism and active opposition to Socialist China.

This in essence is the class collaborationist policy of the CPSU leadership and this policy is diametrically opposed to the interests of the world people.

In pursuit of this class collaboration policy, the revisionist leadership of the C P S U has become an ally of U. S. imperialism for world domination, for a division of spheres of influence throughout the world as testified by their nuclear agreements, their confabulations in U.N. O, their recent talks at Glassborough with the U.S. imperialists.

Does such a characterisation of activities of the C P S U leadership mean keeping the Soviet Union out of the socialist camp? No, certainly not.

The CPSU leadership, which has embraced bourgeois ideology and which has been adopting steps for the restoration of capitalism in Soviet Union, if allowed to have its own way will try to take the Soviet Union out of the socialist camp. A timely ruthless exposure of its betrayal alone will rouse the consciousness of Soviet people and Soviet Communists and help their resistance to this betrayal of the C P S U leadership. The international communist movement owes this responsibility towards the Soviet people. Any shielding of betrayal of C P S U leadership or any soft peddling of the exposure of the betrayal of the CPSU leadership will be a violation of international duty of the world communist movement and the interests of the Soviet people.

Thus we see the contradiction between Marxism- Leninism and revisionism of the C P S U leadership is an antagonistic contradiction.

In their pursuit of class collaboration, the C P S U leaders are following the footsteps of the old revisionists-Bernstein, Kautsky, Browder and Tito.

It was the Yugoslav Titoites who first advanced revisionist theories and went out of the socialist camp after the Second World War. They changed the proletarian character of the Communist Party. They took measures to change the socialist

state into a bourgeois state. They took measures that help the process of growth of capitalist elements both in town and country. They openly took to the path of collaboration with U.S. imperialism.

It is significant to note that the CPSU leadership has begun to implement all the measures that the Yugoslav revisionists implemented in their country. They have taken over the mantle of revisionism from the Yugoslav revisionists and now they have become the leaders of modern revisionism.

It is the duty of all Marxist - Leninists to carry on irreconcilable fight against modern revisionism, represented by CPSU leadership. It is only such a fight that will help the Soviet people to see through the treachery and betrayal of the CPSU leadership. It is wrong to view this great fight of Marxist - Leninists against CPSU leadership as being anti-Soviet. It is the present leadership of the CPSU that is really anti-Soviet. Its measures for the restoration of capitalism, its attempts to convert the proletarian State into a bourgeois State and the proletarian party into a bourgeois party-all are really anti-Soviet. And this great fight is really in the interest of the Soviet people themselves.

It is true, compared to the present leadership of the C P S U the old revisionists of the Second International were mere pigmies. The C P S U leadership is using the highest prestige of the C P S U, which has been held in high esteem by all the Marxist - Leninists for many years, to cover up the essence of its revisionism and splittism and deceive those unaware of the truth. But the revisionism of the C P S U leadership has its own weaknesses also. It occurred in the land of Lenin and Stalin whose people and communists have got great traditions of revolutionary struggles and experience. And the fight against modern revisionism is taking place in the background of ever deepening crisis of world capitalism and growing class and communists have got great traditions of revolutionary struggles. In the face of these class struggles modern revisionism cannot succeed to deceive the Soviet people for long. The people and the Communists of the land of Lenin and Stalin will surely come forward and restore the unity in the socialist camp and repair the damage done by modern revisionism to the great cause of world revolution. The great ideological fight carried on by Marxist - Leninists against modern revisionism has already started yielding good results. The fall of kruschov is the first great victory against modern revisionism. It is the beginning of the end of it. Marxist - Leninists should not relax this great struggle. Faced with the prospect of complete isolation the present leadership of the CPSU, which is of Khrushchov's old cast cannot but remove him from his post and adopt supple tactics to carry on their old class collaborationist line, which is also doomed to fail. The continuation of this irreconcilable fight against modern revisionism represented by CPSU leadership and its class collaborationist policies alone will keep the Soviet Union within the socialist camp and will restore full unity in the socialist camp and the international communist movement.

## **New Deceptive Slogans and Anti-Revolution Policies of the C P S U Leaders**

The present leadership of the C P S U which has stepped into the shoes of Khrushchov has been continuously trying to gain breathing space, using every means to blur the dividing line between Marxism - Leninism and revisionism and has been trying to halt the struggle against revisionism so that it can easily speed up the measures for the restoration of capitalism in the Soviet Union and split the socialist camp for more collaboration with U.S. imperialism for world domination. With this purpose in view the new leaders of the C P S U have been loudly chanting the honeyed words and phrases, such as 'unity', 'unity of the socialist camp', 'unity of the international communist movement' on so-called 'common programme', 'unity against the enemy', 'unity against imperialism', 'united action on Vietnam' etc., all in their attempt to sap the militant will of Marxist - Leninists in fighting against modern revisionism and U.S. imperialism. Imperialism headed by U.S. imperialism is carrying on a death-bed struggle and it needs badly the services of modern revisionism in its vain attempts to save itself from its final doom. Revisionism has always been a social prop of imperialism. The new leaders of the C P S U are no exception. They in their attempt to deck themselves as different from Khrushchov to do better service to U.S. imperialism have been using a façade of 'unity' slogans in order to conceal the essence of their continued pursuance of Khrushchov revisionist line. It is common with all moribund forces to take over such progressive slogans for their reactionary purposes. But what is the reality? The present C P S U leadership, along with Khrushchov, taking advantage of every concession given, seriously tried to create confusion in the ranks of the world Communists and came out against all the revolutionary principles of the militant revolutionary programme of world communist conferences of 1957 and 1960. It is they who came out against all revolutionary struggles and ganged up with U.S. imperialists and all the reactionaries of the world against the great People's Republic of China, the base of the national liberation struggles, to isolate it from the fighting people and socialist countries. It is they who attempted to split the socialist camp and the world communist movement. The new leaders of the C P S U, who were forced to discard Khrushchov, did not change this basic line and took over Khrushchov's revisionism in its entirety. In such a situation, how can there be any base for 'unity' on 'common programme' and unity in the socialist camp when they doggedly pursue the anti-revolutionary revisionist line?

The present CPSU leaders have repeatedly declared that the line laid down at 20th and 22nd Congress of the CPSU was, is and will be their "sole and immutable line in domestic and external policy". They expressed that there was not a shade of difference between them and Khrushchov on the questions of international communist movement and on China. In spite of some new gestures and new deceptive slogans the present C P S U leaders adopt the same collaborationist policy. The emergence of Khrushchov revisionism is not due



to a few individuals and it is not an accidental phenomenon. It has deep social roots in the privileged stratum in the socialist society. Unless the Soviet people prevailed over and changed the whole course and the revisionist line, the new leaders in the interest of the privileged stratum continue to pursue the old revisionist line on all fundamental issues.

The new gestures and 'unity' slogans of the present C P S U leaders are intended to deceive the people and to serve U.S. imperialism. While criticising U.S. imperialism as the 'aggressor' and 'war-monger' they in one breath praise Johnson administration as 'sensible', 'moderate'. While asserting that they, together with the people of the world, will oppose U.S. imperialist war, maintain close contacts, exchange information against with mutual understanding with U.S. imperialists revolutionary struggles. While asserting their support to national liberation struggles, they conspire with U.S. imperialists to organise U.N. Force for the suppression of these struggles and with the reactionaries of the newly independent countries against the democratic struggles. By offering 'aid' to Vietnam, they are trying to bring the Vietnamese question into the orbit of U.S. Soviet collaboration. With these dubious methods in pursuance of the collaborationist policy the new leaders of the C P S U have fallen in a predicament to explain the contradictions in their statements.

Thus, its call for unity of action is a clever camouflage for greater disunity, for greater disruption within the socialist camp and within international working class movement.

### **Struggle for International Unity of the Proletariat and the United Action**

The history of the international communist movement was one of struggle by Marxism against opportunism and of struggle of Marxists to safeguard international unity of proletariat and to oppose the attempts by opportunists and revisionists to divide it. Marxist - Leninists uphold in the course of struggle against capitalism and imperialism in the course of world revolution, the international proletariat can defeat the enemy only through uniting the forces and uniting with all other forces that can be united. In the light of the changes in the balance of world power after the Second World War, Marxist - Leninists advanced the slogan of the international united front against U.S. imperialism, the main enemy of the world people. They stated that it has the unity of the international proletariat as its core and the unity of the proletariat and the oppressed nations as its base.

Marxism - Leninism teaches that international unity of the proletariat is a revolutionary unity, unity based on principle. Marx and Engels declared implicitly that *"it is ... impossible for us to cooperate with people who wish to expunge this class struggle from the movement"*. The great C P C and other Marxist - Leninists waged a long struggle against modern revisionism represented by C P S U leadership in order to uphold the unity of the international communist movement based on Marxism - Leninism and proletarian internationalism and broaden this united front against U.S. imperialism. Unity of Marxist - Leninists with revisionists, a unity based not on principle, will neither help the consolidation

and broadening of the united front against U.S., imperialism nor help the anti-imperialist struggles, as the core of the united front gets weakened. Only a principled struggle for unity strengthens the core of the united front. *Lenin said:*

*"unity a great cause and a great slogan-but the workers' cause requires the unity of the Marxists and not the unity of the Marxists with the opponents and distorters of Marxism."*

The present leadership of the CPSU continues its line of U.S. Soviet collaboration for world domination and continues to be the force mainly allied with U.S. imperialism. Opposition to or alliance with U.S. imperialism constitutes the hallmark for deciding whether a political force can be included in the united front against imperialism.

It is significant to note that, after this call for so-called "unity of action", the CPSU leadership has taken to the vilest slanders against Socialist China, to the worst falsifications of the actual state of affairs with regard to the cultural revolution in China, to open collaboration with the Indian and Japanese reactionaries against Socialist China, to open alliance with U.S. imperialism for world domination in opposition to the international working class movement and, in particular, in opposition to the People's Republic of China.

The Communist Party of China is absolutely right in refusing to fall into the trap of the C P S U, in refusing 'unity of action' on the basis of the so-called "common programme." The CPC has rightly said., *"there are things that divide us and nothing that unites us, things that are antagonistic and nothing that is common."*

The very fact that the great C P C has repeatedly stated that they are ready to take united action with C P S U leaders if they really opposed U.S. imperialism and did go by actual deeds goes to show their urge for principled unity, for anti-imperialists struggles.

A section in our Party views the whole issue from a different angle which is completely wrong.

They wrongly feel that the slogan of 'united action' is given by the new C P S U leadership at a time when the socialist camp is seriously divided on several ideological-political issues as if the purpose is to bridge the gulf; and that it was given in connection with U.S. aggression on Vietnam in order to work out with the people's republic of China a joint plan against aggression, which is not in consonance with facts. Everybody knows that the liberation struggle of Vietnamese people still continues only because it could withstand the opposition of CPSU leadership. When the international working class movement, particularly the great People's Republic of China, has magnificently rallied to the cause of Vietnamese people, the C P S U leadership with its revisionist theories and practices has done everything possible to disarm, to disrupt and to sabotage the Vietnamese struggle. Failing in his attempt to isolate and put down to Vietnamese struggle Khrushchov even went to the extent of threatening 'non-involvement'. Faced with the prospect of complete isolation, the new C P S U leadership adopted the policy of

'involvement'. Involvement or 'non-involvement',- both serve the interests of the U.S. imperialists unless the policy of collaboration with US imperialists is completely reversed. When the Vietnamese struggle has been progressing victoriously against U.S. imperialists in spite of the C P S U leadership, with full cooperation of the People's Republic of China and the world people, when it has become a rallying point for the unity of all anti-imperialists and all Marxist - Leninists, who are seriously interested in the decisive defeat of U.S. imperialism in Vietnam and when it has become a turning -point in the anti-imperialist struggles after many debacles, as in Congo and Dominican Republic due to their betrayal, the present leadership of the C P S U has advanced the slogan of 'united action' to cover its isolation from the struggling people and Marxist - Leninists of the world and to worm itself into the anti-imperialist front for further disruption. The attempt of the C P S U leadership to isolate Vietnamese struggle has failed. Vietnam has never been and will never be alone against U.S. imperialism. It has to be seriously noted that only when the stage of isolation of the C P S U leadership commenced, it has come out with such deceptive slogans. It is incorrect on the part of a section of our party to oppose the principled stand of the C P C and support the slogan of united action, through not as a slogan of immediate action.

Everybody knows that the present C P S U leadership has been doggedly pursuing the policy of close collaboration with U.S. imperialism. Its stand on the question of Vietnam is inseparable from its line of collaboration with the U.S. Facts prove the correctness of this proposition. Whenever the U.S. imperialists needed the help of the C P S U leadership in its 'peace' swindle in Vietnam, it readily responded in its own way. In January 1966 it proposed to the Democratic Republic of Vietnam to accept the U.S. conditions for peace. In February 1965, it forwarded Johnsons' proposal for unconditional negotiations and carried on diplomatic talks with France violating the promise made to C P C. After a strong rebuff from the Democratic Republic of Vietnam, the C P S U leadership changed its tactics, publicly put forward another slogan that negotiations can be started after U.S. bombing is stopped. When these plots were foiled, it began to collaborate with Indian reactionaries and the Tito Clique, both the brokers of U.S. imperialism on the Vietnam question. The practice of the C P S U leadership was demonstratively proved that it is not interested in a decisive defeat of U.S. imperialism in Vietnam and, all along the line, at every step in the Vietnamese struggle, the C P S U leadership has been pursuing different strategic aims in opposition to the aims of the liberation struggle of the Vietnamese people. Even while giving military aid to Vietnam it goes on with its anti-China propaganda and maintains close contact with America, searching for more areas of co-operation. The bitter experiences of this period show that the present C P S U leadership has completely transposed enemies and friends. In such a situation, to abandon the principled stand and take 'united action' with revisionist leadership will only whitewash it, help it in deceiving the people of the Soviet Union, of other Socialist countries and the world. It will be nothing but taking chances and

making experiments with the glorious struggle of the Vietnamese people which defied all plans of treachery and betrayal and has valiantly moved ahead.

A section of our Party, knowing fully well that the revisionist theories and practices have gone only to abet and encourage the American expansionists rather than in restoring real peace in Vietnam, knowing fully well that a host of steps and actions were deliberately perpetrated by the C P S U leadership 'to damn the Chinese Communists as war-mongers and traitors to the cause of socialism' and knowing fully well that in the present context the slogan of united action given by the C P S U leadership 'reduces itself to one of scoring points and deceiving the gullible', persists in upholding the deceptive slogan of the C P S U leadership as a slogan of future united action and in supporting the proposal for joint discussions between revisionist leaders and the leaders of the people of the Republic of China and Vietnam. Whether at present or in future, united action is possible and necessary between Marxist - Leninists and revolutionaries but not with anti-revolutionary revisionists. Any unprincipled unity will help to disrupt the struggles. Joint discussions between revisionist C P S U leaders and revolutionary leaders of China and Vietnam cannot strengthen the core of the anti-imperialist front against U.S. imperialism in Vietnam and the failure of the meeting will be a handle in the hands of imperialists and revisionists for impeding the Vietnam struggle itself.

The argument that united action in Vietnam should not have been refused in principle with the parties and states in which revisionists held the sway in the light of the concepts of united front, united action etc., is completely wrong and illogical. Such parties and states are not parties and states in general; they are communist parties and socialist states, which have to serve as the constituents of the core of the anti-imperialist front. Ideological and political struggles and a kind of sorting between Marxist - Leninists and revisionists is taking place in those parties and states. The condition for the united front is struggle against imperialism. If the people and communists in those states and parties are allowed to be deceived and lulled in their vigilance against the revisionist leaders, it will only help the disruption of the anti-imperialist struggle. Such slogans of 'united action' which help the disruption of the struggle itself, are diametrically opposed to the very aims and principles of united front tactics. There is a wrong notion that there is only some misunderstanding and some mess created between the C P S U and C P C and that some facile notion of C P S U leadership has created that split in the socialist camp and communist movement and for that reason, a section of our party has gone to the extent of suggesting bilateral talks and abandonment of the 'facile notions' by the leaders of the C P S U to repair the split.

What is standing between C P S and C P S U and between the people and the communists in those states and parties on one hand and the Marxist - Leninist parties on the other is neither a mess nor a 'facile notion' - (of maintaining world peace in collaboration with U.S. imperialism without China) - held by the C P S U leadership. What is standing in between is the modern revisionism represented by the C P S U leadership and its policy of collaboration with U.S. imperialism for

world domination. This section of our party fails to understand that the peace sought to be maintained by C P S U leaders is a peace of the burial ground and they want to win that peace not only with the collaboration of U.S. imperialism but also against the great people's Republic of China, against the struggling people of the world. Everybody knows that the main aim of the U.S. war plans is the destruction of the People's Republic of China and the socialist camp, to be achieved after the suppression of the national liberation struggles-all this for world domination. When the leadership of the C P S U collaborates with U.S. imperialism and all reactionaries against China and dogmatically pursues the line what is it for if not for world domination? Only the revisionists, representing a privileged bourgeois stratum can pursue such an aim. The leading section of our party fails to see the revisionist depths of the C P S U leadership and their policy and supports the deceptive slogans and proposals of the C P S U leadership.

The damage done to the unity of the socialist camp and the international communist movement will be repaired and unity will be fully restored before long. But that can be and has to be done on the basis of principled struggle.

### **The Contribution of C P C**

The C P C under the leadership of Mao, basing on the experience of the Great October Revolution, creatively applied Marxism- Leninism to the conditions of China, following the correct tactics of united front, following the correct tactics of struggle-and through a prolonged armed struggle, first liberating the countryside and finally liberating the towns, liberated 70 crores of population from age -long slavery and established people's democracy and now through its cultural revolution is struggling for the strengthening of the dictatorship of the proletariat and completion of the socialist revolution.

With this rich experience of revolutionary struggle , C P C tried to correct the revisionist mistakes of the C P S U leadership through friendly criticism. When the C P S U leadership spurned this friendly criticism, and openly took to a class collaborationist line, the C P C had to begin an open ideological battle against modern revisionism represented by the C P S U leadership to preserve the sacredness of Marxism - Leninism . Its numerous articles exposing modern revisionism have greatly contributed to the enrichment of Marxism - Leninism in the present era.

People's Democracy, People's War, completion of the socialist revolution through the present cultural revolution, struggle for the accomplishment of the world socialist revolution basing on the national liberation struggles of the oppressed nations; an irreconcilable ideological battle against modern revisionism-this in essence is the thought of Mao, Marxism - Leninism of the present epoch, upheld by the Marxist - Leninists through out the world.

Marx and Engels developed their theories of scientific socialism in a period of growing industrial capitalism.

Lenin further developed Marxism applicable to the period of imperialism.

Stalin developed Marxism - Leninism in building socialism in a single country encircled by capitalist states, and his struggle for creating mass communist parties throughout the world.

The thought of Mao is a further development of Marxism - Leninism applicable to the present era when imperialism is first disintegrating and the national liberation struggles have come to occupy a central place for the completion of the world socialist revolution.

Already recent world history has amply proved that wherever people have assimilated the experience of the Chinese revolution, and applied it to the concrete conditions of their country, there the revolutionary movements have won complete victory, or have made significant advances. And wherever the people have failed to assimilate the experience of the Chinese revolution, there the revolutionary movements have failed to make any significant advance or even counter-revolutions have succeeded.

### **Consolidation of the International Communist Movement**

It is the urgent task of all Marxist - Leninists to work hard for consolidation of the international communist movement to accomplish the tasks of the present period.

In the recent period the revisionist leadership of the C P S U by its efforts to impose its own programme on fraternal parties, by its blatant interference in the internal affairs of other parties, in the name of personality cult, by its splitting activities, has seriously disrupted the international communist movement and damaged the fraternal relations of the Communist Parties throughout the world.

In the course of the struggle against modern revisionism regrouping of Marxist - Leninists is taking place throughout the world.

There must be a common programme based on Marxism - Leninism for the general direction of the world communist movement in the present period. Such a common programme alone will help in the consolidation of the international communist movement.

*'A Proposal Concerning the General Line of the International Communist Movement'*, proposed by the C P C lays the proper basis for such a common programme for the world communist movement.

Fraternal relations between the various communist parties based on proletarian internationalism must be restored to achieve consolidation of the world communist movement. These relations must be based on the principle of solidarity, the principle of mutual support and mutual assistance, the principle of independence and equality and the principle of reaching unanimity through consultation.

It is the primary duty of the Communist Party in each country to acquire an accurate knowledge of the trends of the different classes in its own country through serious investigation and study, and to know how to apply the universal truth of Marxism - Leninism and integrate it with concrete practice of its own country, to evolve its own programme and tactical line based on Marxism - Leninism to achieve victory in its revolution.

When the political line of a particular Party goes completely wrong, and when that party rejects the friendly criticism of brother parties, fraternal parties will have no other option except open criticism. This has been the practice of past history.

When the Third International was founded in 1919, Lenin had to criticise the programmes of many parties to put them on the correct track in the interests of the movement of the concerned country and in the interests of the international movement.

Today, the world communist movement is facing a similar situation. Many Marxist - Leninist Parties are evolving a struggle against modern revisionism.

C P C, the leading detachment of the world communist movement, with its rich experience of revolutionary struggles, in its discharge of international tasks, is offering criticism of the activities of certain parties to help them correct their mistakes.

It is highly regrettable that relations between our party and the C P C have been greatly damaged recently.

Taking the strong language alone used by the C P C into consideration, we should not miss the essence of the criticism in the interests of our own Party. We must seriously try to self-critically examine our own work in the light of that criticism and speedily correct our mistakes. We must take speedy steps to re-establish fraternal relations between our two parties.

We must recognise that the main danger to our movement comes from revisionism, both nationally and internationally. The long legacy of revisionism, the predominant petty-bourgeois atmosphere in the country, our work in united fronts in ministries, Parliament and Assemblies offer a continuous breeding ground for revisionism. We must resolutely combat revisionism in all its forms.

While combating revisionism, we must at the same time guard against any left- sectarian mistakes that may occur.

The world communist movement is at a turning point in its history. The international communist movement will deal a crushing blow to modern revisionism and before long achieve complete victory in the World Socialist Revolution.

28-10-1967



# DOCUMENTS OF ANDHRA COMMUNIST PLENUM RESOLUTION OF THE ANDHRA COMMUNIST PLENUM

## *AP PLENUM REJECTS THE*

### *NEO-REVISIONIST IDEOLOGICAL DRAFT*

*[The Andhra Communist Plenum was held in Palakole (West Godavari district in Jan 1968) as part of the internal debate organised by the CC, CPI(M) on the questions of International Communist Movement. This Plenum was a culmination at the State level of plenums at different - taluka and district - levels. It adopted a Resolution on the MADHURAI IDEOLOGICAL DRAFT OF THE CC, CPI(M). Out of a total 231 delegates, 158 voted for the Resolution while 52 against it and 8 remained neutral. Here is the Text. -EC]*

Andhra Communist Committee Plenum, after discussing the Central Committee Draft on **International Ideological Discussions**, has adopted the following resolution:

1. This Draft does not show a clear-cut way to the solution of the fundamental issues that are being faced today by the International Communist Movement and the Indian Communist Movement.

2. This Draft has not tried to expose the treacherous character of the Soviet Revisionist leadership, which has weakened and disrupted the International Communist Movement, the Socialist Camp, the National Liberation struggles and the world working class movements through its revisionist theories and practice and has thus become a counter-revolutionary force.

3. This Draft is trying to point out non-class reasons, without going into and examining the class roots of the Soviet revisionist leadership.

4. This Draft refuses to recognize the truth (the objective reality) of the Soviet revisionist leadership's effort to destroy the socialist system and to restore capitalism. This Draft refuses to recognize the effort of this leadership to convert



the Soviet State into an ordinary bourgeois state, and the Soviet Communist Party into an ordinary bourgeois Party.

5. Soviet revisionist leadership is functioning as the political representative of the new capitalist forces having special rights and as political representative of this privileged stratum.

6. Because it has acquired the character of the bourgeoisie, the Soviet revisionist leadership has been working as the enemy of Soviet people, of the socialist system, of the Socialist Camp and of the World Communist movement. It is working as an ally and friend of the imperialists, within the world communist movement and in the socialist camp.

7. The Soviet revisionist leadership which has betrayed Marxism-Leninism, has been implementing class collaborationist line with American imperialists on a world wide- scale against revolutionary movements, against Socialist China and against world working class movement, and thus joined hands with American imperialists for world hegemony and for division of spheres of influence.

8. This Draft refuses to see neither the decisive role of National Liberation struggles in the new epoch nor the truth that to make these national liberation struggles achieve complete success, People's War is the only form and that there is no other way.

9. Vietnam Peoples' Liberation struggle has advanced, fighting on the one hand against the aggression of American imperialists and on the other hand resisting the betrayal of Soviet revisionist leadership. Because of its disruptive role being exposed it is getting isolated. In order to enter into the ranks of Marxist-Leninists and in the ranks of National Liberation struggles, so as to carry on greater disruption, the Soviet revisionist leadership has come forward with deceitful slogans of "common theory", "common programme" and "unity in action". The Chinese Communist Party, reacting against this deceit, has correctly rejected these proposals. For the C.C. Draft to find fault with the Chinese Party on this question, this Plenum considers it to be totally wrong.

10. The Chinese Communist Party has carried a serious ideological and political struggle against Modern revisionism, rescued Marxism-Leninism and applied it to the conditions of the new epoch and thus developed it.

In the struggle that is being waged against imperialism and modern revisionism, the CPC is in the vanguard. Through the Cultural Revolution, it is strengthening proletarian dictatorship and is trying to enrich and complete the socialist revolution.

We consider the following as the essence of the Thought of Mao Tse-tung: Peoples' Democracy; Peoples' War; the struggle against Modern Revisionism; enriching and completing the Socialist Revolution through the Cultural Revolution.

Thus the Chinese People's Republic is functioning as the Revolutionary Centre of World Communist Movement. The C.C Draft refuses to recognize this truth and reality.

This Draft is not helpful to examine self-critically, the differences which have arisen between our Party and the Chinese Party and to correct the mistakes of our movement.

It is true that while fighting against Modern Revisionism, it is necessary to safeguard against Left Deviationist trends, but to say that left Deviation has become an immediate danger is totally wrong.

11. If, instead of trying to solve the ideological and political differences that have arisen in the Party through principled inner-party discussions and by adopting necessary measures for such discussions, one tries to solve the differences through organisational measures, it will only result in doing great harm.

The only way to solve the ideological and political differences that have arisen in the Party is through thorough and complete discussions. At different levels it is necessary for the Party units to discuss and implement the decisions of the Central and State Committees, in accordance with party forms. It is through conducting ideological and political discussions alone that differences can be solved.

But the C.C., has given its Draft to the press, even before it reached the party members. It has declared it as party policy, while it is still under discussion. It has refused to circulate differing views, for discussion. This Plenum considers these and similar steps taken by C.C. as totally wrong.

12. Therefore this Plenum rejects the *C.C. Draft*. This *Plenum* appeals to the C.C. Plenum to prepare a new Draft on the basis of the June 14<sup>th</sup> Letter of the Chinese Communist Party, and on the basis of its Nine Comments, and also keeping in view the criticisms that are voiced in the resolutions of the 3 comrades, Pulla Reddi, Nagi Reddi and Kolla Venkaiah. That new Draft along with differing notes and views are to be circulated among Party members for discussion and the Party Congress has to be convened for taking final decisions.



## **RESOLUTION SUBMITTED BY T.NAGI REDDY & C.PULLA REDDY TO THE ANDHRA PLENUM**

**[Held in Jan 1968]**

The C.C. Draft for the Ideological Discussion has come at a great turning point in the struggle of the international communist movement against world imperialism headed by the U.S. imperialists and against Modern Revisionism represented and practised by the revisionist leadership of the CPSU.

At the time of the Seventh Congress of our Party, when the Party Programme was being adopted, we did not discuss the various fundamental issues involved in the great international ideological debate. Even when certain aspects of this international debate having a direct bearing on certain issues of our Programme were discussed, at least these and the conflicting views about these issues, were not separately formulated and discussed thoroughly to enable us to come to proper conclusions.

Beginning with the victory of the Great Chinese People's Revolution, a new epoch of all round peoples struggles against decaying imperialism has been unfolding throughout the world, heralding a new epoch of rapid decay and disintegration of the imperialist system, heralding the eve of the complete victory of World Socialist Revolution.

But world imperialism headed by American imperialism has been conducting ferocious last-ditch battles to drown the revolutionary struggles in blood and save imperialism from its inevitable doom.

Just at the time when imperialism is on the verge of complete collapse, when the world socialist forces are on the verge of complete success, when the forces of the international working class movement are conducting titanic class struggles against the dying forces of imperialism, Modern Revisionism, represented and practised by the present CPSU leadership, has raised its ugly head within the ranks of the World Communist Movement, with a host of revisionist theories and practices, to demoralise, disrupt and sabotage the international working class movement, to liquidate the revolutionary struggles of the oppressed peoples and nations and thus save the imperialist system from its inevitable doom.

Beginning with the 20<sup>th</sup> Congress of the CPSU, Modern Revisionism represented by the CPSU leadership has passed through various phases of development-its emergence, formation, growth and systematisation.

Now, Modern Revisionism, represented by the CPSU leadership, has been revealed as open betrayal of the revolutionary struggles, as open collaboration with U.S. imperialism for world domination.

Now, it is as clear as daylight that the Programme of the CPSU leadership is a Programme which opposes revolutions of the peoples still under the imperialism and the capitalist system, which opposes the carrying of revolution through to completion on the part of the people already on the Socialist Road. It is a revisionist Programme for the preservation and restoration of capitalism.

Marxist-Leninists throughout the world, especially the glorious CPC, had to conduct a merciless ideological battle against Modern Revisionism represented by the CPSU leadership. The forces of Marxist-Leninists regrouped themselves, both nationally and internationally, fought valiantly against this treachery and betrayal perpetrated by the CPSU leadership in the international working class movement, and the revolutionary struggles.

The revolutionary struggles of the oppressed peoples and nations, the revolutionary forces of the international working class movement, based on Marxism-Leninism had to withstand the repressive forces of imperialism and counter-revolution and, the deception and disruption practised by Modern Revisionism represented by the CPSU leadership, and inspite of certain defeats, made significant advances throughout the world.

In these struggles, Marxist-Leninists and the revolutionary forces of the world are getting consolidated, taking the initiative into their own hands, and are advancing in the struggle against imperialism and Modern Revisionism represented by the CPSU leadership.

Faced with the prospect of growing isolation from the ranks of the world revolutionary forces, from the ranks of the National Liberation forces, from the ranks of the Marxist-Leninists the revisionist leadership of the CPSU, has been parading a façade of "unity" slogans, to worm itself back into the ranks of the Marxist-Leninists, into the anti-imperialist front, for further disrupting this front, and thus to better serve the imperialists.

It is the duty of the Marxist-Leninists to ruthlessly expose the deceptive new slogans of the CPSU leadership, to rebuff their efforts to work themselves back into the ranks of the revolutionary struggles, in order to achieve victory in their struggle against imperialism and Modern Revisionism.

The consolidation and the further rapid advance of the World Communist Movement to accomplish the tasks of the new epoch is inconceivable without waging a principled and determined fight against this menace of Modern Revisionism, against the deceptive new slogans of "unity", given by the CPSU leadership.

It is at this stage of the struggle against imperialism and modern revisionism represented by the CPSU leadership, that our Party is discussing the various issues involved in the great international ideological debate.

We strongly feel that the C.C. Draft and the outlook expounded from time to time in various documents, particularly *'the New situation and Party's Tasks'*, will not and cannot serve as an instrument in the hands of the Party to fight against Modern Revisionism and reorientate itself to the rising struggles in the Country in the present international revolutionary situation.

***1. The depth of the treachery and betrayal of Modern Revisionism represented by the CPSU leadership towards the international working class movement.***

At this stage of the struggle of the international working class movement against the imperialists and the deceptive and disruptive tactics adopted by Modern Revisionism represented by the CPSU leadership, the duty of every Marxist-Leninist Party is, not merely to oppose the revisionist theories and propositions of the CPSU leadership, but also to ruthlessly expose the devastating results of this policy in practice, the depth of the treachery and betrayal of the CPSU leadership towards the international working class movement, the crass nature of Soviet Revisionism and the class roots of Soviet Revisionism.

This Plenum meeting strongly feels that the C.C. Draft has completely failed in discharging this task.

(a) The policies of the CPSU leadership on peace, Peaceful Co-existence, Peaceful Economic Competition and Peaceful Transition-which have resulted in a line of compromise, conciliation and collaboration with U.S. imperialism for world domination, have been based on its description of the new epoch as an epoch of peaceful transition.

This anti-Marxist-Leninist description of the New Epoch made by the CPSU leadership, in practice, was merely a mask to cover up the aggressive nature of U.S. imperialism, to create illusions in the revolutionary forces about achieving peaceful transition to Socialism without gigantic battles, without heavy sacrifices; illusions about achieving victories without a fight. Thus, it was an attempt on the part of the CPSU leadership to sap the fighting will of the fighting forces and facilitate the aggressive plans of U.S. imperialism.

It is a deceptive cover through which the CPSU leadership carries its betrayal of national liberation struggles, the betrayal of world revolutionary struggles.

Instead of ruthlessly exposing this deception of the CPSU leadership, the C.C. Draft explains away as though the CPSU Leadership's estimation of the New Epoch is due to an *"erroneous definition"*, *"over-simplified formulas subjectively drawn, presenting utopian and false perspectives"*, as though it is living in a *"dream world in which imperialism has ceased to be the monster which has to be annihilated"*.

For the C.C. Draft to say that the CPSU leadership wrongly evaluated the New Epoch as an epoch of peaceful transition to Socialism because it underestimated the strength of imperialism still to resist the advance of the popular

forces, is not exposing the deception of the CPSU leadership, but only inventing an explanation for this deception.

Not only that: In this New Epoch of final collapse of imperialism and the final triumph of world wide victory of Socialism, the national liberation struggles have become the decisive force for the final destruction of imperialism. It is the imperative duty of the international working class movement to give all its support to NLM. It is sacred duty of the Socialist countries to give every kind of support-ideological, political, economic and military-to help NLM to achieve complete success.

The C.C. Draft has failed to locate the NLM as playing the decisive role for the final destruction of imperialism.

Instead of this, the C.C. Draft has said that revolutionary combination of "Socialist diplomacy" and the "armed might of the Socialist Camp" as essential factors for the complete victory of National Liberation struggles.

This is akin to Suslov who said that *"the duty of the Socialist countries to give to these countries political and diplomatic support and when necessary, to curb the imperialist aggressors by using the whole might of the Socialist System"*. (Suslov Report- English P.38)

(b) The CPSU leadership has been dogmatically asserting that the basic contradiction between Socialism and Imperialism is almost the only contradiction which determines the course of world revolution, while the other contradictions play a minor role in the development of world history.

This so-called understanding of the CPSU leadership on the question of contradictions was only a means for its advocacy of peaceful solutions for all the fundamental contradictions of the present epoch.

It was only a means to cover up the growing contradiction between the oppressed nations and imperialism, to negate the decisive role of the NLM in deciding the success of the world revolution which practically served the interests of imperialism, the U.S. imperialism in particular.

Instead of unmasking these pernicious effects of the theory of the CPSU leadership on contradictions, the C.C. Draft describes the theory of the CPSU leadership on contradictions as merely *"wrong in theory and harmful in practice"* and that this wrong theory merely led to "serious opportunist mistakes".

Not only that. The C.C. Draft finds an explanation for this "wrong theory" of the CPSU leadership and declares that this is due to a *"totally erroneous and undialectical understanding, study and assessment of the contradictions"*.

In the recent period, the ever growing forces of NLM are seriously undermining the rear of the imperialist system, the U.S. imperialism with its 3,000 military bases throughout the world is concentrating its main military strength in the continents of Asia, Africa and Latin America to drown NLM in blood. Thus Asia, Africa and Latin America have become the main theatre of war between the world revolutionary forces and imperialism. The struggle between these two forces is of decisive importance for the cause of World Socialist Revolution.

To say that the CPSU leadership does not see this reality, that it merely underestimates the role of NLM, is merely a refusal to see the treachery of the CPSU leadership.

(c) Practice has revealed that the sole aim of the peace policies of the CPSU leadership has been to come to an agreement with the greatest enemy of the peoples of the whole world-U.S. Imperialism.

To achieve this purpose, it disrupted the socialist camp betrayed the revolutionary struggles of the oppressed peoples, disrupted the anti-imperialist front, disrupted the unity of the international working class movement, the only key weapons in the hands of the world peoples to defeat the war plans of the U.S. aggressors and preserve world peace.

Its nuclear agreements with the U.S. imperialists were merely intended to isolate China, to preserve the monopoly of USA and USSR over nuclear weapons.

Friendship with America-enmity with Socialist China- this in essence has become the peace policy of the Soviet Union.

Instead of exposing these pernicious manifestations of the policies of the revisionist leadership of the CPSU, the C.C. Draft explains that *"the attitude of the Soviet leaders on the entire issue is based on the unwarranted premise that their collaboration with the Anglo-American imperialists is a greater guarantee for the preservation of peace"*.

So, the betrayal of one revolutionary post after another by the CPSU leadership, to purchase peace with America, is the result of a more *"unwarranted premise"*.

(d) The essence of the policy of peaceful co-existence practiced by the revisionist leadership has been allround peace with the exploiting classes throughout the world- peace between the oppressed people and oppressor nations, peace between the proletariat and the capitalists', peace between the Socialist Camp and the Imperialist Camp even at the cost of revolution.

Thus, the policy of peaceful co-existence of the CPSU leadership is a negation of all revolutions throughout the world, and an allround cooperation and collaboration with the class enemy.

Its practice fully demonstrated that friendship with America is the heart and soul of the policy of peaceful co-existence of the CPSU leadership.

This great betrayal of all revolutionary struggles, and its global collaboration with U.S. imperialism is being painted by the C.C. Draft as though the CPSU leadership merely *"tends to shield the aggressor", "seeks to conceal the constant imperialist aggression, to appease the aggressor"*.

Not only that. The C.C. says that *"peaceful co-existence is of course an essential part of the Leninist foreign policy obligatory to every Socialist State"*.

We think that this is not in consonance with Lenin, who said:

*"Alliance with the revolutionaries of the advanced countries and with all the oppressed peoples against any and all the imperialists- such is the external policy of the Russian Revolution"*.

To say that peaceful co-existence policy of a socialist state is the "*essential part of the Leninist foreign policy*" is adding grist to the policies of the CPSU leadership on peaceful co-existence.

Instead of trying to analyse the class roots of the revisionist leadership of the CPSU, to understand its treachery and betrayal of the revolutionary struggles, to understand its collaborationist policy, the C.C. document tries to issue good conduct certificate to the CPSU leadership by saying that its "wrong" theories with "harmful effects" are merely due to "totally erroneous and undialectical understanding, study and assessment" of the new epoch and contradictions of the new epoch. This amounts to saying that the collaborationist policy of the CPSU leadership is not due to its betrayal of Marxism-Leninism, to its treachery and betrayal of the revolutionary struggles but merely to an undialectical understanding of the new epoch, as an epoch of peaceful transition.

But what is the reality? The revisionist leadership of the CPSU, exploiting the peace sentiments of the peoples of the world and the peace sentiments of the peoples of the S.U. in particular, introduces its treacherous policy of peace and peaceful co-existence to betray the revolutionary struggles and to serve the interests of the U.S. imperialists.

Lenin never tried to explain 'peace' policy of the revisionist leaders of the Second International as resulting from their wrong understanding of the situation. He said:

*"The theory reduces itself to this and only to this, that Kautsky utilizes the hope for a new peaceful era of capitalism to justify the opportunists and the official Social Democratic parties who joined the bourgeoisie and repudiated the revolutionary, i.e. proletarian tactics during the present turbulent era not withstanding the solemn declarations of the Basle Resolution." (Lenin - Collapse of the Second International.)*

He declared:

*"..... the very thought of peacefully subordinating the capitalists to the will of the majority of the exploited, of the peaceful, reformist, transition to socialism is not only extreme philistine stupidity, but also downright deception of the workers, the embellishment of the capitalist wage slavery, concealment of the truth."*

## **II. National Liberation movements.**

(a) The growing National Liberation Struggles are breaking the base of the imperialist system. Imperialist rule has been overthrown in many colonial and dependent countries, and, in others it has suffered heavy blows and is tottering. This inevitably weakens and shakes the rule of imperialism in the metropolitan countries themselves.

Thus the National Liberation Struggles have become a powerful force in thwarting the war plans of U.S. imperialism for world domination and in preserving world peace.



Thus, in the present era, the NLMs have got overall and decisive importance in deciding the course of the world socialist revolution.

Instead of seeing this, the C.C. Draft merely says that the intensification of the contradiction between the NLMs and imperialism "*influences the course of all other contradictions.*"

We feel this characterisation does not fully bring out the decisive role of NLM in advancing the course of the world Socialist Revolution.

We have to bring this fact here, because, the C.C. in "*New Situation and Party's Tasks*" has expounded certain wrong notions on this question.

(b) The C.C. Resolution says:

*"The popular victories scored in a series of countries in Asia and the Middle East against the imperialists have become a cause of panic for the U.S. imperialists who began raising the pernicious slogan of 'power vacuum'."* (Page.15)

What is it that the C.C. wants to convey by this?

According to the C.C. Resolution, the NLMs in Asia, Africa and Latin America threaten the imperialist system in Asia and U.S. imperialism shifted its centre of attack against the NLM to dominate the East with its "*amended global strategy and tactics*" "*for its aggressive and expansionist aims in Asia.*" (Page 16)

So according to the C.C. Resolution, the NLM threatens the imperialist system in the East and the U.S. imperialists are attacking the NLM to achieve their domination in the East.

Is not this outlook similar to that of the CPSU leadership, who have been propagating the view that the NLM in Asia, Africa and Latin America have got only a geographical and regional significance?

But we firmly believe that what is at stake today in Asia, Africa and Latin America is not only the imperialist system in these parts but the very existence of the world capitalist system as a whole. The destruction or the preservation of the world capitalist system is today dependent upon the success or failure of the liberation struggles in these areas.

The U.S. imperialism rightly sees in NLM a threat to the whole world capitalist system, the biggest impediment to their plans of world domination, and are fighting their last ditch-battles against NLM in connivance with the revisionist leadership of the CPSU to preserve the fast crumbling world capitalist system, and to achieve their world domination.

Further the C.C. Resolution says that the military strength of the Soviet Union under the present CPSU leadership and the Warsaw Pact are an effective force in resisting the war plans of U.S. imperialism to dominate Europe. *The C.C. Resolution* says:

*"In Europe, the Soviet Union has rebuilt its war-ravaged economy rapidly, broken the U.S. nuclear monopoly, outstripped the U.S. in the scientific and technological fields, manufactured atomic and hydrogen weapons including the ICBM and the anti missile-missiles, and proved itself to be more than a match to*

*the U.S. in the defence and military sphere. The East European peoples' Democracies had succeeded in consolidating their revolutionary victories and had put their states firmly on the road to socialism and communism. U.S. imperialism also found that its aggressive NATO military alliance was effectively countered by the Warsaw Pact under the Soviet leadership. At the same time it was being faced with the mounting tide of the NLM forces that was threatening to further undermine the imperialist system in Asia."*

What an amazing statement! Leaving aside the question as to whether the East European Democracies have been placed firmly on the road to socialism and communism for future discussion, the C.C. Resolution wants the Party members to believe that the *"U.S. imperialists then shifted their main centre of aggressive activities and sphere of expansion from Europe to Asia"*, because its plans for the domination of Europe were thwarted by the military strength of the Soviet Union and the East European Democracies.

To say the least, this is completely a travesty of truth.

The advocacy of peaceful transition to socialism by the CPSU leadership and Modern Revisionists of the European continent which sapped the will of the fighting sections of the proletariat. The active opposition of the revisionist leadership of the CPSU to all revolutionary struggles, the constant efforts of the CPSU leadership to come to an agreement with U.S. imperialism on all key issues of the day, even at the cost of revolution, its nuclear agreements with U.S. imperialism, its constant secret negotiations with U.S. imperialists in the corridors of UNO, gave confidence to the U.S. imperialists about the readiness to collaborate with U.S. imperialism in suppressing NLM, and it was this that enabled the U.S. imperialists to shift their military concentration from Europe to that of Asia, Africa and Latin America to successfully carry its aggressive wars against the oppressed nations.

Instead of showing up this treachery of the CPSU leadership towards the NLM, the C.C. Resolution merely tries to show it up as an effective force in rebuffing the U.S. efforts to dominate Europe.

(c) The C.C. Resolution has further tried to reduce the significance of the PRC as against the aggressive war plans of the U.S. imperialists, to one of geographical importance. *The C.C. Resolution says:*

*"What, according to the U.S. strategists, stands as the biggest stumbling block to their Asian expansionism and domination?..... They now treat PRC as the chief force standing against their expansionist aims in Asia."*

So according to this, the U.S. imperialists are fighting for expansionism in Asia, and PRC as an Asian power is fighting the expansionist aims in Asia.

But the truth of the matter is, the U.S. imperialists are fighting for world domination while the PRC carrying through the behests of Lenin and Stalin is doing its utmost to help NLM to success heroically championing the cause of world socialism and valiantly fighting the aggressive war plans of the

U.S. imperialists for world domination. Such is the world liberating mission that PRC is gloriously carrying on its shoulders.

Only prejudices can blind one not to see the world liberating mission of the PRC, that PRC, with its consistent struggle against U.S. imperialist plans for world domination, with its irreconcilable ideological battles against modern revisionism, with its self-less support to the revolutionary struggles throughout the world, is actually acting as the base of the world revolution.

(d) Soviet Economic Aid

The C.C. Draft describes Soviet economic aid to the backward countries in the name of the non-capitalist path, as aid to capitalists, to build capitalism in their respective countries.

This description is misleading, giving the impression as though Soviet Economic Aid to the backward countries plays an anti-imperialist role to resist imperialist pressures on those countries.

Practice has shown that Soviet Economic Aid has been used to build a so-called public-sector, subservient to the growth of monopoly capitalism, subservient to the penetration of American capitalism.

More and more Soviet economic aid is acquiring the character of aid to buttress reactionary governments as in Indonesia, Bolivia and India, as aid to create its own sphere of influence in the backward countries, as aid to gang up reactionary governments against PRC.

When this is becoming the growing character of Soviet Aid, to say that Soviet Aid is aid to build capitalism, is not to thoroughly expose the real features of CPSU leadership.

(e) Peoples War

Recent history has amply proved that NLMs faced with the armed intervention of the U.S. imperialists, faced with armed counter-revolution, are taking more and more to the path of people's war inspired by the experience of the Chinese Revolution.

When this is becoming the main form of struggle, such expressions as, *"the foremost thinkers, founders and leaders of Marxism-Leninism were always eager to find out ways and means to restrict, minimise and, if possible to avoid the bourgeois violence in the way of effecting the Socialist revolution, since peaceful transition is advantageous to the proletariat"*, or *"Marx, Engels, Lenin and the foremost leaders of the world proletariat did strive to achieve the socialist revolution by peaceful means wherever and whenever such an opportunity did open before them without allowing it to be missed"*, would only emphasise the possibilities of peaceful transition and create illusions among the fighting ranks about peaceful transition, as has been done in *"New Situation and Party's Tasks"*.

(f) Intermediate Zone

The C.C. Draft has not discussed the significance of the intermediate zone. It is not for nothing.

In between U.S. imperialism and the socialist camp, the intermediate zone and the inter-imperialist contradictions in this area have got a particular significance in isolating U.S. imperialism.

In this context alone, we can understand PRC's relations with France or Pakistan, which have yielded good results in isolating U.S. imperialism.

The revisionist leadership of the CPSU which opposed this line in the beginning, had to swallow its own words and try to develop its relations with France and Pakistan with its own ulterior motives.

The C.C. could not appreciate the attitude of PRC to Pakistan as it fails to understand the approach of PRC towards the intermediate zone.

Attitude towards the NLM has become an important line of demarcation between Marxist-Leninists and modern revisionists represented by the CPSU leadership.

And, it is on this question the revisionist leadership of CPSU has exhibited the worst features of betrayal of all revolutionary struggles.

True, sometimes the CPSU leadership pretends to be supporting the NLM and does give some limited help to them to justify themselves as communists in the eyes of the world public.

But, the essence of the policy of the CPSU leadership is total betrayal of the national liberation struggles one by one. Congo, Rhodesia, Dominican Republic, the Middle East- are all standing monuments to the great betrayal of the national liberation struggles by the CPSU leadership.

The C.C. Draft, instead of bringing out this through betrayal of the National Liberation struggles by the CPSU leadership, has dismissed its whole attitude on this question as one of neglect or underestimation of the national liberation struggles.

It is pertinent to remember that some of our C.C. leaders even as late as 1964 have been singing praises to *"disinterested, technical, industrial and economic aid liberally given by the Soviet Union..... to the underdeveloped and newly liberated countries."*

### **III. CPSU Leadership's collaboration with U.S. Imperialism for world domination.**

The C.C. Draft agrees that *"the bankrupt revisionist line of the Soviet leaders"* is being glaringly seen and understood by *"every intelligent student of politics in the world, let alone the Marxist-Leninists, as more and more a line of conciliation, compromise and collaboration between the two great powers the USSR and the USA, a line which objectively preserves and perpetuates the international status quo and as a line which summarily abandons the revolutionary class struggle of the proletariat."*

But the C.C. Draft has rushed to add that this collaboration is not for *"sharing world hegemony with American imperialism and for the division of the spheres of influence in the world."*

Then, why is this collaboration for?

According to the C.C. Draft, this collaboration is due to the CPSU leadership's *"facile notion of maintaining world peace in collaboration with the most aggressive U.S. imperialism."*

U.S. imperialists are conducting ferocious wars of aggression against oppressed nations throughout the world. It is arming itself to the teeth with deadly weapons to achieve world domination. It has created a huge war machine.

To think that the CPSU leadership really believes that it could preserve world peace in collaboration with such a power, is nothing but blindness to see the depth of the treachery of the CPSU leadership.

The global strategy of U.S. imperialism has been to grab and dominate the intermediate zone lying between the U.S. and the socialist camp, put down revolutions of the oppressed peoples and nations, proceed to destroy the socialist countries and thus to dominate the whole world.

Is not the CPSU leadership collaborating with U.S. imperialism in the accomplishment of these aims?

The CPSU leadership with its theory that 'local wars lead to world conflagration' has been trying to demoralise, disrupt and sabotage the NLM thus facilitating the wars of aggression of U.S. imperialism against struggling nations.

It has been helping the U.S. imperialism to use UNO as an instrument of suppression of peoples struggles.

With its teachings of peaceful transition, it is trying to sap the fighting will of the proletariat and thus help U.S. imperialism in preserving the capitalist system and the capitalist world.

The CPSU leadership is trying for peaceful restoration of capitalism in the Soviet Union which has been the dream of imperialism.

Both USA and USSR have come to an agreement to maintain their monopoly of nuclear weapons to blackmail the weaker nations.

The CPSU leadership has disrupted the socialist camp and International Communist Movement which is the fond hope of U.S. imperialism.

The CPSU leadership is ganging up with all reactionary powers to malign and isolate China, to build the so-called containment wall against China, which is in the forefront of the struggle against U.S. plans for world domination.

If these acts of the CPSU leadership are not acts of collaboration with U.S. imperialism for world domination, what else is it?

Both imperialism and the CPSU leaders are shouting about their collaboration for world domination.

Willy Brandt of Western Germany recently declared:

*"We are by now doubly assured by the Soviet collaboration with U.S., started in Cuban crisis, followed by the Middle East now."*

*"It is proved beyond any doubt that Soviet leadership will not dare clash with U.S. and the rest of the West. Now is the time to redivide the spheres of influence between U.S. and USSR in both Western Europe as well as Asia".*

Gromyko declared in 1962:

*".....If there is agreement between N.S. Khrushchov, the head of the Soviet Government and John Kennedy, the President of the United States, there will be a solution of international problems on which mankind's destinies depend."*

The revisionist leadership of the CPSU uses deceptive peace slogans to deceive the peoples of the world, the Soviet people in particular, to cover up its dirty collaboration with U.S. imperialism for world domination.

The CPSU leadership resorts to all *"these subterfuges, sophistries and fraudulent falsifications"* only in order to disassociate themselves from revolutionary struggles, to *"conceal their desertion to the liberal policy i.e. to the bourgeoisie"* to cover up their dirty deals with U.S. imperialism for world domination.

We are sorry to note that the C.C. Draft has fallen a prey to the deception of the CPSU leadership.

To sustain its wrong arguments, the C.C. Draft declares that to speak of the CPSU leaders' collaboration with U.S. imperialism for world domination is *"tantamount to nothing short of placing the Soviet Union outside the socialist camp."*

Who is trying to place the Soviet Union outside the Socialist Camp?

It is the CPSU leadership, by its efforts to restore capitalism in the Soviet Union, by its efforts to transform P.D. (Proletarian Dictatorship) into a bourgeois state, by its efforts to transform CPSU from a party of the working class into a bourgeois party, by its class collaborationist policy, that is actually trying to take the Soviet Union out of the socialist camp.

A timely ruthless exposure of its betrayal alone will rouse the consciousness of the Soviet people and Soviet Communists and help their resistance to this betrayal of the CPSU leadership. The international communist movement owes this responsibility towards the Soviet people.

Any shielding of the betrayal of the CPSU leadership or any soft pedalling in the exposure of the betrayal of the CPSU leadership will be a violation of international duty of the world communist movement and the interests of the Soviet people.

The C.C. Draft by negating the naked fact that the CPSU leadership's collaborating with U.S. imperialism for world domination and by asserting that such a characterisation amounts to placing the Soviet Union outside the socialist camp, is only trying to negate all the criticism it has made about the policies of the CPSU leadership in the previous chapters, to bestow some good intentions on the CPSU leadership for its collaboration with U.S. imperialism and lay the basis for a united front with the CPSU leadership.

#### ***IV. Building communism in the Soviet Union -Transformation of P.D. into the so-called peoples state and the transformation of CPSU from a working class party into a party of the whole people***

The C.C. Draft has characterised the decision of the present leadership of the CPSU to transform P.D. into a state of the whole people and the transformation

of the CPSU into a Party of the whole people as negation of Marxism-Leninism on the question of P.D. and the proletarian character of the Communist Party.

The C.C. Draft has also admitted that *"the resort to capitalist incentives and ideas of personal profit, in the final analysis, paves the way for the restoration of a new type of capitalism and harms the cause of socialism and communism."*

But the C.C. Draft concedes the claim of the CPSU leadership that it is building communism when it says that *"this danger is all the more so when the concept of material incentives is unduly emphasized in a socialist society at a stage which they claim to be full-scale construction of communism."*

So the C.C. Draft's complaint is that the CPSU leadership is unduly emphasizing the concept of material incentives at the stage of full scale construction of communism.

But, what is the reality?

As long as differences between town and country, between worker and peasant, between mental and physical labour remain, as long as a new man imbued with the spirit of selfless service to society is not created, as long as encirclement of the socialist state by the capitalist states remain, to think of building communism is an utopia. So the claim of the CPSU leadership that it is building communism in the Soviet Union is a hoax. The C.C. Draft fails to expose this hoax that the CPSU leadership is playing on the Soviet and world people.

Not only that. The practice of the Socialist states teaches us that the socialist society covers a very long historical period. Throughout this historical period, the class struggle between the bourgeoisie and the proletariat continues and the question of 'who will win' - the capitalist road or the socialist road remains. Thus till society enters the period of communism, the danger of restoration of capitalism persists.

But the present revisionist leadership of the CPSU, which has abandoned the principle of class struggle, both nationally and internationally, in the name of building communism is actually taking steps for the restoration of capitalism in the Soviet Union.

Their disbandment of machine and tractor stations and selling that property to the collective farms, their introduction of free market, their decentralisation of certain industries and particular sectors of industry, their investment of greater power to the local managers of industries, their introduction of material incentives, profit motive and bonus system, their introduction of competition, are all against the teachings of Lenin and Stalin on transition from socialism to communism. They are steps that will lead not to the building of communism, but will definitely lead to the restoration of capitalism in the Soviet Union.

And recently a very dangerous phenomenon has appeared in the East European States. Many of them are building joint industries with foreign Western collaboration. Even the Soviet Union is negotiating with the Japanese capitalists for the joint exploitation of Siberian mineral wealth.

It is pertinent to remember that all these measures of decentralisation, competition, profit motive, free market- were measures that Lenin and Stalin

adopted to use them to revive capitalist relations to a certain extent under the vigorous control of P.D. before going to the full scale construction of socialism.

But to-day these steps are being introduced by a revisionist leadership which has adopted bourgeois ideology and which is following a policy of collaboration on a global plane, and these steps have given rise to new type of capitalistic elements both in town and countryside.

It is pertinent to remember that the revisionist Tito clique in Yugoslavia adopted the very same measures long before the revisionist leadership of CPSU adopted them.

The new bourgeois elements, who have usurped the leadership of the party and the State step by step, have formed a privileged stratum in Soviet society.

This privileged stratum is the principal component of the bourgeoisie in the Soviet Union to-day, and the present revisionist leaders are the political representatives of the new bourgeois elements, particularly of the privileged stratum.

Thus we see that while shouting that it is building communism in the Soviet Union the CPSU leadership is actually taking steps to restore capitalism.

That is the reason why the bourgeois world, instead of being afraid of the construction of 'communism' in the Soviet Union are showering praises on the CPSU leadership for its new measure.

This should open the eyes of all the Marxist-Leninists as to the nature of 'communism' being built in the Soviet Union.

The C.C. Draft, instead of exposing the ugly fact that the CPSU leadership, under the guise of fake communism, is actually taking steps for the restoration of capitalism in the Soviet Union, that new capitalist elements have already appeared in the Soviet society, says that material incentives *"in the final analysis pave the way for the restoration of a new type of capitalism"*, as though the danger is only in the distant future and not in the present.

## **STATE OF THE WHOLE PEOPLE AND PARTY OF THE WHOLE PEOPLE.**

Keeping in line with its policy of restoration of capitalism in the Soviet Union, the revisionist leadership of the CPSU is taking steps to transform P.D. into a bourgeois state in the name of state of the whole people.

State can always only be a representative of a particular class and there cannot be a super class state. It is only the bourgeoisie who camouflage their state with the name 'People's State', to cover up their class rule. Engels said:

*"free peoples state was a programme demand and a catchword current among the German Social Democrats in the seventies. This catch word is devoid of all political content except that it describes the concept of democracy in a pompous philistine fashion."*

Exactly the present CPSU leadership is using the people's state to cover up the bourgeois state it is trying to build.



Similarly, the deceptive term '*Party of the whole people*' is a mask to cover up the efforts of the CPSU leadership to change the proletarian character of the CPSU into a bourgeois party.

The C.C. Draft while opposing the decisions of the CPSU leadership to change the proletarian character of P.D. and CPSU, it does not expose that the CPSU leadership, in the guise of '*State of the whole people*' and '*Party of the whole people*' is actually trying to convert the Soviet State into a bourgeois state and the Communist Party into a bourgeois party.

Because the present CPSU leadership is the privileged bourgeois stratum representing the new capitalist elements in the Soviet Union, it doggedly pursues its line of collaboration with U.S. imperialism for world domination.

The C.C. Draft refuses to see this ugly development.

Ofcourse this does not mean that the cycle of restoration of capitalism in the Soviet Union is already complete, or the efforts of the CPSU leadership in this direction are going to succeed.

The privileged bourgeois stratum in the Soviet Union, represented by the present revisionist clique, represents only the new capitalistic elements, constituting a small percentage of the Soviet population. It is diametrically opposed to the overwhelming majority of the Soviet people, to the great majority of the Soviet cadre and the Communists.

The contradiction between the Soviet people and this privileged bourgeois stratum is now the principal contradiction inside the Soviet Union and it is an irreconcilable and antagonistic class contradiction.

It is our firm conviction that the great Soviet people, the great Soviet Communists, who have long traditions of revolutionary struggles, will, before long see through the vile attempts of the revisionist leadership of the CPSU at restoration of capitalism in the Soviet Union, resist their attempts, discard their revisionist theories and practices and preserve socialism in the Soviet Union.

But confidence in the strength of the Soviet people to preserve socialism should not blind us to the ugly fact that the present revisionist leadership of the Party, which has temporarily usurped the leadership of the Party and the State, is attempting to restore capitalism in the Soviet Union.

It is the duty of the International Communist Movement towards the Soviet people to mercilessly expose this treachery of the present CPSU leadership.

The C.C. Draft, by refusing to take up this sacred task and by asserting that the CPSU leadership is not trying to restore capitalism in the Soviet Union, is only helping the present revisionist leadership of the CPSU to further deceive the Soviet people and the peoples of the world and successfully carry through their restoration of capitalism in the Soviet Union.

#### ***V. The class roots of revisionism in the CPSU leadership***

*Lenin always taught us that "the inevitability of revisionism is determined by its class roots in modern society".*

Now the C.C. Draft has admitted that the CPSU leadership is following a revisionist line.

Then, what are the class roots of revisionism in the CPSU leadership?

As noted above, the old and new bourgeois elements, the old and new rich peasants and the degenerate elements of all sorts constitute the social basis for revisionism in the CPSU leadership. The existence of bourgeois influence is the internal source of revisionism and collaboration with imperialism is its external source.

But the C.C. Draft refuses to analyse the class roots of revisionism of the CPSU leadership.

Then the legitimate question arises as to how the C.C. leadership, has come to the conclusion that the leadership of the CPSU is revisionist without going into its class roots.

In the same breath they say that they do not accept the view that new capitalistic elements have grown up in the Soviet Union and that the present CPSU leadership represents these new capitalist elements.

Lenin said:

*"Everybody agrees that opportunism is not an accidental thing, not a sin, not a slip, not the treachery of individual persons, but the social product of a whole historical epoch."*

Revisionism either of the Soviet brand or of Yugoslavia brand or of the brand of the capitalist countries or revisionism of the revisionist leaders of the Second International-all of them are a prop of bourgeois ideology.

One cannot draw a distinction between the Tito clique and the present CPSU leadership.

The only difference is that while the Tito clique is working for these aims from outside the socialist camp, the Soviet revisionist clique is working for the same aims from inside the socialist camp. Their class roots and class nature are one and the same.

The CPSU leaders have been shouting from their house-tops that they and the Tito clique are 'not only class brothers' but 'brothers tied together-by the singleness of the aims confronting us' that they are 'reliable and faithful ally' of the Tito clique, that they and the Tito clique 'belong to one and the same idea and are guided by the same theory.'

The CPSU leaders are vociferously shouting about their identity with the Tito clique. It is really curious on the part of the C.C. leaders to draw a distinction between the Tito clique and the CPSU leadership.

Characterising the opportunism of the revisionist leaders of the Second International, Lenin said:

*"Advocacy of class collaboration, abandonment of the idea of socialist revolution and revolutionary methods of struggle, adaptation to bourgeois nationalism, losing sight of the fact that the borders of nationality and country are historically transient, making a fetish of bourgeois legality, renunciation of the class viewpoint and the class struggle, for fear of repelling 'the broad masses' of population*

*(meaning the petty bourgeoisie)-such doubtlessly, are the ideological foundations of opportunism." (Lenin-COLLECTED WORKS-Vol.21,P.35)*

Does not this description fully fit in with the opportunism and revisionism of the CPSU leadership?

Are the theories and practices of the CPSU leadership on War and Peace, Peaceful Co-existence, National Liberation Struggles and on Peaceful Transition to Socialism any way different from those of Kautsky and Co.?

Characterising the theories and practices of Kautsky, *Lenin* said:

*"Kautsky takes from Marxism what is acceptable to the liberals, to the bourgeoisie- and discards, passes in silence, glosses over all that in Marxism which is unacceptable to the bourgeoisie (the revolutionary violence against the bourgeoisie for the latter's destruction). That is why Kautsky, by virtue of his objective position and irrespective of what his subjective convictions may be, inevitably proves to be a lackey of the bourgeoisie." (Proletarian Revolution and Renegade Kautsky.)*

Does not *Lenin's* description of Kautsky exactly apply to the present revisionist leadership of the CPSU?

Have not the Soviet revisionist leadership with their class collaboration theories with their opposition to revolutionary struggles, with their efforts to restore capitalism in the Soviet Union sold themselves, body and soul to bourgeois ideology and are acting as the 'lackey's bourgeoisie'?

The C.C. leaders argue that the revisionist leadership of the CPSU should not be treated as an ally and agent of imperialism, because according to the C.C., the revisionist leadership of the CPSU is part and parcel of the socialist system, a part and parcel of the Soviet people.

With its policies of class collaboration, with its policies of undermining socialism, how are we to equate the CPSU leadership with the Soviet people who are genuinely interested in the preservation of socialism and destruction of imperialism?

*Lenin* has said:

*"Actually the fact that the opportunists formally belong to workers' parties, does not by any means remove the fact that, objectively, they are a political detachment of the bourgeoisie, channels of its influence, its agents in the labour movements." (Lenin -Against Revisionism-P.263)*

Does not this description apply to the CPSU leadership? Are not the CPSU leaders, with their line of class compromise, conciliation and collaboration on a global plane acting as the agents of the world bourgeoisie, as the agents of American imperialism in the socialist camp and the international working class movement?

Lenin said:

*"The crisis that was created by the Great War has torn off the coverings, has swept away the conventions, has exposed the abscess, that has long been ripe, has revealed opportunism in its role of ally of the bourgeoisie". (Lenin-Against Revisionism-P.273)*

The growing crisis of world capitalism, the raging national liberation struggles throughout the world, the gigantic class battles against imperialism, have all 'torn off the coverings' of the CPSU leaders, have torn off the mask of 'communism' which they have been donning so far and showed them up as nothing but allies of the bourgeoisie within the socialist camp.

Our love for the Soviet people, our solicitude for the Soviet people, should not hide the fact that Modern Revisionism represented by the CPSU leadership is today acting as the enemy of the socialist camp as a counter-revolutionary force inside the international working class movement.

It is the duty of all Marxist-Leninists to carry on an irreconcilable fight against the menace of this Modern Revisionism. It is only such a fight that will help the Soviet people to see through the treachery and betrayal of the CPSU leadership.

Modern Revisionism is occurring in the background of ever deepening crisis of world capitalism and growing class struggles. In the face of these class struggles, Modern Revisionism can not deceive the Soviet people for long.

The great ideological fight of the Marxist-Leninists against Modern Revisionism has already started yielding good results. The fall of Khrushchov is the first great victory against Modern Revisionism. It is the beginning of the end of it.

The continuation of this irreconcilable fight against Modern Revisionism represented by the CPSU leadership and its class collaborationist policies, alone will unite the socialist camp and international communist movement based on Marxism-Leninism.

We are sorry to note that the C.C. Draft, instead of helping in this irreconcilable ideological fight against the revisionism of the CPSU leadership is laying the basis for a united front with the CPSU leadership in the name of the unity of socialist camp.

***VI. Irreconcilable battle against revisionism of the CPSU leadership or, united front with the CPSU leadership-Unity of Action in Vietnam.***

We believe the central theme of this document is that inspite of ideological differences between Marxist-Leninists and the revisionist leadership of the CPSU, united front with the revisionist leadership of the CPSU, is the immediate task in order to achieve success in the struggle against imperialism.

To carry through this idea, the document puts forth even more wrong ideas before the Party. The C.C. Draft says:

*"A look at the present world communist movement and the socialist camp would convince anybody that it is sharply divided, and it is plunged into a serious crisis – a crisis that have virtually paralysed the initiative of*

*the world communist forces in successfully resisting and rebuffing the offensive let loose by the world imperialists-chiefly the U.S."*

So the C.C. Draft sees only crisis and paralysis in the socialist camp, an "unity in action against imperialism between different socialist states whose state and Party leaders have come to hold diametrically opposed views on a series of ideological-political issues of the day" becomes the immediate and imperative need.

This is the guiding principle in this document.

But '*crisis*' and '*paralysis*' in the camp of the international working class movement, in the camp of socialism- Is it true?

The International Communist Movement tried to correct the revisionist errors of the CPSU leadership through the 1957 and 1960 conferences.

The CPSU leadership, including Khrushchov, taking advantage of every concession given, seriously tried to create confusion in the ranks of the world communists and came out against all revolutionary principles of the militant revolutionary programme of the World Conferences of 1957 and 1960. They openly came out against all revolutionary struggles and ganged up with U.S. imperialists and all the reactionaries of the world against the great PRC, the base of the NLM, to isolate it from the fighting people and the socialist countries.

Marxist-Leninists, who understood the betrayal of Marxism-Leninism by the CPSU leadership, inspite of initial confusion, regrouped their ranks, both nationally and internationally and resolutely fought back the treachery, betrayal and splitting activities of the revisionist leadership of the CPSU.

Inspite of the betrayal of the CPSU leadership, its sabotage, its open collaboration with U.S. imperialism, the national liberation struggles against imperialism have continued to advance. It is in this period that liberation struggles have spread in the continent of Latin America and they are taking more and more to the path of armed struggle. The national liberation struggles have made significant advances in South East Asia.

In particular, the people of Vietnam have scored spectacular successes in their national liberation struggle, in bogging down the American imperialism in a bottomless pit.

Peoples Republic of China has scored great victories in industrial and agricultural production, in its Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution, in achieving atomic weapons to match the American imperialists and these successes of PRC have gladdened the hearts of all freedom loving peoples.

The advancing national liberation struggles have sharpened the crisis of world capitalist system, have increased the crisis of American imperialism in particular. The American people themselves, especially the Negro people have begun to fight the policies of U.S. imperialism.

The advance of the national liberation struggles has not only thrown U.S. imperialism into a crisis, but also they have led to a crisis in revisionism of the CPSU leadership.

In actual life, in the fields of battle, the line of the CPSU leadership was being more and more exposed as a line of class collaboration, as a line of collaboration with U.S. imperialism for world domination.

Faced with the prospect of complete isolation from the ranks of revolutionary forces, from the ranks of the liberation struggles, from the ranks of Marxist-Leninists, the CPSU leadership had to throw out Khrushchov from power and a new set of leaders, the present leaders, had to be placed in power.

The present CPSU leaders following the same old Khrushchovist collaborationist policies had to invent new deceptive and honeyed slogans like '*unity of the socialist camp*', '*Common Programme*', '*common ideology*', '*unity of action in Vietnam*', '*unity against the common enemy*' and etc.

The C.C. Draft fails to see the general advance of the revolutionary struggles, inspite of certain defeats in certain sectors, the growing crisis in the camp of revisionism. It sees only crisis and paralysis in the camp of socialism.

That is why the C.C. Draft readily catches the deceptive slogans of the CPSU leadership and puts forth the idea of united front with the CPSU leadership.

### **THE DECEPTIVE SLOGANS OF THE CPSU LEADERSHIP**

As the forces of NLM and revolutionary forces advance, imperialism headed by U.S. imperialism has been carrying on a Death bed struggle for its existence and it badly needs the services of Modern Revisionism in its vain attempt to save itself from its final doom.

In their vain attempt to deck themselves as different from Khrushchov to do better service to U.S. imperialism, the new CPSU leaders have been raising a façade of 'unity' slogans in order to conceal the essence of their continued pursuance of Khrushchov's revisionist line. All moribund forces take to such progressive slogans for their own reactionary purposes.

The CPSU leaders shout for 'united action' on the basis of the so-called '*common programme*' and '*common ideology*'.

But it is the revisionist leadership of CPSU who have completely betrayed Marxism-

eninism, the common ideology of all Marxist-Leninists, and the revolutionary principles of the common programme of the Communist Parties, unanimously agreed upon by the 1957 and 1960 Conferences.

The CPSU leaders, disregarding the common programme of the world Communist movement, have been telling time and again that the line of the class collaboration 'adopted at the 20<sup>th</sup> and 22<sup>nd</sup> Congresses of the CPSU "*was, is and will be the only immutable line in the entire home and foreign policies of the Communist Party and the Soviet State*".

The common ideology of all Marxist-Leninists is Marxism-Leninism, while the common ideology of Modern Revisionism is bourgeois ideology.

The common programme of the Marxist-Leninists is revolutionary struggle for the final destruction of imperialism, for the success of the world socialist revolution, while the common programme of modern revisionism represented by

the CPSU leaders is the preservation of the imperialist system and active opposition to world socialist revolution.

Therefore the antagonism between Marxism-Leninism and modern revisionism represented by the CPSU leadership is a class antagonism, between the proletariat and the bourgeoisie; it is the class antagonism between the socialist and the capitalist roads, between the line of opposing imperialism and the line of surrendering to it. It is an irreconcilable antagonism.

### **UNITED ACTION AGAINST 'THE COMMON ENEMY'.**

The new leaders of the CPSU incessantly cry for 'united action' against 'the common enemy' inspite of ideological and political differences.

In the struggle against capitalism and imperialism and in the course of world socialist revolution, the international proletariat can defeat the enemy through uniting its own forces and uniting with all other forces that can be united.

In today's world situation, the U.S. imperialism is the common enemy of the whole world. United front against U.S. imperialism has the unity of the international proletariat as its core and unity between the international proletariat and the oppressed nations as its foundation. It means uniting closely with the masses of the people, who constitute over 90% of the world's population, uniting with all the political forces subject to U.S. aggression, control and interference or bullying, and making use of every possible contradiction, all for the purpose of isolating U.S. imperialism, the main enemy of the peoples of the whole world to the maximum extent and dealing it the hardest possible blows. This is the way to mobilise all the positive factors conducive to world revolution for the achievement of victory in the peoples revolutionary struggles in every country.

In the contemporary world, opposition to or alliance with U.S. imperialism constitutes the hall-mark for deciding whether or not a political force can be included in the united front against the United States.

Can the CPSU leadership, judged by its actions, be included in the united front against U.S. imperialism?

While they sometimes criticise U.S. imperialism as 'aggressor' and 'war monger' in the same breath they praise the Johnson administration as 'sensible' and 'moderate', they declare that 'there are sufficiently broad areas for co-operation', and behind the scenes they are stepping up their secret diplomacy and their deals with the United States.

The programme of the CPSU leadership is alliance and collaboration with U.S. imperialism to dominate the world.

Sometimes they deceive the people with their verbal attacks on U.S. imperialism. These verbal attacks meet the needs of U.S. imperialists and the revisionists themselves. They have to give an appearance of opposing the U.S. imperialists to hoodwink the masses and sabotage revolution. Otherwise they could not play this deceptive role and that would not be to the advantage of U.S. imperialism. Minor attacks in words and major help in deeds-such is the way the new leaders of the CPSU serve U.S. imperialism.

Thus its call for unity of action is a clever camouflage for greater disunity, for greater disruption within the socialist camp and within the international working class movement.

Such being the case, can the CPSU revisionist leadership have a place in the united front against U.S. imperialism? Is U.S. imperialism the common enemy for both Marxist-Leninists and the Modern Revisionists represented by the CPSU leadership?

The CPC is absolutely right in refusing to fall into this trap of the CPSU, in refusing 'unity of action' on the basis of the so-called common programme. The CPC has rightly said, "*there are things that divide us and nothing that unites us, things that are antagonistic and nothing that is common.*"

It is wrong on the part of the C.C.Draft to find fault with the CPC's stand on this question.

#### UNITY OF ACTION ON THE QUESTION OF VIETNAM.

The very fact that the great CPC has repeatedly stated that they are ready to take united action with CPSU leaders, if they are really opposed to U.S. imperialism and did so by actual deeds, goes to show their urge for principled unity for anti-imperialist struggle.

The C.C. wrongly thinks that the slogan of 'unity of action' is given by the new CPSU leadership at a time when the socialist camp is seriously divided on several ideological political issues, that this slogan was given in connection with U.S. aggression in Vietnam, and that this slogan would bridge the gulf in the socialist camp, and to work out a joint plan of action with PRC against U.S. aggression in Vietnam.

But, this is not in consonance with facts.

When Khrushchov was in power, the revisionist leadership of the CPSU openly sided with U.S. imperialism and opposed and undermined the revolutionary struggle of the Vietnamese people. With their declaration, that any local war would lead to a world conflagration, they tried to frighten and intimidate all peoples engaged in revolutionary armed struggle; they openly refused to support and aid the Vietnamese people in their anti-U.S. struggle. When the struggle became acute, their policy was one of 'disengagement'. In July, 1964, they indicated the desire of the Soviet Government to resign from its post as one of the two Co-Chairmen of the Geneva Conference. Soon after -wards, when the U.S. imperialism engineered the Bac Bo gulf incident, Khrushchov went so far as to concoct the slander that the incident was provoked by China.

The liberation struggle in Vietnam continued and grew intensity in opposition to the policy of the CPSU leadership. World revolutionary forces magnificently rallied to the cause of Vietnam.

The liberation war in Vietnam is Victoriously progressing against U.S. imperialism inspite of the CPSU leadership's betrayal, with the full support of PRC and the world people. It has become a rallying point for all anti-imperialist forces and all Marxist-Leninists who are genuinely interested in a decisive defeat of U.S. imperialism in Vietnam. It has become a turning point in the



anti-imperialist struggles, after certain debacles as in Congo and Dominican Republic due to the betrayal of the CPSU leadership.

The CPSU leadership, which has so far done everything to disarm, to disrupt and sabotage the Vietnamese struggle, has now come forward with the slogan of 'united action', to cover up its own isolation from the struggling people and Marxist-Leninists of the world, and to worm itself back into the anti-imperialist front for further disruption.

'Involvement' or 'non-involvement' of the Soviet Union-both serve the interests of the U.S. imperialists.

The stand taken by the CPSU leadership on Vietnam, is inseparable from its general programme of collaboration with U.S. imperialism for world domination.

In 1965, the Soviet leaders directly transmitted to the North Vietnamese Government, the preposterous peace conditions of the U.S. imperialists demanding the North Vietnamese Government not to support the liberation struggle in the South and that the attacks on the cities in South Vietnam should be stopped.

At that time, they proposed to the CPSU to help the U.S. *"to find a way out of Vietnam."*

In February 1965, it forwarded Johnson's proposal for unconditional negotiations, and carried on diplomatic negotiations with France.

When the North Vietnamese Government refused to accept this proposal, they again proposed negotiations, if bombing of North Vietnam was stopped.

When these plots were failed, they began to collaborate with the Tito clique and Indian reactionaries, both brokers for U.S. imperialists' peace overtures.

While pretending to be supporting the Vietnamese struggle, they have been continuously conducting secret negotiations with U.S. imperialism about the Vietnamese issue.

They have been cooperating and collaborating with U.S. imperialism and coming to an agreement with them on every issue of the day.

They allowed the U.S. imperialists to use Moscow Radio to denounce Socialist China as standing in the way of peaceful settlement of the Vietnamese issue.

Its help to Vietnam is being used to malign Socialist China and to carry the most slanderous campaign against the cultural revolution of China.

The limited help that the CPSU leadership is peddling to Vietnam should not blind us as not to see the real aims of the CPSU leadership in Vietnam.

This limited help to Vietnam is not against the wishes and interests of the U.S. imperialists. They are openly declaring that *"eventually an agreement might be contrived involving the Soviet troops in North Vietnam.....while American troops remain in South Vietnam"* and that *"one of the paradoxical advantages of more direct Soviet military involvement should be the establishment of a direct American-Soviet bargaining relationship in this area."*

The actions of the Soviet leadership amply demonstrate that it is not interested in a decisive defeat of U.S. imperialism in Vietnam.

As a matter of fact, the strategical aims of Vietnam liberation war are diametrically opposed 'to those' of the CPSU leadership.

While the Vietnam war aims at a decisive defeat of U.S. imperialism, the sole of the CPSU leadership is to bring Vietnamese issue into the orbit of U.S. – Soviet collaboration.

### WHY THESE DECEPTIVE SLOGANS

The class collaboration policy of the CPSU has been fully exposed.

To cover up their growing isolation, to cover up their collaboration with U.S. imperialism for world domination, it wants to worm itself back into the ranks of Marxist-Leninists to confuse, deceive, corrupt and disrupt them, to work itself into the ranks of the national liberation struggles for further disruption, to stop the open polemics which are relentlessly exposing their real class character, to deceive the Soviet people for some more time to complete the process of restoration of capitalism in the Soviet Union and lastly to bring the Vietnamese issue into the orbit of U.S. Soviet collaboration.

Taking into consideration these diabolical aims of the CPSU leadership, the CPC has rightly rejected any united action in principle with the CPSU leadership on the Vietnamese question.

To abandon the principled stand and take united action with the revisionist CPSU leadership will only white wash its collaboration policy, and help it in deceiving the Soviet and world people. It will be nothing but taking chances and making experiments with the glorious Vietnamese struggle which has advanced in opposition to the treachery and betrayal of the CPSU leadership.

The global strategy of U.S. imperialism is, the destruction of PRC and the socialist camp to be achieved after the suppression of the national liberation struggles, all for world domination. The CPSU leadership collaborates with U.S. imperialism in this global strategy for world domination. Only revisionism, representing the privileged bourgeoisie stratum can pursue such an aim.

The C.C. Draft fails to see the revisionist depths of the CPSU leadership, falls a prey to the deceptive slogans and proposals of the CPSU leadership.

The C.C. Draft, while noting that the line of the CPSU leadership in Vietnam *"is disappointing and is not what is rightly expected of a leading and mighty Socialist State"*, that the CPSU leadership *"takes hesitant, halting and compromising steps"* and *"makes repeated attempts at restoring some kind of peace in Vietnam in compliance with U.S. aggressors"*, that it has tried to isolate China and *"pressurise it into submission and a host of similar steps and actions deliberately perpetrated by them to damn the Chinese Communists as War-mongers and traitors to the cause of socialism"* still supports the call of the CPSU leadership for 'unity of action in Vietnam'.

The C.C. Draft holds the view that CPC should not have rejected a united front action with the CPSU leadership on principle. The Draft says that this is against the concept of united action and untied front.

What the C.C. Draft forgets is that these states and parties are not states and parties in general. They are Communist Parties and Socialist States, which have to serve as the constituents of the core of anti-imperialist front. Ideological and

political struggles and a kind of sorting between Marxist-Leninists and the revisionists is taking place in these parties and states. The condition for the united front is, the struggle against imperialism. If the people and Communists are allowed to be deceived and dulled in their vigilance against the revisionist leaders, it will only help in the disruption of the anti-imperialist struggle. Such slogans of 'united action' which help the disruption of the anti-imperialist struggle, are diametrically opposed to the very aims and principles of united front tactics.

Joint discussions between the CPSU leaders and the revolutionary leaders of CPC and Vietnam will not strengthen the core of the anti-imperialist front against U.S. imperialism in Vietnam and the failure of the meeting will be a handle in the hands of imperialists and revisionists to disrupt the Vietnam struggle itself.

To sustain their unprincipled support to the unity call of the CPSU leadership, the C.C. leaders are putting forth certain absurd arguments.

The Draft argues that "North Vietnam is fighting alone against U.S. aggression" and as such united front with the CPSU leadership is an imperative duty.

The liberation struggles being waged against U.S. imperialism throughout the world, the American peoples struggle against American intervention in Vietnam, the great solidarity campaign in support of the Vietnam struggle spreading throughout the world are powerful factors of support to the Vietnam liberation struggle.

The great PRC, short of direct intervention, has been giving every kind of help to the fighting forces in Vietnam. The CPC had declared time and again that they would directly intervene whenever North Vietnam demands it.

Recently North Vietnam comrades have declared that they have been allowed to use Chinese mainland as the rear for the Vietnam struggle.

It is true the Vietnam people are shouldering the main brunt of the struggle against U.S. imperialism in Vietnam. But it is not true to say that they are fighting alone.

Another argument that the C.C. leaders put up is that the CPC stand in Vietnam is against the experience of anti-fascist front in 1935.

Here the C.C. leaders forget three pertinent factors.

At that time Communist Parties had completely demarcated themselves ideologically, politically and organisationally from the Social Democratic Parties and as such united front between such parties could not confuse the masses about their aims and identity.

But now such a demarcation between Communists and Revisionists-ideologically, politically and organizationally is taking place and it is yet to be completed.

Struggle against Fascism was the pre-condition for any force to be included in the front. But when CPSU leadership is an ally of U.S. imperialism it cannot have a place in the united front against U.S. imperialism.

At that time the united front slogan had been given by the Communist Parties to build a genuine united front, and in the process of struggle to isolate the vacillators.

But now the unity call is given by the CPSU Leadership to deceive the Soviet people and world people to cover up its collaboration with U.S. imperialism for world domination.

Curiously enough, the C.C. leaders argue that judged by the experience of our united front tactics with regard to the Dangeite revisionists, the CPC stand on unity call is wrong.

How far our tactics are correct, is a subject matter to be seriously discussed. But to transplant our experience to the question of Vietnam, where military strategy between great powers is involved, is absurd.

To sustain their support to united front with the CPSU leadership, the C.C. Draft even bestows certain anti-imperialist character to the CPSU leadership. The Draft says:

*"Thus, instead of an irreconcilable struggle-economic, political, ideological and military-as the main form and content of struggle between the two systems, a regular hunt for discovering areas of even wider cooperation and collaboration with the U.S. is on by the revisionist leadership of the Soviet Union. The fundamental aspect is to be relegated to the subordinate and secondary position while the cooperation and collaboration aspect is thrust to the forefront."*

So the complaint of the C.C. Draft against the CPSU leadership is not that it has become the agency of imperialism but merely that its anti-imperialist role is occupying only a secondary position.

But how are we to reconcile this with Lenin's description of revisionism as *"the lackey of the bourgeoisie"*, as *"vehicle of bourgeois influence"*, as *"agency of imperialism"*?

No amount of solicitude for the Soviet people, for the Vietnamese people' will hide the ugly fact that the C.C. Draft seeks united front with the revisionist leadership of the CPSU in the so-called common struggle against 'the most hated and immediate enemy.

The C.C. Draft thinks that differences on ideological and political issues should not come in the way of united action with the revisionists.

But Lenin said that *"the fight against imperialism is inseparably bound up with the fight against opportunism."*

What is standing between CPC and CPSU leadership, between Marxist-Leninists and the Modern Revisionists represented by the CPSU leadership is neither a mess nor a facile notion (of maintaining world peace in collaboration with U.S. imperialism without China)- held by the CPSU leadership. What is standing in between is, Modern Revisionism of the CPSU leadership and its policy of collaboration with U.S. imperialism for world domination.

Unity of the socialist camp and unity of the international communist movement is the cherished goal of all Marxist-Leninists.

It is the revisionist leadership of the CPSU that has disrupted the unity of the socialist camp and the unity of the international working class movement.

The history of the international communist movement is one of struggle by Marxism against opportunism and revisionism, a history of struggle by Marxists to safeguard the international unity of the proletariat and to oppose attempts by opportunists and revisionists to divide it.

Marxism-Leninism teaches us that the international unity of the proletariat must be based on principle and its achievement demands resolute and unequivocal struggle against revisionism and opportunism.

*Lenin said:*

*"Unity is a great thing and great slogan. But what the workers cause needs is, the unity of Marxists, not unity between Marxists and opponents and distorters of Marxism."*

Unity of socialist camp, unity of the international communist movement will be achieved in bitter struggle against imperialism and modern revisionism represented by the CPSU leadership.

Unity of the socialist camp and unity of the international communist movement "is moving and will move", "is proceeding and will proceed" against the modern revisionism represented by the CPSU leadership and it will be a victory over them.

### ***VII. The contribution and Role of CPC***

The Chinese Revolution is a great epoch making event, ranking next only to that of the Great October Revolution. This is the first peoples revolution that took place, breaking the shackles of colonial and semi-colonial system. It has heralded the era of final collapse of imperialism and the victory of world socialist revolution.

The glorious CPC under the leadership of Comrade Mao, basing itself on the experience of the Great October Revolution creatively applied Marxism-Leninism to the Chinese conditions, and following the correct tactics of united front and prolonged armed struggle, first liberating the country-side and finally the towns, liberated 70 crores of Chinese population from age long slavery, established peoples democracy under the dictatorship of the proletariat and now through its great Proletarian Cultural Revolution, is strengthening the dictatorship of the proletariat, and struggling for the completion of the socialist revolution.

With this rich experience of revolutionary struggle, CPC tried to correct the revisionist mistakes of the CPSU leadership through friendly criticism. When the CPSU leadership spurned this friendly criticism, and openly took to a complete class collaboration line, the CPC began an open ideological fight against modern revisionism represented by the CPSU leadership to preserve the sacredness of Marxism-Leninism.

Its numerous articles exposing Modern Revisionism have greatly contributed to the enrichment of Marxism-Leninism in the present era.

People, Republic of China, adhering to the principles of Marxism-Leninism, if firmly fighting the aggressive expansionist war plans of U.S. imperialism. PRC is in the forefront of the struggle against the global strategy of U.S. for world domination.

PRC, faithfully implementing the behests of Lenin, is helping the national liberation struggles. the revolutionary struggles with all the means at its command- ideological, political, economic and military.

The PRC is acting as the base of the world revolution.

We are sorry to note that the C.C. Draft refuses to see these facts, facts of reality.

The whole historic role of CPC in the present era, has been reduced into one single sentence that *"CPC has rendered yeoman service to the world working class and communist movement in fighting against this menace of Modern Revisionism and in defence of Marxism."*

In the same breath, the C.C. Draft adds that *"there have been certain dogmatic manifestations in individual parties and on individual propositions, precepts and actions," and that "there also exist certain dogmatic and left-sectarian trends in some parties on certain issues connected with the revolutionary movement of the proletariat"*- all this keeping in view CPC and other parties that agree with its line.

But we firmly believe that CPC is acting as the beaconlight of the world communist movement.

Peoples Democracy, Peoples War, completion of the socialist revolution through the cultural revolution, an irreconcilable ideological battle against Modern Revisionism- this is the essence of the thought of Mao-Marxism-Leninism of the present epoch, upheld by Marxist-Leninists throughout the world.

Marx and Engles developed their theories of scientific socialism in a period of growing industrial capitalism.

Lenin further developed Marxism, as applicable to the period of imperialism.

Stalin developed Marxism-Leninism, while building socialism in a single country encircled by capitalist states and in his struggle for creating mass communist parties throughout the world.

The thought of Mao is a further development of Marxism-Leninism applicable to the present era, when imperialism is fast disintegrating and the national liberation struggles have come to occupy a central place for the completion of the world socialist revolution.

Already, recent world history has amply proved that wherever the people have assimilated the experience of the Chinese revolution and applied it to the concrete conditions of their countries, there the revolutionary movements have won complete victory, or have made significant advances. And, wherever the people have not assimilated the experience of Chinese revolution, there the revolutionary movements have failed to make any significant advance or even counter- revolutions have succeeded.

### ***VIII. Consolidation of the International Communist Movement***

Consolidation of all Marxist-Leninists throughout the world, is the urgent task facing the world communist movement to accomplish the tasks of the present epoch.

There must be a common programme based on Marxism-Leninism for the general direction of the world communist movement in the present period. Such a common programme alone will help in the consolidation of the international communist movement.

*"A proposal concerning the general line of the International Communist Movement"*, proposed by the CPC lays the proper basis for such a common programme for the world communist movement.

Fraternal relations based on proletarian internationalism must be restored between the various constituents of the world communist movement.

These relations must be based on the principle of solidarity, principle of mutual support and mutual assistance, the principle of independence and equality and the principle of reaching unanimity through consultation.

It is the primary duty of the Communist Party in each country to acquire an accurate knowledge of the trends of the different classes in its own country through serious investigation and study and know how to apply the universal truth of Marxism-Leninism and integrate it with the concrete practice of its own country, evolve its own programme and tactical line based on Marxism-Leninism, to achieve victory in its revolution.

When the political line of a particular party goes completely wrong, and when the party rejects the friendly criticism of brother parties, fraternal parties will have no other option, except open criticism. This has been the practice of past history.

Marxist-Leninists are evolving in struggle against Modern Revisionism. CPC, the leading detachment of the world communist movement, with its rich experience of the revolutionary struggles, in its discharge of international tasks, is offering criticism of the activities of certain parties to help them correct their mistakes.

It is highly regrettable that relations between our Party and CPC have been greatly damaged recently.

It is not true to say that the CPC first started publicly criticising our Party Programme and Political Line through its press and radio.

We know that there were certain basic differences on our Programme, between our Party and CPC, even at the time of our Calcutta Party Congress.

But it was unfortunate that these differences were not properly formulated and thoroughly discussed inside our Party before the Party Programme was adopted at the Calcutta Congress.

But CPC did not attack our Party till 1967, till *"New Situation and Party's Tasks"* appeared.

From 1964 to 1967, on many occasions, some of our leading comrades of the P.B., have been criticising CPC sometimes publicly, sometimes inside our Party, on many issues affecting us and the CPC.

The differences between our Party and CPC relating to the Indian situation should be patiently discussed, try to come to correct conclusions, and thus bridge the gulf between our Party and CPC.

It is with this spirit, that we offer the following points for the consideration of the Party:

# **1. GROWING COMPRADOR NATURE OF THE MONOPOLY CAPITALISTS IN INDIA.**

After 1958-59, the economic dependence of our country under the present Government is growing apace.

Majority of our industries, both in the Public and Private sectors, especially the industries of the collaborating big business are completely foreign oriented. They are dependent for their existence, on foreign imported machinery, spare parts, raw material, and technical know-how.

Of late, establishment of joint industries, with foreign imperialist investments is becoming the predominant feature of our industries wherein the western capitalists have come to dominate.

Because of the growing economic crisis, the rapid decline of the purchasing capacity of the overwhelming majority of our population, we see a rapid shrinkage of internal market due to which the Indian big business is forced to try for external market in collaboration with foreign imperialists.

Because of the above reasons, the collaborating big business, is acquiring a marked comprador nature depending more and more for maintaining its profits on imports and exports.

Instead of seeing this growing comprador nature of the big business, the C.C. Resolution on Differences with CPC, says that the comprador bourgeoisie occupies only a minor place in India, and that it is the *"industrial bourgeoisie which, to-day has emerged as a powerful force holding the leading position in the new state and Government, and not the comprador element"*.

While at the time of the Seventh Congress, our Party Programme spoke of 'contradictions and conflicts that do exist between the Indian bourgeoisie including the big bourgeoisie and foreign imperialism' and that these conflicts should be utilised for practical purposes, in "New situation and New Tasks"- the C.C. Resolution speaks of growing contradictions between big business and the imperialists.

It says:

*"The economic and political crisis that is enveloping the country, no doubt sharpens the basic contradiction between the big bourgeois-landlord alliance and rest of the democratic classes and masses. At the sametime the fissures, conflicts and contradictions between the big bourgeoisie and imperialists are not only not ruled out, but in fact they do also grow and find expression."* (P.56)

We are not able to understand one point. When *"the economic crisis deepens and the pressure of the imperialists increases the danger of greater and greater concessions to the imperialists by the big bourgeois-led government, allowing the foreign monopolists to make still bigger inroads into our economy and political*



*life, becomes more serious*” as the same resolution says, how do the conflicts and contradictions between the *“collaborating big bourgeoisie and foreign imperialists”* grow and find expression?

Experience has proved beyond any doubt that, however the Indian big business may try to utilise the inter-imperialist contradictions, however much they try to counterpose Soviet aid to the Western aid, the Indian big business is rapidly going down on an inclined plane towards a more and more surrendering policy vis-à-vis the Western imperialists. Devaluation, liberalization of imports and exports policy in favour of the foreign imperialists-all go to show that the Indian big business is acquiring more and more a comprador nature.

But the C.C. Resolutions are showing the industrial base of the Indian big bourgeoisie as a powerful factor in its resistance to imperialist pressure.

What the C.C. forgets is that the big business in our country is big business of a colonial country. The big business in a colonial country, because of its close links with feudalism and its collaboration with foreign imperialists, cannot withstand foreign imperialist pressures unlike the industrial bourgeoisie of a developed capitalist country.

Forgetting this aspect, the C.C. in *“New Situation and Party’s Tasks”* says that *“every concession and each step of surrender”* should not be equated with *“final surrender”*. But do not continuous surrenders, after sometime, change the qualitative nature of surrenders?

To sustain its wrong evaluation about the strength of the Indian big business to resist foreign imperialist pressures, the C.C. in *“New Situation and Party’s Tasks”* speaks of *“big socialist investments, especially from the Soviet Union, the offers of still larger aid and the other trade and economic relations developed between the Soviet Union and the Indian big bourgeoisie”* as *“important factors to reckon with”* and that *“at least in the immediate future, may even acquire added vigour against increasing U.S. pressures and STAGE OF ECONOMIC CRISIS.”*

We completely disagree with this evaluation of the role of Soviet aid in Indian economy. Experience has proved that Soviet aid is aid to a public sector, subservient to monopoly interests, subservient to foreign imperialist penetration. It is becoming an instrument to cover up the abject surrender of the collaborating Indian bourgeoisie.

This is a departure from the understanding of the Programme.

The Programme says:

*“Despite assistance of key importance from the socialist countries, despite the increase in trade with the socialist countries, despite the fact that the Indian capital has grown in volume, the most glaring fact of our economic life is that the country’s economy as a whole is in many respects precariously dependent on Western assistance and particularly U.S. assistance.”* (Para.26)

We feel that in the face of the growing economic crisis in India, in the face of growing world capitalist crisis, in the face of the American pressures, the abject surrender of the collaborating big business is rapidly growing and the comprador nature of the collaborating big business is becoming the principal character.

## 2. FORMAL INDEPENDENCE

The whole economic policy that the present Congress Government has followed has resulted in the growing dependence of the Indian economy and the internal and external policies of the Indian Government on foreign imperialism especially U.S. imperialism.

Our Rupee is tied to the American dollar. Our imports and exports are dependent upon the wishes of the World Bank and the U.S. imperialists. Our Budget and Five-Year Plans are dependent upon loans from World Bank and U.S. imperialism. Our industries depend on foreign supplies of machinery, Spare parts, raw materials and technical know-how. Our military hardware is dependent on foreign imperialist supplies. Our rationing is dependent upon food supplies from America. Because of this dependence and its dependence for more and more loans from U.S. imperialists, the surrender of the Indian Government is rapidly growing.

The same surrender we can see in the foreign policy of the Indian Government, as seen in its policy towards American aggression in Vietnam, in its opposition to national liberation struggles in its stoppage of trade with Cuba and North Vietnam and in its pronounced anti-communist policies.

The so-called non-alignment policy of the Indian Government has become a big hoax and it is becoming a part of the global strategy of U.S. imperialism, an instrument to suppress national liberation struggles in the East and an instrument to build an anti-China axis in alliance with other reactionary powers subservient to U.S. imperialism.

In this connection we want to remind our C.C. that there was large opposition to characterising the foreign policy of the Indian Government *"to be within the broad framework of non-alignment and opposition to world war,"* in our programme adopted at the Seventh Congress.

Sometimes the Indian Government appears to take independent positions different from that of America. Such efforts are becoming more and more efforts to cover up its surrender to U.S. imperialism, as in the Middle East Crisis to keep up its image of independence, to deceive the Indian and world people, and thus better serve the U.S. imperialism. Surrender to U.S. imperialism is becoming more and more real, while independence of the country is getting more and more formal.

The C.C. Resolutions issued from time to time say that the revolutionary movement is weak, that the rule of this government is not threatened and, as such the Indian big business has no need to surrender to U.S. imperialism.

This is a very superficial view of things. The growing economic crisis, the crisis of the ruling party, the growing discontent of the masses, the growing world capitalist crisis, the growing crisis of the U.S. imperialism in particular, and resultant U.S. pressures, are acting as real causes for the growing surrender of the Indian Government to U.S. imperialism.

### 3. BREAKING MONOPOLY OF POWER OF THE CONGRESS

Our *Party Programme* has given the tactical slogan of participating in provincial ministries, *"to bring into existence governments pledged to carry out a modest programme of giving immediate relief to the people."*

The *Party Programme* visualised such non-Congress Governments at the provincial level as governments *"which give immediate relief to the people and thus strengthen the mass movement."*

Now in *"New Situation and Party's Tasks"* the C.C. describes the coming into existence of a number of non-Congress Governments as *"breaking of the Congress monopoly of power at the hands of several opposition parties."*

This is really a very astounding statement.

Parliament, central cabinet, provincial assemblies and ministries, Presidents and the central nominated Governors, the administration, the military, police, jail and judiciary, are all part and parcel of the bourgeois-landlord constitution pledged to the preservation of the bourgeois-landlord system of exploitation.

From our experience, we know that the provincial assemblies and the provincial ministries have no real power to effect any basic change affecting the life of our people. Every Act and Bill is to be assented by the President who is the nominee of the Congress. And today the bourgeois-landlord constitution is still administered by the Congress Central Cabinet.

When such is the case, how the non-Congress provincial governments, with no real power to affect any basic change, which are directly under the thumb of Congress nominated Governors, which are part and parcel of the bourgeois-landlord constitution under the Congress rule, are breaking the monopoly of Congress rule is beyond our comprehension. Is it not against the teachings of Lenin who said that bourgeois parliaments are mere talking shops, are brothel houses where fraternity, equality, and brother-hood are cheaply sold?

Nay, the formation of the non-Congress Governments is almost raised to the level of dual power in the country.

Look at the following evaluation in *"New Situation and Party's Tasks."*

"If it is a question of some sort of 'truce' that is being proposed between the central government and the non-Congress governments, one can understand it and decide one's attitude to it. It is so because the ruling party in power at the centre has ceased to be that strong, powerful and holding monopoly way as to frontally and immediately challenge the opposition parties and their non-Congress Governments in eight states; the opposition parties, too, have not acquired the requisite strength and necessary mass sanctions to frontally and immediately challenge the authority of the central Congress Government. Both mark time, avoid head-on conflicts for the present, and move cautiously and with circumspection in formulating and practicing the respective Governmental policies." (P.65)

How many atrocious statements in one sentence?

We are supposed to believe that the non-Congress Governments-the DMK in Madras, the Swatantra in Orissa, the Janasangh dominated Government in U.P.,

the landlord Government in Haryana or the Kerala and Bengal Governments where we are supposed to be playing the key role—are acquiring the ‘requisite strength’ to ‘frontally’ challenge the central authority.

It appears that the two warring camps—the Congress Central Government and the opposition non-Congress Governments at provincial level, are marking time and are in a period of truce.

Does not this mean that half of the country is under a form of dual power one at the Centre and another at the Provincial level?

#### **4. CENTRE-STATE RELATIONS**

After the general elections, with the establishment of the Congress Government at the Centre and the formation of non-Congress Governments in a number of states, it is true that the conflicts between the centre and the states on various issues have increased. We have to utilise these conflicts in the development of the democratic movement.

But in “New Situation and Party’s Tasks” the C.C. tries to exaggerate these conflicts between the centre and the states.

“*New Situation and Party’s Tasks*” says:

*“The struggle these non-Congress Governments will have to carry on in defence of states’ autonomy and the rights of the people belonging to different nationalities is essentially democratic and progressive in content and will go a long way in influencing and strengthening the wider democratic movement with its ultimate object of replacing the big bourgeois-landlord set up by a People’s Democratic order. It would be a grievous mistake to under-rate it.” (P.40)*

It further says:

*“The second important manifestation of the developing political crisis, which has come to the front with the election results, is what is now-a-days frequently and commonly talked off as centre-state relations.” (P.47)*

It further says:

*“In other words, the crisis that has gripped the capitalist path of development in India has now projected itself into the political super-structure, namely the Federal Structure of the Indian Union. A stage is reached when the struggle from the economic sphere has passed into the political sphere.” (P.49)*

The meaning of these statements is too clear. It tries to portray that the whole present political crisis is being reflected in the Centre-State relations. Such an over-emphasis of the Centre-State conflicts will only divert us from developing the struggles of the basic masses basing ourselves on the economic and political crisis.

#### **5. THE ROLE OF KERALA AND BENGAL UNITED FRONT GOVERNMENTS IN THE PRESENT DAY SITUATION.**

We joined these united front governments when the people voted down the Congress and voted for anti-Congress coalition.

Judged by the results, we have to make a painful reappraisal of the correctness of joining such governments in coalition with parties with a definitely reactionary class character, in spite of the popular verdict of the masses against the Congress.

Even if we joined such governments we should have no illusions of affecting any real basic change in the present structure.

As Communists, our work in the ministries while trying to give some immediate relief to the extent possible, should help the masses to see through the complete ineffectiveness of these Assemblies and Ministries, raise their consciousness and thus *'prepare them for an irreconcilable battle for the overthrow of the bourgeois-landlord system.'*

Have these two Governments been 'instruments' of struggle to mobilise the people on an All-India scale for an assault on the bourgeois-landlord government on the basis of an alternative programme?

To say the least, the experience of the past 10 months has proved that the achievements, their work, and their programme have not been able to make any appreciable impact on the All-India situation to mobilise the people on the basis of an alternative programme, even to the extent we could make with the Kerala Government in 1957.

Even in the concerned provinces, we have so far failed to place an alternate programme on the floor of the Assemblies, differentiating our Party from all other parties.

Any attempt on our part to bring forth basic alternative programme on any basic issue would have really shown the reactionary nature of our coalition partners, but we are afraid to bring forth any such programme because the hodge-podge coalitions would have broken to pieces considering the reactionary elements with whom we are sailing to-day.

Not only that. We have so far failed to unleash any big mass struggle on any basic issue.

Our whole work in these ministries is overwhelmed by agitation on food.

And even on the food issue, while there has been some attempt at internal procurement from the richer sections, our struggle against rising prices, and black-market has been at a very low ebb.

On the other hand, the whole campaign of the Party has been not to mobilise the people against the food policies of the Central Government, against hoarding and blackmarket, but to convince the people that we are not responsible for the existing distress of the masses, but the central Congress government.

Instead of rousing the masses for struggle against the food policies of the Central Government, the hoarder and black-marketeers, we give some calls, just stop them the moment a petty vague promise of a few bags of rice from the centre is made. The pity is we ourselves have begun to participate in hunger strike, even at the gates of Indira Gandhi- which have only helped to divert the attention of the masses from the real struggle.

We cannot hide the fact that the distress of the masses is growing, the dissatisfaction of the masses is growing, and we see the repressive machinery of the government and the police is being used against the struggling people in spite of our wishes and opposition.

Of course, our comrades in Bengal did try to make a demarcating line to some extent from the other parties and made some advances in the form of the gherao agitation of the workers, distribution of the banzar lands, taking over the management of the British Tramway Company- unlike our admitted failure in Kerala.

But taking the growing crisis, the growing distress, and the possibilities into account, our achievements fall short of the expectations of and hopes raised with the formation of the ministries.

Not only that. In Andhra, in the wake of the Telengana struggle, even though we were in the opposition, we could then mobilise the masses on many political and economic issues-issues like linguistic province, Nagarjunasagar project, banzar lands- could take them to the level of political struggle and force the government to bow before the will of the people.

But, because our Party had no clear-cut perspective of the path of the struggle and failed to reorientate our work to reach that perspective, the invasion of revisionism in the subsequent period could destroy many of those achievements and we lost our bearings and we are still struggling to regain the lost initiative.

We only wish that this experience should not repeat itself again in Kerala and Bengal, which are our strongest bases to-day.

To-day the Party as a whole is lacking a clear-cut perspective of the path of our revolution towards which all our struggles must be directed.

We feel that, instead of our governments being used to unleash big mass struggles, mass agitations are being subordinated to the existence and continuation of the ministries.

We doubt the sagacity of our continuance in the ministry after the dastardly plan of October 2nd conspired by Ajoy Mukherjee and his open denouncement accusing us as welcoming Chinese invasion, and our own inability to force the ministries to take drastic steps and bring the much needed relief to the suffering masses.

In this connection, we must remember the intensity of the peoples' struggles, the continuity of the struggles, their spread from province to province, drawing every class affected by the policies of the government, leading to open confrontation with the government forces, leading to bloody clashes, on the crest of which a verdict against the Congress could be obtained at the subsequent polls.

To-day, the crisis is deeper, the distress of the masses is deeper and wider, and the popular forces including our Party are in more advantageous positions both in the Assemblies, Provincial ministries and Parliament. But the mass struggles that have unfolded in the post-election period are nothing in a comparison with the pre-election battles.

Has the participation of the left forces in the so-called united front governments in partnership with known reactionary forces and the revisionists been a fillip to the mass struggles against the bourgeois-landlord government?

How true was *Lenin* when he said:

*"The experience of alliances, agreements and blocks with the social reform liberals in the West and 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 most vacillating and treacherous. Millarandism in France –the biggest experiment in applying revisionist political tactics on a wide really national scale– has provided a practical appraisal of revisionism that will never be forgotten by the proletariat all over the world."*

(*Lenin-Against Revisionism*- P.116)

We feel, the Party has to seriously think whether our work in the united front ministries together with bourgeois sections and revisionists has not resulted in blunting the edge of the peoples struggles against the policies of the bourgeois-landlord government.

## **6. PATH OF OUR REVOLUTION**

We are not only failing to unleash mass struggles on an extensive scale in the present period, we feel also, that the Party is working without a clear-cut perspective of the path of the Indian revolution.

We feel that, the rich experience of the Chinese revolution and the recent experience of the liberation struggles in the backward countries have shown that peoples war, prolonged agrarian armed revolution is the only path left open to all the backward countries for social emancipation. We feel that, the path of peoples war, taking our own particular objective conditions in our country into consideration, is the only path of our revolution.

The terrain of our country, the geographical conditions of our country, the areas suited to such forms of struggle, should be properly studied and selected, the whole party should be educated and reorientated to such forms of struggles.

The mass struggles of the basic agrarian classes should be conducted in various parts of the country, which will finally lead to the path of peoples war.

But we feel at present, our Party has not paid any thought to this question.

Various CC documents and recent B.T.Rs articles on Naxalbari reveal, a quiet different perspective of the path of our revolution.

These documents and articles are counter-posing, winning the majority of the people, building strong mass organisations, building a strong, well-organised, revolutionary Party to the tactics of armed struggle in those areas, where the course of struggle and the repression let loose by the reactionary forces bring it on the agenda for the further advance of the struggle.

The question is often posed in our press and resolutions, as between those of armed-struggle-walls, the ultra-revolutionaries, and those who want to mobilize the majority of the people behind the party before thinking of any armed struggle.

We categorically say, that in all backward countries, winning the majority of the people, building mass organisations and Party building is closely linked with the armed struggle.

Of course, we do not mean to say that such a struggle could be started tomorrow. The whole point is, the Party has no perspective of this and no conscious preparation towards this direction- political, organizational, ideological-is being under-taken.

Now, due to Naxalbari and Chinese criticism, the CC says that it stands by the 1951 tactical line. Having sit tight over that line, for the last 15 years, without any thorough discussion on the point at any level of our party till this time, the CC's statement on this question merely surprises us.

So far, we have no perspective of Peoples War. The whole perspective expounded in the hitherto CC documents is long legal and illegal work, parliamentary work coupled with mass agitation and mass struggles to a limited extent, and endlessly remain waiting for an insurrection taking place in our industrial centres, which will thence lead to the socio-political emancipation of the country. Repeated assertions about winning the people, building the mass organizations, building the Party-unrelated to armed resistance-gives us this impression and nothing else.

Is such a perspective possible in a backward country like India, even with its marked industrial growth compared with other backward countries? Certainly not. On the other hand if we wait for such a development to take place, we will only be faced suddenly, with the fate of the Indonesian Communist Party.

As we have said earlier, the CC does not have the perspective of a prolonged armed struggle as the strategic weapon of the Indian revolution. On the other hand, the CC is holding out that, the fate of our Party and the course of the struggle will decisively depend, on our work in the Kerala and Bengal united front governments.

*"New Situation and Party's Tasks"* says:

*"Hence it is imperative that our Party realizes that its immediate future, in no small way depends on how it plays its worthy part in running the two state governments of Kerala and West Bengal."* (P.67)

It further says:

*"Since the fortunes of the entire Party, at the present stage of development, are closely linked with the successful running of these ministries and the role our Part throughout the country will have to be mobilised to back the agreed programmes of these two non-Congress ministries and see that they are earnestly implemented."* (P.67)

And what is the aim of this successful running of these ministries?

*"It is this struggle of the democratic parties and groups in different legislatures and among the people, in Parliament and in states with non-Congress democratic governments that alone can pave the way for consolidating and widening the unity achieved by the democratic forces and*



*open the prospects, of realizing the slogan of a non-Congress democratic government at the centre.”(P.79)*

All the above preachings give one meaning and only one, i.e., not the mass struggles of the basic agrarian masses, a prolonged armed struggle leading for a change of government at the centre, but Parliamentary struggles, especially, successful work of the non-Congress governments, is the key to the establishment of a non-Congress democratic government at the centre.

What a wishful thinking! UF governments of Bengal and Kerala leading to the establishment of a non-Congress democratic government at the centre. What will the Indian army in the hands of the central government, in the hands of the bourgeois-landlord government be doing? Sitting with folded hands, silently looking at this Melodrama of basic change of government at the centre.

Successful running of the Bengal and Kerala UF governments have come to occupy such a central place in the programme of the whole party, that the CC Resolution describes these two as instruments of struggle in the hands of the people. Nay, recently Com. E.M.S. as reported in the press has said “that they are instruments of future revolution”!

Lenin gave the general strike as a strategic weapon of the proletariat to achieve its socialist revolution in the industrially developed countries.

Mao gave peoples war as a strategic weapon of the peoples of the backward countries, to achieve their social and political emancipation.

Our CC is offering its creative contribution-the UF governments of Kerala and Bengal—as strategic weapons for the social and political emancipation of the Indian masses!

Look at the following sentence in “New Situation and Party’s Tasks”:

*“In clear class terms, our party’s participation in such governments is one specific form of struggle to win more and more people and more and more allies for the proletariat and its allies in the struggle for the cause of Peoples Democracy and at a later stage for socialism..”(P.70)*

UF governments of Bengal and Kerala-leading to Peoples Democracy and socialism-could anything beat this?

## **7. SELF -DETERMINATION**

Our Party has not yet found time to decide its attitude to self-determination for the various nationalities inhabiting this country. At the Party Congress in 1964, the Party leadership promised to study this problem and soon take decision on the matter.

Meanwhile, Kashmir, Mizo, Naga, Sikkim, Bhutan-language issue and various border conflicts between states, all cry for immediate solution. The Party has no definite line on these questions, basing on self-determination. Events passing are over our heads without our effective intervention.

But it appears that the CC is yet to “take immediate steps to see that our Party studies the problem, formulates the question, takes initiative in the matter” to intervene in the situation effectively.

Three years are not sufficient for the CC to decide its attitude on this question!

But in the meantime, due to the compulsions of the international situation, CPC decides in favour of self-determination for Kashmir, a state lying on its next door, and we find fault with it for the same.

We don't decide our own attitude, and we don't want others also to take a definite stand!

### **8. UNITED FRONT WITH THE REVISIONISTS**

We broke from the Dange revisionist clique when we found them acting as lackeys of the Indian bourgeoisie within the Indian Communist Movement.

The Seventh Congress of our Party at Calcutta was the beginning of the break with revisionism of Dang and Co.

But we are alarmed at the developments that are taking place in the post-election period.

There is no use now to compare our Calcutta Programme or our practice of the pre-election period with the Bombay Programme or the pre-election practice of the revisionists.

The Bombay Programme of the revisionists is dead and gone, and none could resurrect it.

During the election period itself, and after the elections the Dange revisionists have completely changed their Programmatic slogans and their practical line of action.

From their press, it is quite clear now, that the revisionists.

- Characterise this government as a government dominated by big business-landlords.
- that this is an independent government, increasingly subjected to American pressures, the independence being threatened by US imperialism.
- that the non-Congress governments are democratic and are instruments of struggle for national democracy.

On all these points, on Naxalbari and on the question of unity of action in Vietnam-our line is almost in line with that of the revisionists. And both of us are united in the governments of Kerala and Bengal.

Thus we see the demarcating line between us and the revisionists getting blurred.

Are not these tactics of united front with the revisionists helping them to reinstate themselves in the eyes of the public? Any how we feel that the battle against the revisionist theories and practices and unity with them in class organizations or on agitational issues are policies which are to be carefully selected and implemented.

Before the elections, the revisionists were rapidly getting isolated from the masses and were being more and more exposed as agents of the ruling Congress party.

But unity with the revisionists in the ministries is harming the cause of exposing them as the agents of the bourgeoisie among the working class and

helping the revisionists to get out of their isolation. We must make a distinction between, the issues on which we have to give an irreconcilable battle against the revisionists and the issues on which we could unite with them to our own advantage. This is all the more necessary when the revisionists are not yet completely exposed among the people as the agents of the bourgeoisie within the working class movement and when the demarcation between the revisionists and our Party is not yet complete before the public eye.

Instead of this, "*New Situation and Party's Tasks*" makes the sweeping statement, "*Our Party, while ready to have unity of action with the right communist party on all issues affecting our people, in all mass and class organisations, in the functioning of the non-Congress democratic state governments, and in its work in the different Legislatures and Parliament, will have to conduct a principled and uncompromising struggle against revisionism and all its manifestations in our country.*"

Shorn of all verbiage, this is nothing but paper struggle against revisionism and united front with them in practice, which works only to the advantage of the revisionists.

It is not correct to say that "there is not one single basic question connected with the Indian revolution on which we and the revisionists do not diametrically oppose each other" as the CC Draft claims. This is not the truth. On the other hand we have begun to move closer to them.

We think that the CPC is essentially correct on all these points and it has discharged its international duty in pointing out how the Party is slipping into wrong channels. We should not be carried away by the strong language used. We must take the essence of the criticism and self-critically examine our Programme and the present Political Line of the Party.

Of course, while fighting against revisionism, we should guard ourselves against left mistakes.

But the CC Draft has almost posed it as the immediate danger threatening the whole Party.

Not only that. Comrades who differ from this document are being looked with suspicion and a tendency is growing inside the Party to pounce on such comrades even for trivial matters, with disciplinary actions.

We must face the naked fact that there was no complete ideological and political unity inside the Party when our Party was formed. There were sharp differences even at that period. They were being expressed on various occasions in the subsequent period also. Now they have taken a serious turn. The CC must conduct a patient and dispassionate discussion on all the fundamental issues concerning our Programme and tactical line and present policy. This is the only course to unite the Party- politically and ideologically and take the movement forward.

Instead of adopting such a course, our CC assuming that there is already 'bed-rock ideological political-unity' inside the party is trying to settle political

-ideological differences inside the Party through organisational methods without patient discussions at various levels to achieve maximum unity.

We must recognise the fact that the issues of difference inside on Party- the death of the betrayal of the CPSU leadership, the class roots of revisionism inside the Soviet Union, the class nature of Soviet revisionism, acting as the agency of imperialism inside the socialist camp and the International Communist Movement, the dire necessity of an irreconcilable battle against Modern Revisionism represented by the CPSU leadership, the leading role of CPSU in the International Communist Movement at the present time, the thought of Mao-Marxism- Leninism of the present epoch, the method of peoples war as the only weapon in the handle of the people of the backward countries to achieve their emancipation- are issues that are being debated internationally and that this debate is going to continue for a long time to come.

When such is the position, for the CC to settle these issues through organisational methods, will only fan up discontent in the ranks and will only lead to further disruption of our Party.

Such methods, have already resulted in disruption in Naxalbari and U.P., which have only gladdened the hearts of the revisionists.

The Indian Government is going more and more into the grip of American imperialism and the revisionist leadership of CPSU. It is the CPC and PRC that are in the forefront of the struggle against U.S. imperialism and Modern Revisionism represented by the CPSU leadership.

Our Party must be an active partner in this powerful current against U.S. imperialism and Modern Revisionism.

We feel that the CC Draft, instead of helping this current will only take away our Party from the powerful current of struggle against US imperialism and Modern Revisionism and lead the Party eventually to united front with Modern Revisionism represented by the CPSU leadership, thus doing irreparable damage to our own cause and the cause of the International Communist Movement.

It is pertinent to remember at this time, that some of our CC leaders have been propagating the view that it was a *"welcome attempt and a great contribution by the leaders of the CPSU at its 20<sup>th</sup> Congress to reassess the mighty forces for peace and against war"* (A contribution to Ideological Debate- P.38), and that *"while not for a moment forgetting the responsibility in this regard of other communist parties, particularly parties like that of China, We RIGHTLY EXCEPT THE LEAD FROM THE GREAT CPSU, WHICH ALONE CAN PLAY A DECISIVE ROLE IN THE REUNIFICATION OF THE INTERNATIONAL COMMUNIST MOVEMENT TO DISCHARGE ITS TASKS"*. (P.9 Ibid)

We are sorry to note that the CC Draft has not yet completely broken from this understanding.

We feel the ways and the forms that the CC has adopted to conduct the discussions on the international ideological issues are entirely wrong.

Having given a draft to the Party members for discussion the CC has released the draft to the press. Before the Party members could discuss and give the final shape to the draft, the CC has declared that the draft would be the official line of the Party even during the period of discussion.

Calcutta Party Congress had enjoined the CC to conduct 'dispassionate discussions' on the international ideological issues. We feel the CC has taken these decisions contrary to the mandate of the Party Congress.

To add to this, our Provincial Committee, by a majority vote, has asked the right to place an alternative document to the CC Draft for the discussions of the Party members. But the CC has refused this request. The CC has refused to place the alternative document sent to the CC, with the specious argument that there is no requisite strength for the alternative document inside the CC to allow for such a procedure.

Even the request of our PC to allow comrades with dual membership to explain their view in both the Committees has been refused by the CC.

With such decisions, we feel the CC has tried to restrict the freedom of the Party comrades to freely discuss the draft and we feel that all these decisions are entirely wrong.

Taking all these developments into consideration, the issues concerning the international debate, Party Programme, our tactical line, the differences between our Party and CPC, should be thoroughly discussed at all levels inside the Party, alternative documents of the different comrades should be placed before the Party members for discussion. Our Plenum, wants the CC Plenum to take steps to call the Party Congress as soon as possible to take final decisions on all the above issues.

This Plenum strongly feels that only by such broad-based discussions dispassionately conducted and the calling of the Party Congress to take final decisions, full unity of the Party-ideological, political, organisational-could be restored inside the Party and thus take the movement forward.



## **RESOLUTION SUBMITTED BY KOLLA VENKAYYA TO THE ANDHRA PLENUM**

**[Jan, 1968]**

1. The Dange clique, with the aid and abetment of the leaders of the CPSU, who are preaching and implementing modern revisionism, betrayed Marxism-Leninism and the Indian Communist movement. Basing on the writings of CPC, which is fighting modern revisionism and applying Marxism-Leninism to the conditions of the New Epoch, the Marxist-Leninists in India united and held their 7<sup>th</sup> Party Congress in Calcutta and declared to be the real heirs of the Communist Party of India (CPI). In the absence of favourable conditions for a full-fledged discussion on the ideological questions, the 7<sup>th</sup> Congress in its Declaration appealed to the Party members and sympathisers to "continue their efforts to achieve unity in the CPI by applying Marxism-Leninism in a correct way." In another resolution, the 7<sup>th</sup> Congress directed the CC to organise a fullfledged discussion on the ideological questions, and to conduct the discussions in a dispassionate manner.

The Dange group betrayed the Communist movement which has been fighting the repression and oppression of the Government. While uniting and advancing against this Dange group, the 7<sup>th</sup> Congress adopted a Programme and some other resolutions regarding tactics. After the General Elections, the CC passed "New Situation and Party's Tasks". This resolution went a step beyond the Party Programme and stipulated a political line for the Party. Either in the 7<sup>th</sup> Congress or after, the leadership of the CC did not place the ideological issues implied in the Party Programme and tactical decisions for a separate discussion. Our Party as a whole had no occasion to discuss these issues in the light of the views expressed by fraternal parties. Now the CC has prepared a draft on ideological questions and released it for inner party discussions.

2. Proletarian theory of Marxism-Leninism is the basis for the unity of the party of the working class. This is a complete and integral theory with international character. The future of the Communist Movement in our country depends on our discussions which have to be carried on, keeping in view the theories and practices and thus coming to a correct understanding. Revolutionary theory is a guide to action; practice not based on correct theoretical understanding is blind. Theory that has no relation to practice is dogma. For a very long time, we have been

discussing only some issues of controversy with the Dange group and some other national questions. We have not discussed these ideological questions which shook the entire world communist movement. Only by having a full-fledged discussion and arriving at correct understanding on these questions, will we be able to understand the correctness or otherwise of our Party Programme, our tactics and our practice. Then only our Party can get consolidated as a contingent of the international Communist movement.

3. The CC has described the draft as one of explaining "Modern revisionism as the main danger to the International movement at present" (Page 52). The CC, in the draft has openly criticised the CPC for saying that tactics of unity in action with the leaders of the Soviet Party are wrong and for its rejection in practice. In this draft the CC has described the Party Programme and the tactical line it is pursuing, as "the bedrock" of party's Political unity and that they are unquestionable (Page.3). It describes CPC's open criticism of these after General Elections as interference in fraternal affairs and appeals to party members to guard against any such outside interference and "jealously defend its independence and its independent political line" (Page 52). The CC in its draft declares that sectarian and dogmatic tendencies manifesting in the form of demanding rediscussion of Party Programme and political line are arising and that conducting merciless fight against these tendencies is the elementary duty of every Communist (Page.53). The CC has made these exhortations in the name of "Internationalism" and "Democratic Centralism". But these do not create a conducive atmosphere for proper discussions.

4. The CC in its draft explains only its difference and some differing aspects with modern revisionism on ideological questions and that, too, in its own way. A great debate was conducted against modern revisionism on New Epoch and ideological matters relating to it. The CC draft accepts that "*the Chinese Communist Party has rendered yeoman service to the world working class movement and Communist movement in fighting against this menace of modern revisionism and in defence of Marxism-Leninism*" (Page.35). But along with the modern revisionist arguments on ideological questions, the CC did not straightly place the arguments of that Party which had done "yeoman service" before the Party members while discussing various other arguments. Only while making "unity in action" as a "serious point of dispute" in the ideological debate the argument of CPC was presented by the CC, that too, in its own way. This does not help ideological discussion. The arguments of modern revisionists and invaluable views of Marxist-Leninists on the ideological issues that shook the Communist movement and the views of CC on these two points must be placed before the Party members clearly and unequivocally and in such a way that the Party members can understand them all easily. Then only the Party members will be able to play their role in the ideological discussions. The CC draft does not aim at it. This is not useful for that purpose.

The task of all the Party members including the CC is to thoroughly discuss and understand the important issues connected with the working class theory

which is the basis for the unity and internationalism of the working class party and thus correct the present state of affairs; the discussion and consolidation has to be done through a Party Congress.

The CC draft is not only not useful for the purpose but also the understanding expressed in the draft on issues like Communist movement and our tasks, New Epoch and the tasks of Marxist-Leninists, fundamental contradiction, unity in action, relations among fraternal parties, is wrong and harmful. We cannot but say that the understanding expressed in the draft is close to that of the Soviet leadership and that it is confusing Party members. An analysis of the various issues will make it, clear.

#### **PRESENT DAY INTERNATIONAL COMMUNIST MOVEMENT—TASKS**

With the victory of the Chinese Revolution under the leadership of the proletariat and the establishment of Peoples' Government the national liberation struggles and peoples' struggles began to surge forward like waves. The world imperialists, headed by the US imperialists, began to wage criminal last-ditch battles. Exactly at this critical juncture modern revisionism raised its ugly head in the international communist movement. The leadership of the CPSU which played an important role in the world communist movement began to propagate and implement revisionist theories. This line expressed itself in all the national liberation struggles such as Congo, Algeria, Angola, Dominican Republic, South Vietnam and Laos. It expressed itself clearly in its actions against China and Albania and their Parties and in its economic policies towards socialist countries. Marxist-Leninists are combating Soviet leaders' propaganda of war being not fatalistically inevitable and their denouncing of national liberation movements. The revisionists in capitalist countries are carrying in line of the Soviet leaders and supporting their collaboration with the US imperialists and their unity with reactionaries and all such things openly. Consequently the communist movement has to face many difficulties. Unless the Marxist-Leninists fight the treacherous theories and betrayal of the Soviet leadership, they cannot advance even a single step forward. The Communist Party of China under the leadership of Com. Mao Tse-tung prepared a General Line concerning the world Communist Movement and placed it before the CPSU and the international Communist movement on June 14, 1963. The CPC in its General Line warned against making no distinction between enemies, friends and ourselves and leaving the fate of humanity to collaboration with the US imperialists. They made it clear in the General Line that those who denounce the national liberation movements are fully defending the monopoly capital and that the World Socialist Revolution depends on the outcome of national liberation struggles. They further clarified that the attitude towards these struggles "is an important criterion for differentiating those who want revolution from those who do not, and those who are truly defending world peace from those who are abetting the forces of aggression and war." The preparation of this document is a historic event in the world Communist movement. It is a call for the international Communist movement to discharge its historic



responsibility towards the national liberation struggles and for principled unity in the international Communist movement. The Communists rose to the call. The Soviet leadership in its open letter rejected it as a "slander" and as an easy way of winning popularity among the people of Asia, Africa and Latin America. Continuing these controversies the Soviet leadership began to split and disrupt the anti-Imperialist struggles, socialist camp, movement and the Communist Parties.

Marxist-Leninists of all countries under the leadership of the CPC surmounting the difficulties, are united by combating the class collaborationist theories, policies and betrayal of the leadership of the CPSU and began to discharge their historic responsibilities towards national liberation movements and people's movements. Wherever the Marxist-Leninists were united and waged struggle against modern revisionism, in those countries they achieved spectacular victories. Among national liberation struggles that are overcoming the revisionist betrayal and advancing forward, the Vietnam struggle is a turning point. The daily expanding national liberation struggles and people's struggles in Asia, Africa, and Latin America are creating terror among the American imperialists and reactionaries who were already horrified with the Vietnamese struggle. Modern revisionism is in a hopeless position to save them. This is a heartening and encouraging situation for all the Marxist-Leninists in the world.

So far the leadership of the CC has made no effort to make our Party a partner in the great international ideological struggle of the world Marxist-Leninists against modern revisionism and make our Party join its hands with the national liberation movements. The leadership of the CC did not give importance to the ideological issues which are shaking the international Communist movement.

What is it that the leadership of the CC and their draft tell about the favourable conditions created by the struggle against modern revisionism conducted by the world Marxist-Leninists? The central leadership and the Central Committee are not happy over the present favourable situation.

The CC in its draft says that *"the world Communist Movement is sharply divided, its unity disrupted and it is plunged into a serious crisis."* The CC did not refer to the date and time of the crisis they imagine. When compared to the situation existing before the 1964 Calcutta Congress did the Indian Communist movement go forward or backward? When compared to the situation existing before the CPC's proposal concerning the general line of June 14, 1963, did the international Communist movement achieve unity and development of the Marxist-Leninists or not?

Whether the unity of that day has got distructed; is in a crisis? And is it going backward? It is not proper to confuse the Party, taking into consideration only the propaganda launched by the reactionaries and revisionists and the presents day difficulties. The document of the CC hides the fact that the present situation is far better than that of past four years or even ten years. In spite of revisionist betrayal Vietnam is advancing, three fourths of Laos and 60 per cent of Burma

are already liberated. The national liberation struggles are expanding throughout all the backward countries. They have spread to Thailand, Malaysia, Philippines, Bolivia and such other countries. The national liberation forces in Indonesia have overcome the fascist terror and are advancing in spite of the propaganda regarding its total collapse. In this connection the initiative shown by the Marxist-Leninists in mobilising the national liberation forces is commendable. The CC's presentation of this situation as a "sad state of affairs," whatever the reasons may be, is not true to the reality. The CC's presentation of the present situation as "*a crisis that has virtually paralysed the initiative of the world Communist forces in successfully resisting and rebuffing the offensive let loose by the world imperialists,*" (P.9) is nothing but denying the unity and victories achieved so far by the Marxist-Leninists and the national liberation struggles all over the world under the leadership of the CPC. The CC in its draft, while believing that "*modern revisionism had been and does still remain the main danger to the World Communist movement*" also emphasises that "*there have been certain dogmatic manifestations in individual parties and on individual propositions, precepts and actions*" (p.9).

The draft clearly says that the modern revisionist theories as advocated and practised by the leadership of the CPSU are "*the main cause for this sad state of affairs.*" But what are the dogmatic manifestations in individual parties and on individual propositions and precepts and actions? How and in which parties do they express themselves? Are they the causes for the "sad state of affairs" though secondarily? How far do they contribute to present conditions? Is there any difference between those modern revisionist theories which are the "main cause" for the "present situation" and the modern revisionism represented by the Soviet leadership? The CC draft does not answer these questions in a straight forward way. The CC makes it clear that "*the consolidation and further rapid advance of the world Communist movement is inconceivable without waging a principled and determined fight against this menace of revisionism in all its manifestations and conducting sustained struggle in defence of Marxism-Leninism and the principled unity of the International Communist Movement*" (P.9)

The principled struggle against modern revisionism is meant by the CC only as a theoretical struggle against modern revisionism. By "principle unity" in the international communist movement is meant only the unity achieved in the theoretical struggle against modern revisionism. Modern revisionism, and its representatives, Soviet leadership, beginning with the ideological betrayal went to the extent of betrayal in practice, beginning with the political betrayal went to the extent of betrayal in organisational matters and travelled further and further along this line. The CC draft insists that only an ideological struggle has to be conducted against this line and that only is the 'principled' line. But, whatever the reasons, may be, the CC's insistence is not recognising the danger of modern revisionism at the present stage. This method of struggle will be one of hiding the danger and betrayal of modern revisionism. That is why Marxist-Leninists

under the leadership of CPC declared that the struggle for fulfilling the tasks in the New Epoch and struggle against modern revisionism should be conducted through to the end.

The modern revisionists are continuing their conspiracies to split and disrupt the world communist movement and the Soviet camp. Marxist-Leninists are uniting against this and discharging their historical responsibilities. The effect of this struggle is seen on the Party members and people in the countries under influence of Soviet revisionist leadership. They are coming forward as against the Soviet revisionist leadership and other revisionist leading cliques. In the present circumstances, in the name of 'principled struggle' to limit struggle against modern revisionism only to a theoretical one does not help either national liberation struggles or the Parties and the people in the socialist countries under the leadership of Soviet revisionists, but only harms them. In the name of 'principle unity' to make the Marxist-Leninists confine only to theoretical struggle does not help the parties and the people in the socialist countries under the leadership of the Soviet revisionists to come out of the revisionists' grip, but only hinders this process.

It should not be forgotten that the majority of the people and the Party members in the socialist countries under the influence of the Soviet leadership, believe in Marxism-Leninism. Modern revisionism is the main obstacle for their coming forward. Modern revisionism will use all in its capacity to see that they do not come out of it. In the name of 'principled unity', reducing the struggle against revisionism only to an ideological struggle, establishing contacts with the revisionist leaders in the socialist countries will harm the interests of not only the people and the parties of those countries, but also the interests of the world communist movement, national liberation struggles and other revolutionary struggles. This makes no distinction between the Marxist-Leninist Parties and the revisionist parties.

"Principled ideological struggle" against modern revisionism and principled "struggle for unity" with modern revisionism- this is the line the CC Draft expresses. By virtue of the position the modern revisionists occupy in the Socialist camp, the line of the CC boils down to ideological struggle against and unity in practice with the modern revisionists, i.e., the line of struggle and unity regarding modern revisionism.

Whatever high-sounding words like "determined fight" against modern revisionism "in all its manifestations" the draft may express, such a line will make the struggle against revisionism nominal and unity with it real. This line will lead to making no distinction between revisionists and Communists and confuse the fighting people.

This line is against the teachings of great Marxist-Leninists that the contradiction between Marxism-Leninism and modern revisionism is an antagonistic one and by waging struggle against modern revisionism, Communists are discharging their historical responsibilities.

## NEW EPOCH: TASKS OF MARXIST-LENINISTS

In the face of distortion of the New Epoch by the Soviet leadership, their policy of confusing the world communist movement and national liberation struggles and pursuing the policy of class collaboration, the CPC with its invaluable experience came forward to resist the line. The CPC prepared the general line and placed it before the CPSU and the world communist movement on June 14<sup>th</sup>, 1963. Various parties discussed this general line.

Rejecting the CPC's proposal concerning the General Line, the CPSU expressed certain ideas in its open letter. The Soviet leadership expressed in its open letter that the changes brought all over the world in the New Epoch, "*changes in the balance of forces, new opportunities for the movement.*" (p.18) brought to fore, the "*problems of strategy and tactics of the world working class movement and national liberation movement*". It also declared that its own general line was the solution for all these problems.

The C.C. draft does not clearly express its opinion on the "*new opportunities*" preached by the modern revisionists. It does not explain their concrete manifestations. Rejecting the CPC's arguments, the Soviet leaders in their open letter said that it was meaningless to reject completely the method of negotiations and agreements as a solution for problems arising inevitably out of the relations among countries. They also said that if this method of solution was rejected, then wars would never come to an end (P.30). The C.C. does not clinch whether this is the way of avoiding wars between the two systems. The C.C. only says that the "*co-operation and collaboration aspect is being thrust to the forefront by the Soviet leadership*" (p.33). The Soviet leadership in its open letter expressed that it is a matter of the C.P.C's belief, not to believe imperialists in any affair and that they would certainly deceive but, it was a "matter of reasonable estimations" (p.30). Only according to this, the open letter said, that the "U.S. stick to its word in Cuba" and that they were "fulfilling their promises". In this open letter, the Soviet leadership talked of "new opportunities." But what is the understanding of our CC on these "new opportunities"? What does the draft explain? The C.C. draft warns that if "one were to proceed on several possibilities of averting war and establishing durable peace, and on that basis weave out theories and workout tactics, one is bound to end in grief" (P.17). The draft says that "*there were powerful imperialist forces with economic political and military resources*" and that the Marxist-Leninists should base themselves on these "realities" (p.17). But the C.C. does not specify the "several opportunities" which are imagined by it.

The C.P.C. explained that the New Epoch created opportunities for the national liberation movements and peoples' struggles. The C.C. draft does not say where it differs from the C.P.C's argument. The draft does not explain why the Soviet leadership, which "came to reasonable estimations was keeping its promises to the W.S" and whether what the C.P.C. said was only a matter of its own belief? Or is it a theory based on relations of the New Epoch and which is necessary for the present stage? The C.C. draft refuses to say this. If the C.P.C. is not able to see

the "new opportunities" which the C.C. imagines, atleast that should have been clearly stated. The C.C. does not express its opinion regarding the responsibilities of Marxist-Leninists towards the national liberation struggles which play a special role as against the war schemes of imperialists and for the advance of the world socialist movement at the present stage.

#### DEFINITION OF NEW EPOCH

The C.C. draft says that *"the definition of the New Epoch should not be based on utopian formulae, subjectively drawn"* (p.8). According to their own definition of the new Epoch, the CC draft defines the *"forces of revolution"* as *"the countries that have already come under the socialist system, the proletarian revolutionary movements in the advanced capitalist countries, the national liberation movements, and forces in the newly liberated and colonial countries, of the widespread popular movements against war and in defence of world peace"* at present (p.8). The C.C. draft does not clearly say whether the Indian Government is one among the forces in the newly liberated countries. The Soviet leadership places the Indian Government in the anti-imperialist peace zone and is propagating it. The leadership of our Party is preaching that the Indian Government did not join its hands with imperialism. Whatever may be the difference between both the estimations, the C.C. draft does not say whether the Indian Government is one in the list of these "forces of revolution". The C.C. does not clarify whether the Soviet leadership, representing modern revisionism, is one among the forces of revolution. It only says that imperialism can be defeated if these forces of revolution could stand united.

Modern revisionists reject the special role of national liberation struggles in the New Epoch and in the present stage in thwarting the war schemes of imperialists and in accomplishment of Socialist revolution. Marxist-Leninists chalk out their tasks by having this special role in their view. This is precisely the difference between the Marxist-Leninists and modern revisionists. It is precisely from here that the modern revisionists, betrayal and splitting activities start. The C.C. draft sidetracks this. The C.C. draft preaches *"a revolutionary combination of socialist diplomacy, calculated to isolate the most reactionary imperialist groups with the use of the armed might of the socialist camp,"* when the imperialists resort to aggression and bloodshed (p.9). The socialist countries under the influence of the Soviet revisionist leadership are using their diplomatic relations for improving friendly relations with U.S. imperialism, which has become the main enemy of the people of the world, and with those reactionary groups in those countries where the national liberation movements are advancing. This is clear to every student of politics. The leadership of the C.C. is not unaware of the Soviet propaganda that the C.P.C. is attempting to force the Soviet and U.S. into a war, that the U.S. imperialists had shifted their military concentration from Europe to Asia and their conspiracies of encirclement of Chinese People's Republic and that the Soviet revisionist leadership is provoking border clashes with China mobilising their armies to the Chinese borders. What does it mean when the C.C.

Draft hides these facts and preaches the revolutionary combination of socialist diplomacy with the armed might of the socialist camp? The C.C. Draft says that the unity of the revolutionary forces should be one that can defeat the imperialists and that "unity in which the ruling parties of the socialist countries render all forms of aid" against imperialist aggression and intervention (p.9). But it is well known that the obstacle to this unity is modern revisionism and the Soviet leadership which represents it.

The Soviet leadership joining hands with the enemies of the world people, U.S. imperialists and all reactionaries, and utilising the U.N. for diplomatic relations betrayed the people of Congo, Dominican Republic, Vietnam and Arab countries. The history of present day struggles has proved that the struggles conducted in alliance with modern revisionists could not strike and defeat imperialists. What does it mean, when the C.C. draft preaches for such unity in which the parties under the influence of Soviet revisionist leadership also could give all forms of aid?

The Soviet revisionist leadership also expressed the same thing, of course, in different words. The Soviet revisionist leadership rejecting the C.P.C.'s proposal concerning the General Line said in its open letter as follows: *"Today, the world revolution advances in the form of consolidation of the socialist camp, proletarian revolutionary struggles against capitalist countries, continued national liberation struggles, strengthening of economic and political independence of newly liberated countries in Asia, Africa and Latin America in opposition to aggressive schemes, people's struggles against monopoly capitalists etc. One should not be counterposed against the other. All should be directed towards a single aim-elimination of imperialist rule"*. The open letter criticised the CPC for its alleged counterposing of national liberation struggles to others. It also criticised the CPC for believing in national liberation struggles as the decisive force in the New Epoch. The open letter theorised that, among the anti-imperialist revolutionary forces, it is the international working class and its creation, the world socialist camp, that could play the decisive role (p.53). The meaning is very clear; they want to subject and subordinate the national liberation struggles to their strategy and tactics. This is precisely the controversy in the world communist movement. The open letter of the CPSU saying that *"it is the struggle for averting nuclear war which is crucial among the tasks facing the anti-imperialist forces,"* counterposed this to others and revealed its plan for unity with reactionaries and collaboration with the U.S. They have regarded the Indian Government as a "revolutionary force" fighting imperialism and tried to pit it against the Chinese People's Republic. It is helping by all means and befriending the reactionaries in backward countries. This is precisely the controversy regarding the New Epoch. Then, which is anti-imperialist and which is not? In the name of "averting nuclear war" and directing all struggles as against imperialism, is it correct to subordinate the national liberation struggles and thus water them down? Or is it correct by surmounting all obstacles to continue national liberation struggles which play a decisively role in thwarting imperialist

war machinations and in advancing the world socialist revolution? The C.C. has thought it irk-some to express its opinion clearly in the draft over this controversial issue. The C.C. Draft stands away from this controversy. The Soviet leadership in its open letter explained away the national liberation struggle according to their own strategy.

It said: *"Marxist-Leninists always emphasise this great significance of national liberation movements and its feature. If it wants to achieve proper victories, it should have firm friendship and cooperation with the world socialist system which is the main force in the anti-imperialist struggle"* (p.56).

In his report of 15<sup>th</sup> February, 1964, on *"struggle for solidarity of the world communist movement,"* Suslov said, *"unity of the revolutionary forces is the basis for victory in the anti-imperialist struggle"* (p.37)

He proposed that in order to combat imperialist aggression, socialist countries extend their political and diplomatic aid in their full capacity, to the newly liberated countries (Ibid P.38).

There is no difference between the Soviet leaders' proposal of "firm friendship" and the C.C.'s draft explanation of the "unity of revolutionary forces". There is no difference between the "political and diplomatic aid", preached and implemented by Suslov and "Combination of socialist diplomacy with the use of armed might." The difference is only in words. The C.C. draft refuses to raise the question, whether the national liberation struggles have any special role to play in defeating the imperialist war plans.

Marxist-Leninists note that in the New Epoch and at the present stage the national liberation struggles have got a special role to play in thwarting the imperialist war plans, in defeating their strategy and in achieving the world socialist revolution. Only the modern revisionists reject this. What does it mean when the CC draft bypasses these struggles which have special significance and preaches such unity to defeat the imperialists? The CC is counterposing the "revolutionary forces" which it imagines and their "unity" to the national liberation struggles which have special significance at the present stage. This is nothing but rejecting the role played by the Korean war, Vietnam struggle and other national liberation struggles in defeating the imperialist war plans. The draft intends indirectly to tell that the national liberation struggles against U.S. imperialism have no special significance and they cannot achieve victories till such "unity" is achieved through skilful methods preached by them. The father of modern revisionism, Khrushchov, vainly attempted threaten about the fate of the Vietnamese struggle if he gave it up. His heirs tried to force a compromise with the U.S. imperialists by showing the difficulties which might arise if they would not combine their forces with it. The leadership of the CC and the CC draft do not have such confidence in the national liberation struggles as in the military might and diplomatic strength of modern revisionists.

The draft has more confidence in the unity in which the parties under the revisionist leadership could render all help against imperialism rather than anti-

imperialist struggles. The draft formulated that the struggle *"for unity against imperialism is inseparable from the struggle against modern revisionism"* (p.9). The meaning is very clear. The CC thinks that the struggle against modern revisionism should be such in which the ruling parties in the socialist camp could render all forms of practical aid, including direct military intervention to the anti-imperialist struggles. The CC's idea is that during Marxist-Leninists struggle against modern revisionism and the revisionist leadership of the ruling parties in the socialist camp, it should be seen that those parties would not withhold their help to the anti-imperialist struggles. The CC rejects to note that the very struggle against revisionism would help the parties to overcome these respective revisionist leaderships and help to discharge their respective duties and achieve unity.

Modern revisionism and the Soviet revisionist leadership stand at the helm of the socialist countries and parties under its leadership. Thus it also becomes part of the "forces of revolution", defined by the draft. The Soviet leadership is tied up with Indian Government and such other reactionary forces. What does it mean when the CC draft links the struggle for unity "in which the Soviet leadership and the parties in the socialist countries under its leadership would not withhold practical and military aid to the anti-imperialist struggles" with the struggle against modern revisionism? Is it not conducting the struggle against modern revisionism in a way subjected to and subordinated to the acceptance of the Soviet leadership, so that it may not withhold its help to these struggles? Is it not subjecting and subordinating the struggle against revisionism to the acceptance of the Soviet leadership which rejects the special role of the national liberation struggles, and vainly tries to disrupt them by all means? This is nothing but subordinating the struggle against revisionism to the whims and fancies of modern revisionists in the name of unity. The CC may think that this "unity" is possible if the struggle against revisionism is carried out as a "principled" ideological struggle. It may also think that it is a revolutionary skill." But all this leads to unity with revisionism and the betrayal of national liberation struggles.

In this connection it is necessary to remember some of Lenin's formulations. He warned us in his book *"Imperialism, the Highest Stage of Capitalism"* as follows: *"If the struggle against imperialism is not made inseparable from that against opportunism it is bogus and humbug. They are the most dangerous who refuse to understand this."*

The great Lenin's warning is invaluable; precisely by having this warning in their views, Marxist-Leninists are carrying the national liberation struggles by linking them with struggle against modern revisionism, and achieved great victories. The Soviet leadership called its attempt for unity with the reactionary forces and such other heterogeneous forces as a struggle for unity. What is meant by struggle for unity? The CC draft decides to combine the struggle for unity with the struggle against revisionism. This is against the great Lenin's method and makes the anti-revisionist struggle nominal and waters down the national liberation struggles.



If we notice the CC draft's criticism of modern revisionism in the context of the New Epoch, we can understand what sort of struggle it preaches. The draft's understanding of modern revisionism is that it underplays certain salient features of the Epoch, while exaggerating certain other aspects and paints a period of more or less peaceful transition to socialism has set in (p.7). The CC thinks that it is due to erroneous ideas that the revisionists hide the fact that the rule of monopoly capital is still continuing in the advanced capitalist countries, that militarisation is growing in those countries, that "modern revisionism builds a dreamland in which imperialism has ceased to be one which has to be annihilated?" And the C.C. concludes that with these dreams modern revisionism is disrupting unity and undermining the national liberation struggles. Such are the mistakes of revisionism according to the C.C. So it can be clearly said that the understanding of the draft regarding the New Epoch and the responsibilities of Marxist-Leninists in this Epoch is not only mistaken but is close to the understanding of the Soviet revisionists.

### MODERN REVISIONISM: C.C.'S ESTIMATION

The revisionist theories of "peaceful co-existence", "peaceful economic competition", and "peaceful transition" started by the Soviet leadership in the 20<sup>th</sup> Congress were developed and are being implemented as a political and organisational line. What does the CC draft tell us about this? It describes that the trio "with every passing day are being rendered in to a fully worked out line of class conciliation and collaboration on a global plane" (p.33). This is what the C.C. tells about international and class collaboration policies of Soviet revisionist leadership. The draft may delight itself that it has satisfied the Party members by saying that it has described the Soviet revisionist policy as being rendered into a fully worked out class collaborationist party. But it is not "by each passing day", that it becomes "fully worked out line of class conciliation and collaboration on a global scale". It would have been good if the CC explained how many days should be passed for it to become a fully worked out line? This is not the straight and unequivocal method of expressing its opinions to party members by the CC.

By hiding things it may have some temporary advantages, but it does harm to the movement rather than contributing to it. The CC tells in a roundabout way that the class collaborationist policy of the Soviet leadership which represents modern revisionism is only being rendered into a fully worked out line with every passing day and that it is not a fully worked out line as yet. These are against realities. It is impossible to hide the fact that the Soviet leadership is conniving with the US imperialists and helping them at every step in their conspiracies regarding Congo, Vietnam, West Asia, monopoly of nuclear arms, isolating China and all other international issues. The CC only intends to create an opinion that the policy of the Soviet leadership which represents modern revisionism is not a fully worked out line of class collaboration as yet.

In this connection one more important aspect must be studied. The CC Draft says that "the Soviet leadership is seeking to relegate the struggle against the

imperialists to a secondary position,” and thrusting cooperation with the US imperialists to the forefront (p.33). The CC describes their line as a bankrupt revisionist line. “Cooperation and collaboration” with the imperialists, particularly the US imperialists, the main enemy of the world, is unthinkable for the communist world even as a secondary one. Negotiations over controversial issues and compromises that are useful for the revolutionary movement are different things. It is impossible to hide the fact that the Soviet revisionist leadership has become a complete ally of US imperialism. This is the understanding of the Marxist-Leninists. To reject this the CC Draft adopts another roundabout way. It tells us that according to its criticism, the Soviet Union has not become an ally of US imperialism. The CC Draft is utilising the name of the Soviet Union to help the betrayal of the leadership in the same way as the Soviet leadership tries to cover up its betrayal by utilising the name of the Soviet Union. The imperialists in their pursuit for world domination are trying to isolate the Chinese Peoples’ Republic which stands in their way, are building up military encirclement around China, trying to suppress the national liberation struggles and disrupt the Socialist world. The Soviet leadership also is conniving with the US imperialists and other reactionaries and has concentrated against China. What else is this if not for sharing the domination of the world? And the CC Draft clearly tells that their criticism does in no way imply that the Soviet Union is working for sharing world hegemony with US imperialism. And thus the CC’s Draft rejects to accept the betrayal of the Soviet leadership and obstructs those who fight it. The draft propagates that the acceptance of this is tantamount to placing the Soviet Union outside the Socialist camp. This is clearly giving a place to the Soviet leadership in a roundabout way. The Soviet leadership is conniving with U.S. imperialism for sharing world hegemony on the one side and is taking quick steps to restore capitalism on the other, in order to strengthen its own base. Thus the Soviet leaders are trying to remove the Soviet Union from out of the Socialist camp. The world Marxist-Leninists are discharging their international responsibilities by exposing this before the Soviet people and the Soviet Party. The leadership of our Party and the CC Draft are standing in their way by trying to cover up the betrayal. For this they are using the name of the Soviet Union. There can be no worse anti-internationalism than this.

Only with this understanding the CC Draft tells us that the policies of the Soviet leadership are “right opportunist policies”, that the aggressive activities of the imperialists will grow in future and that peoples’ movements will be damaged. It means, according to the draft, that the policy of the Soviet leadership has not yet become a fully worked out class collaborationist policy, that they are only poisonous ideas and that these revisionist ideas cause serious damage to the world communist movement. Thus it bypasses the real issues, while stating that they accept the role played by the CPC in the struggle for the advancement of the working class and the communist movement. The Draft hides the fact that it has rejected the essence of the CPC’s line. The CC might have

thought that since the struggle chalked out by the Draft is confined only to the ideological struggle, it automatically becomes a criticism against the Chinese Party. Now let us analyse the various aspects.

### **ON THE ISSUE OF FUNDAMENTAL CONTRADICTIONS**

It has to be said that the CC has erred in its analysis of this issue. The general line of the international communist movement should be based on the sum total of the actual conditions and on the analysis of the fundamental contradictions in the contemporary world. Otherwise, besides being of no help to the world Socialist revolution and the world Communist movement it will harm them. It is here that Marxism-Leninism and alien ideologies struggle and this is not just a difference in words.

Is the general line preached by the Soviet leadership based on the analysis of the fundamental contradictions or not? Are the ideas propagated in this context correct or not? What is their end result? What is the Marxist-Leninist understanding? Presently these are the important issues in debate. The General Line proposed by the CPC has examined all these issues and shown the way.

The CC Draft has said that the Soviet leadership accepts the fundamental contradictions; but accepting the fundamental contradiction in words is not enough. They have to be understood from the class point of view. Whether the Soviet leadership is doing it this way or not is the real issue. The CC Draft has not intended to clearly state its stand on this issue. It has reduced the dispute to be one of a minor issue. It gives out that in treating the contradiction between the socialist camp and the imperialist camp as "almost the only contradiction," by the advocacy of "pet methods" for the solution of all the fundamental contradictions (p.10), modern revisionists are covering up the class essence of the contradiction between the camps of imperialism and socialism. They refuse that there is no difference between this contradiction and the one between socialist and imperialist Governments. This is an important issue under dispute. The CC has not at all touched upon this.

The CPC from a class analysis of the fundamental contradictions has given the slogan of broad UF with the Socialist countries and the international working class as its core against imperialism and reactionaries headed by US imperialism. At a time when the US imperialists are subjecting the intermediate zone between the Socialist camp and US imperialism to aggression and grabbing, the CPC had made it clear that the international working class should utilise inter-imperialist contradictions for "uniting all forces that can be united." It laid down that cooperation and collaboration with US imperialism is wrong. The General Line proposed by the CPC explained the contradictions and pointed that these national liberation struggles play a decisive role in the present stage in blowing up the war plans of imperialism and in achieving world socialism.

The Soviet leadership has rejected all these points. The Soviet leadership, while cooperating with US imperialism, ridiculed the Chinese Government for its relations with France and with Pakistan, which were maintained with a view

to utilising the inter-imperialist contradictions. It argued that to ask them, not to maintain relations with the US is ill-intended. In the name of "anti-imperialist peace front", the Soviet leadership, enlisting Indian Government and such other reactionary forces in it, has been giving all sorts of aid to them as against national liberation movements. It reveals its real face, when besides lending aid to the Suharto regime, the Soviet Ambassador lavishes praises on it. The Soviet leadership paints the national liberation movements as of regional significance. The C.C Draft has refused to state its opinions either on these disputed aspects or on the class content of contradictions, on the question of which is its principal aspect, and on the related intermediate zone and the attitude towards the national liberation movements. The CC Draft is not prepared to go deep into these important points of dispute.

The CC Draft has said that Marxist-Leninists understand that the contradiction between imperialism and oppressed nations has got accentuated and assumed the acutest form culminating in the outburst of national liberation movements and that it is "influencing the course of all other contradictions" and that it has become "the focus of all contradictions" (P.9). This may be their understanding, but not the understanding of the Marxist-Leninists. Marxist-Leninists understand that the contradiction between imperialism and oppressed nations is the principal contradiction for this entire stage that the various types of contradictions in the contemporary world are concentrated in the vast areas of Asia, Africa and Latin America that this principal contradiction leads to a surge of national liberation struggles. When they are unable to dispute this, it is incorrect to attribute their understanding to Marxist-Leninists. To understand well what the C.C thinks about the fundamental contradiction, one has to examine the CC resolution on "New Situation and Party's Tasks." Narrating the national liberation struggles in the period primarily before 1950, it included Vietnam with them, saying that a "glance at the continents of Asia, Africa and Latin America would convince anybody how powerful national liberation struggles have become a pronounced feature of our time" (p.10). The CC resolution then concluded that this contradiction got intensified, surmounting the dangled imperialist economic aid (P.11-12). The CC resolution has described that "a concrete study of international developments during this decade would more clearly reveal" that this contradiction "has assumed a particularly acute and sharp character" (p.13). The CC resolution has concluded that "at the present stage of international developments, Vietnam has become such a focal point of all world contradictions: (p.13). This means that Vietnam has become the focal point of world contradictions, while the principal contradiction has got accentuated. This is not how the Marxist-Leninists all over the world understand. They understand that the vast areas of Asia, Africa and Latin America constitute the focal point of all the contradictions. It is true that Vietnam has become a crucial one in the national liberation struggles. Its specific significance lies precisely in the fact that it withstood the betrayal of modern revisionism.

The method which the CC has adopted to study the fundamental contradictions is not the correct one. It is not studying the real situation. It is only the interpretation of their view, in terms of class contradictions. This would be more clear if we see one more aspect. The April resolution has said that *"the central theatre where all the fundamental contradictions and conflicts are sharply focussed, has now shifted from Europe, where they were concentrated in the first post-war decade, to Asia today"* (p.14). While saying that it has lead to the change in the theatre of military activities, the CC Draft explained at length- the Chinese revolution and national liberation struggles and in addition to these *"the Soviet Union has proved itself to be more than a match to the US in the defence and military sphere", the European People's Democracies had put their states fairly on the road to Socialism and Communism"*, and *"the NATO military alliance countered by the Warsaw Defence Pact under the Soviet leadership"*- all these as reasons for the change. Will American imperialism leave Europe to forces which have surpassed its own military strength and shift its military target to Asia just because China has become a hard nut to them? Is this the reality? This simple doubt of a layman did not strike the CC. The CC is not bothered about as to which contradiction led American imperialism to shift its target. Do they mean to say that American has shifted its target only in accordance with the principal contradiction and that the Soviet leadership in the world and the Chinese Government in Asia have become hurdles to American imperialism? The way that the CC studies the fundamental contradictions itself is wrong. The study of the fundamental contradictions should be as to decide a general line and policy but not to defend our own understanding in their name. This erroneous understanding does manifest in the CC Draft. The soviet leadership has spread certain wrong ideas in support of its policies. They have begun to remove the class content of the contradiction between imperialism and the Socialist camp and to differentiate this with the contradiction between the imperialist Governments and the Socialist Governments to reject the other fundamental contradictions and propagate that the contradiction between different social systems will get resolved through *"peaceful economic competition, and that the contradiction between the proletariat and the capitalists and that the contradiction between the oppressed nations and imperialists will get resolved without revolution"*. The CPC in its General line has warned that these erroneous ideas would inevitably lead to wrong and dangerous policies (p.9).

The CC Draft says, "this totally undialectical understanding, study and assessment of the contradictions has landed the revisionists in opportunist mistakes". This is nothing but interpreting the deeds of the modern revisionists in an inverted way. The Soviet leadership did not formulate its general line with a class understanding of the fundamental contradictions. They have formulated it from their own thinking. And now to defend it, they have been circulating certain wrong notions about contradictions. The history of the Communist movement has proved that erroneous ideas lead to dangerous policies. The revisionist

mistakes pointed out by the CC Draft are only some of the wrong ideas that they are propagating. The C.C. Draft does not mention in all these the key point, which discards the class content of the contradiction between different social systems. Did the "mistakes" pointed out by the draft lead to the dangerous policies, or not? How will the undialectical understanding lead to "mistakes"? The CC does not answer these questions. This would mean supporting the general line of the Soviet leadership, while saying that it is wrong "in principle" on the question of contradictions. Its attitude in the study of contradictions is clear from its evasion to touch upon the intermediate zone and the responsibilities to be discharged towards the national liberation movements.

This will be more clear if we examine the understanding of the CC regarding the class contradictions in India.

India is a backward country. It remained under the direct rule of the imperialists till 1947. The big bourgeoisie compromised with imperialism and since 1947 is wielding state power. This situation would not eliminate the contradiction between imperialism and the Indian nation as a whole and between imperialism and the national bourgeoisie, as well. It is accepted by one and all that as the crisis deepens, this contradiction is getting intensified.

The CC which said that the economic crisis in the country has been projecting itself into a political crisis and that the contradiction between the Government and the people gets accentuated in its resolution on *"The New Situation and the Party's Tasks"* of April 1967, also stated as follows:

*"At the same time, fissures and conflicts between the big bourgeoisie and the imperialists are not only ruled out, in fact they do also grow and find expression"* (p.56). There is no relation between the Programme and what the CC is now telling in this resolution. It did not stop there. In the same resolution, the CC has shown how the contradiction between the Indian Government and imperialism is getting accentuated in this way:

*"Did we not find that during the last two or three years there arose serious differences and conflicts between the Indian Government and US imperialism, on a number of questions such as the Indo-Pak War, the fertilizer deal, Indo-US educational foundation, terms and conditions for food aid, the rupee devaluation and the tightening of US and other foreign credits, etc?"* This explanation is contrary to the facts. It gave full opportunities for American intervention in our educational sector. The Indian Government stopped its trade with Cuba and Vietnam, faithfully carrying out the US directives. To show these examples asserting the developing contradiction between the Government of India and imperialism only gladdens those none other than the Government of India. This resolution also said that *"as the US offensive increases such conflicts are bound to increase"*. The CC intends to assert that the contradiction between the big bourgeoisie and imperialism and that between the Government of India and imperialists gets accentuated while the general crisis of capitalism is in the third stage and when the country is facing an economic and political crisis!

The CC explained in the following manner as to how the contradiction between imperialism and the democratic movement influences the class contradictions within India and the significance of its utilisation by the big bourgeoisie.

*"This tendency of utilising the contradiction between the Socialist and imperialist camps at least in the immediate future, may even acquire added vigour because of their efforts to defend themselves against increasing US measures and their eagerness to stave off the economic crisis. Big socialist investments, particularly from the Soviet Union, the offers of still larger aid, and other trade and economic relations developed between the Soviet Union and the Indian bourgeoisie are important factors to reckon with."*

*"It would be wrong to satisfy ourselves and rest content with the idea" that "what proves strong and real is the collaboration of the big bourgeoisie with foreign monopoly capital and not the friendly ties with the Socialist states, since the big bourgeoisie is capable of severing the latter at any hour it chooses. This is an over simplification par excellence" (p.57-58).*

What is meant is clear. It is the view of the CC that in the near future our big bourgeoisie will more and more utilise Soviet economic aid against American imperialism, that it is wrong to think that the big bourgeoisie can break at its will the relations that are established in this process and that we should maintain our relations with the Indian Government keeping in our view the Soviet economic aid and the relations that are established.

This is not the way to study the fundamental contradictions from the class point of view. This cannot help in our study of the fundamental contradictions in our country and formulate our line and tasks. The CC is circulating certain wrong ideas to support its arguments.

It cannot but be said that the method adopted by the CC in the study of the fundamental contradictions in the national and international spheres and the explanations it has offered are wrong.

#### WAR AND PEACE

The CC Draft criticises modern revisionism for formulating that war is not inevitable, that the laws of social development are changed due to technological progress and advance of nuclear weapons and criticises it as giving up Marxism-Leninism. The CC Draft attempts to convince us that modern revisionism commits this mistake as they fail to understand the real nature of the imperialists and as they "proceed on several possibilities of averting war and establishing durable peace" and on that basis the Soviet leadership and modern revisionists "weave out their theories" and that they did not have any other motive (p.17). This is nothing but propagating the love for an enduring peace of the Soviet revisionist leadership in the name of criticising their theories.

The CC Draft preaches that "*new possibilities have certainly arisen*" for averting a new world war and establishing an enduring peace, and that "*these possibilities can be translated into realities*" by uniting and strengthening all the

forces of peace and democracy that can be united", "*and that they do not fall victims to either pacifist illusions....or the class collaborationist utopias.*" This is nothing but supporting the Soviet leadership in the name of peace unity with reactionaries in backward countries. The importance of the NLMs did not strike the CC and it is not recognising that these are shattering the imperialist war plans. In the name of criticism, this is to propagate the good intentions of the Soviet leadership, sidetracking the real issue, and defending their general line.

The CC Draft criticises the Soviet leadership for concluding a treaty with the American imperialists to maintain their monopoly of nuclear arms as an outlook that emanates from a "*non-class and right-opportunist understanding*" (p.20). Modern revisionism is not without its class basis. It is an agent of the reactionary capitalist class. This is nothing but an attempt by the CC to cover up the class nature of the Soviet revisionist leadership.

It is manifest in the CC Draft that while being a sovereign nation, it is wrong to take protection from a fraternal state against imperialist nuclear weapons (p.20). This is a wrong argument.

The CC Draft teaches that the attitude of the Soviet leaders regarding China on the issue of nuclear weapons "*is based on an unwarranted premise*" that "*their collaboration with the Anglo American imperialists is a greater guarantee for the preservation of peace for the outlawing of the use of atomic weapons, and for averting a thermonuclear war*" (p.20). Whether the attitude of the Soviet leaders is based on "unwarranted premise" or not is one thing. But, to speak the truth, whatever the CC might tell in the name of criticism, none else can make better propaganda for the Soviet leadership than the CC Draft. American imperialists and all reactionaries are making preparations for a military encirclement of China. When the Soviet leadership is joining hands with them, should the Marxist-Leninists lay it bare or propose to propagate the good intentions of the modern revisionists? This is the problem. It is the betrayal of their responsibilities if Marxist-Leninists cover up the modern revisionists betrayal in any form.

The Chinese Party is making it clear that while making efforts to avert world war and establish peace on the one hand, the revolutionary forces on the other should muster all their energies and prepare to repulse if the imperialists force a world war. The CC Draft has completely left out this point.

Likewise we also know that the Soviet leadership and the CC Of CPC are expressing completely divergent views on what happens if the world war comes. The Soviet leadership writes that if a world war breaks out, it develops into a nuclear war, that nuclear weapons do not distinguish between Socialism and imperialism, that the entire humanity will be annihilated and that this land will turn into a graveyard. Instead of developing hatred among people against world war, they intend to create fear and scare them. Contrary to this the Chinese Party asserts that it is imperialism, and not the Communists who start a world war. It said: Socialist revolutions were victorious in the Soviet Union after the first world



war and in many other countries after the second world war. Similarly if a third world war occurs, imperialism and capitalism will be rooted out and it is wrong to say that humanity will be annihilated. It said that world war is not an inevitable necessity for the success of Socialist revolutions but the revolutions will certainly be victorious if world war occurs. It said in such a war one third of humanity might be lost, but on the ruins of capitalism, humanity would build a very great new society, and thus the CPC gave confidence to the people. The CC Draft has completely skipped off to give its opinion on the bankrupt formula of Soviet leadership, which scares the people and leads to compromise with imperialism and on the formula of the Chinese Party which imbues the people with confidence in the future and prepares them to fight imperialism.

### PEACEFUL COEXISTENCE

Modern revisionists and the Soviet leadership are covering up and encouraging the aggressive acts and the interventions of American imperialists in the name of peaceful coexistence. Socialist foreign policy is opposed to imperialist aggression and supports national liberation movements and proletarian revolutions. In the respite between the Socialist and imperialist camps, the Socialist world should utilise peaceful coexistence to strengthen the national liberation movements. Peaceful coexistence should be subordinated to the needs of the Socialist camp and the national liberation movements.

The CC Draft while criticising that the modern revisionists are making peaceful coexistence the general line of Socialist foreign policy, covers up the above point and makes peaceful coexistence the important component of Socialist foreign policy (p.23). The Soviet revisionist leadership joined hands with aggressive imperialism and reactionaries and betrayed the Socialist camp. They are joining hands with evil forces to isolate China, which criticised their policy as betrayal. Covering up all this, the CC says that the Soviet revisionist leaders are laying exclusive emphasis only on some aspects of the policy of peaceful coexistence and that they are following opportunist methods to put up with the blatant aggressive acts of imperialism (p.23). The draft depicts that these happened, because the Soviet revisionist leaders think that real peaceful coexistence is possible with US imperialist rulers (p.24). This is nothing but propagating the good intentions of the modern revisionists. The CC preaches that "*peaceful coexistence is obligatory to Socialist states*", even when the imperialists are committing acts of aggression and intervention (p.24). Rejecting the idea that peaceful coexistence should be subordinated to the resistance against the imperialist aggression, the CC tells that they should be "combined". There is no difference between this and what the Soviet leadership is practicing, except in words. This is one way of condemning the help being rendered by the Chinese Party to national liberation struggles.

### FORMS OF TRANSITION TO SOCIALISM

The Soviet revisionist leadership and modern revisionists began betraying the revolutions under the slogan of peaceful transition.

The CC Draft which has intended to make a scientific analysis of the forms of transition, stressed the need and the desire of the Communists to utilise the opportunities for peaceful transition. In the course of its explanation, the CC, Draft quotes from what Lenin has said in his analysis: "that the only programme of international social democracy must be recognition of civil war, though violence is, of course, alien to our ideals" (p.27)

What is the intention of the CC in stressing the "possibilities" while on the one hand and admitting that "the capitalist states have come to build and expand a thousand times more monstrous military apparatuses" (p.28) In reply to the General Line of the CPC the Soviet leadership has said in its open letter that it "is in keeping with the interests of the working class and all people" to realise the possibilities *"to carry out Socialist revolutions in a peaceful way without civil war"* and that *"if the exploiting class resorts to violence against the people, the working class will be forced to use non- peaceful means of seizing power"* (p.34). The CC Draft did not give its categorical opinion regarding these "possibilities" preached by the Soviet leadership. The CC Draft has only said that what the Soviet leadership has been saying is wrong for the reason that the military apparatus of the exploiting class had expanded. That is not the real issue. It is obvious from the editorial of the COMMUNIST (No.11, 1963), that the Soviet leadership does not see these possibilities from that stand point (News and Views from Soviet Union, 5-9-63, Vol.No.64).

The editorial wrote that the letter of the CPC concerning the general line ignored the new factors in the strategy and tactics of Communist Parties in the capitalist countries. The editorial said as follows:

*"The letter of the CC of the CPC even makes no mention of the new stage of the general crisis of capitalism, of such a process of modern capitalist society as the development of the state monopoly capitalism, the mounting role of the mass general-democratic movements in the struggle against the monopolies, or the importance of nationalisation and other political demands in the present day anti-monopolist class struggle. This is no accidental omission.*

*"The Communist Parties acting in the capitalist countries proceed from the fact that new, more favourable possibilities of class struggle of the proletariat and of the anti-monopolist struggle of the masses open up in the present day situation. Under the conditions of peace and peaceful coexistence of states with different socio-political systems the possibilities for the imperialist export of counter-revolutions are restricted considerably; monopolist bourgeoisie finds it increasingly difficult under such conditions to foment jingoism, chauvinistic sentiments among the masses..."* It further said.

*"Under the conditions of the aggravation of the international tension, of war hysteria, the influence of military, reactionary forces is growing while the successes of the policy of peaceful coexistence furnish more favourable conditions for winning over the masses to the side of socialism and for the development of the world revolutionary movement. By neglecting this point the Chinese*

*theoreticians reveal their ignorance of modern imperialism and the specific conditions and problems of the Communist Parties of the developed capitalist countries" (page.22. News and views Vol.XXII No.64.)*

The reasons for quoting this long passage here are, that it happened to be the editorial article of the Soviet theoretical journal and that specific ideas regarding the development of capitalism in our country are prevalent. To what extent does our CC's draft accept the "*new factors*" in the strategy and tactics preached by the theoretical journal of the Soviet leadership? To what extent does it accept the "*new possibilities*", they preach? And to what extent does it reject? This precisely is the central issue-what is the understanding of our CC about "the mounting role of the mass general democratic movements in the struggle against the monopolies", in the process of contemporary development? What is the CC's opinion on the "more favourable conditions for winning over the masses to the side of socialism and for the development of the world revolutionary movement" and on "the conditions of peace and peaceful coexistence of states with different socio-political systems" under which the imperialists find themselves "restricted considerably?"

Our Party should not rest content by merely saying that "*the positions taken by the leadership of the CPSU on all the fundamental questions connected with the Indian Communist movement completely coincide with those of the Dangeite revisionist*" (page.4). These tendencies are manifesting in the understanding of the Central Committee, in one form or another.

Mainly from 1956, our Party propagated that parliamentary and extra-parliamentary struggles should be combined and carried together. What is the role of the parliamentary struggle? What is its importance? What is the importance and role of the struggle against monopoly capital in the people's struggle? What is the role of the peasant struggles? How important are they? What is the relation between these struggles and the anti-imperialist struggles? Our Party never discussed these issues concretely. In Asia, Africa and Latin America, peasant struggles and liberation movements have come to the fore. The CC Draft does not make its opinions clear about these and their influence and does not draw the lessons. But recently the Central Committee has revealed certain ideas regarding the parliamentary struggles.

In its resolution after the 1967 general elections, the Central Committee has said that the "immediate political future" of our Party "in no small way depends on how it plays its worthy part in running the state governments of Kerala and West Bengal" (N.S. & P.T. Page 67) and has shown the way to "open the prospects of realising the slogan of a non-Congress democratic government at the centre" (Page.79). This is nothing but peaching peaceful transition. This is a step forward on what has been said about parliamentary democracy in the Party Programme. Since 1956 our party has been giving call for breaking the monopoly power of the ruling Congress party. In any country, state power lies in the hands of the ruling classes. In the countries in which the parliamentary system works, there

will be no significant change in the power of the ruling classes due to change in the parties in power. In 1957, the Kerala Government being the only non-Congress Government under the leadership of our Party, was very useful as an instrument of propaganda. Illusions of seizing state power through parliamentary democracy have also set in. The idea of breaking the monopoly of power, to give vent to the dissatisfaction of the people towards the Congress Government is manifest in our Programme. Our Party did not think that a basis would be laid for a change in the present economic system by either the formation of non-Congress Government in the states or the formation of a non-Congress Government at the centre which includes reactionaries. But now the Central Committee says:

*"It is this struggle of the democratic parties and groups in different legislatures and among the people, in parliament and states with non-Congress democratic Governments, that alone can pave the way for consolidating and widening the unity achieved by the democratic forces and open prospects of realising the slogan of a non-Congress democratic government at the centre" (page.79).*

This is nothing but preaching the peaceful parliamentary path. It must be said that between this and the understanding of the Soviet leadership there is almost no difference.

India got independence after the second world war. Yet, no fundamental social changes occurred after independence. As one of the two biggest countries in the Asian, African and Latin American countries, the peasant struggles have got special significance here. In the circumstances when the ruling classes attempt to suppress every struggle through repression and violence, revolutionary forces should be prepared to meet the situation by all means. But in this context the attitude of the Central Committee is different.

The attitude taken by the central leadership towards the Naxalbari struggle is not only different from the tactical line of 1951, but it is an attitude that should not be adopted to any people's struggle. This is quite evident from the attitude taken towards those who led the struggle, whatever may be the difference with them and the help rendered to the state Government in the name of controlling the struggle.

### NON-CAPITALIST PATH-NATIONAL DEMOCRACY

Accepting that the Soviet leadership is rendering economic and other aid to "the capitalists" of the underdeveloped countries "to develop capitalism" (Page 32), the Central Committee's Draft denies that this aid is for non-capitalist development. In fact that aid is not rendered to develop capitalism in those countries. It is not given to the national bourgeoisie. The Soviet aid is given to the big bourgeoisie and the big bourgeoisie-big landlord Government having close links with imperialism. It is not being used for national development. The aid rendered to the bourgeoisie which has no links with imperialism will help the development of the backward countries to some extent. But the major portion of the Soviet aid has been useful to the home and foreign monopoly capitalists, big landlords and reactionary Governments in these countries. The CC in its

resolution on the "New Situation and the Party's Tasks" has said that the Soviet aid would help the big bourgeoisie in their struggle against US imperialism, and that the relations the Soviet might develop in this process were "factors to reckon with" (Page.57). This is not telling the real situation. The fact is, the big bourgeoisie maintaining close relations with the imperialists is utilising this aid. The CC's explanation is different from the Party Programme also.

Since 1956, discussions have taken place in our Party on the issue, whether the line pursued by the Congress Government was a progressive one or reactionary one. We argued that their professions of building Socialism were bogus, and that they "attempt at capitalist development" in the only sense that they attempt at reactionary capitalist development." It is not our Party's understanding that it is progressive. We have been saying that the illusions they foster will not live longer in the period of the general crisis of capitalism. But some arguments have been raised that the party of the ruling class aspires progress, but that in this period of crisis it will not be successful. National capitalist development in underdeveloped countries is progressive; but the path pursued by the Indian Government is reactionary and this is not anti-imperialism.

The CC Draft has only said that it is correct to reject the theories of joint hegemony of the workers and the capitalists but did not even touch upon the betrayal of modern revisionism under the cloak of this class collaborationist line. In this way, it covers up the treachery of revisionism. This is to indirectly support the Soviet understanding.

#### **ON THE ISSUE OF PEOPLE'S STATE AND PEOPLE'S PARTY IN SOVIET UNION- MATERIAL INCENTIVES**

The CC Draft in its explanation expresses that the Soviet revisionist leadership is talking of "state of the whole people" and "party of the whole people" with "non-class revisionist concept" (page 38). Revisionism is not a non-class concept. It started in defence of the capitalist system. This is what all Marxist-Leninists say about it. To describe revisionism as non-class is anti-Marxist. To say that the Soviet revisionist leadership has transformed the working class parties and the proletarian states into parties of the whole people and states of the whole people respectively with such concepts, is only covering up their treachery. For, the Soviet leadership represents the people with reactionary class ideas, the bureaucrats in the Party and the Government and the people with huge incomes. It is difficult to give prominence to the interests of such people and restore capitalism when the principled ideas of the working class party and proletarian state prevail. They adopted these methods to liquidate them. This draft does not at all take into account the efforts of the Soviet leadership for the restoration of capitalist relations in the name of Communism. The CC has only said that the undue emphasis laid on material incentives by the Soviet leadership at this stage is wrong, but it does not express its opinions on their treacherous attempt to restore capitalist relations.

The thesis of the Soviet leadership on material incentives in socialist countries has inaugurated the restoration of capitalist relations. The incentives given in this way can be brought from nowhere else except from the fruits of the workers' labour. Hiding this fact with their propaganda, they preached the proletariat to keep its self-interests above everything and is kept in darkness regarding the specific need for building socialist economy through their own labour. Thus the Soviet leadership is anxious to see that nothing stands in their way for the restoration of capitalism. In contradiction to this the cultural revolution under the leadership of the CPC is resisting capitalist ideas and restoration of capitalism and is successfully advancing towards building the Socialist system. Refusing to recognise this fact, the CC Draft is indirectly supporting the Soviet leadership under the cover of the criticism that it is unduly emphasising material incentives.

#### ON THE QUESTION OF STALIN

The C.C. Draft which has at length criticised Khrushchov's report on Stalin, refuses to state that Comrade Stalin was a great Marxist-Leninist; his achievements greatly overweighed his lapses. Telling on the one hand that the Soviet leadership should have consulted important fraternal parties on this issue, the CC Draft on the other expresses that the Soviet leadership was entitled to think over the matter for themselves and discuss it. The CC Draft could not expressly state that the criticism of great Marxist-Leninists should be made only after discussions with the fraternal parties.

#### ON YUGOSLAVIA

Preaching revisionist theories, the Tito clique had removed their country from out of the Socialist camp catering to the needs of the US imperialists and capitalism is being rapidly restored in that country. The Tito clique has betrayed the victories won by the Yugoslav people. Hiding this fact, to say that they have "exposed the Yugoslav people to the danger of losing the revolutionary gains achieved through heroic struggle" (page 42) is not to depict the real situation. The CC Draft hides the open change in the attitude of the Soviet leadership towards the Tito clique and the fact that it has taken over the mantle of modern revisionism from the Tito clique, and instead, has by passed the entire thing by merely saying that "it is not for nothing that the Soviet leadership has gone back" (page.42). The real controversy is precisely here. The Soviet leadership upholds that even today, Socialism is being built in Yugoslavia and that even though certain ideological differences exist they should be resolved through discussions-speaking thus, it has taken the heritage of Yugoslav revisionism. For having held this as wrong, the revisionist leaders indicted openly the CPC in the East German, Italian and other Party Congresses, they have ridiculed and insulted the Chinese delegates at the East German Party Congress. It is not correct to end as the C.C. has done by saying, all this happened "not for nothing."

#### UNITY IN ACTION

The Vietnamese people's struggle is a turning point in the national liberation struggles. Modern revisionists and their representatives, the Soviet leadership,

have done everything to emasculate the national liberation struggles. Khrushchov, the father of modern revisionism and his heirs, the Kosygin-Breznev clique also failed in their treachery towards the Vietnamese peoples' struggles. Their efforts in March, 1965 to split the Communist movement did not bear fruit. They have come out with new slogans to make way again into the anti-imperialist front by any means, to make way again into the anti-imperialist front by any means, to gain respite to intensify their efforts for the restoration of capitalism and carry on their splitting activities, to serve the imperialists better. They came out with the slogans of "unity in action" on the basis of "common ideology" and "common programme", unity in action against the "common enemy" and the proposal for the meeting of the leaders of the Soviet, Chinese and Vietnamese parties. Shouting about American aggression on the one hand, they began talking of the American government's "wisdom" and that it "could take steps" to ease tension. With this, they were forced to explain the contradictions in their own words.

It is the Soviet leadership which abandoned the revolutionary programme, formulated in the 1957 and 1960 conferences of the world Communist Parties and allied with the American imperialists and reactionaries. It is they who abandoned Marxism-Leninism and preached the thesis of class collaboration with reactionary exploiting classes. How can the Marxist-Leninists have "common programme" with them? The Soviet revisionist leaders, in collaboration with American imperialism, the sworn enemy of the oppressed peoples of the world, and with all reactionaries are undermining the Socialist camp, the Communist Movement and revolutionary struggles and are encircling People's China, the base of national liberation struggles and people's movement. Who is the common enemy for these and the Marxist-Leninists? How can there be "defence of Vietnam" in alliance with those who even after the fall of Khrushchov till today are conniving with US imperialists in Glassborow and in every conference, and with those who are betraying the Vietnamese struggle? It is because of this that the world Marxist-Leninists have rejected their fake slogans for "unity in action" and laid bare their conspiracies. The first primary condition for anyone joining the anti-imperialist people's united front is that he must be an anti-imperialist. That is the important principle for the united front. When the Soviet leaders are acting in collaboration with imperialism regarding national liberation movements, unity with them is not a principled one as per the principles of united front. The Communist movement and the Socialist camp should act as the centre of the anti-imperialist front. The contradiction between the Communist movement and modern revisionism is antagonistic but not non-antagonistic. It is wrong in principle and dangerous in practice for Marxist-Leninists to function as the centre in alliance with modern revisionists. The CPC has made all these points clear to the fraternal Parties and rejected the slogan of the Soviet leaders and their proposal for joint conference. Marxist-Leninists of the world acclaimed the principled stand of the CPC. The revisionist leadership of the Japanese Party in its efforts to restore relations with the Soviet revisionist leadership in one way or the other, launched a campaign against the CPC. They visited many countries; leaders of some other

Parties raised doubts. Our CC Draft is saying that "a serious debate is on in the world Communist movement as to the correctness or otherwise of the stand taken by the C.P.C." (Pages 43-44). This is not the real situation. Since the leadership of the Japanese Party has been supporting the Soviet slogans inspite of the treachery of the Soviet revisionist leadership, it is true that doubts raised by them are under study. But it is incorrect to say that it has become a serious point of debate in the international communist movement.

What is the understanding of the CC on this issue? The CC says that it does not entertain "illusions that such united action can materialise" (page 48). It says that Vietnam is fighting alone against US aggression (page 45). It wishes us to await for the moment when "the bleeding Vietnamese people might in their just war of national liberation together with the states of the Socialist camp, rout the armies of imperialist intervention" (page 48). The C.C. Draft supports the call of the Soviet leaders for united action even though it found them to be not "immediately realisable."

It is accepted by one and all that the Vietnamese people carrying on their heroic fight have every right, to urge for help from the Socialist countries. The Chinese People's Government rendered every help and offered its territory as a rear without regard for boundaries, and declared its readiness to face the consequences arising therefrom. The Vietnamese Party leadership did not accept the proposal of the Soviet leadership to send its volunteers. It declared with revolutionary ardour its readiness to fight for years to end American aggression. It stood as a great exemplary inspiration for the national liberation movement in Asia. It inspired the oppressed peoples in Asia, Africa and Latin America. It caused great stir among the American people, the American military and the world peoples against American aggression. People's war got intensified in many countries like Burma, Laos, Malaya, Indonesia, Phillippines and Thailand. What the Marxist-Leninists meant in saying that the contradiction between the imperialists and the oppressed nations is the principal contradiction is being proved in practice. The American imperialists have fallen into a quagmire. The hot-line has come to function. Under these circumstances it is incorrect to say that Vietnam is alone. It is the American imperialists and their agents who are isolated. The Vietnamese Workers' Party stood up with unstinted confidence in the national liberation struggles; the Vietnamese people are winning great victories by shedding their blood. The Parties of the oppressed countries inspired by this struggle are advancing by drawing lessons from it. Our CC Draft does not think in that direction. Though entertaining no such "illusions" about united action, it has placed in the forefront the slogans given by the Soviet revisionist leadership and entered into controversy with the CPC. The world has learned that in Cuba, the Soviet revisionist leadership did not respect even the sovereignty of that country. They knew that the development of disputes and collisions among socialist countries during discussions in the conference and in the actual struggle will cause more damage, rather than inspiring the people. The leadership of the Vietnamese Workers' Party which has long years of experience in protracted



struggle did not think it "prudent" to support either the proposals or the slogans of the Soviet leadership. Also it is absolutely wrong if anyone imagines that the Vietnamese Government has this position in view of its difficulties. The new leaders have changed Khrushchov's policy of non-involvement in the Vietnamese struggle, to that of involvement. While the Soviet leaders intend the same either by involvement or by non-involvement the draft brought an erroneous argument to support it. What they intend to do is to help the American imperialists to get out of their predicament. To portray this as a change is meaningless. But our CC in its draft places these slogans and proposals in the forefront and sets itself to "eagerly work" for their materialisation (Page.48). This is of no use except for causing harm in practice to the Vietnamese struggle and make room for the Soviet leadership, which is getting isolated from the Communist movement and the national liberation movements.

The arguments brought by the CC Draft in this context are erroneous and harmful. It portrays this as a timely and correct slogan given by the Soviet revisionist leadership. Marxist-Leninists view this as a slogan given by the Soviet leadership to continue their treachery in a new way, after having failed to emasculate and disrupt the Vietnamese struggle and split the Communist movement. The draft describes the abetment of the US war of escalation by Soviet leaders as being "guided by the thesis regarding the danger of leading local wars to a world war." This is not true. The Soviet revisionist leadership proceeding from ideological betrayal to organisational sabotage and collaborating with American imperialists has put forward this thesis to scare the Soviet people when they are opening their eyes to the realities, when the Soviet leaders want to gain respite to sabotage the Socialist system and when they want to sneak into the advancing Vietnamese struggle. Our CC Draft describes such slogans as a call given by the Soviet leaders to "work out a plan of united action against US aggression" (Page. 43). The Soviet leadership cannot get a better conduct certificate from those who profess to criticise their revisionism.

The CC has listed "a chain of events that have embittered Sino-Soviet relations to the point of a serious split between the two" saying that "united military action demands minimum mutual confidence" and that nobody in his senses can imagine that such minimum mutual confidence exists between the Soviet and Chinese leaders (page 45-46). In this chain of events it did not strike to the CC that the Soviet leadership is pursuing its class collaborationist policy, that it is betraying the world peoples and has allied with American imperialists. The CC is well aware that if it admits this, then their slogan of united action against American aggression in Vietnam with the revisionist clique will be questionable. This is an issue facing the oppressed peoples of the world and the world Communist movement. This is not just a split between China and Russia. Neither a "mass" has been created between Russia and China on the one hand and the Soviet people, Soviet Communists, the world people and world Communists on the other, nor is it a "facile notion" of maintaining world peace in collaboration with the most aggressive US imperialists (page 46). To view this as a Sino-Soviet dispute is

narrow thinking. The draft portrayed that the Soviet leadership with this "facile notion" is collaborating with US imperialism "by passing People's China", instead of saying that it is collaborating with US imperialism in opposition to the national liberation movements. It is nothing but fostering illusions about the Soviet leadership and distorting facts. The proposal to the Soviet leadership that they will have to abandon "facile notions" and that they "will have to resort to bilateral talks with the Chinese leaders in order to clear up the mess that has been created" (P.46) is nothing but telling them to start afresh in a new cloak. The CC draft attempts to make us swallow the bitter pill of "unity in action" of the Soviet leadership, with the fake criticism that the slogan cannot be materialised immediately. It brought another argument in its support. It said that united action should not be rejected simply because the leadership is revisionist, that the tactics of united action should be adopted to unite with the Soviet people and that otherwise, it "Objectively tantamounts to make a present of that state and its people to the revisionists" (Page 48). It is unprincipled to call for a united front with such men who are in favour of American imperialism instead of calling for a united front of all people fighting against US imperialism. It is because of this that the CPC had adopted a principled stand. The draft's criticism of the principled stand taken by the CPC shows that the CC Draft is more concerned about unity with revisionism than about the principled stand. The C.C.'s attitude of demanding C.P.C. to sit and enter into discussions with revisionist leadership and provoking controversy with C.P.C. will not help anything, except to confuse the Communists and the Soviet people and thus help the Soviet leaders to continue their betrayal. The Vietnamese Party is adopting such methods and such united front tactics as to get help from the Soviet people, which leaving no room for betrayal of the Vietnamese struggle. The Chinese Party also encouraged this. The CC's criticism in the draft that this is not uniting all people that can be united, is nothing but harming the Vietnamese struggle which plays a key role in the national liberation movements and subjecting the Soviet people to the betrayal of the Soviet revisionist leadership. In this present period when the revisionist clique representing the privileged stratum of the Soviet people is intensifying its efforts for the restoration of capitalism and, when the Communists had to help the Soviet people realise this through their experience, our C.C. takes an attitude which harms itself. By preaching this attitude to others it helps nothing but disruption.

It should be said that the attitude of the CC and its arguments on this issue are a specimen to the sum-total of its ideas of the whole ideological issue. However much the CC Draft may say of its differences with the Soviet revisionist leadership, it is clear that they are not serious differences of strategy, tactics and practice in the New Epoch. What the draft has said on the united action makes it clear that they propose, only slight and limited changes in the line of the Soviet leadership.

#### **RELATIONS BETWEEN FRATERNAL PARTIES**

Our C.C. Draft which has taken up the slogan of "united action" given by the Soviet leadership representing modern revisionism, raised a controversy over the

principled stand taken by CPC, and charges the CPC that it is interfering in our Party's internal affairs violating the sound proletarian principle of internationalism guiding the relations between fraternal Parties. It has also launched upon a public propaganda against the Chinese Party on this issue. But what is the truth? Who is interfering in the internal affairs of the CPI? Since 1955-56, it is the Soviet leadership headed by Khrushchov in league with our leaders who provoked controversy in our Party, regarding the character of the Government of India and its role in the international affairs. Since the border dispute in 1959, it is they who propagated the Nehru Government's policy of peace. The leaders of the CPI got a resolution supporting the Nehru Government passed in the National Council and attended with this resolution in hand, the Moscow Conference of the Communist Parties in 1960. After the Conference, the leadership of the CPSU has taken up a fulledged class collaborationist policy and allied itself with the Indian Government and such other reactionary Governments, characterising them as anti-imperialist forces, started collaborating with the American imperialists on all the major issues of the day. Only after conferring with and getting direct advice from the Soviet leaders, the Dange clique has adopted a class collaborationist policy regarding the class nature of the Indian Government, its policies and on every other issue, confused the party members and began disrupting the party. The attitude to be taken towards the Nehru Government, which was friendly both to the Soviet revisionist leadership and American imperialism, has become a point of controversy in the national and international Communist movement. In these circumstances, the Chinese Party has said that the India Government is a big bourgeois- big landlord government which has compromised with imperialism, mainly US imperialism, and that this big bourgeoisie is of the compradore, bureaucrat nature. Compradore character consists mainly in its trading nature in addition to the industrial aspect. Bureaucratic nature consists in its growth, mainly with the help of the state machine. On this count, to charge the CPC that it is showing a "tendency to subordinate the internal class policy of a Party without power to that to the needs of its foreign policy" (Page 50) is nothing but narrow-mindedness which bar brother Parties from studying Indian conditions. To say that the CPC asks the fraternal Parties to subordinate their internal class policy to its needs of foreign policy relations, will only help in practice the propaganda of arch-reactionaries. Whatever may be its reservations, the Chinese Party would not have given its opinion unless asked for, even after our draft programme has been prepared. The CPC would not adopt the method of the Soviet revisionists, who push forward their ideas through individual contacts. The central leadership did not place for discussion in any form the advice of the fraternal parties on the draft programme at least in the CC or in other higher committees, take opinions of the Party members and utilise them in the finalisation of the party programme. It is ridiculous for the draft to charge the CPC that it did not observe what itself had said, that every Party should "use its brains to think for itself". The CPC did not publicly come out with its differing opinions for two

and half years, even though our Programme was finalised without taking the opinion of a fraternal Party to the notice of the higher committees and without observing minimum courtesy.

The Soviet revisionist leadership is continuing its efforts to create confusion in our Party ranks on the ideological issues through maintaining contacts with individuals in the central leadership of our Party. It certainly has its influence on the central leadership and on the CC Draft. The Chinese Party is not one to resort to such acts. It acts in a principled way.

In its resolution on the *"New Situation and Party's Tasks"* the CC has surpassed the limits laid by the Party Programme, has almost taken up the line of peaceful transition and created a new situation. It recalls that the Party Programme *"does take cognisance of the contradictions and conflicts that do exist between the Indian bourgeoisie including the big bourgeoisie and foreign imperialists"*, and that *"in the background of the daily intensifying general crisis of world capitalism, the different contradictions obtaining in the national and international spheres are bound to get intensified"* (para 108, Party Programme). The CC's resolution explaining this, went a step further and said that the *"Government of India is surrendering step by step to the imperialists, notably to the US imperialists"* (Page 55) and that *"each step of surrender", "should not be equated with the final surrender"* (Page 56). It formulated that *"the fissures, conflicts and contradictions between the big bourgeoisie and imperialists are not only not ruled out, but in fact they also grow and find expression"* (Page 56). The resolution observed that the contradiction between the Indian Government and imperialism has intensified. The resolution also said that the aid it gets from the Soviet Union and the relations it has with the Soviet Union are of anti-imperialist nature and that they can be utilised. It surpassed the bounds laid by the Party Programme and said that the contradiction between imperialism and the Indian Government is of importance *"at least in the immediate future"*. The C.C resolution said that the *"immediate political future"* and *"the fortune of the entire party"* depends on how it plays its part in running the two state Governments of Kerala and West Bengal and decided to *"open the prospects of realising the slogan of non-Congress democratic government at the centre"* (Page 79). It is undoubtedly true that this led the Party closer to the modern revisionists. Under the circumstances, the CPC made its criticism in a comment on May 7<sup>th</sup> without mentioning our Party. It is clear that our Party leadership is not prepared to reconsider its erroneous stand whatever might have happened during consultations and discussions. It is incorrect to refuse to take the content of the criticism of the CPC because of the sharpness of the words used. Only friends offer sharp and clear criticism, while only the deceitful resort to methods of flattery. It is very important that our Party discusses our Programme and the resolutions in the light of the criticism made by the fraternal Marxist-Leninist Parties and set right the present situation. Our CC Draft expresses that we must be *"modest enough to learn from....all other fraternal parties of the world"* (Page 52). Making efforts to establish relations with

revisionist groups and the revisionist leadership that split away from the Communist movement will help only to create confusion in the Communist movement and helps the modern revisionists.

#### **FIGHT AGAINST REVISIONISM THROUGH TO THE END**

Though our Party broke away with the revisionist Dange group, our Party and the central leadership have not come out of the revisionist tendencies persisting for long in the ideological, political and practical fields because of the influence of the Soviet leadership and due to certain internal causes. As a contingent of the world Communist movement, it can play its due role in the national liberation movements, only if it can sharpen the critical outlook of the Party members, conduct discussions in a democratic manner, examine the lapses regarding the ideological issues, Party Programme, tactics, and policy and rectify them. From among the working class and peasantry, those who stand in the front ranks of struggles become conscious, and come into our Party. In the present stage of our movement when the correct tactical line has to take its shape, it is highly objectionable and harmful on the part of the CC to treat the criticism of our Programme and tactical decisions as a manifestation of sectarian, dogmatist and adventurist tendencies and to state that the Party remains under the threat of being swayed into extremes because of the petty-bourgeois origin of the Party membership. The CC Draft has simply forgotten that these are the very Party members who preserved Marxism-Leninism and the Party from the betrayal of the Dange clique. During the last 12 years of inner-party struggle, the membership gained invaluable experiences. The vigilance they show, is commendable.

#### **CONCLUSION**

This draft cannot serve as a weapon in the hands of Marxist-Leninists and help to discharge, the revolutionary tasks concerning the New Epoch and fight against modern revisionism, which is watering down, splitting and disrupting the Communist and the national liberation movements and revolutionary struggle through its sham theories and conspiracies. This draft on the one hand characterises modern revisionism as defective Marxist understanding, and equating Marxist-Leninist Parties with revisionist Parties, preaches opportunist unity between them; on the other, this draft comes out with heavy criticism of those real Marxist parties, who rejected opportunist unity and stood for principled unity. It cannot but be said that this draft is not such as to be useful, to conduct discussions in a dispassionate manner on all the ideological issues, connected with the New Epoch, national and international situation -keeping in view the experiences of the international Communist movement, and thus, to arrive at a unified understanding which only can help us in analysing the Party Programme and tactical line adopted and being implemented out of necessity and to consolidate our Party as a contingent of the international Communist movement.

In this context, one more important point has got to be made clear. Bracketing the fraternal Chinese Party with the Soviet revisionist leadership and depicting their criticism as orders and rejecting them, the CC Draft expresses that such

criticism would give scope to the propaganda of being led by the leadership of foreign Parties. Reactionaries always subject real Marxist-Leninist Parties to such scandals. This is not something new. To bring in such arguments in the context of ideological discussions is to encourage the blind rejection of the arguments of the fraternal Parties and the refusal to learn from them. In addition to its failure in explaining the CPC's opinions on various ideological issues, the draft's warning to Party members against enemy propaganda will only help to deprive the Party and side track them. This pointing out, is only to help the enemy. Thus the draft has taken up a wrong attitude.

Even before the completion of the inner-Party discussions on this draft, the CC made it a policy declaration. Basing on this, the central leadership of our Party continues to conduct slander campaign against the CPC on the one hand and, in the name of attempting to "learn from all fraternal parties", began on the other hand to improve relations with the leaderships of some revisionist parties and also started openly urging for the recognition of Soviet revisionist leadership. The CC leadership rejected to place differing opinions on various ideological issues straightly before the Party members; it did not prepare and place this draft before the party in such a way that the party members can express their opinions freely. In this connection the CC imposed such harmful restrictions as, that members of higher committee could not express their opinions in the lower committees, though they are members of both committees.

In addition to this, the CC passed a resolution on the CPC and on the "sectarian" trends in the Party without inner-Party discussions. These are all violations of proletarian internationalism on the one side and violation of democratic centralism on the other. This situation causes harm to the unity of our Party and that of the international Communist movement. This gladdens only the reactionary forces, both national and international, and modern revisionists who act as their agents. The leadership of the Central Committee is mainly responsible for this situation.

The understanding of the central leadership regarding the danger of modern revisionism and the relations they maintain with the revisionist leaders in various countries on one pretext or other, are responsible for this situation.

So it cannot but be said that the CC Draft is very much unsatisfactory and that it stands on wrong ideological and political basis. The harm caused by this draft is visible during the short period of its enforcement as a policy. So, the Central Plenum has to discuss this by keeping the above things in view. The Andhra Pradesh Plenum urges that a correct draft be prepared in a proper manner and make arrangements for discussions throughout the whole Party.



# LETTER TO ANDHRA COMRADES

*[This is an open letter released by the PB of CC, CPI(M) after the Burdwan Central Plenum as part of its move to unleash a tirade against the CRs in Andhra who rejected its neo revisionist positions on the Ideological questions and organisational methods and also as a preparation for organisational measures it proposed to take against them. -E.C.]*

Dear Comrades,

The meeting of the Central Committee, which was held at Burdwan, following the conclusion of the debate on and adoption of the ideological draft, reviewed the political-organisational developments inside the Party and took certain decisions. One of these decisions was to address a Party Letter to all party members in Andhra, and the Polit Bureau was directed to draft and forward it to comrades in Andhra.

What is the nature of the problem that our party unit in Andhra Pradesh is faced with and why has it become necessary for the C.C. to address such a letter to the entire membership?

The alternative drafts presented to the Central Plenum by some leading comrades of Andhra, the majority decision of the Andhra Plenum rejecting the C.C.'s draft and the resolution placed before the Central Plenum, the detailed exposition of the political views contained in the alternative drafts by one of the important spokesmen chosen by their votaries, and a series of amendments moved and supported by the majority of delegates from Andhra, make it abundantly clear that the differences with the present political-ideological line of the Party do not confine themselves to one or two individual issues or propositions in the C.C.'s ideological draft, but constitute a fundamental opposition to a whole series of basic questions concerning the Indian revolutionary movement as well as the international communist movement.

The Central Plenum, after a free, frank and thorough discussion, decisively rejected the alternative drafts and the political line propounded in them as totally wrong and basically departing from the Marxist-Leninist standpoint. It characterised it as a fully worked out left-adventurist line which stands diametrically opposed to the Party Programme and the political line of our Party.

This, undoubtedly, is a serious political development, and its gravity is all the more heightened because of the fact that this left deviation has come to

dominate one of our Party's key strongholds, namely, Andhra, which has occupied a proud place inside the Indian communist movement during the last three decades and more.

Not merely this. Such a fundamental opposition to the political line of our Party, obviously, cannot but have its direct imprint on the party organisation in the state as well as the entire Party in the country. The reports made by the members of the Central Committee from Andhra in the meeting of the C.C. and the one, in particular, presented by Comrade Hanumantha Rao, Secretary of the State Committee, have convinced the C.C. beyond a shadow of doubt that the party unit in Andhra is in the midst of a serious inner-party crisis which, in its turn, has virtually paralysed the functioning of the State Committee and its Secretariat for the last two months and more. The reports also reveal that disruptive tendencies of groupism, factionalism, indiscipline and even open defiance of party forms, at different levels, have come to freely prevail. Instead of sharply reacting against this menace, the C.C. learns that a sort of justification is sought to be given to these evil manifestations by some comrades, who argue that it is, after all, the sharp expression of serious political-ideological divergencies and, hence, need cause no big concern and worry to the Party and C.C. Some comrades even go to the length of maintaining that these sad developments are mainly due to the C.C. and its persistence in upholding its ideological-political line, which according to them, is right-reformist and revisionist, and, hence, they should be treated as a necessary part of the "inner-party struggle" for a correct revolutionary line.

The C.C. views these developments in the Andhra unit as a serious threat to the Party's unity in the state. It decides to do its utmost to defend the unity in the Andhra state unit and assist the erring comrades in overcoming their left-opportunist deviation, and to strictly adhere to the Party's political line and its organisational discipline. This, in short, is the object of the present Party Letter, and we shall endeavour to point out how on a series of ideological-political issues, several leading comrades in Andhra are swayed into extreme left-sectarian positions, and how they will have to seriously rethink and retrace from these erroneous views.

Let us start from the basic concept of the present epoch, the controversy around this concept and its implications and see how the right-revisionist and left-opportunist distortions express themselves on it.

## 1. NEW EPOCH

The concept of the new epoch, in short, is nothing but the reassessment of the new alignment of class forces on a global scale in the period following the Soviet victory in the second world war which culminated in the formation of the formidable world socialist camp, comprising one-third of humanity and one-fourth of the earth's surface. This big and fundamental change in the correlation of class forces on an international scale has its immense revolutionary implications and no Marxist-Leninist can work out correct strategy and tactics of revolution without fully grasping the significance of these changes, with all the implications that accompany



these changes. Hence the utmost importance of precise definition of the present epoch and the need to concretise what it exactly signifies in class terms to the world proletariat fighting for its final emancipation from wage slavery.

What is the controversy over this question in the world communist movement? The controversy, in fact, is not so much regarding either the definition of the epoch or about the new radical changes in the world balance of class forces that have come about.

The entire controversy centres round the issue as to how the modern revisionists are distorting the meaning and significance of the new epoch, how under cover of the new epoch they seek to negate class contradictions and class struggle, how they attempt to revise the valid Marxist-Leninist propositions applicable to the entire epoch of imperialism and proletarian revolution and the epoch of the victory of socialism and communism on a world scale, and as to how the bankrupt and class-collaborationist thesis of so-called peaceful coexistence, peaceful economic competition and peaceful transition is sought to be made into a general line of the world communist movement.

Further, as clearly seen in the case of the Indian revisionists, they extended this right-opportunist thesis to a number of questions connected with revolutions in colonial and economically dependent and newly liberated countries. The repudiation of the concept of proletarian hegemony in the people's democratic revolution, the advocacy of the so-called independent or non-capitalist path of development under the joint hegemony of the bourgeoisie and the proletariat, the deceptive picturing of the role of socialist aid as though it counteracts the evils of foreign monopoly capital and paves the way to the country's industrial revolution, the defining of the present Indian state as a 'bourgeois state' and by implication, virtually negating the anti-feudal and anti-imperialist tasks of the revolution, and the advocacy of faith in the parliamentary and peaceful path *in practice*, despite certain demagogic slogans to cheat the gullible, are some of the crude manifestations of modern revisionism.

Our Party Programme decisively rejects one and all of these revisionist distortions of Marxist-Leninist propositions. Our ideological resolution adopted at the Burdwan Central Plenum carries forward the correct programmatic understanding and clarifies the issues connected with the world communist movement. This principled and uncompromising fight against the menace of modern revisionist theories and practice shall have to continue and it is our earnest duty as Marxist-Leninists to carry it to the end.

But, in the name of carrying on the struggle against modern revisionism and the right-opportunist distortion of the meaning and significance of the new epoch, certain left-sectarian and infantile trends are raising their head. If they are not fought and eliminated promptly, no effective struggle against modern revisionism or the determined defence of Marxism-Leninism is possible.

How do they express in our Party as revealed in the inner-party discussions on our ideological draft ?

Some comrades object to the very concept of the new epoch and maintain that there is nothing new from what Lenin had defined in his time, i.e., the epoch of imperialism and proletarian revolution, "the era of social revolution is beginning", etc. They seem to entertain the wrong idea that this whole concept of the new epoch is the 'creation' of the modern revisionists in order to push forward their class-collaborationist theories under its cover. Thus their entire wrath and hatred towards revisionist distortion of the significance of the new epoch is allowed to cloud their revolutionary vision making it difficult for them to perceive the real meaning and content of the new epoch.

These comrades are obviously wrong and the new big class changes in the post-second war period were being noted by Marxist-Leninists, long before the 20th Congress of the CPSU and the 1957 Moscow Declaration and 1960 Moscow Statement. To cite a few : *"The end of the second world war brought with it big changes in the world situation. The military defeat of the bloc of fascist states, the character of the war of liberation from fascism and the decisive role played by the Soviet Union in vanquishing the aggressors, sharply altered the alignment of forces between the two systems-the socialist and capitalist-in favour of socialism"*. (A. Zhdanov, *International Situation*, September 1947-Emphasis added).

*"This is the historic epoch in which world capitalism and imperialism are going down their doom and world socialism and people's democracy are marching to victory"*. *"The strength of the world anti-imperialist camp has surpassed that of the imperialist camp."* (Mao Tse-tung, December 25, 1947 Emphasis added).

The same is more positively and clearly asserted thus: *"It is a great new epoch that we are facing, and its main characteristic is that the forces of socialism have surpassed those of imperialism, that the forces of the awakening people of the world have surpassed those of reaction,"* (CPC, *Long Live Leninism*, April 16, 1960- Emphasis added)

Any number of such references to the concept of the new epoch can be cited from the speeches and writings of Marxist-Leninists, and it is totally wrong to dismiss it as the 'invention' of the modern revisionists. It is utterly unbecoming of a communist to shun the assessment of new alignment of class forces for fear of the revisionists running away with it and distorting it.

There are some other comrades who, too, are victims of a left deviation. They formally, no doubt, agree with the concept of the new epoch but in practice negate its existence.

On the one hand, they grossly exaggerate the world revolutionary situation depicting world capitalism to be 'on the verge of final collapse' and advocate aggressive tactics of revolution, and on the other, weave out theories that modern revisionism- the outcome of the external pressure of imperialism and the internal influence of the bourgeoisie - has more or less succeeded in 'peacefully' transforming several socialist states including the Soviet Union into allies of U.S. imperialism for the division of the world into spheres of influence.

This sectarian school of thought indulges in the glib talk of the existence of a powerful socialist camp, but when defining it, all socialist countries including the

USSR which are under the leadership of the modern revisionists are virtually discounted and the People's Republic of China and Albania are talked of as the only two states constituting the socialist camp at present.

They talk of U.S. imperialism being isolated and encircled by world people's revolutionary flames and simultaneously advance the thesis of U.S.- Soviet axis for the encirclement and annihilation of People's China, the only remaining "base of world revolution and liberation".

If the 1960 Statement of 81 Communist Parties maintains that "*it is the principal characteristic of our time that the world socialist system is becoming the decisive factor in the development of society*", the left-sectarians maintain that national liberation movements play the decisive role in the destruction of imperialism and for the final emancipation of mankind.

In the year 1960, when representatives of the world Communist Parties met, there were 81 Communist and Workers' Parties. Subsequently some more Communist Parties have been formed in the newly liberated countries of Africa and other continents. Some left-sectarians argue that most of these parties have ceased to be Communist Parties by virtue of their being led by the modern revisionists, and consequently, the CPC and some other parties it recognises as Marxist-Leninist, alone remain as the Communist Parties of the world. Thus it is not a powerful world communist movement, with whatever revisionist and dogmatist defects afflicting it, that exists today, but one or two real Communist Parties and some splinter groups in different countries that agree to follow them.

If all the above-mentioned views are pieced together and their class meaning is assessed concretely, the new alignment of class forces that goes into the making of the new epoch simply disappears, and the picture of a totally different alignment of forces on a world scale emerges. The left-sectarians do not realise the line they advocate lands them into such an absurd position, and when the C.C. sharply points it out, they 'protest' that their viewpoint is distorted.

This grossly sectarian and clearly subjective understanding of the new epoch and the alignment of class forces that constitutes it run like a red thread in several propositions of theirs on a series of issues connected with the communist movement in India and the world as well. Unless these comrades rectify their erroneous views on this question, they can neither succeed in overcoming the sectarian positions on a series of connected issues nor can they fall in line with the correct political line of the Party.

## 2. ON THE CHARACTER OF INDIAN INDEPENDENCE

With the new and changed correlation of class forces in the world arena in favour of the socialist and anti-imperialist forces, the capacity of the imperialists to practise, as they did before the second world war, trickery and deception of conferring nominal and formal independence, while retaining the actual and real political power in their hands, is considerably restricted and weakened. The imperialists, confronted with the formidable socialist camp on the one hand and

the world working class movement and the surging tide of world-wide national liberation movements on the other, were compelled to compromise with the bourgeois leaders of the national liberation struggles and concede national independence to scores of colonial countries in the period following the second war. As a matter of fact the imperialists have changed their tactics in the radically changed conditions of the world from the old colonial method of direct, military-political rule over colonies to the indirect methods of economic, political, trade and aid, etc., to perpetuate their colonial plunder, while not hesitating to use direct, military and aggressive methods when faced with popular revolutions threatening the very foundations of foreign monopoly capital in these newly liberated countries.

In the new conditions created as a result of the new radically altered balance of world forces, the national bourgeoisie - both big and non-big --of the newly liberated countries have secured new opportunities, not only to play between the camp of socialism and the camp of imperialism for their class advantage but also on the rivalries between different imperialist states; they have found additional opportunities in the newly secured state power to assert their political independence to bargain hard with the imperialists and also to beat down the internal popular revolutionary movements wherever they tend to acquire such sweep and tempo as to threaten their exploiting class rule.

It is precisely this new situation that offered scope for the emergence of the so-called foreign policy of non-alignment and independence as an important political phenomenon to be taken into account; it is again this fundamentally altered alignment of forces in the international arena that enabled several newly liberated countries, under bourgeois leadership, to conceive the so-called planned industrial development with the 'aid' of both the socialist and the imperialist states; it is this new world situation that forms the background where even some of the smallest newly liberated states under bourgeois leadership are, sometimes, able to stand up against the imperialist pressure and blackmail.

Our Party, during the period 1947-55, did fail to take due note of these big new world changes and, instead, tried to assess the meaning and significance of the newly won national independence of India, in the old frame-work and characterised Indian independence as formal and fake; and rejected the new status of India as of either political independence or national independence, and thus committed a left error.

The right-reformists and revisionists, in the name of the new epoch and under the plea of correcting the then-prevailing sectarian and dogmatic understanding on the issue, have come to the conclusion, that Indian independence is, more or less, complete and real, that what has come to exist in India is a *bourgeois state with a bourgeois government*, and that all that is required to remove the weaknesses, if any, and make it full and complete, is to build an independent economy with the aid of the socialist camp and also by hard bargaining with the imperialist bloc. Thus, by implication, they reduce the stage of our revolution to the socialist stage and consequently, even skip the present democratic or agrarian stage of our revolution which has to complete the anti-feudal and anti-imperialist tasks. But

they continue to talk of national democracy under the joint leadership of the bourgeoisie and the working class or under the leadership of all firm anti-imperialist forces to carry out the tasks of the present stage of the Indian revolution.

Further, they draw two other totally false lessons, i.e., that Indian independence could be achieved without violent revolution, and through peaceful means; and that the national bourgeois leadership could secure it contrary to the commonly asserted communist stand that the proletariat alone is destined to lead the successful struggle against imperialism for national independence in the present era.

It is this non-class right-reformist assessment of Indian independence that gave birth to the bankrupt thesis that the internal policy of the Congress government is directed towards the building of independent capitalist economy and a corresponding social structure, and that the foreign policy it is pursuing, is a policy of non-alignment, independence, peace and anti-colonialism, which deserves the support of the proletariat. It is this thesis that ended up in the advocacy of the infamous slogan of united front with the so-called progressive wing of the Congress party and government, against the so-called, 'extreme right reaction' both inside and outside the Congress, which is depicted as the sole danger.

The Programme of our Party decisively rejected both these right and left errors, has concretely and correctly assessed the nature and character of Indian independence in the background of the emergence of the new epoch, after the end of the second world war :

"As a result, the country was partitioned into India and Pakistan, and political power was transferred to the leaders of the Congress party on August 15, 1947. Thus ended the political rule of the British in India and a state headed by the Indian big bourgeoisie was established. With this the first stage of the Indian revolution, the stage of general national united front, chiefly directed against foreign imperialist rule, came to an end.

*"The British imperialists hoped that despite the transfer of power, they would be able, by their entrenched positions in our economy, to make our independence formal. But the course of historical development since then has been disappointing to the imperialists and their hopes were belied."* ( Party Programme, paras 3 and 4 )

But, once again, the left-sectarian trend inside the Party is advocating the thesis of Indian independence being 'formal', 'fake', etc. The difference from the 1948-55 mistake, of course, is that if earlier our national independence was characterised as 'formal' and 'bogus' under the British imperialists, it is now described as 'formal' and 'fake' under the U.S. imperialists; if earlier the sectarian thesis on the issue was sought to be buttressed with the argument that the national bourgeoisie had gone over to imperialism and surrendered before it because of the imminent threat of class revolution at home, the present thesis argues that the ruling big bourgeoisie has been transformed into a comprador bourgeoisie, that the internal class contradictions have become so acute, reaching the stage of 'armed revolution facing armed counter-revolution', that, as a result, the bourgeoisie has

finally gone over to imperialism and surrendered national independence; and if the earlier sectarian assessment reduced Indian political independence to a satellite status under the old colonialism of the British imperialists, the new sectarianism seeks to define it as a puppet status under the U.S. imperialists, a neo-colonial state.

If modern revisionists 'liquidate' imperialism by the magic word of the new epoch, the modern sectarians seek to liquidate the entire significance and political import of the new epoch, virtually reducing it to mean that U.S. neo-colonialism has replaced the old colonialism of the British.

### 3. THE STAGE OF THE INDIAN REVOLUTION :

It is the ABC of Marxism-Leninism that there are not, and cannot be, revolutions without stages. It is, again, the ABC of Marxism that each of these stages of the revolution is distinguished by one contradiction as the principal contradiction since *"at every stage in the development of a process, there is only one principal contradiction which plays the leading role"*. (Mao Tse-tung )

Our Party Programme describes the nature of our revolution in the present stage as essentially anti-feudal, anti-imperialist, anti-monopoly and democratic (Para 96).

Consistent with the stage of the revolution, the principal contradiction is pinpointed as the one between feudal and semi-feudal landlordism and the great mass of the peasantry, or in political terms, between the bourgeois-landlord state and government, led by the big bourgeoisie, defending the landlord order and protecting the foreign monopoly interests, and the entire people interested in the completion of the people's democratic revolution.

The revisionists, on the one hand, characterise the present Indian state and government as a bourgeois state and government and, on the other, define the stage of the revolution as democratic or in their terminology national democratic. If the state power is in the hands of the bourgeoisie as they assert, then, a revolution against that state power cannot but be proletarian, socialist in character. Since they have given up Marxism, these contradictory characterisations do not worry them. Nor do they bother to define which is the principal contradiction in the present stage of the Indian revolution.

The left-sectarians formally accept that the present stage of our revolution is people's democratic or agrarian. But when the question of defining the principal contradiction of this stage of the revolution is undertaken, they passionately argue that the country's sovereignty has been surrendered to U.S. imperialism, that the big bourgeoisie has transformed itself into compradors and lackeys of U.S. imperialism, and thus the contradiction between the nation as a whole on the one hand and the U.S. imperialists and its lackeys on the other has been intensified and assumed the character of the principal contradiction. They do not stop for a while to think that they are arguing in support of the national liberation stage or the all-in national united front stage of the revolution and against the people's democratic or agrarian stage.

#### 4. THE INDIAN BIG BOURGEOISIE AND ITS CHARACTER

The right-reformists and revisionists do not lag behind others in formally denouncing the Indian big bourgeoisie as monopolists and big business who are reactionary and counter-revolutionary. They, too, exclude them in words from the revolutionary front in their class strategy for democratic revolution. Then how does their right-opportunism express itself on the issue? They deliberately hide the fact, first, that the big bourgeoisie is in the leadership of the present Indian state and government, and, second, they deny the fact of their alliance with big landlordism, the alliance for the preservation and perpetuation of their class rule and exploitation through compromise and collaboration with foreign monopoly capital. The revisionists maintain that it is the non-big national bourgeoisie which, in the main, is at the helm of the state and government and its only crime is allowing the big bourgeoisie "to hold powerful influence" and "having strong links" with the landlords. From this opportunist and class-collaborationist thesis comes their bankrupt policy of support to and unity with the Congress party and government, in order to rescue it from the pernicious clutches of the so-called extreme right reaction, represented by the big monopolists and landlords. The latest volte-face of the revisionists and their loud-mouthed denunciations of the Congress government and noisy slogans of anti-Congressism do in no way absolve them from this guilt, because their basic understanding on the class character of the state and government, as formulated in their programme, remains basically the same in spite of their latest modifications at the Patna congress of their party.

How does left-sectarianism express itself on this controversial question? In the past, the left-sectarian view contended that the entire Indian bourgeoisie - big and non-big-- had gone over to imperialism under the growing threat of class revolution at home, and that it had become the lackey and stooge of British imperialism. Hence, there was no question of any section of the bourgeoisie having a place in the class strategy of the democratic revolution, and the two stages- democratic and socialist- of the revolution got "intertwined" into one stage since it had to be a revolution against the entire bourgeoisie, big and non-big.

Our Party Programme steers clear of these two deviations, right and left-opportunist in character, and incorporates the correct Marxist- Leninist conclusions on the issue.

But, once again, certain sections inside the Party supported by others from outside the Party, are denouncing the programmatic formulations and are demanding their revision in a thoroughly left-sectarian direction. Of course, it now wears a new garb and plays a new tune. The left-sectarians argue that the Indian big bourgeoisie has been transformed into a comprador bourgeoisie and, consequently, it has become the stooge and lackey of U.S. imperialism; that, since the Indian big bourgeoisie is comprador and serving as the lackey of imperialism, it has no contradictions whatsoever with foreign monopoly capital which need to be taken into account and tactically utilised by the Indian working class in its struggle for the people's democratic revolution; that the Indian big bourgeoisie and the government dominated by it are neither in a position to utilise the inter-imperialist

contradictions, to any extent, nor can they afford to play between the world camps of socialism and imperialism; and finally because of all these developments and, in particular, due to the extremely sharpened class contradictions at home, a shift in the contradictions has come about. The contradiction between the nation as a whole and the U.S. and its comprador lackeys has assumed the role of the principal contradiction and, consequently, a shift takes place in the stage of our revolution, that is a shift to the stage of general national united front, when the edge of the revolution is to be chiefly directed against U.S. imperialism with the slogan of 'national liberation-war' against U.S. imperialism and its Indian stooges.

## 5. ON THE ASSESSMENT OF CAPITALIST PATH

The new Indian state and government, under the leadership of the big bourgeoisie, embarked upon the so-called five-year plans of development and even gave it the name of building a 'socialist pattern of society' in India. Before 1955-56, our Party was denouncing them as plans carried out under the dictates of the imperialists and in league with them. They were described as only "the means of looting the state budget by foreign firms of experts and suppliers, by high-placed bureaucrats in charge and big speculators on the stock exchange."

Subsequently, in the name of correcting this sectarian, lopsided and negative understanding, the dominant leadership of the then-united CPI, had begun to move in exactly the opposite direction, the direction of right-reformism and revisionism. In course of time, step by step, the revisionists have degenerated into unashamed apologists of the Indian big bourgeoisie and its capitalist path.

The right-revisionist assert that "*the national bourgeoisie, having secured state power, set itself the task of putting the country on the path of independent capitalist development*" (Para 32 of the Rightist Programme). Their programme states, "*In pursuance of this general aim the Congress governments have substantially curbed feudal vested interests...*"

Thus, neither is the big bourgeoisie found in the leadership of the new state and government, nor has big landlordism any place in the state and government power. 'National bourgeoisie' secured power! And took upon its head the task of independent capitalist building! And the "national proletariat" under revisionist leadership has to ally with this "national bourgeoisie" to transform it into a 'non-capitalist path'!

The right revisionists assert that "*the public sector becomes an instrument of building an independent national economy, of weakening the grip of foreign monopoly capital and, to a certain extent, of Indian monopolies*" and the same "*public sector goes a long way towards eliminating the legacy of our colonial past.*" (Aspects of CPI Programme, Pages 8-9)

The revisionist programme also views "*socialist aid as essential for independent anti-imperialist economic growth, as a crucial force aiding the completion of the national democratic revolution.*" (Aspects of CPI Programme, Pages 9-10 --Emphasis added)

Our Party Programme has resolutely rejected this line as crassest revisionism and also corrected the left-sectarian and dogmatic approach that was current in



the early period of 1948-55. Clear, correct and unequivocal formulations are made on one and all the topics connected with the capitalist path of the Indian ruling class.

However, once again, a left sectarian and dogmatic trend is now raising its head, and is openly challenging the line of the Party Programme on the issue of the capitalist path and its political and economic implications.

The fundamental critique of the capitalist path from the Marxist-Leninist angle is being erroneously understood and interpreted as though no industrial development of any significance is possible or has taken place, that the development of capitalism and capitalist relations in any degree is completely ruled out, and that all that has taken place under the capitalist path is only the increasing dominance of foreign monopoly capital and the strengthening and further consolidation of feudal and semi-feudal land relations. Thus the strategical despising of the capitalist path is being mechanically and dogmatically projected into its tactical evaluation, refusing to take into account the development of capitalism and capitalist relations under the bourgeois-landlord government.

If the right-opportunists and revisionists grossly exaggerate the potentialities of the capitalist path of development and then proceed to weave out theories of so-called 'independent development' and 'industrial revolution' led by the bourgeoisie, the sectarians seek to discover only increasing dependence on imperialism in every new step in the direction of setting up industries, and the strengthening of feudal and semi-feudal land relations, in every step of agrarian reform or in every new technique in the field of agriculture.

If the revisionists indulge in the impermissible talk of "*socialist aid as the crucial force aiding the completion of the national democratic revolution*", the left-sectarians look upon socialist aid as the main lever through which U.S. capital penetrates into, and dominates over, our national economy.

They characterise Soviet aid as aid intended to buttress the reactionary governments in order to gang them up against the People's Republic of China.

If revisionists sing panegyrics to the public sector in industries and depict it as an instrument to liquidate the grip of foreign capital and to curb native monopoly capital, the sectarians describe the public sector as an instrument to develop subservience to the imperialists as well as native big capital.

The fundamental truth that there is no capitalist path opened before our bourgeoisie under the present epoch is being extended to its absurd limits of negating the actual extent of development of capitalism and capitalist relations in the country; and finally, this sectarian trend seeks to drag the Party back to the mistaken positions of 1948-55, which the Party has corrected.

## 6. ON THE ISSUE OF FOREIGN POLICY

The government of India, soon after it took over the reins of the newly liberated state, declared that it would pursue a policy of friendship, neutrality and independence in its relations with the nations of the world and this has come to be characterised as a policy of non-alignment, peace, independence and anti-colonialism.

The policy of non-alignment, of course, it goes without saying, is in the main, a class policy of the bourgeoisie heading the weak and economically backward countries and states. It enables them, in one degree or other, to play between the two world camps and also on the rivalries between different imperialist states, to their class advantage; in objective, political terms this trend of non-alignment, in the measure it resists being drawn into the aggressive war-blocs of the imperialists, is anti-imperialist; and it is incumbent on the forces of socialism and democracy to utilise this trend in the general world anti-imperialist struggle for peace, freedom, democracy and socialism, while not for a moment forgetting either the treacherous and opportunist character of the class which adopts this policy, or the tremendous inconsistencies it exhibits when putting this policy into practice.

However, due to the inadequate assessment of this new big political trend and the new world conditions that gave birth to it, our Party, during 1948-55, was characterising the government as one that was essentially carrying the foreign policy of the British imperialists, and as following a foreign policy of the British imperialists, and as following a foreign policy that was flirting with the USA and facilitating the struggle of aggressors against peace-loving countries. Instead of seeing the dual character of the so-called policy of non-alignment and the dual nature of the class that is operating it, and accordingly adopting a dual tactic towards it we were dogmatically denouncing the non-alignment policy as merely the smokescreen for a policy subservient to the imperialists.

The right-reformist and opportunist trend in our Party adopted a non-class and revisionist interpretation of the concept of the "non-alignment policy". It was elevated to the height of genuine anti-imperialism, peace and anti-colonialism, clean missing the class which operates the said policy. They were also trying to mechanically copy the tactics of the Communist Parties in power, while echoing what the leaders of the socialist states were saying to the non-aligned governments at the governmental level- and all this in the name of proletarian internationalism and creative Marxism.

Our Party Programme has corrected the earlier sectarian approach and understanding on this issue and also resolutely rejected the revisionist line on the same.

But, once again, a noisy left-sectarian attack on the correct programmatic position of our Party is being launched by some comrades. They demand its revision in a left-adventurist direction.

The present left-opportunist line describes the policy of non-alignment of the Indian government as a myth and a "big hoax and it is becoming a part of the global strategy of U.S. imperialists, an instrument to suppress national liberation struggles," and "an instrument to build an anti-China axis."

The very comrades who hold these views dare not deny that the non-alignment policy of the Government was "progressive, anti-imperialist" between 1954 and 1959, when the slogans of "Hindi-Chini Bhai-Bhai and Hindi-Russi Bhai-Bhai"

were rending the skies in India, but it is now denounced as imperialist -inspired because there are marked pro-imperialist stances in the current stage.

It is true, and our Party takes due note that the single biggest factor that has gone to seriously undermine the non-alignment policy of the government since 1959 is the consistent anti-China policy that the government of India has embarked upon. Thereby, the government of India's policy of non-alignment, i.e., not joining either camp, has undergone a shift, since the open hostility and opposition to People's China, a country with 700 million population and a big part of the socialist camp, virtually places the Indian government in a state of undeclared war with one part of the socialist camp. The tall claims of the government leaders that their policy of non-alignment remains intact and unscathed are deceptive in the extreme.

Our Party Programme, after a thorough description of the different phases and facets of the non-alignment policy of the government, correctly concludes "that neither the policy of non-alignment nor its genuine implementation can be taken for granted with the big bourgeoisie leading the state and pursuing anti-people policies."

But, from this, to conclude, as our sectarians do, that the entire policy of non-alignment is given up, that the relations with the rest of the socialist camp have come under complete rupture, and that the Indian government has aligned itself with the imperialist camp and become a subservient tool of U.S.imperialism, is obviously wrong and factually incorrect.

If, sometimes, the Government of Pakistan takes an independent stand, then it is considered as a measure of its national independence and its assertion!

But, if "sometimes the Indian Government appears to take an independent position, different from that of America," then "such efforts are becoming more and more efforts to cover up its surrender to U.S. imperialism."

With India "surrender to U.S. imperialism is becoming more and more real, while independence of the country is getting more and more formal"!

With Pakistan, the assertion of national independence is becoming more and more real while its alignment with military blocs is simply formal!

The sectarian school of thought, which correctly notes that the bourgeois-landlord government of Pakistan that is formally aligned with the imperialist war blocs is able, in the recent period, to take steps in the direction of non-alignment, arrives at a totally incorrect conclusion that the non-alignment policy of the Indian government is given up for food, substituting it with a policy of total surrender and subservience to imperialists.

They do not ask themselves the question as to what are the new changes in the alignment of class forces, both nationally and internationally, that enable the government of Pakistan to move in the direction of 'non-alignment' from 'alignment' and prevent the Indian government pursuing a policy of non-alignment and take it to alignment with the U.S. war blocs? They tactily admit that the correlation of world forces, today, offer enough possibilities for the weak and economically backward states to assert independence, in a measure, and be non-

aligned. The main reason the left-sectarians ascribe to the said total 'surrender' of the Indian government is that internal class contradictions in India are extremely accentuated to the point of a threatening class revolution, and it is this that compels the government to completely abandon non-alignment and totally surrender to the imperialists.

This, obviously, is a grossly subjective and sectarian estimation of the situation, which we propose to deal with next.

## 7. THE CURRENT SITUATION AND ITS ESTIMATION

A correct estimation of the situation alone can enable a Communist Party to evolve a correct tactical line- this, of course, is an established Marxist-Leninist dictum. Lenin emphasised in his own time that "Tactics must be based on sober and strictly objective estimation of all the class forces in a given state- and in neighbouring states, and in all states of the world over- as well as of the experiences of the revolutionary movements" ("Left" -Wing Communism). This truth is repeated over and over again by several Marxist-Leninist leaders, and history shows us that whichever revolutionary party ignored or neglected taking this truth into serious account had come to grief. Our own experience in the long past convincingly confirms the complete truth of this statement.

What was one of the main mistakes that cost us dearly during the period 1948-51? Besides a number of theoretical and ideological errors with regard to the stage and class strategy of revolution, they were the mistakes of overestimating the depth of the economic crisis, overestimating the political awakening of the classes and masses, the undue reliance on the spontaneous mass upsurge and the evolving of a political-tactical line on that basis- all this did prove immensely harmful to building and advancing the revolutionary movement.

Hardly two years after this, and even before the ink was dry on our 1948-51 lessons, our Party repeated another such serious mistake. Basing on the electoral defeats of the Congress in 1952 and events following immediately and citing certain data that strengthened our pre-conceived conclusion, the Political Resolution, at Madhurai, in 1954, declared; "All these make it unmistakably clear that what we are witnessing today is not merely the maturing of the economic crisis but, along with it, the initial stages of the development of a political crisis" (Madurai Resolution, Page 28). But life and events proved that it was a gross overestimation of the situation.

On the basis of such an estimation of the situation and in the background of that political understanding, our Party had gone into the mid-term election battle of Andhra in 1955. Again, how did we estimate the level of political and class consciousness of the people and the state of their class and mass organisations in Andhra? Life and history proved that we suffered from the mistake of a sectarian overestimation of the situation.

Let us take the latest example of the 1967 general elections. Does not our election review sharply bring out that in a number of states our committees had overestimated the mass strength of the Party, overestimated the degree of

revisionist isolation and also grossly overestimated the degree of political consciousness of the people?

One of the sources of the rise and spurt of both the right-opportunist and left-sectarian deviations inside the communist movement is this monstrous mistake of over-estimation of a given situation, leading to political debacles and consequent frustration among the party ranks.

Taking all this into serious account the C.C., in its resolution on "New Situation and Party's Tasks" adopted immediately after the 1967 general elections, attempted to soberly assess and estimate the then-prevailing economic-political situation in the country.

It notes the deepening economic crisis, as an integral part of the world capitalist crisis, and also points out how the capitalist path of development, embarked upon by the big bourgeoisie to extricate the national economy from the chronic crisis it was thrown into by the British colonialists, has itself got into a crisis.

Secondly, it notes the post-election political developments in the country and comes to the conclusion that a political crisis too has set in, and is in its initial stages.

Thirdly, it takes stock of the degree of political consciousness and the state of organisation of the masses and classes, in particular, the working class and the peasantry, and notes: the proletariat "as a class is very poorly organised, and to the extent it is organised in trade unions, the movement suffers from crude economism. Only a very small part of the organised trade union movement in the country is led by the Communist Party while the rest is under the leadership of several petty-bourgeois and bourgeois parties. Its class consciousness is at a pitifully low level and its Communist Party is extremely weak and confronted with the menace of revisionism organised in the shape of the right Communist Party. Living and functioning in a country as ours, with a predominantly agrarian population, its unity with the toiling masses, particularly with the peasantry, is not yet forged even in its rudimentary form. We as Marxist-Leninists are quite aware that the entire course of progress and the outcome of the struggle ultimately depends upon the degree of the development of the class consciousness and organisation of the proletariat as a class and its firm alliance with the peasantry. Our Central Committee has already examined the serious defects of our work in the working class and peasant fronts and discussed the ways and means to overcome them and these conclusions are embodied in two separate documents, now before the Party." (Page 51)

Lastly, the C.C. resolution, while presenting the picture of the new favourable situation that is developing in the country for the proletariat, warns thus: "*The deepening economic crisis, no doubt, has now passed to the political sphere and set in motion a political crisis. And yet, it is still in its initial stages, though in the days to come it is bound to get intensified and mature. Any attempt to over-rate or exaggerate the degree of its depth and maturity would lead us to grossly underestimate the immense reserves which they still have on the one hand, and to do everything to disrupt and suppress the popular struggles on the other to perpetuate their exploiting class rule. Such a wrong and oversimplified estimation*

*is fraught with dangers to our Party and other democratic forces since it might land them into erroneous moves, and thus play into the enemy's hands."* (New Situation and Party's Tasks, Page 50)

It is on the basis of such an assessment of the situation that the C.C. has worked out its political line to head different mass fronts and movements in the country.

The revisionists and their leaders who, for a decade upto now, were singing eulogies to the planned development and steady progress under the Congress regime discovered, in the post-election situation, a golden opportunity for staging a "parliamentary insurrection." They decided to ally with any and every party and accept ministerial posts wherever they were offered to them; they began to acclaim the non-Congress state governments as transitional governments paving the way to their much-talked - of national democratic government; and they got themselves noisily busy for a parliamentary insurrection to topple the central Congress government and establish a non-Congress coalition government- mind you, all this, again, with a score of M.P.s in their group in the Lok Sabha whose total strength exceeds five hundred members. Their day-dreams went so far as to visualise an immediate possibility of split and class differentiation in the bourgeoisie, when the so-called progressive wing of the Congress would join hands with their 'twenty-two' in forming a new coalition government !

If such is the revisionist estimation of the situation and a corresponding tactical line has been worked out, how does the new sectarian standpoint assess the current situation and advocate its own tactical line?

It declares open opposition and hostility to the entire assessment of the current economic-political situation presented by the C.C. in the resolution on "New Situation and Party's Tasks", and roundly denounces it as nothing but a modified version of the revisionist tactical line.

It maintains that the thesis of deepening economic crisis and the setting in of the initial stage of the political crisis is as old as that of the Madurai congress resolution of 1954, and what we are in, at the present stage, is a revolutionary situation, demanding the highest revolutionary forms of struggle and methods of organisation.

It puts forward the thesis that the big-bourgeois led government stands exposed and isolated amongst the masses as the comprador lackey and stooge of U.S. imperialism, that counter-revolution has placed the bayonet and bullet on the agenda leaving no alternative for the revolution except to meet it with the same weapons, that the masses are tired of and fed up with strikes, demonstrations, petitions and elections and hence they refuse to be mobilised through these 'time-worn' forms of struggle, that the talk of building the class and mass organisations, the building of a strong Communist Party and a powerful united front, etc., is empty prattle as all these are tasks impossible to be fulfilled, unless they are integrated with and carried side by side with the peasant partisan war.

This grossly subjective and left-adventurist school of thought contemptuously rejects the tested Marxist-Leninist yardstick of judging whether a situation is

revolutionary or not, and seeks to substitute it with its own dogmatic formulae, conjured up in its grand seclusion. It does not bother to raise the elementary question and answer as to how the proletariat is organised in any state or the country as a whole, as to what the level of its class and political consciousness is, and what its exact mood is at the present stage; it does not care to ascertain as to what the actual state of the peasantry is, how far it is organised or not, whether the proletariat and its Communist Party has so far succeeded to any appreciable extent in popularising its revolutionary agrarian programme, let alone organising struggles on the widest scale, and at what stage is the much-needed worker-peasant alliance. This sectarian school does not think it necessary to assess the strong and weak points of the Communist Party as it now stands nor deem it as one of the key factors in the matter of decisively influencing a political situation; and, of course, its study and assessment of the class enemy and the forces behind him, is all the more deplorable.

Thus the left-sectarians have, virtually, come to adopt, as Engels puts it, the Blanquist "viewpoint that a relatively small number of resolute, well-organised men would be able, at a given moment, not only to seize the helm of the state, but also by a display of great, ruthless energy, to maintain power until they succeeded in sweeping the mass of the people into the revolution". The only amendment of the sectarians to this Blanquist theory seems to be that if Blanquism conceived of capturing central state power through its method, our 'left' conceive of capturing state power, first in one or several rural pockets and finally at the centre. Otherwise the new left-sectarians maintain the same Blanquist theory of repudiating the role of the classes and the masses. The atrocious part of the story is that the left-adventurist school wants to pass all this under the sign-board of Marxism-Leninism, even though there is hardly anything common between the two.

From such utterly un-Marxian theories of petty bourgeois revolutionism and adventurism, the utilisation of the bourgeois parliament and legislature by the proletarian party is condemned out of hand as 'parliamentary cretinism'; the utilisation of the positions in the government at states' level, under conditions where the Party has neither the fear of becoming the camp-follower of other classes and parties nor is in a weak position to be dominated and swamped by alien political parties, is sought to be denounced as 'Millerandism' - proletarian parties allying with imperialist bourgeoisie and joining its government. The tactics of united front and united action with other democratic classes and the parties representing them, is decried as "opportunistic alliances", since according to them those parties are not consistently democratic and hence "out and out reactionary"; if our Party declares that it strives to achieve the revolution by peaceful means and pins the responsibility on the ruling classes for forcing violence on the revolution to counter the violence unleashed against it, they say, "it is all breeding revisionist illusions of peaceful transition", and demand that we should declare for violent revolution since it is anyway inevitable under the bourgeois-landlord dictatorship; these comrades pick out stray, scattered and tiny islands of militant peasant and tribal people's struggles in the vast ocean of our country's peasantry and then proceed to

make the thesis of a matured agrarian revolution and give armed struggle, people's war, national liberation war and similar other grossly exaggerated and highly bloated slogans of the day; and as a result of this totally un-Marxian outlook, contempt is shown for patient, painstaking and sustained work among the basic revolutionary classes of the proletariat and the peasantry, while directing their appeal to the emotions of the restive petty bourgeois student and youth sections who are yet to be schooled, tempered and trained in Marxism-Leninism and its revolutionary theory and practice.

The gross left-sectarian estimation of the current situation does not stop there. This petty bourgeois revolutionary trend virtually negates the role of the classes and masses, and their unity, organisation and political consciousness in the revolutionary struggle. The ultra-sectarian thesis that this left school of thought expounds, that in the struggle against imperialism united action by the Soviet Union and China is ruled out since the former is headed by revisionist leaders, is extended and projected into the sphere of building united class and mass movements in India. It is opposed to any united work and action with trade union and kisan organisations which are under the leadership of the revisionists; and it is also opposed to the forging of any electoral fronts with the revisionist party as well as other non-Congress democratic parties. Thus, the most elementary Marxist-Leninist tactical principles of building class and mass unity in struggle are being discarded under the pseudo-radical slogan of "fighting an uncompromising struggle against the revisionists". This left trend erroneously projects the correct Marxist-Leninist position that there can be no unprincipled unity with revisionism inside the same party to the question of united fronts and united actions with the revisionists to reject these correct Marxist-Leninist tactics.

Thus, the left-opportunist estimation of the current situation and the corresponding tactical line it advocates has nothing in common with Marxism-Leninism. This grave error of our sectarians, if not immediately corrected, would prove doubly disastrous to the cause of our revolution and, in a sense, more damaging than their equally mistaken views on the programmatic issues, which we pointed out earlier.

## 8. OPPORTUNIST ERRORS AND THEIR IDEOLOGICAL ROOTS

We have so far examined how on a series of issues connected with the programme, strategy and tactics of the Indian revolution, right-revisionist and left-opportunist mistakes express themselves. As far as the question of right-reformist mistakes, their origin, evolution and culmination in the Indian communist movement are concerned, it is dealt with in detail in the seventh congress report, published under the title *Fight Against Revisionism*. Further, the resolution on the ideological questions in the international communist movement, adopted at the extended plenary session of the C.C. at Burdwan between April 6 and 12, 1968, makes it abundantly clear as to how the standpoint of the Indian revisionists finds itself in complete agreement with the positions of modern revisionism led by the



leadership of the CPSU. Hence, it needs no more elaboration in this letter. But the manner in which the left-sectarian trend manifests today needs examination.

It is quite interesting to note that the Programme and the general political line of our Party, as evolved and adopted at the seventh party congress and pursued since then, did not encounter any opposition from any party unit or any leading comrade at different levels, till the time of releasing the C.C.'s ideological draft for discussion in the middle of August 1967. Not merely there was no opposition, but the Programme and the political line were generally acclaimed by the entire Party as basically correct and resting on sound Marxist-Leninist foundations, steering clear of both right and left mistakes.

Then, how is it that the majority of leading comrades in Andhra Pradesh and a few others from different states now come to consider that our Party Programme is wrong on several crucial questions, that our political line is essentially revisionist and that our resolution on the ideological questions concentrates its main fire against the alleged left-sectarianism instead of right-revisionism, and directs its edge on the left errors of Chinese leaders instead of the modern revisionism of the CPSU leaders.

Evidently there is a big shift in the political-ideological position of these left critics, and it is a shift, sudden, patent and to the extreme left from that of the till-now-accepted standpoint of the Party Programme and the Party's political line. They cannot deny it.

How do they explain the reasons for this shift? They admit that it is principally due to their rethinking which has begun after the campaign of open denunciation of our Party and its political line as neo-revisionist was let loose by the Chinese press and radio since the middle of the year 1967.

Yes ! Rethinking, and rectifying the mistakes if and when any are found, and learning from the fraternal criticism of any brother party is always necessary and welcome. But is it permissible under the plea of rethinking to follow uncritically the denunciatory critique of the Chinese Communist press and radio? Have they, also, not to rethink for themselves as to how a political line they were accepting as basically correct for three years till the middle of the year 1967 is suddenly transformed into a totally wrong one subsequently, and whether they are not now as uncritically and as blindly accepting the Chinese critique as correct as they seem to have done in the case of accepting the Party Programme and its political line till recently? It is for these comrades to seriously ponder over these questions and objectively and self-critically review their stand.

As far as these comrades are concerned they cannot plead that they are kept in darkness regarding our differences with the CPC on specific questions dealing with our Programme and political line. As early as the first quarter of 1964, when the present Programme was in its drafting stage, it was clearly and openly stated in one of our printed and widely circulated documents thus:

*"We would also like to bring to your notice that on some of the concrete questions such as the characterisation of the present Indian state, the nature of the present government and its leadership we have some differences and serious*

*reservations with the positions taken by the CPC as well as the CPSU in some of their documents. In drafting our Programme we tried to incorporate our understanding on these questions and excluded all this from this ideological document. It has been our endeavour to be as objective as possible without the fear of being dubbed pro- or anti-CPSU or CPC as our enemies often try to do."* (Introduction to *A Contribution to Ideological Debate, Page 2*)

The attention of the comrades was drawn to the same point, during the pre-congress and seventh congress discussions. And yet, none objected to it and every comrade present had accepted it. The easy acceptance of political positions and still more easy rejection of the same on no sure and tested a ground, we have to observe, does not behove of any serious Communist, let alone leading party cadres.

Coming to the point of our attitude towards the leadership of the CPSU and that of the CPC, contrary to the allegations and accusations of our left critics, our C.C. and Party have made their position absolutely clear.

We hold the leaders of the CPSU responsible for the opening of the flood-gates of modern revisionism in the world communist movement with many of their discredited theories and practices, on a series of issues. We also have announced publicly, that they are responsible for the prevailing disunity and division in the socialist camp and world communist movement.

We are equally clear and categorical about the ideological-political stand of the CPC in this controversy. On all the issues of ideological debate- such as war and peace, peaceful coexistence, peaceful economic competition, peaceful transition, the issue of Stalin, the so-called party of the people and state of the people concepts, and the principle of independence of Communist Parties and non-interference, the critique of the Chinese Communist Party is essentially correct, and based on the unassailable standpoint of Marxism-Leninism. Further, the CPC, by boldly taking up this fight against modern revisionism, led by the leaders of the CPSU, has rendered great service to the cause of Marxism-Leninism, and our Party and its C.C. gratefully acknowledge it and hail it.

However, we cannot accept certain positions of the CPC on some vital issues connected with the world communist movement as well as on the Indian question as either correct or conforming to the Marxist-Leninist standpoint. The outright rejection of the principle of unity in action, between different socialist states and the world Communist Parties, against imperialism, on the ground that some of these socialist states and Communist Parties are under the leadership of the revisionists, according to us, is wrong in principle and harmful in practice. Similarly, while believing in the complete correctness of the unhesitating and sharp exposure of the class collaborationist and revisionist policies of the leaders of the Soviet Union, we cannot subscribe to the erroneous theory of U.S. -Soviet collaboration for the sharing of world hegemony and the perpetuation of world domination.

Lastly, we are firmly convinced that the CPC, in its reading of class relations in India, in its assessment of the current situation and the tactical line worked out on that basis, is completely incorrect and contrary to realities and life. This mistake assumes

all the more grievous proportions when it, openly and frontally, interferes in the internal affairs of our Party with a view to imposing its own political line on it.

It is not strange, in the face of these factors, that our left critics, instead of sharply reacting to the unwarranted and hostile attack, launched by the Chinese press and radio against our Party and its political line, atrociously assert that our Party with its ideological-political line is directing its main fire against the Chinese Party?

This strange behaviour can be explained only by the fact that our left-sectarians are carried away by the CPC and its great contribution in the fight against revisionism, to the point of losing their objective and independent thinking that they clean miss to note certain of its left mistakes. And in fact what our party considers as some left errors of the CPC in the course of its struggle against modern revisionism, our lefts have come to consider these very mistakes as the heart and soul of the Chinese contribution in the fight against revisionism. If, for a long time, in the past the cult of the CPSU was fostered on the ground that it was infallible, now, the new-sectarian trend is attempting to preach the infallibility of the CPC with all the harmful consequences that accompany such a creed.

If the Indian revisionists, on the one hand, proclaim from the house-tops that every non-Congress government that provides them with a ministerial post is a 'transitional government' on the road to the so-called 'national democracy' of their invention, the sectarians, on the other, simply echo the Chinese denunciation of the Kerala and Bengal U.F. governments as Congress-blessed reactionary governments, more reactionary than the Congress governments.

If the revisionists are indulging in the infantile talk of parliamentary insurrection basing on a few scores of left and democratic MPs in a house of five hundred, with hardly ten to fifteen per cent of the electorate to back them, the sectarians rejoice in repeating the stories of non-existent rural armed insurrections in scores of places in India.

If the revisionists define the present Indian state as a bourgeois democratic state, the sectarians seek to correct them by describing it as a neo-colonial state.

If the revisionists hate the People's Republic of China, denounce the CPC as 'Trotskyite' and anti-Communist, and heartily desire its exclusion from the socialist camp and world communist movement, the sectarians, with a vengeance, reply to them that there now exists a U.S.-Soviet axis for world hegemony and domination under the evil leadership of the revisionist leaders of the CPSU, that the Soviet Union and other socialist states following it hence have no place in the socialist camp, and a global strategy to fight this U.S. -Soviet axis is the dire need of the hour for world proletarian revolution.

If the revisionists believe in the theory of one world liberating centre ( the Soviet Union ) and one party hegemony ( the CPSU), not withstanding some other revisionist theories of 'polycentrism', the sectarians fondly imagine and fanatically advocate the thesis of People's China assuming the role of the 'world liberation mission' and the CPC acquiring the 'leading role' of the world communist

movement. But the CPC itself, in its polemics against the Soviet leadership, quotes approvingly the resolution of the Communist International in 1943 dissolving the Comintern: "the solution of the problems of the labour movement of each country through the medium of some international centre would meet with insuperable obstacles." The CPC, then, declares, "in the present international communist movement, the question of who has the right to lead whom simply does not arise."

If the revisionists have come to consider that the CPSU has acquired the god-given right of grossly interfering in the internal affairs of other brother parties, of course, in the name of defending Marxism-Leninism of its own definition, the sectarians argue that such a 'right' has now descended upon the CPC, since, according to them, it, alone, is the exclusive repository of Marxism-Leninism, with a historic duty and a mission to chalk out the political lines for one and all the C.P.s in the world.

But the CPC itself in its "*Polemic on the General Line*", refuting the CPSU's charge against it of seizing the leadership to the international communist movement had said:

*"However, we must tell the leaders of the CPSU that the international communist movement is not some feudal clique. Whether large or small, whether new or old, and whether in or out of power, all fraternal parties are independent and equal. No meeting of fraternal parties and no agreement unanimously adopted by them has ever stipulated that there are superior and subordinate parties, one party which leads and other parties which are led, a party which is a father and parties which are sons, or that the leaders of the CPSU are the supreme rulers over other fraternal parties."*

After tracing the history of this question in the international proletarian revolutionary movement the CPC said, "*The question confronting all communists and the entire international communist movement today is not who is the leader over whom*" and concludes:

*"In the present international communist movement, the question of who has the right to lead whom simply does not arise. Fraternal parties should be independent and completely equal, and at the same time they should be united."*

Both the right-revisionists and left-sectarians compete with each other in their attempt to create some sort of church-like centres of Marxism-Leninism with their own high priests to preside and give divine, unerring and final decisions reducing the science of Marxism-Leninism, virtually, to the status of a mediaeval 'faith'. The correct Marxist-Leninist concept of Communist Parties learning from each other, from mistakes and achievements, of collectively thinking and commonly imbibing the lessons and of each party correctly applying the theory to its own concrete conditions is sought to be substituted with the dangerous concept of 'ordering parties' and 'obeying detachments'. It is better to remember always the following from the CPC's *General Line*:

*"If it is not a party that can use its brains to think for itself and acquire an accurate knowledge of the different classes in its own country through serious investigation and study, and knows how to apply the universal truth of Marxism-*

*Leninism and integrate it with the concrete practice of its own country, but instead is a party that parrots the words of others, copies foreign experience without analysis, runs hither and thither in response to the baton of certain persons abroad, and has become a hodgepodge of revisionism, dogmatism and everything but Marxist-Leninist principle:*

*"Then such a party is absolutely incapable of leading the proletariat and the masses in revolutionary struggle, absolutely incapable of winning the revolution and absolutely incapable of fulfilling the great historical mission of the proletariat."*

The grossly subjective and left-infantile attacks on the party's ideological and political line emanate from the fact that some of our comrades, in their immense hatred of revisionism and innate urge for militant struggle against the exploiters' rule, have lost their Marxist-Leninist bearing and slipped into petty-bourgeois revolutionism. The tardy progress of the revolutionary movement in the country, the frustration caused in the face of long years of bourgeois-landlord misrule, and the ocean of petty bourgeoisie that surrounds the poorly organised and politically backward working class movement of our country, offer fertile ground for the flourishing of these alien trends. Above all, the long-neglected Marxist-Leninist schooling and tempering of cadres, through theoretical and practical training, in the once united Communist Party of India, has left its evil legacy to our Party, and we need not feel shy of admitting how weak and vulnerable we are in this regard, and what stupendous difficulties we face in overcoming it.

The interesting part of the story is that both these opportunist deviations seek to cover up their mistakes by wearing the mantle of Marxism-Leninism, while attacking the correct positions of our Central Committee as 'centrism' or 'neutralism'. This attack on the correct class line, sometimes, also assumes a funny form, i.e., the revisionists maligning it as essentially left-sectarian and dogmatic and the left-opportunists slandering it as essentially revisionist and 'neo-revisionist'; and the common feature of both is to spurn the very correct Marxian concept of fighting on two fronts, the right and left-opportunist errors, in defence of Marxism-Leninism, while its respective adherents parade as self-annointed knights and crusaders of demolishing the menace of modern revisionism or modern dogmatism. Both the wrong trends pretend to take inspiration from the great Lenin and his immortal teachings in the fight against revisionism and left-sectarianism, but in actual practice the revisionists practise the trick of citing passages after passages from his famous work of *"Left"-Wing Communism* and the like and to scrupulously avoid mentioning anything from his voluminous and rich contributions in the relentless fight against revisionism and its chieftains of the Second International, whereas the left-sectarian school quotes profusely from Lenin's scathing attacks on right-reformism and revisionism and meticulously avoids mentioning anything from his merciless exposure of dogmatism and left-adventurism. Lenin, by both the schools, is presented not as the great Marxist revolutionary who fought on two fronts, sparing neither, but only as uncompromising fighter either against revisionism or sectarianism ! Add to all this, the Indian revisionists, to defend their position, heavily rely on the modern revisionism of the leaders of the CPSU,

and try to exploit the great prestige built around the CPSU, Soviet Union and all its might, accumulated over half a century under the leadership of Lenin and Stalin; on the other hand, the sectarian trend that is rising in our Party, in the recent period, is attempting in a big way to defend its sectarian theories and actions by heavily drawing upon the prestige of another big Party leading another mighty socialist state, i.e., the Chinese Communist Party, the prestige of which is doubly enhanced amongst the world revolutionary ranks because of its sharp exposure and bold fight against modern revisionism led by the leaders of the CPSU. In short, if Marxism-Leninism for the Indian revisionists has come to virtually mean the uncritical acceptance of CPSU as the infallible guide to the Marxist-Leninist doctrine, for our sectarians, the uncritical acceptance of every proposition and step of the CPC and unquestioned loyalty to it have come to mean the hall-mark of Marxism-Leninism.

#### 9. THE RIGHT AND LEFT OPPORTUNIST TRENDS AND THEIR ORGANISATIONAL MANIFESTATIONS

The Moscow Declaration of 1957 has very correctly pinpointed how the revisionists reject "the Leninist principles of party organisation and, above all, of democratic centralism, for transforming the Communist Party from a militant revolutionary organisation into some kind of debating society." We are quite familiar with our Indian revisionists, how they do not care to respect either democracy or centralism inside the party, utilise either the aspect of democracy or the aspect of centralism only in the measure that suits their revisionist political line, and in the bargain make a mockery of the principle of democratic centralism, sticking to offices like leaches, no matter even if the majority in the Party is pronouncedly opposed to their leadership.

The sectarians and left-adventurists in their turn, as seen in the case of the Naxalbari leaders and others who are wedded to the Naxalbari political-ideological line, also, make the Leninist organisational principle of democratic centralism, the first casualty in their inner-party struggle.

They demand the right of revolt against the party line and also simultaneously the right of party membership, and if opposed, they non-chalantly ask the question, "did we not do the same while breaking with the revisionists"? Thereby, they clean forget and ignore the fact that such a revolt took place after ten full years of intense inner-party struggle for a correct political line, after the Dangeite leadership closed the doors of deciding the dispute through inner-party discussion and by democratic means, and after the majority of the members in the Party found no alternative except to revolt and break if the Party and the revolutionary working class movement were to be defended and safeguarded.

They justify their revolt against the C.C. and the accepted party line, at the very first appearance of their differences with it, without either caring for the opinion of the overwhelming majority of party members, or to the decisions of the duly-elected C.C. which is to function as the highest authority between two congresses.

They seek to reverse the political line of the Party and substitute it with an alternative line, which is neither born out of experience nor an outcome of reviewing the implementation of the accepted political line, but one broadcast by Peking radio and circulated by the Chinese press.

They defy party forms and norms and in turn accuse the C.C. of not adhering to forms and norms, not because the C.C. was not acting within the strict confines of the party's constitution, but because the exercising of C.C.'s rights would curtail their right of taking liberties with the party organisation and party's political line.

They threaten the Party with a split, and to cover it up spread the unfounded gossip that the C.C. is out to resolve political-ideological differences through disciplinary measures.

They arrogantly defend their open breach of loyalty to the Party Programme and the party's constitution which they have solemnly pledged, and in turn demand the C.C. and Party to be loyal to the CPC and its political line, which we have neither pledged nor can ever pledge. Communists, all over the world, are known to be loyal only to Marxism-Leninism, and to the party programme and constitution worked out by the concerned party of the country in accordance with its Marxist-Leninist understanding. Strangely enough, the sectarian view that confronts our Party, today, advocates the same discredited theory of "father party and son party", a theory sought to be practised by the Khrushchovites and roundly denounced by the Chinese Communist Party and all the Marxist-Leninists of the world as one of atrocious and disruptive character.

Has all this anything in common with Marxism-Leninism, its organisational principles and proletarian internationalism? Absolutely there is nothing in common. And yet, it is sad to see that a good section of our comrades in Andhra Pradesh who have for years loyally served the Party and its cause, have fallen victims to such an infantile left-opportunist line, both in matters of politics and organisation.

Comrades, the Polit Bureau is addressing this letter to our party members in Andhra Pradesh at a crucial turn of events in the life of our Party. The P.B. hopes that every party member and, in particular, every leading comrade in Andhra Pradesh, would rise to the occasion, overcoming every manifestation of subjectivism, and earnestly endeavour to appreciate the spirit in which this letter is drafted and understand its contents.

The first nucleus of the Communist Party in Andhra Pradesh was set up in 1933-34, and it is by now full thirtyfive years since then. During the long and chequered history in this period, it has earned a proud place in the hearts of the toiling millions of Andhra Pradesh, through its services and sacrifices in the cause of our common people. Its sustained work and diverse activity among the worker and peasant masses, the leadership given to the democratic demands of forming the separate state of Andhra and Visal Andhra, and above all, the historic Telengana peasant armed revolt it had heroically led against the mediaeval and oppressive regime of the Nizam of Hyderabad, have acquired for the Party big prestige and a national status in the political life of Andhra Pradesh as well as in our country.

This was proved beyond a shadow of doubt, when the people in their millions rallied round our Party's banner during the first general elections in the year 1952 and in the short period immediately following it.

However, the fact remains that the communist movement in Andhra, as it stands at the present stage, is not yet able to firmly base itself either on a strong and organised working class movement or a powerful and solid agrarian revolutionary movement. The bourgeois-landlord classes through their political party, i.e., the Indian National Congress, utilising the state and governmental power they secured, were able to capitalise on the democratic gains more than us, the democratic gains achieved mainly by our Party's active participation and contribution. Thus, in the struggle that our Party, as a working class party, is locked with the bourgeois-landlord classes during the last one-and-a-half decades we were thrown on the defensive, and our advance has been very tardy, halting and has been even reversed, in some respects. For this state of affairs, apart from the temporary and short-lived political advantages our class enemies could secure for reasons beyond our control, the ascendancy of the right-reformist outlook and practice in the Andhra Pradesh party unit, which subsequently led to serious revisionist disruption and split in the party and people's movements under its leadership, has its disastrous contribution, and in no way it can be minimised.

Our party unit in Andhra is called upon to concretely assess the class realities obtaining in the state at present, to correctly estimate the political situation and the alignment of class forces, and to devise ways and means to overcome the existing shortcomings. Our Party's existence and activities are confined to seven to eight districts out of a total of twenty in the state, and, also, to some taluks and pockets in these seven to eight districts. It is evident that without widening and extending the democratic movement to ever-wider areas and sections of people, the task of defending or taking the movement to higher levels in the few strong pockets where the movement is strong and on which the class enemies are concentrating their attacks, becomes doubly difficult. The class enemies, as experience tells us, are out to squeeze us out of the existing pockets, and to achieve their objective, they are constantly resorting to violent and provocative actions against our Party and thus seek to draw us out into unequal class battles in which they hope to destroy us. How to tack, manoeuvre, and mark time in order to meet the enemies' offensive in a more advantageous situation to us is a difficult job to be tackled by our State Committee. But in no case we should be helplessly dragged into a position of accepting battle on their terms to oblige our class enemies.

The present phase we are now passing through, the deepening economic crisis and the growing political crisis, do certainly offer us greater opportunities of overcoming the lags and shortcomings in our movement in a comparatively shorter period of time, provided we do not lose our balance in the face of provocative violence and the calculated offensive of the bourgeois-landlord classes and their government.



What is required to fully utilise the possibilities inherent in the developing economic-political situation is a strong, united and disciplined Communist Party. As Lenin put it, "in its struggle for power the proletariat has no other weapon but organisation", and the Communist Party alone is that highest organisation. The enemy, having tasted the fruits and reaped the benefits of disruption of the Party and the movement caused by the revisionist betrayal, is once again anxiously looking for another round of disunity and disruption from left-opportunistic mistakes, and he is not hiding his evil intention and glee over it. In such a situation, to allow any more weakening of our Party, its unity, discipline and cohesion, is nothing short of playing into our enemies' hands and causing damage to the cause we all cherish, and for which we have so far given all our best.

The Polit Bureau appeals to all party members and units in Andhra Pradesh to rise to the occasion, to accept the decisions of the central plenum and to loyally and truthfully implement them, and to defend the unity and discipline of the Party, a party that is built over decades of struggles and great sacrifices.

No quarter should be given to the subversive and disruptive slogans of the Naxalbari leaders who staged an open revolt against the Party and openly and shamelessly advocate the subversion of the CPI(M) wherever it is possible and disruption where such subversion is stalled. Such a conspiracy for building a factional party within the Party should be scotched. Every honest party member will have to be doubly vigilant against this undermining tactic of the "ultras" parading under the garb of uncompromising revolutionaries.

No party member should tolerate any tendency to overtly or covertly challenge and defy the accepted party line, the decisions of the Burdwan plenum, the norms and forms of our party organisation and its basic principle of democratic centralism.



# **AN OPEN LETTER TO THE PARTY MEMBERS DEFEAT NEO-REVISIONIST POLICIES OF THE POLIT BUREAU ! FORWARD TO BUILD A REVOLUTIONARY COMMUNIST PARTY !!**

*[Released by four leading Comrades in AP in reply to the "OPEN LETTER" by the Polit Bureau of CPI(M) to "ANDHRA COMRADES" in later part of 1968-EC]*

Comrades ;

The Central Committee leadership has refused to implement the decisions of the Calcutta Congress on the ideological issues; it has adopted a complete neo-revisionist line; it has destroyed internal democracy of the communist party, and has taken to dictatorial organisational methods; in consonant with these steps, they have expelled four of us from the party.

Already the Communist Revolutionaries of Bengal, Kashmir, U.P., Bihar, Orissa, Kerala and other provinces are fighting the neo-revisionist policies of the central leadership.

In Andhra Pradesh, overwhelming majority of party members, district and taluq committees are valiantly fighting the neo-revisionist policies of the central leadership. Recently provincial committee members, secretaries and important functionaries of district committees met at Vijayawada and have called for the rebuilding of the communist party on revolutionary lines.

We declare that the neo-revisionist central committee leadership and its disruptive policies alone are responsible for such a development inside the communist party.

## **The Origin of the party :**

Our party was born in the ideological struggle against the revisionist policies of the Dange group. We thought that it was born with the aim of working on the basis of Marxism-Leninism. The Calcutta party congress declared the establishment of people's democratic state through agrarian revolution as its aim.

But today the central committee leadership has betrayed the aspirations of the party members, has betrayed the party programme and has betrayed the aims

of the party congress; it has adopted the policy of class collaboration in the place of the policy of class struggle; it has renounced Marxism-Leninism and has adopted a complete neo-revisionist policy.

In our ideological struggle against revisionism of Dange group, the ideological battle of the Chinese Communist party against the revisionist policies of the CPSU leadership, roused the consciousness of our party members and inspired them for an irrevocable ideological battle against revisionism; it gave them confidence about the future of communism and Marxism-Leninism. It greatly helped us to rally majority of the party members in the struggle against revisionism of the Dange group.

But immediately after the party congress was over, immediately after the rebirth of our party, the central committee leadership has taken up the despicable method of rousing anti-China sentiments inside our party.

The central committee leaders held classes inside the jails on Kutch issue, Kashmir issue, on the issue of Indo-Pak conflict. They initiated disputes on the attitude of the CPC towards these issues. The then acting secretary of the All India party EMS Namboodripad openly condemned the attitude of the CPC towards Indo-Pak dispute. The leaders of the central committee joined the reactionaries in rousing anti-China chauvanism in the country.

Sri P.Sundarayya, who had gone to Russia for medical treatment took cudgels against the CPC even from there. He, by himself, laid the basis for the ideological line of the party, in the letters he wrote from Moscow. He sharply condemned the attitude of the CPC towards CPSU leadership and Vietnam. He certified that the CPSU leadership, inspite of certain mistakes, was greatly helping the national liberation struggles. He declared that the CPSU leadership must be treated as a friend and not as a foe, that efforts must be made to correct the CPSU leadership, and that points of common agreement between our party and CPSU were greater than points of disagreement.

Are not these letters a result of an agreement with the CPSU leadership?

These letters were written from Moscow, the source and centre of modern revisionism; they were sent through Sri Bhupesh Gupta, revisionist leader; who ever might be responsible, the letters were leaked to the press; they were given world-wide publicity. The world and our government made to understand that our party leadership was against the CPC line.

After the recent general elections, in "New situation and party's Tasks", the CC criticised all those meaning the CPC, for the "mistake of equating every concession and each step of surrender with final surrender and final going over to imperialism", for their "infantile exercise to substitute tactics for strategy and vice-versa".

The central leadership condemned the struggle of Naxalbari peasants for land and existence; it supported the repressive measures that the central and provincial governments adopted against that struggle. The CPC welcomed the Naxalbari peasant struggle. It gave its whole-hearted support to that struggle. Our party leadership publicly denounced the CPC for its support to the Naxalbari peasant

struggle. The CC leadership braved this support as an interference in the internal affairs of our party and thus find to rouse national chauvanism in our party ranks.

Thus, after the Calcutta party congress, the CC leadership has tried to rouse anti-China sentiments both inside our party and among the public on every important issue.

The ideological resolution of the Bardwan plenum was the culmination of the anti-China activities that the CC leadership has been continuously following.

**PB. Open letter - the Neo-revisionist line:**

The PB open letter is an open expression of the neo-revisionist policies of the PB.

The PB leadership, in its open letter, has claimed that it is fighting both against the revisionist policies of the CPSU leadership and the "adventurism" of the CPC. They have certified themselves that they alone are the sole guardians of Marxism-Leninism, that their creative line is a result of their independent thinking. They are uplandng themselves for this "independent" thinking.

But there is not a particle of truth in these false claims; the PB line is nothing but a neo-revisionist line covered with deceptive revolutionary phraseology; it is nothing but a replica of the revisionist line of the CPSU leadership. Any person with little common sense could clearly see that the line of the PB is nothing but an anti-China line in its concentrated form.

The PB pretends to be criticising the CPSU revisionist leadership on every issue; but, in practice, implements that very same line with a deceptive coverage of revolutionary phraseology. This is the line of the PB.

**New Deception in the Name of the New Epoch:**

With the victory of the Chinese revolution, the socialist camp came into existence. This is a new epoch of world wise peoples struggles against decaying imperialism. This is a new epoch of transition to socialism from capitalism. This is a new epoch when the colonial system is crumbling. This is new epoch of national liberation struggles and socialist revolutions.

This is a new epoch which has brought the completes destruction of the world imperialist system on the agenda. This is a new epoch which heralds the success of the world socialist revolution.

But American imperialism, armed with deadly weapons, is fighting its last ditch battles for the preservation of the crumbling world imperialist system.

The consciousness of the people of the backward countries has been roused; they are united; and adopting the methods of peoples war; they are dealing death blows to the imperialist system for their national liberation; They are marching forward despite all odds.

It is the duty of the socialist countries, the world working class and communist movement to give all kinds of help-ideological, political, diplomatic, military-to these national liberation struggles who dealing a death blows to the colonial system. This is the line that the CPC is advocating. This is the line that Marxist-Leninists are everywhere implementing.

At a time when the national liberation struggles are advancing like a hurricane, the CPSU leadership betrayed the world revolutionary movement, and the national liberation movements. It threatened the revolutionaries that even small armed struggles any where in the world, will lead to world conflagration; it threatened them by saying that American imperialism was not a paper tiger, but a tiger with "nuclear" teeth, that any underestimation of American imperialism will lead to disastrous results, that armed struggles, in these circumstances, will lead to unnecessary heavy sacrifices. Thus the CPSU revisionist leadership weakened the national liberation struggles and helped imperialism.

Today the PB leadership is again repeating the very same theories of the CPSU revisionist leadership on national liberation struggles. The PB makes fun of the revolutionaries by saying "on one hand, they grossly exaggerate the world revolutionary situation depicting the world capitalism to be 'on the verge of final collapse' and advocate aggressive tactics of world revolution" (PB's open letter to the Andhra comrades, pp. 6)

Comrade Mao described American imperialism as a mere paper tiger. The events after the second world war have amply proved the correctness of this evaluation. Armed national liberation struggles have erupted and are advancing throughout Asia, Africa and Latin America inspite of armed suppression of the imperialists and the betrayal of the CPSU revisionist leadership. As an outstanding example of the anti-imperialist struggles, the heroic struggle of the Vietnamese peoples is striking blow after blow on the American imperialism spelling its death-hell. American imperialism has been thrown into a serious economic and political crisis. The negro and other working class struggle in America itself, student and working class struggles throughout western Europe are advancing. That imperialism is waging its last ditch battles from its death bed.

But the neo-revisionist leadership of the PB does not see this development. It sees only over estimation of the revolutionary situation in all this objective description.

While the CPSU revisionist leadership threatened the revolutionaries with its description that American imperialist 'paper tiger' was armed with nuclear teeth, the neo-revisionist leadership of the PB speaks of the overestimation of the world revolutionary situation. The arguments of both are the same; their aims are one-to weaken the revolutionary struggles.

### **The Decisive Role of the National Liberation Movements:**

Because of the intensification of the basic contradiction between the imperialist and socialist camps, and under the influence of this basic contradiction itself, national liberation movements have erupted in this new epoch. They have shaken the very foundation of imperialism in Asia, Africa and Latin America.

The growth of the national liberation movements will intensify the contradictions between the various imperialist powers, resulting in the further weakening of imperialism; the war plans of the imperialists will be thwarted; the socialist countries will get a breathing space to advance in all fields without the fear of world war. The growth of the national liberation movements will lay the

basis for the working class revolutions in the capitalist countries. In a way, the fate of the world humanity depend on the victory of national liberation movements. This is the estimation of the Marxist-Leninists throughout the world; this is the estimation of the Chinese communist party.

That is why, Marxist-Leninists throughout the world hold that today the national liberation movements play a decisive role in the destruction of imperialism in colonial and semi-colonial countries in the destruction of imperialism; they hold that the socialist camp and the world communist movement should help the national liberation movements in all possible ways.

The CPSU revisionist leadership refused to see this reality. They propagated the pervicious view that colonial and semi-colonial countries will be liberated by the successful building of communism in the Soviet Union and its economic help to the backward countries.

In other words, the neo-revisionist PB leadership has begun to propagate this very pervicious view; they are preaching that the national liberation movements in colonial and semi-colonial countries could not stand upon their own legs and achieve help from outside.

Look at the following statements from articles in *Peoples Democracy*: "The armed intervention of the Chinese volunteers defeated American attempts to export counter-revolution to Korea and in collaboration with the people and working class of North Korea, saved North Korea for democracy and socialism". (No. 3 PD articles) "The experience of the South Vietnam struggle itself shows that without the active help of the socialist countries, freedom struggle itself becomes extremely difficult". "The experience of Korea and Vietnam shows that armed help is essential for the success of the struggle". (from PD articles).

The meaning of these statements is very clear. The national liberation movements in colonial and semi-colonial countries cannot play a decisive role in winning their liberation; they cannot achieve victory without outside help.

If anybody opposes above statements, he is dubbed as a counter-revolutionary. According to PB to say that the national liberation movements will play the decisive role in destroying imperialism in the colonial and semi-colonial countries is a counter-revolutionary proposal; to wait with folded hands for outside help is a revolutionary act; to say that the national liberation movements have stand on their own legs to achieve victory in their struggles is a counter-revolutionary act.

Lenin had seen the decisive role of the people of the backward countries in destroying imperialism. He had said in 1919:

*"The period of the awakening of the East in the contemporary revolution is being succeeded by a period in which all the Eastern peoples will participate in deciding the destiny of the whole world, so as not to be simply an object of enrichment of others. The peoples of the East are becoming alive to the need for practical action, for every nation to take part in shaping the destiny of all mankind" (from the address to the Second conference of Communist Organisations of the Peoples of the East).*

This is the very same idea that the CPC is propagating today. It says: "*A fundamental task is thus set before the international communist movement in the contemporary world, namely, to support the revolutionary struggles of the oppressed nations, and people of Asia, Africa and Latin America, because these struggles are decisive for the cause of the international proletariat as a whole*" (More on Togliatti, pp.45).

Lenin could foresee the decisive role of the national liberation movements in the destruction of imperialism; the CPC has brought this idea to the forefront.

But the neo-revisionist PB leadership refuses to see the correctness of this estimation; not only that it castigates the very idea itself as counter-revolutionary.

The theory of the CPSU leadership that the colonial and semi-colonial countries will win their liberation through the economic aid of the socialist countries and the theory of neo-revisionist leadership of the PB that socialist diplomacy and armen help of the socialist countries is essential for the liberation of the colonial and semi-colonial countries are one and the same; their aim is same-both aim at weakening the key role of the national liberation movements at the present times; both aim at weakening the national liberation movements.

### **Peoples War:**

The neo-revisionist leadership of the PB has not only refused to recognise the keyrole of the national liberation movements in the destruction of the imperialism in the colonial and semi-colonial countries, it refuses to recognise the universal method of the peoples war that the national liberation movements have adopted after the second world war.

The Chinese revolution developed in a way different from that of the Russian revolution. The Chinese revolution achieved its victory through a protracted armed struggle, through the method of liberating the countryside first and liberating the towns in the end. This was their peoples war. The tactics of peoples war, the experience of the Chinese revolution, is showing the way for the liberation of the backward countries. After the Second world war, the peoples, the Marxists-Leninists of all the backward countries could advance their national liberation struggles by applying the experience of the Chinese revolution, by applying the tactics of the peoples war to the conditions of their own countries. The neo-revisionist PB leadership refuses to apply the experience of this peoples war to the conditions of their own countries. The neo-revisionist PB leadership refuses to apply the experience of this peoples war to our own conditions and evolve our own forms of struggle.

The neo-revisionist PB leadership, while saying that victory of social revolutions cannot be achieved through peaceful parliamentary methods in the conditions of our country, at the same time stresses, time and again that the possibility of peaceful methods should always be kept in mind, thus instilling illusions about the possibility of peaceful transition.

The neo-revisionist leadership of the PB has clearly stated that the methods of the peoples war are not applicable to the Indian conditions. They refuse to

apply the universal tactics of peoples war, that are being adopted in all the colonial and semi-colonial countries, to the Indian conditions, by showing the differences between the geographical conditions of India and China.

The neo-revisionist leadership of the PB is declaring its fidelity to the 1951 tactical programme, only to cover up its parliamentary path.

Though the 1951 tactical programme has been accepted, it had never been properly discussed during all these seventeen years. We have never discussed the steps to implement this programme, the political line to be adopted for the implementation of this programme, the areas suitable for the implementation of this programme.

But all these years, the peoples of various areas of the country have been fighting for land, food and liberation; those struggles are still continuing. The party has never discussed the lessons of these struggles.

Last year, the Naxalbari peasants have started the struggle for land; it is closely related to their liberation from landlord oppression. The Naxalbari peasant struggle showed the proper way for the people who were waiting for an alternative path of struggle. It was the minimum duty of the communists to support this struggle through all possible means; we should try our utmost to advance that struggle.

But the neo-revisionist leadership of the PB has betrayed that struggle. It stabbed the struggle of the sons of peasants in the back, by describing the whole struggle as a struggle for disruption. It tried its utmost to isolate that struggle from the other democratic movements in the country with falsehoods and lies.

The PB stooped to the low level of supporting the repressive measures of both central and provincial governments against that movements. The neo-revisionist leadership of the PB was a party to the repressive measures that the Bengal provincial government adopted against that struggle.

Today it is taking the same disruptive methods towards the movements of Srikakulam and Telangana. The people of these areas are fighting for land and food. The Andhra provincial government is suppressing that movement. Police, landlords and goondas are unitedly and viciously attacking the people, and the party cadres; in false hundred are being arrested; thousands are being involved cases; they are burning villages one by one; party cadres are being subjected to inhuman torture, women are being raped; party cadres are being murdered.

How are we to defend the movement in these areas? How are we to resist these inhuman raids? How are we to extend this movements? This is the serious problem that the party in Andhra facing. What is the solution that the neo-revisionist leadership of the PB to this movement? Satyagraha, demonstration, petitions-this is thier solution to stop these raids.

The PB leadership is viciously attacking all those who want to organise resistance to these repressive measures in defence of the movement. They are publicly declaring in the press that all such attempts are nothing but a call for an immediate armed revolt. But everybody knows that this is a lie. The PB leadership itself is supplying the political arguments in justification of government repression.



Not only that, they are belittling the Srikakulam and Telangana movements which are the strongest bases for the party movement in Andhra, they say that we 'pick out stray, scattered and tiny islands of militant peasant and tribal peoples struggles in the vast ocean of our country's peasantry' (*PB open letter*, pp.27)

Our is a vast country with uneven development: peoples movements are also developing unevenly. In these conditions, in today's economic and political crisis, militant struggles are bound to break in various parts of the country. The communist party must boldly lead those struggles; we must resist the repressive measures against those movements; we must develop the anti-landlord struggles in other parts, that we must coordinate all these struggles and according to a plan, develop these struggles towards a peoples war.

But this is not the line of the neo-revisionist leadership of the PB. It says that revolutionary conditions have not yet matured; that party organisations are weak; that we are not yet in a position to beat back repression: with those arguments the neo-revisionist PB leadership refuses to lead these struggles and thus weakens them.

They are counter-posing the resistance movement to that of the party and mass organisations.

But in all backward countries, the mass movements, after reaching a particular stage, have to face severe repression from the government. After this stage has been reached, the peoples movements could make further advance only by beating back the repressive measures, only by combining the mass movements with armed struggle. The neo-revisionist leadership refuses to recognise this hard truth.

### **Naked Parliamentary Path:**

Why is the neo-revisionist leadership of the PB opposed to the tactics of peoples war? Why is it falsely swearing by the 1951 tactical programme? Why is it opposed to any resistance programme to any militant struggle?

The basic reason is that the neo-revisionist PB leadership has taken to a complete parliamentary path.

It has given up the aim of achieving peoples democratic revolution and instead has adopted the aim of establishing non-congress government.

At one time, all the exploiting classes were behind the congress. Today anti-congress sentiment is growing among the masses. Because of this, the exploiting classes themselves are coming forward in the garb of opposition.

They want to mobilise the anti-congress sentiment of masses behind themselves, win power for themselves and thus save their exploitation. It is with this aim that the swatantra party, Bangla congress, Bharatiya Krantidal, DMK, Muslim League etc. are born.

Now the revisionist leadership of the PB wants to build united front with these bourgeois parties. It wants to establish non-congress governments in the provinces in partnership with these parties. It wants to establish a non-government at the centre. Thus, It says, it wants to break the monopoly power of the congress and thus to think if achieving peoples democratic revolution. This is the "revolutionary" line that they are following today.

Partnership in the non-congress government with the bourgeois parties not will basically change class exploitation. Such a change has not come. Still the neo revisionist leadership of the PB loudly claims that it has broken the monopoly power of the congress.

It is sheer deception of the masses to say that today's non-congress governments are breaking the monopoly power of the congress when the whole power at the centre is still in the hands of the congress, when the President, Governors and the military are still in the hands of the congress.

Communist must have the basic aim of developing the anti-congress sentiments of the masses into class consciousness and of leading the anti-congress masses towards class struggles.

Having united front with bourgeois parties for elections in the name of votes and seats is nothing but creating illusions among the masses about bourgeois parties. This is nothing but renunciation of the theory of class struggle and adopting a class collaboration policy.

Participation in ministries without real power along with bourgeois parties is nothing but creating illusions among the people about the parliamentary path.

The neo-revisionist leadership of the PB is following exactly the same path. United front with bourgeois parties in elections; participation in ministries without real power in partnership with bourgeois parties-this will only create illusions among the masses that they could achieve their liberation without class struggles, without revolution. This is a betrayal of the revolutionary movement.

The neo-revisionist leadership of the PB has taken to a complete parliamentary path. This is why it is opposed to peoples war, to the resistance movement against landlord goonda attacks. It has renounced all mass struggles in order to save its ministries. That is why it is preaching that the rural poor and the peasants could not advance in the face of armed might of the reactionary forces.

#### **United Front with CPSU Revisionist Leadership:**

After the Second world war, after the victory of the Chinese revolution, when the revolutionary forces were advancing throughout the world like a hurricane, revisionism raised its head to destroy the revolutionary movements. Soviet Union has become the centre of modern revisionism and CPSU has become its leader.

The policies of modern revisionism, led by CPSU leadership, adopted in the name of new epoch towards world contradictions, transition to socialism, war and peace; building up of communism in Soviet Union, the dictatorship of the proletariat in the soviet Union, have betrayed the world revolutionary movement. It is joining hands with the reactionaries of various countries to suppress revolutionary movements; it has weakened the world revolutionary movements; it has opposed and obstructed the revolutionary struggles of the Vietnamese people; it has disrupted the unity of the socialist camp and the world communist movement; it has joined hands with American imperialists and reactionaries throughout the world to build an anti-China axis; it has joined hands with US imperialists for world domination; it is weakening socialism in the USSR and is trying to restore capitalism in the USSR.

In short, the essence of the policies of the CPSU revisionist leadership is preservation of capitalism in the capitalist countries and restoration of capitalism in the socialist countries.

Today the revisionist leadership of the CPSU is acting as a counter-revolutionary force, as an agent and friend of imperialism inside the socialist camp and the world communist movement. It is a class enemy of the working class.

But the neo-revisionist leadership of the PB while pretending to be criticising the policies of the CPSU leadership as revisionist, refuses to see the counter-revolutionary nature of the CPSU revisionist leadership, refuses to see that the CPSU leadership is acting as an agent and friend of imperialism inside the socialist camp and world communist movement. The PB is saying that such a characterisation is against the very character of the New epoch.

Not only that the neo-revisionist leadership of the PB has declared that the CPSU revisionist leadership is not collaborating with American imperialism for world domination. It appears, according to PB, that the CPSU leadership is collaborating with American imperialism because it thinks that friendship with US is a greater guarantee for the world peace than friendship with China. Can there be a greater deception than this?

Revisionism is a child of capitalism. But, the PB claims that social conditions of a capitalist nature in the Soviet Union are not the basis for revisionism in the Soviet Union, that the soviet revisionism does not have capitalist nature, that new capitalistic elements are not growing inside the Soviet Union, that the CPSU revisionist leadership does not represent the new capitalistic elements, but on the other hand represent the whole soviet people. Thus the neo-revisionist leadership of the PB is revising the basic lessons of Lenin on revisionism.

The neo-revisionist leadership of the PB in its open letter to the Andhra comrades has gone one step further from the resolution of the Burdwan plenum. In the open letter to the Andhra comrades, it has declared USA and USSR are not trying to build an anti-China axis but everybody could see that both America and Russia are developing their relations with the reactionary government of India, Japan and Indonesia against China. While American imperialism has established war bases to the south of China, the USSR is building such bases to the north of China. Both USA and USSR have concluded number of nuclear agreements against China. Everybody could see that both USA and USSR are united in a conspiracy to isolate China economically, politically and militarily. The neo-revisionist leadership of the PB refuses to see even this fact. This only shows the degeneration of the neo-revisionist leadership of the PB in its anti-China hatred.

They are even propagating the view that even parties with revisionist leadership should be recognised as communist parties. If so why not the Dange party a communist party? Then why did we separate ourselves from the Dange party?

The meaning of all these arguments is only one. The criticism of the neo-revisionist leadership of the PB against the CPSU revisionist leadership is only a pretence. In practice, it is following exactly the policies of the CPSU revisionist

leadership. All the efforts of the PB leadership are directed towards building a united front with the CPSU leadership.

### **Enmity towards the Chinese Communist Party:**

The neo-revisionist leadership of the central committee, which is striving its best to build united front with the CPSU leadership, has naturally developed enmity towards the Chinese communist party.

Within the socialist camp with 100 crores of population China has alone got 70 crores of population. Today Peoples Republic of China is in the forefront of the struggle against American imperialism; it is helping the national liberation movements to the best of its capacity. Peoples Republic of China and the Chinese communist party are in the forefront of the struggle against modern revisionism.

China is fighting for the completion of the socialist revolution through the great cultural revolution. The neo-revisionist leaders of the PB refuses to see this fact.

The Chinese communist party has developed Marxism-Leninism, applicable to the present-day world situation, in order to achieve the tasks of the new epoch. The Chinese communist party has developed Marxism-Leninism Mao's thought for the accomplishment of the tasks of new epoch-the complete destruction of world imperialism and winning world socialist revolution.

Marx and Engels developed their theories of scientific socialism in a period of growing industrial capitalism.

Lenin further developed Marxism as applicable to the period of imperialism.

Stalin developed Marxism-Leninism in building socialism in a single country encircled by capitalist states and in his struggle for creating mass communist parties throughout the world.

The thought of Mao is a further development of Marxism-Leninism applicable to the present era, when imperialism is fast disintegrating and the national liberation struggles have come to occupy a central place for completion of the world socialist revolution.

Peoples democracy, Peoples war, Completion of the Socialist revolution through the great cultural revolution, an irreconcilable ideological battle against modern revisionism -this is the quintessence of Mao's thought.

Already, present world history has amply proved that wherever the people have assimilated the experience of the Chinese revolution, and applied it to the concrete conditions of their countries, there the revolutionary movements have won complete victory or have made significant advances. And where ever the people have not assimilated the experiences of the Chinese revolution, there the revolutionary movements have failed to make any significant advance or even counter-revolution has succeeded.

The neo-revisionist PB leadership refuses to see this fact, refuses to accept Mao's thought.

The neo-revisionist PB leadership has replaced peoples democracy with non-congress democracy, agrarian revolution with the establishment non-congress

governments both at the centre and the provinces. It is belittling the great cultural revolution of the CPC. That is why they have refused to accept Mao's thought.

The neo-revisionist leadership of the PB wants to cover up these ugly truths. Under the pretence of praising the service of CPC to the cause of Marxism-Leninism, it tries to cover up its anti-China hatred.

But soon they have to come out in their true colours.

At Palakollu provincial plenum meeting the central committee leaders have to come out openly in their anti-China colours. They declared that while the CPSU leadership was revising Marxism-Leninism from the right, the Chinese communist party was revising Marxism-Leninism from the left. They declared that the CPC was following an anti-Marxist-Leninist policy in treating the CPSU as a friend of American imperialism, in refusing united action with CPSU leadership on the question of Vietnam and in its criticism of our own party.

The degradation of neo-revisionist PB leadership has reached such low levels as to say that CPC is responsible for the murder and torture of lakhs of communists in Indonesia. They have not stopped with that. The following are the certificates that the neo-revisionist PB leadership has bestowed on the CPC for its refusing united action with CPSU leadership in Vietnam.

- Anyone who opposes it under whatever pretext only aids the game of imperialism as the revisionism policies do.
- This is how a fake fight against revisionism works and coincides in action with it.
- This opposition to the very proposal of united action in relation to Vietnam, is disruptive of international unity.
- The utterly reactionary character of this line stands unmarked when it is realised that it obstructs and hinders the united action of the socialist camp for Vietnam.
- This is where departure from Marxism-Leninism leads.
- One who confuses ideological unity, unity between parties, with proposal for united action on a specific issue, has no right to be considered a Marxist-Leninist.
- Abandonment of this attempt is on par with the revisionist betrayal of Vietnam and our critics are guilty of it.
- The picture they present, the arguments they advance, the positions they take have nothing to do with Marxism-Leninism.
- Thus they dare not say openly that they really do not recognise the existence of socialist camp- a counter-revolutionary conclusion.

All these certificates have been taken from the articles of Peoples Democracy. It is the CPSU leadership that had given the call for united action in Vietnam. It is the CPC that has refused to accept this call. Even a fool could see that all these certificates of the neo-revisionist leadership of the PB really refer to the CPC.

That means, according to the PB leadership, CPC has no Marxism-Leninism, that it has taken to a counter-revolutionary ideology. This is their estimation of the

CPC. Thus they have joined the anti of their-China chorus of the reactionaries. This is the low level anti-China hatred; this is the measure of their degradation.

### **Dange Revisionism in New Form:**

Just as they have adopted the policies of the CPSU leadership on the international issues, neo-revisionist leadership of the PB has adopted the policies of the Dange group with regard to the internal issues.

Our country has become bankrupt because of the economic and political policies of the congress government. Our rupee is tied to the American dollar. Our exports and imports are dependent upon the wishes of the world bank and the US imperialists. Our budget and the five year plans are dependent upon the loans from world bank and US imperialism. Our industries depend on foreign supplies of machinery, spare parts, raw materials and technical know-how. Our military hardware is dependent on foreign imperialist supplies. Our rationing is dependent upon the food supplies from America. Today American domination is to be seen in every sphere of economic life. It is able to force the congress government to change its political policies according to the wishes of US imperialists. The foreign policy of the Congress government has become a part of the foreign policy of US imperialism.

Today our country is subjected more and more to the economic and political exploitation of US imperialism. The independence has become nominal. The country has become a neo-colonial country for American imperialism. Slavery to US imperialism has become real.

The Dange revisionists tied their best to cover up this reality. They praised the congress government that it achieved full independence for the country, that the country was advancing on independent lines.

Today the neo-revisionist PB leadership is seeing independence in the government of Indira Gandhi still to some extent, and that this has been possible because of the political power in the hands of the congress government, that it is wrong to speak of American slavery seeing only American domination over our economy. Is there any difference between the arguments of the Dange group and the neo-revisionist leadership of the PB? Is this not a new deception of the masses?

Due to the economic policies of the congress government the whole economic life of the country is in a great crisis.

Instead of seeing this reality the revisionists of the Dange group expected the congress government itself to achieve industrial revolution. Today the neo-revisionist PB leadership is seeing economic 'development' and industrial 'development' under the congress regime. (PB open letter to the Andhra comrades, pp. 16)

While the Dange revisionists expected the Congress government to build an independent economy and achieve industrial revolution through the economic aid of the Soviet Union, the neo-revisionist PB leadership is saying that the congress government is able to save the independence of the country to some extent through Soviet economic aid.

Not only that; they have begun to see the so-called “planned” industrial development with the ‘aid’ of both the socialist and imperialist states” (PB open letter pp. 9) This only means that the neo-revisionist PB leadership is dreaming of planned industrial development through the aid of American imperialist capital.

Because of American domination over the economic life of the country, the foreign policy of the government is subservient to the foreign policy of the US government; it is occupying a key place in the world strategy of US imperialists to suppress national liberation struggles and Anti-China conspiracies. The attitude of the Indian government towards North Vietnam, Cuba, Middle East clearly proves this. In the recent period, with the expected withdrawal of British imperialism from Asia, the Indian government, with the support US imperialism and Soviet Union, is aspiring to fulfil the part of the British imperialism in these parts. The recent tour of the Prime Minister in the South-eastern countries only confirms this. The neo-revisionist leadership of the PB wants to be blind to these developments.

The Dange revisionists praised the foreign policy of the congress government as a policy of full non-alignment, as an anti-imperialist foreign policy. The neo-revisionist leadership of the PB is loudly declaring that it is wrong to say that *“the non-alignment policy of the Indian government is given up for good, substituting it with a policy of total surrender and subservience to imperialists”* (PB open letter- pp 20)

While the Dange revisionists dreamt of achieving national democracy through an united front with ‘progressive’ congressmen and other ‘progressives’, the neo-revisionist PB leadership wants to achieve its revolution through an united front with congressmen who have come out of the congress or other bourgeois parties and establishing non-congress governments.

Instead of leading the anti-congress masses into class struggles, the neo-revisionist PB leaders are creating illusions among the masses about the bourgeois parties by its united front with bourgeois parties like the Bangla Congress.

While the party programme placed the aim of peoples democracy through an agrarian revolution, the neorevisionist PB leadership is working to achieve non-congress governments through its election fronts with bourgeois parties.

Hiding this fact, the neo-revisionist leadership of the PB is finding fault with the Dange revisionists for trying “to topple the central congress government” (PB Letter, p 24)

But the neo-revisionist leadership of the CC itself has placed this aim of establishing a non-congress government at the Centre. In the New Situation and party's tasks, the CC has declared:

*“It is this struggle of the democratic parties and groups in different legislatures and among the people, in parliament and in states with non-congress democratic governments that alone can pave the way for consolidating and widening the unity achieved by the democratic forces and open prospects of realising the slogan of non-congress democratic government at the centre”* (New Situation and Party's Tasks, p. 29)

Thus we see that the neo-revisionist leadership of the PB has copied the slogan of non-congress government at the centre from the Dange revisionists. Now in the open letter they pretend as though they are opposed to such an idea.

An analysis of the above facts clearly show that the fight of the neo-revisionist leadership of which the revisionism of the Dange group is merely a paper fight, while the truth is they have adopted all the policies if the Dange group with regard to the internal situation. That is why the Dange revisionists and the neo-revisionists could unite on every issue- one-congress governments, Naxalbari peasant struggle and anti-China campaign.

If the CPC criticises their policies, the neo-revisionists PB leadership condemns such a criticism as interference in the internal affairs of brother parties and tries to rouse national chauvanism against the CPC in the country.

If our party comrades question the correctness of such a policy, the neo-revisionist leadership of the PB decries that such comrades, having adopted the party programme are opposing the same because of the CPC criticism that they do not have independent thinking, that they are agents of the CPC.

But what is the truth? Even at the time of Calcutta Congress, when the party programme was being adopted, the Naxalbari comrades put forth many amendments on the subjects mentioned above.

In the Andhra party conference at that time, an amendment was carried which declared that the foreign policy of the Indian government was a fake non-alignment policy, that its foreign policy was subservient to that of US imperialism; but it was defeated at the Calcutta congress.

An amendment to the party programme, demanding self determination to the nationalities was proposed before the party congress. But the leadership prevailed on the Congress to post-pone admission on the subject.

Some of the Guntur comrades brought an amendment to the party programme in the district and provincial conferences that "it was wrong to fight that section of the bourgeois which was not tied to the imperialism and feudalism" that such a step "will interlink democratic stage of the revolution with that of the socialist revolution".

Even in 1964, at the time of Tenali convention, comrades pointed out that it was wrong to decide the party programme without deciding our stand on the international ideological debate.

In 1965, during our detentions in jails, there were very serious discussions about the anti-China attitude of the CC leaders. There were serious discussions with the PB leaders face to face.

Thus we see that even at the time of Calcutta congress, many comrades raised objections to certain aspects of the party programme.

At that time, each comrades raised a point of discussions based on his own experience. Now when the experienced CPC is criticising our party programme and policy on a clear cut ideological basis comrades are opposing the neo-revisionist theories and policies with self-confidence.



It is for this that the neo-revisionist PB leadership is accusing us as Chinese agents, that we have mortgaged our brains to China. They have stooped to the low level of telling lies when they say that none opposed its programme previously.

### **What does All This Show?**

The claim of the neo-revisionist PB leadership that it is fighting against the revisionist policies of the CPSU leadership and the adventurist and dogmatic policies of the CPC at the same time, is a false claim.

This middle course is merely a myth. It is only a cover for their neo-revisionist line:

- United front with the CPSU revisionist leadership and enmity towards CPC;
- United front with the Dange revisionists and enmity towards Marxists-Leninists; love for parliamentary path and opposition to militant struggles;
- This is the meaning of the PB's letter to the Andhra comrades. This is the naked neo-revisionist line.

It is the duty of every communist to expose this neo-revisionist line before the people and the party members. It is the duty of all to carry on an irreconcilable, ideological, political and organisational battle against this neo-revisionist line.

The central committee leadership is spreading lies and adopting dictatorial methods against these comrades who have opposed its neo-revisionist line. They are denouncing us throughout India saying that we are going against the seventh congress decisions and the party constitution.

Who has gone against the decisions of the Seventh congress? The party congress had asked the CC to organise ideological discussions in the dispassionate atmosphere. The party congress had asked the members to enrich Marxism-Leninism to the end their own experience. It is the central committee that has really gone against the decisions of the seventh congress, as proved by the following facts:

Even before the party has taken decision the ideological issue, as against the decision of the seventh congress, the PB leaders and the CC have carried a right opportunist anti-China line.

In 1965, during Indo-Pak dispute, the PB leaders, both inside and outside jails, have carried on an anti-China campaign, against the spirit of proletarian internationalism leading to serious inner-party disputes.

The General Secretary of the party, while in Moscow, having come to an agreement with the CPSU revisionist leadership on national and international issues, wrote letters from Moscow, which got publicity in the press.

One PB member wrote to Nanda, in contradiction to the party programme, saying that our programme does not differ from that of Dange revisionists on peaceful transition (M. B. letter).

In the course of internal discussion the leadership utilised the party press against those comrades who opposed its opportunist line.

In 'New situation and party's tasks', the CC leadership tried to cover up the betrayal of the CPSU revisionist leadership on the dependency of the Indian government raising a serious discussion inside the party.

Having started such internal disputes inside the party, even before the ideological discussions started inside the party, the CC leadership expelled the Naxalbari comrades who are leading the peasant struggle, disrupting the party and rousing passions in the party.

in contradiction to the rights of the party members conferred by the party congress, the CC leadership declared the Madurai ideological draft as a policy statement; refused to distribute the alternative draft to the party ranks, put certain restrictions on free and full discussions on the ideological draft.

All these facts clearly show that it is the PB and CC who violated democratic centralism inside the party, who went against the decisions of the Seventh congress.

Who went against the Party Constitution?

According to the constitution, every party member, whatever may be his position inside the party, should abide by party discipline (clause 19 (4)). The CC must represent the whole party (clause 16 (14)).

The CC did not discharge its tasks towards the decisions of the party congress, behaved in a sectariat way, did not control the activities of the PB. In the end, the PB itself has acted against the decisions of the party congress.

In the name of majority for the so-called official line, the PB nominated its followers to the provincial secretariat and the provincial committee.

In spite of this nomination, when the PC by one vote majority decided to include the issue of Srikakulam and Nalgonda mass movements, the PB members who have lost confidence in internal democracy of the party have got a ruling from the president, its follower, keeping this to the end.

Two PB members took that whole authority into their own hands to expel four secretariat members including a CC member.

The CC leadership have gone against the party constitution itself : they have reduced communist committees into bourgeois organisations. Now their efforts to spread the lie that we have gone against the party constitution is only a part of their disruptive neo-revisionist line. Having refused to decide the ideological issue democratically through a party congress, they can only take to disruption.

### **Disruption by the Neo-revisionist Leadership :**

While we were all uniting and gathering strength with the help of international literature, to fight modern revisionism, to fight against the Dange group, its anti-proletarian internationalism, the present CC leadership pretended to be supporting us. At that time we did not see through the disruption game of this leadership in making the Dange letters the main point of discussion, in post-poning the discussion on the ideological issue, in pursuing for the party programme in the name of fighting Dange group; we could not see that it was a planned disruption. We could see the conspiracy of this leadership when it declares in the Burdwan resolution that the party congress has decided its Marxism-Leninism through the party programme,

and that they are only projecting that experience of the international experience to the international issues. As its neo-revisionist policy is exposed, the CC leadership has resorted to disciplinary actions and party disruption. They have no need to look back on their activities. They are disrupting the party in province after province. Having renounced the aims of the Seventh congress, and now they are calling for the Eighth party congress.

A party congress without communist revolutionaries in the various provinces it will only be a congress of the neo-revisionist group.

We should have no illusions about this neo-revisionist leadership. Let all the communist revolutionaries concentrate on the following immediate tasks:

- We should propagate Mao's thought, Marxism-Leninism of the present era, against modern revisionism.
- We should defend our mass movements against all inhuman repression: we must struggle to expand those movements.
- Organise and lead class struggle of the exploited classes of the countryside against landlord exploitation.
- Organise the trade union movement on revolutionary lines.
- We should organise student and youth organisations so as to attract large number of youth and students towards scientific socialism.
- We must build a strong and disciplined communist party through struggles, based on Marxism-Leninism. This is our aim. We earnestly hope that every party member will participate in this struggle. Let us all together march forward.

With revolutionary greetings

1968

**Tarimela Nagi Reddy**  
**Devulapalli Venkateswara Rao**  
**Kolla Venkayya**  
**Chandra Pulla Reddy**



# **Resolutions of the Naxalbari -O- Krishak Sangram Sahayak Committee**

## **Defend and Protect Naxalbari and Peasant Struggle**

*[Resolution on Naxalbari and recent peasant struggle adopted in a mass meeting on 14 th June 1967 at Rammohan Library, Calcutta.]*

This gathering of various Trade Unions, Student organisations, intellectuals and citizen of Calcutta express its deep shock and anger against the firing on the peasants of Naxalbari in North Bengal by the regime of West Bengal united front government. As per the report published in today's news papers the touring Minister has given the police the full authority to open fire on peasants in Naxalbari, Kharibari and Fanshideva. The meeting has taken serious notice of this news. If there is any truth in it we condemn it in strongest terms. This meeting opposes such decision on the part of the government and request the government to think of its consequences. Such activities under the regime of United Front Govt. will give the impression among the people as an act of reactionary government. Therefore this meeting request the U.F.Govt. to take serious note of this issue. The toiling peasants of Naxalbari had waged the struggle against illegal eviction from their land and are continuing their struggle against combined forces of landlord, reactionary forces and police forces to protect their own rights. The fall of Congress govt. and installation of L.F. government has become possible in West Bengal because of the promise made by the left parties to give the rights to the tillers of land and stop the eviction from their lands. Without such promise the base of congress in rural areas would not have been broken. Therefore any retreat from or action against this promise will definitely create an adverse reaction in the minds of the peasantry about the present govt. This meeting appeals to the U.F. Government to be conscious about this and demands to immediately fulfill the demands of the peasants of Naxalbari. The meeting further asks the Govt. not to repeat such incident of heinous firing on the peasants of Naxalbari.

The peasant movement of Naxalbari is not an isolated incident. This is nothing but an expression of peasant unrest. Recently the peasantry of Canning in 24 Paraganas has started the struggle against the eviction from the water body by the big landlords. Without radical land reforms such peasant unrest can not be stopped

and without distribution of land to tillers the present food crisis can not be resolved. The meeting also observes that concerted attempts are being made to project this struggle of Naxalbari as local isolated unrest and villify this movement as left anarchist, terrorist act of a handful of peasantry. Such propaganda is only an attempt to confuse the general masses. This meeting strongly feels that such attempts will only encourage the reactionary forces and hamper peasant agrarian movement.

This meeting appeals to all democratic forces to be conscious against such attitude and activities.

The meeting feels that peasant struggles of Naxalbari and Canning are a part of incomplete people's democratic revolution and a continuation of struggle for radical land reforms programme.

Therefore the working class, students and toiling masses are expressing their urge with all responsibility to stand by this struggle. Hence this mass meeting appeals with deep feeling to all sections of working class, students, intellectuals and citizens to create a mass opinion in support of this movement and to take proper organisational steps to protect, to create broad mass opinion and to initiate supporting organisation.

This meeting puts forward the following demands.

1. Withdraw the power of police to open fire in Naxalbari.
  2. Withdraw arrest warrants issued against peasant activists.
  3. Release all peasants and its activists.
  4. Declare the compensation for peasants who were killed.
  5. Ensure the rights of the peasants and return their land in Naxalbari & Canning.
  6. Rely on the agricultural workers, and poor peasants instead of bureaucracy and police and ensure the land distribution to tillers through peasant organisation.
- Finally, the meeting extends its full support to above mentioned peasant movement.

This meeting announces the formation of "*Naxalbari O Krishak Sangram Sahayak Committee*" in order to help and protect the Naxalbari peasant movement. This committee will undertake the task of organising propaganda in support of the Naxalbari.

206, Cornawalish Street  
Calcutta - 6

**Naxalbari -O -Krishak  
Sangram Sahayak Committee**



## **Resolution adopted by Naxalbari -O -Krishak Sangram Sahayak Committee at West Bengal Food Convention held at Rammohan Library on 2nd Sept. 67.**

### **On Food Crisis**

Food crisis in West Bengal has reached to a dangerously acute stage. Situation in rural area is more acute and it is impossible to collect food there. Rationing system has become ineffective and a laughing stock. W.Bengal is approaching famine. This crisis is nothing but a reflection of economic system and the policy of ruling class has resulted in food crisis. It is increasing day by day. The main reason behind this crisis is, in fact, inability to change the existing land relations and distribute land to the tillers; not being able to abolish imperialist economic domination over the Indian economy; allowing feudalism to exist, and, on the whole, not initiating total industrialisation programme. It is impossible for the present Government to change the basic system.

The United Front Govt. is following the same old path of Congress on food policy and govt. failed to implement their commitments. In reality, it is observed that by opposing Naxalbari peasant movement the U.F. govt. opposed the programme of land distribution to the tillers and thereby acted like a reactionary Government. On food procurement policy, U.F. had adopted the policy of appealing to the land lords for their kind help, rely on the police and begging the Central Govt. and its P.M. By adopting such a policy they actually insulted the people. This convention is condemning the food policy of the U.F. Govt. and put forward the following demands:

- 1) Land should be distributed immediately to the peasants.
- 2) Take firm steps with the support of people to procure the food from the grain storage of land lords and black marketeers instead of relying on the administration and police forces.
- 3) initiate full rationing system
- 4) take over the food grain business into the hands of Govt.

Convention expresses its strong opinion that we should not remain silent after putting forward the demands. People should take the initiative for their survival. Therefore the Convention is placing the following programme of action before the people:

- 1) Immediately form the peasant committees in rural areas for initiating and extending the peasant struggle in rural areas.

2) Form volunteer force among the people and seize the food grains from the land lords and distribute them among the people.

3) take possession of harvest of crop and distribute it through peasant committees in a disciplined way.

4) Excess food grain be collected by the government only through peasant committees.

5) Prepare working class for food movement.

6) Create pressure and organise 'Gherao' of Govt. food Depots.

7) organise broad movement on the demand of food and create wide range of mass movement on the issue of food every where.

Convention appeals the people to take bold steps to organise the movement on the basis of above programme of action

**NAXALBARI - O- KRISHAK  
SANGRAM SAHAYAK COMMITTEE**

( Note: Late Com Promode Sengupta was the President of the NOKSSC. )



# **EIGHT DOCUMENTS OF CHARU MAJUMDAR (1965-67)**

## **Document One**

### **Our Tasks in the Present Situation**

**28th January, 1965**

The Congress government has arrested one thousand communists during the last one month. Most of the Central and Provincial leadership are in jail today. Gulzarilal Nanda has announced that he will not accept the verdict of the electorate (and he has not), and he has started telling absurd stories about guerrilla warfare. This offensive against democracy has begun because of the internal and international crisis of capitalism. The Indian government has gradually become the chief political partner in the expansion of American imperialism's hegemony of the world. The main aim of American imperialism is to establish India as the chief reactionary base in South-East Asia.

The Indian bourgeoisie is unable to find any way to solve its internal crisis. The perennial food crisis, its ever increasing price level, are creating obstacles for the Five-Year Plan, and as a result of this, there is no other way for the Indian bourgeoisie to come out from this crisis excepting importing more and more Anglo-American imperialist capital. As a result of this dependence on imperialism, the internal crisis of capitalism is bound to increase day by day. The Indian bourgeoisie has not been able to find out any other way except killing democracy, faced with the instructions of American imperialism and its own internal crisis. There were imperialist instructions behind these arrests, since the American police chief 'Macbright' was in Delhi during the arrest of the communists, and the widespread arrests took place only after discussions with him. By killing democracy there can be no solution of this crisis, and the Indian bourgeoisie also will not be able to solve this crisis. The more the Government will be dependent on imperialism, the more it will fail to solve its internal crisis. With every passing day, the people's discontent will increase, and with every passing day, the internal conflict of the bourgeoisie is bound to increase.

Imperialist capital demands the arrest of communists as a precondition before investing; so also it wants a temporary solution of the food problem. To solve this food crisis, some steps to stop trade and profiteering in food are necessary, and it



is for this that control is necessary. In a country of backward economy like India, this control invariably faces opposition from a large section. This conflict of the bourgeoisie is not mainly a conflict between monopoly capitalists and the national bourgeoisie. This conflict is mainly between the trading community and the monopoly industrialists. In a country of backward economy, trade in foodstuff and essential commodities is inevitable for the creation of capital, and control creates obstacles in the reation of this capital, and as a result of that, internal conflict takes the form of internal crisis. India is a vast country. It is not possible to rule the 450 million people of this country by following a policy of repression. It is not possible for any imperialist country to take such a big responsibility. American imperialism is writhing in death pangs, in keeping its commitment to those countries of the world which it has assured of giving aid. Meanwhile, an industrial crisis has developed in America. It can be seen from President Johnson's utterence itself that the number of unemployed is increasing in the country. According to the official statement, four million people are absolutely unemployed; 35 million people are semi-unemployed and in factories also semi-unemployment is continuing. So the Indian Government will fail to supress the ever-increasing discontent of the people. This attack on democracy will inevitably transform the people's discontent into struggles. Some indication of the shape of the protest movement of tomorrow is available from the language movement of Madras. So, the coming era is not merely an era of big struggles, but also an era of big victories. The Communist party therefore will have to take the responsibility of leading the people's revolutionary struggles in the coming era, and we shall be able to carry out the responsibility successfully only when we are able to build up the party organization as a revolutionary organisation.

What is the main basis for building up a revolutionary organisation? Comrade Stalin has said: "The main basis for building up a revolutionary organisation is the revlutionary cadre." Who is a revolutionary cadre? A revolutionary cadre is he who can analyse the situation at his own initiative and can adopt policies according to that. He does not wait for anyone's help.

### **Our Organisational Slogans**

1. Every party member must form at least one Activist Group of five. He will educate the cadres of this Activist Group in political education.
2. Every party member must see to it that no one from this group is exposed to the police.
3. There should be an underground place for meetings of every Activist Group. If necessary, shel tters for keeping one or two underground will have to be arranged.
4. Every Activist Group must have a definite person for contacts.
5. A place should be arranged for hiding secret documents.
6. A member of the Activist Group should be made a member of the Party as soon as he becomes an expert in political education and work.
7. After he becomes a Party member, the Activist Group must not have any contact with him.

This organisational style should be firmly adhered to. This organisation itself will take up the responsibility of revolutionary organisation in the future.

### **What will be the Political Education?**

The main basis of the Indian Revolution is agrarian revolution. So, the main slogan of the political propaganda campaign will be -make successful the agrarian revolution. The extent to which we are able to propagate the programme of agrarian revolution among the workers and the petty-bourgeoisie and educate them in it, to that extent they will be educated in political education. Every Activist Group, should discuss the class analysis among the peasantry, the propaganda of the programme of agrarian revolution.

## **LONG LIVE THE REVOLUTION**

### **Document Two**

## **Make the People's Democratic Revolution Successful by Fighting Against Revisionism**

As Revisionist thinking nestled in the Indian party for a long time, we could not build up a correct revolutionary party. Our primary task today is to build up a correct revolutionary party fighting uncompromisingly against this revisionist thinking.

(1) The first among revisionist thoughts is to regard '*Krishak Sabha*' (peasants' organisation) and trade unions as the only Party activity. Party comrades often confuse the work of peasants' organisation and trade union with the political work of the Party. They do not realize that the political tasks of the Party cannot be carried out through the peasants' organisation and trade union. But it should be remembered at same time that the trade union and the peasants' organisation are one of the many weapons for serving our purpose. On the otherhand, to regard peasants' organisation and trade union work as the only work of the Party, can only mean plunging the Party in the mire of economism. The proletarian revolution cannot be made successful without an uncompromising struggle against this economism. This is the lesson that com Lenin has given us.

(2) Some comrades think and are still thinking today that our political task ends with the launching of a few movements on demands, and they regard a single victory through these movements as a political victory of the Party. Not only that, these comrades seek to confine the responsibility of carrying out the political tasks of the Party within the limits of these movements only. But we, the true Marxists know that carrying out the Party's political responsibility means that the final aim of all propaganda, all movements and all organisations of the party is to establish firmly the political power of the proletariat. It should be remembered always that if the words "Seizure of Political Power" are left out, the Party no longer remains a revolutionary Party. Although it will remain a revolutionary Party in name then, it will be actually reduced to a reformist party of the bourgeoisie.

When speaking of seizure of political power, some mean the Centre. They think that with the gradual expansion of the limits of the movement, our only aim

will be to capture power centrally. This thinking is not only wrong; this thinking destroys the correct revolutionary thinking within the party and reduces it to a reformist party. At the World Trade Union Congress in 1953; the well-tested and well-established Marxist leader of China, member of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of China, asserted firmly that in the coming days the tactics and strategy of the unfinished revolution of Asia, Africa and Latin America will follow the footsteps of China. In other words, the strategy and tactics of these struggles will be area-wise seizure of power. It was not only that comrade and member of the Central Committee of the Chinese Party, but Com Lenin also mentioned area-wise seizure of power in his writings. Above all, the working class in Russia gave a concrete proof of Lenin's conclusion when they kept the town of Kronstad under seizure for three days. In the era of socialism, all the elements of area-wise seizure of power are present in our frame work.

A burning instance of the fact that this is possible is the Naga rebellion. The main condition of this area-wise seizure of power is weapons in the hands of the revolutionary forces. To think of seizing power without arms, is nothing but an idle dream. Our Party has a very long history of struggles. We gave the leadership to the peasants' and workers' movements in the extensive country side of North Bengal. Naturally, we shall have to examine and analyse the movements of the past and draw lessons from them and we shall have to move forward anew in the present revolutionary era.

### **Analysis of the concrete events and experiences of the Tebhaga Movement in 1946 and 1947**

The participant peasants in this movement numbered about six million. It should be remembered that in the entire peasant movement this was a golden era. In the massiveness of the movement, in the intensity of emotions, in the expression of class hatred, this movement was the highest stage of class struggle. To help understand that stage, I am citing a few moving instances of that movement.

#### **A day's event:-**

I was then living underground in the interest of the movement. I have personally witnessed the tide of the revolutionary movement. I have seen how a single little note made a man ten miles away come, running like a mad man. On the other hand, I have also seen standing beside the husband, a newly wed young Muslim woman who was subjected to demoniac, barbarous assault by the class enemy. I have heard the pathetic appeal of that unarmed husband- Comrade, can't you take revenge? The very next moment, I have seen the intense hatred of the exploited against the exploiter, have seen that awful spectacle of killing a living man in cold blood by twisting his throat.

Comrades, the above mentioned incidents demand from us some analysis.

Frist, what was the historical reason as a result of which this massive form of that movement in those days could create intense hatred against the class enemy?

Secondly, what again were the causes which turned that vast movement into a failure?

First, it was the slogan of seizure of political power that created the massive form of that movement of those days, created the intense hatred against the class enemy. On the opposite side, it was this slogan that made the class enemy adopt his class role. It is the expression of this that we find in the barbaric rape of the young peasant woman and the beastly violent attack to smash the movement. On the other hand the peasants also did not hesitate to attack the class enemy. This raises the question; Why couldn't power be seized even after this? It couldn't be seized for one reason only- it was because the fighting people of those days looked to the centre for arms; we then lost faith in the path indicated by Lenin. We hesitated in those days to accept that bold declaration of Lenin to carry forward the revolution by collecting arms locally and seizing power area-wise. As a result, the unarmed peasants could not stand up and resist in the face of arms. Even those who fought defying death had also to retreat finally. The lesson that has to be drawn from the mistakes of those days is that the responsibility of collecting arms lies with the local organisation, not with the centre. So the question of collecting arms will have to be put up before every Activist Group from now on. 'Dao', knives, sticks- all these are weapons, and with their help at opportune moments, firearms will have to be snatched. The events described above are manifestations of revisionist thinking in its theoretical aspect. Now, from the organizational point of view, those mistakes will have to be found out which were hurdles in the way of a correct leadership of the vast movements of those days, so that they may not find a nest afresh in the revolutionary Party. To smash all those mistakes in the Party, the Party will today first have to establish its leadership over the mass organisations. For, a review of the history of the party over a long period would reveal that as a result of the revisionist thinking of regarding leaders of trade unions and peasant organisations (krishak sabha) as the real representatives of the people, the party was reduced to a party of a few individuals. Because of this thinking, the party's political activities became inert, and the proletariat also became deprived of a correct revolutionary leadership. All movements became confined within the bonds of movements on demands. As a result Party members became enthusiastic over a single victory and despondent over a single defeat. Secondly, as a result of overestimating the importance of this organisation, another type of localism is born. Comrades think that the party will suffer a serious loss if any comrade is shifted from his area and they take this as a loss to personal leadership. From this localism another type of opportunism develops. Comrades think that their area is the most revolutionary; naturally nothing should be done here so that there is police persecution. Because of this viewpoint they do not analyse the political situation of the entire country. As a result, commandism develops and organisational and daily propaganda work suffers. As a result, when there is a call for a struggle, they assert that they will not do any small work and commit adventurism. Naturally the question arises- what are the methods which help to get out of these deviations? What are those Marxist directives which become essential tasks for building up a revolutionary party?

First, all works of organisation of the future will have to be done as complementary to the party. In other words, the mass organisations will have to be used as a part of serving one main purpose of the Party. For this reason, naturally, Party leadership will have to be established over the organisations.

Secondly, immediately from now the entire effort of the Party will have to be spent on recruiting newer and newer cadres and on forming countless Activist Groups consisting of them. It should be remembered that in the coming era of struggles, the masses will have to be educated through the illegal machinery. So every Party member from now on will have to be made habituated to illegal work. To get used to illegal work, it is an essential task for every Activist Group to paste illegal posters. It is only through this process that they will be able to act as the bold core in leading struggles in the era of struggles. Otherwise, the revolution will be reduced to a petty bourgeois idle dream.

Thirdly, it is through these active organisations that the Party will be able to establish its leadership over the mass organisations. So from now on we shall have to help the members of the Activist Groups so that they can fearlessly criticize the leaders of the mass organisations, and their work.

Fourthly, the work of the mass organisations will have to be discussed and decided upon in the party before it is implemented in the mass organisations. It should be remembered here that the policies of the mass organisations have been wrongly practised so long in the Party. To hold discussions on Party decisions is not called democratic centralism. This thinking is not in accordance with Marxism. And from all this thinking the conclusion has to be drawn that the Party's programme will be adopted from below. But if it is adopted from the lower level, then the correct Marxist way is not implemented; in all these activities there inevitably is bourgeois deviations. The Marxist truth of democratic centralism is that the Party directive coming from high leadership must be carried out. Because the Party's highest leader is he who has firmly established himself as a Marxist through a long period of movements and theoretical debates. We have the right to criticise Party decisions, but once a decision has been taken, if any one criticizes it without implementing it, or obstructs work, or hesitates to implement it, he will be guilty of the serious offence of violating Party discipline.

As a result of having this idea of Party democracy as that of a debating society, the road for espionage inside the Party is thrown open. Naturally, the revolutionary leadership of the Party then becomes bankrupt and the working class is deprived of a correct revolutionary leadership. This petty-bourgeois sort of thinking inside the Party leads the Party on to the verge of destruction. And this is the manifestation of petty-bourgeois thinking inside the Party. Their comfortable living and attitude of indisciplined criticism reduces the Party to a mere debating society. This thinking becomes a hurdle in the path of building up a Party of the proletariat -strong as iron.

Fifthly, the indisciplined life of the petty-bourgeoisie draws them towards indisciplined criticism; that is, they do not want to criticize within the limits of the organisation. To get rid of this deviation, we should remain conscious of the Marxist

viewpoint regarding criticism. The characteristics of Marxist criticism are: (1) Criticisms must be made within the Party Organisation, that is, at the Party meeting. (2) The aim of criticism should be constructive. That is, the aim of criticism is to advance the party from the point of view of principles and organisation, and we must always be vigilant that there is no unprincipled criticism within the Party.

Come, comrades, in the present revolutionary era, let us complete the People's Democratic Revolution by fighting uncompromisingly against revisionism.

LONG LIVE THE REVOLUTION

### **Document Three**

## **What is the Source of the Spontaneous Revolutionary Outburst in India**

9th April, 1965

Comrades,

Two events occurred in the world in the era after the second world war. As, on the one hand, the naked form of the defeat of the so called Fascist powers was exposed before the people, so also, on the other, the world socialist state system under the leadership of Comrade Stalin created confidence in the minds of the people. As a result, a spontaneous revolutionary outburst was witnessed throughout the entire world. Above all, the success of the Chinese revolution in 1949, without the war itself, brought about a new revolutionary high tide in the midst of this spontaneous outburst about which the Communist Party of India could never make a correct assessment. As a result the revolutionary change in the whole of Asia, Africa and Latin America brought about by this great revolution was never noticed by us. Hence, we failed to understand the significance of this bold revolutionary slogan, the clarion call of the 650 million revolutionary people- "See, we have on our own taken ourselves on to the path of socialism. No, even US imperialism failed to check the tremendous motion of our irresistible revolutionary current."

But the fighting people did not make the mistake. That revolutionary spark spread to Vietnam, Cuba, every country in the whole of Latin America.

The people of India responded to that call. We saw the expression of this in the spontaneous democratic revolution of 1949 which was dimmed by us in trying to confine it within the narrow bounds of socialist revolution. Not only that, there was an attempt to negate the significance of the entire Chinese Revolution by openly criticizing the source of this spontaneous movement, the great Chinese Revolution and its Great Leader Comrade Mao Tsetung. Above all, later on, it was as a consequence to the denial of this Chinese Revolution that the slogan was raised within the Party that the revolution will be achieved not through the Chinese path but only through a truly Indian path. And from here itself was born today's revisionism. It was because of that left sectarianism of those days that we were unable to guide that movement along the correct path.

But, no, Comrades! The tide of that revolutionary movement of 1949 could not be exhausted, because no imperialism could wipe off the Chinese Revolution, the Red Flag of hope of the city of Peking.

We saw again that ebbing movement turning into a huge tide in 1951 during the Korean war. It is a full blossoming of this that we saw in spontaneous meetings, processions, in greeting the counter attack made unitedly by China and Korea. It was the objective form of this that we witnessed in the great victory of the Communist Party in the 1951 election.

And it was the fighting form of this that we saw in the spontaneous erection of barricades by the fighting masses in 1953-54.

We could not understand. But the bourgeoisie could understand, could recognise the form of the fighting masses, could know its source. It realised that this great revolution could no longer be ignored, so to dupe the people it turned its face towards the socialist state, towards the great Chinese Revolution. That is why it participated in *Panch Sheel*, in the Bandung Conference.

Decadent imperialism also realised that it was not possible to carry on in the old method. So it took a new form, introduced a new method of exploitation by giving dollars as gift. Neo- colonialism began.

When imperialism and all the reactionaries of the world were groping for a way out, to save themselves, the revisionist policy of the traitor Krushchov in 1956 made its appearance before them with a light of new hope. The reactionary government of India found a way to create illusion about Krushchov's independent capitalist path. But the reactionary government knew that it was impractical, illusory. That is why the reactionary government of India's bourgeoisie entered into a secret pact with the U.S. imperialism in 1958.

That is why in 1959 as it launched an attack on democracy, on the one hand, by suspending the constitution of Kerala, so also it started, on the other hand, slandering against the source of the spontaneous movement, the great Chinese People's Republic. It provided shelter to Tibet's imperialist agent, Dalai Lama. But when in spite of this the people spontaneously started along the path of struggle, the bourgeoisie without any delay shot dead 80 people. Thus the last possibility of peaceful transition to socialism ended.

But, no, Comrades, even then the people did not stand still before the government's might. The spontaneous strike of 1960 spread all over India on a massive scale, because the light of Chinese Revolution, the container of a force hundred times, thousand times stronger than this force, is showing them the way. That is why, comrades, even without the Communist Party, the people started on the path of struggle.

When the fighting people of this spontaneous struggle, being defeated with arms, were thinking of still harder struggle, the slogan of alternative government of 1962 could not create revolutionary enthusiasm in their minds. Because they wanted a reply to the question- What will happen if the Kerala episode is repeated in Bengal? We could not give a correct answer to this question. We could not put forward this correct and bold slogan at that time- In the event of the Kerala episode

recurring in Bengal, it is armed struggle that would be the only way of overthrowing the government.

But the bourgeoisie did not make any mistake in noticing the image of the militant masses. That is why in 1962 the panic stricken Indian government attacked the source of the struggle of the fighting masses, it attacked the great Chinese Democracy. But two events occurred as a result of which the bourgeoisie itself dug its grave. First, because of the defeat of the armed forces of the bourgeoisie, the naked form of the weakness of this government became as clear as daylight before the fighting masses. The fighting masses found a new light of struggle. Secondly, because of the unilateral withdrawal of the Chinese troops from the Indian areas, the poisonous influence of perverted nationalism could not touch the peasants. The bourgeoisie became panic-stricken; it imprisoned the communists.

But it could not stop the spontaneous struggle. Work stopped in Bombay. The "*Dum*" *Dum Dawai* was started. To get out of this terrible situation, the bourgeoisie released the communists and tried to utilise their internal conflicts. But the notorious letter of Dange, the running dog of imperialism, spoiled their hope. A new revolutionary Party was formed, Krushchov fell from power, world revisionism received a terrific blow. The pillar, by depending on which the bourgeoisie had started attacks against China, began to shake in Viet Nam. The bourgeoisie saw the danger and found themselves, with their back to the wall, unable to make any retreat. So it attacked, imprisoned two thousand communists. But the fighting masses gave their verdict in Kerala, the government saw the outburst of spontaneous movement. It tore off the last mask of democracy.

But no, this spontaneous movement cannot be prevented even by imprisoning hundreds and thousands of communists and resorting to thousand ways of repression. Because the Chinese Revolution cannot be destroyed, No stormy wind can put off the light of that Revolution. The delirious bourgeoisie knows that, so it has started raving about its own weak spots. It is trembling, imagining an organisation being formed within the military. It has started seeing the ghost of Telengana.

Yes, Comrades, today we have to speak out courageously in a bold voice before the people that it is the area-wise seizure of power that is our path. We have to make the bourgeoisie tremble by striking hardest at its weakest spots. We have to speak out before the people in a bold voice- See, how poor, backward China, within sixteen years, has with the help of the socialist structure, made its economy strong and solid. On the other hand, we have to expose this traitorous government which has, within seventeen years, turned India into a playground of imperialist exploitation. It has converted the entire Indian people into a nation of beggars to the foreigners. Come, Comrades, let all toiling people unitedly prepare for armed struggle against this government under the leadership of the working class, on the basis of the programme of agrarian revolution. On the otherhand, let us lay the foundation of the New People's Democratic India by building liberated peasant areas through peasant revolts.



Let us together, shoulder-to-shoulder, roar:  
Long live the unity of the workers, peasants and the toiling masses!  
Long live the imminent armed struggle of India!

#### **Document Four**

### **Carry on the Struggle Against Modern Revisionism**

We shall have to carry on daily the struggle against revisionism, adopting the tactics of area-wise seizure of power. Certain revisionist ideas are firmly rooted inside the party. We shall have to carry on the struggle against them. We are discussing some questions here.

(1) The question that has assumed importance today in the struggle against revisionism is the complete support given by the Soviet leadership to the reactionary ruling class of India. They have announced that they will give India an aid of Rs. 600 crores during the Fourth Five Year Plan. The idea that Soviet aid is strengthening India's Independence is extremely wrong. For, there is no class analysis behind this. We shall have to place clearly before the people our views against this support. If support is given to the government of India which is following the path of co-operation with imperialism, and feudalism, it is the reactionary class which is strengthened. So Soviet aid is not strengthening the democratic movement of India, but is increasing the strength of the reactionary forces in co-operation with US-led imperialism and the Soviet. It is the Soviet-US. co-operation of modern revisionism that we are observing in India- a satanic association against the people's liberation struggles in the future. We are seeing from our experience in India that the dominance of the big monopolists exists on the production of the big industries that have grown in the public sector with Soviet aid. So the State will not be able to control the power of the monopolist employers through public sector industries, it is the monopolist employers who are controlling the production of the public sector industries. Our experience is the same in both the cases of steel and petroleum.

(2) The question that has become important to us to-day is bourgeois nationalism. This nationalism is extremely narrow and it is narrow nationalism that is today the biggest weapon of the ruling class. This weapon they are using not only in the case of China, but also on any question like Pakistan, etc. By raising the slogan of national unity and other slogans, they want to preserve the exploitation of monopoly capital. We should remember that the sense of unity of India has arisen as a result of anti-imperialist movement. As the Indian Government is carrying on compromising with imperialism, that sense of unity is being struck at its root. There is only one aim at the root of the slogan of unity given by the present ruling class, and that is unity for the exploitation by monopoly capital. So this slogan of unity is reactionary and Marxists must oppose this slogan. The slogan- "Kashmir is an inalienable part of India"- is given by the ruling class in the interest of plundering. No Marxist can support this slogan. It is an essential duty of the Marxists to accept the right of self-determination by every nationality.

On the questions of Kashmir, Nagas, etc., the Marxists should express their support in favour of the fighters. The consciousness of a new unity will come in the course of the very struggle against this government of India of imperialism, feudalism and big monopolists, and it is in the interest of the revolution that it will be necessary to keep India united then. That unity will be a firm unity. It is from this consciousness of nationality that there have been struggles in South India against the imposition of Hindi and 60 people have lost their lives in this year of '65. So if the significance of this struggle is belittled, the working class will isolate itself from the struggles of the broader masses. It is in the interest of the working class that the efforts for development of these nationalities should be supported.

(3) "Establishing class analysis in the peasants' movement". At the present stage of the revolution the entire peasantry is the ally of the working class, and this peasantry is the biggest force of the People's Democratic Revolution of India and it is by keeping this in mind, we shall have to march forward in the movement of the peasantry. But all peasants do not belong to the same class. There are mainly four classes among the peasants- rich, middle, poor and landless- and there is the rural artisan class. There are differences in their revolutionary consciousness and ability to work according to the conditions. So Marxists must always try to establish the leadership of the poor and landless peasants over the entire peasant movement. The mistake that is often made while analysing the class of the peasants is to determine it on the basis of the title deeds of land. This is a dangerous mistake. It has to be analysed on the basis of their earning and level of living. The peasant movement will become militant to the extent we establish the leadership of the poor and landless peasants over the entire peasant movement. It should be remembered that whatever fighting tactics is accepted on the basis of the support of the broad peasantry, it can never be in any sense adventurism.

It should be remembered that all these years, basing ourselves on the support of the non-peasantry we have looked for narrowness of the peasant movement, and whenever repression came we thought that there must have been some adventurism. It should be remembered that no movement of the peasants on basic demands will follow a peaceful path. For a class analysis of the peasant organisation and to establish the leadership of the poor and landless peasants, the peasantry should be told in clear terms that no fundamental problem of theirs, can be solved with the help of any law of this reactionary government. But this does not mean that we shall not take advantage of any legal movement. The work of open peasant associations will mainly be to organise movements for gaining legal benefits and for legal changes. So among the peasant masses the most urgent and the main task of the party will be to form party groups and explain the programme of the agrarian revolution and the tactics of area-wise seizure of power. Through this programme, the poor and landless peasants will be established in the leadership of the peasant movement.

(4) From 1959, on every democratic movement of India, the government has been increasingly launching violent attacks. We have not given leadership to any active resistance movement against these violent attacks. We gave the call for

passive resistance in the face of these attacks, like the mourning procession after the food movement, among such instances. We shall have to remember Comrade Mao Tsetung's teaching - "*Mere passive resistance against repression drives a wedge in the fighting unity of the masses and invariably leads to the path of surrender.*" So, in the present era during any mass movement, active resistance has become in absolute necessity before any mass movement. Without this programme, to organize any mass movement today means to plunge the masses in despondency. As a result of the passive resistance of 1959, it was not possible to organize any mass rally on the demand for food in Calcutta in the years 1960-61. This organisation of active resistance will arouse a new confidence in the minds of the masses and the tide of struggle will arise. What do we mean by active resistance? First, preservation of cadres. For this preservation of cadres, proper shelters and communication system are necessary. Secondly, teaching the common people the techniques of resistance, like lying down in the face of firings, or taking the help of some strong barrier, forming barricades, etc. Thirdly, efforts to avenge every attack with the help of groups of active cadres, which has been described by Comrade Mao Tsetung as '*Tit for tat struggle.*' At the initial stage, in proportion to their attacks, we shall be able to avenge a few attacks only. But if even a little success is gained in one case, extensive propaganda will create new enthusiasm among the masses. These active resistance struggles are possible in cities and in the countryside, everywhere. This truth has been tested in the Negro resistance movement of America.

(5) There is no clear-cut idea in the Party about the underground organisation. A secret organisation does not grow merely if a few leaders stay underground. On the contrary, these very leaders face the danger of getting isolated from the Party ranks. If party leaders go underground and work as leaders of open mass organisations, they will invariably get arrested. So the underground leadership will have to go forward with the work of building a secret Party. So, it is not a fact that the task of forming a secret Party is solely that of the underground leaders; every Party member should work for the secret organisation and through those new Party cadres the Party's links with the masses will be established. Only then the underground leaders will be able to work as leaders. So in this era, the main call before the Party is - every Party member will have to form a Party Activist Group. These Activist Groups will have to be enthused with revolutionary politics. This task of forming Activist Groups will be the main task for all Party members of all fronts. How soon we can raise these activists to Party membership will depend on how many new activists these activists will be able to collect. Only then we can get a large number of Party cadres unknown to the police and all the difficulties of underground leaders in maintaining links with the party ranks will disappear. Some revisionist ideas among us, about political and organisational matters and mass organisations etc, have been pointed out here. Today Party members will have to think anew about every mass movement. In the style of our movement, in our organisational thinking, in other words in almost every sphere

of our lives, revisionism has built its nest. As long as we cannot uproot it, the new revolutionary Party cannot be built, India's revolutionary possibilities will be hindered. History will not forgive us.

## **Document Five**

### **What Possibility the Year 1965 is Indicating?**

There are some comrades who get scared at the mentioning of armed struggles, and go on seeing the spectre of adventurism. They think that the work of building a revolutionary party has ended with the very adoption of the programme in other words with the adoption of the programme that is the strategic documents at the Seventh Congress of the Party. Merely from some resolutions on movements adopted at the Party Congress, they arrived at the decision as if besides the present stage of revolution and the class composition, the tactics of the present era had also been decided at the Seventh Congress. From their words, it appears as if peaceful mass movement itself is the main tactics of struggle of the present era. Although they do not openly state Kurshchov's tactics of peaceful transition to socialism, what they want to say almost amounts to the same thing. They want to say that there is no possibility of revolution in India in the near future. So at present, we shall have to move along the peaceful path. In the era of world-wide struggle against revisionism, they cannot openly state the revisionist decisions. But they are abusing as adventurist and police spies anyone who is speaking of armed struggle. Yet, even if we leave out the mass movement of Kashmir, the government has killed at least 300 people during the last eight months, the number of prisoners have risen to several thousands and one after another, the States have been shaken by mass movements. What programmes are we placing before these agitators? Nothing! On the other hand we are dreaming- under our leadership organised peaceful mass movements will grow up. This itself is a shameless instance of revisionism. We are still unable to realize that in the present era we cannot build up peaceful mass movements. For, the ruling class will not give us and is not giving us either, such an opportunity. We should have drawn this very lesson from the tram fare resistance movement. But we are not taking that lesson. We have become anxious to organise satyagraha movements, we are not realizing that in the present era this satyagraha movement is bound to fail. It does not mean that satyagraha movements era altogether outmoded today. All types of movements have to be carried on at all ages; but the form of the main movement depends on the ruling class. The present feature of our age is that the government is fighting every movement by violent attacks. So for the people, the armed resistance movement has appeared as the most important necessity. So in the interest of mass movements, the call should be given to the working class, the fighting peasantry and every fighting people: (1) Take to arms; (2) Form armed units for confrontation; (3) Politically educate every armed unit. Not to give this call means pushing without any consideration the unarmed masses to death. The ruling class wants that, for in

this way they can break the strength of mind of the fighting masses. The agitated masses today attack railway stations, police stations, etc. Innumerable agitations are bursting forth upon government buildings, or on buses, trams and trains.

This is like that Luddites' agitation against machines. The revolutionaries will have to give conscious leadership; strike against the hated bureaucrats, against police employees, against military offices; the people should be taught- repression is not done by police stations, but by the officers in charge of police stations; attacks are not directed by government buildings or transport, but by the men of the government's repressive machinery, and against these men that our attacks are directed.

The working class and the revolutionary masses should be taught that they should not attack merely for the sake of attacking, but should finish the person whom they attack. For, if they attack only, the revolutionary machinery will take revenge. But if they annihilate, everyone of the government's repressive machinery will be panic-stricken. We should remember that the teaching of Com Mao Tsetung's: "The enemy's armoury is our armoury." To build up that armoury the working class should take the lead. It should give leadership to the peasantry in the villages, and those very armed units will be transformed into guerilla forces in the future. If these armed units also are trained in political education, they themselves can build base areas for struggles in the country side. Only through this method we can make successful the People's Democratic Revolution. By forming these fighting units among the working class and the revolutionary classes, we will be able to build up that revolutionary Party, the Party which can stand firmly on revolutionary Marxism-Leninism and can carry out the responsibility of the coming age. The government is failing to supply food to the people, so the people have become agitated. So it is in the interest of the reactionary bourgeoisie of India that India has attacked Pakistan. The US imperialist plan of the world war is also operating behind this war. By attacking Pakistan, the ruling class again wants to create a tide of bourgeois nationalism. But this time it is clear like daylight that India alone is the aggressor. So, as a result of the defeat of the Indian army, the anti-government struggle will fast crystalize among the masses. So Marxists want today that the aggressive Indian army should be defeated. This defeat will create new mass agitations. Not merely wishing that they should be defeated; Marxists at the same time should make efforts so that this defeat becomes imminent. In every province of India agitations should be created on the lines the mass agitation in Kashmir is progressing. The ruling class of India is trying to solve its crisis by imperialist tactics. To resolve the imperialist war we should advance along the path determined by Lenin. "*Turn the imperialist war into a civil war*", -we should understand the significance of this slogan. If we can realise the truth that the Indian revolution will invariably take the form of civil war, the tactic of area-wise seizure of power can be the only tactic. The tactic of seizure of power of China is the only tactics. The tactic which was adopted by China's Great Leader Com Mao Tsetung- the same tactic should be adopted by the Indian Marxists.

From this year's experience the peasants have seen that the government did not take any responsibility of providing food to the poor peasant, but on the contrary the repressive machinery of the government was unleashed the moment the peasant masses took to the path of any movement. Over and above this, by attacking Pakistan, more burdens were imposed upon the peasants. So the poor peasants should get prepared for next year. If they are deprived of the crops in the field, they will have to die of starvation next year. So prepare yourselves now. How can the struggle to preserve the crops be conducted? (1) Organize armed forces in every village. (2) Make arrangements so that these forces can collect as much arms as they can and fix secret places to keep the arms. (3) Fix places for hiding the crops. In our past days we did not make any permanent arrangement for hiding the crops. So most of the crops were either destroyed or fell in the hands of the enemy. So permanent arrangements should be made to keep the crops hidden. Where can they be hidden? In every country of the world, wherever the peasant fights, crops have to be hidden. For the peasant, the only place to hide the crops can be under the earth itself. In every area, every peasant will have to make a place to hide the crops under the earth. Otherwise by no means the crops can be saved from the enemy. (4) Besides armed units, small bands of peasants should be formed to keep guard, and maintain communications and other work. (5) Every unit will have to be given political education and political propaganda should certainly be carried on. It should be remembered that it is only the political propaganda campaign that can make this struggle more wide-spread and strengthen the fighting spirit of the peasant. Two to three months are now left for harvesting. With in this period the Party units in the peasants areas should carry on political and organisational preparations to continue this work, and should attain a good grasp of the tactics of secret work.

*(After he had written this much, Comrade was arrested under the Defence of India Rules. When this article was about to end, a big change came over the leftist politics of India. Because of this change, he thought of writing the documents in a different way. But he did not get the chance. But what he said verbally was:*

All those so-called Marxist leaders and journals (Leftist) which have directly raised the sky-riding slogan of defending the country, have betrayed Marxism. We shall not only have to carry on the theoretical struggle against them, but shall have to raise new confidence in the struggle among the revolutionaries in different corners of India through militant activities (a description of the militant activities is given above), and this single spark itself at this one place will create a prairie fire of revolution in different corners all over India, the path of area-wise seizure of power will widen, the People's Democratic Revolution of India will be imminent.

Come Comrades, let us march forward firmly to give bold leadership to the armed struggle in the coming days.)

## **The Main Task Today is the Struggle to Buildup the True Revolutionary Party Through Uncompromising Struggle Against Revisionism 12-8-1966**

The Party leaders after long imprisonment, after the Party Congress, for the first time had a session of the full Central Committee. The central leadership of the party which was formed through struggles against revisionism, adopted an ideological resolution and declared bluntly that all the criticisms made against the Indian government by the great Chinese Party were wrong. At the same time they have stated in the resolution that criticism of Soviet revisionist leadership should not be made public now, as otherwise the people's faith in socialism will decrease. That is, the mask must not be torn off the attempt that is being made by the Soviet revisionist leadership in collaboration with the U.S. imperialism to establish world hegemony.

The leader of the Great Chinese Revolution, the Communist Party of China, and its leader Com Mao Tsetung, are leading today the proletariat and revolutionary struggles of the world. After Lenin, Comrade Mao Tsetung has today filled Lenin's position. So the struggle against revisionism cannot be carried out by opposing the Chinese Party and Com Mao Tsetung. The purity of Marxism-Leninism cannot be maintained. By opposing the Chinese party, the Indian party leadership has forsaken the revolutionary path of Marxism-Leninism. They are trying to pass off revisionism by putting it into a new bottle. So party members should understand this clearly today that in the struggle against revisionism, this Party leadership is not at all our comrade-in-arms, not even an associate.

Soviet revisionist leadership in collaboration with the US imperialism is today trying for world hegemony. They are acting as enemies of every national liberation movement today. They are trying to establish the revisionist leadership by splitting the revolutionary parties and are shamelessly acting as agents of the US imperialism. They are today the enemies of the people's liberation struggles in every country, enemies of the revolutionary struggles, enemies of revolutionary China, even the enemies of the Soviet people. So no struggles against American imperialism can be made without carrying out an open struggle against this Soviet revisionist leadership. It is impossible to lead the anti imperialist struggle if it is not realised that the Soviet revisionist leadership is not a partner in the anti-imperialist struggle. The party leadership, far from following this path is rather trying to convince the people through different writings that the Soviet leadership, in spite of a few mistakes, is basically opposing the policies of the Indian government, and is still moving along the path of socialism. That is, they are trying to conceal in a cunning manner the fact that the Soviet leadership is transforming the Soviet Socialist State into a capitalist state gradually and that the Soviet -American collaboration itself is because of that.

So, in the political and organisational analysis of India during the last two years, there has been no mention of imperialist, particularly American imperialist interference, although from Johnson to Humphrey, all the representatives of US imperialism have repeatedly declared that they will use India as a base against China. Such an important question did not come to the notice of the Central Committee at all. So in the political and organisational resolution, no word of caution has been uttered for party members against the imperialist counter-offensive. On the contrary, after reading the entire resolution it appears that there has been no particular change in the situation; that in some cases regours have increased and they can be fought through ordinary movements. The Party leadership is absolutely silent about the new future in the struggles during the last two years—the expression of revolutionary violence against counter-revolutionary violence—this new emerging trend of mass movements. They posed the questions of mass movement in such a way that the simple conclusion that follows from it is the our main aim during the coming elections will be to establish a noncongress democratic government. In no part of their resolution it was mentioned that this election was being held to hide the exploitation and indirect rule by imperialism. The reactionary government of India through this election wants to spread constitutional illusion and behind that, under imperialist instructions wants to build up our country as a counter-revolutionary base of South East Asia, and wants to stem the resistance of the people by violent attacks on the revolutionary sections of the masses. The experience of Indonesia has taught us how violent today dying imperialism can become. It was the responsibility of the Party leadership to prepare the Party members to face this situation and to hold up clearly that the only way was revolutionary violence and to organise the entire Party on that basis. The leadership of the Indian Party not only did not do this work, but it has not also made any talk about revolutionary resistance illegal within the Party.

The party leadership is raising the hue and cry of adventurism whenever it hears about “revolutionary resistance” or “armed struggle”. But at the same time they indiscriminately use the words “dehoarding of stocks,” “gherao,” “continuous strike,” etc. But whenever there is any talk about resisting the repression that invariably follows these struggling tactics, they regard it as adventurism. The slogan of “State-wide continuous strike” is nothing else but a petty-bourgeois like ultra-Leftist slogan. On the one hand this ultra-Leftist slogan and on the other, in regard to the political question, a desperate desire to forge unity in the electoral field which means acting as an appendage of the bourgeoisie.

So this Party leadership is refusing to take the responsibility of the democratic revolution of India and as a result of that they are resorting to the cunning tactics of modern revisionism, that is, the path of being revolutionaries in words and an appendage of the bourgeoisie in deeds. So the revolutionary Party can come up only through the destruction of the present party system and its democratic framework. So to abide by the so called ‘form’ or “constitutional frame work” of this party, means to render Marxist-Leninists ineffective and to co-operate with the revisionist leadership.



So from the party leadership to the ordinary workers, all those who believe in Marxism-Leninism, must come forward before the Party members with the revolutionary views of Marxism-Leninism. Only then we can start work on building the revolutionary Party. The Indian government has been forced to retreat in the face of the India-wide mass outburst. As a result, the scope of democratic movement has increased in the period preceding the elections. The government is organising the counter-revolutionary forces in this period. The revolutionary forces also will have to take full advantage of this apparently democratic atmosphere. The fighting tactics adopted by the masses during the recent mass movements, were nothing but "partisan" struggles of an initial stage. So the revolutionary forces must lead in an organised manner those "partisan" struggles and before the massive counter-revolutionary offensive starts, Party members must be well-trained in the tactics of these struggles through theories and concrete application.

The meaning of the Party Activist Groups today is that they will be "combat units". Their main duty will be political propaganda campaign and to strike against counter-revolutionary forces. We should always keep in mind Mao Tsetung's teaching- *"Attacks are not for the sake of attacking merely, attacks are for annihilating only"*. Those who should be attacked are mainly: (1) the representatives of the state machinery like police, military officers; (2) the hated bureaucracy; (3) class enemies. The aim of these attacks should also be the collection of arms. In the present age these attacks can be launched everywhere, in cities and in the countryside. Our special attention should be paid especially to peasant areas.

In the post-election period, when the counter revolutionary offensive will assume a massive character, our main base will have to be established in the peasant areas. So immediately now, we shall have to clearly put up before our organisation this view that with the development of sense of responsibility among working class and revolutionary petty-bourgeois cadres, they will have to go to the villages immediately. So with the development of the sense of responsibility among the working class and petty bourgeois cadres, they will have to be sent to the villages. In the period of counter revolutionary offensive, our main tactics of struggle will be that of Great China, the tactics of encircling the cities with villages. How fast we can silence the counter-revolutionary offensive depends on how soon we can build up the people's armed forces. It is true that in the beginning, we can achieve some success, but in the face of massive counter-revolutionary offensive, we shall have to retaliate in the interest of self-preservation alone. Through this long-drawn difficult struggle, the People's Revolutionary Army will grow up- the army which is inspired by political consciousness, and made firm through political campaign movements and encounters. Without this type of an army, it is not possible to make the revolution successful, it is not possible to protect the interests of the masses.

Comrades, instead of running behind spontaneous movements, partisan struggles will have to be developed in an organised manner today. Not even six

months are left. If we cannot begin this struggle within this period, we shall have to confront the difficult task of organising in the face of imperialist attacks.

**Communist Party of India,  
Maoist Centre**

## **Document Seven**

### **Take this Opportunity**

During the last two years, the spontaneous struggles of the petty-bourgeois youths and students have created a stir from one end of India to another. Although at the beginning the demand for food was the main demand, but gradually the demand for ousting the congress government has become main. Chairman Mao has said: *"The petty-bourgeois students and youth are a part of the people and at the inevitable conclusion of their struggle, the struggle of the workers and peasants will reach a high tide."* So hardly had the struggle of the students and youth ended, the peasants' struggle has begun in Bihar. Hundreds of peasants are harvesting and carrying away the crops. They are seizing the hoarded stocks of crops of landlords. This struggle is bound to spread in the coming days to West Bengal and other states. The government is resorting to violent repression to suppress the agitating peasants. Chairman Mao has said: *"Where there is oppression there is bound to be resistance against it."* So we are witnessing spontaneous resistance in the struggles of the students and youth. The peasants of Bihar are carrying on resistance spontaneously. The official spokesmen are repeatedly declaring that they would resort to further repressive policies to preserve peace and order. So the responsibility of consciously building up resistance struggles has come up before the revolutionary working class and its Party.

This era is the era of active resistance movement. Active resistance movement will open up the source of the revolutionary genius of the revolutionary masses. It will spread the tide of revolution all over India. So in this age, to lead legal trade union or peasant association movement can never be the main task before the revolutionary cadres. Trade union or peasant association (Kisan sabha) movement cannot be the main supplementary force in the present age of revolutionary tide. It would not be correct to draw from this the conclusion that trade unions or peasant associations have become outmoded. For trade unions and kisan sabhas are basically organisations to build up unity between Marxist-Leninist cadres and working class and peasant masses. This unity will be consolidated only when Marxist-Leninist cadres move forward in the work of building up the revolutionary party among the working class and peasant masses with the tactics of revolutionary resistance movement. The revolutionary working class and Marxist-Leninist cadres will have to go forward in the face of peasant struggles to give active leadership to the peasants' struggles through resistance or "partisan" struggles. The reactionary government of India has adopted the tactics of killing the masses; they are killing them through starvation, with bullets. Chairman Mao has said: *"This is their class character. They launch attacks on the people even at the risk of being defeated."*

There are some leaders who faced with these indiscriminate murders, get scared and seek protection. Chairman Mao has said about them: "*They are cowards and unworthy of revolutionary leadership.*" There is another group of people who boldly face death. They try to avenge every murder-they alone are revolutionaries and it is they who can show the masses the path.

Apparently the government might look powerful, because it has in its hands food and arms. The people do not have food; they are unarmed. But it is the unity and firm spirit of these unarmed masses that smash all the arrogance of reaction and make the revolution successful. So Chairman Mao has said: "The reactionary force is actually a paper tiger." In the present era, our main task will be on the basis of three main slogans.

First, unity of workers and peasants. This unity does not mean that the workers and petty-bourgeois masses will give only moral support to the peasant movement. This slogan means the realisation that the peasants are the main force of the revolution in a semi-colonial and semi-feudal country like India, the unity of peasants and workers can grow only on the basis of class struggle. So on the question of seizure of state power, Chairman Mao has said: "It is the liberated area in the countryside which is the concrete application of workers-peasants unity." So it is the responsibility of the workers, and particularly of the petty-bourgeois masses to develop peasants movement for building liberated areas. So Chairman Mao has told petty-bourgeois students and youth about movement: "Whether they are revolutionaries can be determined only by how much they become participants of this movement." Those who will not participate in this movement have the danger of becoming reactionaries.

Secondly, the revolutionary resistance movement, armed struggle. The reactionary government of India has declared war against every struggles for democratic demands of the masses. Inside India, it has created a playground for imperialist and feudal exploitation, and in its foreign policy it has turned India into a base of reaction in collaboration with imperialism and modern revisionists. The people of India have become rebellious against this intolerable situation. In this situation, the revolutionary resistance movement or armed partisan struggle of the revolutionary Marxist-Leninist Party against reaction and the passive resistance movement of the revisionist party, have today become the main part of the Party's politics. So every Party member and revolutionary cadre will have to grasp this tactic of struggle. They should learn to practice it and temper the revolutionary spirit of the masses through propaganda among the masses. The success of the struggle is depending on how far we can popularise the politics of armed struggle through propaganda of it among the masses.

Thirdly, the building up of a revolutionary Party. In this revolutionary situation in India today, our Party organisation is not capable of giving leadership. Without being firm in theory, clear in politics and without a mass base in respect of organisation, it is impossible to give leadership in this revolutionary age of today.

(1) On the theoretical question:- It should be remembered that the Party leadership of the world's first socialist state, the Soviet Union, has been captured

by a revisionist clique. As a result, revisionist influence has fallen on the Communist Parties of different countries of the world. In our country also as this revisionist influence was felt, the need for forming a separate Party was felt. And as a result of that, a separate Party was formed at the 7th Congress. The formation of a separate Party does not mean that the fight against revisionism has ended. Revisionism speaks of fighting against imperialism, feudalism and the reactionary force, but in deeds it widens the path of collaboration with these forces. Marxism-Leninism firmly opposes these forces, avenges their every attack, and mobilising the masses through long-drawn struggle alone destroys these reactionary forces. The old ideas become manifest in (i) not accepting the leadership of the great Chinese Party against international revisionists; (ii) in not accepting the new developing forces; (iii) in not making the working class conscious of this new realisation; (iv) in not aiding the struggle of the peasantry, which is the main ally of the working class.

(2) Political:- The People's Democratic Revolution will have to be seen as the task of this moment. Chairman Mao has said, "*No dying force gives up its power easily; freedom comes out only from the barrel of a gun.*" So in our politics the main part will be armed struggle for seizure of power. The common people have started this armed struggle spontaneously. The main aim of our politics will be to establish consciously this armed struggle on mass base. The basic three points are, (i) Worker-peasant unity under the leadership of the working class. (ii) Consciously establishing armed struggle on mass base, and (iii) firmly establish the leadership of the Communist Party. It is imperative not to leave aside any of these three tasks. This politics will have to be propagated extensively among the masses.

(3) Organisational:- The mass base of the Party will have to be extended. We have seen during the last few years, thousands of militant cadres come to join the work of the organisation during different movements and struggles, try to give leadership to the struggles, but the moment the movement stops, they again become inactive. Today, in the age of the revolutionary upsurge, people of many backward areas are coming forward on the road of struggles, and it is through those struggles that many young militant cadres are joining the work of the organisation. If we can educate these cadres in our revolutionary theory and politics, the Party can get its mass base. We shall have to begin working boldly on collecting these cadres and on forming secret groups with them. These cadre-groups will carry on political propaganda and will act as units of armed struggle. The striking power of the Party depends on how far we are able to form these groups in increasing numbers among workers and peasants. With whom we are forming the groups and organisational details, like shelter, dumps, etc., should certainly be kept secret. But our theories, politics and the slogan of Party formation must never be kept secret. In the age of armed struggle, every Party unit must be participants in the armed struggle and be a self-reliant leader. The general elections are coming. During these elections the discontented people desire to and will listen to politics. Before the elections, every party will try to propagate their politics among the masses. We shall have to take advantage of these elections to propagate our politics.

Let us not be confused by the false slogan of non-congress democratic government. We shall have to take to the masses courageously the politics of our Peoples Democratic Revolution, that is, the politics of worker-peasant unity under working class leadership, of armed struggle, of establishing the leadership of the Party. If we fully take advantage of this it will not be possible for any leftist leader to oppose us. We shall have to take full advantage of this opportunity.

### Document Eight

## IT IS BY FIGHTING AGAINST REVISIONISM THAT THE PEASANT STRUGGLE WILL HAVE TO BE TAKEN FORWARD

In the post-election period, the party leadership has girded up their loins to prove our anticipations true. The P.B. has indicated our tasks: "Struggles should be carried on to save the non-congress ministries from the hands of reaction," that is, it is not the intensification of class struggle, but the main work of the Marxists should be to plead for the ministries. So to firmly establish economism in the working class, a convention of party workers was called. And immediately after that, under the leadership of the ministry, an agreement for peace in the industry was signed. The workers were forbidden to 'gherao'. What else could be a more naked expression of class collaboration? The employers are being given full rights to exploit and the workers are being told not to fight. The moment the communist party joined the government which came into office as a result of a big mass movement, they chose the path of class collaboration. The Chinese leaders predicted long ago that those who are following a neutral policy regarding the international ideological differences, will very soon choose the path of opportunism. And now the Chinese leaders are saying that these neutralists are actually revisionists, and they will soon go over to the counter-revolutionary camp. We have witnessed this truth in our country. We have seen before our eyes how the working class has been betrayed. Take along with this the statement of the communist party leader Hare Krishna Konar. He first promised that he would distribute all the vested lands among the landless peasants. Then the amount of land came down. Finally, he announced that this year things would remain as they were. The question of foregoing all land revenue was left at the mercy of the J.L.R.O's. The peasants were asked to submit applications. And it was said that the peasants must not forcibly occupy land. Hare Krishna Babu is not only a member of the central committee of the communist party, he is also the secretary of the *Krishak Sabha* of Bengal. It was at the call of his *Krishak sabha* that in 1959 the peasants carried on a movement to occupy vested lands and illegally transferred lands. The government unleashed repression in the interest of the landlords. The judgement was given for eviction. Still the peasants in many cases did not give up the land—they kept them occupied by the strength of the unity of the village. Did the leader of the *Krishak sabha* support their movement after he became a Minister? No, what he said meant that vested land would be redistributed. Who will get it? The J.L.R.O. would

consult the *Krishak sabha* in that matter. But will the opinion given be acted upon? Harekrishna Babu has not made any commitment in this regard. But if the J.L.R.O. rejects the views of the *Krishak sabha*, the peasants by no means will be able to occupy the land. In this respect Harekrishna Babu did not take time to come out clearly. What will you say about this? Is this not acting like the lackey of the government and the jotedar? Even congressmen did not dare to hold brief so shamelessly for the feudal classes. So to abide by the directives of the party leaders means to accept without any judgement the exploitation and rule of the feudal classes. So it will be the responsibility of the Communists to expose before the Party members and the masses the anti-class reactionary role of this leadership and move forward following the policy of intensifying class struggle. Then again, suppose the landless and poor peasants accept Harekrishna Babu's proposal and submit applications, what happens then? It is true that there is some uncultivated land in the vested land, but the amount of cultivated land is more. There are peasants working on these cultivated lands; today they are either enjoying it under licence, or giving share to the jotedar. When this land is redistributed invariably conflicts will develop among the poor and landless peasants and as a result of that, over the entire peasant movement, the leadership of the rich peasant would be established. For the rich peasant has the opportunity of pulling strings, he is also a partner in feudal influence. So Harekrishna Babu is not only refusing to launch struggles today, he is also making arrangements so that in the future also the peasant movement does not move along the militant path.

Yet, we have taken the programme of People's Democratic Revolution and the task of that revolution is land reforms in the interest of the peasants. Land reforms in the interest of the peasants are possible only when we are able to annihilate the authority of the feudal classes in the countryside. To do this we shall have to take away the land from the feudal classes, and will have to distribute it among the landless and poor peasants. We shall never be able to do that if our movement remains confined within the bounds of economism. We have seen in every area where there has been movements on vested land, the peasant who has got the occupation of vested land and managed to get licence, ceases to be active in the peasant movement. What is its reason? Because, in a year the class character of that poor peasant has changed and he has now become a middle peasant. So the economic demand of the poor and landless peasant is no longer his demand. So economism drives a wedge in the unity of the fighting peasants and plunges the landless and poor peasants in despondency. Those who uphold economism judge every struggle by the number of *maunds* of paddy seized or the number of *bighas* of land the peasant received. They never judge by the yardstick whether the fighting consciousness of the peasants has increased. So they do not make any effort to increase the class consciousness of the peasant. Yet, we know no struggle can be waged without sacrifice. Chairman Mao has taught us, wherever there is struggle there is sacrifice. At the initial stage of the struggle the power of reaction will naturally be greater than that of the masses. So the struggle will be long-drawn.

Since, the masses are a progressive force, its power will increase day by day, and since the reactionary force is dying, its power will decrease day by day. So unless the masses are inspired to make sacrifice, no revolutionary struggle can succeed. Economism takes away from this basic revolutionary outlook into the dark alley of bourgeois outlook. The party leaders are doing exactly this by all their activities. If we review all our peasant movements of the past, we shall see that the party leaders imposed compromises on the peasants from above. Yet, it was the responsibility of the Party leadership to establish the fighting leadership of the working class over the peasant movement. They did not do this before, nor are they doing it now. Now they are asking us to depend on law and bureaucracy. Lenin has written that even if a progressive law is passed, if the responsibility of implementing it is given to the bureaucracy, the peasants will not get anything. So our leaders have departed far from Lenin and the revolutionary path.

Agrarian revolution is the task of this moment today; this task cannot be left unimplemented. And without doing this, no benefit can be done to the peasant. But before the agrarian revolution, it is necessary to destroy state power. To carry out the agrarian revolution without destroying the state machinery means revisionism straight-away. So the first and main task of the peasant movement today is to destroy the state machinery. If this cannot be done all over the country, all over the state, will the peasant rest quietly? No, Marxism-Leninism-Mao Tsetung Thought has taught us that if the peasant of any area can be enthused with political thought, the work of destroying the state machinery in that area should be carried forward. It is this which is known as peasants' liberated area. The struggle to create this liberated area, is today the most urgent and immediate task of the peasant movement. What according to us is a liberated area? We shall call that peasant area a liberated area from where we have been able to oust the class enemies. To build this liberated area, the peasants' armed force is necessary. By this armed force, as we mean the hand-made weapons of the peasants, so also guns are needed. We shall understand whether the peasants have moved forward to collect guns. Where will the peasants get guns? Class enemies have guns with them, and they stay inside the villages. Guns have to be snatched away from them. They will not give us guns on their own. So we shall have to seize those guns by force. For this the peasant militants will have to be taught all tactics beginning from setting fire to the houses of class enemies. Apart from this, we shall get guns from the armed forces through sudden attacks on them. The area where we shall be able to organise this gun snatching campaign, will fast be transformed into a liberated area. So to do this, it is necessary to propagate the politics of building up armed struggles, extensively among the peasantry. It is further necessary to organise small secret militant groups to carry on the campaign of collecting guns. As members of these groups will propagate the politics of armed struggle. So also they shall simultaneously try to successfully implement the concrete programme of collecting guns. The appearance of the struggle does not change merely with the collection of guns- the collected guns will have to be used. Only then the creative powers of the peasant will develop and a qualitative change in the struggle will take place. This can be done only by

the poor and landless peasants- the firm ally of the working class. The middle peasant is also an ally, but his fighting spirit is not as intense as that of the landless and poor peasants. So he cannot become a participant in the struggle at the same time- he needs some time. It is for this that class analysis is a must for the Communist Party. So the great leader of China, Chairman Mao Tsetung at the very first did this work and was able to correctly give the guideline for revolutionary struggle. So the main thing in our organisational work is to establish the leadership of the poor and landless peasant in the peasant movement. The leadership of the poor and landless peasant will be established in the process of organising peasant movement with the politics of armed struggle. Because they alone are the most revolutionary force among the peasant classes. A separate organisation of agricultural labours will not help this work. On the contrary, a separate agricultural labourers' organisation increases the trend towards trade union movement based on economism and aggravates differences within the peasants. It does not enhance unity of the ally classes because in our agrarian system it is the exploitation of the feudal class that is the main feature. In this connection another question crops up- the question of compromise with the small owner. What will be the attitude of the Communists in this case? In the case of compromise, we shall have to judge on whose side we are. So we cannot support any other class against them. All along in the peasant movement the Communists had forced the poor and landless peasants to give up their interests in the interests of the petty-bourgeoisie. As a result of this, the poor and landless peasants lose their fighting spirit. We should also have separate attitude regarding the middle and rich peasants. If we regard the rich peasant as a middle peasant, the poor and landless peasant will feel despondent. Again, if we judge the middle peasant as a rich peasant, the fighting enthusiasm of the middle peasant lessens. So communists must learn according to Chairman Mao's directives, make class analysis of peasants in every area.

Peasants of India have exploded again and again into revolts. Again and again they have sought guidance from the communist party. We did not say that the politics of armed struggle and the campaign for collecting guns is the only way. This way is the path of the working class, the path of liberation, the path of establishing a society free from exploitation. In every state all over India, the peasant today is discontented, the Communists will have to show them the way. That way is the politics of armed struggle and the campaign of collecting guns. We must hold aloft this only path of liberation. The Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution of China has declared war on all types of selfishness, groupism, revisionism, tailism of the bourgeoisie, praise of bourgeois ideology- the burning influence of that revolution has reached India also. The call of that revolution is - *"Be ready firmly to make all sorts of sacrifices, remove one by one the obstacles on the road, victory will surely be ours."* In however frightful form imperialism might come, however ugly, the net might be which modern revisionism would spread to help them, the days of the reactionary force are numbered, the sunlight bright with Marxism-Leninism-Mao Tsetung Thought will wipe out and banish all darkness.



Naturally, the question crops up- in that case is there no need for the peasants to organise mass movements in this age on the basis of partial demands? Certainly the need is there and will remain there in future. For, India is a vast country and the peasants also are divided into many classes. So the standard of political consciousness cannot remain at the same level in all the areas and among all the classes. So the opportunity and possibility of peasants' mass movement on the basis of partial demands will always be there and Communists must take full advantage of that opportunity at all times. By what tactics shall we lead the movements on partial demands, and what will be their aim? The main point of our tactics will be to see whether there is the mobilisation of the broad peasantry and our main aim will be to see whether the class consciousness of the peasant has increased - whether they have moved forward towards widespread armed struggle. Movements on partial demands will intensify class struggle, will increase political consciousness among the broad masses, the broad peasant masses will be inspired to make sacrifices, the struggle will spread to newer and newer areas. Movements on partial demands can take any form, but the Communists should always propagate among the peasantry the need for higher forms of struggles. Under no circumstances, should there be any attempt to pass off as the best whatever form the peasants have accepted. In fact, Communists should always propagate among peasants revolutionary politics, that is, the politics of armed struggle and the campaign of collecting arms. In spite of carrying on this propaganda, the peasants might decide on mass-deputation and we shall have to lead that movement. In the period of white terror, the effectiveness of mass deputation should never be belittled, for it is these mass deputations that will increasingly draw the peasant into the struggles. Movements on economic demands are never wrong, but to lead these struggles in the manner of economism is a crime. And it is also a crime to propagate that movements on economic demands will on their own take the form of political struggles, because this itself is worshipping spontaneity. None of these can show the way to the masses, can bring clarity of attitude, or give inspiration for making sacrifices in struggles. There is only one task at one stage of the struggle. Unless this is done, the struggle cannot reach a higher stage. Today, that particular task is the politics of armed struggle and campaign of collecting arms. Whatever work we might do leaving aside this task, the struggle will not reach a higher stage, the struggle will collapse, the organisation will not grow. In the same way there is only one way for the Indian revolution-the way shown by Lenin - the people's armed force and the formation of republic. Lenin said in 1905 that even if it is not possible all over Russia, build up these two wherever it is possible. Chairman Mao Tsetung has enriched further this path indicated by Lenin. He has taught the tactics of people's war, and the liberation of China has been achieved through this path. Today that path is followed in Vietnam, Thailand, Malaya, Phillipines, Burma, Indonesia, Yemen, Leopoldville, Congo and different countries of Africa and Latin America, in India also that path has been adopted by the Nagas, Mizos, the people of the Kashmir area- the path of armed forces and administration by the liberation front. So today the working class will have to be called upon and told that the

working class will have to give leadership to the democratic revolution of India, and this task will have to be done by the working class through its providing leadership in struggles to its main ally, the peasantry. So it is their responsibility to organise the peasant movement and to elevate that struggle to the stage of armed struggle. The advanced section of the working class will have to go to the countryside to participate in the armed struggle. This is the main task of the working class. "*Collection of arms and forming bases of struggle in the countryside*" - this is what is called the politics of the working class, the politics of seizure of power, we shall have to enthuse the working class with this politics. Organise all the workers in trade unions- this slogan does not enhance the political consciousness of the working class. This of course does not mean that we shall no longer form trade unions. This means that we shall not confine the revolutionary cadres of the party in trade unions- their task will be to carry on propaganda campaign among the working class, that is to propagate the politics of armed struggle and the politics of gun snatching campaign and build up the party organisation. Among the petty-bourgeoisie also our main task is to carry on our political propaganda and explain the significance of the peasant struggle. In other words, in every front of the party the task is to explain the importance of peasant struggles and to give the call for participation in those struggles. The extent to which we can do this work, to that extent we shall reach the stage of conscious leadership in the democratic revolution. Opposition to this basic Marxist-Leninist path of the party is not only coming from the revisionists. The revisionists are taking to the path of class collaboration straight away. So it is easy to take their mask off. But there is another form of opposition within the party which is called dogmatism. They accept the necessity of revolution, accept that revolution can be possible only through armed struggle. But they dream that it is possible to take to the path of armed revolution only by extending mass movements all over India. Before that there might be small, or even big clashes, but seizure of power would not be possible. About seizure of power, they hope that a version of the October Revolution would be enacted in India. They apply to India in the same way their bookish knowledge as to how the October Revolution became successful. They forget that before the October Revolution there occurred the February Revolution and the bourgeois parties came to power and power was also in the hands of the Soviets of workers, peasants and soldiers. As a result of this duel power, the leadership of the working class was effective in the Soviets. And when the petty-bourgeois parties in these Soviets handed over power to the bourgeoisie, only then it was possible for the working class to make the October Revolution.

They do not analyze the concrete conditions of India. They do not take lessons from the struggles that are taking place in India. The main reason for the success of the Russian revolution lay in the correct application of the united front tactics. In the case of India also the question of united front tactics is equally important. But the form of democratic revolution in India will be different from this. In India also in Naga, Mizo, Kashmir and other areas, struggles are taking place under petty bourgeois leadership. So in the democratic revolution, the working class will

have to advance by forming united fronts with them. And in newer and newer places struggles will begin under the leadership of bourgeois or petty-bourgeois parties. The working class, will certainly forge alliance with them also and the main basis of this alliance will be anti-imperialist struggle and right of self-determination. The working class certainly accepts this right, along with the right of secession.

Those who dream of revolution in India along the path of the October Revolution, although they are revolutionaries they cannot boldly give leadership, because of their doctrinaire attitude. They do not understand the significance of peasant struggles and as a result unwittingly they become propagandists of economism among the workers. They cannot take lessons from Chairman Mao's teaching. They cannot imbibe the experience of the revolutionary struggles of the masses of Asia, Africa and Latin America. One section among them becomes worshippers of Che Guevara and do not stress the work of organising the peasantry which is the main force of the democratic revolution of India. As a result, they invariably become victims of Leftist deviation. So we shall have to give particular attention to them and must gradually educate them through experience. On no account should we become impatient with them. Apart from them, there is also another group of revolutionary comrades among us, who accept the Chinese Party and Mao Tsetung Thought and also accept that that path is the only path. But they take the book 'How to become a Good Communist' as the only way to self-cultivation; as a result they fall into a dangerous deviation.

The only Marxist way of self-cultivation that Lenin and Chairman Mao have taught us, is that of class struggle. Only by burning himself in the fire of class struggle can a Communist become genuine gold. Class struggle alone is the real school for the Communists, and the experience of class struggle will have to be assessed in the light of Marxism-Leninism -Mao Tsetung Thought and lessons will have to be drawn from it. So the main point of party education is to apply the lessons of Marxism-Leninism in the field of class struggle, to come to general principles from that experience, and to take again to the masses those principles gained from that experience. This is known as '*From the People to the People.*' This is the main point of Party education. These revolutionary comrades fail to realize this main truth of Party education. As a result they commit idealist deviations about Party education. Chairman Mao Tsetung has taught us that there can be no education without practice. In his words, '*doing is learning.*' Self-cultivation is only possible through changing the situation by revolutionary practice alone.

REVOLUTIONARIES OF THE WORLD UNITE !

LONG LIVE THE REVOLUTIONARY UNITY OF WORKERS AND  
PEASANTS!

LONG LIVE CHAIRMAN MAO TSETUNG!



## **II**

# **DOCUMENTS OF A I C C R**

# DECLARATION OF THE REVOLUTIONARIES OF THE COMMUNIST PARTY OF INDIA (MARXIST)

(Popularly known as First Declaration)

*November 13, 1967*

An excellent revolutionary situation prevails now in our country with all its classical symptoms as enunciated by Comrade Lenin. But the neo-revisionist leadership of the CPI(M) has betrayed the people and the Party. They have betrayed the cause of the Indian Revolution.

Despite all their revolutionary phrase-mongering it has now become crystal clear that these renegades have chosen the path of parliamentarism and class-collaboration and have shelved for good the revolutionary struggle for political power. The great trust reposed in them by revolutionary comrades when the latter in their glorious struggle against revisionism repudiated the leadership of the Dange clique, has been shamelessly betrayed. The process of betrayal had, of course, started before the organisational split came. The split itself was brought about not on the basis of ideology, but artificially, through the instrumentality of Dange letters in order to prevent consummation of the inner-party struggle into a genuine split, which these neo-revisionists feared most. They, however, succeeded, though temporarily, in their game; this bunch of conspirators was able to incorporate surreptitiously into the Party's Programme formulations alien to Marxism - Leninism and Mao Tsetung's Thought. By disowning, in the name of independent analysis, the neo-colonial nature of our country and its semi-feudal, semi-colonial character as well as the strategy and tactics of democratic revolution following therefrom, they indirectly indicated that what was being built up in India was an independent capitalist economy and that the Indian big bourgeoisie had not exhausted its anti-imperialist role, and thus they managed to discard Comrade Mao Tsetung's great blue-print for world revolution, specially for the revolutions in the countries of Asia Africa and Latin America as presented in a concentrated form by comrade Lin Biao with regard to the world communist movement, their attitude of "non-committal" non-partisanship was a camouflage for their support to Khrushchev revisionism. Thus, nationally and internationally, the seeds of Titoism were cunningly sown, which in course of time sprouted forth into the notorious Madurai resolutions.

It is profitable to recall here that since the inception of our party, its leadership has been usurped at different phases by revisionists, adventurists and opportunists. As a result, glorious class battles fought by revolutionary comrades and people under our Party flag have again and again been betrayed. The blood of invaluable cadres of the Party has flown in profusion in many a sanguinary class battle, and many a significant victory has been won, of whose fruits, however, the fighters themselves were deprived, thanks to the treachery of the persons at the helm of the Party. Time and again revolutionary elements inside the Party have conducted intense and principled inner-party struggles; time and again they have risen in open revolt; time and again international Communist leadership has come forward to help and guide our Party; and every time the opportunist usurpers of the party machinery- both of the 'right' and of the 'left'- have treated these inner-party battles and fraternal offers of help and advice from the international leadership with utter cynicism and insolence.

Naxalbari came as a turning point in the history of our Party and country. The revolutionary comrades of Darjeeling district of West Bengal rose in open revolt against the Party's revisionist leadership and politics as well as against the organisational slavery imposed by this leadership. But unlike earlier inner-party struggles, this revolt was accompanied by revolutionary practice. It is a typical peasant war modelled on Comrade Mao Tsetung's Thought and led by communists and working class, opening up the real and only way to India's democratic revolution. This great class battle of Darjeeling peasants at once received the warm fraternal care of the leader of world communism - the Chinese Communist Party led by Chairman Mao Tsetung and at once it galvanised long - simmering inner - party struggles into open revolutionary revolt. Simultaneously, Naxalbari unleashed militant and armed peasant battles in different parts of the country, sometimes spontaneous and sometimes led by revolutionaries. But one of Naxalbari's great contributions to the Indian Revolution is that it has stripped naked the leadership of the party and of other parties mouthing revolutionary slogans and has laid bare before the eyes of the world the utter hollowness of their revolutionism. They even openly joined hands with Indian reactionaries to crush this revolutionary peasant base with utmost military and police brutality.

Comrades must have noted that revolutionary peasant struggles are now breaking out or going to break out in various parts of the country. It is an imperative revolutionary duty on our part as the vanguard of the working class to develop and lead these struggles as far as possible. With that end in view all revolutionary elements inside and outside the Party working rather in isolation today in different parts of the country and on different fronts of mass struggle must co-ordinate their activities and unite their forces to build up a *revolutionary party* guided by Marxism - Leninism, the Thought of Mao Tsetung. After the final and decisive betrayal at Madurai the situation brooks no delay. Hence, this urgent need for co - ordination.

So we, the comrades of different states, who have been thinking and fighting on the above line, have decided after meeting in Calcutta to form an All

- India co-ordination Committee. On behalf of this committee, we declare that its main tasks will be;

(1) To develop and co-ordinate militant and revolutionary struggles at all levels, specially, peasant struggles of the Naxalbari type under the leadership of the working class;

(2) To develop militant, revolutionary struggles of the working class and other toiling people to combat economism and to orient these struggles towards agrarian revolution;

(3) To wage an uncompromising ideological struggle against revisionsism and neo-revisionism and to popularise the Thought of comrade Mao Tsetung, which is Marxism - Leninism of the present era, and to unite on this basis all revolutionary elements within and outside the party;

(4) To undertake preparations of a revolutionary programme and tactical line based on concrete analysis of the Indian situation in the light of Comrade Mao Tsetung's Thought.

Naxalbari has shown us the way to the Indian people's democratic revolution as much as it has unmasked the true face of the neo-revisionists at present controlling the Party. Now it is time to act and act we must, here and now. It is time we start building *a really revolutionary party*. A great responsibility rests upon us and we must shoulder it as true revolutionaries and try to prove ourselves worthy disciples of Comrade Mao Tsetung.

We call upon the revolutionary comrades still within the Communist Party of India (Marxist) to *repudiate openly* the neo-revisionist leading clique and its politics and *openly* to join hands with us who are striving to *build a genuine Communist party* in our country.

[ Reprinted from *Liberation*, Vol. 1 No. 2, December 1967 ]



# DECLARATION OF ALL INDIA CO-ORDINATION COMMITTEE OF COMMUNIST REVOLUTIONARIES (popularly known as second declaration)

May 14, 1968

The All India Co - ordination Committee of Revolutionaries of the Communist Party of India ( Marxist ), in its first session held on the eve of the first anniversary of the Naxalbari peasants' struggle , reviewed the events subsequent to its first session held six months back and decided to issue a new declaration in consideration of the changed situation. It was also decided that henceforward the Committee would be called the *All India Co - ordination Committee of Communist Revolutionaries*. The declaration is as follows :

Exactly a year ago the nor 'wester' with all its fury burst over India and proclaimed throughout the world that a new era had begun in india's history. Inspired by Marxism - Leninism and Chairman Mao's Thought and led by the communist revolutionaries, the heroic peasants of Naxalbari rose in revolt with arms in their hands to smash the chains of slavery . Once again they showed that the parliamentary path which all sorts of revisionists , overt or covert, had been treading had become altogether outmoded . Since that day the message of Naxalbari - the message of armed peasant struggle under the leadership of the working class - has reached villages in remote areas of India and under its .nspiration many a peasant struggle has begun in different parts of the country. While, on the one hand , this event has caused panic in the minds of U.S imperialists, Soviet revisionists, the Indian big landlord class , comprador - bureaucrat bourgeois class and their stooges, the renegade Dange clique and neo - revisionists, on the other hand, the toiling people of India and all the revolutionary elements irrespective of their party affiliations have greeted this event with hope and exuberance. To them Naxalbari is a path - the path which is brightly illuminated with Cahirman Mao's Thought - the path which is the path of liberation of all colonial and semi - colonial people - the path along which the Chinese Revolution is victorious.

A little over twenty years ago India was a colony of Britain ; today India has been turned into a neo - colony of some imperialist powers , the principal of them being the United States and the Soviet Union . The U.S imperialists , the most aggressive enemies of mankind , are also the worst enemies of the Indian people. Their neo - colonial grip over India is now complete. The traitorous Soviet ruling clique who have re-established bourgeois dictatorship in the first Socialist State of the world are to -day actively collaborating with the U.S. imperialists and they have turned India into a neo- colony of both the United States and the Soviet Union. India is a perfect example of the entente into which the U.S imperialists and Soviet neo- colonialists have entered to jointly establish hegemony over the world.



The increasingly growing economic and political crisis is the result of extreme and acute contradictions between the ruling classes and the people. In the present era capitalist-imperialist system is heading towards final collapse. In the semi-colonial and semi-feudal India, the contradiction between imperialist and neo-colonial powers and the people, the contradiction between feudal classes and the peasantry and the contradiction between comprador-bureaucratic capital and the working class have assumed the most acute form. Today, U.S imperialism, Soviet revisionism, the big landlord class and the comprador-bourgeoisie of India are the principal enemies of the Indian people - these are like four mountains weighing heavily on the backs of the Indian people.

The people's Democratic Revolution can succeed only by overthrowing the direct and indirect rule of these four enemies. Under the leadership of the working class, the peasantry - the principal force in the revolution - will have to develop revolutionary base areas in the countryside, carry on a protracted armed struggle, encircle the cities from the villages and in the end occupy them and win countrywide final victory. On the basis of the alliance of the working class with the peasantry will be built the united front of the working class, the peasantry, the petty-bourgeoisie and the national bourgeoisie. The success of the Indian Revolution will depend on how much the revolutionaries and the people have been enthused by Chairman Mao's Thought which is the highest development of Marxism-Leninism of our time. The foremost task of all the communist revolutionaries is to propagate and spread the Thought of Mao Tsetung. The enemies of the Indian people can be overthrown not by conspiratorial methods but only by pursuing a mass line.

It has been our experience that revisionists of all varieties the Dangeite traitors or the neo-revisionists are lackeys of U.S imperialism, Soviet neo-revisionism and domestic reactionaries and are undoubtedly the enemies of the Indian people.

At Burdwan, the neo-revisionist leaders put a final seal of approval on the anti-Marxist, revisionist ideological political line; but faced with opposition of revolutionaries and the people they became more cunning and wicked than ever before. The opportunists alone and not the Marxist-Leninists can remain inside the Party - a Party which rejects Marxism-Leninism, Chairman Mao Tsetung's Thought and adopts the parliamentary path, discarding the path of revolutionary violence. It has become all the more clear after the Burdwan Plenum that like the Dangeite traitors, the neo-revisionists too have joined the counter-revolutionary camp, and with Marxism-Leninism on their lips they are actively striving to disrupt from within the agrarian revolution that is being launched. Those who, instead of severing all connections with them, still think that there is yet some scope left for inner-party struggles, are creating illusions anew amongst the anti-revisionist fighters and are creating obstacles to their unity.

Today India has a position of vital importance in the counter-revolutionary world strategy of U.S. imperialists and Soviet neo-colonialists. They have reduced India to a powerful bastion of reaction

in order to conduct war against the revolutionary forces of India , to defeat the great and glorious war of liberation of the Vietnamese people , to smash the wars of liberation of other nations and people of South and South-East Asia and to attack the socialist China ; and the reactionary ruling class of India has been eagerly , enthusiastically and actively co - operating in these schemes of theirs. To achieve these designs , the Soviet betrayers , hand in gloves with the U.S. imperialists, have increased their supply of military hardwares to the Indian reactionaries. Supersonic jet bombers and submarines are among those hardwares. They have set up MIG- factory and missile bases on the soil of India and have been trying to secure marine bases for their warships in the Andamans and Nicobar islands. World today is divided into two camps. The U.S imperialists and their chief accomplice , the Soviet neo-colonialists, are the leaders of one camp; socialist china and Chairman Mao are the leaders of the other camp . The present era is the era of Chairman Mao Tsetung. This is the era when imperialism is on the verge of final collapse and socialism is advancing towards final victory worldwide. Assured is the victory of the Indian people who are a contingent of the great anti-imperialist army of the world people against imperialism , its accomplices and agents.

At this historic moment we once more appeal to the revolutionaries in all parts of India, to all those who have accepted Chairman Mao's Thought to consolidate their forces and to co-ordinate their struggles so that the victory of the Indian Revolution is hastened. Come, let us rally under the red banner of Chairman Mao's Thought , apply his thought in the concrete conditions of India and organise Naxalbari -type struggles and thus build up a genuine Indian Communist party ; for, without a revolutionary party revolution cannot achieve victory.

We, on this occasion , appeal to all those revolutionaries who firmly believe in Chairman Mao Tsetung's Thought and have revolted against the revisionist and neo-revisionist leadership but are still maintaining separate group-identity, to disband their groups and join the All India Co-ordination Committee of Communist Revolutionaries.

They should realise that today existence of separate groups is harmful to the cause of the Indian Revolution.

The day of final destruction of imperialism and its chief ally, the revisionists, is drawing near. The victory of the Indian Revolution will take us closer to that great day . Chairman Mao in his most recent statement has predicted :

It can be said with certainty that the day of complete destruction of colonialism, imperialism and all systems of exploitation , and the complete liberation of all exploited nations and people of the world is not far off.

*[Translated from the Bengali version of the Declaration ]*

[Source : *Three Documents of the AICCCR* (in Bengali) published by Deshabrati Prakashani, Calcutta]



# RESOLUTION ON ELECTIONS

[A statement issued by the AICCCR.]

*May 14, 1968*

“ Following the completion of the Chinese Revolution there is a tide of national liberation movement in various countries, and Chairman Mao Tsetung's Thought - which is Marxism - Leninism in the era of rapid collapse of imperialism and rapid progress of socialism has made its appearance. As a result, bourgeois parliamentary institutions having already become historically obsolete, are now obstacles to the progress of revolution in general, and in particular, to the progress of revolution in semi- feudal and semi-colonial countries like India; for, a country like India is not bourgeois but feudal. From their experience of the past twenty years people have realised this bitter truth that as an alternative to the path of armed struggle as developed by chairman Mao in China, Parliamentary path keeps intact the chain of slavery and hastens the process of destruction. Particularly from their experience of the last ten months during which the revolutionary struggle of Naxalbari was born, they have derived a more important lesson. They have seen with their own eyes that the communist and socialist hypocrites are in reality partners of this conspiracy of the ruling class. They have seen with their own eyes how the betrayer Dange clique and the neo-revisionists have preached class collaboration while mouthing revolutionary jargons, how they have tried to give a fresh lease of life to the parliamentary path and have tried to create illusions anew in the minds of the people regarding that path. At the behest of their masters, they have sought to destroy the revolutionary peasant struggle of Naxalbari - not only the Naxalbari struggle but also the struggles of all workers, peasants and other toiling masses. In the background of the past twenty years of the satanic

Congress rule, people have learnt from their past ten months' experience that the betrayer Dange clique, the neo-revisionists and other left parties are, in fact, part of the reactionary ruling classes of India all of them are their faithful agents and have been safeguarding their interests. Because they have donned the garb of 'leftists', they have been performing all the more effectively this task of safeguarding their interests. But our people have begun to learn from their experience. Their illusion regarding the parliamentary path-their illusion regarding elections and ministries is being quickly shattered. Their revolutionary consciousness is continuously on the rise.

“ After the great Chinese Revolution, we are living in a revolutionary era of rapid collapse of imperialism; we are now in the midst of a great revolutionary upsurge. The traitors have betrayed the great struggle of Telengana. But today Naxalbari has made its appearance on the horizon. Naxalbari came as a turning point in the history of India's revolution. Naxalbari has dug the grave of parliamentarism in India. People of India had so long been submerged in the mire of parliamentarism. Now they have seen the light. Now they have realised

that the path of Naxalbari is the only path of their liberation. The reactionary ruling classes and their agents-the betrayer Dange clique and neo-revisionists, have understandably become panicky over Naxalbari. So, lest the spark of Naxalbari turn into a prairie fire they are desperately peddling elections.

"So, comrades, our call is: 'Down with Elections'. We call upon all the revolutionaries and revolutionary masses to raise this slogan, "Boycott this Election". By raising this slogan foil the mischievous counter-revolutionary conspiracy of the reactionary ruling classes and their agents, the betrayer Dange clique and neo-revisionists. But at the same time we must not forget that this mere negative slogan of "boycott" will not take us very far. Simultaneously we must have concrete tasks. Side by side with the "boycott" campaign, people have to be organised and rallied under the banner of Chairman Mao's Thought, along the path of revolutionary class struggles, and efforts must be made to build up Naxalbari type of movements-such movements as will help us march ahead along the path of the People's Democratic Revolution."

*[ translated from the Bengali version of the Resolution ]*



## RESOLUTION ABOUT OUR ACTIVITIES IN THE TRADE UNION FRONT

[ Resolution unanimously adopted in the second meeting of the All India Co-ordination of the Communist revolutionaries held in 1968.]

### (1) MAIN OBJECTIVE :

To organise and complete Agrarian Revolution in India is our present historical task and main objective. It is our historic responsibility to establish working class leadership over the revolution. The workers should be imbued with revolutionary thought and vanguard proletariat should be trained to fulfil their task. A complete inner change in the minds of the workers should be brought with revolutionary political thought and training in order to unfold their potentiality in this mission. We must move keeping this objective in view.

The T.U. movement has definitely a historic role and it should not be minimised, though T.U. movement, in the sphere of the present revolution, should be considered as an auxiliary movement to peasant struggle.

In the present situation of India, the urban area should not be considered as a dark zone of Reaction and a place of complete white terror. There is scope for T.U. movement and organise working class struggle. Hence, it must be our duty to organise T.U. movement in the line of our basic politics and revolutionary objective.

## **(2) REORIENTATION OF T.U.MOVEMENT :**

T.U.movement in India, even under the leadership of the communist forces, has, for a long period, been deeply sunk into the mud of Economism. The root of economism is in the reformism and revisionism in politics. In relation to movement, economism is an attitude and design of limiting the workers' struggle within the frame-work of economic demands and relief only. In the present revolutionary situation and in the context of our revolutionary task we must reorientate our T.U. movement with a revolutionary outlook and must make every endeavour to make it free from the tentacles of Economism.

We shall no doubt utilise the movement of partial demands or economic concessions for developing consciousness of the working class towards our revolutionary politics; but we must definitely make a departure from old trend of movement in form and contents. Old form of starting movement with an agitation on charter of demands should gradually be replaced with a new form of creating movement independently on political slogans so as to ingrain consciousness in the minds of the working class to fight for seizure of State power. Even in the old form new contents i.e. exposure of State power and effort for development of revolutionary consciousness of working class in the process of struggle, should be brought in. We must make conscious effort in this new direction.

## **(3) SOME STEPS TO MAKE T.U. MOVEMENT FREE FROM ECONOMISM:**

### **A--SOME GENERAL PRINCIPLES TO BE FOLLOWED:**

- (i) Politics of agrarian revolution as viewed by us in the line of Mao Tse Tung's thought and the task and responsibility of working class related thereto, must consistently be campaigned amongst the workers.
- (ii) It must be brought to the realisation of the workers, through consistent campaign, that in the present period of deep economic crisis there is no scope for achieving real economic concession through partial struggles and the working class must fight for an overall change by smashing the existing state machinery and coming to political power jointly with peasantry.
- (iii) The working class must be enlightened with the ingredients of the present revolutionary period and their duty to support the cause of other revolutionary classes and develop fraternal co-operation with them.
- (iv) The working class should be made conscious that without Agrarian revolution their condition will not improve and the existing economic situation cannot be altered.

### **B --- NATURE OF OUR ACTIVITIES :**

#### **(a) General :**

- (i) We shall not take partial struggle as an end in itself and conduct the same with political perspective; we shall utilise partial struggles for developing political and revolutionary consciousness amongst the workers. Slogans, which at this stage, will develop political consciousness should be advanced ; such as, illegalisation of automation, retrenchment & lockout, lowering down price level and food for all, scrapping of repressive and anti- labour law, etc.

- (ii) We shall mobilise workers independently with our political slogans and in support of the cause of other revolutionary classes. This must be done consciously and frequently as far as practicable. Joint meetings and demonstrations with other revolutionary classes must be organised. Workers should be mobilised against police atrocities, whenever takes place against any revolutionary class and masses. We shall drive effort towards organising political strikes.
  - (iii) We shall make consistent endeavour to eliminate from the minds of the working class the illusion of bourgeois laws and existing machinery of conciliation and adjudication for getting their demands realised and shall make consistent effort to develop the attitude of militant struggles. We must never adopt Satyagraha, Huger Strike, etc. as forms of Struggle.
- (b) Organisational**
- (i) We shall not create independent T.U. platform at this stage.
  - (ii) We shall create factories and industries with our politics.
  - (iii) We shall avoid T.U. generally ; however wherever overwhelming workers so desire we should shoulder responsibility to establish unions. We shall endeavour consistently to establish
  - (iv) We : ; to Power group industries, Transport, are bourgeoisie, plantation, public sector industries, industries run by Imperial and Foreign capital in any form.
  - (v) Our urban area comrades, who cannot remain in village to work in peasant front, should mainly work in T.U. and student fronts and they should laboriously endeavour to bring the workers within the fold of our politics and revolutionary activities.
  - (vi) We shall make systematic attempt to send worker militants to village to work among the peasantry and shall endeavour to develop organisational co-ordination between T.U.s and Peasant Fronts.
  - (vii) We shall pay special attention to develop net work of organisation in compact area where workers reside and shall endeavour to build up our organised zones there organising our forces together and built up resistant organisation against reaction and offensive of state machinery. This should not lead to the idea of creating urban-centric revolution.
  - (viii) We shall issue independently political and agitational leaflets and distribute political literatures on communism and Mao's thought and organise political classes amongst the workers. We shall explain to the workers the Marxian concept of wage and expose the hollow of Bourgeois concept.
  - (ix) We shall train up the worker groups in revolutionary activities independent of their T.U.works.



## RESOLUTION ON APCCCR

*February 7, 1969*

After discussions with the representative of the Andhra Co-ordination Committee, AICCCR (All India Co-ordination Committee of Communist Revolutionaries) is of the opinion that there are basic differences between AICCCR and the Andhra Co-ordination Committee. AICCCR therefore decides to part with Andhra Co-ordination Committee and to treat them as friends and comrades outside AICCCR.

These differences relate first and foremost to the question of loyalty to the Communist Party of China. AICCCR thinks Comrade Nagi Reddy's press statement on the Kerala incident and his failure to revise it, which is tantamount to adherence to it, even after the Chinese comrades' clear and categorical pronouncement is a clear proof that Comrade Nagi Reddy and the Andhra Committee, which supports his stand, are not loyal to the CPC.

The second question relates to the attitude to the Srikakulam struggle. AICCCR holds that instead of owning and glorifying it, the Andhra Committee simply accords it at most lukewarm support. The politics behind this attitude is basically different from the politics of AICCCR.

The third question is the question of Boycott of Elections. With AICCCR it is a basic question of revolutionary struggles for a whole period but the Andhra Committee still persists in taking it as a matter of tactics. Moreover, Comrade Nagi Reddy's failure to comply with AICCCR's resolution by not resigning from the Andhra State Assembly within the specified time, that is, within two months from the end of October, 1968, issues out of this basic political difference.

AICCCR thinks that with this political difference all along the line, that is, difference regarding loyalty to the CPC, difference regarding people's armed struggle, and difference regarding boycotting elections, AICCCR and the Andhra Committee cannot and should not continue in the same Co-ordination. AICCCR should henceforth treat the Andhra Committee as friends and comrades outside the Co-ordination and should try to maintain non-antagonistic relations with them.

*-From Liberation, Vol.II, No.5 (March 1969).*



# RESOLUTION ON PARTY FORMATION

## IT IS TIME TO FORM THE PARTY

*[Adopted by the All India Co-ordination Committee  
of Communist Revolutionaries on February 8, 1969.]*

A little over 18 months has passed since the revolutionary peasant struggle was launched in Naxalbari under the allconquering banner of the thought of Mao Tsetung. And it is more than a year ago that the All India Co-ordination Committee of Communist Revolutionaries was formed under the inspiring leadership of the Naxalbari comrades.

During this period, though brief, the Co-ordination Committee has, no doubt, made significant achievements in dealing powerful blows at all reactionary ideology, including revisionism and neo-revisionism, and in spreading the flames of agrarian revolution. This period has witnessed the victorious march of Chairman Mao's thought, the acme of Marxism-Leninism in the present era, which is winning new adherents every day. It is during this period that the flames of agrarian revolution have spread out from Naxalbari to Srikakulam in the south and to Mushahari and Lakimpur Kheri in the north. It has been the period when the peasant revolutionaries of Kerela have staged a heroic revolt that has shaken the whole of India. It has also been the period of the bursting forth of the revolutionary liberation struggle of the Adibasi people in Chotanagpur and its uninterrupted advance. It is also in this period that the national liberation struggles of the Nagas, the Mizos and the Kukis have entered a new phase. The reactionary Indian Government has become a stooge of U.S. and Soviet imperialism and a dead-weight on the Indian people. And so the resistance of the Indian people both in the countryside and in the cities-among the working class and the petty-bourgeois masses-is growing fast and is creating a new upsurge in the agrarian revolution which is the main content of the Democratic revolution in India today. The revolutionary struggle of the Indian people to achieve emancipation from the yoke of imperialism, Soviet revisionism, feudalism and comprador-bureaucrat capital has now reached a new height.

In this excellent revolutionary situation, when the people of India have finally embarked on the road of revolution, all the parties of the ruling classes, including the various revisionist parties, are feverishly trying to strengthen the parliamentary illusions. The call of "Boycott Election" issued by the Co-ordination Committee has exposed the hollowness of parliamentarism and the counter-revolutionary character of the revisionist and neo-revisionist parties.

It is a heartening fact that within the last one year, revolutionaries from Assam to Maharashtra have united under the banner of the All India Co-ordination Committee and all the centres of revolutionary peasant struggles are linked with



one another through this Committee. The reactionary ruling classes and their counter-revolutionary agents, including the revisionists and the neo-revisionists, who pinned their hopes on the disunity within the revolutionary ranks, have been sorely disappointed. The growing unity within the ranks of the revolutionaries despite the obstacles created by the reactionaries of all sorts proves that we have overcome the main impediment to the formation of a revolutionary party in India. The Co-ordination Committee has thus served as the first indispensable link in the chain-the process of forming a Marxist-Leninist Party in India.

However, the experiences of the last one year have also made it amply clear that the political and organisational needs of the fast developing revolutionary struggles can no longer be adequately met by the Co-ordination Committees. These struggles have to be led and co-ordinated in an effective manner. The entire revolutionary forces have to be fully roused and organised to consolidate and extend the existing areas of struggle. The rich experiences of these struggles have to be analysed and assessed, generalisations have to be made and lessons drawn in order to lead these struggles along the correct line. These struggles cannot develop to a higher stage and a revolutionary authority cannot grow if we depend merely on local initiatives. Without a revolutionary party there can be no revolutionary discipline and without revolutionary discipline struggles cannot be raised to a higher level. Only a revolutionary party can infuse revolutionary discipline, the spirit of self-sacrifice and death-defying abandon. So, for taking these struggles forward, it is essential to form an all India Party and a centre recognised by all revolutionaries. The All India Co-ordination Committee was set up to help this process of forming a revolutionary party and this was set down in the very first Declaration. In the absence of such a Party, comrades in the areas of struggle have come to look upon the Co-ordination Committees as Party Committees and expect them to function in the same manner. But the Co-ordination Committees cannot fulfil the complex political and organisational tasks arising out of the present stage of revolutionary struggles. At a time when Communist revolutionaries all over the country have given priority to the task of building revolutionary bases in the rural areas, at a time when the slogan of revolutionary class struggle is rending the sky, it is our immediate duty to form a revolutionary Party without which the advance of revolution is sure to be impeded. Chairman Mao teaches us; "If there is to be revolution, there must be a revolutionay Party. Without a revolutionary Party, without a Party built on the Marxist-Leninist revolutionary theory and in the Marxist-Leninist revolutionary style, it is impossible to lead the working class and the broad masses of the people in defeating imperialism and its running dogs".

Idealist deviations on the question of Party building arise as a result of the refusal to recognise the struggle that must be waged within the Party. The idea that the Party should be formed only after all opportunist tendencies, alien trends and undesirable elements have been purged through class struggles is nothing but subjective idealism. To conceive of a Party without contradictions, without the struggle between the opposites, i.e., to think of a pure and faultless party is indulging

in mere idealist fantasy. Chairman Mao has taught us: "*Opposition and struggle between ideas of different kinds constantly occur within the Party; this is a reflection within the Party of contradictions between classes and between the new and the old in society. If there were no contradictions in the Party and no ideological struggles to resolve them, the Party's life would come to an end.*"

Revisionism is bourgeois, counter-revolutionary ideology. The inner-party struggle between revolutionary ideology and counter-revolutionary ideology will continue so long as classes exist. It is through an uncompromising struggle against revisionism and other alien trends that the Party shall grow and develop.

Fortunately for us, we are living in an era when the thought of Mao Tsetung is winning victory after victory, when the great proletarian cultural revolution, personally initiated and led by Chairman Mao, has gained historic victory in China and has immensely enriched the treasure-house of Marxism-Leninism, when Chairman Mao is still living and leading the world proletarian forces in the final struggle for complete victory of Socialism all the world over. We are confident that with the active co-operation of all the revolutionaries of our country we shall succeed in building a Party in the revolutionary style capable of leading the Indian revolution through to complete victory.

It should be borne in mind that ours is a new great era of world revolution and that the responsibility of the Communist revolutionaries of India, a contingent of the world communist movement, is tremendous. All the imperialist powers of the world headed by the U.S. imperialists and the Soviet social fascists are trying to win a fresh lease of life by exploiting the 500 million people of India. They are also trying to use Indian people as cannon-fodder in a war to destroy Socialist China, the base of the world revolution. By carrying the Indian revolution to victory we shall not only end the brutal exploitation of the vast masses of our country but also hasten the collapse of world imperialism and revisionism and thus help in building a radiant future for ourselves and for all mankind. We must unite with our class brethren who are waging heroic struggles in Vietnam, Burma, Thailand, Malaya, Indonesia and various other countries of the world and forge that great bond of internationalism—that internationalism which has been given noble expression by Chairman Mao in the great proletarian cultural revolution.

A stage has now been reached when the formation of the Communist Party brooks no further delay. The Party should immediately be formed with those revolutionaries as the core who are building up and conducting revolutionary class struggles. This Party composed of revolutionary cadres, steeled and tempered in the fire of class struggle, shall play its historic role in leading India's People's Democratic Revolution to victory, in carrying it forward to the completion of the Socialist Revolution and in helping to bring about the total collapse of world imperialism and revisionism.

*[Reproduced from Liberation, Vol 2, No.5, March 1967]*



## COMMUNIQUE

*[Issued on 22nd April 1969]*

The All India Co-ordination Committee of Communist Revolutionaries, which met in a plenary session from 19th to 22nd April 1969, announces the formation of the revolutionary party, Communist Party of India (Marxist-Leninist), based on the Thought of Mao Tse-tung on 22nd April 1969, the one-hundredth birthday of Great Lenin—a task it set itself eighteen months ago, in November 1967—and also announces its own dissolution after setting up a *Central Organizing Committee* to hold Congress at an appropriate time.

*-From Liberation, Vol. II, No. 7 (May 1969).*



### **III**

# **DOCUMENTS OF A P C C C R**

## T.NAGI REDDY'S INTERVIEWS

*[We are reproducing three interviews of T.N. The first one is taken from the Book "Face to Face -Fascism and Revolution in India" by Lasse and Lisa Berg, published by Ramparts Press, California USA. These two young sweedish Journalists visited India in 1966 as tourists and then again , in 1968-69 to do socialological research on revolutionary peasant movements. In the course of their second visit they travelled widely in the Indian country side and spent much of their time living in villages. The second one is taken from BLITZ. Its correspondent, A. Raghavan, interviewed .T.N.on Aug 15, 1968. Third one is from Frontier Anthology-2 published under the title, "Srikakulam Story". Narayana Murthy interviewed T.N. on Sept 20, 1969 - EC]*

### a) To A.Raghavan, BLITZ Correspondent:

#### KISAN ARMED STRUGGLE ONLY PERSPECTIVE

The following is the full text of the questions and answers :

**Mr. Reddi, what are the ideological and political reasons for the series of splits in the Marxist Communist Party ?**

There had been sharp differences in the undivided Communist movement about the perspective of the revolution in India. In the international movement from 1960 there has been the Soviet line and the Chinese line.

#### PEOPLE DECEIVED:

When the CPI split in 1964, most of us who formed the new party thought that its leadership would follow Chinese formulation. We were manoeuvred by the leadership into believing that, unlike Dange and his followers, the Communist Marxists would tread the revolutionary road and not the beaten track of Parliamentarism.

**You are all veterans. How come that you are hustled ?**

One reason was that we got diverted by the so-called Dange letters. The leadership played upon the emotions the letters roused. In the process, the ideological differences that brought about the split went overboard. They were

not properly debated so much so that there was no clarity among the ranks. The dismal result is that today, though the CPI(M) leadership talks vociferously about revolution, objectively it is sinking deeper into sterile Parliamentarism than even the CPI.

### **DEGENERATION:**

In that respect, the CPI is intellectually honest. It is frank about its pursuit of the Parliamentary line. On the other hand, the CPI(M) is deceiving the people and its own ranks by its loudmouthed declarations on revolution, while sticking like leeches to the ministerial chairs.

As a sequel to the degeneration of the CPI(M) the old debate ( on the perspective and strategy of Indian revolution ) was resumed among the ranks leading to the present series of split.

There have been two helpful factors in this thinking.

ONE is the victory of armed liberation struggles in Vietnam and elsewhere leading to the isolation of US imperialism.

SECOND is the famous article of Lin Piao "Long Live Peoples War". Its postulate that villages will surround the cities on a world scale has greatly encouraged us all.

The Marxist leadership has been getting away from the Chinese line. Moreover, it has no line on such internal questions as nationalities, national language, etc.

### **NATIONALITIES:**

The question of nationalities brings us to the question of Kashmir. What is your attitude?

I personally agree to formalising the present cease-fire line. But basically the Kashmir issue can be solved by letting the Kashmiris to exercise their right of self-determination. Again, in such an event, personally I would tell the Kashmiris to choose India. But people must have a say.

**Are you not self-contradictory ? Tibetans are a distinct nationality. If they can be part of China without any such exercise which you propose for Kashmiris, why can't you let Kashmiris;.....**

Tibetans are not an Indian nationality. That question has to be decided by China.

### **COALITION HOAX :**

**The other day you spoke about the Telangana was being your way. It is the path of armed struggle. At the same time you are not boycotting Parliament and State Assemblies. How would you harmonise the two methods ?**

Telangana way and armed struggle are part of the perspective. When I talk of armed struggle, don't think I have right now given an order for insurrection. That is the perspective.

Even when we enter the legislative bodies we will keep that perspective in mind. We will enter these bodies to expose their fraudulent character to convince the masses that revolutionary way is the only way to solve their problems.

### **FRAUDULENT :**

**Mr. Reddy apparently there is a difference in your approach and the approach of the Bengal rebels headed by Charu Mazumdar. You will seek election to legislative bodies whereas your Bengal Comrades have called for**

**the boycott of the midterm election there.**

I know. But I don't want to say anything about it till I meet and discuss with them.

**What is your understanding about non-congress coalition governments.**

They are hoax. We will enter the Assemblies to expose them, but not join any coalition governments. Your interview with EMS (Blitz, July 20 ) is an eye-opener to me.

In the course of that interview EMS has said that no basic change can be made under the existing constitutional framework. Tell me, why is he then sticking to his ministerial chair ?

In India the mass deception practised through parliamentary institutions has been subtle unlike in the Czarist days. That is why the bourgeoisie does not bother about non-Congress governments. It knows that these governments would not bring about any basic changes.

And sure enough EMS has also joined this going in deceiving the people. He never does anything to expose it nor does he mobilise people to discard it. No wonder that people are saying that there is nothing to choose between the EMS government and any other Congress government.

**What is he talking about when he told you that "Ever so many shifts in the power and influence of various parties have to take place before a real alternative to the Congress can present itself on a national scale ?**

**SO MANY SHIFTS :**

I don't expect any Communist to talk in these terms. I am convinced that EMS is not for any basic change in the economic or Constitutional set up.

Did not EMS give an apology to the US Consulate in Madras for the damage caused to an USIS Jeep at Trivandrum in the pro-Vietnam demonstration. How are we to explain this ?

A coalition government can be thought of only in terms of anti-imperialist and anti-feudal programme.

As it is, non-Congress governments are more dangerous than Congress governments in the art of deceiving people.

**But EMS is not the only leader of the CPI(M). What about Sundarayya, the General Secretary ?**

Sundarayya, he is in supreme charge of the neo-revisionist policy. Does Sundarayya agree with all what EMS said in his Blitz interview ? If not, why didn't he contradict it ?

**The last question Mr. Reddy. You spoke of the armed struggle and cited the shining examples of China, Vietnam and Cuba. But aren't the Chinese and Cuban paths vastly different ?**

Yes, there is a fundamental difference between the Chinese and Cuban theories on guerilla warfare. But there is one thing common : ARMED STRUGGLE.

## **b) To Sweedish Journalists:**

### **The Revolutionary**

T. Nagi Reddy, revolutionary leader in Andhra Pradesh. We meet him at his home in Hyderabad the day he leaves Parliament, some hours before he is to take the train to his home district and leave this residence of parliamentary leaders for good.

He comes rushing in with his portfolio under his arm and a contented expression on his face. He looks rather young, has a finely chiseled face and intense eyes; he smiles a lot and talks a lot. We are interrupted occasionally during the interview by Indian journalists coming in and asking why he left Parliament. He gave a fiery speech earlier in the day and exhorted the peasants to extraparlimentary methods and armed struggle, so his is the biggest name in India today. His wife is a little bewildered but says that this was not unexpected. Now she must pack up the little they own and follow her husband out into the countryside. She was a very poor girl from a southern village when she met her lifelong companion. She doesn't really understand politics, she sighs, with a glance toward the little bookshelf where Lenin's collected works stand in a row. She is very thin and delicate, has her black hair tied in a knot over the back of her neck, wears glasses, and is dressed in a brown sari. She has devoted her life mostly to raising her daughter who is now married and lives in Delhi. She smiles slightly at her husband when he rushes off for the train with a small suitcase in his hand.

T. Nagi Reddy has the greatest national reputation among revolutionary Indian communist leaders. He was purged from the CPI(M) in 1967 and left his parliamentary post in Andhra Pradesh in 1969. He led the committee which was set up to organize the various revolutionary movements in the country.

#### **What are the most important problems in India today ?**

The farming problem. During the last two or three years the problem has become more and more acute with the result that numerous revolts are now going on, both organised and unorganised. The oppression by the landowners is growing, but so is the people's resistance continues to grow, but when there is no organisation, it explodes and dies out. Our duty is to see that this mobilisation of the anti-landowner fight gets organised in such a way that it will continue to grow in intensity and will culminate in armed struggle. Without armed struggle, it cannot survive. Without armed struggle, a revolution cannot succeed:

#### **What will be your greatest difficulties be ?**

The difficulties are of course our own mistakes during the last sixteen years, which have naturally led us to a condition of disorganisation. To be frank we are not organised in the way we ought to be if we are to function in a revolutionary way. We have created illusions among the people about parliamentary action, organised the Communist party's revolutionary machinery in a very parliamentary way. The old discipline has been lost. The old unselfish tendency has gone to waste; the old hard work has disappeared. Everything that a revolutionary needs has been lost. We must rebuild. This will be our greatest difficulty.



### **Where is the struggle most developed right now ?**

I would say that right now there is no really great struggle going on at all. A few years ago the people in Naxalbari had a revolt. Now a rebellion is going on in Srikakulam. There will be rebellions here and there in the country during near future. Organising them all will take time it will surely take two or three years- but we must work patiently toward this goal and organise the peasants in different places so that they are coordinated during the rest of the struggle. In Andhra we are trying to reorient our organisation to concentrate on base areas where we can fight and hold out in our struggle.

### **What role will the cities play ?**

We will, of course support every democratic struggle of the middle class or working class but the cities will play only a secondary role. They will never be able to play a leading role in a revolution, especially not in a country like India. The leaders of the revolution must come from the agricultural areas because it is in the agricultural areas that the economic crisis is most intense; it is there that the peasants' oppression is greatest. The people can also hold out in their struggle in the agricultural areas longer than they can in the cities.

### **What role will be played by the various sectors among the peasants-farm workers, small peasants, middle peasants ?**

In India the situation is such that the dominant feudal landowners take advantage of the capitalist economy. They now have greater political and economic advantages than they had under the English. So what could happen is that the middle peasants and everyone below them could be unified in the struggle against the landowners. This might even include the smaller landowners. The very biggest landowners sometimes have quarrels with small landowners and small landowners would like to see an end to the hegemony of the large landowners. So the very biggest of the feudal landowners will be our first target and we will not spread enmity between ourselves and the small landowners ; we want them on our side as far as possible. Today the feudal landowners are the greatest danger, and our fight will be primarily against them.

### **Will parliamentary action have any meaning in this struggle to liberate the peasants?**

For the present we don't think so.

### **You left the state parliament today.**

Yes, but if we had been carrying on the working class struggle in its revolutionary form during these sixteen years. We could probably have also used parliament, even if an agrarian revolution is going on in some places. India is a gigantic subcontinent ; it has many different organisational and revolutionary requirements.

We can go in for armed struggle in a really large area and still sit in Parliament in other areas where no armed struggle is going on. This would probably have been the best way to organise the revolutionary struggle- sometimes parliamentary and sometimes extraparlimentary. Trying now to organise both is meaningless.

As for the future, we must wait and see how things develop, how successful our organisations's work is and how the coordination of all these struggles goes. Then we must consider very clearly the various tactical possibilities open to us.

**What are the greatest difficulties in your work of politicising the peasants when it comes to their attitudes for example ?**

When you get right down to it, the peasant has a very conservative attitude since he is so severally oppressed today- economically, socially, and politically. But the peasants' conservative attitudes are no hindrance when they begin to fight; that has been our experience. The opportunities I can see today are greater than those of two or three years ago. For example, the peasants are getting disillusioned with the parliamentary line; the peasants are getting disillusioned with everything. If we don't intervene they will become demoralised. We must now see to it that they don't become demoralised by all these disappointments, but rather take part in struggle so that they understand that only they themselves can save the situation. No one else can do it only they themselves.

**What role do the imperialists play in the oppression of Indian peasants ?**

Good God! Their role is the most basic role one can imagine. The encroachment of foreign monopoly on the Indian agricultural economy is growing very rapidly, especially now that the Congress regime is attempting to develop what is called capitalist farming in everything new being introduced -- fertilizers, pesticides, new seed, cooperation. In some places the monopolies are directly involved in the produce trade. The imperialists encroach upon and take over all these areas. Unfortunately, the revolutionary left did not foresee this, so it has never been explained to the peasant masses in such a way that they could understand it. I am afraid that many within the so-called left in Parliament still do not understand the tremendous significance of this imperialist penetration into the agricultural economy. It is only during the last year that we have begun to study the problem in its correct perspective and have attempted to understand the depth of this penetration. I think that the peasant problem is not just a problem of feudalism, which is an external, visible enemy; there is also a big anti-imperialist problem, concerning prices and markets, concerning the goods they need.

**What were the biggest mistakes of the Naxalbari movement ?**

To tell the truth, I have not studied the Naxalbari struggle in detail. Not every armed struggle, whether in Naxalbari or some other place, will be a continuous series of victories. If every armed struggle was an unbroken string of victories, we could say that it was only a question of two or three years; but there will be many successes and many failures. The fact is that Naxalbari stands for a new way of thinking that is now making its mark in many places throughout the country, far out into the isolated villages. In this respect, Naxalbari was a great success; but if we think in terms of armed struggle, its continuation, a continuous series of armed successes- then Naxalbari is no success. But if you expected it to be so, then you were an optimist, not a revolutionary. Naxalbari could not be a success of this sort. Nor is it good to believe that Srikulam will be a series of successes without small defeats. It's not even like that in Vietnam; how could we expect it of Naxalbari ?

**A completely different question, Can the European left play any part in your struggle?**

Oh yes! An enormously important part. But I don't expect material aid. What I expect is that the left will explain to the European people that this struggle is now being carried out by the peasants in the villages. I also expect the left to explain the political and economic background of what is happening, and that the struggle will lead to the final national war of liberation in this country. People will not understand that this is a question of war of liberation now that India is politically independent. Unfortunately, this has never really been true, even if it seems that we became self-governing. Now it is completely clear that our independence was a false independence. Therefore, you must be able to explain that the agrarian revolution is a result of the political, economic, and social domination of the present imperialist powers. This domination is actually greater now than it was in 1947. I notice it even in my daily life, in a way that I did not in 1947. The universities were not so flooded by European thought as they are now. When I was a student I was more independent politically. There was more political thinking, more national thinking than today's Indian students experience. This is due to the encroachment of imperialism on our universities. Such encroachments occur everywhere. You must be able to explain all this to your own people and tell them that among students, the middle class, workers, peasants- everywhere - at some level the struggle against imperialism is being fought.

**c) To Narayana Murthy :**

### **The Srikakulam Story**

The struggle in Srikakulam has been caught in the vortex of a controversy between a group of young enthusiasts; encouraged and egged on by the All-India Co-ordination Committee of Communist Revolutionaries (now called Marxist-Leninist party) directly leading the struggle in Srikakulam on the one hand and the state revolutionary CO-ordination committee led by Mr T. Nagi Reddy on the other, guiding the struggle with his experience of the historic Telengana struggle.

The trouble seems to have started when the All-India committee, while carrying on a discussion with the state committee over the ideological and political issues, overran the state committee, gave some local enthusiasts the status of a state committee and asked it to take the resistance movement forward to the stage of an armed guerilla struggle without adequate preparation and without rousing the people to a level when they can act as an effective cushion against the onslaught of the police.

It was, however, not merely the organisational controversy but the very philosophy of armed struggle itself that was involved.

Here is a published interview with Mr. T. Nagi Reddy (on Sept 20, 1969) about the points of difference:

**Q : What are the main differences between the CPI(ML) and the Andhra State Committee of Revolutionaries?**

**A : The first issue is the question of tactics in relation to people's war. When**

does an armed struggle start? It starts only as a resistance to the landlord goondas and government repression and this resistance is in the form of people's resistance. Out of this resistance alone, resistance squads are to be formed. But the CPI(ML) does not bother about this aspect of people's participation as a form of resistance to landlord goondas and police repression. Formation of squads even in areas where there is no people's movement at all is their methodology, which isolates the squads from the masses.

The second difference: People's war always starts only as a form of resistance, not as a form of offensive. Therefore, it is a battle in defence of their demands, be it for land, be it for wages. It is a struggle for economic demands, it organises people to resist the landlord goondas and the government offensive and it is through this form of resistance that a real people's army could be built up in future.

But the method of the CPI(ML) has no relation to people's demands and people's struggles. Without any such relation, they go in for offensive actions against any and every landlord even in places where there is no mass movement of any type.

To put it simply, for us it is a matter of resistance, and for them it is a matter of offensive.

The third difference is on the question of other forms of struggle. Even though armed struggle is a basic struggle and is the most important struggle, it is not the only form of struggle in all places. For example, if Srikakulam can go into armed struggle to prepare the ground, organisation of people's consciousness towards armed struggle in other areas may have to be pursued. We will have to take to various forms of struggle, according to conditions prevailing in particular places. It might be a question of wages for agricultural labourer or the question of share of tenants or a question of distribution of cultivable waste lands of the government or even a question of occupation of government lands which are under occupation of landlords or have been converted into seed farms. In the process of these struggles for these demands, we would use various methods of struggle including the lowest form of struggle such as signature campaigns, deputations and demonstrations, just as we participate in the labour courts and in the industrial tribunals in the cities. Eventually, all these various forms of struggle should be conducted in such a manner as to develop better organisation, consciousness of the people towards people's direct participation on the question of land and other issues, leading to resistance against landlord and government repression.

But the Marxist-Leninists do not believe in any form of struggle other than armed struggle in all areas, irrespective of the strength of the party or the people. It is for this reason that they gave the call for party units to form themselves into squads in the coastal districts and to take action against the landlords.

This type of action, according to the Andhra Committee, does not help to build up a mass movement even in an area where such actions take place. Such actions are against the fundamental principles enunciated by Mao in relation to peasants, armed struggle.

**Q : In this background , how do you evaluate the armed actions in Srikakulam ?**

**A :** Every action in the Parvatipuram Agency area and agencies of similar type is real people's action on the basis of a movement , which has been built up over a number of issues including the basic question of land .People's participation is evident there and action against landlords is selective.

But in the plain areas, generally , there is neither a people's movement nor people's participation which can sustain those actions to develop a peoples movement there in future.

**Q: Do you agree with the view of the CPI(ML) that the Srikakulam armed struggle is a national liberation struggle ?**

**A :** Not every armed struggle is a national liberation struggle immediately , even though every struggle is an embryonic form of such struggle. To characterise every peasant struggle as a struggle for power and national liberation is to divert the attention and consciousness of the people from the basic demands of the people. National liberation struggle becomes a fundamental form of struggle only after a series of peasant armed actions in various places get coordinated into a people's army to fight for national liberation and people's Democracy.

Even Peking Radio has characterised the Naxalbari movement in Benagal as mainly an armed struggle of peasants for land and as an embryonic struggle for national liberation.

**Q: Will actions of the Srikakulam type lead to armed struggle ?**

**A :** No, There are two reasons : Without a people's demand being focussed and people being oarganised to get those demands implemented by their own actions, mere actions by squads divert the attention of the people from the issues on which they will have to fight.

Secondly, the people are their own liberators under the leadership of the Communist Party. That means they themselves must form part and parcel of the squads. But the manner in which this is being implemented by the Naxalites makes the people feel that liberators are someone else and not themselves. They look to someone for liberation. In consequence , instead of taking to actions on the basis of their own unity and organisational strength, they will look to others to do this job for them and save them from the exploitation of landlords.

The views expressed in this interview indicate that differences are pretty serious but very clear.

Attempts to discuss these differences with the All - India Co-ordination Committee appear to have proved futile. It is perhaps this that has made the section led by Mr. Nagi Reddy and like - minded people in other states including West Bengal to think in terms of forming another party. It is a sad but stark reality.

*[Reproduced from FRONTIER ANTHOLOGY-2]*



## LAY FOUNDATIONS FOR A STRUGGLE - ORIENTED MASS MOVEMENT

*[This is a Party Letter sent by the APCCCR led by T. Nagi Reddy on Sept 1, 1968 to all its units in AP to guide their work in the light of revolutionary mass line and peoples war path - EC. ]*

**Comrades,**

The entire central leadership which led the Indian Communist movement for a number of years has, as a whole, is guilty of the greatest betrayal. Notwithstanding the differences in what the Dange clique and neo-revisionist leadership profess, the class struggles have, in the hands of both of them, fallen prey to the right revisionism. Before the 1952 General Elections, they gave up the Telangana armed struggle and the other class struggles that scored great victories and set the future course of the country. In the name of legal limitations, they gave up the propaganda, agitation and the people struggles which alone could create among the people the consciousness that the problems of the oppressed people can be solved only through peoples struggles. They reduced the democratic Front into an electoral front of the non-congress parties. They began to form united fronts even with the most reactionary groups and parties. They gave up the task of building the democratic front by advancing the peasant struggles to the higher level through resistance against the brute force of the Government. They also gave up the tactical line that could achieve the peoples democracy. They have turned the participation in elections, Assemblies and Parliament into the main task of the party. They subordinated the party activities to the parliamentary front. They confined the movement to mere legal propaganda, agitational activities on demands within the limitations dictated by the Laws of the Government. The opportunist central leadership limited the class struggles that rose in their respective regions, led them to the legal path and weakened them. They had, in the name of non-congress united fronts blunted the edge of the class consciousness and the class fervor and set them on the parliamentary path. Whatever might the neo-revisionist leadership profess to show that there are differences between them and the Dange clique, there isn't any difference between them and the Dange clique, as far as this fundamental aspect is concerned. They portrayed the peasant struggles of Naxalbari, Srikakulam and Nalgonda as minor struggles and set out to betray them. Now, they have started a whispering campaign that they would get the repression eased if only the cadres of Nalgonda and other areas follow

them. All those that take to the path of revisionism have to inevitably degenerate themselves to this position.

The communist revolutionaries have waged a relentless struggle against this opportunist line and the betrayal of the old as well as the neo-revisionists. They have, through their revolutionary practice, set the course of the movement on the lines of the class struggles.

We should march forward on the path of revolutionary struggles. For this, the national and international situation affords excellent opportunities. The national liberation struggles as well as the working class, student struggles of the West are rapidly advancing. Today, there exists an excellent revolutionary situation in the country. The ruling classes as well as the ruled are finding it impossible to keep to the normal ways and means. The ruling class and the opposition parties including the old and neo-revisionist parties are hobnobbing on all the important issues. They are suitably revising their policies. Whatever might they profess on Nagamizo revolts and Kashmir question, they are striving to reach a common understanding on all these questions. The economic crisis is acute. As the commodity stocks are piling up, the industries are being closed down and unemployment is mounting. The ruling classes are caught in the vortex of an acute political crisis. There is instability in the country. With the spiralling prices, growing unemployment and corruption, the life of the people has become miserable and unbearable. With the accentuation of the social conflicts, the ruling classes are thrown into a position where they find it impossible to shift the burden on the ruled without whipping up anti-china hysteria and unleashing ruthless repression. This is a revolutionary situation where the people, throwing off the right opportunist hold, are stepping in the arena.

The ever growing struggles of the working class and middle class people in the cities and the working class centres, as well as the struggles of the peasants and the agricultural labour raging in the countryside, especially in the areas where the feudal relations are strong, go to prove this fact. The people are facing, during these struggles, the ruthless repression let loose by the government goondas. In certain of the areas, the people are even carrying on resistance for months at an end.

In case of severe repression, the peoples resistance has to face a number of ups and downs. Usually, the repression is being confined to a particular village or a limited area. Concentrating the armed reserve forces on big scale, they are with the help of the landlord goondas, setting out to completely destroy the whole villages or areas that spear-head the peoples struggles. It is no exaggeration to say that they are thus letting loose naked fascism in the struggle areas.

In the girijan areas of Sriakulam, they have completed a round of armed attacks, destroyed the properties of the people, and subjected them to all sorts of sadistic tortures. They carried out military operations such as military encirclement of the villages, ransacking of every house, and combing of forests. They have provided protection to the properties, the landlords amassed by plundering the people. Nullifying the gains the Girijans achieved through their countless

struggles and sacrifices, the armed police squads are aiding and abetting the landlords and the businessmen to plunder the people. We should, in conformity with this situation, formulate our tactics.

Ruthless repression is let loose in the Suryapet and Huzurnagar taluques of the Nalgonda District. One by one, they are picking up and systematically destroying all our strong hold villages. The armed police, the landlords and the goondas, looting the homes of the people, for turning them, foisting false cases and arresting them in hundreds, and encircling the villages in the name of right patrolling, has become a routine affair. The people, in these centres, are putting up organised resistance. Yet, as the experience goes to prove, this resistance, however well organised it might be, is proving to be of no avail against the firings by the armed police.

Besides, the murders of the local mass leaders organising and leading the resistance against the landlords in various districts has become a common feature.

Under the circumstances, the time has come for us to re-examine the hitherto adopted forms of struggle, the tactics and the forms of organisation and to formulate new tasks.

**Certain wrong Trends:** In this situation, certain wrong trends are raising their head. The revolutionary movements will not advance unless we expose them thoroughly, wage a relentless struggle and defeat them.

The ideology of the leaders of Polit Bureau of "Marxists" is the main among these wrong trends. The sum total of it is: Today, in our party, the mass organisations and the democratic movements are very weak. The Government has adopted the policy of isolating and wiping out our scattered strong holds. Under the circumstances, to adopt new forms of struggle is to help carry out the government designs to wipe us out. This is nothing but left sectarianism in view of the members of the Polit Bureau.

While viewing people's struggles with defeatist outlook, they are underestimating the people's consciousness as well as the potentialities of people's resistance. They are magnifying the strength of the enemy. They are also underestimating the revolutionary situation. For this, the only solution, according to them is to strengthen the party, the mass organisations and the democratic movements.

It is no doubt a fact that we should strengthen the party, the mass organisations and the democratic movements. It is also a fact that we need to further strengthen them where ever they exist and expand them wherever they do not exist. But, only when the people's struggles are organised on the basis of the people's demands, especially on the basis of anti-feudal and anti-imperialist demands, only when the party, the mass organisations and the democratic movements are built on the basis of these struggles, would it be possible for us to strengthen and expand them on proper foundations. Today the enemy is adopting a policy of repression. For the enemy to let loose repression against and at times of people's struggles (sometimes to nullify the gains the people achieved through their struggles) and for the people to carry on resistance in defence of their struggles



as well as the gains of their struggles, is but a common thing. Thus, it becomes evident that the party, the mass organisations and the democratic movements we should build are based on and intertwined with the new forms of resistance as well as the people's struggles on people's demands.

But this is not the outlook of the Polit Bureau. For them, the immediate task is to build the party, the mass organisations and the democratic movements in a sufficiently wide area. The government will not unleash repression only when we build them without any truck with the people's struggles on people's demands. In such a case, the very question of organising resistance against the repression doesn't arise at all. In case if there still happens to be any repression, they hope to counter it by the mobilisation of public opinion against it. The very conception of building the party, the mass organisations and the democratic movements independent of the people's struggles is by itself a revisionist outlook. Today, the repression is being unleashed in the areas where the party, the mass organisations and the democratic movements happen to be strong. The repression is being launched only in order to counteract the anti-feudal struggles led by the party. Therefore, it will be possible for us to go forward without having to face the problems of repression only when we bid goodbye to the people's struggles on people's demands. This is precisely what the P.B. leadership wants.

Therefore, we should reject this revisionist outlook. We should adopt a correct Marxist outlook. It means, we should build the party, the mass organisations and the democratic movements on the basis of people's struggles on people's demands. This is the only Marxist outlook. We will have to inevitably face the repression if we were to march forward with this outlook. Therefore, in order to face it, it becomes imperative for us to adopt new forms of resistance. Only then would the party, the mass organisations and the democratic movements, advance a step forward and reach the higher stage.

The experiences of the Telangana armed struggle also testify to the correctness of this outlook. This struggle had expanded only when the party, the mass organisations and the people's democratic movements were built on the basis of people's struggles on people's demands and only then the repression unleashed by the enemy was fought back. It was only then that this struggle had advanced and reached the higher stage.

It is only as a part of this revisionist outlook of the Polit Bureau, they are arguing that the partial struggles should be conducted only as partial struggles and not as political struggles. A few months back they had even gone to the extent of declaring that they would defend only the economic struggles. When the people are waging struggles for their legitimate demands, the government itself is changing the character of these struggles by unleashing armed forces against them. These struggles would then automatically transform themselves into political struggles. The people would, through their own experience realise the necessity of fighting against the government and automatically get prepared to fight against the government in order to solve their economic demands. Thus, according to

the learned lot of the P.B. a number of economic struggles going on today are transforming themselves into political struggles.

During the period of 1946-47, such a bankrupt theory was spread by the then party Secretary P.C.Joshi. The then central leadership went all out for this bankrupt theory and betrayed the Indian revolution. Today, this is precisely what the P.B. is doing.

In the present period of crisis, all the economic struggles are being transformed into political struggles due to the policy of repression pursued by the government. We should conduct them as political struggles with the aim of advancing them to the higher stage. The slogan of "Abolition of feudalism-land to the tiller" should be the central slogan of the rural movement. This policy should be propagated during every partial struggle. Gradually expanding the rural struggles, they should be extended to the distribution of banjar lands under the occupation of land lords, the tenant lands, and the landlords lands. We should never at any stage forget the fact that the land question is the crucial question. We should, in every village, collect the data relating to the land as well as the living conditions of the agricultural labour, the tenant farmers, the handicrafts men and the people of other professions and the poor and the middle peasants. The fact finding meetings will prove very useful for this. We should call experienced poor cadre for these meetings. We can call five to ten cadres of them. In the cities, besides the mobilisation of the poor and working class masses on their demands, their mobilisation into struggles in support and solidarity with the rural struggles should be taken up as the main task.

Today, there manifests a wrong tendency among some of the comrades that it is impossible to conduct struggles without first uniting the party. One of the chief causes for the present split in the party is the differences on the question of assessment of the Indian situation and the adoption of suitable forms of struggle based on this assessment. In such a situation, the question that faces us is-should we or should we not unite the party on the basis of the path of struggle? We should reject the latter. We should take up the task of uniting the party only on the basis of the path of struggle. We will work out our tasks for different areas, after we come to a conclusion on the above question.

**Different Areas and Movements:** In terms of the level of movement, the areas can be classified to three categories.

- 1) Struggle Areas.
- 2) The areas of inactivity despite the existence of party organisation.
- 3) New Areas.

1) ) **Struggle Areas:** We have already explained about the struggle areas. There are certain main weaknesses in the building of movement in these areas. First, there is no active movement in the village or villages adjoining to the struggle areas. The enemy is selecting one or two villages and concentrating his force on them. The movement in the adjoining villages is not in a position to rise in support of the people of these villages. We should therefore, mobilise the people

of the adjoining villages immediately and develop the people's struggle in a sufficiently wide area. Then the people will be in a position to face the repression with increased self-confidence and in an appropriate level. We have, in some of the areas, successfully expanded the movement during the recent period. Still, this is not adequate. This becomes very essential especially in the plains areas where the repression is unleashed. We could, through the struggle conducted by us since some time past, achieve certain gains. Increase in agricultural coolly rates and other facilities, smashing up the landlords domination etc. are some of the gains achieved. With the launching of repression, the landlords have nullified these gains and restored their old exploitation. In certain cases, they have even intensified their exploitation more then ever. We, while giving up the defence of the gains, are thinking in terms of the prospects of facing the repression and of extricating ourselves from it.

In this way, to some extent our thinking and activities are going in the wrong direction. We should, in these areas, on the basis of the earlier gains, formulate the slogans and demands and put before the people a programme for once again achieving the gains nullified subsequently. The people will then clearly grasp the fact that the new forms of struggle we adopted against the repression are intended to safeguard their hard won gains. The people will thus come forward to participate in the struggle with redoubled vigour and determination. Owing to our failure to take up this task, our enemies are able to get away with their deceptive propaganda that the government is striving to maintain law and order in the conflicts between the congress and communists.

We are not taking up the task of establishing secret party organisation in the struggle areas. Consequently, the party will be functioning openly before the repression begins. Hence, with the beginning of attacks by the police and goondas, cases and arrests, the local leadership and cadres getting disorganised leaving none in the field to assist the masses is but a common thing. Instead, if we were to provide continuous leadership to the masses, it will be very essential for us to carry on our work establishing the secret party organisation well in advance in the villages or areas where the struggle is going on. The repression by the government is inevitable as soon as the people's mobilisation and the resistance begin. Therefore, the secret organisation should also be established simultaneously with it.

So far, we have not formulated the forms of resistance. The people are showing initiative in resisting the goondas. We are merely providing leadership to it. But, this is proving to be inadequate. It is becoming impossible to face the surprise attacks of the goondas. Further, the forms of self-defence against the joint attacks of the goondas and the police are yet to be formulated. We are yet to prepare the people, the volunteer squads and the party especially to face the attacks of the armed police.

We should, in the towns adjacent to the struggle areas, mobilise the workers, the youth and students into struggles. We should explain to the urban masses the

significance of the struggles waged in the countryside. We should make them realise the need of assisting these struggles and provide the assistance.

We are organising solidarity campaigns in support of the people's struggles and against the repression in the rural areas, only sporadically and not incessantly. This is not being intensified especially in the villages adjoining the movement. We should therefore, concentrate especially on the adjoining areas and organise solidarity campaigns. When we organise solidarity campaigns in this way, there is a possibility that in some areas this itself might transform into a mass movement, becoming a prelude to people's struggles. We had a number of such experiences during the Telangana armed struggle.

**2) The Areas of Inactivity:** Though the party units and taluq committees are in existence in various areas, they are only functioning confining themselves to the day to day activities. They are not mobilising the people and organising struggles. The village party leadership have turned themselves into village elders and village bosses and become dead-weight to the mass movement. As a result, the anti-feudal struggle is not taking shape in such areas. It is not developing. Such a situation is prevailing more in the areas where the party members and party units are in existence. We should, in these areas, first make the party members realise the need for them to actively move and organise people's struggles on people's demands. They should, for the purpose, call for the unit meetings and explain them the need for struggle.

We should, after preparing the party members of about 10-15 villages to organise the struggle in the given area, formulate common and specific demands. We should, in the villages concerned, carry on a general propaganda about them. Afterwards, we should mobilise the people into struggles on the most pressing demands.

Often, only after one section of the people are fully mobilised on their demands, would the other sections will begin to move on their demands. In such a case the party should also lead the people on these demands as well.

In the present situation, often the police forces rush in support of the landlords and the employers and launch raids, against the people as soon as the people's mobilisation begins. We may, in case if this is absent, reach a settlement if the landlords and employers are ready to concede the people's demands. The gains thus achieved should widely be propagated not only among these people but also in the surrounding areas. For this, we can distribute leaflets and hold mass meetings. We should, while propagating that these are the gains of the people's struggles, call upon the other people to march forward on the path of struggle.

When the upsurge among the struggling masses is deep, when their will to fight is high and when the movement, surpassing the demands formulated, reaches the higher stage of achieving the main demands-the land and grain distribution there will be no need to compromise on the demands previously advanced. We should, in accordance with certain conditions, formulate the demands and declare that the struggle will continue until these demands are won. We should explain

to the masses the conditions and causes responsible for the change in the objective of the struggle.

We should, as soon as the people's mobilisation on demands begins, organise the volunteer squads. This should be done on a mass scale ranging from 50 to 100. We should draw into the volunteer squads all the youth from our following in the village. In the beginning, it should be their task to mobilise the people and to carry out the tasks allotted to them by the party: To carry on self-defence against the attacks of the landlords and goondas and to assist the masses during these attacks should constitute the main task of the volunteer squads. We should, from among them, select and draw the best elements into the party and the people's militia. We should, before the repression begins, conduct political and self-defence classes for them.

The repression may not immediately begin, when the people's mobilisation is not on a big scale. It may start sometime later. But, it should be born in mind that there will not be much gap between the beginning of people's mobilisation and the beginning of repression. However, the indications of the impending repression will be evident. We should carefully mark these indications and start the secret party organisation so as to ensure the continuity of our activities-political and self defence-even in the period of repression. We should organise secret party centres, shelters for the cadre, courier service for mutual contacts and the funds needed for this purpose. The organisation should be such that it should be capable of continuous functioning inspite of the attacks and arrests.

We should as soon as the people's mobilisation begins, organise the village committees (peasant organisations). They should play the main role in the implementation of the struggle programme. It is possible that in the beginning, the rich peasants might dominate these organisations. We should, as the class struggle advances, take steps to reduce their strength and replace them with the real revolutionary forces, (especially from the poorer sections) so as to ensure that these forces carry on the functions of the village committees. These committees should, besides the implementation of the struggle programme, assist the peasant and agricultural labour masses in all their problems.

Thus these committees should function as a skeleton administrative apparatus wherein there will be no place for corruption, inequality and oppression. We should consider it as a government machinery in its embryonic form. While the movements are thus carried on, there will be mass upsurge in the villages adjacent to these areas. Even in various areas connected with the movement it will give rise for movement among the people and they will be prepared for struggles. The party leadership should be able to mark such a development and provide leadership to these areas.

The repression may not always come in the form of attacks. It may come in the form of mass arrests of peasant and agricultural labour, foisting of false cases against them, dragging them around the courts in order to force the people to surrender. Boycotting the courts is not the only method to fight it. The people

may have to attend the courts for a time. But we should preserve the cadre needed to carry on the activities of the party un-interrupted. We should, giving them the necessary training, carry on the party activities. With this, the people will come to have the self confidence that their leadership is safe and strong. Our local cadres also will become experienced in the work under the conditions of repression.

Instead, the wrong tendency to depend more on the courts and deputations to the higher officials should go.

Only when the movement is conducted in this way, would the necessary favourable conditions for it to face the repression, to expand to a wide area and to reach the higher stage, be secured.

**3) New Areas:** What is explained above will apply to these areas also. But, in these areas, the party organisation will be either totally absent or nominal. Therefore, we should send the necessary cadre and leadership from the areas where our movement is strong and start the preliminary work in these areas. We should meet the people, study their problems, formulate the demands and slogans and propagate them among the people.

Since the party activities are absent in these areas, the exploitation by the landlords and the rich will naturally be intense and ruthless. Once the people begin to move, naturally the mass upsurge will also be very wide and deep. Usually, the people, due to their lack of experience, easily get frightened of even minor incidents. At the same time, they will also try to stand their ground. We should, keeping this in view, provide leadership with courage and determination.

We should gradually develop the local leadership in the party, the village organisations and the people's militia.

Owing to the fighting tradition and the prestige of the party, it is possible that the people in our new areas might move into struggles on a big scale. We should, fully utilise this opportunity, build and expand the movement far and wide.

As already explained, we should, as soon as the people's mobilisation begins, take up the task of building up the movement. However minor the problems might seem to be, we should, without neglecting them, organise and mobilise the masses on these demands.

**URBAN AREAS:** Since the workers, students and the middle class people are concentrated in the cities, we should take up their problems and organise the movements. Further, we should also secure their support and solidarity to the struggles, the peasants and the agricultural labour are waging in the countryside. Thus the unity of the workers and peasants should be secured. We should, to the extent we can, concentrate and work in the cities.

By the grace of revisionists, the urban people's struggles have been totally deprived of their political character and orientation. As a result, there has developed a big gulf between the urban and rural masses. We should close this yawning gulf and achieve the alliance of workers and peasants.

**DELTA AREAS:** In view of the socio-economic conditions prevailing in these areas, we should carry on an extensive political propaganda and organise

struggles on the demands of the agricultural labour. Besides the mobilisation for increase of cooly rates, we should mobilise the people against the social injustice perpetrated against them. We should organise these struggles not only in wet areas but also in dry areas.

**RAYALA SEEMA AREAS:** The repression by the landlords is very severe in this region. Though there are areas of commercial crops and fruit gardens in this region, the landlord domination is very common. There is serious discontent among the people against the landlordism. Owing to the party's failure to shape this discontent into a mass movement, the people are falling prey to the village feuds. Murders have become a routine affair in this region. We should therefore build a powerful anti-feudal peasant movement in these areas. This movement should base itself on poor peasants and agricultural labour.

Today, all our work in this region is confined to the legal limitations. We should gradually give it a struggle orientation. We should begin to mobilise the rural masses on demands. We should unite the people, having consciousness, on the class basis. We should, in this way, organise a powerful anti-feudal movement.

**GIRIJAN AREAS:** Ever since the party has begun its work among the girijan masses, it has succeeded to mobilise them on a mass scale. The movement is spreading to the various districts. The exploitation by the landlords and money lenders, from the plains the difficulties created by the forest laws, the atrocities perpetrated by the forest officials and others are very severe in these areas. Besides these problems are taken up in time (i.e. problem of beedi leaf) there is a possibility to spread the movement to vast area within a few months. The party should grasp this situation and pay proper attention to these problems. In these areas, we may not be able to get the local cadres in the beginning itself. We should, therefore, transfer the cadre from the plains, establish local contacts and go among the masses with their demands. The struggles of Srikakulam and Warangal have influenced the other girijan areas. The girijans of all these areas are showing their preparedness for struggles. Therefore, we should immediately send our cadres and cope up with the situation.

Usually, the masses will have immense confidence in the leadership emerging from among them. We should, therefore, draw the militant girijan youth into the leadership and train them properly.

We should build the village mass organisation, volunteer force and mobilise the girijan masses under their leadership. We should mobilise them on demands.

The Srikakulam experiences have shown that the repression against the girijans would be very ruthless. We should therefore train the mass of the girijans, especially the youth, in self-defence.

Thus, on the basis of the gains achieved, the resistance movement against the repression will grow and the people's struggles in these areas will, in a short time, reach higher forms. Therefore, the party leadership should concentrate on the girijan movement and expand it far and wide.

**PARTY ORGANISATION:** The party organisation should first come out of its present state, if it were to carry out all this programme. It should shape up itself into a party of struggles. For this, the party should depend upon the fighting forces existing within itself. We should encourage and bring them to the forefront. We should give them necessary training and mobilise them. We should, in the party, develop determination and a will to fight. The comrades with such qualities should be entrusted with proper responsibilities and be developed. If they pass the test they should be entrusted with still higher responsibilities.

We should, on the basis of the mass movement and the mass programme, develop the secret party organisation. We should clearly grasp the fact that the objective of the secret party organisation is only to safe-guard the party from falling into the hands of the enemy but not to minimise and limit the mass activities. On the contrary, the party activities as well as the mass activities should go on ceaselessly. The habit of resorting to shortcuts, on the part of the cadre and leadership will cause serious harm to the secret life. We should, overcome them take up the task of building up the secret party. This party should become not only a secret party but also a fighting party.

#### **ORGANISATION OF UNITED FRONT:**

Whenever we take up the people's demands, we should never for even an instant lose sight of the need for organising the united front. It should be our task to build an anti-feudal united front in the countryside as well as a countrywide united front against the ruling classes. Therefore, whenever we take up a problem, we should analyse and decide as to the classes and forces that are likely to move immediately and rally them together. All the classes and forces may not move at the beginning itself. All of them will gradually move into struggles only after they are mobilised into struggles a number of times on a number of problems. Similarly in case of the classes and forces that should come into the united front also, we should have a clearcut understanding as to those that should unite with us and those that will unite with us immediately, in a given village, a city or an area. We should gradually rally them together on various problems. Only then would this united front be a united front based on struggle. We should organise struggles giving primary importance to the demands of the agricultural labour and the poor peasants in the countryside and to the demands of the working class in the cities. We should grasp the fact that the worker peasant alliance will form the basis for the united front since these are the main among the revolutionary classes.

#### **CONCLUSION:**

Since the revisionist policies prevailed in the party for a number of years, a number of wrong notions in respect of the building up the party and united front have taken deep roots and become main obstacles in the way of development of the revolutionary movement. We have not dealt with all of them here. We should gradually deal with them in detail and wage a struggle against them. We have explained here, the minimum tasks for our party to set out as a fighting



party and for our movement to emerge as a fighting movement. If we locally work out the programme in accordance with these minimum tasks and begin to implement, we can, on the basis of the experiences we gain, face and over-come the problems and obstacles that would arise. Therefore, we should go into practice forth with.

Sept 1, 1968

**-AP STATE CO-ORDINATION COMMITTEE OF  
COMMUNIST REVOLUTIONARIES**



# **T.NAGI REDDY'S SPEECH ON HIS RESIGNATION TO AP STATE ASSEMBLY "TO MOVE THE PEOPLE INTO REVOLUTIONARY ACTION IS OUR TASK"**

*[Speech made by T. Nagi Reddy in the Budget Session of AP State Assembly in March 1969. Here he announced his resignation to the Assembly. The speech was made mostly in Telugu and partly in English. The italics indicate the english part of the speech - E.C. ]*

*We are meeting today in the midst of the extremely serious crisis all-round.* We can see it right in Andhra Pradesh. If we keep in our mind that we are in a great crisis not only here in Andhra but through out India, it will be possible for us to carefully understand all these phenomena.

## **A SEVERELY INTENSIFYING CRISIS AND A GREATER SURGE OF STRUGGLES**

As we come into (the House), we find some on hunger strike and some others on strike for wage increase. If we do not have a policy or programme to control them, it is possible to think that our government has no policy other than resorting to lathi charge or repressive measures on them. After 20 years of rule, could the government establish a peaceful atmosphere anywhere in the peasants, farm labour or middle class people? I don't know if the government in the saddle can afford to ponder over this today. One thing is clear. I have no hope whatsoever that the policies followed, either in India as a whole or in the states, will help us come out of the crisis we are facing today. They will only further intensity the crisis. And there will be the consequent rise in restiveness, more apprehensions and a further increase in struggle. I don't think if these Assemblies, these governments, or the Parliament have any way out to search for and implement appropriate measures. **THE COMPRADOR RULING CLASSES MORTGAGING OUR COUNTRY TO IMPERIALISTS**

What is our economic situation? To tell the truth, the economy of our state is not in the hands of the government, it had slipped away. Perhaps it is fondly hoped that it is in the hands of the Central government. But then the economic plight of

the Centre itself needs to be considered. It is surprising, but it is characteristic of the entire country today. If in any country, the government runs into deficit, there are only two ways of tiding over the deficit. One way is to cover up the budgetary deficit with loans raised within the country. Once in a while, under special circumstances, we can attempt to cover up the deficit with foreign loans. But what is the policy adopted by our government? Since the last five or six years, the Central government had been relying more on foreign loans than on domestic loans to cover the deficit.

Is this government called a national government? Or shall we call it a foreign government? This is my genuine doubt. As there is no time to give detailed figures, I will just show an instance or two.

If we examine carefully how the foreign loans raised by the government are increasing year after year, we find they were Rs.711 crores in 1961-62 and rose to Rs.1586 crores in 1967-68. Our budget stands on foreign loans. Our Indian government's budget cannot survive unless it draws Rs.1500 crores annually as foreign loans. If Mr. Brahmananda Reddy (Chief Minister-Tr) sits here consulting the stars- as to how much money the Central government would grant us, the Central Government is also doing the same there as to how much foreigners would grant them. Beyond this and beyond befooling the masses by chanting about self-sufficiency and what not, what else are we doing here? Ponder over this and it will be surprising. And what is the effect of these foreign loans? The percentage of foreign loans in our national income was 0.039 in 1950-51. It went up to 11.1 per cent in 1955-56, to 15.4 per cent in 1960-61 and to 20 per cent in 1966-67. So, by 1966-67 itself the loans we have to repay to the foreigners is 20 per cent of our national income. We may all think that ours is an independent government and that we are independently managing all the affairs of the government. But to tell the truth, *It is a deceit deceiving ourselves and deceiving the people.*

### **THE ANTI-NATIONAL GOVERNMENT : PRIORITY TO DEFENCE**

Why is this crisis? Why are all the people coming on to the streets? Why is it they are being roughed up by lathis? Is it enough to say that we are passing through a hot period? Will development be possible if the major portion of our budget is to be earmarked to repay foreign loans? *Therefore a situation has arisen. It has become impossible for this country to progress even a step forward unless certain very important decisions are taken, of course, which neither this government nor the government based on this society can take: That is the fundamental feature of this crisis.* This is why there is a feeling that there is no regional development, that some from outside are bossing over here - and that jobs would not be available unless they are driven out. Such diversionist trends are seen at many places. *That only shows the greatest crisis that has entered into our society.* What should the government do then? Alas for them there is only one way and they are doing it. What is it? It is not spending on developmental measures, but to spend on defence and police to bash up-lash up-the people. So as our loans increase. As we increasingly rely on foreigners, the government expenditure can no more be on

development but will have to be on defence. It is good to keep this also in mind. Look into the budget, the revenue budget of the Central Government. If Rs.545 crores are spent to repay foreign loans and interest and Rs.895 crores on defence annually, from where Mr.Brahmananda Reddy can get loans for development, I ask? Out of a total revenue of Rs.2,595 crores in 1968-69. Rs.895 crores is for defence, Rs.545 crores for debt servicing. This debt servicing increases year after year. *Therefore, I would say that the present government is anti-national.* When I said this last time, I put it briefly as I spoke only for 10 minutes. I said only in two words that this is a government that has come only to implement an *anti-national policy*. If I take more time now, it is to substantiate it. For that I put this before you. *Let us not deceive ourselves thinking that we are the independent government- we are not.*

### **FIVE YEAR PLANS-AT THE MERCY OF THE IMPERIALISTS**

Whenever we had to formulate and shape our Central budget during the last 10 years, we had been *inviting men* from World Bank, whom we call, 'experts' in the technical know how etc., and we are preparing our budgets as per their likes and dislikes. If anybody entertains or mistakes that we are doing as per our likes and dislikes, it is harmful to the country. *I do not want to create that opinion. This will be wrong, false, I have also seen what are heads showing rise.* Leaping forward in our state or nation as a whole? What happens in Delhi will reflect here also. Though we have a separate budget, can we leap a step forward here if they leap a step backward there in the Centre? Impossible. But then why are they putting up pretence, there in Delhi? During the first plan, for 5 years, our debt servicing was IRS. 199 crores. It was Rs.276 crores during second plan, Rs.1,293 crores during the third plan. Three years have passed. They say fourth plan is in the offing. But I don't believe it would come off. It is not there, it is blown away. After the eagle from Americans knocked it away, what is left for you? During third plan, for 5 years, the debt servicing was about Rs.1,300 crores. And then in the three years that followed we paid out Rs. 1,500 crores. As we increasingly resort to loans, the interest due is also growing. Besides interest, we have to repay the principal amount. Where is budget for it? They brought out a stamp also to commemorate Wheat Revolution and presented us with it. They said everything is O.K.now: the country is self-sufficient. Then why do they take steps, as part of the government policies, which prevent self sufficiency? If there is to be self sufficiency by chance, by default, they take steps to prevent it. They know how to strangle such a development. No consideration on what to tax and not to tax. After all, when the (foreign) money lender sits before you wielding his stick, what else would you do except mopping up everything by taxation? Can you escape this? You brought out a stamp on Wheat Revolution. And you taxed fertilisers. A first class step, a clever one indeed! Nothing cleverer was forth coming. It is a surprise. But it is only one part of the story.

It is three years since the third plan was over. They said gigantic industries are set up. When I read the R.B.I. report, there was a surprising thing. Of the industries set up in our Country, 80% of the industries are foreign-owned or foreign

collaborated industries. We have little. Mr.Chairman, We are all nationalists (0,perhaps with one exception.) As Mr.Chavan (the Union Home Minister-Tr.) puts it, ideas from across the mountains are said to be pouring into the heads of some people. I do not want to deny it. I said it plainly in one of my statements. But what pains me is that orders are coming from across the mountains. You cannot prevent ideas from flowing across the mountains. It is impossible in the world (Mr. Chavan was referring to Maoist ideas, while Com. T.N. was referring to Imperialist orders - Tr). Do we profit from 80% foreign industries? I said it the other day. *The drain to our resources from this country has begun to flow with full force. It has not even happened at the period of colonial exploitation of this country.* Dadabhai Naoroji and R.P.Dutt...wrote great things about exploitation, about drain of our resources in those days. If we closely examine them, we find the resources drain from India today is huge, greater than in British regime it is twice or thrice. We should not forget this.

### SERVILE TO FOREIGN MONOPOLISTS

Is it enough to say, 'Look the factories here. look there'? Yes, in Visakhapatnam there are some industries, no matter who erected them. Walls are erected there, there is smoke going up the chimney, something is being produced...Is it enough to say this? Assume they are ours? What sort of factories are they? I will read out. This address (which T.N.quotes - Tr.) is of Mr. Adorkar, Deputy Governor, Reserve Bank of India:

*"The collaboration agreements had been (having) number of restrictive clauses. Apart from heavy royalty fees, there were clauses to obtain material, equipment and personnel from the collaborating firm and also to fix price in consultation with it."*

Would you enlighten us to what are our powers in this? We say ours is an independent India! In this independent India, what is the control we exercise over these industries? We cannot determine the price! We cannot determine where to purchase raw material, nor about production! What do you call it? "Even restrictions on exports were also fairly common," After the imperialists have tied down the economy of this country.,when Telangana people are wronged and when money needs to be spent on them...I ask, where is the money? Would it - go in to repay loans to America? Or is it for doing something for Telangana people? Where is the money?This drain goes on in umpteen ways. Adorkar said : *As a matter of national policy, the industries should be free from any conditions. It cannot limit its freedom to export or to fix a price.*

After so much time, after having left all the industries for them to gobble up, today we want to control them. But we cannot. I told you - The fertilizer unit would not come up in Kothagudem. It is not in the hands of the Central Government to say that it would come. It is in the hands of America or some other imperialist, of some capitalist. It is neither in the hands of Indira, nor of Brahmananda Reddy. To set up a fertilizer factory in India, there are no powers to decide anything here. If you think you have- (go, set up the factories...) you have raw material for that in Kothagudem. You have enough of it for two fertilizer factories in Visakhapatnam.

That is why I said - *You cannot rule this Country in the interests of your own country. You are ruling this country in the interests of foreign monopoly. This is anti-national.*

After you started implementing such policies, the budget, the economy, the raw materials, everything of this country are at his call. Perplexing! Our coal mines are closing down, in Bihar, in Kothagudem. But trains are being dieselised. I wonder, is dieselisation so important? Even if the coal mines close down? To make steam engines we set up gigantic units in the public sector. Even if it has to close down, yes dieselisation is a must. With American aid you have to set up a factory in Varanasi for switch over to dieselisation. And that is not a factory to really produce those engines. It will import material, it is merely an assembling unit. It is not a production factory. *It is a process factory. That is the state of affairs of this country, and these people who think that we all anti-nationals are deceiving us, the public, but not for long.*

When this is the situation, after you handed over the reigns of development of this country to somebody else, if you ask me to give instructions and suggestions, I can't. (it was budget session of the House- Tr.). *I am at a loss. There is no constructive suggestion that can be given to our degenerated budget which is already placed in the hands of foreign monopolists. The state cannot function on its own, except on the good wishes of somebody who is outside our country. This is the totality of the picture.*

We have also to see how the resources in our country are being drained out as a result of this penetration. *Do you know, as per my calculations - it is only a rough calculation, perhaps a technical committee can give a more accurate one than mine, minimum of Rs. 110 crores other than trade which is regularised trade between our country and other countries is passing outside our country every year.*

Towards repayment of principal and interests and sundries, we are paying to the foreigners Rs. 500 crores from the Central budget, four loans raised afresh. For the capital invested in our country, we are paying out a few hundred crores of rupees every year, either as interest or as profit over the capital. *It may be minimum of Rs. 10,000 crores. Repatriation of capital must be quite a big amount.* In addition to this, how much are we paying up as royalties? How much for technical know how? Because there is that clause in every company, the clause which I referred to in the R.B.I. bulletin and which stipulated that we should purchase raw materials etc., from specified sources, lie is selling them to us after inflating the cost by anywhere up to two thirds its cost in the international market. So the costs of goods manufactured in factories within our country are rising. Once the drain has started, *It can not be stopped. What can be done from here? Nothing can be done. That is the state of affairs to which we have come.* So these prices have to go on increasing. They will be. I have 12-14 years of experience with Assembly and Parliament. We have said many things. We have waited if anything we said would be implemented. *To my bitter experience, I don't think we have succeeded in getting even a single suggestion implemented.*

## THE RULING CLASSES PROTECT THE INTERESTS OF LANDLORDS

As an example, let us take the recent two or three years. How many instances of atrocities by landlords and by police have we brought up here, either through our speeches, or call attention motions or adjournment motions? Has, anything been done? *Atleast in one instance, has any action been taken? What should I say when I go back to my village? Six miles from my own village, in one village, a landlord beat up a farm servant to such an extent that he was about to die. Then endrine was thrown into (his) mouth and report was made that he died because he drank endrine.*

When an ordinary farm labourer is killed, we have never heard any landlord being arrested, never in the history of our society. That will not happen. For that matter, have we ever really enquired into complaints of police atrocities? A hotel worker of Anantapur town was taken to the police station twice (and beatup).... even before could be treated he died. Was it enquired into and any action taken? Such things, countless instances of landlord and police atrocities in West Godavari district, in Khammam, in Kurnool were brought before this house by us. And not one of them the government was prepared to order an inquiry. Under the circumstances, what should we decide to do?.... *Nothing can be done here. The best thing is to rouse the people outside. That is exactly the decision to which I had to come.*

There is a movement going on in Srikakulam -Who inaugurated it? The day (31-10-67) in 1967 when landlords fired on a procession of people going to a meeting and killed two people. And today police are being sent on a massive scale S.A.P. squads are being sent. That day the government did not take any steps whatsoever to immediately arrest the landlords,. to break into their houses and take necessary steps. *The softness to the landlord class is the very basis of this government, with the result that all classes are coming out in revolt today, may be in a small way in one place and in a bigger way in another place. The revolt, the tendency to revolt is the most evident factor in the whole country.* We are not even giving a temporary consolation to them that we are here talking in the assembly on their behalf. Instead, we are handing over the economy and politics of the entire country to the foreign countries. Neither are we able here to resist the atrocities in the villages, nor are we organising the people outside for resistance. And thus the people are left to fend for themselves.

## UNLESS PEOPLE ARE MOVED, EXPLOITATION AND ATROCITIES DO NOT END

Sitting here in the Assembly for 16 years, could I render the people any consolation by reflecting about these here? Would it even be possible? When I think of this, I find there was no other purpose served, except an attempt at a sort of demoralisation. Unless people are moved, unless people learn to stand up to and resist these atrocities on their own, there is no way out. Because I came to the conclusion that there is no other way except this .... *It is after a serious thought*

*that I decided that I should get out of this Assembly here and now. That is one of the most important reasons. I have tried my level best to bring forward a number of things on various acts of exploitations, immoral and illegal and no body could even support in any manner. Nothing could be done. What else could be done? The country is going into a bigger crisis, economic and political. Are we going to leave the people to themselves and ask them to wait on, to see as to what is happening inside the Assembly. When this Assembly has become to my experience just a talking shop, a kind of mockery so far as the interests of the people are concerned what I have decided is a very serious decision after a long life of 16 years of parliamentary democracy in the country in which I have played a part all these years.*

*Meanwhile, I would like to inform the house also as I leave, that if you think that out of discussions, deliberations and decisions of the house, the situation in this country is going to be bettered, you will be disillusioned just as I have been. There is no doubt about it. If you think that through the proceedings of this Assembly or in Parliament we are going to end the anti-national policies of this government, I am sure you will be disillusioned in course of time just as I have been now. Then what is our duty? The way out for any person to save his own country, is to rouse the people to action against the exploiting and ruling sections of imperialism and landlordism. That is exactly what I had said in my previous speech. It is to do that job that I leave this house and I wish I will be able to devote as much time with vigour as I have devoted my time in this Assembly. What ever the political opinions expressed.*

*I must thank for the personal regard, affection and quite an amount of leniency that they have shown to me in this house. Quite a number of times I have been harsh and quite a number of times I have been excited and quite a number of times I have shown patience with the hope that something will be done. Whether I was excited, whether I was angry, or whether I tested the nerves of the ministers, the speaker or the members, they have always shown me a great regard and they have given me enough patient hearing. With all the disillusionment that I am carrying outside on the achievements these 16 years of my existence in this house I carry with me pleasant memories; the house has treated me well and the members also have shown due regard.*

*I must specifically thank the Speaker for whenever I have provoked him quite a number of times, knowing that it is not proper within the rules of the Assembly, knowing that I have done quite a number of times, even then he has given me enough opportunity to express my opinion, and I must thank him and take leave of the house*





### **III. 4**

## **DOCUMENTS OF STATE CONVENTION of APCCCR**

## IMMEDIATE PROGRAMME

*[Document adopted by the State Convention of  
APCCCR led by T.NagiReddy held from 10-12 in  
April 1969 - EC.]*

We, the Communist Revolutionaries who have broken from the revisionism, are striving for the victory of Indian revolution in accordance with Marxism-Leninism -Mao's Thought. India is a neo-colonial country. The Indian people are being subjected to the neo-colonial exploitation of the American imperialism, British imperialism and the Soviet revisionism. Together with imperialism, the feudalism is the main exploiting force in the country. 70 to 80 per cent of the population live in the countryside. They are being subjected to various forms of feudal exploitation. In view of these conditions, the Indian revolution would be completed in two stages. Today we are in the stage of New Democratic Revolution the basic points of the general programme would remain unchanged.

### **These basic points are:**

1. The comprador and the bureaucratic bourgeoisie i.e., the big bourgeoisie-feudal State should be smashed. In its place the New Democratic State should be established.
2. The feudalism should be abolished. The land of the landlords should be distributed among the poor peasants and the agricultural labour.
3. The foreign capital as well as the capital of the Comprador bourgeoisie and bureaucratic bourgeoisie in collaboration with it in the industries and banks should be confiscated.
4. For the working class, increase of wages, reduction of working hours and other facilities should be secured and the problem of unemployment should be solved.
5. The middle class people should be given the guarantee of employment.
6. For defence of the country the existing mercenary army should be abolished and a revolutionary people's army should be built up in its place.
7. The basis of the foreign policy should be the formation of a United Front against the world imperialism, especially the American imperialism and the British imperialism and its collaborator the Soviet Social imperialist clique. India should be party to this United Front.
8. Various nationalities in the country should have the right of self-determination.

9. All types of unequal treaties should be abrogated. India should quit the "Common Wealth".
10. Anti-imperialist and anti-feudal education, science and culture should be promoted. The problems of unemployment among the middle class people should be solved.
11. Integration of the country should be based on complete independence and democracy.

The revolutionary programme based on these eleven points would constitute the New Democratic revolutionary programme. Having a revolutionary programme alone is not enough. We should also have a revolutionary path in order to achieve this programme. This path is totally different from the parliamentary path of revisionists. One of the main aspects of Mao's Thought is people's war. The essence of the path of people's war is to establish the guerilla bases in the countryside, to encircle and liberate the cities and to ultimately liberate the country. It is the task of the revolutionaries to apply the path of people's war to the revolutionary practice of India and to carry it out.

The United Front is very important for the successful completion of the Indian revolution. This United Front should be formed against imperialism, feudalism and their collaborators the big bourgeoisie. Under the leadership of the proletariat, this United Front should be formed of the working class, peasantry, middle class and the national bourgeoisie. Unlike the electoral United Fronts of the revisionists, this would be a Front for struggle which would emerge and develop in the course of revolutionary struggles and the armed struggle of Liberation.

To build and develop the United Front for the implementation of the path of people's war and the New Democratic Revolutionary Programme, a Communist Party capable of applying Marxism-Leninism-Mao's Thought to the revolutionary practice of India should be built. This should be a Communist party formed of the revolutionaries. The revolutionaries of today should come forward to build such a revolutionary party. We should realise that this party should be totally different from the revisionist parties that have betrayed the Indian revolution. It is with this basic understanding we should formulate a clear cut programme suited to the present conditions.

We have already stated that, our general programme would be such that it would be applicable for the entire stage of New Democratic Revolution. Following the path of people's war, we are and will be implementing this programme in different regions encircling the cities by first liberating the villages and to gradually liberate the cities are the important points of this path. We should, in accordance with this, formulate our programme for rural and urban areas.

The mass movement and the organisation is in different stages of its development in different parts of the Andhra Pradesh.

The mass movement of the Agency Areas of the Srikakulam district has reached the stage of armed struggle. The mass movement in the forest areas of

Warangal and Khammam Districts is past ordinary legal confines. The peasantry, especially the landless poor peasantry and the agricultural labour is coming forward not only to occupy the forest banjars but also to reoccupy the lands illegally grabbed by the landlords. Hundreds of militants from these classes are participating in the day to day activities. In the Agency Area of East Godavari district, the Agency peasantry is coming forward to fight for the abolition of the "muthadari" system and to reoccupy the lands illegally grabbed by the landlords. The movement is spreading to the neighbouring areas of Vishakhapatnam Agency, Bastar Area, Karimnagar and Adilabad districts.

During the months of July and August last year, there was a tremendous mass upsurge in the plains areas of some districts adjacent to the forest areas and reached the stage of confiscation of food grains from the landlords. This position still continues. The mass movement in Khammam and Madhira taluqs of Khammam district and Janagam and Manukot taluqs of Warangal district is thus marching forward. Reaching the stage of direct resistance against the landlords the movement in Nalgonda district had been subjected to a severe government repression and once again is getting prepared for struggles.

#### **OUR IMMEDIATE PROGRAMME**

With the peasantry constituting more than 73 percent of the population in our country, the agrarian revolution would play the main role in the New Democratic Revolution. The abolition of feudalism and the distribution of land to the tiller is the main item of the agrarian revolution. Together with this, the emancipation of the rural masses from all forms of feudal exploitation would be the main item of the agrarian revolution. In Andhra Pradesh the problem of land belonging to the landlords class and the government is mainly in the following forms.

1. The land-holding of the landlords cultivated through farm servants. (this is known as self cultivation).
2. The lands cultivated by the tenant farmers paying the rent in the form of grain or money to the landlords as well as the lands cultivated for the landlords by some of these tenant farmers.
3. The pastures and the other similar categories of lands.
4. That temple and the endowment lands under the occupation of landlords.
5. The cultivable government Banjar lands. (This includes the government banjar lands under the cultivation of landlords)
6. The forest lands needed for the cultivation by the peasantry.

The land issue could be solved only by the distribution of the lands to the poor and landless peasantry and the agricultural labour. Therefore the Communist revolutionaries in different parts should study the land issue and carry on, among the people, especially the peasantry, the propaganda about the importance as well as the urgent need for the land distribution.

While thus carrying on the propaganda we should from now on make the preparation, for the occupation of lands by the peasantry in the next year. All the lands that should be occupied immediately, would come in for cultivation from

June, this year. Therefore we should take detailed decisions as to the Areas, villages and the lands that should be occupied and prepare the peasantry from now on.

We should for the present concentrate only on the big landlords, the main enemies of the people. It is only these big landlords that we should keep in view. When we should occupy the lands under the "self-cultivation". Keeping the question of whether all the lands under the "self-cultivation" should be distributed or not, open for discussion, it is essential to distribute the land to the extent available.

Where there is no preparedness among the poor peasantry and the agricultural labour, the distribution of the lands under the "self-cultivation" would only be a propaganda slogan. Among the lands under the "self-cultivation", pastures of landlords, the lands that the landlords had grabbed from the poor peasantry and the agricultural labour illegally or with nominal compensation or towards debts can be restored to the people belonging to the respective families in case if they still remain to be poor peasants or agricultural labour. But, owing to this there should not arise a situation where some would get the land while some would not. We should, in such a situation see that others would also get a portion of such land. Thus it should be possible for all the poor peasants and agricultural labour to get the land equally (inclusive of the land they have already in their possession).

At present we are only concentrating on the lands of the big landlords. The question of ceiling would arise at the time of distributing the landlords land. We should recognise the land needed by a middle peasant who cultivates the land by himself as the maximum ceiling limit. It is possible that this may differ from area to area. As the agrarian revolution advances, it would as well become necessary to distribute a portion of the land from the small landlords also. In such a situation depending upon the needs of the agrarian revolution, decide as to where and how the distribution should be carried out. We should trace out the temple and endowment lands under the occupation of the big landlords (they are often hidden) and make preparations for their distribution among the poor peasants and agricultural labour. We should wherever it is possible, take it up as an immediate problem.

The common people are not in a position to make use of common banjar lands as well as forest lands since a major part of these lands is under the occupation of the landlords. The cultivable lands from among them should be distributed among the poor peasants and agricultural labour. The rest of the lands should be taken over by the people.

The poor peasants and the agricultural labour would need cattle and the implements for the cultivation of lands thus distributed. At the time of land distribution itself, the cattle and the implements of the landlords should also be distributed among such of those that are in need of them.

Money lending, Nagulu, Khandanalu -they should be abolished in whatever form they may exist. But it is only on the big landlords, money lenders (shahukars) and the rich peasants who carry on exploitation in this way, that we should

concentrate. The common people would lose the credit facilities if we were also to concentrate on petty individual money lenders. It would be necessary to promote the credit facilities to a certain limited extent until such time the liberated base areas are established and the credit facilities are arranged for the people. Therefore credit facilities are permitted in such a way that they continue on reasonable rate of interest-either the bank rate or the lowest reasonable rate in vogue in the respective regions.

Besides, thus, the forced labour (Vetti), tithes, the peasants tilling the land (of the landlord without any payment) with their own cattle and such other feudal exploitation should be abolished in whatever form they may exist. We should mobilise the people without leaving any other problem because of which the rural people are facing difficulties owing to the domination of the landlords. We should concentrate on this problem, especially in the villages where the conditions of the people are worst. The conditions of the people in some villages may be better than the other villages owing to the work of the party over a number of years. But it would however be wrong not to mobilise the people into struggles on the presumption that the conditions of the people in all the villages are also better. The problem of Toddy tappers is serious in the Telangana region. The degree of exploitation by the government contractors (who include local landlords) is very high. They are put to untold sufferings due to the corrupt practices of the government officials. Against this exploitation, we should organise and lead them into struggles on the slogan of "tree to the tappers". We should carry on propaganda among them that their problems would be solved only with the establishment of the New Democratic Government and that for this the path of the armed struggle should be taken up.

Similarly, the agricultural labour and the poor and middle peasants in all the regions are suffering for want of house sites. We should take up this problem. This is a programme which would be applicable to all parts of Andhra Pradesh. Now let us work out a programme on problems pertaining to different regions.

**FOREST AREAS:**

The forest and mountainous regions would be crucial in accordance with the path of people's war. Here in these regions not only the enemy is weak, but also these areas are favourable for the people's guerilla squads to carry on resistance against the armed forces of the enemy for a long period of time and to establish guerilla base areas. The landlords, the money lenders and the forest officials are exploiting the ordinary people and the Girijans inhabiting the forest and mountainous regions, in ever so many ways. In these regions, the masses have become conscious and are revolting against the government and exploiting classes. Srikakulam Girijan struggle is a prelude to it. In all these areas, especially in the forest areas of Warangal, Khammam and Karimnagar the land with irrigation facilities as well as a major portion of the fertile cultivable is in the hands of the landlords. For the purpose of grazing usually hundreds and thousands of cattle belonging to these landlords are left off in the forest itself. They earn lakhs of

rupees in the business of cattle. Besides the distribution of banjar lands under the occupation of government as well as landlords, among the poor peasants and agricultural labour, we should in these areas carry on a struggle for the fertile dry lands as well as the irrigated lands under the "self-cultivation" of the landlords and distribute them. The cattle, available in thousands should also be distributed.

For this we should make preparation from now on ploughing should commence with the commencement of monsoon.

In the coming months, the contractors would employ the people as coolies to move out the forest produce. We should therefore intensify the struggles on the question of coolie rates in the next month. Thus by intensifying the mass activities, we should, by the end of April, advance the movement to a higher stage. In this period a good amount of work has been done to organise and mobilise the girijans in the Agency area of East Godavari District. The "MUTHADARU" system, the worst kind of feudal exploitation is in practice in this area. The remnants of it are also found in the Agency Area of Visakhapatnam. The people themselves should go in for revolutionary actions to abolish this system.

The fertile lands and the fruit gardens that were grabbed from the girijans are in the hands of the landlords. The people are very eager to take them back. We should prepare the people for their occupation. The land occupation should commence with the commencement of monsoons.

Allotting the land needed by the girijans for "podu" cultivation we should create opportunities for their cultivation. The government grabbing away the lands from the girijan peasantry, is raising coffee and other big plantations. We should study the problem of these plantations. We should examine this problem taking into account the extent of these gardens that needs to be distributed in order to solve the land problem of the peasantry.

All the corporations set up for the purpose of purchasing forest produce are nothing but a means for the exploitation of the people and for filling the pockets of the officials with the peoples wealth. They should therefore be abolished and the girijans should be afforded with opportunity of freely selling to whom every they wish to.

We should not, while implementing this programme, permit girijan and non-girijan discrimination. Rallying all the non girijans, including the poor middle peasants, a United Front with the girijans should be formed and the struggle carried on; The division on the basis of girijans and non-girijans would only prove helpful to the enemy. This applies equally to different tribes among the girijans themselves.

The tips, forced labour (Vetti) and bribe to the forest officials and the employees have ceased by now. We should not permit them in any form or to any extent.

#### **PLAINS AREAS:**

There are dry and wet lands in the plains areas. To this day, the exploitation and attractions of the landlords continues to be a serious problem in the dry lands.

The food problem is a serious problem here. Vast areas of banjar lands are available for distribution. There are opportunities in these areas to organise and mobilise the people on ever so many problems such as land, cooly rates, food problem, against the domination of landlords and so on.

Despite the fact that in terms of armed resistance this area is less favourable than the forest and mountainous regions, it would be wrong to conclude that this area would not be useful for resistance. Under the present conditions a limited guerilla resistance would be possible even in these areas. Though it would take time for an incessant resistance to take off these areas, these areas are highly important since they include areas adjacent to forest areas and the Telangana area where the armed struggle was carried on in the past. It is very essential to develop revolutionary movement in these areas in order to send the cadres and other help needed in the forest areas.

#### **WET LANDS:**

In view of the social conditions and geographical features, there are no possibilities for immediate development of guerilla resistance here in these areas. Yet from these areas cadres – funds and other help should be sent to the areas of resistance. Ceaseless class struggle against the exploitation of the people should be carried on in these areas. These areas should also be liberated gradually.

Here, among the struggles of the agricultural labour as well as the struggles against the general domination of the landlords, we should mainly concentrate on the struggles of the agricultural labour and the tenant- farmers. We should launch struggles for the abolition of government Forming Societies and for the distribution of lands under their control among the poor peasants and agricultural labour. There is every possibility of starting and developing struggles on land issue in some districts. We should study where the possibilities for developing such struggles exist and make efforts to develop the struggles there.

#### **POLITICAL PROPAGANDA:**

We should propagate, while implementing the above programme, that the people are waging struggles for their liberation, that the liberation could be achieved only through the armed struggle, and that the people should seize the political power into their own hands. We should make them realise the fact that we could seize the political power only through the path of people's war. Despite the fact that the need for achieving a peoples Raj, safe-guarding the gains achieved through the struggles and for our liberation from the exploitation of the exploiting classes is being propagated, a comprehensive political propaganda is however not being carried. We should especially propagate the politics of armed struggle much more extensively than what we are doing now. We should carry on comprehensive propaganda about the revolutionary struggles going on in different parts of the country as well as the Srikakulam struggle. In addition to the propaganda by our cadres through speeches, we should organise local cultural squads and carry on propaganda through them.



## **BOYCOTT PANCHAYAT ELECTIONS-ESTABLISH VILLAGE SOVIETS:**

Panchayat elections are due in the month of May. We have resolved to boycott them. We should immediately take steps to implement this decision. We should give no room for entering the Panchayat Boards by back-door methods.

The experience has proved that in the anti feudal struggles, the panchayat Boards could not be the instruments in the hands of the people. It is because even in the villages where we had been a majority in the Panchayat Boards during this period, the landlord class has got only strengthened but not weakened. What is more by way of taxes and other means the Panchayat system has only proved helpful for the further strengthening of the ruling classes.

We should from now on make the people realise as to how the panchayat system and the election system is proving useful for the ruling class as a cover to safe-guard their power. We should convince the people that they should not participate in the elections and thus make them boycott. We should make, especially the people that follow us to boycott the elections. For this we should strictly rely on the consciousness and the organised strength of the people. But we should not resort to any shortcut methods. We should make it clear to the people that it is not merely boycotting the elections; that there is the path of people's war for them to follow, that it means establishing the village Soviets and the people's committees, that it is under their leadership that we should implement the agrarian revolutionary programme and that there are the foundations for the New Democratic revolutionary state.

(There will be no change in our programme despite the postponement of the Panchayat elections for the present. We should carry on an extensive propaganda about the need for boycotting the elections.)

We should, in all the villages of the forest area where we are working, mobilise the people to boycott the elections. In the villages where the elections are thus boycotted, the question of how to manage the affairs of the village would arise. Then all the people, the adults of the village should assemble and elect the people's committees. These committees should assist the people in all problems connected with the lives of the people. In the plains areas the District committees should take steps to boycott the elections in the villages where we are strong. Boycott by the revolutionaries alone does not mean the boycott of elections. In the villages where the elections are thus boycotted, the people's committees elected by all the people should come into being. These committees should function as alternate committees to the government Panchayat Boards. These would be the committees empowered by the people. They should provide leadership in all the affairs of the village and stand by the people. They should implement the agrarian revolutionary programme.

They should take the responsibility of law, revenue, defence of people and so on. These committees should be prepared to carry out the given responsibilities at the given stage. As the struggle reached the higher stage in the countryside, the village committees.

Against the feudal system and the elections, the village soviets and the people's committees would be the United Front committees to launch and successfully conclude the agrarian revolution. In these committees, led by the revolutionaries and dominated by the poor peasants and agricultural labour, the others that rally with us should also be given proper representation. As the agrarian revolution advances, a few of the representatives, especially of the rich peasantry can also be given representation.

These committees should have a clear -cut class and political outlook. We should educate them in the understanding of the path of people's war and develop their political consciousness. We should not permit the opportunists, careerists as well as the representatives of the rich classes from the poor to join these committees.

#### **VOLUNTEER SQUADS:**

With the mobilisation of people on the boycott of elections, on food problem, and the problem of forest areas the problem of people's self-defence would arise. For this we should build the volunteer squads. In the forest areas where the people have already been mobilised into struggles, the volunteer squads should be organised on a large scale. All the youth of the villages should be the members of these squads. One squad if it is a small village as many squads as necessary depending upon the feasibility of work if it is a large village, can be organised. Each of these squads should have a commander and an assistant commander. They should be politically conscious and disciplined. They should be elected for these posts. For the purpose of self-defence the ordinary volunteers can use any weapon that is locally available. They can use even sticks, in case if they cannot secure any other weapon.

These squads should assist the village soviets and people committees in the implementation of their decisions. In case of attacks from the armed police and military, these squads assist the people in ever so many ways.

The volunteer squads should be organised not only in the villages where the village Soviets exist but also in the villages where the people's committees exist. Only when there is a volunteer squad, could the activities of the people's committees be carried on effectively. The decisions could be implemented. The confidence in the committees could be created among the people.

We should, in a simple language, educate the volunteer squads in our political line; path of people's war and the current politics. The party should take steps for this.

#### **LOCAL SQUADS:**

The government armed police attacks would begin with the implementation of agrarian revolutionary programme. With this resistance should also begin. For this it would be better to have local squads along with the regular squads. Depending upon defence needs, these squads could consist of seven members. They can arm themselves with bows and arrows, spears and axes.

Usually the local enemies are terrified by the very sight of the people and volunteer squads. It should be task of local squads to deal with the people's

enemies, that cannot be dealt with by the people and volunteer squads. The local squads should provide leadership in the mass actions against the landlord. They should render necessary assistance to the regular squads. They should be given good military training and political education.

### **MASS ORGANISATIONS:**

We mobilise the masses of people for the agrarian revolutionary programme. We should recruit the masses in to the peasant organisations. As in the past, we should not, for this purpose print books and collect membership fee.

In the meeting of the village people, we should, by show of hands decide as to who are not willing to join. We should take all those that are willing to join. The landlords should not be permitted to join. All those people that join thus should elect the people's committees and village soviets.

We should also hold the meetings of the women and organise them. This task would be easy where there are female comrades. The women should also join the men and fight in the agrarian revolutionary struggle. For this they should be recruited into the women organisations in the same as above manner. They should also be gradually recruited into the volunteer squads, local squads and the regular squads. In a situation when there is severe repression, and when it is not possible to openly recruit the people into the mass organisations, the cadres should go door to door and recruit the members secretly.

### **INTENSIFY THE MASS ACTIVITIES:**

We should, in the next month intensify our activities both in the forest areas as well as plain areas. By May, not only these activities should be intensified and the village soviets and people's committees formed and start functioning but also we should get prepared for offensive actions against the landlord class. It is at this higher stage of these mass activities that we should implement the agrarian revolutionary programme. For this we should politically and organisationally get prepared from now on.

### **EXTEND TO NEW AREAS:**

At present the movement is; to some extent being expanded to the areas adjacent to the forest areas. But this expansion is very slow. The shortage of cadre is the main reason for it.

We should quickly bring the Vishakhapatnam Agency Area which is adjacent to East Godavari into the movement. We should cover the centres and areas left in Khammam and Warangal districts. We should intensify our activities in Karimnagar and Adilabad districts. The units of the revolutionaries have already begun to function in these areas.

Steps are being taken to begin mass activities in Mahabubnagar District.

In Rayalaseema districts, it is decided to convene a meeting of the district leaders and intensify the anti-feudal struggles. Steps are being taken in this direction. We should also begin to intensify the activities in other districts.

## **WORK IN CITIES:**

Notwithstanding the fact that of the revolutionaries units are functioning in our cities, we are not putting a well concentrated work here. Eventhough the forest areas are of importance, it is not correct to leave out the cities. The armed struggle that we are conducting should have the support and solidarity of the urban working class. The help of the transport as well as the workers of various other branches of industry would be needed for the transportation of material and other technical assistance. We should give proper importance to the students as well as to our work in the cities. Influenced by the revolutionary ideas today's students and youth are fast attracted to Marxism-Leninism-Mao's Thought.

Ours is a path of people's war: i.e., to liberate the villages and then to liberate the cities. For this we should carry on work in cities from now on. At the same time we should on one hand smash the enemy's plans to suppress the peasant armed struggle and should, on the other hand, prepare the Party and the people to seize the political power by the time we liberate the cities. We should, keeping this in view, plan our work in cities.

## **SUPPORT THE SREEKAKULAM ARMED STRUGGLE:**

The armed struggle is going on in Srikakulam. We are releasing a separate document explaining as to how this movement has developed and what are the problems that arose in the course of the development of this movement.

We should take lessons from the experiences of Srikakulam movement. We should carefully study the experiences that the comrades are gaining at present. We should take lessons from these experiences. We should give our experiences to the comrades working in that struggle.

We should not only support the Srikakulam armed struggle, but also we should face the vile propaganda that the enemies are carrying on against it.

## **CONSOLIDATE THE ORGANISATION OF THE REVOLUTIONARIES:**

We should have well organised and disciplined organisation to implement the programme explained above, to build a revolutionary movement through it and to carry on the armed struggle. Eventhough the state committee and all the district committees remain to be Co-ordination committees, they are often taking majority decisions and functioning as Party Committees.

Should we, the revolutionaries and our committees function like this as co-ordination committees? Or should we, based on the principle of democratic centralism go in for the organisation of the party? This is a point of discussion now.

We are unable to centralise our activities due to the absence of discipline in the name of co-ordination. As a result they are not acquiring revolutionary character. In the areas where the committees observed discipline and functioned as party committees, the revolutionary movement has acquired a form and is marching forward. Since our activities in other areas are being confined to mere discussions, they are not taking the form of mass movement. In view of these experiences, our co-ordination committee has decided to take necessary steps for the building of the party.

In the light of this decision the party building is going on in the struggle areas. The committees are deciding as to who should be the party members. To carry on the party activities effectively, the Area committees and the Zonal committees have been constituted and functioning. Necessary steps are being taken for the functioning of these units in accordance with the principles of democratic centralism.

The area committees have been formed and functioning in the Jangam, Mulugu and Khammam areas of Warangal and Khammam districts. We should further consolidate and develop them so that they would be capable of leading the armed struggle. Further we should take steps for the units in all the districts to function in accordance with the principles of democratic centralism.

Only then could the necessary conditions for the party building be secured.

These steps are necessary for the future advance of the revolutionary movement.

The question of as to who should be recognised as the party members, still remains to be a problem. All our cadres accept the path of people's war. We should mainly examine as to whether their practice is in accordance with it or not. From the time we began our work in the struggle areas to this day we should examine the activities of each of the cadres and decide as to who should be and who should not be given the membership. The membership should not be given to those, whose class on work is defective who exhibition timidity who are selfish and who have anarchic habits. They should be kept at an arms length.

Those that should be given membership, to need not necessarily be whole-timer's, they should be prepared to go underground when there is repression. The membership of they that are not whole-timers should be keptness the.

We should see that the party members would, through their exemplary and revolutionary work, emerge as the members of the village soviets and people's committees as well as the leaders of the regular squads, local squads and the volunteer squads.

## **GET PREPARED FOR ARMED STRUGGLE**

It is our opinion that we should, quickly completing the political propaganda, mass mobilisation as well as the above tasks on the organisational front get prepared for the armed struggle by the coming monsoon. We could, with the first drizzle begin the land distribution programme-the main item of the agrarian revolutionary programme. By co-ordinating the guerilla warfare with this, a strong and broad mass base would be secured for the struggle. The rainy season is a favourable period for resistance. During this period the land distribution and the functioning of the village soviets on one side and the resistance on the other by the implementation of all of them simultaneously the revolutionary movement would be strengthened and it would be in a position to withstand and march forward in the face of the enemy's counter-offensive that would follow. The comrades should bear it in mind and march forward.

As part of these preparations, a militant mass mobilisation against the landlords becomes necessary in the end of the summer season. Such a mobilisation would prove helpful for the launching of the armed struggle.

**Comrades!**

Today there are favourable conditions for the implementation of the above programme. The ruling classes are frightened out of their wits at the activities of the revolutionaries. With this they are resorting to ruthless repression. At such a time any complacency on our part would be unpardonable.

In accordance with Mao's Thought, the liberation struggles are going on against imperialism, feudalism and reactionary forces in various parts of the world. Following the path of people's war the liberation struggle has also started advancing in Thailand.

In China, the Communist party under the leadership of Mao has victoriously concluded the cultural revolution, liquidated the revisionism and marching forward.

Taking advantage of all these favourable conditions, we should, with the path of people's war strive to take the agrarian revolution forward. Only then could we march forward.

**LONG LIVE MAO'S THOUGHT!**

**LONG LIVE PEASANT ARMED STRUGGLE!**



## ON SOME PROBLEMS CONNECTED WITH SRIKAKULAM GIRIJAN MOVEMENT

*[Document adopted by the State Convention of APCCCR  
led by T.NagiReddy held from 10-12 in April 1969 - EC.]*

In the girijan areas of Srikakulam district, Girijan armed struggle began in the last week of November (24.11.68) and is continuing under the leadership of communist revolutionaries.

The Srikakulam district committee persistently propagates that the State Co-ordination Committee leadership opposed armed struggle and they established direct contacts with the All India Co-ordination Committee for this reason. It is needless to say that this propaganda is fully ill-motivated. We are placing this report before comrades to explain the situation that prevailed till the starting of the armed struggle, the problems that arose in the movement and the attitudes taken by the District and State Committee.

### PRE-1959 SITUATION

Srikakulam District is situated at the end of Andhra Pradesh on the borders of Orissa. In about 800 sq. miles in the Dt., there is a Girijan population of about 2 lakhs. Though there are plains in between, all this area is adjoining the Girijan areas of Orissa. In these hilly tracts there are roads here and there. In the regions adjoining plains, non-Girijans live along with Girijans.

Some who came from the plain areas and settled down in these areas had became the landlords and big shahukars through trade and money lending are exploiting the girijans. Village and forest officials and officers of the girijan welfare department, for that matter every one who had an opportunity to loot, joined them and are exploiting the girijans.

The exploitation of Girijans is in the following forms:

1. **Money lending:** To clear the debts, Girijans had to sell grain, other crops and forest produce at lower rates to those money lenders.
2. **Occupation of Girijan lands:** Those who could not clear debts had to mortgage and sell away their lands to the money lenders.
3. **Exploiting the agricultural labourers:** In lands thus lost to the landlords, Girijans had to work as palerlu (annually paid workers) and daily labour for nominal wages.
4. **Purchase of forest produce:** Girijan Corporation officers, shahukars, money lenders were purchasing forest produce from Girijans at nominal rates and selling them outside for huge profits.

**5. Exploitation by forest officers:** These forest officers were obstructing the Girijans from cultivating Podu (shifting cultivation) in forests and from collecting forest produce. Then they were demanding bribes, mamuls and forced labour (Vetti).

The Big Bourgeoisie landlord Government, serving the interests of imperialism, protects the exploiters. This government walking in the footsteps of the British rulers, helped only to intensify the kind of exploitation prevalent in those times rather than exterminating such exploitation. For example we may note from exploitation continuing even against 1917 regulations which are in vogue even today.

Against such exploitation, Girijans rose in revolt now and then before 1959. In 1900 in Salur agency, there was a revolt against the British Government which suppressed it. In 1946 in Parvatipuram agency area, there was some agitation under Ranga group (a section of congress men) leadership. When finally the Girijans occupied lands, the leadership betrayed and left them to the mercy of the Govt. officials and police. The Govt. acted in favour of landlords, filed several cases against Girijans, dragged them to courts and gradually suppressed the struggle.

#### **Girijan Movement under the Leadership of the Communist Revolutionaries (From 1959 to 1967)**

From 1959, the Communists built a broad based Girijan Sangham and under its leadership. It conducted several struggles against all sorts of exploitation (as referred to already), oppression and irregularities and the Girijans had won victories. These struggles were conducted based on the following ten demands:

1. All lands seized illegally from the Girijans by non-girijans in the agency, should be returned to Girijans.
2. Distribute Banjar (Waste) lands to Girijans immediately.
3. All debts, which were increased daily by all sorts of illegal methods should be abolished. Credit facilities should be provided sufficiently.
4. Agricultural implements and cattle should be supplied to Girijans to carry on agricultural operations.
5. Forest produce should be purchased from Girijans at reasonable rates. Consumer goods should be supplied to them at fair prices.
6. Those who extract free labour from the Girijans should be severely punished.
7. Salaries to Palerlu ( farm servants) and wage rates for agricultural workers should be fixed in consonance with the cost of living.
8. There should be no restriction on the use of forest timber by Girijans for their house construction and daily needs.
9. In the new atmosphere that will be created when the above programme is implemented, educational and cultural programmes should be organised on a large scale.
10. Girijan areas should be declared as autonomous regions and its administration should be handed over to the representatives of girijans.



When we take up these items one by one, we can see that the Girijans gained the following through their struggles:

1. From 1959 itself Girijans gradually re-occupied lands which were illegally seized by non-Girijan sahuks and landlords from them. Also they began to cultivate such lands. Till 1967, about 600 to 700 acres were thus occupied.
2. Upto 1967, about 1500 acres of forest waste lands were occupied and cultivated by Girijans.
3. Upto 1967, they refused to clear debts to the tune of about Rupees 2 Lakhs.
4. They got free timber for their agricultural use.
5. Even in the beginning, they sold their forest produce at weekly markets and got reasonable rates from private merchants and government corporation.
6. Free labour has been completely abolished.
7. The nominal rates for palerlu and daily labour were increased. The rates for palerlu increased from 6 bags per annum to 14-15 bags. Similarly the daily wage rates increased upto 12 times.
8. Forest timber has been taken freely for house construction and daily needs.
9. The implementation of this programme brought a big mass upsurge. The cadre utilised this to raise the political consciousness of the Girijans through cultural programmes, night schools and reading to them the party journals regularly.

The Girijans would get their autonomous region only when New Democratic Revolution begins. The aim of the present armed struggle is the victory of such a revolution.

Communist revolutionaries took up these issues, built up Girijan Sanghams on a broad basis and led the Girijan movement. They carried on the political propaganda that important problems like land and constitution of Autonomous region will be solved only with the establishment of peoples rule (New Democratic State) in the place of the present big Bourgeoisie -landlord State.

On the organisational front, Girijan Committees and party units were constituted. There were mass mobilisations on all the above issues because of relentless made by Girijan cadre and those from the plains.

As part of their political education, Girijan cadre as part of the district cadre, were given lessons on the Telangana armed struggle and its experiences. There was a lapse during this period: No widespread propaganda was carried on about the need to carry on armed struggle to capture power by the people.

#### **DURING 1967 AND AFTER**

By the beginning of the 1967 rainy season, Girijan movement reached a new stage. Girijans had already reoccupied some of their lands. They occupied 800 more acres in the possession of landlords and began cultivation. 2500 acres of forest waste land was also cultivated. Because there was acute food shortage,

the people prevented the landlords and sahuks from exporting their grain to outside the area with a view to realise high rates. They saw that sufficient grains were stocked in the Girijan areas. Even the rates were decreased and merchants were made to sell rice at 2 seers per rupee. Thus they even solved the food problems.

In this manner, land distribution and grain distribution, which are important items in the programme of Agrarian revolution, were implemented and this led to intensified mass upsurge. In these activities people began to participate on a big scale. The Girijan struggle reached a higher stage.

The landlords were frightened at the mass upsurge. On 31<sup>st</sup> October, 1967, the land lords and their goondas waylaid some delegates who were going to the taluk Girijan conference and beat them brutally. The victims included women also. When people came in support of beaten delegates, the landlords opened fire and murdered two Girijan activists-Manganna and Koranna. All this took place in a village named Levidi. This firing was a pointer to the fact that the struggle has reached a higher stage.

Eventhough there was a temporary frustration and disappointment amongst the Girijans as a result of this firing the masses once again moved when there was a public rally to pay homage to the martyrs. Similarly all over the Girijan area several meetings were held to pay homage to the martyrs. During these meetings big rallies were held on a large scale. Theserallies did not stop here. Some more items of our programme which were till then only in propaganda stage, were implemented now.

Alongwith the crops cultivated by Girijans in their own lands, they also took possession of the crops ready for harvest in the land still remaining with the landlords. They brought such harvested crops to their own houses. Girijans refused to pay and cancelled debts payable to landlords and sahuks. Such cancelled debts come to about Rs.3 lakhs. (There is another version that the amount is 8 lakhs: Ed.) They took possession of the cattle and goats belonging to the landlords and distributed them amongst themselves. Thus, along with the distribution of land, the programme for the cancellation of debts etc., also came into effect.

It became common for the masses to carry their big axes, bows and arrows and country-made guns wherever they went for demonstrations.

This situation continued upto February 20. Landlords responsible for murder escaped temporarily. There were no additional police camps. There were no raids by the armed police. Utilising this opportunity, people implemented the revolutionary programme to the extent possible. They felt and behaved as though their Raj has come. Girijan Sangham supervised all the village matters. All decisions of the party and Girijan Sangham were being implemented.

This was the actual situation. But *Liberation* wrote: "*Even after the landlords deliberately killed two activists of the Girijan Sangham in October, 1967, when the anger of the masses against the class enemy was at its height, the masses were not allowed to proceed against their enemies*" (*Liberation* Dec.68, P.30). The District committee also wrote similarly in its report.

The meaning of this is clear: when the people were advancing, the leadership pulled them back. But this is not true. There is not even one incident when the leadership—either local or at higher level—dragged the people back when they were advancing. Comrades provided leadership to every action of the people. People occupied landlords' lands. They took possession of their crops. They demonstrated with fire arms. In the clash with the police on 4-3-68 people used fire arms. When such are the realities it is only a baseless charge to say that the leadership did not allow masses to advance. This is not a genuine criticism.

From February 20 police activities began with the establishment of special armed camps. They gave a warning on 24<sup>th</sup> to surrender the arms. Though the SAP was moving about in the area, there were no raids till the end of February.

In this situation, the DC met on 24-2-68. This meeting took note of the coming police raids. The meeting decided that arms, especially the fire arms should not be surrendered, people should prevent any arrests and if arrested, people should rescue the arrested persons.

On 3<sup>rd</sup> March, police began large scale raids. On that day there was a raid on Burjaguda (Seethampet). By early hours, the armed police surrounded the village, arrested most of the villagers, raped some women, looted houses and carried away fowls, goats and other movables. The armed police adopted the same technique in all the subsequent raids.

On 4<sup>th</sup> March, there was a raid on Pedakarja (Parvathipuram agency). People vacated the village and went to the nearby hill. Police fired on the people. People replied the firing. But because people had only country-made guns police were not hurt. But two Girijans died due to police firing.

After this incident, the people were demoralised.

Here we have to take note of a point:

Even in the conditions when there were large scale armed police raids and serious repression we could have put up some more resistance if we were prepared organisationally. As we were not prepared when the police raids began the people moved helter skelter and there was no self defence and protection of immovable properties. These incidents only prove that when there is Govt. armed repression, there is need to put up armed resistance as far as possible.

The State Co-ordination Committee was formed at the time of the State Committee (Marxist) meeting held from March 9 to 11, 1968. The meeting felt the resistance problems in the agency area should be decided after discussing with the District Committee.

As per this, the DC met at the end of March (from 29<sup>th</sup>) and discussed the problems facing the movement. By then, except in a few areas, armed police raids were continuing seriously in the rest of the region. All important leaders came out of the agency. As SAP and goondas looted all grain and movables of people and the non-availability of salt, grains and cloth became a serious problem. The police and goondas looted all the forest produce gathered by the people intended for sale. Now the people had nothing to sell. Thus they lost all the cash necessary to eke out their living for the rest of the year.

In this situation, the question of organising people's resistance did not come before the meeting as an important one. But the issues such as supply of salt, foodgrains, clothes and agricultural implements came before that meeting as an important one. On the advice of the State committee representatives the DC decided to make arrangements for the supply of the above articles, to re-establish contacts by the cadre with the masses, to safeguard remaining arms and to make arrangements for giving guerilla training to all leading cadres.

In this meeting we discussed problems connected with guerilla struggle. All these decisions were taken with this understanding: that we should organise squads, give training and be ready to begin the struggle when the masses moved again. Because it was end of March, the training had to be completed by April and May. As soon as rains start in June, we could begin struggles for seizing lands of the landlords and our armed squads could resist the repressive SAP and the goondas. This way we could co-ordinate the land problem of the agrarian revolution with guerilla struggle. Our understanding was that in such a situation, we could carry on stable and protracted armed guerilla struggle. So, the issue whether guerilla struggle is to be carried on or not, did not at all arise between the State Co-ordination committee and the Srikakulam District committee. On that issue there were no differences whatsoever.

But during the discussion, two issues came forward. First: Whether minimum military training was necessary to begin guerilla struggle? Secondly: Whether guerilla struggle could be started even when the masses were not on the move?

These issues were discussed. We came to the conclusion that minimum military training was necessary to begin guerilla struggle and the people should be moved to the required extent to participate in the guerilla struggle. After the discussion, we came to the conclusion that it was wrong to think that the people would move only after the guerilla struggle started.

It is not correct to say, as the District Committee propagates, that the State Committee did not give the training locally but took them to distant places. Such propaganda is also completely false. In the beginning, arrangements were made to give the training locally. But the DC leaders themselves came to the conclusion that it was not possible because of the concentration of the enemy in the area. With no other alternative, they were to be taken to distant places.

Now the DC says that what was taught in the training was not useful. It is a different matter if they refuse to utilise that because of their opposition to the State Co-ordination Committee. The issue before us is how to utilise the experiences of the Telangana struggle. They will not be useful for those who refuse to utilise them. For revolutionaries who utilise them, the experiences of every struggle would be useful. Even today it is necessary for the DC to try to utilise them.

In the same DC meeting, it was decided that even the combined Seethampet and Parvathipuram agency areas are very limited. This area is surrounded by roads. When severe raids take place, it would be impossible for all the squads to remain

in the region (especially in summer). So we have to extend the movement to the other agency areas in the district and also to the agency areas of Orissa.

As per these decisions, leading comrades again went amidst masses, maintained contacts with them and began work amongst them. They went to some Girijan areas and worked for the extension of the movement. But the decision regarding guerilla training was not implemented immediately. The DC could not make the necessary arrangements on its behalf. So the State Committee had to intervene and there was some delay in completing all arrangements.

Burdwan Plenum was held at the beginning of April. In Andhra the Communist revolutionaries revolted against the Party (Marxist) leadership in the second week of June and came out of it. Immediately the Srikakulam DC met from 16<sup>th</sup> June (1968).

In this meeting, some comrades in the DC criticised the State leadership for not coming out of the Party immediately after the Burdwan Plenum and for delaying till June. There was one opinion that comrades should have resigned and come out individually instead of the leadership giving a call for revolt, which would undermine discipline in the party to be formed by us. Another opinion was that all these developments were nothing but "old wine in new bottles." But the State Committee representative made it clear that some time was needed to rally all the revolutionaries in the party and therefore they could not come out immediately after the Burdwan Plenum. It also said that their formal attitude about discipline was wrong as in the process of building a new party through revolutionary movements revolutionary discipline would be established; it was wrong to say all this as 'old wine in new bottles' and all that would be proved in practice.

Comrades gave reports about the situation of the masses in the Girijan areas. They explained that people had not yet overcome their frustration, there was not yet any possibility to move them on the issues of tilling of landlords' land and the police were also making raids wherever we moved.

On the advice of the State representative, the DC decided: While completing the arrangements for guerilla training for all those to lead the guerilla struggle, we must prepare the local militants-men and women- to use hand bombs, bows & arrows, spears and other country made weapons and to give directions to Girijans to use them in resistance and self defence during SAP and goonda raids, loot and violence. The State representative made it clear that some move in the masses was necessary to begin regular guerilla struggle and it was necessary to wait till the masses move on issues like land, crops etc. DC was asked to inform the State Coordination Committee when that is materialised so that it can take a decision in the matter. On this, it was decided that armed resistance must be put up while at the same time preparing for higher forms of regular guerilla struggle.

As per these decisions, a batch of important activists were given guerilla training. To complete the training for the second batch, there was some delay due to some unavoidable reasons. Some material was collected for local armed resistance. But arrangements for resistance were not made.

When the realities are such, the propaganda carried on by the DC that the State Committee was against armed resistance, is nothing but false. The State Committee on the one hand gave a programme for immediate resistance and on the other hand made preparations for immediate starting of protracted guerilla war. Just to deny this, the DC resorts to propagate lies and untruths.

Also, in their attempt to criticise the State leadership, they went to the extent of defaming the very movement and its nature. See the following sentences which they wrote in the same issue of *Liberation*: "*On the whole, the movement did not proceed beyond its democratic nature*".

This is incorrect. To seize the lands from the landlords and cultivate them, large scale armed demonstrations, using arms in one or two cases of resistance—all, these describe the revolutionary nature of the movement and not just a democratic nature. On another occasion, they compare this struggle with that of Hunan peasants revolt. Then is it not defaming the movement to say that the movement here did not advance beyond democratic nature?

They have also written as follows:

*"In the face of the attacks of landlords and the police the neo-revisionists had always suggested that our policy should be one of exposing the ruling classes and extending the areas of struggle. Before and even after the large scale military type operations, that attitude was not basically changed. Confusion and vacillation, atleast for a temporary period."*

Everybody knows that the neo-revisionists pointed out to the non-extension of the movement as a pretext to postpone the armed struggle. But it is baseless to accuse the State Co-ordination Committee of having tread the same path. Only in May the State Committee began to deal with the DC directly. By then, most of the raids were over. From that day it was making preparations for armed struggle. Only as part of such preparations it wanted the extension of the movement. We got good results to the extent we implemented these decisions. To the extent they were not implemented we did not get results.

This false propaganda was carried on not only in *Liberation* but also in the report published by the DC.

Ordinarily any party unit has to overcome many difficulties to make these arrangements. Because we were starting armed struggle for the first time, we had to overcome some more difficulties. DC did not concentrate on this at a time when these difficulties had to be overcome by District and State Comrades working together with mutual co-operation and get ready for armed resistance and regular guerilla struggle. It established direct relations with the All India Co-ordination Committee. Even by then, a comrade and leader of a cultural squad from this district carried on propaganda against the State Co-ordination Committee wherever he went for cultural performances. He contacted and worked with Venkatarathnam group, who had a centre in Gudur District, with groups in various districts, which was working against the State Co-ordination Committee in the name of Naxalbari Solidarity Committee.

In this context it is also necessary to point out to comrades about one more point. As soon as it was formed the State Co-ordination Committee did not join the All India Co-ordination Committee. The AICCCR published one of the documents which the State leadership placed for discussion at the Burdwan Plenum and put up a note pointing out some basic differences on it. This they published openly. We wanted to know their motives for doing so before joining them. With this in view, the State Co-ordination Committee opened direct talks even before these talks were concluded, a representative of the AICCCR visited Guntur and informed Venkatarathnam group of the details of the discussions with the State Co-ordination Committee and gave them instructions to coordinate the work of the revolutionaries in the State. With this, they carried on large scale propaganda against the State Co-ordination Committee all over the state. The essence of their propaganda was that there was no difference between the politics of the neo-revisionists and the politics practiced by the State leadership.

In this serious situation, the DC met during the third week of September. At this meeting some DC leaders stated that primarily the State Co-ordination Committee leadership was following the neo-revisionist path and opposed to the armed struggle; and they went to the extent of saying that these were our political motives for not starting armed struggle in Girijan areas of Srikakulam and for not joining the AICCCR. The reply given by the State representative who attended that meeting to their criticisms did not satisfy them. At the end, the DC passed the following resolutions on armed struggle and joining the AICCCR.

**On Armed Struggle:** *"Police have again begun raids. After the SAP was withdrawn in June, these raids began from the second week of August. In the interval, our cadre went to the masses and explained the situation. They exposed the deceitful promises of the Government. People were enthused. They made it clear that this time they should fight and they were ready for it. But they feel that our leadership (squad) should be in their midst. Even the cadre are also enthusiastic. They are of the strong opinion to get ready for struggle this time."*

*"The police raids have begun at a time when our cadre went to the people to explain and the atmosphere was enthusiastic. Landlords, goondas with the aid of those who have surrendered to the police are carrying on these raids. It has become normal to loot, beat the people and compel them to reveal the whereabouts of the activists."*

*"In this situation, the people are expressing their readiness to resist these raids. But they feel this time the resistance should be armed one. In the context of first raids we retreated. At that time we told the people and cadre that we were preparing for a higher form of struggle and would soon resist. Similar raids have begun. But we are unable to begin resistance as promised earlier. With this the people and cadre are losing confidence on us. If we delay further, there is a danger of our isolation from the people. The cadre are very demoralised. So our DC requests for the decision to start armed struggle immediately."*

*"For the present, we can use hand bombs, country-made guns and bows and arrows. We think that we can use hand bombs during police raids and give these hand bombs to militants. The squad should assist the people."*

*"For the present, we have formed one squad with 8 persons from 3 'propaganda squads'. Apart from these there are 86 militants, Squads could be formed from them."*

*"It is necessary for the PC to give technical assistance. We request that this should be done quickly."*

(The above resolution was adopted unanimously)

It was not clear during the DC discussion, as was made out in the resolution, that the people were in action. Further they alleged that it would take two more years for the masses to move, by then the general elections would come, and only with a view to participate in them, the State Committee is showing the pretext of masses not being in action to postpone armed struggle. If we just turn back, it would be clear how baseless are such charges by these comrades. Had we implemented the decision taken at the last DC meeting (held in June) there was no necessity to pass this resolution now as though no such decision was taken earlier. There is already a decision to resist the police with hand bombs and arrows. They ought to have reviewed how far they implemented it. They passed this resolution now. This won't help the armed struggle. In the last DC meeting, it was made clear that if the masses begin to move on any issue, we would decide for regular guerilla struggle and this armed resistance with country bombs and bows and arrows would only help this regular guerilla struggle. There was no need for much time to start regular guerilla struggle with guerilla squads, if armed resistance had been organised before.

It is totally unreal to say that the State Committee banned the use of fire arms and allowed, "only if necessary" to use of Country bombs and bows & arrows etc. The DC had agreed to the advice of the State representative for the programme of continuous armed resistance with Country bombs and arrows and bows. Use of fire arms is an important part of military training. So, we could use them as soon as it was completed. But there was no ban placed on its use.

## **SECOND RESOLUTION:**

### **ON JOINING THE ALL INDIA CO-ORDINATION COMMITTEE:**

*"In the country Naxalbari comrades stood in the fore front and carried on the inner party ideological struggle. They exposed betrayal of the neo-revisionists before the people. They first raised the flag of revolt, applied Mao's Thought and blazed the way for all revolutionaries. Addressing the comrades who are still with the neo-revisionists, they stated in December 'We call upon you to repudiate openly the neo-revisionist leading clique and politics and openly join hands with us who are striving to build a genuine Communist party in our country.'"*

*"Again in May, revolutionaries from different States met and formed themselves into "All India Co-ordination Committee of Communist Revolutionaries" and requested the comrades still with the neo-revisionist clique and comrades in separate groups to join the AICCCR. They made it clear that*



*all revolutionaries should realise that the existence of separate groups is harmful to the Indian revolutionary movement. As a result of these two public calls, many State Co-ordination Committees of Communist Revolutionaries joined the AICCCR. But our Andhra Co-ordination Committee did not join them. The DC feels that this is a very regrettable Position."*

*"This DC approves the calls given by the AICCCR during December-May and agrees to join AICCCR. We hope the State Committee will approve the calls given by the AICCCR and join it."*

There was an amendment to delete the sentence: 'It (DC) agrees to join the AICCCR', as it implied to directly join the AICCCR without being a part of State Co-ordination Committee and as it was not a correct procedure. This amendment was lost by 4 to 3 votes.

In this manner, it has been made clear through their writings and actions that the basic differences on ideological and organisational matters between the AICCCR and APCCCR as the cause for delay in joining the AICCCR. On this, the State Committee felt the cause of unity amongst revolutionaries would be advanced only through direct talks and expressing the mutual stand points and then join the AICCCR. The State Committee continued the discussions with the AICCCR. On this matter, we reported to the Srikakulam Committee.

It is not correct to say that all the revolutionaries in all States had joined the AICCCR by the time the DC passed this resolution. In Bengal itself 5 groups were outside. In Kerala, Kosalram and K.P.R.Gopalan's groups were outside. In Tamilnadu one group was outside. Even Kashmir group did not have contacts with it. All these comrades are working on the basis of Mao's Thought. They are trying to understand each other and carry discussions with the AICCCR to come together. It is now clear not only APCCCR but there are others also in other States, comrades who want to come to a clear understanding on problems through discussion with a view to join the AICCCR.

Not only that. In this resolution the DC did not mention anywhere that they wanted to join the AICCCR because the Andhra Committee opposed armed struggle. They expressed regret for the Andhra SC not joining the AICCCR and only stated they were joining the AICCCR after approving the call of the AICCCR.

Similarly, though they concealed the resolution already (June) made in favour of armed resistance. This DC passed the resolution asking for permission to start armed struggle. Joining the AICCCR directly and asking for permission for armed struggle are mutually contradictory. Yet it asked for permission and technical assistance from the State Committee which decided accordingly. Then when did we oppose the armed struggle? The DC, through their decision, made it clear about their action 'to agree to join the AICCCR'. They also immediately joined them. This was confirmed by "*Liberation*" later on. In December 1968 "*Liberation*" wrote as follows:

*"Very recently they (revolutionaries of Srikakulam:Sc) have joined the AICCCR and thus they have now access to the rich experiences of the revolutionaries throughout India".*

The DC's decision and the subsequent endorsement by the AICCCR make it very clear that the DC rejected the leadership of the State Committee in September, 1968 i.e., long before the starting of the armed struggle. The AICCCR had also approved it. Establishing direct links with the leadership of Venkatarathnam group who worked against the State Committee, was only a part of their activities.

The DC resolution added a sentence on the lines that it wanted the State Committee to join the AICCCR. But this was only formal. Because even after the State Committee joined the AICCCR, the DC was acting independently. It never recognised the State Committee leadership.

Eventhough the DC thus resolved and is working directly after joining the AICCCR, arrangements were completed for giving guerilla training to the remaining leading cadre in the Dist. The State Committee met and decided to join the AICCCR. Though the resolution passed by DC on armed struggle, had some weaknesses (as already pointed out), the State Committee agreed for the starting of the armed struggle.

In this situation, in the beginning of October (8<sup>th</sup>) important leaders of DC met at Eluru. In the meeting, the State representatives explained the above resolutions of the State Committee. But the DC rejected them and refused to receive guerilla training. As a result of this all arrangements made towards that had to be cancelled. After the meeting, the leading cadre of DC went to Krishna, Guntur, W.Godavari Districts, directly contacted important activists there and tried to detach them from the State Co-ordination Committee. They established direct contacts with various groups working with Venkatarathnam group and carried on their activities. Already Venkatarathnam group, was having contacts with some local units of Srikakulam Dt. (Boddapadu etc.).

The State representatives attended the AICCCR meeting held in October 1968. After discussions with leaders, it became clear there were no basic differences between them regarding the following: Owing allegiance to Mao's Thought, characterising the Soviet revisionist leadership as pursuing imperialist policies, rejection of parliamentary path and recognition of armed struggle as the immediate problem. It was also made clear to the AICCCR the views expressed by some State representatives on the question of elections were not that of the committee and even the State Committee felt that they had over-emphasised the matter. It was also made clear that the main reason for not coming out of the Marxist party immediately after the Burdwan Plenum was not the desire to carry on the inner party struggle from within the Marxist Party but to help the party ranks by giving our alternate line to enable them to decide which side to take; and towards this end, we violated the party discipline at every step and finally gave a call for revolt and came out. So it was wrong to call all this as opportunistic which was against reality. All these were reported by the AICCCR leaders to the representatives of the Srikakulam district who were present there on the invitation of the AICCCR itself.

On behalf of the State Co-ordination Committee, we pointed out to the Dt. Committee meeting held in November (by then the December issue of Liberation has not come out) at a time when we are to prepare the people to carry on immediate armed struggle in different parts of the State, it would be useful if the Srikakulam district unit, which was in the struggle area, worked with the State Co-ordination Committee on the basis of democratic Centralism and it would be good to observe the highest form of discipline through democratic centralism to carry on the highest form of struggle i.e., armed struggle. But the DC did not accept this suggestion. They made it clear they would work with the State Committee only on the basis of Co-ordination, they would implement only such decisions which are acceptable for them and in respect of others they would act according to their own independent decisions.

After this meeting, they rallied people belonging to Venkatarathnam group in Krishna and Guntur districts and took them to Srikakulam Dt. There leaders made it a particular point to slander the State leadership and create dissatisfaction among the comrades. Among those who went, there were some honest revolutionaries who desired to go and work among the people. There were some undesirables also.

In December two State Committee Secretariat members discussed with the Secretary of the Srikakulam Dt. Committee about tactics and measures to be taken after the armed struggle started and gave some suggestions. These were accepted by them. Along with this, they made it clear to the DC secretary that having direct relations with other districts and recruiting people who worked against the State Committee can not be called co-ordination. Yet these DC comrades gradually moved in the direction of establishing a rival centre. These developments would naturally cause distress when the need of the hour was to rally support and cooperation from all revolutionaries in the State behind the armed struggle going on now in Srikakulam Dist.

All this would make it clear that the propaganda against the State Committee that it opposes armed struggle is untenable, incorrect and not genuine.

They also carried on another mispropaganda that the State Coordination Committee banned the distribution of the pamphlets issued by the Dt. Committee. The DC distributed all its pamphlets through its own group. They did not distribute through State or District Committees. As such the question of banning does not arise. This is nothing but an attempt to justify their action of distribution of pamphlets through their own group.

Thus, all attempts by the State Committee, working under heavy odds, to improve relations between the State Committee and the District Committee comrades ended in failure. Yet the State Committee is trying its best to help the armed struggle.

#### **CLARIFICATIONS OF SOME ISSUES:**

In view of the above explanations, it would be clear that it is baseless to say that the State Committee was against armed struggle in the Srikakulam Girijan areas. On the other hand, it desired to start armed struggle as soon as

possible. It worked to that end. It agrees that there are some short comings in this effort. The main shortcomings are :Failure to make preparations for armed resistance even before the police raids began in the beginning of March 1968, failure to make necessary arrangements to quickly complete guerilla training, failure to allot one comrade on behalf of the centre to check up the preparations. The last two failures reflect only the organisational weaknesses of the centre and not its understanding. As for the first, the State Committee was not even constituted by the time the police raids began. The State Committee was constituted only after the raids started. Till then, State leaders used to carry on their previous responsibilities in various areas.

Though these are the difficulties yet objectively these were failures. To correct the position, even now it becomes necessary to make organisational arrangements.

But there was no unanimity among DC comrades as to when and how the struggle should start. If we examine the various opinions expressed during discussions, it would be clear there were some differences.

### **ARMED STRUGGLE-LAND QUESTION:**

Some comrades not only in the DC but also outside are of the following opinion: The struggle we are conducting now is liberation struggle. This has no immediate relation to the land problem or the system of exploitation by landlords. This would remain as a problem that must be resolved after liberation was achieved. Build peoples army, liberate the rural areas and liberate the cities. For this we have to establish base areas.

Today, all the peasant armed struggles bursting out in various regions of our country are liberation struggles i.e., struggles for seizure of power. Even the struggles, which have not yet reached the stage of armed struggle, they would also develop into armed struggles and liberation struggle if developed with this understanding and taken to higher level. At this time, when in the country there is a revolutionary situation, all the peasant struggles will have this character. But the starting, developing, consolidating and extension of all these struggles will have to be based on agrarian revolutionary programme only. For the peasant liberation means liberation from landlord-imperialist system. Though complete liberation is attained only after the establishment of base areas after seizure of power throughout India and after establishment of New Democratic Govt., liberation begins with the starting of the class struggles, with the starting of anti-landlord struggles, with the starting of the Agrarian Revolutionary programme.

The experience of the Srikakulam Dist. also prove the same. From 1959 we built a broadbased mass movement of Girijans rallying them against exploitation by feudal landlord, Govt. officers. With the occupation of lands in the possession of landlords, seizure of crops, cancellation of debts, the movement reached a higher stage and the conditions are created for armed struggle.

Peasants fight for liberation not only from imperialism but also feudalism. So before and after starting armed struggle, we have to advance basing on agrarian revolutionary programme. So, we will combine armed struggle and will carry it on to protect the gains of the struggles, to extend them.

But it would be wrong to confine this armed struggle to land problem or problems connected with feudal exploitation only. Armed struggle should be carried on with the aim of seizing power. We must create this consciousness in the people. In regions under feudal exploitation, the peasantry will gain this consciousness in the course of struggle against such exploitation.

This question arises before us: Is it absolutely necessary to continue this anti-feudal struggle in all places, on all occasions and for a number of years, before we could reach the stage of armed struggle? To this our reply is : It is not necessary. Today the presence of a revolutionary situation, the influence of armed struggle that began in various regions, a revolutionary leadership owing allegiance to Mao's Thought, leading the peasants with an orientation of seizing power all these create possibilities for struggles in which, without the necessity to continue a long drawn struggle and within a short time the struggles to reach the stage of armed struggle. Revolutionaries should use these opportunities fully and develop armed struggle.

The question arises: How are we to combine the armed struggle where there is no naked feudal exploitation, where it is not so intensive or where it is absolutely non existent? In those places there would be other forms of exploitation which depend on Govt. Officers, imperialists or others. We have to carry on struggles against such exploitation. On all occasions seizure of power would be main question. So the problem does not depend solely on the seriousness of exploitation. The struggle against exploitation will be utilised to reach as quickly as possible the stage of struggle for seizure of power. So we have to make use of it to the extent possible.

If we attempt to continue armed struggle leaving aside the agrarian revolutionary programme or the gains of the struggle, participation of rural masses in the armed struggle would be weakened. Gradually it would be on the decrease. Thus the very armed struggle would be weakened with the danger of collapse.

For the masses of the rural people, liberation from feudalism means giving land to the tiller; any liberation struggle not related to this would, in practice be abstract for them.

### **ARMED STRUGGLE AND THE ROLE OF THE MASSES.**

Guerilla struggle is the people's armed struggle. Without the participation of the people, no guerilla struggle would succeed. Similarly, to begin guerilla struggle, participation by the masses in it becomes necessary.

When agrarian revolution begins, the Govt. would send armed forces to suppress it and brutal repression would be unleashed against the masses. In such a situation, the mass upsurge which would have been there before the raids, would not be there after that. Activity would decrease. On many occasions there may be temporary lull. The revolutionaries often face a problem. Could we start guerilla struggle during such lull periods, or not? Some comrades argue that even at such times, we could begin.

Accordingly to our experiences of mass movements, in the present circumstances, such a lull would be only temporary. During such a lull,

revolutionaries should revive their links with the masses, carry on political propaganda, move them as far as possible on mass issues and prepare for the ensuing struggle. Then it will not be long for the people to move into struggle. But this time the mass upsurge may not be as extensive as it was before the repression. But in this mass upsurge people's hatred against the enemy and the armed forces and their determination to fight against them through to the end would be many times greater than earlier. This would immensely help to increase the fighting mettle of the masses and the guerilla squads. This would also create a broad mass base for Guerilla struggle. This advantage would not be there for guerilla struggle that begins when masses are not on the move. Also there is a possibility of people exhibiting weaknesses in withstanding the enemies armed onslaught.

This does not mean that it would be wrong to resist in any form the enemy raids during such lull periods. Only by resisting enemy raids even during such times we could prepare the masses and militants for the ensuing guerilla struggles. Forms of resistance could be decided according to the level of the movement. Primarily we should carry on our resistance with whatever arms available with the people. Through such organised resistance masses and militants would learn the first lessons of guerilla warfare.

Even the experiences of Srikakulam make this clear. After the armed police carried on raids from March to May 68, masses were temporarily terrorised. But revolutionaries stood firmly and carried on work in the midst of the masses. So there was some move among the people by the time of harvest. Even after that, as a result of the continued activity of the cadre, the masses were prepared for the higher form of struggle going on now.

We must recognise that the trend which says during a lull period, it is not possible for masses and militants to resist with whatever locally available arms, is wrong.

#### **GUERRILLA STRUGGLE-TRAINING:**

Whether a minimum military training is necessary or not before starting the guerilla struggle? The correct answer would be: Yes it is necessary.

Our basic principle is that guerillas learn guerilla tactics in the course of guerilla struggles only. Yet when these exploiting classes banned the use of fire arms-let alone giving military training for the masses it is necessary for the guerillas and guerilla leaders to have minimum military training.

If the guerillas had to enter the struggle straight away this minimum training has to be given to them in the front itself. Ordinarily it is better to begin after giving minimum training. Even this training should not be on the model of training lasting for months adopted by the ruling classes. It is better to complete it in a few days time depending upon place and circumstances.

'To protect oneself and destroy the enemy' -this is the general principle of war. We have to apply this in the guerilla warfare learn through a minimum training how we - a weak force- can beat the stronger enemy. Skill can be attained in the

battle field. In the beginning we would incur some losses. Only to avoid such losses to guerillas and leaders, it is necessary to have minimum military training.

**PROBLEM OF COMMAND**

Armed struggle is going on in Srikakulum Dist. We are attempting to develop armed struggle in other parts of the State. At an appropriate time the struggle will start in these areas. It is necessary to carry on these struggles under one command. Then only it is possible to develop these armed struggles according to one plan.

In guerilla struggles, the leadership would not be completely centralised. Similarly there would not be complete decentralisation. As far as strategy is concerned, there would be a centralised leadership. In relation to wars and battles there would be decentralisation.

Within these limits, there should be relations between the leadership both at local and higher levels. Complete centralisation, is wrong in military wars. Similarly in guerilla war, complete decentralisation is wrong. By this, it would not be possible to effectively face the enemy forces. Mao, while explaining the principles of guerilla warfare, has given due importance to this.

At a time when we revolutionaries are working separately in the name of co-ordination, it is but natural for trends of decentralisation to raise their heads. We must fight against this. We must see that struggles are carried on under one command in any area.

#### **UNITED FRONT:**

For the victory of the armed struggle which we carry on, United Front is one of the important weapons used by the party. We should never give up our idea of UF organisation in our propaganda and activity. Which class will lead this UF? Who form its basics? Which are the classes that must be rallied into UF? We must have clarity on these issues. Similarly we should know our enemies. If we lack this clarity, enemies may escape from our attacks. Those who are not our enemies may be attacked unnecessarily by us. If we are to avoid such a situation, we must have a correct understanding of the United Front.

The pamphlet published by the Srikakulum District Committee completely lack this understanding. They correctly wrote: "All peasantry in the district who are exploited by landlords, money lenders, bureaucratic officials are like living corpses." They wrote: "In the future, students, teachers and N.G.O. and other associations will move on a larger scale, because in future their position would deteriorate." Though there are many limitations for Associations under reactionary and reformist leadership, in coming into struggles, there is a possibility of middle classes coming into struggles in future on an increased scale.

These points have been stated correctly. But they have not even touched about the working class which should lead the united front and about national bourgeoisie, which could join the UF and for whose joining there are possibilities. Similarly, it did not even give an outline of the agrarian revolutionary programme, which has to be implemented to abolish feudalism.

We must build a United Front for the overthrow of imperialism, comprador bourgeoisie and feudalism, under the leadership of working class, with worker-

peasant alliance as basis and rallying middle class and national bourgeoisie into it. Our revolutionary path will be People's War. This is People's Democratic Revolution.

The said pamphlet lacks this perspective. It creates an impression that power could be seized without any necessity of united front and by overthrowing the ruling classes through armed struggles.

By this, we must note there is a possibility of creating some confusion in sections which co-operate with us or remain neutral.

The inseparable relation between the party, armed struggle and United Front was well explained by Chairman Mao in the following lines:

"Our eighteen years of experience show that the United Front and armed struggle are the two basic weapons for defeating the enemy. The United Front is a united front for carrying on armed struggle. And the party is the heroic warrior wielding the two weapons, the united front and the armed struggle, to storm and shatter the enemy's positions. This is how the three are related to each other"[Vol.II, P.295].

These lines by Com. Mao Tse-tung must be followed not only in the far off future but even in the course of implementing our immediate programme.

**Comrades,**

Here we have explained the developments that came about in the course of revolutionary movement of the Girijan areas of Srikakulam Dist. Also the problems that arose in that connection and the attitude we should have towards it. After this explanation, it would be completely baseless and slanderous if any one says that State Co-ordination Committee was against the armed struggle or tried to weaken it. An examination of above points make it clear that the State Committee was never against armed struggle whether in the form of armed resistance or regular guerilla struggle. Also in 1968 June itself, it gave the Srikakulam committee a clear programme for armed resistance without any reservations. It began necessary preparation for regular guerilla struggle. If all these efforts have not come to fruition, the responsibility is entirely on the DC which attempted to establish a rival centre against the State Committee.

But there arose differences between the State Committee and the DC in relation to various issues. Briefly they are as follows:

1. The DC denies the necessity for a general armed resistance which is the beginning stage for regular guerilla struggle. The State Committee is of the view that such an armed resistance is necessary in the conditions of the repression.
2. The DC feels that there is no necessity for minimum training, for regular guerrilla struggle. The State Committee feels it necessary.
3. The DC feels there was no need of mass participation. They feel masses will move by themselves, once we start armed struggle. State Committee feels the guerilla struggle must begin with mass participation.



4. The DC feels that armed struggle could be carried without any relation to issues like land in the agrarian revolution. They say this itself is liberation struggle. But the State Committee feels that there is inseparable relationship between agrarian revolution and armed struggle.
5. In the view of the State Committee when armed struggle is carried on we should have a perspective of United Front. The DC lacks such perspective.
6. The State Committee feels, for proper conducting of armed struggle there should be unity between State and District Committees based on principle of democratic centralism: and the armed struggle should be carried on under a centralised leadership. But the road taken by the DC is to create a rival centre and disunity among the revolutionaries and the revolutionary movement.

All these differences come to the surface even in the beginning of the armed struggle itself. We have to wait and see how these will develop as the movement advances.

We have not received any authentic details about the armed raids carried on from the beginning of armed struggle. Yet there is news that generally masses are participating in them. This is commendable. They may argue that it was the result of starting armed struggle. But this is not correct. There was an indication of this development even in August and September 68. Then we had not started armed struggle. These changes (of mass participation) are the result of waiting till the masses moved.

There is a good future for the Srikakulam armed struggle which started on the basis of a deep and concrete revolutionary peasant movement. We wish this struggle to advance. The advance of this struggle, would be very much helpful to the advancement of the struggles in other areas. If the District leadership adopts correct tactics with correct perspective and carries on the armed struggle, it would beat back the armed attacks of the ruling classes and would be able to advance. We must carefully study the experience of the Srikakulam struggle.

Now, let us pay our homage to the Martyrs who laid down their lives in the Srikakulam Girijan struggle. Let us pledge to carry forward their objectives. In our country let us destroy imperialism, comprador bourgeoisie, bureaucratic capitalism and feudalism, and establish New Democracy. For this let us build up rural revolutionary bases and carry forward the armed struggle.

This is possible in the present national and international situation. Let us hold high the banner of Mao Tse-tung's Thought and go forward to make the Revolution a success.

**:VICTORY IS OURS:**



## IV

# DOCUMENTS OF CPI (ML)

# 1.POLITICAL RESOLUTION

[COC, Communist Party of India (Marxist-Leninist) - April 22, 1969]

The events of the last eighteen months since we repudiated the neo-revisionists, prove beyond doubt the correctness of our stand. They prove that the line of rejecting the parliamentary path and adopting the path of revolutionary struggle is wholly correct. During this period, the people of India have seen the rank opportunism of all the bourgeois and revisionist parties and their total political bankruptcy. They have lost faith in all the bourgeois and revisionist parties and are convinced of the utter futility of the parliamentary path.

## **Indian Society : Semi- Colonial and Semi- Feudal**

The events have also confirmed the correctness of our assessment as regards the stage, nature and character of our society, state and government. While rejecting the revisionist understanding, we stated that India is a semi-colonial and semi-feudal country, that the Indian state is the state of the big landlords and comprador-bureaucrat capitalism and that its government is a lackey of U.S. imperialism and Soviet social-imperialism. The abject dependence of Indian economy on "aid" from imperialist countries, chiefly from U.S. imperialism and Soviet social-imperialism, the thousands of collaboration agreements, the imperialist plunder of our country through unequal trade and "aid", the utter dependence for food on P.L. 480 etc, go to prove the semi-colonial character of our country.

The increasing concentration of land in the hands of a few landlords, the expropriation of almost the total surplus produce by the toiling peasantry in the form of rent, the complete landlessness of about 40% of the rural population, the back breaking usurious exploitation, the ever-growing eviction of the poor peasantry coupled with the brutal social oppression- including the lynching of HARIJANS, reminiscent of the mediaeval ages, and the complete backwardness of the technique of production clearly demonstrate the semi-feudal character of our society.

The fleecing of the Indian people by extracting the highest rate of profit, the concentration of much of India's wealth in the hands of seventyfive comprador-bureaucrat capitalists, the utilisation of the state sector in the interest of foreign monopolies and domestic big business and their unbridled freedom -all go to prove that it is the big landlords and comprador-bureaucrat capitalists who run the state.

The political , economic, cultural and military grip of U.S imperialism and Soviet social - imperialism on the Indian State, the dovetailing of its foreign policy with the U.S-Soviet global strategy of encircling Socialist China and suppressing the national liberation struggle, the recent tours of Latin America

and South East Asia by the Indian prime Minister to further the interests of this counter - revolutionary strategy, the total support given by the Indian Govt. for the Soviet armed provocation against China, the fascist approval of soviet aggression against Czechoslovakia and the active collaboration with the U.S imperialists against the national liberation struggle of Vietnam clearly show that the Indian Govt. is a lackey of U.S. imperialism and Soviet revisionism.

The rising tide of the peasant struggles in various parts of our country is further confirmation of our stand that the principal contradiction in our country at the present phase is between feudalism and the masses of our peasantry.

The Indian revolution at this stage is the democratic revolution of a new type the People's Democratic Revolution-the main content of which is the agrarian revolution, the abolition of feudalism in the countryside. To destroy feudalism, one of the two main props (comprador -bureaucrat capital being the other) of imperialism in our country, the Indian people will have to wage a bitter, protracted struggle against U.S and Soviet social - imperialism too. By liberating themselves from the yoke of feudalism, the Indian people will also liberate themselves from the yoke of imperialism and comprador- bureaucrat capital, because the struggle against feudalism is also a struggle against the other two enemies.

#### ***Excellent Revolutionary Situation***

The interantional development that have taken place in the recent period vindicate our stand that a very excellent revolutionary situation prevails in the world today. The U.S imperialists and their chief accomplice, the Soviet revisionists are facing increasing difficulty in their dirty efforts to re - divide and enslave the whole world. The growing intensity of the armed struggle in Asia, Africa and Latin American countries for national liberation, is destroying the very foundation of imperialist rule.

A new upsurge of struggle of the working class and the toiling peasants have overtaken the capitalist countries and the revolutionary ruling classes are facing an irreconcilable contradiction at home.

An unprecedented wave of struggle of the Afro-American people against racial oppression that erupted with working class action is dealing powerful blows at the rule of the monopolistic classes in the United States. The revisionists, headed by the Soviet Union, are also confronted with an acute crisis and the people in the countries ruled by them are rising in revolt against the restoration of capitalism and national subjugation and for the restoration of the dictatorship of the proletariat.

On the other hand, Socialist China is performing a miracle of socialist construction. The Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution has consolidated the dictatorship of the proletariat in every sphere of life, has created conditions for the emergence of the socialist man. The victories of the cultural revolution have culminated in the triumph of Mao's thought, the victories of Ninth National Congress of the great Communist Party of China. The thought of Chairman Mao is winning ever new victories. The international class struggle has grown more intense than before and the doom of imperialism and all other reaction is near. The world has created a new era in history- the era of Chairman Mao's Thought.

The events of the last eighteen months have also proved the correctness of our view that the revolutionary situation in India is quite excellent. Today, the ruling classes are enmeshed in a deeper economic and political crises than ever before. Contradictions between imperialism and the people, between feudalism and the peasants, between capital and labour, and between different sections of the ruling classes are growing sharper and sharper everyday. The feudal fetters on the masses of our peasantry have not yet been smashed and as a result of the intensified exploitation of our people by various imperialists, headed by the U.S. and Soviet imperialists and their Indian compradors, the working class, the peasantry and the petty-bourgeoisie are victims of growing pauperisation and unemployment. At least ninetyfive percent of our people are so hard hit due to poverty and wretchedness that they can no longer tolerate it and now they are impatient for a fundamental change. At the same time, a dog-fight is going on between different sections and parties of the ruling classes that have linked their fate with that of the U.S., Soviet or British imperialists.

Everywhere in India, the people are rising in bitter struggles to remove the four mountains that weigh upon them heavily. These mountains are U.S. Imperialism, Soviet Social-Imperialism, Feudalism, and Comprador-Bureaucrat Capitalism.

Armed peasant struggle, which started in Naxalbari, have now spread to Srikakulam, Musahari and Lakhimpur Kheri and are spreading to the new areas. Recently, the peasant revolutionaries of Kerala stage a heroic revolt. The revolutionary struggles of the Nagas, the Mizos and kukis, who have risen with arms in hand, are also dealing hard blows at the reactionary regime. The resistance of our people, both in rural and in urban areas, fast develops and brings about a new upsurge in the agrarian revolution- the main content of the democratic revolution.

The reactionary ruling classes are resorting to brutal repression in order to beat back the rising tide of people's struggles. They are rushing their armed forces and police personnel to the areas where armed struggles have broken out. Police firing, lathi-charge, tear-gassing, arrest and detention without trial have become the order of the day. The ruling classes are everyday arming themselves with all sorts of "democratic" legislative power to crush the class struggles. At the same time, every effort is being made to deceive the people and disrupt their struggles. Communalism, casteism, provincialism and all types of parochialism are being pressed into service to destroy the growing unity of our fighting people. National chauvinism is being fanned against Socialist China and neighbouring Pakistan to dupe the people and suppress thier struggles. In the name of national integration, the ruling classes are trying to impose Hindi in the teeth of stiff opposition from various nationalities. Equality of all nations and national languages is being denied.

In such a situation when revolutionary struggles are advancing rapidly and when the ruling classes are making frantic efforts to suppress them, the revisionists and neo-revisionists have come forward to serve as the lackeys of imperialism

and domestic reaction. By presenting the so-called 'United Front' govts. as "organ of struggle", by raising the slogan of "providing relief" to the people they are trying to create illusions among the people in order to blunt their revolutionary consciousness and divert them from the path of revolutionary struggle. These "United Front" govts. are in essence the answer of the reactionary ruling class to the challenge thrown by the people. The neo-revisionists have been shouting that "time is not yet ripe for revolution", "the people are not yet prepared for it", and that "the slogan of armed guerilla struggle is an adventurist slogan." There is no doubt that these lackeys of foreign and domestic reaction are only trying their best to dampen the revolutionary spirit of our toiling people in order to save their masters from the fiery wrath of the people.

#### *Struggle between Two Lines in the Party*

The history of the Communist Party of India is the history of struggle between the line of class struggle and the line of class collaboration and treachery, between the proletarian revolutionary ranks and the bourgeois reactionary leadership. An appraisal of the Party history will show that the leadership has always acted as conscious traitors to the revolutionary cause of our people. It will also show that the revolutionary ranks failed to overthrow the treacherous leadership earlier because of their inability to make concrete analysis of the classes in Indian society and of their role in the Indian revolution.

With the great victory of anti-Fascist war, in which the Soviet people led by Stalin, played the most outstanding role, and the glorious victory of the Chinese people led by Comrade Mao Tsetung, over Japanese imperialism, the fascist imperialist powers met with their doom, thus severely weakening imperialism as a whole. The world-shaking victory of the great Chinese Revolution under the wise leadership of Comrade Mao Tse-tung breached the imperialist front in the East and the world balance of force underwent a change. It is during the anti-Japanese War of Resistance that Comrade Mao Tsetung's theory of people's War was fully developed: it charted a new path—the path that all the people of colonial and semi-colonial countries like India must pursue, to liberate themselves from the yoke of imperialist and domestic reaction. A storm of revolutionary struggles raged over various countries of Asia where the people followed the road indicated by Chairman Mao, the road of People's War. The pent-up wrath of the Indian people found expression in a widespread, heroic revolt against the rule of the imperialists. Led by the working class, India's peasantry took to the path of armed struggle: the peasants of Punnappa-Vayalar put up resistance against the reactionary armed forces, the peasants of Telengana rose with arms in hand against the rule of the feudal lords, the peasants of Bengal waged the Tebhaga struggle against feudal exploitation. There was an upsurge of working class struggle all over the country. The revolt spread even among the ranks of the police, the Army and the Navy. But the revisionist leadership acted as the lackey of the imperialists and the domestic reactionaries and betrayed these great struggles. Alarmed at the revolutionary upsurge, imperialism struck a deal with the congress that represented comprador capital and feudalism in India. The country was partitioned, the direct rule of the

imperialists changed into their indirect rule. Together with all other political parties of India, the revisionist leadership committed this treachery against the people.

The second Congress of the Party witnessed the revolt of ranks against the sordid betrayal. The Renadive clique utilised these revolts to seize the leadership of the Party. The Secretariat of the Andhra Provincial committee which was then leading the Telengana struggle, correctly pointed out that the Indian revolution could win victory only by following the road blazed by China, the road of people's War. The Ranadive clique opposed this correct formulation of the Andhra Secretariat and adopted the Trotskyite theory of accomplishing both the democratic revolution and the socialist revolution at one stroke. Thus, this clique diverted the attention of the Party ranks from the agrarian revolution- the basic task of the democratic revolution. Sectarianism led the Party members into adventurist actions. Though the Ranadive clique followed this wrong and suicidal policy, the peasant revolutionaries of Telengana did not deviate from the path of struggle. They advanced this struggle forward by adopting the tactics of guerilla war. The Ranadive clique formally abandoned the sectarian line when they were forced with a revolt of the ranks. The just intervention of the international leadership helped this process. But the same treacherous policy was restored with the adoption of the programme of 1951.

The programme and the tactical line of 1951 were adopted on the understanding that the Indian big bourgeoisie has a dual character. By this dual character was meant that the Indian big bourgeoisie has an anti-imperialist role as well as a proneness to compromise with imperialism. In other words, the Indian big bourgeoisie is regarded as the national bourgeoisie. Though Comrade Stalin said as early as 1925 that the section of the Indian bourgeoisie which is big and powerful had already deserted to the camp of the imperialists and had formed a bloc with them, yet, while swearing by the name of Stalin and adopting a programme of national uprising, the treacherous leadership of the Communist Party depicted the big bourgeoisie as the national bourgeoisie. This enabled the revisionist leadership to describe the Indian State as an independent bourgeois state. Though they held that the Indian Govt, is the government of the landlords and the big bourgeoisie closely linked with imperialism, they put forward the theory that the big bourgeoisie is the most powerful element in this combination and that it is they who are building the Indian State as an independent bourgeois state. Taking advantage of this theory, the Dange clique adopted the political line that feudalism no longer exists in India and that capitalism has developed in agriculture. Thus, Nehru was described as the representative of the progressive bourgeoisie. The Dange clique adopted a liquidationist policy as they held that India's national democratic government would be set up by forming an alliance with the bourgeoisie. At the same time, they preached that the more Soviet 'aid' India received, the more secure would be India's freedom. That is, Soviet 'aid' would enable India to move out of the orbit of imperialist domination. We learn from the experience of the great Chinese Party that in 1927, after Chiang Kaishek's

rise to power, the Chinese Trotskyites declared that the Chiang Kaishek clique had overthrown imperialism and feudalism and were preaching the path of independent capitalist development. The Right opportunist Chen Tu- Hsiu followed this Trotskyite line. They held that with the completion of the democratic revolution, China had entered the stage of socialist revolution. They raised the demand "Set up the National Assembly", opted for legal movement and deserted the path of revolutionary struggle. They were opposed to all kinds of revolutionary struggle and were expelled from the Party. The treacherous revisionist leadership of the CPI followed the same path and opposed every kind of revolutionary struggle. They forced Telengana's revolutionary peasants to surrender arms and stabbed the struggles of the peasants in the back wherever, in India, they rose in revolt.

When, in 1962, the Indian Govt. launched an aggression against the Chinese frontier guards, the treacherous role of the Dange clique was clearly exposed before the party ranks. The Party members rebelled against the renegade Dange clique. Taking advantage of their revolt, the Ranadive clique again seized the leadership of the Party, as in 1948. Even in the programme adopted at the Seventh Congress of the Party in 1964, they depicted the Indian state as an independent state. Assuming that the Indian big bourgeoisie had an anti-imperialist role, they declared that Soviet 'aid' would safeguard India's freedom and lead to the sharpening of the contradiction with U.S. imperialism. The same Trotskyite theories had been adopted in the programme of the Seventh Congress too. By describing the Indian revolution, instead of directly calling it socialist revolution, the Ranadive clique had resorted to trickery. No sooner had the Seventh Congress been over than it was declared on behalf of the Polit Bureau that the Party would pursue the legal parliamentary path. So, no revolutionary party but another bourgeois party emerged out of the Seventh Congress. And this party has today forged unity with world reaction by allying itself with the renegade Dange clique and has become a Party hostile to the Indian masses-an instrument for suppressing the liberation struggle of the Indian people. Yet, this period has witnessed increasing collaboration between Soviet and U.S. Imperialism. The Soviet renegade clique is opposing every national liberation struggle in the world and has tightened its neo-colonial grip on India. Despite all this, the Ranadive clique not only sing praises of the Soviet Union as a 'Socialist State' but are also loud in praise of Soviet 'aid'. Though the character of the Indian big bourgeoisie is essentially comprador and bureaucratic, the Ranadive clique propagate that they are independent and sovereign and thus try to make India's revolutionary struggle an appendage to the bourgeoisie. By under-estimating the feudal exploitation of the peasant masses they belittle the importance of the agrarian revolution and seek to lead the peasant struggles along the path of compromise. So, the most important task today is to build up a revolutionary Communist Party armed with Marxism-Leninism, and the Thought of Mao-Tsetung. Today, the sparks of Naxalbari have spread to many parts of India and will soon spread to newer and newer areas. Without overthrowing the enemies of the Indian people- U.S. imperialism, Soviet social-imperialism, India's



comprador-bureaucratic capitalism and feudalism, there can be no solution of any of the problems of the Indian people, the reign of darkness over India cannot be ended, nor can India advance one step along the road of progress.

### ***Task before the Revolutionary Party***

While this revolutionary Party has been formed in India, it should be borne in mind that the Indian Party may commit both Right and 'Left' deviations because the Party of India's wroking class has never before given serious consideration to the role of the peasants in the agrarian revolution. Chairman Mao has taught us, *"Who are our friends ? This is a question of the first importance for the revolution. The basic reason why all previous revolutionary struggles in China achieved so little was their failure to unite with real friends in order to attack real enemies. A revolutionary Party is the guide of the masses and no revolution ever succeeds when the revolutionary Party leads astray. To assure that we shall definitely achieve success in our revolution and shall not lead the masses astray, we must pay attention to uniting with our real friends in order to attack our real enemies. To distinguish friends from real enemies, we must make a general analysis of the economic status of the various classes in Chinese society and of their respective attitudes towards the revolution"*. If the poor landless peasants, who constitute the majority of the peasantry, the firm ally of the working class, unite with the middle peasants, then the vastest section of the Indian people will be united and the democratic revolution will inevitably win victory. It is the responsibility of the working class as the leader of the revolution to unite with the peasantry -the main force of the revolution- and to advance towards seizure of power through armed struggle. It is on the basis of the worker peasant alliance that a revolutionary united front of all revolutionary classes will be built up. As the party of the working class, the Communist Party must take upon itself the chief responsibility of organising the peasantry and advancing towards seizure of power through armed struggle. To fulfil this task the revolutionary Communist Party must study Chairman Mao's Thought, for it is only Chairman Mao's Thought that can bring the peasant masses into the revolutionary front and Chairman Mao's theory of Peoples' War is the only means by which an apparently weak revolutionary force can wage successful struggles against an apparently powerful enemy and can win victory. The basic tactic of struggle of the revolutionary peasantry led by the working class is guerilla warfare. We must bear in mind the Chairman's teaching : " Guerilla warfare is basic but lose no chance for mobile warfare under favourable conditions". Our tactics as described by Comrade Lin Piao are : "You fight in your own way, we fight in ours, We fight when we can win and move away when we cannot". The task of the Party of the working class is not merely to master tactics but also to rally all the other revolutionary classes behind the basic programme of the agrarian revolution. The revolutionary Party will be able to carry out this task only when it educates itself in the Thought of Chairman Mao, adopts the style of work taught by him, and practises self- criticism.

It is the delay in India's democratic revolution that enables U.S imperialism and Soviet social-imperialism to unite the reactionary forces of the world and to

oppose the liberation struggles in different countries of the world. The U.S imperialism and Soviet social-imperialism are using India as a main base for carrying out their strategy for joint world domination. India is also the centre of conspiracies against Socialist China, the base of world revolution, the hope of the exploited people of the whole world. That is why it is not merely the patriotic duty of the Indian people to accomplish the Indian revolution, it is also their internationalist duty. The international significance of the Indian revolution is very great. Great Lenin dreamt of the day when revolutionary India would unite with revolutionary China and bring about the collapse of the world imperialist system. That is why at the time of the formation of the Party, the Indian revolutionaries must resolve that they shall unite with the great people of China and thus forge unity with the liberation struggles of the various countries, that they shall build up a revolutionary united front and destroy world imperialism and its chief accomplice, modern revisionism. Chairman Mao has given the call:

*" People of the world unite still more closely and launch a sustained and vigorous offensive against our common enemy, U.S. Imperialism and its accomplices. It can be said with certainty that the complete collapse of colonialism, imperialism and all systems of exploitation, and the complete emancipation of all the oppressed people and nations of the world are not far off. "Our task is to prepare ourselves to respond to this call.*

*[ Reproduced from Liberation Vol.2, No. 7, May 20, 1969]*



## RESOLUTION ON PARTY ORGANISATION

COC, Communist Party of India (Marxist-Leninist) April 22, 1969

### *Background*

Our Political Resolution has already made it amply clear how at each critical stage of our National Liberation struggle the leadership of the Party consciously betrayed the revolutionary cause by dragging the Party into the morass of Right Opportunism and Left Sectarianism . We have seen how the Party leadership betrayed the great armed struggle of the Telenagana peasantry, the struggle of the people in the Native States, the great Tebhaga and Bakasht peasant struggles in North India, the great mutiny of the R.I. N. ratings and other sections of the armed forces. We have seen how the Party leadership recoiled in dread at the sight of the great anti-imperialist and anti-federal upsurge that engulfed the whole of India in the post-war years, the upsurge that was part of the world-wide high tide of national liberation struggles delivering devastating blows against imperialism and their lackeys, thus shaking the entire edifice of the imperialist rule in Asia, Africa and Latin America. We have seen how the Party leadership consciously worked in post-war years to transform the Party from the weapon of class struggle into the weapon of class collaboration from the general staff of revolution into a docile stooge of reaction, from a revolutionary Party into a legal and parliamentary Party and from a Party of proletarian internationalism into a national chauvinist Party. The bloody repression unleashed on the heroic peasant masses of Naxalbari by the Revisionist leadership was the final act of treachery which completely unmasked their ugly and counter-revolutionary face. A careful analysis of the Party history proves beyond a shadow of doubt that there was nothing accidental in these betrayals of the Party leadership as they have refused to learn from the great armed struggle of the Chinese people who were conducting the most longdrawn and the bitterest war of liberation in the hitherto known history against imperialism and their lackeys. These betrayals could take place because the leadership took care to see that the Party was not rooted among the toiling people, especially among the working class and the peasantry . They could take place because political consciousness of the ranks was deliberately kept at a low level.

However, the history of the Party also proves that time and again and Party ranks have risen in open revolt against the policies of betrayals by the leadership and have been constantly fighting for a thorough revolutionary and proletarian internationalist line in both theory and practice. The Party ranks have played a glorious role in unleashing and conducting the above-mentioned struggles and have kept the flames of class struggle burning throughout India's struggle for

emancipation from imperialism and feudal bondage. The rank and file of the Communist Party have stood at the head of bitter class struggles and have borne the brunt of bloody repression and thousands of them fell martyrs to the cause of the Indian revolution. There is nothing accidental in this phenomenon either. It was natural that fired by the highest ideals of Communism and closely linked with the suffering masses, the Party ranks represented the revolutionary urges of the people throughout this period.

To sum up, it can be safely said that the history of the Communist Party of India has been the history of ceaseless struggles between the bourgeois stand-point and the proletarian stand-point, between the bourgeois line and proletarian line and between the bourgeois reactionary leadership and the proletarian revolutionary ranks.

It must also be emphasised that the revolutionary struggle of the Naxalbari peasantry represented the final break of the revolutionary ranks from the counter-revolutionary leadership and the formation of the All India Co-ordination committee of the Communist Revolutionaries was the first link in the chain process of building a truly revolutionary Communist Party in India. Inspired by the invincible Thought of Chairman Mao and drawing lessons from the Great Chinese Revolution, the All India Co-ordination committee have been conducting heroic armed struggle in many parts of the country, Particularly in Srikakulam, Lakhimpur Kheri and other places. The bankruptcy of the parliamentary path has been proved and the treachery of the Revisionists and Neo-revisionists has been exposed considerably. The last eighteen months have witnessed the unification of the revolutionaries of India on all the essentials of Party Programme, thus placing the immediate formation of the Party on the agenda, as chairman Mao teaches us : " If there is to be a revolution, there must be a revolutionary Party."

### ***The Ideological Political Unification***

The building of a revolutionary Party is, first and foremost, the ideological and political building. The neo-revisionist leadership of the Party could easily be fool the revolutionary ranks simply by deferring the ideological and political questions to a secondary place and putting the organisational tasks in the first place. Most of the revolutionary cadres were swayed away by wrong notions about party unity and legality and thus played into the hands of the revisionist gang. We must now draw a proper lesson from this mistake and must give first place to ideology and politics above everything else.

The ideological and political building of the party today means :

- i) That we all accept Marxism-Leninism -Mao's Thought as the guide to all revolutionary activity and apply their general truths to our concrete conditions. We all pledge to become true disciples of Chairman Mao, the greatest Marxist-Leninist of our era.
- ii) We must attain unanimity regarding fundamental problems raised during our struggle against revisionists of all varieties and also regarding the mistakes made by most of the revolutionaries.
- iii) We must attain unanimity regarding the essential points of our Party Programme, namely the nature of Indian society, the primary task and

perspective of Indian revolution , the motive forces of our revolution and the path that we have to traverse, that is, on the general plan of Indian revolution.

The unanimity that we have arrived at is being summarised in another resolution and the whole of the Party has to be educated and united on that basis.

### ***The Party of Armed Revolution***

The revolutionaries of India have now arrived at a common understanding regarding the futility of the parliamentary path, the parties which were organised on the basis of parliamentarism have sunk to the level of reaction and counter-revolution all over the world. Our experience, like the experiences gained by many other parties, shows that the so-called inter-weaving of parliamentary and non-parliamentary paths, in practice, amounts only to the degeneration of the Party into a parliamentary party, into the position of appendage to the reactionary ruling classes. In present day India, the big landlords and the big bourgeoisie have found out a new device for hoodwinking the people, i.e by setting up non-Congress Governments with revisionists and reactionary politicians of all descriptions . Under such conditions, great pulls and pressures of parliamentarism are bound to creep up again and again.

All these pressures and pulls have to be combated most vehemently so that we are able to lead the Indian people on the path of revolution. So, our Party is the Party of Armed Revolution. No other path exists before the Indian people but the path of Armed Revolution. It must be understood that the Party cannot be built in isolation from armed struggle.

### ***The Rural-Based Party***

The revolutionaries have also assimilated the truth that the path of armed revolution is the path of the People's War. In the conditions in India, Asia and all other semi-colonial and semi-feudal countries in Africa and Latin America, it is first and foremost a peasants' war against feudalism. Therefore, the first and foremost task of our Party is to rouse the peasant masses in the countryside to wage guerrilla war, unfold agrarian revolution, build rural base areas, use the countryside to encircle the cities and finally to capture the cities and to liberate the whole country. Thus, in the present day phase of Indian Revolution, the centre of gravity of our work has to be in the villages.

So our Party, in the first instance, has to be a rural-based Party and not a town-based Party.

### ***The Secret and Underground Party***

A revolutionary Party, to be able to conduct a longdrawn armed struggle, cannot and must not remain a legal Party. It must function with the utmost secrecy and keep its main cadres underground. Though the Party should learn to utilise all possible legal opportunities for developing its revolutionary activities, it should under no circumstances , function in the open.

We must assimilate the teaching of Comrade Lin Piao, which has also been confirmed in our recent Sonapat struggle "*Guerilla warfare is the only way to mobilise and apply the whole strength of the people against the enemy*". The

coming period will be a period of fast developing guerilla struggle throughout the vast expanse of our country and the Party is called upon to conduct and lead them confidently. Therefore, the Party should concentrate, in the main, on developing guerilla forms of armed struggle and not waste time and its energies in holding open mass meetings and forming kisan sabhas in the old style.

### ***A Party of New Style***

According to Chairman Mao, the Marxist-Leninist style of work essentially entails integrating theory with practice, forging close links with the masses and practising criticism and self-criticism. It means that our Party, while persisting in the ideological and political line has to evolve a mass line on the basis of 'taking from the masses and giving to the masses' and must constantly raise the level of its understanding.

It also means that it has to evolve a proper method of criticism and self-criticism. The cadre has to be educated through self-criticism by the leadership. In criticising the mistakes of the cadre, the policy of 'curing the disease and saving the patient' will have to be constantly worked out.

It is in this way that our Party is going to be a Party of the new style.

### ***Developing Teams of Revolutionary Leadership***

All these tasks can be performed only by a leadership which is advanced in theory and boundlessly loyal to the historical mission of the proletariat. Absolute devotion to the cause, contact with the masses, ability to find out one's bearings and observance of discipline independently are the first and foremost criteria on the basis of which the teams of leadership should be reorganised at all levels. We should not, in the least, hesitate in 'getting rid of the stale and taking in the fresh'. It will be the incumbent duty of these leading teams at different levels to work out the method of 'combining general with the particular' and of 'combining leadership with the masses'. It means that those who refuse to take active part in revolutionary activities and refuse to leave the cities and go to the rural areas to organise red bases of agrarian revolution should, in no case, be allowed to remain members of these teams. Every member of these leading teams, in whatever post he is, should be entrusted with the task of the particular guidance to a selected area and to get personal experience therefrom. Exceptions to this rule may be granted only from the point of view of the Party's requirements and the requirements of the armed struggle and from no other angle.

It means that the leading teams are to be organised only by professional revolutionaries, only by those who are ready to give up every other interest but the revolution.

While organising such leading teams, care must be taken to bring in all the professional revolutionaries in the Co-ordination who accept and implement the main line put forward by our Political and Organisational resolutions.

It may take some time and great energy in organising the kind of leading teams that our Party requires. It will be a difficult job. Much explanatory work will have to be done, traditional boundaries based upon administrative units of our committee will have to be changed. But these committees or leading teams of

leadership cannot perform their jobs unless the criteria set for the teams are strictly applied and the method of leadership enunciated by Chairman Mao properly implemented.

### ***Recruitment of Party Members***

It is under the guidance of such committees that proper enrollment of Party membership has to be conducted.

While enrolling the membership of the Party, all notions about mass membership of the Party should be combated. A revolutionary Party does not become a mass Party by virtue of its large number of members. Such is the criteria fixed by revisionists and parliamentary parties. A revolutionary Party becomes a mass Party by virtue of its mass line, by virtue of its closest links with the masses, by virtue of its being merged with the masses. It is not the number but the quality that is essential and primary for a revolutionary Party.

We will enroll only such members in our Party who accept Marxism-Leninism-Mao's Thought as a guide to action, who accept all the essential points of our Party Programme and the organisational line set forth in our Political and Organisational resolutions, participate in daily activity under the discipline of some of the party organisations and give financial aid to the party according to their capacity. Those comrades who are unable to fulfil these primary conditions of Party membership but have stood with us in revolt against the revisionists, will certainly not like to degrade our Party to the level of social-democracy by lightening these conditions and we are fully entitled to expect that they will remain our best sympathisers and helpers. We are confident that with the rising tide of revolution, innumerable young and fighting elements from the working class, peasants, especially the poor peasants and other toiling sections will join our Party readily fulfilling all the conditions of Party membership. It must be our constant endeavour to bring them into the Party organisation and turn them into the finest cadre. Elements from the petty-bourgeoisie, who take the standpoint of the working class and integrate themselves with the basic masses will also be welcomed. But those who belong to the exploiting classes, bad characters etc, should in no case be allowed to join the Party.

No nation or class has ever attain its liberation without braving the storms and fulfilling the quota of sacrifices. Our Party and its members have to play an exemplary vanguard role by their perseverance, courage ,initiative and sacrifices.They must place the interests of the Party and the people above their personal interests.

### ***Democratic Centralism***

Our Party will be organised on the principle of democratic centralism . To conduct a revolutionary struggle, establishing iron discipline in the Party is indispensable. But the first condition to establish iron discipline in the Party is by creating an atmosphere of democracy and establishing democracy under central guidance. Only by constantly giving correct line of guidance, only by constantly getting familiar with the lower bodies and with the life of the masses, only by taking firm and well-considered decisions and only by promptly transmitting those

decisions to the lower bodies. getting them thoroughly discussed and helping the lower bodies in finding out methods of implementing them can the democracy under central guidance be developed and the authority of the leadership established.

This is the proper way of establishing the authority of the leading bodies. This is the proper way of developing innumerable successors of revolution by unleashing their initiative.

***Fight wrong conceptions and alien trends***

The bureaucratic methods employed by the bourgeois reactionary leadership of the Party during the entire period of our Party's existence, coupled with their meanest craftiness have terribly shaken the confidence of the Party ranks and, as a result, all sorts of idealist, anarchic and autonomist tendencies have grown in them. The apprehension of a possible re-emergence of a bureaucratic leadership has been utilised by various petty-bourgeois groups who are assiduously campaigning to prevent the building up of a revolutionary Party in India. All sorts of anti-marxist ideas and concepts like 'historical inevitability of groupism at this stage', 'the Party growing automatically out of struggle' and leaving the task of building the Party to spontaneity in the name of building the Party from below and general varieties of 'poly-centrism', are being preached by these groups. On the one hand, they claim to preach the thought of Chairman Mao and support the Naxalbari path and on the other, they deliberately work to sabotage the building of a revolutionary Communist Party in India which alone can lead a revolution through to the end.

Hence the building up of the Party means, on the one hand, to declare a relentless war against the bureaucratic methods of leadership still prevalent among us at various levels and on the other, to expose and annihilate the alien, idealistic, anarchic and autonomistic concepts being preached by these groups. It is only by exposing and thoroughly smashing these alien concepts that those honest revolutionaries who are still following these groups can be won in to the Party.

There must be complete clarity in our minds in the methods of our leadership, in the style of our work and in our day to day practical life. Revisionist methods, habits and practices still dominate and they can be eradicated and revolutionary proletarian methods, habits and practices can grow only by constant endeavour to remould ourselves through active participation in revolutionary struggles and subjecting ourselves to criticism and self-criticism.

Ours is the real Communist Party of India. (It will affix the word 'Marxist-Leninist' after its name to denote its differentiation from the parties running under the leadership of the Dange clique and other neo-revisionists.)

This is the Party of the proletariat and it represents the true aspirations and policies of the revolutionary class.

This Party will give first preference to ideological and political building rather than to organisational structure.

This Party will take as its first task the training of revolutionary cadres in revolutionary activity.



This Party will be a Party of armed struggle and will be a rural-based Party in the first instance and will give first preference to the building of revolutionary base areas in the countryside rather than work in the cities in the present phase of the revolution.

This Party will give first preference to prepare the working class to assume the role of leadership of our revolution than to carrying on economic and cultural activities in the cities.

This Party will give first preference to the task of organising leading teams of the Party than to the enrolment of the Party members on a mass scale. This Party will give first preference to the quality of membership rather than to the quantity.

This Party will be organised on the basis of democratic centralism but it will give first preference to the task of unleashing democracy under centralised guidance rather than to the formal discipline.

This Party will develop a mass line and will be the first on criticism and self-criticism.

It is in this way that we take our first organisational steps towards rebuilding the Party.

The All India Co-ordination Committee sets up the Central Organising Committee from its midst with those of its members leading the armed struggles as its guiding force.

The Committee appeals to all the State units and all other units to discuss this resolution along with our Political resolution and to send us their points and suggestions within the next two months.

It appeals to all its State Committees to set up State Organising Committees and Committees for different areas in the same manner, strictly adhering to the criteria set forth for the leading teams. It is only under the strict guidance of the State Organising Committees that the members of the Party will be enrolled.

It appeals to all revolutionary comrades to unite ideologically and politically and to shoulder the responsibility of rebuilding the Party. It is on the basis of this discussion and some experience of functioning of the Party that the Central Organising Committee will place before a Party Congress the drafts of the Party Programme and the Party Constitution and take further steps towards Party building.

We earnestly appeal to all State Units of the Co-ordination Committee to prepare reports of the conditions of the masses and self-critical reviews of their functioning so that a consolidated review of all-India developments may be placed before the Congress and necessary decision may be taken on that basis.

We are fully confident that our Party, led by invincible Thought of Chairman Mao and trying to become his worthy disciple, will be able to lead the revolution through to the end



# **DOCUMENTS OF MAY 1970**

## **PARTY CONGRESS**

### **PROGRAMME OF THE COMMUNIST PARTY OF INDIA (MARXIST-LENINIST)**

*Adopted at the PARTY CONGRESS held in May 1970*

1. Our beloved country is one of the biggest and most ancient countries of the world inhabited by 500 million people. Ours is an agrarian country, a country of the peasant masses, hard-working and talented. They have rich revolutionary traditions and a glorious cultural heritage.

2. The British imperialists conquered India and established their direct rule some 200 years ago and since then the history of our country has been a history of ceaseless struggles waged by the heroic Indian peasantry against British imperialism and feudal oppression. The First War of Independence in 1857, a war fought by the peasantry and rebel soldiers, turned into a conflagration engulfing the whole of the vast country, inflicting many humiliating defeats on the imperialists and shaking the very foundations of the alien imperialist rule. This great uprising of the Indian people failed owing to the betrayal by India's feudal princes.

3. Since then India has witnessed innumerable armed peasant revolts. However, these revolts failed as there was no scientific theory and no revolutionary leadership capable of leading them to victory.

4. The Indian bourgeoisie, comprador in nature, intervened to divert the national liberation struggle from the path of revolution to the path of compromise and surrender. Beginning from the Champaran peasant struggle, the Gandhian leadership representing the upper stratum of the bourgeoisie and feudal class, with its ideology of 'ahimsa' 'satyagraha', passive resistance and 'charkha', sought to tailor the national movement to serve the interests of the British imperialist rule and its feudal lackeys.

5. The Great October Revolution brought the ideology of Marxism-Leninism to our country and the Communist party of India was born. However, despite tremendous opportunities, the leadership of the working class could not be established over the national liberation struggle as the leadership of the Party refused to fight Gandhism and the Gandhian leadership and to take to the path of revolution. The leadership refused to integrate the universal truth of Marxism-

Leninism with the concrete practice of Indian Revolution. It refused to integrate the party with the heroic masses, chiefly the revolutionary peasantry and to forge a revolutionary united front. It refused to learn from the great liberation struggle of the Chinese people led by the CPC and Chairman Mao Tsetung and to take to the path of armed struggle.

6. On the contrary, the leadership of the CPI consciously trailed behind the leadership of the Congress and betrayed the revolution from the very beginning. The leaders of the CPI were agents of imperialism and feudalism. Despite the treachery of the leadership, the Party ranks stood with the suffering people, led many class battles and made untold sacrifices for the cause of the Indian proletariat.

7. The smashing defeat of the fascist powers at the hands of the world people led by the Soviet Union under the leadership of Great Stalin and the world-shaking victorious advance of the Great Chinese liberation struggle under the leadership of Chairman Mao brought about a new alignment of forces the world over. Imperialism was very much weakened and the national liberation struggle of the colonial people surged forward like a torrent throughout Asia, Africa and Latin America, threatening to sweep imperialism and its lackeys away.

8. An unprecedented revolutionary situation overtook the Indian sub-continent too. The mighty movement for the release of "Azad Hind" prisoners, powerful anti-imperialist demonstrations by students all over India, the great *Tebhaga* and *Bakasht* struggles, the anti-feudal struggles in the princely states, the powerful struggle of the P&T workers, the armed revolt of the R.I.N. ratings along with rebellions in the Air Force and the Army and the police revolt in Bihar, the great solidarity actions of the working class and the beginning of the historic armed peasant struggle in Telengana brought the imperialist rule in India almost to the verge of collapse.

9. Faced with such a situation, the British imperialism pressed into service its tried agents—the leaders of the Indian National Congress, Muslim League and of the CPI with a view to crushing this revolutionary upsurge of the Indian people. The country was partitioned amidst communal carnage and the Congress leadership representing the comprador bourgeoisie and big landlord, was installed in power while the British imperialists stepped into the background. The Sham independence declared in 1947 was nothing but a replacement of the colonial and semi-feudal set-up with a semi-colonial and semi-feudal one.

10. During these years of Sham independence the big comprador-bourgeoisie and big landlord ruling classes have been serving their imperialist masters quite faithfully. These lackeys of imperialism, while preserving the old British imperialist exploitation, have also brought U.S. imperialist and Soviet social-imperialist exploiters to fleece our country.

11. They have mortgaged our country to the imperialist powers, mainly to the U.S. imperialists and Soviet social imperialists. With the weakening of the power of British imperialism the world over, the Indian ruling classes have now hired themselves out to U.S. imperialism and Soviet social-imperialism. Thus instead of two mountains, British imperialism and feudalism, the Indian people are now

weighed down under the four huge mountains, namely, imperialism headed by U.S. imperialism, Soviet social-imperialism, feudalism and comprador-bureaucrat capital. Thus, India has turned into a neo-colony of U.S. imperialism and Soviet social-imperialism. The ruthless exploitation and oppression by these four enemies of the Indian people have created unprecedented miseries, sufferings and calamities. Millions are struggling on the brink of death. Several millions go hungry, naked, houseless and unemployed.

12. In the name of 'national integration,' these enemies of the people have been suppressing the genuine rights of all the nationalities and national and religious minorities. The right of self-determination is being denied to the Kashmiris, Nagas and Mizos. Equal status to all the national languages is being denied and Hindi is being sought to be imposed on the people by them.

13. Our country is the country of the peasant masses who constitute over 75 percent of its population. They are the most exploited people of our country living in conditions of semi-starvation and absolute pauperisation. In India's semi-feudal economy, 80% of the land is concentrated in the hands of the 20% of the landowners, i.e., 'rajahs', landlords and rich peasants, while the starving peasantry constituting 80% of the rural population has no land or very little land.

14. The landless and poor peasants have to turn over 50% to 90% of their annual harvest in the form of rent to the landlords. The extortionate usurious capital continues to fleece the peasants. Eviction of peasants is the order of the day. Social oppression on scheduled castes including the lynching of Harijans, reminiscent of the middle ages, is continuing unabated.

15. The semi-feudal land relations have transformed our country into a land of perpetual famine, as a result of which millions of people die of starvation every year.

16. In brief, out of all the major contradictions in our country, that is, the contradiction between imperialism and social-imperialism on the one hand and our people on the other, the contradiction between feudalism and the broad masses of the people, the contradiction between capital and labour and the contradiction within the ruling classes, the one between the landlords and the peasantry, i.e., the contradiction between feudalism and the broad masses of the Indian people is the principal contradiction in the present phase.

17. The resolution of this contradiction will lead to the resolution of all other contradictions too.

18. While preserving and perpetuating the semi-feudal set-up, the big comprador-bureaucrat bourgeoisie and big landlord ruling classes have become Pawns in the hands of U.S. imperialism and Soviet Social-imperialism.

19. The phenomenal increase in the total quantum of foreign capital, the heavy remittances of profits abroad, thousands of collaborationist enterprises, total dependence on imperialist "aid, grants and loans" for capital goods, technical know-how, military supplies and armament industries for building military bases and even for markets, unequal trade and P.L. 480 agreements have made U.S. imperialism and Soviet social-imperialism the overlords of our country.

20.U.S. imperialism and Soviet social-imperialism have brought the vital sectors of the economy of our country under their control.U.S.imperialism collaborates mainly with private capital and is now penetrating into the industries in the state sector, while Soviet social imperialism has brought under its control mainly the industries in the state sector and is at the same time trying to enter into collaboration with private capital.

21.U.S. imperialism and Soviet social-imperialism do everything possible to foster the growth of comprador-bureaucrat capitalism for continuing their unbridled exploitation of the Indian people.

22.The much-trumpeted "public sector" is being built up by many imperialist exploiters for employing their capital and for exploiting the cheap labour power and raw materials of our country. The public sector is nothing but a clever device to hoodwink the Indian people and continue their plunder.It is state monopoly capitalism i.e., bureaucrat capitalism.

23.With their octopus -like grip on india's economy, the U.S. imperialists, and the Soviet social-imperialists control the political, cultural and military spheres of the life of our country.

24.At the dictates of U.S. imperialism and Soviet social-imperialism , India's reactionary ruling classes pursue a foreign policy that serves the interests of imperialism, social-imperialism and reaction. It has been tailored to the needs of the global strategy of the U.S. imperialists and Soviet social-imperialists to encircle Socialist Chiana and suppress the national liberation struggles raging in various parts of Asia, Africa and Latin America , of which Vietnam has become the spearhead. India's aggression against Socialist China in 1962 and her continual provocation against China since then at the instance of U.S. imperialism and Soviet social-imperialism, her support to the Soviet attack on China , her tacit approval of Soviet aggression against Czechoslovakia, her dirty role in supporting U.S.imperialism against the Vietnamese people prove beyond a shadow of doubt that India's ruling classes are faithful stooges of U.S imperialism and Soviet Social-imperialism.

25.These hard facts irrefutably prove the semi-colonial character of our society, besides its semi-feudal character.

26.As the obsolete semi-feudal society acts as the social base of U.S. imperialism and Soviet social-imperialism and as it facilitates also the plunder of our people by comprador bureaucrat capital, the problem of the peasantry becomes the basic problem of the Indian revolution.

27.Therefore, the basic task of the Indian revolution is to overthrow the rule of feudalism, comprador-bureaucrat capitalism, imperialism and social-imperialism. This determines the stage of our revolution. It is the stage of democratic revolution, the essence of which is agrarian revolution.

28.It, however, is not the old type of democratic revolution but a new type of democratic revolution, People's Democratic Revolution, as it forms a part of the world socialist revolution , ushered in by the Great October Revolution, and as

such, it can be successfully led by the working class alone and by no other class. The working class is the most revolutionary class and the most organised advanced detachment of our people.

29. This revolution will establish the dictatorship of the working class, the peasantry, the petty-bourgeoisie and even a section of the small and middle bourgeoisie under the leadership of the working class. They, together, constitute overwhelming majority of the Indian people. It will be a state guaranteeing democracy for 90 percent of the people and enforcing dictatorship over a handful of enemies. That is why it is people's Democracy.

30. The main force of the democratic revolution led by the working class is peasantry. The working class fully relies on the landless and poor peasants and firmly unites with the middle peasants and even wins over a section of the rich peasants while neutralizing the rest. It will be only a tiny section of the rich peasants that finally joins the enemies of the revolution. The urban petty-bourgeoisie and the revolutionary intellectuals of our country are revolutionary forces and will be a reliable ally in the revolution.

31. The small and middle bourgeois businessmen and bourgeois intellectuals are vacillating and unstable allies of the democratic revolution. They will now support, then oppose and sometimes even betray the revolution. Their dual role in the revolution arises because of their contradiction as well as unity with the enemies of our revolution.

32. Thus, in order to carry the democratic revolution through to the end it is necessary that a Democratic Front of all these classes is built up under the leadership of the working class.

33. This Front can, however, be built up when worker-peasant unity is achieved in the course of armed struggle and after Red political power is established at least in some parts of the country.

34. It must be understood that the working class can and will exercise its leadership over the People's Democratic Revolution through its political party, the Communist Party of India (M-L). It also performs its vanguard role by launching struggles on political issues, both national and international, by solidarity actions in support of the revolutionary classes, mainly, the revolutionary struggles of the peasantry and by sending its class-conscious vanguard section to organise and lead the peasants' armed struggle.

35. The path of India's liberation, as in the case of all other colonial and semi-colonial and semi-feudal countries, is the path of People's War. As Chairman Mao has taught us, *"The Revolutionary war is the war of the masses ; it can be waged only by mobilising the masses and relying on them."*

36. The working class can wage a successful People's War by creating small bases of armed struggle all over the country and consolidating the political power of the people. This is possible only by developing guerilla warfare which is and will remain the basic form of struggle throughout the entire period of our Democratic Revolution.

37. As Comrade Lin Piao has pointed out, "Guerilla warfare is the only way to mobilise and apply the entire strength of the people against the enemy." Guerilla warfare alone can unleash the initiative and rouse the creative genius of the Indian people, make them perform miracles, function in various ways and can enable them to effectively co-ordinate those ways. Thus guerilla war alone can expand the small bases of armed struggle to large, extensive areas through mighty waves of People's War and develop the People's Army which will overthrow the reactionary rule of the four mountains in the countryside, encircle and capture the cities, establish the People's Democratic Dictatorship all over the country and resolutely carry it forward to the Dictatorship of the Proletariat and Socialism.

38. The People's Democratic State will carry out the following major tasks:

(a) Confiscation of all the banks and enterprises of foreign capital and liquidation of all imperialist debt.

(b) Confiscation of all land belonging to the landlords and their redistribution among the landless and poor peasants on the principle of land to the tillers ; cancellation of all debts of the peasantry and other toiling people. All facilities necessary for development of agriculture to be guaranteed.

(c) Enforce eight hours a day, increase wages, institute unemployment relief and social insurance, remove all inequalities on the basis of equal pay for equal work.

(d) Improve the living conditions of soldiers and give land and job to the ex-servicemen.

(e) Enforce better living conditions of the people and remove unemployment.

(f) Develop new democratic culture in place of colonial and feudal culture.

(g) Abolish the present educational system and educational institutions and build up a new educational system and new educational institutions consistent with the need of People's Democratic India.

(h) Abolish the caste system , remove all social inequalities and all discrimination on the religious ground and guarantee equality of status to women.

(i) Unify India and recognise the right of self -determination.

(j) Give equal status to all national languages.

(k) Abolish all exorbitant taxes and miscellaneous assessments and adopt a consolidated progressive tax system.

(l) People's political power to be exercised through Revolutionary People's Councils at all levels.

(m) Alliance to be formed with the international proletariat and the oppressed nations of the world under the leadership of the CPC.

39. The Democratic Revolution in India is taking place in the era of Mao Tsetung when world imperialism is heading for a total collapse and socialism is advancing towards world-wide victory. Our revolution is a part of the Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution which has consolidated socialism and proletarian dictatorship in China into the reliable base area of the World Revolution. Our revolution is taking place at a time when the great Ninth Congress of the great, glorious and correct CPC-the Congress of unity and victory-has tremendously

inspired the international proletariat. It is taking place at a time when the CPC, headed by Chairman Mao and Vice-Chairman Lin Piao, is leading the international proletariat to fulfil its historic mission of emancipating the whole of mankind from the rule of imperialism and reaction and establishing Socialism and Communism on this earth. We are a contingent of this great army of the international proletariat.

40. The CPI(M-L) is placing the Programme of People's Democratic Revolution before the Indian people and dedicates itself to this great revolutionary cause. The Party is confident that the granite unity of our people with all socialist and oppressed nations, particularly the Chinese people, will bring about the victory of the Indian revolution, which as Chairman Mao has predicted, " will end the imperialist reactionary era in the history of mankind" and will ensure the world-wide victory of Socialism.





## POLITICAL-ORGANISATIONAL REPORT

*[Adopted at the PARTY CONGRESS held in May 1970]*

Our congress is taking place at a time when U.S. imperialism is continuing open and naked aggression on Cambodia and expanding the war of aggression throughout Indo-China with the sheer logic of an aggressor, reminding us of the days of Munich. This attack can easily be termed as the beginning of the Third World War, as the march of the Hitlerite hordes on Sudetanland was the beginning of the Second World War. But the world situation today cannot be understood only in the light of the aggression and aggressive designs of U.S. imperialism and Soviet social-imperialism for, unlike Munich, a new thing has emerged under the leadership of the great CPC and China. The three Indo-Chinese people have united and presented a united front against the U.S aggressors. This marks a great victory of the Indo-Chinese people and serves as the key to the understanding of the present world situation. Our struggle against imperialist warmongers must take note of this new danger of aggression and the great victory of the Indo-Chinese people.

In our country also, the Indian Government under the cover of national defence are feverishly preparing for an aggressive war to serve the needs of the global strategy of U.S.imperialism and Soviet social-imperialism .Soviet and U.S. specialists are actually controlling the entire defence organisation of our country and this pressure of war efforts is breaking down the entire economy and throwing the country into an abyss of permanent and severe economic crisis. But in the Indian situation a new thing also has emerged which marks the victory of the people : it is the peasants' armed struggle under the leadership of the CPI (M-L). Within a year, this struggle has spread far and wide-from Assam to Kashmir-and has engulfed more than 12 states of India and has already become a motive force of history. The puppet character of the present regime and the hollowness of the parliamentary system are becoming clear to the entire people and the bitter class struggles are shattering the myth of Gandhism and the "peaceful professions" of the present regime. The bitter class struggles have exposed the butcher nature of the present reactionary Government, the necessity of the battle of annihilation against these butchers is felt by the vast masses of the people and the struggle is spreading to rural areas with tremendous vigour.

The emergence of the Party-CPI(M-L), is the victory of the revolutionary people of India and also the victory of the all-powerful Thought of Chairman Mao on the soil of India. Equipped with the great Mao Tsetung Thought, this revolutionary peasants, armed struggle has already become an invincible force which the imperialists, social-imperialists and native reaction cannot suppress. That this onward march of the armed revolutionary struggle of the peasantry will continue unabated and that the struggle will spread to all the states of India is not only the truth of history but has already become the reality of history.

In order to achieve victory, we must pay attention to the building of our Party-CPI (M-L). This task is the most important, most immediate and most sacred task of the revolutionary people of India. We must build up our Party among the landless and poor peasants and on this alone the revolutionary striking power, of the Party and the revolutionary people, depends. The working class and the petty-bourgeois cadres must integrate themselves with the landless and poor peasants and this task of integration cannot be over-emphasised. The history of our inner-party struggles shows that centrism is the vilest weapon of the revisionists and we must fight all signs of centrism. Centrism undermines the revolutionary politics and makes the fighter defenceless.

With the peal of the spring thunder of the Naxalbari struggle came a turning point in the history of the Indian revolution. When revisionism seemed triumphant and the whole of India was steeped in darkness, Comrade Charu Majumdar, who organized and led the Naxalbari struggle, analysed correctly the character of the Indian society and state and the great role of the peasantry in India's democratic revolution, upheld Chairman Mao's great teaching : "*Political power grows out of the barrel of a gun*," and applied Mao Tsetung Thought to the concrete conditions of India for the first time in India's history. The Naxalbari struggle led by Comrade Charu Majumdar marked the beginning of the rout of revisionism in India -the beginning of the victorious onward march of Mao's Tsetung Thought on the soil of India. The leadership provided by him since then has kindled the flames of armed peasant guerilla struggles in Srikakulam and Andhra and spread those flames to eleven other states in India.

The battle between the two lines was fought bitterly in the Co-ordination period on issues like boycott of elections, characterisation of Soviet revisionism as social-imperialism and the fight against economism. The bitter fight over these issues led by Comrade Charu Majumdar, strengthened and consolidated the revolutionary ranks and this resulted in the expansion to new areas of struggles like Mushahari and Lakhimpur Kheri. Another major struggle inside Co-ordination was fought and won on the question of the formation of the Party. The intellectuals' resistance to democratic centralism, the metaphysical understanding of a "pure" Party, the worship of spontaneity as reflected in ideas like "building the party through armed struggles and from below" were among the many expressions of the wrong line which was defeated and the Party was formed marking the victory of Chairman Mao's line on Party building.

After the formation of the Party, which consolidated the victory of the revolutionary line over the revisionist line, the struggle between the two lines entered a new stage. The revisionist line sought mainly to undermine the authority of the Party, encouraging polycentrism inside the Party, to attack the correct political line of the Party in the name of mass organisations and mass movements for economic demands as pre-requisites for the development of guerilla struggles, to encourage big and spectacular actions for the development of peasants' armed struggles and to rely upon the petty-bourgeois intellectuals for the development of peasants' armed struggles.

The successful battle against this wrong line has spread the struggle from one State to another and the peasants' armed struggles are rousing the working class and petty-bourgeois intellectuals and thus a new stage is opening when the peasants' armed struggles will create waves of mass uprising engulfing the vast land of ours in a conflagration and the Party will be required to lead this revolutionary upsurge into a nation-wide victory of revolution.

Though we are a small Party now, we can fulfil this sacred task if we raise our study and application of Chairman Mao's Thought as embodied in the "Quotations" and the "Three Articles" to a new height, entrench ourselves deeply among landless and poor peasants and integrate ourselves with them, promote the landless and poor peasant cadres to higher responsibility, study and concretely apply the correct thesis of Vice-Chairman Lin Biao: "Guerilla warfare is the only way to mobilise and apply the whole strength of the people against the enemy", realise and apply methodically the correct thesis that the annihilation of the class enemy is the higher form of class struggle and the beginning of guerilla war and people's war, and realise that the class struggle, i.e., this battle of annihilation, can solve all the problems facing us and lead the struggle to a higher plane, raise the political consciousness of the people to a higher stage, create conditions for the emergence of a new type of man, the Man of *Mao Tsetung era* who fears neither hardship nor death, develop the People's Army and can thus ensure the formation of a permanent base area. This battle of annihilation liberates the people not only from the oppression of the landlord class and its State but also liberates them from the shackles of backward ideas and removes from the minds of the people poisonous weeds of self-interest, clan interest, localism, casteism, religious superstitions, etc. Thus this battle of annihilation can bring the East Wind of splendour and glory of Man.

The politics of seizure of political power can alone rouse bitter class hatred among landless and poor peasants and only by putting this politics in command, the battle of annihilation can be raised to a new height.

The revisionists all the world over are trying to unite the groups who are parading the name of Chairman Mao and fighting Mao Tsetung Thought in the name of Mao Tsetung by seeking to arrest and enounce this battle of annihilation. So any idea of unity with these groups means the liquidation of the main plank of our struggle and submerging the entire Party in the morass of revisionism.

Our comrades must keep in mind that entirely through our own efforts we have been able to create a new situation in India when the ruling classes and their parties are openly quarreling with one another in a downright dog-bite-dog manner, when stable governments have become a thing of the past and when vast masses of people are coming into the arena of struggle and creating a new and better situation for the revolutionaries to carry on their struggles. Our Party's call: "China's Chairman is our Chairman, China's path is our path", our call against any aggressive war against China and our call to turn the '70's into the decade of liberation have gripped the imagination of the masses, particularly, of the revolutionary youth and won a victory over national-chauvinism and revisionism

and have opened up a new era of greater victories. Our battle of annihilation has linked together our two sacred tasks the task of liberating our country and the people and the international task of ending imperialism and imperialist war and has created the material basis, that is, the emergence of the new man, for fulfilling these great tasks.

So, our Party should continue this battle of annihilation in a more determined and concerted way, create newer and newer areas of operation, depend upon unsophisticated arms which alone can release the initiative of the landless and poor peasants and develop the struggles in mighty waves, continue the political campaign in a purposeful way to develop this battle of annihilation, try continuously to draw in fresh forces from among the landless and poor peasants and know how to rely upon them, concentrate on 'one area, one unit, one squad' basis, direct their entire work to fulfil the main task of the period, try constantly to improve the political level of the people, help the fighters study "Quotations" and the "Three Articles", link the fighters with the work of production and draw them inside the Party.

Comrades ! Imperialism, social-imperialists and native reaction are hatching plans to launch fiercest attacks upon us when preservation of our main force and our leadership will depend upon how deeply we dig in among the people. So the method of work evolved by Chairman Mao should be studied and applied methodically and conscientiously by our leaders and cadres, because that alone can ensure the preservation and victory of our revolutionary struggles.

The world is progressing at a breathtaking speed towards the final emancipation of Man under the leadership of Chairman Mao : our struggle in India, too, is developing at an inconceivably fast speed. The victory of the Indian Revolution will certainly banish forever imperialism and imperialist war from the face of the world. Our comrades must always feel this great responsibility that is on us, must develop the internationalist spirit of becoming one with the fighters of the world under the leadership of Chairman Mao. This feeling will give them immeasurable strength to carry on this great responsibility history has placed on us.

Let this Congress usher in greater unity among the revolutionary cadres and greater victory for the great Indian people.

Let this Congress give new strength to the cadres to end the age-old sufferings of the Indian people, rouse our cadres and the people for greater sacrifice to change this India of darkness into an India of brightness and brilliance. Chairman Mao is there, victory is ours.

Long live the Indian Revolution !

Long live the CPI (ML) !

Long live Chairman Mao ! A long, long life to Chariman Mao !

*[Reproduced from 'Mass Line', Vol. 2, No. 36, Sept. 13, 1970]*



## ON THE POLITICAL -ORGANISATIONAL REPORT

*[Charu Majumdar's speech introducing the Political-Organizational Report at the May 1970 Congress of CPI(ML) ]*

In the present world situation there are two important phenomena. On the one hand, there is U.S. imperialism's naked aggression against Cambodia. The U.S. imperialists have thrown away all pretences and invaded Cambodia. Their logic is Hitler's logic---- the logic of all aggressors. They cannot wait any more, they can no longer talk of peace. Now they will attack one country after another. So this is the beginning of the third world war.

On the other hand, the revolutionary united front of the peoples of Viet Nam, Cambodia and Laos under the leadership of China has been built up to fight the U.S. aggressors. The unity of the three Indo-Chinese peoples has been achieved. This is a great thing in world history, which did not exist when Hitler's hordes marched across Sudetanland. The Second World War was preceded by Munich-by great betrayal. But now the united front of revolutionary peoples under the leadership of China is taking shape. So this is the great beginning of the defeat of imperialism and the great beginning of the victory of the world's people.

The same kind of phenomena exist in India also. India's reactionary ruling classes are making frenzied war preparations to suit the global strategy of U.S. imperialism and Soviet social-imperialism. They are hatching criminal war plans against China. But the emergence of the C.P.I. (M-L) has changed the internal situation in India. The armed revolutionary peasant struggle led by the C.P.I.(M-L) has become the motive force of history. We must take into account not only the offensive of the ruling classes but also the counter-offensive of the revolutionary people.

Our cardinal tasks therefore are : to build up the Party and to get it entrenched among the landless and poor peasants. The building up of the Party means the development of the armed class struggle. And without armed class struggle the Party cannot be developed and cannot entrench itself among the masses.

The struggle between the two lines is there within the Party and will continue. We must oppose and defeat the incorrect line. But we must be on our guard against centrism. Centristism is a brand of revisionism--its worst form. In the past, revisionism was defeated again and again by revolutionary elements but centrism always seized the victories of the struggle and led the party along the revisionist path. We must hate centrism. On the question of boycotting elections Nagi Reddy

said : "Yes, we accept it but it should be restricted to a certain area at a certain period. We shall participate in elections where there is no struggle." This is Nagi Reddy's line. This is centrism. We have fought against it and thrown the Nagi Reddys out of our organization. Regarding Soviet social-imperialism, some say : "The Soviet leaders are revisionists. But how can they be imperialist ? Where is that development of monopoly capital ?" These are centrists. We have fought them and thrown them out of our Party. So the centrists raised the questions of trade unions and "working class-based Party" when armed class struggle is to be developed by relying on the peasantry. We fought Asit Sen and company on these issues and threw them out of the Party.

We must not only distinguish between the correct and the incorrect line but also find out the centrist position and smash it.

Now the centrist attack is coming from inside the Party. On the questions of using fire-arms, the dependence on the petty-bourgeois intellectual and the battle of annihilation, the Party is facing centrist attacks.

It must be understood that the battle of annihilation is both a higher form of class struggle and the starting-point of guerrilla war. There are two deviations on this question :

1. Some comrades agree that annihilation is the starting-point of guerrilla war but they do not agree that it is a higher form of class struggle. It should be borne in mind that only through the development of class struggle can all the problems be solved.

2. There are other comrades who carried on class struggle- the struggle for the seizure of land lord's land and property-but did not wage the battle of annihilation. So the cadres became degenerate : they were lost. The comrades missed the point that annihilation is the starting-point of guerrilla war.

Class struggle will solve all other problems- the problem of building liberated bases and the problem of building the revolutionary army.

We have tried to develop the army in some areas without class struggle and have failed. Without class struggle- the battle of annihilation - the initiative of the poor peasant masses cannot be released, the political consciousness of the fighters cannot be raised, the new man cannot emerge, the people's army cannot be created. Only by waging class struggle - the battle of annihilation- the new man will be created, the new man who will defy death and will be free from all thought of self-interest. And with this death-defying spirit he will go close to the enemy, snatch his rifle, avenge the martyrs and the people's army will emerge. To go close to the enemy it is necessary to conquer all thought of self. And this can be achieved only by the blood of martyrs. That inspires and creates new men out of the fighters, fills them with class hatred and makes them go close to the enemy and snatch his rifle with bare hands.

We have poured much of our blood in Srikakulam and we have also spilled much blood of the enemy. Yet the class enemy exists there. Unless we throw the class enemy out of the land a new consciousness, a new confidence, cannot arise.

We cannot then go close to the enemy and snatch his rifle. It is the class struggle that can solve this problem of building the people's army.

The annihilation of the class enemy - this weapon in our hands- is the greatest danger to the reactionaries and revisionists all the world over. So the leaders of world revisionism are trying to contact the various groups which pay lip-service to Chairman Mao and the CPC and are trying to unite them to oppose the battle of annihilation of the class enemy. We refuse to unite with these groups because they are opposed to the annihilation of the class enemy, to class struggle and so are enemies of the people.

Why am I against taking up fire-arms now ? Is it not our dream that landless and poor peasants will take up the rifles on their shoulders and march onward? Yet the use of firearms at this stage, instead of releasing the initiative of the peasant masses to annihilate the class enemy stifles it. If guerrilla fighters start the battle of annihilation with their conventional weapons, the common landless and poor peasants will come forward with bare hands and join the battle of annihilation. A common landless peasant, ground down by age-old oppression, will see the light and avenge himself on the class enemy. His initiative will be released. In this way the peasant masses will join the guerrilla fighters, their revolutionary enthusiasm will know no bounds and a mighty wave of people's upsurge will sweep the country. After the initiative of the peasant masses to annihilate the class enemy with bare hands or home-made weapons has been released and the peasants' revolutionary power has been established, they should take up the gun and face the world. The peasant with his rifle will be the guarantee of the continuation of the peasants' revolutionary power.

Comrades, the peasants' suffering has reached a stage when they can no longer endure it. If we can show them the way, there is not a single point in India where the peasants will not be roused to action. There is the possibility of a tremendous upsurge in India if we consciously work for it. Guerrilla war can be waged through the battle of annihilation in every village in India. So, start as many points of armed struggle as possible. Don't try to concentrate. Expand anywhere and everywhere. This is one principle to be followed. The other principle is : Carry on the battle of annihilation of the class enemy.

All the revisionists, all the groups taking the name of Chairman Mao, are attacking us on this issue of the battle of annihilation. So, Comrades, anyone who opposes this battle of annihilation cannot remain with us. We will not allow him to remain inside our Party.

One can see how the revolutionary armed peasant struggle is rousing the other classes. Look at Calcutta. The revolutionary struggle of the youths of Calcutta surges forward under the impact of the armed peasant struggle. The working class in Calcutta is also rising . And I hope there will be revolutionary upsurge of the working class not only in Calcutta but in all other cities of India. This is bound to happen. The situation in the cities will then change completely.

Comrades, let a vigorous armed peasant struggle rage all over India after the victorious conclusion of our Congress. Then a spontaneous mass upsurge in the wake of the armed guerrilla struggle will come as an avalanche, as a thunderbolt. It is sure the Red Army can be created not only in Srikakulam but also in Punjab, Uttar Pradesh, Bihar and West Bengal. With these contingents of the Liberation army, the Indian peasants will march onward and complete the revolution. Three factors guarantee the victory of the revolution. First, the revolution that has been delayed by more than twenty years brooks no further delay. Second, the revolution is taking place in the era of the total collapse of imperialism and the world-wide victory of Socialism, the era of Mao Tsetung Thought. Third, we have been able to hold this Congress despite severe repression.

Comrades, let us march onward. The seventies will surely be the decade of liberation.

**[From Liberation, May - July, 1970]**





V

**DIFFERENCES  
WITHIN THE  
C P I (M L)**

## **R.N.UPADHYAYA IN 1970 MAY PARTY CONGRESS**

### **THE OPINIONS EXPRESSED BY RAM NARAYAN UPADHYAYA, THE DELEGATE FROM UTTAR PRADESH**

The All India Congress of CPI(ML) was held secretly in May 1970 in Calcutta. The delegates from many states had taken part in it. It was named as the Eighth Congress but not as the First Congress as the Seventh Party Congress had already taken place. From UP, 4 Comrades, namely, Com.Sivakumar Mishra, Com.R.N.Upadhyaya, Com.Mahendra Singh and Com. Ramswaroop Yadav had taken part in it.

Firstly, a 3-Member Presidium consisting of Com. Saroj Dutta, Com.Sushital Roy Chowdhury and Com. Kanu Sanyal was elected. After this, Com. Satyanarayan Singh presented the draft programme before the delegates. He made a long speech on it. Then the Presidium asked the delegates to give the names if they proposed to speak or give amendments to the draft programme. The delegates remained silent. I stood up and asked for permission to propose my amendments to the draft programme. I was called to do so.

Here I am giving my amendments to the extent I could recollect them. Besides this, I also made some comments on some of the articles published in the LIBERATION. I am also briefly mentioning them here.

The atmosphere in the Party Congress was such that whatever Com.Charu Mazumdar said must be accepted as an ultimate truth. Therefore, any critical comment on him seemed intolerable for those like Ashim Chatterjee. Barring a few, all the delegates had listened to my amendments attentively.

#### **AMENDMENTS TO DRAFT PROGRAMME**

1. Add "*The upper strata of the*" before "*Indian bourgeoisie, whose nature is comprador*" as it is wrong to call the entire bourgeoisie as "*comprodar*". Com.S.N.Singh did not accept it. But he finally accepted it as Com.Charu Mazumdar was in agreement with my amendment.

2. Replace "*The Indian people now are weighed down under the four mountains....*" with "*The Indian people are weighed down by three mountains, i.e., imperialism headed by US imperialism; feudalism and comprador bourgeoisie.*"

Delet the word, "*Soviet social-imperialism*" from here as well as from where ever this word was used in the draft and write in its place "*the soviet revisionist leadership.*"

3. The Draft said: "*It is state monopoly capitalism, i.e.,bureaucratic capitalism.*". Delet where ever the expression, i.e., "*the bureaucratic capitalism*" was used and retain the word, "*the state monopoly capitalism.*" It is wrong to say the state monopoly capitalism means the bureaucratic capitalism.

4. Remove the following Lin Piao's quotation from the Draft: "*Guerilla warfare is the only way to mobilise and apply the entire strength of the people against the enemy.*" In its place, write:  
"*The armed guerilla struggle is the main form of struggle to mobilise the entire strength of the people against the enemy and unite this force against the enemy. This must be combined with other forms of struggle.*"

Delet the sentence, "*Our revolution is a part of the Chinese Cultural Revolution .*" It is correct to say that the "*Indian revolution is a part of World Socialist Revolution.*"

All these amendments moved by me were rejected.

My objections to the articles published in the LIBERATION are given below.

1. There is one article on the "*authority.*" It insisted on the acceptance of Com Charu Mazumdar's '*authority*'. I view it as theoretically wrong. In the same article, he was projected as India's Lenin and Mao. This will promote individualism. So, I do not accept it at all. Com.Ashim Chatterjee became furious at my view. I did not at all care it.
2. It is said: "*The annihilation of class enemy is the highest stage of class struggle and the begining of the guerrilla war.*" It is totally wrong. The annihilation of class enemy means the annihilation of its army and the state power, but not the assassination of some individuals.
3. The statement, "*Chairman Mao is our Chairman*" too is not acceptable to me. We get further alienated from the people by saying so.

The discussion had taken place on my comments. But they were not accepted.

As far as the question of Com. Charu Mazumdar's '*authority*' was concerned, he himself did not think it necessary to raise because it encountered opposition from some Central Committee Members.

( From :Com.R.N.Upadhyaya's Book MERA JEEVAN SANGHARSH  
AOUR ANUBHAV- In HINDI )



## A CRITIQUE OF THE POLITICAL RESOLUTION

*[Here are some of the main points of criticism of the Political Resolution of the CPI (ML), contained in the 18-point document, placed before the Party leadership in June 1969 by a section of cadres of Howrah District, West Bengal, who, subsequent to their expulsion from the Party, formed the LIBERATION FRONT-EC.]*

- 1) Although it is a fact that the revolutionary section of the Indian people has discarded the parliamentary path, it would be incorrect to suggest that people as a whole have lost all faith in all the bourgeois and revisionist parties, or they no longer harbour any illusion about the parliamentary path, or they are eagerly waiting for a fundamental and radical transformation of the socio-political system.
- 2) At present, clearly visible is the unity -and not disunity amongst the ruling classes that have identified their interests with imperialism.
- 3) The principal contradiction in the present phase of the Indian revolution is the contradiction between feudalism and the Indian people and not that between feudalism and the peasantry.
- 4) It would be wrong to draw a strict parallelism between the experiences of the CPC and the Communist movement in India while referring to some deviations from the correct path committed by the Party leadership.
- 5) Maintaining silence over the need to form a political 'base area' may provide incentive to form "roving guerilla bands".
- 6) Notwithstanding the correctness of the formulation that under the leadership of the working class the principal tactic of the revolutionary peasants is guerilla war, it is wrong to maintain that there is no need for mass movements, mass organisations and class struggles.
- 7) The contention that the major part of India's wealth is in the hands of 75 comprador capitalists is not correct as feudalism still constitutes the main enemy of the Indian people and the largest part of India's wealth is still under the control of the feudal lords. Moreover, taking the banking and public sectors into account, this contention is far from correct in the light of the data published by the Monopoly Enquiry Commission, 1965.



# THE GENERAL LINE IN COLONIAL REVOLUTION

REFIQUIL ISLAM (Utpal Datta)

October, 1969

Mao Tsetung's leadership over the revolutionary war now being waged in Asia, Africa and Latin America has been firmly established through the experiences of the people themselves. The general principles of the Chinese path to revolution have been found to apply equally to all colonial countries and any attempt to evade them has inevitably led the revolutionaries to defeat or to capitulation.

But that does not mean that all colonial revolutions must be carbon copies of the Chinese revolution. Marxism does not permit this kind of ritual. As Mao himself said :

*"...how to turn Marxism into something specifically Chinese, to imbue every manifestaion of it with Chinese characteristics i.e., to apply it in accordance with China's characteristics, becomes a problem which the whole Party must understand and solve immediately .... for the fresh and lovely things of Chinese style and Chines flavour which the common folk of China love to see and hear."*

*( The Role of the Chinese Communist Party in the National War )*

Similarly the Indian revolutionary must of necessity "imbue every manifestaion" with Indian characteristics, and clothe the theory of revolution in Indian style and Indian flavour.

The Red political power can exist in a liberated zone, and that such a zone must necessarily be created for protracted civil war, and that such a zone is an inevitable feature of colonial revolution, can no longer be disputed. But the five conditions listed by Mao for the emergence and survival of such parallel Red power in China must be carefully studied, and differences with our country taken note of , rather than-as a wag commented recently - "passing off dung-heaps in Sonarpur as mountain hideouts".

The first condition was China's semi-colonial state and that she was under indirect imperialist rule -a condition fully satisfied in the Indian situation today. But Mao goes on to qualify this condition with reference to "*prolonged splits and wars within the White regime*" (See *Why it is that Red political power can Exist in China ?*). Chinese revolutionaries took brilliant advantage of these splits and wars. Now, even by stretching sophistry to its limit, one cannot find a parallel of the wars among the Chinese warlords in this country. The splits and miniature coups of the Indian ruling classes hold no promise yet that an uprising will not immediately unite them. The sinister unity at all levels from Delhi to Calcutta in suppressing

Naxalbari and brutally murdering women and children proves that the reactionaries also learn from experience and the Indian rulers today need not behave as their Chinese counterparts did in 1927.

Mao's second condition refers to the strength of the bourgeois-democratic revolution in the areas where Red power rose, the formation of trade unions and peasants' associations "on a wide scale" prior to armed uprising. This is an aspect almost entirely rejected by several groups, and notably, the CPI(ML). Their resolutions refer to "guerilla warfare" as the "only" form of struggle. (They attribute it to Lin Piao, who had merely used the expression in the military sense, describing guerilla warfare as the *only* method of mobilising the masses *when the people's army is already in action*.) They have repeatedly declared through their organs that they consider the economic struggle of the peasantry to be a "revisionist" diversion of revolutionary energy ; currently they are dubbing trade unions as part of the capitalist establishment. But Mao Tsetung never said that armed struggle is the "only" form of struggle. He said :

*"Our Party was able to co-ordinate directly or indirectly the armed struggle, the principal form of struggle, with many other necessary forms of struggle.....the struggle of the workers, the struggle of the peasants (this is the main thing), the struggles of the youth, the women and all other sections of the people, the struggle for political power, the struggle on the economic front, the struggle on the espionage front, the struggle on the ideological front, and other forms of struggle."*

(Introductory Remarks to the 'Communist' Italics added.)

Thus, Mao Tsetung has been surreptitiously revised, the word "principal" has been removed and the word "only" slipped in ; and this has been done in order to justify the total rejection of work on all other fronts , the virtual withdrawal of our comrades from mass organisations, and the disastrous tendency, carefully cultivated, of "starting action somewhere, somehow, even though no preliminary work has been done there to turn the "action" into a struggle for building a base area. The precondition for Red political power in any area is "peasant association" etc. according to Mao. By rejecting all frontal work, our comrades here have openly announced that they do not want the so-called "actions" to lead to Red political power. Or they are trying to tell us that Mao Tsetung is wrong and that they have discovered a new method of jumping over frontal work straight at armed struggle and Red power!

While Mao's third condition -the development of nation-wide revolutionary situation -obtains even more acutely today in every country, the fourth and fifth conditions are conspicuous by their absence in India : the existence of a Red Army, and a strong and correct Communist Party. We have no Red Army yet, and we have the beginnings of a Party that has already begun to revise Mao.

But does this mean that Red political power cannot be established in India ? Certainly not. However, the conditions for the rise of Indian Yenans must be

calculated from Indian conditions and the present epoch. Herein is the first necessity of looking for Indian characteristics, the study of peculiarly Indian contradictions. The CPI(ML) has once more solved this question by misquoting Mao. It has declared :

*"In the present stage, the principal contradiction in our country is between feudalism and our peasant masses. In this stage, the Indian revolution is the new type of democratic revolution -people's democratic revolution...."* (Translated from Bengali)

Two misrepresentations in one paragraph ! Never has Mao said that at a stage when imperialism is indirectly exploiting a country the principal contradiction is between "feudalism and the peasant masses." On the contrary, he explicitly states that at such times the principal contradiction is between "*the masses*" on the one hand and "*the alliance of imperialism and the feudal classes*" on the other. (On Contradiction).

Lin Piao also stresses "the Chinese people as a whole", and probably never imagined that anyone calling himself a revolutionary could distort this into "peasant masses." (See *Long Live the Victory of the People's War*). Mao's "masses" has become "peasant masses" in our comrades' formulation, and "the alliance of imperialism and feudal classes" has become simply "feudalism" ! How they can talk about a semi-colonial country and in the same breath exclude all reference to imperialism as an enemy is a mystery.

Furthermore, it is gross distortion of the thoughts of Mao to say that "in the present stage.... in the stage of people's democratic revolution," the principal contradiction constantly remains the same. Mao has pointed out, how the imperialists will inevitably pass into *direct* aggression and then the principal contradiction of the previous period will become non-principal, and the contradiction between imperialism and the entire people will become principal. To assert that the "feudalism-peasant masses" contradiction will remain principal right through the stage of people's democratic revolution is to deny that imperialism is bound to pass into naked aggression when its lackeys fail to suppress revolution.

Why has it been necessary for them to replace Mao's "masses" with "peasant masses"? Naturally to exclude all other classes from the struggle, to deny the necessity of a democratic, revolutionary front, without which, according to Mao, *there can be no revolution*. It is obvious to any one that the entire crisis in India springs from the feudal system.

It is obvious that this system keeps about seventy percent of the people of India deprived of purchasing power, with the result that industries retrench and close down, the worker is thrown out of employment, the student faces the prospect of starvation and the commuter that of losing his job tomorrow. It is obvious that even the smaller producers can not market their goods and the shopkeeper can not sell his ware, as long as the vast majority of the people, the peasants, do not buy. It is obvious therefore that feudalism is the enemy not only of the peasants, but of

all classes and therefore the broadest possible front can be built against this common scourge. That is exactly what our CPI(ML) comrades have all along rejected-the necessity of building a united front. Hence their abstruse, negative slogans scribbled on city walls : Agricultural revolution is the way to liberty ! Naturally therefore the petty bourgeois of the city fails to understand how the peasants' struggle concerns him. No one is bothering to tell him that his job depends on the victory over feudalism, that he should join this struggle not to help the peasant to a plot of land, but for his own economic survival.

Why have our comrades, twice in one paragraph, tried to shield the role of imperialism in the forced backwardness of India ? Why are they going to the length of revising Mao to obliterate all references to "the alliance between imperialism and the feudal classes", when everyone knows the sordid history of American fertilizer-factories to strengthen the feudals in India ? Everyone knows the disgrace of a Five Year Plan held up at U.S. orders.

Everyone is familiar with the abolition of export duties on iron, manganese and jute, for the sake of American exploiters. Everyone knows the economics of food shortage so that the USA can sell wheat to India. It is obvious that the feudal economy in India is primarily in U.S. interests so that she remains a supplier of raw materials. And therefore the principal contradiction is indirect, is always between the people on one side and "the alliance between imperialism and the feudal classes" on the other, and never abstract "feudalism".

It is being frequently said that only during direct aggression by imperialism ( a phase totally ignored by ML theoreticians ) does imperialism make its appearance at one end of the contradiction; and that during indirect exploitation it is only feudalism that is the enemy. Mao never said so. He said, even during indirect exploitation, imperialism is still the enemy, the hidden enemy behind the feudal classes, but that during direct aggression by imperialism, "foreign imperialism and domestic reaction stand quite *openly* at one end of the pole...."

Clear, one would think. The difference between the phases of indirect and direct aggression is not one of absence of imperialism from the principal contradiction, but only that of whether it is hidden or "standing openly."

To the ML comrades, of course, all this has no meaning. To them the entire people's democratic revolution can be completed without any thought of imperialism. To them Lin Piao's clear instruction that any country that wants revolution, freedom and peace must necessarily aim its spearhead at U.S imperialism, is nonsense. To them, the Chinese Communist Party's repeated warning like the following are mere phrases :

*"Two outstanding facts since World War II are that the imperialists and the reactionaries are everywhere reinforcing their apparatus of violence for cruelly suppressing the masses and that imperialism headed by the United States is conducting counter-revolutionary armed intervention in all parts of the world."*  
(*The Proletarian Revolution and Krushchev's Revisionism*).



The ML comrades are not interested in such assessments of the role of the imperialist "gendarme." They are sure there will be no direct aggression, and while there is only indirect exploitation, feudalism is the only enemy !

But if we are aware of imperialism as the real master behind the feudals and the big bourgeoisie, we would at once be conscious of another major contradiction which is peculiarly Indian. This is a multinational federation of States, and the people's struggle is increasingly assuming the form of asserting the right of self-determination, of struggle against the central power. It is obvious that the principal instrument whereby imperialism exploits India is the Central Government, and the retention at all costs of the federal structure is meant to serve the interests of imperialism. The armed forces, with which a parallel Red power must at once come into conflict, is under the control of the Centre, and even talk of secession can be punished by 15 years in prison. It is obvious that the disintegration of this federation will immediately force the hidden imperialist into the open, and we shall enter the phase of national patriotic war against imperialism. The Chinese Communist Party has repeatedly come out in support of the Kashmiri people's rights and even the Telengana struggle. Our comrades in Calcutta have merely repeated these declarations, but have scrupulously refrained from applying the lessons in the country at large. They have nothing to say about the Punjabi, or the Maharashtrian, or the Bengali people's rights. In fact the ML political resolution has not a word to say about national rights and the role of communists in a people's struggle for self-determination, in spite of the clear general line of colonial revolution.

If the communists fail to seize the leadership of these movements, the fascists will. But the leading theoretician of the CPI(ML) has declared in print that communists should not lead movements for national self-determination (*Deshabrati*, May 30, 1968, P.5). What has this in common with Mao's teaching that "*in the final analysis national struggle is class struggle*" (See *Peking Review*, No. 16 of 1968, P.13) ? What has this in common with the general line laid down by the Chinese Party ?

History has entrusted to the proletarian parties in these areas (i.e. Asia, Africa and Latin America) the glorious mission of holding high the banner of struggle against imperialism....., of standing in the forefront of the national democratic revolutionary movement..... It is of primary importance for advanced members of the proletariat to work in the rural areas, help the peasants to get organized and raise their class consciousness *and their national self-respect and self-confidence*.

(*General Line of the International Communist Movement, C.C., C.P.C., 1963.* Italics added)

But, of course , if imperialism does not even exist in our assessment of the whole period of democratic revolution, naturally China's lead will fall on deaf ear and the ML Party can set itself up against Mao Tsetung.

But if at the present stage we recognise " the alliance of imperialism and the feudal classes" as the enemy, and if we are sure that direct aggression by

imperialism is inevitable in the near future, little more humility will assert itself, and we shall not have the audacity to reject outright the experiences of the Chinese Communist Party. We shall then see that the feudals in the Indian countryside can be exposed before the peasants not only as class enemies, but also as national enemies ; not only as exploiters, but also as traitors. All classes then will rally against the reactionaries, who are not only impoverishing the masses, but have also sold the country's freedom to the imperialists. Class struggle and patriotic struggle will then merge into one, under the hegemony of the proletariat. It can then take the road-a road already taken spontaneously by the masses-of organised destruction of the federal structure that serves the interests of imperialism. Only in this manner can people's democratic revolution be the continuation of the long freedom struggle against British tyranny. Only in this manner is it possible to release a mass upsurge of all exploited classes in defence of national interests. Only in this manner can guarantees be created for the emergence and survival of Red power in liberated zones in India. Armed struggle must be the spearhead of a vast movement of the masses, led by the working class, for people's democracy as well as national independence. Without a people's army the people have nothing, said Mao. Such an army is not created by so-called mobile units "starting" something somewhere ; the guerilla grows out of the people and is sustained by the people, sheltered and nurtured by them. The guerilla must symbolize the highest aspirations of the people in order that the people may rally round him. In short, the guerilla, and finally the soldier of the people's army, must be the man who defends not only the people's home, land, food, democracy, but also their "national self-respect."

The struggle in Srikakulam fills us with hope that the party which is leading it will sooner or later establish itself on the road to revolution which has been lit up by the thoughts of Mao Tsetung. But their activities and quixotic tilts at Mao in this part of the country stand in sharp contrast to the war-cry of the guerillas of Andhra.



# PROBLEMS AND CRISES OF INDIAN REVOLUTION

SUSHITAL ROY CHOWDHURY

*(November, 1970)*

A lesson of the history of the international communist movement is that the genuine communist movement has to advance by waging struggle against the two kinds of deviation, the "Right" and the "Left". From the history of the international communist movement it is again found that after the "Right" errors are corrected, the "Left" errors are liable to crop up. Whenever an individual or the Party advances from one success to another there is the danger of "Left" deviation. This is because arrogance may develop in the wake of enthusiasm caused by success. On the other hand, in times of failure, there may be a trend towards pessimism and depression.

During the Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution in China it has been found that even when the struggle against "Right" deviation continues, some persons raise "ultra-Left" slogans with an ostentatious play of words, try to create disunity of the proletariat with classes which are its allies and thus try to lead the entire struggle astray.

From the history of the international communist movement it is found that in general the centre from which these two-deviations originate lies within the party leadership. From the history of our Party also we know that our experience is no exception to this.

So Marxism-Leninism-Mao Tsetung Thought teaches us that the members of the Communist Party should remain ever vigilant and alert in this regard. All the ordinary members of the Party must use their brains and must always exercise careful supervision over the leadership. In the question of leadership, Chairman Mao's teaching is that the leadership must always be modest; the higher the post, the greater the modesty required of an incumbent. In case of leadership it is a question of principle whether one is modest or arrogant; because to err is human.

Right from the aggression of China by India in 1962 when the Party at the manoeuvring of the leadership deviated from proletarian internationalism, many an ordinary member in our Party started becoming conscious of the danger of revisionism.

This generated a feeling amongst many of us that we must start armed struggle. After March 1967 when the historic peasant struggle burst forth in Naxalbari, this awareness within the ordinary Party members as well as the struggle against

revisionism were raised to a new level. Throughout the country the communist revolutionaries severed connections with revisionists and neo-revisionists and began asserting themselves. On the one hand, they went to the villages and devoted themselves to the task of rousing the peasants ; on the other hand, for the reorganisation of a genuine Communist Party they took initiative in establishing contacts and holding discussions with one another. Through this process was formed the Communist Party of India (Marxist-Leninist). under the leadership of China is taking shape. So this is the great beginning of the defeat of imperialism and the great beginning of victory of the world's people.

The same kind of phenomena exist in India also. India's reactionary ruling classes are making frenzied preparations to suit the golbal strategy of U.S. imperialism and Soviet social-imperialism. They are hatching criminal war palns against China. But the emergence of the C.P.I.(M-L) has changed the internal situation in India. The armed revolutionary peasant struggle led by the C.P.I (M-L) has become the motive force of history. We must take into account not only the offensive of the ruling classes but also counter-offensive of the revolutionary people.

Our cardinal tasks, therefore, are : to bulid up the Party and to get it entrneched among the landless and poor peasants. The building up of the Party means the developmend of the armed class struggle. And without armed class struggle the Party can not entrench itsef among the masses.

The struggle between the two lines is there within the Party and will continue to be there. We must oppose and defeat the incorrect line. But we must be on our guard against centrism. Centrism is a brand of revisionism-its worst form. In the past, revisionism was defeated again and again by revolutionary elements but centrism always seized the victories of the struggle and led the Party along the revisionist path. We must hate centrism. On the question of boycotting elections, Nagi reddy said : "Yes, we accept it but it should be restricted to a certain area at a certain period. We shall participate in elections where there is no struggle." This is Nagi Reddy's line. This is centrism. We have fought against it and thrown the Nagi Reddy's out of our organization. Regarding Soviet social-imperialism, some say : "The Soviet leaders are revisionists. But how can they be imperialists ? Where is that development of monopoly capital?" These are centrists. We have fought them and thrown them out of our Party. So the centrists raised the questions of trade unions and "working class based party" when armed clash is to be developed by relying on the peasantry. We fought Asit Sen and company on these lines and threw them out of the Party.

We must not only distinguish between the correct and the incorrect line but also find out the centrist

Now the centrist attack is coming from inside the Party. On the questions of using fire-arms, the dependence on the petty-bourgeois intellectuals and the battle of annihilation, the Party is facing centrist attacks.

It must be understood that the battle of annihilation is both a high reform of class struggle and the starting-point of guerilla war. There are two deviations on this question :

1. Some comrades agree that annihilation is the starting point of guerilla war but they do not agree that it is a higher form of class struggle. It should be borne in mind that only through the development of class struggle can all the problems be solved.

2. There are other comrades who carried on class struggle-the struggle for the seizure of landlords land and property-but did not wage the battle of annihilation. So the cadres became degenerate, they were lost. The comrades missed the point that annihilation is the starting-point of guerilla war.

Class struggle will solve all other problems-the problem of building liberated bases and the problem of building the revolutionary army.

We have tried to develop the army in some areas without class struggle and have failed. Without class struggle-the battle of annihilation-the initiative of the poor peasant masses cannot be released, the political consciousness of the fighters cannot be raised, the new man cannot emerge, the people's army cannot be created. Only by waging class struggle-the battle of annihilation-the new man will be created, the new man who will defy death and will be free from all thought of self-interest. And with this death-defying spirit he will go close to the enemy, snatch his rifle, avenge the martyrs and the people's army will emerge. To go close to the enemy it is necessary to conquer all thought of self. And this can be achieved only by the blood of martyrs. That inspires and creates new men out of the fighters, fills them with class hatred and makes them go close to the enemy and snatch his rifle with bare hands.

We have poured much of our blood in Srikakulam and we have spilled much blood of the enemy. Yet the class enemy exists there. Unless we throw the class enemy out of the land, a new consciousness, a new confidence cannot arise. We cannot then go close to the enemy and snatch his rifle. It is the class struggle that can solve this problem of building the people's army.

The annihilation of the class enemy-this weapon in our hands-is the greatest danger of the reactionaries and revisionists all the world over. So the leader of world revisionism are trying to contact the various groups which pay lip-service to Chariman Mao and the CPC and are trying to unite them to oppose the battle of annihilation of the class enemy. We refuse to unite with these groups because they are opposed to annihilation of the class enemy, to class struggle and so, are enemies of the people.

Why am I against taking up fire-arms now ? Is it not our dream that landless and poor peasants will take up rifles on their shoulders and march forward ? Yet the use of the fire-arms at this stage, instead of releasing the initiative of the peasant masses to annihilate the class enemy, stifles it. If guerilla fighters start the battle of annihilation with their conventional weapons, the common landless and poor peasants will come forward with bare hands and join the battle of annihilation. A common landless peasant, ground down by age-old oppression, will see the light and avenge himself on the class enemy. His initiative will be released. In this way the peasant masses will join the guerilla fighters, their revolutionary

enthusiasm will know no bounds and a mighty wave of people's upsurge will sweep the country. After the initiative of the peasant masses, to annihilate the class enemy with bare hands or home-made weapons, has been released and the peasants' revolutionary power has been established, they should take up the gun and face the world. The peasant with his rifle will be the guarantee of the continuation of the peasants' revolutionary power.

Comrades, the peasants' suffering has reached a stage when they can no longer endure it. If we can show them the way, there is not a single point in India where the peasants will not be roused to action. There is the possibility of a tremendous upsurge in India if we consciously work for it. Guerilla war can be waged through the battle of annihilation in every village in India. So, start as many points of armed struggle as possible. Don't try to concentrate. Expand anywhere and everywhere. This is one principle to be followed. The other principle is : Carry on the battle of annihilation of the class enemy.

All the revisionists , all the groups taking the name of Chairman Mao, are attacking us on this issue of the battle of annihilation. So, comrades, anyone who opposes this battle of annihilation cannot remain with us. We will not allow him to remain inside our Party.

One can see how the revolutionary armed peasant struggle is rousing the other classes. Look at Calcutta. The revolutionary struggle of the youths of Calcutta surges forward under the impact of the armed peasant struggle. The working class in Calcutta is also rising. And I hope there will be revolutionary upsurge of the working class not only in Calcutta, but in all other cities of India. This is bound to happen. The situation in the cities will then change completely.

Comrades, let a vigorous armed peasant struggle rage all over India after the victorious conclusion of our Congress. Then a spontaneous mass upsurge in the wake of the armed guerilla struggle will come as an avalanche, as a thunderbolt. It is sure the Red Army can be created not only in Srikakulam but also in Punjab, Uttar Pradesh.

However, in different States of the country a number of communist revolutionaries continued to maintain their independent group existence and to make efforts to build up armed struggle. The party declared that the ideological differences with them will be non-antagonistic in character.

As soon as the Naxalbari peasant upsurge took place it was greeted and blessed by Mao Tsetung, the leader of the international communist movement, and the great Communist Party of China.

Immediately after its formation, the CPI(M-L) earned recognition of the international leadership. For natural and justifiable reasons, the communist revolutionaries of Darjeeling district earned respect of the communist revolutionaries throughout the country for these successes. Naturally in all these successful developments the leading role of Comrade Charu Majumdar earned recognition within the Party. Right at the moment of the formation of the Party he was respectfully chosen for the highest post without any dissent.

The peasant struggle of Naxalbari did not only inspire the revolutionary members of the Party, it also enthused and inspired the sympathisers and a large section of people under the Party's influence.

After the formation of the CPI(M-L) they assembled under its banner. After the formation of the Party the peasants' armed struggle began to expand rapidly with the help and co-operation of these sympathisers and the people.

Groups of communist revolutionaries outside the Party too developed armed peasant struggles in some areas of the country.

In May 1970, the Party Congress of the CPI(M-L) was held with success. The successful holding of the Party Congress even in the face of policies of severe repression pursued by the exploiting classes and their government aroused much enthusiasm amongst the Party members, people and sympathisers throughout the country. A large number of guerilla units were formed. In the real sense, the phase marking the beginning of guerilla war was reached. Its influence spread to the urban areas. In particular it generated new initiative and activity amongst students and youth. This successful development has been brightened with new examples of self-sacrifice set by Party members from martyr Babulal to Comrades Panchadi and Nirmala and by the peasant masses.

Today the ruling classes and other political parties are passing sleepless nights because of the CPI(M-L). It has become the focus of the new hope for the common man through-out the country. The task before us is to raise our struggle to a new phase - to advance along the path of the most arduous struggle for developing base areas. In other areas our responsibility is to intensify the class struggle of the peasants and to raise the armed struggle to a higher phase.

It is a matter of deep regret that at this moment of our success, in the name of developing Mao Tsetung Thought, such principles and policies are being introduced in our State and such ideas are being circulated as are nothing but ultra-adventurism. Unless the ordinary members of the Party become aware of these ideas and policies and make an effort to change them, the progress of revolution as a whole will suffer.

What are the concrete manifestations of these adventurist ideas and policies? The line, policies, strategy and tactics of people's war formulated by Chairman Mao Tsetung are inter-connected and constitute an integral whole. These are applicable to and have relevance for all countries.

*"Comrade Mao Tse-tung's theory of people's war is not only a product of the Chinese revolution, but has also the characteristics of our epoch..... Mao Tse-tung's thought is a common asset of the revolutionary people of the whole world."* (Lin Piao : *Long Live the Victory of People's War* P. 116)

Explaining the theory of People's War, Comrade Lin Piao showed that these (lessons) are : (a) Go on fighting with the people's war in perspective ; (b) Correctly apply the policy of the united front ; (c) Establish base areas in the countryside, relying on peasants; (d) Develop the people's Army of a new type; (e) Apply the strategy and tactics of people's war in all spheres of work ; (f) Grasp the principle of self-reliance.

The class enemies of the people are organised : the state machinery is in their hands. In the beginning the strength of the people is unorganised. The protracted war is a process of organising the people, rallying them and arming them. Long-drawn efforts are necessary to weaken the enemy forces gradually and to expand gradually the people's forces.

Quite correctly our activities began in the perspective of this protracted war *"In India this revolution can triumph only if we wage protracted and arduous struggle. Citing the fact that imperialism and social-imperialism will come forward to arrest the revolution in India, it is contended that it is nothing but a blind flight of imagination to think of easy victory in this situation."* (Deshabrat)

But at one time suddenly an idea began to be circulated that our struggle would not be that much protracted . In the manner of an astrologer it was forecast that we need not wait beyond 1975 for the success of the revolution. Undoubtedly, the style of work that established itself under its impact was one of getting quick results.

At the commencement of the Second Civil War in China Chairman Mao wrote: *"Who are the enemies ? Who are our friends ? This is a question of the first importance for the revolution. The basic reason why all previous revolutionary struggles in China achieved so little was their failure to unite with real friends against the real enemies."* (Analysis of the Classes in Chinese Society, March 1926). In explaining the theory of people's war, Comrade Lin Biao has first shown : *"In order to win a people's war it is imperative to build the broadest possible united front and formulate a series of policies which will ensure the fullest mobilisation of the basic masses as well as the unity of all the forces that can be united."* (Lin Biao : *op.cit.* P.25) In explaining the theory of people's war Comrade Lin Biao has given the first place to the task of building the united front.

It is on the basis of this teaching that we have determined the allies and enemies of our revolution. The enemies are imperialism, social-imperialism, big comprador bourgeoisie and the big landlord class.

In our programme we have defined the objective of our revolution : *" This revolution will establish the dictatorship of the working class, the peasantry, the petty-bourgeoisie and even a section of the small and middle bourgeoisie under the leadership of the working class."* As regards these classes we have said : *" They, together, constitute the overwhelming majority of the Indian people"*. As the condition for the success of revolution, we have stated in the programme: *"Thus, in order to carry the democratic revolution through to the end it is necessary that a democratic front of all these classes is built up under the leadership of the working class."*

The united front does not develop overnight . The formation of the front is but a process. As conditions for the successful building of the democratic front we have correctly stated: *" This front, however, can only be built up when worker peasant unity is achieved in the course of armed struggle and after Red political power is established at least in some parts of the country."*



Chairman Mao teaches us that the aim and object of the revolution are at one with the general principle which will regulate all the activities of the revolutionary party. This is known as the political line.

This general principle must have to be reflected in all the policies of the party.

Then it is clear that from the beginning to the end the policies cannot be allowed to go against the Party's general principle. Otherwise a deviation from the political line occurs. But what sort of attitude is being taken towards the ally classes in our activities ? " They will be forced to come to us". " We need not bother about them." Frequently without any second thought such policies are being adopted as are hitting them also. The so-called principle of annihilation is being applied to many traders, teachers and many individuals of such types.

Chairman Mao has repeatedly said : "*The revolutionary war is a war of the masses; it can be waged only by mobilising the masses and relying on them.*" ('Be concerned with the Well Being of the Masses, Pay Attention to Methods of Work', January 27, 1934). He has further said : We are against issuing orders by depending only on a handful of persons.

In starting people's war the first question that has to be faced is how the people, especially the peasant masses, can be aroused within the shortest possible time. This rousing involves developing the initiative of the peasants in regard to different aspects of waging people's war.

Chairman Mao teaches us : Every comrade should be taught to arouse and develop the consciousness of the people in conformity with their levels of consciousness, to help them get organised gradually on the principle of sincere voluntariness, and to help them conduct step by step all the necessary struggles warranted by the internal and external conditions of definite time and place.

Our correct policy was given as follows : "*Guerilla war is basically the higher stage of class struggle and class struggle is the sum total of economic and political struggles. While propagating politics, comrades working in peasant areas should never minimise the necessity of raising a general slogan on economic demands. Unless the broad peasant masses are involved in the movement it will not be possible to bring the backward peasants to the stage of grasping political propaganda, and their hatred against the class enemies cannot be kept alive.*" (Deshabrati, August 1, 1967)

The first lesson to remember, therefore, is : we must not impose anything upon the masses against their wishes. By forgetting this principle we shall land ourselves in many deviations. Such deviations may be called sectarianism, Castroism etc.

"*Unless the peasants are made to participate in broad-based mass movements, it will naturally take time for the politics of seizure of power to strike firm roots in the consciousness of the peasant masses. As a result there may be a trend towards putting arms instead of politics in command. Areas of peasant's armed struggle can be developed only by successfully applying, under political leadership, the four weapons-the peasant's class analysis, class struggle, investigation and practice.*" (Deshabrati, October 17, 1968)

*"There are advanced and backward sections even within the revolutionary classes. The advanced section grasps the revolutionary principles quickly and the backward section naturally takes longer time to absorb political propaganda. That is why the necessity of waging economic struggles against the feudal class exists and it will be there in future also. Hence the need for the movement for seizure of crops. The form this struggle will take in an area will depend on its political consciousness and organisation". (ibid)*

From the above quotations from *Deshabrati* it is seen that at this phase the ideological concepts that guided our policies were briefly as follows :

Guerilla war is basically a higher form of class struggle and class struggle is the sum total of economic and political struggles. As a condition to make the peasants conscious of the politics of seizure of political power, efforts must be made to develop the peasant's mass struggles and mobilise the broad peasant masses (in these struggles). Various economic and political struggles must be waged. Simultaneously with that we must propagate Mao Tsetung Thought ceaselessly. Only then will it be possible to begin the guerilla war and build up base areas and peasant's armed struggle.

In the process of striving to build up peasant movement with the object of developing (raising it to the level of ) armed struggle, ideological concepts entirely opposed to the ones mentioned above were smuggled in. Their manifestations were :

Guerilla units have to be formed "in a completely secret manner," "*by a wholly conspiratorial method*"; we must begin with elimination of the local class enemies by such guerilla units adopting "the method of guerilla action". True, mention was made of the need for propagating the politics of seizure of power prior to actions ; "*but it would be wrong to put too much stress on the importance of carrying on an intensive propaganda before starting the guerilla attacks*". In this way will be created the initiative (of the masses) and mass actions, "*and the flames of people's will engulf the whole of the countryside*".

This meant that there could be only one meaning of 'annihilation' or 'elimination' of class enemies -an interpretation, undoubtedly, opposed to Chairman Mao's Thought.

Those who have gone through Chairman Mao's works attentively will have observed that in his various writings, the words 'annihilation', 'wiping out' and 'to destroy' are used synonymously. 'Annihilation' may mean 'to kill' in particular circumstances, but not always. Chairman Mao says : "*.....to destroy the enemy means to disarm him or 'deprive him of the power to resist' and does not mean to destroy every member of his forces physically.*" (*On Protracted War*, May 1938)

However, on the basis of ideological concepts inspiring it, the movement since Naxalbari has been divided into two phases. If the concepts of these two phases are compared, the change becomes clear :

(1) Instead of mobilising the broad peasant masses in broad-based mass movements, form guerilla units by a conspiratorial method.

(2) Previously it was said that once class struggles were developed by forming the Party units, these party units would be transformed into guerilla units. In the second phase it was said on the contrary that the intellectual comrade would form a guerilla unit by recruiting some one (poor peasant) without any knowledge of the Party unit. Instead of carrying on political propaganda for a long time and striving to build up class struggles, it was argued that it would be wrong to put too much stress on the importance of intensive propaganda.

If only the four weapons-class analysis, class struggle, investigation and practice-were applied successfully, it was said previously, peasants' guerilla action would create mass initiative and mass action and kindle the flames of people's war. But only a little later, guerilla action itself came to be regarded as guerilla war. Whenever any action took place in any district or any State, it was suggested that guerilla war had spread.

Such statements naturally had adverse effects on the minds of the comrades. A leaflet distributed by a local committee in an important rural area even went to the extent of suggesting that "We shall be organised first then we shall fight-this is wrong." This leaflet contained such impractical slogans as : "Annihilate all the class enemies." Of the two- "political propaganda" and "annihilation of class enemies"-the former was given up at one stage in the process. It came to be argued that "action itself is propaganda". Thus there was infiltration of bourgeois thinking. Previously it was written in '*Deshabrati*' (September 4, 1969) : "Another manifestation of bourgeois thinking (i.e. revisionism-S.R.C) is to exaggerate the importance of actions and to deny the importance of political propaganda. This is what Chairman Mao has called 'militarism'."

Exactly the same outlook was reflected in the activities in the urban areas. True, activities in urban areas are not detailed in the *Programme*. But from the theory of people's war it is evident that for a long time the Party's task will be to build up base areas in the countryside and make use of them for encircling, and finally, capturing the cities. This is the path of the Chinese Revolution. Our policy in regard to the cities was determined in conformity with this path. "*In the enemy-occupied cities and villages, we combined legal with illegal struggles, united the basic masses and all patriots, and divided and disintegrated the political power of the enemy and his puppets so as to prepare ourselves to attack the enemy from within in co-ordination with operations from without when conditions were ripe.*" (Lin Piao : *op.cit.* P.53)

Moreover, the line laid down by Chairman Mao in regard to the work in urban areas is as follows : To build up the proletarian base of the party, to build up all mass struggles which are just and advantageous for us, to conduct all these struggles with restraint and thus to preserve our strength and wait.

In our *Programme* we have said : "*It (the working class) also performs its vanguard role by launching struggles on political issues, both national and*

*international, by solidarity actions in support of the revolutionary classes, mainly, the revolutionary struggles of the peasantry and by sending its class conscious vanguard section to organise and lead the peasants' armed struggle. "*

From what has been said above, anyone with commonsense will realise that our first major tasks in towns should be :

- (a) to conduct extensive mass work among the proletarian masses in towns so that cadres from among workers may be sent to the villages ;
- (b) to build up solidarity movements in towns with worker's participation ;
- (c) to build up secret Party organisations with select cadres so that this work may be conducted a long time.

These tasks can be performed if the Party's proletarian base is built up and the Party branches are formed in factories in important districts. These are the primary tasks of our programme in towns.

But what did happen? It was decided to organise a mass demonstration in support of Cambodia. The programme was abandoned. Instead the impression was given out that in our country it was not necessary to wait for a long time in towns as had been the case in China. We need to create Red terror in towns also and for that it was immediately necessary to start the campaign of annihilation directed against the class enemies and the state machinery. All this was said in the name of the new international and national situation, denying the character of uneven development of the revolutionary situation. The sensitive students were exhorted to accomplish the democratic and cultural revolution simultaneously; the 'Luddite'- type action of destroying educational institutions, libraries and laboratories, in the name paralysing the educational system was begun. Needless to say, there was no discussion in the Central Committee on the subject before introducing this method in urban areas.

It has already been mentioned how the necessity of the perspective of protracted war was belittled and how the idea gained currency that quick result should be aimed at. This line of thinking was encouraged by the wrong assessment regarding the Third World War. The U.S. aggression against Cambodia was regarded as the mark of the beginning of the Third World War.

It was Comrade Majumdar who gave this thesis. Of course the Party and the Party Congress were influenced by this assessment. But it is also a fact that after Chairman Mao's statement of May 20\* had been broadcast, Comrade Satyanarain Singh of Bihar drew our attention to the wrong assessment and wrote a few letters to the General Secretary for rectifying the mistake-the Report of the Congress was yet to be published. He had requested not to publish the relevant portion. The General Secretary did not act as requested.

The Marxists' assessment of the international and national situation is not unrelated to their practical tasks. The style of work was influenced by the assessment as regards the beginning or otherwise of the Third World War.

The Party's politics and organisation are closely inter-related. Wrong politics is inevitably reflected in organisational matters. This is the law. In our state

simultaneously with the increasing leftist trend in politics, its predominance in organisational matters is also becoming pronounced day by day. Some of the concrete manifestations of this trend are given below :

(a) Mao Tsetung Thought teaches us that the rejection of the principle of strengthening of the leadership of the Party Committee means the establishing of authoritarianism. Marxism-Leninism-Mao Tsetung Thought teaches us that "The Party Committee system is an important Party institution for ensuring collective leadership and preventing any individual from monopolising of the conduct of affairs." (*On Strengthening the Party Committee System*). Chariman Mao Tsetung has repeatedly warned us against the trend of monopolising of the conduct of affairs and solving of important problems by any individual and making the membership of the Party Committee nominal. But all the members who are regular readers of '*Deshabrati*' must have observed that many an important policy has been published as "Comrade Charu Majumdar's" exhortation. In most cases even the state secretary was not informed beforehand -he also could come to know of it only through the news paper. Even the request to issue these instructions the name of the State Committee was rejected. The latest example was Comrade Charu Majumdar's declaration on the formation of the People's Army. Even the "formation of the People's Army on the soil of India" was not considered in the Party Committee, nor even in the Polit-bureau, nor even in the State Committee ! Can anyone think of such a situation ? Is it not the principle of placing an individual above the Party Committee ?

(b) At one time it was observed that comrade Charu Majumdar was sought to be established as representing the authority and as its only interpreter in India [ Shashanka's \* observation published in *Deshabrati*.] Many a member of the Central Committee had objected to the publication of such articles. Comrade Charu Majumdar also expressed his view that "publication of such articles was not correct". It was also proposed that the Party Congress Report should describe him as the sole authority of Mao Tsetung Thought in India. Quite justifiably many comrades opposed it. The Party (Congress) acknowledged his leading role-the role on which there was never any difference of opinions within the Party. But even after that, some responsible comrades in Bengal continued to project him as the authority. Is not this proposal to appoint him the sole authority ridiculous ? Mao Tsetung Thought teaches us : "Knowledge is a matter of science, and no dishonesty or conceit what so ever is permissible . What is required is definitely the reverse-honesty and modesty,"(*On Practice*). Mao Tsetung further teaches us: "*To learn is no easy matter and to apply what one has learned is even harder;*" "*This process of knowing is extremely important ; without such a long period of experience it would be difficult to understand and grasp the laws of an entire war. Neither a beginner nor a person who fights only on paper can become a really able high-ranking commander ; only one who has learned through actual fighting in war can do so.*" (*Strategy of the Revolutionary War in China*).

Only from 1967 onwards we have begun to learn to study and apply correctly Mao Tsetung's Thought and his theory of people's war. Within such a short time

is it not opposed to the party principle of collective leadership to propagate things such as 'the only interpreter' etc.?

To what level has "authoritarianism" reached today? Some of the most responsible leaders placed ultimatum before the ordinary members of the party, such as these: "This is Charu Majumdar's Party. Only those who would obey him unconditionally will remain inside the party." Is it not the policy of "commandism" that accompanies left deviation?

(c) In this State, anyone expressing dissatisfaction (over the policy) or anyone criticising in any manner (the policy of the Party) is being labelled as "revisionist" or "centrist". And such acts are being performed by Comrade Charu Majumdar himself and by many in responsible positions. Is it encouraging ideological struggle? Or, is it shelving it under threat? According to Mao Tsetung Thought, ideological struggle is the "soul of the Party". Then is not this gagging tantamount to severing the party from its soul?

(d) The Bihar State Committee, in a document submitted sometime ago, drew the attention to the "Left" (deviationist) trend inside the Party. The document together with Comrade Charu Majumdar's replies to the questions raised therein were circulated inside the Party. Our State Committee has given its verdict that it is a "revisionist document". But it is very surprising that the document in question has not even reached many units. Even a Politbureau member who stays very near to the General Secretary - within a stone's throw - was not given the document. Should it be called the honest way of conducting ideological struggle? In this article, without making any comments on the said document or on Comrade Charu Majumdar's comment on it, I want only to point out that Comrade Majumdar concluded his comment with, "This is vile", as is known to all who have gone through it. The question naturally arises - whether comrade Majumdar was commenting on any enemy document or that of criticisms of a State Committee of the Party? Is not such reaction resulting from criticisms levelled by Party members an indication of impatience inherent in "Left" deviations? Is it the correct method of conducting ideological struggle?

Chairman Mao teaches us: "*If there were no contradictions in the Party and no ideological struggles to resolve them, the Party's life would come to an end*" (*On Contradiction*, August 1937).

(e) Militarism in the policy usually casts its shadow over organisational matters too. Those who take part in "action" will form the Party Committees - the Party is being reorganised thus. The party is the Party for "actions". The Party built on the ideology of armed struggles has been reduced to a terrorist Party.

(f) "*We should carry on constant propaganda among the people on the facts of world progress and the bright future ahead so that they will build their confidence in victory.*" By this, Chairman Mao never intended that there should be any exaggerated propaganda. Chairman Mao also says: "*At the same time we must tell the people and tell our comrades that there will be twists and turns in our roads.*" (*On the Chungking Negotiations*, Oct. 7, 1945). In the pages of *Deshabrati*

one comes across many instances of exaggeration. A few among those are being mentioned here.

(1) The "actions" the students and youth are conducting in educational institutions are said to be comparable to the May 4th Movement of 1919, of China.

(2) In the immediate past, hoisting of Red-flags over the factories and educational institutions were said to be comparable to the historic Kharkhov movement.

(3) It is claimed that in Bengal thousands of poor peasants have joined the guerilla units. Chairman Mao teaches us : "In all mass movements we must make a basic investigation and analysis of the number of active supporters, opponents and neutrals and must not decide problems subjectively and without basis." (*Methods of work of Party Committees*, March 13, 1949)

But here Party Committees are not educated to undertake "basic investigation" and "basic analysis" in relation to any movement. Yet report on any movement is presented in such a way as if it is quite impressive.

Many worthy comrades have become martyrs after responding to the call of creating red terror in urban areas. For inspiration to these comrades it is being propagated that the comrades are being 'tempered' through the process. (*Deshabrati*, Nov. 7 issue, editorial). There is a line in Chairman's writings on tempering of comrades :

*"....it is imperative for the revolutionary ranks to turn the backward villages into advanced, consolidated base areas, into great military, political, economic and cultural bastions of the revolution from which to fight their vicious enemies who are using the cities for attacks on rural districts, and in this way gradually to achieve the complete victory of the revolution through protracted fighting ; it is imperative for them to do so if they do not wish to compromise with imperialism and its lackeys but are determined to fight on, and if they intend to build up and temper their forces, and avoid decisive battles with a powerful enemy while their own strength is inadequate." (The Chinese Revolution and the Chinese Communist Party, Dec. 1939.)*

In our State we could not develop one single base area where we could shift our comrades in times of need. In such a situation, the policy of creating red terror in urban areas and thus tempering the comrades is nothing but extreme adventurism.

In the process of developing peasant struggle throughout the country to its present stage since Naxalbari, we have lost many worthy comrades. Compare with this the total number of comrades that we lost during the period of creating red terror in urban areas of our State. It would be apparent that the loss is heavier in the latter instance. Self-sacrifice is essential in revolution but we must also weigh our losses against the gains achieved. Incurring so much loss was not necessary simply for the purpose of tempering the comrades.

It is said that we are in an era of self-sacrifice. Chairman Mao teaches us that fighting is the pivotal point of all our strategy and tactics. Self-preservation is necessary for waging a war ; again war itself demands self-sacrifice. The object of

war is specifically “to preserve oneself and destroy the enemy.” In the strategy of people’s war there cannot be an era of exclusive self-sacrifice or an era of exclusive self-preservation. In the strategy of people’s war, one has to go ahead step by step through protracted struggles. The correctness of Mao Tsetung Thought is well-illustrated even today by the people’s war that is going on around us in our country. To talk of the era of exclusive self-sacrifice is nothing but an empty slogan.

Comrades, today, undoubtedly, we are standing at a very critical juncture. The danger of Chairman’s China being attacked has further increased with the expansion of war of aggression waged by the U.S. Imperialism from Cambodia to Laos. In spite of this, it would be correct to say that revolution is still the dominant trend. The crisis faced by the ruling classes has increased in depth and extent. The holding of general elections, before the scheduled time, clearly indicate this. Chairman Mao teaches us : ‘Get rid of the baggage and start up the machinery.’ (‘To start up the machinery’ means to make good use of the organ of thought.) Mao Tsetung further teaches us : *“Communists must always go into the whys and wherefores of anything, use their own heads and carefully think over whether or not it corresponds to reality and is really well-founded ; on no account should they follow blindly and encourage slavishness.”* (Rectify the Party’s Style of Work, Feb. 1942)

- Resist the ultra-adventurist trend raising its head in our Party.

[Translated by us from the original in Bengali]

[Source : *Samakal* (a Bengali periodical), August 12 & August 26, 1978]





## VI

# **CERTAIN IMPORTANT ARTICLES FROM *THE LIBERATION***

# **MARCH ONWARD BY SUMMING UP THE EXPERIENCE OF THE PEASANT REVOLUTIONARY STRUGGLE OF INDIA.**

**CHARU MAJUMDAR**

We differ from the programme of the revisionists on three questions :

First, we hold that the democratic revolution can win victory only through armed struggle, that is, through people's war.

Second, the village is the centre and the peasantry are the main force of this people's war. This people's war is a peasant war.

Third, this people's war can be victorious only under the guidance of Mao Tsetung Thought. This is why we have accepted Mao Tsetung Thought as the only tool both for our theory and practice.

We stand for unifying India and for recognizing the right of the nationalities to self-determination. In order to be able to grasp the significance of this slogan, we have to realize that our enemies are not weak. Imperialism and social-imperialism rank among the foremost industrial powers of the world. Thanks to the manoeuvres of the imperialists, Indian comprador-bureaucrat capital, though weak economically, is regarded as the leader of the national movement, while feudalism has continued to maintain its entrenched position in India for thousands of years. So, our enemies are not weak. But they can be defeated. This is so because ours is a country of 500 million people. A vast force will be generated once all the revolutionary forces of this country are united. It is possible to destroy our enemies with the help of this force.

Our party is a Party of class struggle and our only task is to develop class struggle. And it is in the interest of this class struggle that we must recognize the right of nationalities to self-determination. This is so because imperialism ruled our country for two hundred years through its policy of 'divide and rule'. By this the imperialists were able to create distrust and suspicion in the mind of every nationality about other nationalities. It is only by sowing the seeds of such distrust and suspicion that the imperialists could carry on their rule. Therefore, the working class must recognize this right of self-determination in order to dispel this distrust. Only when this is done, will it be possible to build the unity of all the revolutionary forces on a nation-wide scale and we shall be able to actively resist the divisive tactics of bourgeois nationalism.

We advocate introducing a system under which the administration will be carried on by revolutionary committees at all levels. This is a thing that did not

form previously a part of the programme of democratic revolution. This is a contribution of the Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution of China. We are adopting it because we believe that the Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution of China is the third revolution that has influenced the world system. After the first revolution - the Great October Socialist Revolution - the democratic revolution of every country became part of the world proletarian socialist revolution. After the second revolution - the great Chinese Revolution - the revolution in every country can be victorious only by taking the path of people's war. Exactly in the same way, today, after the victory of the third revolution - the Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution - the democratic revolution of every country has become a component part of this Cultural Revolution. This is because no revolution of any country in the present era can win victory without fighting revisionism. Today, revisionism is the enemy of the revolution of every country and its weapon is bourgeois democracy. So, the democratic revolution must necessarily fight against bourgeois democracy, that is, against institutions like elections, parliaments, etc., in order to be able to move forward. Therefore, we can never make use of these institutions in carrying forward the democratic revolution today. We must carry on administration with the co-operation of the masses and through revolutionary committees which include their leaders and which are formed with their co-operation. We cannot say just now what the character of the revolutionary committees would be like. It would be bookish to talk of implementing into the 'three in one' alliance which grew out of the Cultural Revolution of China. Our revolutionary committees will grow out of the experience of our struggle and we shall have to work out their form on the basis of that experience.

None of the three great revolutions - the great October Socialist Revolution, the great Chinese Revolution and the Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution - is a revolution of a particular country; on the contrary, each of them is a pillar of triumph of the international working class in its victorious march to conquer the world. Each of these revolutions has worldwide influence and the experience of each of these has enriched the arsenal of the international working class. After the October Revolution it was no longer possible for the bourgeoisie to lead any revolution, because they were frightened by the victory of this revolution. So, it was the working class which had to lead every revolution after the October Revolution. The victory of the great Chinese Revolution has frightened world imperialism. So, revolution in every country has to reckon with the reality of intervention by the world imperialist system. That is why the revolution in every country must learn the lessons of the Chinese Revolution and can be victorious only by taking the path of people's war. Similarly, today, after the great Proletarian Cultural Revolution, revisionism, which has assumed the form of social-imperialism, has turned into the enemy of every revolution. That is why no revolution in any country can win victory without fighting revisionism.

The new thing that we are saying is that we must unite with China and the Chinese Communist Party led by Chairman Mao and Vice-Chairman Lin Biao and that by uniting with it we unite with the revolutionary people the world over.

After World War II, particularly after the death of the great Stalin, imperialism aided by the internal reactionary revisionist forces succeeded in taking away all the achievements of the international working class. Imperialism dragged the world almost to a position similar to the one that existed in 1920 when there was only one socialist country in the world- the Soviet Union. Today, there exist in the world only socialist China and another small country, socialist Albania. There is no other socialist country. Yet we assert that this is the era of total collapse of imperialism and worldwide victory of socialism. This is indeed a fact. This is so because the revolutionary people the world over have accepted Mao Tsetung Thought and grasped the limitless power of people's war, and the fighting masses in various countries of the world have already begun their sacred struggle to destroy imperialism with revolutionary determination and boundless confidence. That force may be weak today but the inexorable law of history is such that it will accumulate strength with the passing of every day until it becomes irresistible. This will destroy imperialism and social- imperialism in its victorious forward march.

This is an era of revolutions and as such, great upheavals will take place in different countries; even imperialism will come forward to lead the upheavals in various countries in order to deceive the masses. So, the compass of revolution in this era is the Communist Party of China led by Chairman Mao and Vice-Chairman Lin Biao. Whether one follows the Communist Party of China, Chairman Mao and Vice-Chairman Lin Biao is the only yardstick to judge a revolutionary. Every party, every struggle and even every individual has to be judged by this yardstick. Today, China is the centre of world revolution and the base area of the revolutionary struggle of every country. So, uniting with the Communist Party of China means uniting with the revolutionary people of the whole world.

In order to put this programme into practice we shall have to study constantly Chairman Mao's Thought and sum up the experience of the revolutionary struggle of the revolutionary people of India.

### **Our Experience**

We learnt the following lessons from the Naxalbari struggle:

1. The peasant fought not for land or crops, but for political power.
2. The peasant carried on armed struggle against the armed attacks of the counter-revolutionary state apparatus.
3. The peasant relied on the weapons that he himself made in order to carry on his armed attacks, and snatched away firearms with the help of these weapons.
4. The peasant relied not on others but stood on his own feet to carry on this struggle.
5. This struggle developed only by fighting against revisionism.
6. This fight against revisionism can be carried on only with the Thought of Chairman Mao and only when the peasant masses grasp Chairman Mao's Thought and put it into practice.

## Four Questions

After the Naxalbari struggle came the struggle of Srikakulam. The latter has demonstrated that the peasant can carry on protracted war only through guerrilla warfare. Guerrilla warfare is the peasant's own mode of fighting. Even after one accepts the guerrilla warfare there still remain four main questions. The revolutionary peasants of India have solved these questions.

**First Question :** Where to start guerrilla warfare ?

The wrong conceptions regarding this question were that guerrilla warfare can be started only in mountainous areas or where there is jungle. Guerrilla war is the people's war of the peasants, and Chairman Mao has taught us that people's war can be waged only by relying on the masses ; therefore, guerrilla warfare can be started wherever there are peasants. By waging guerrilla warfare in the plains the revolutionary peasants of India have demonstrated that it is possible to wage guerrilla warfare in the plains also, that it is possible to wage it wherever there are peasant masses.

**Second Question :** Is it possible to wage guerrilla warfare without mass movement and mass organisation ?

The revolutionary peasants have demonstrated through their struggle that neither mass movement nor mass organization is indispensable for waging guerrilla warfare. What is indispensable is the dissemination and spread of revolutionary politics, that is, the Thought of Chairman Mao. And this can be done only by secret Party organizations. It is possible to wage guerrilla warfare and also to unite the masses by giving prominence to politics, by forming guerrilla squads through secret Party organizations and by using them against the class enemy. The spread of guerrilla 'actions' helps the broad masses to participate in the struggle. Mass organization and mass movement increase the tendency towards open and economist movement and expose the revolutionary workers before the enemy, which makes it easier for the enemy to launch attacks. Therefore, open mass movement and mass organization are obstacles in the way of the development and expansion of guerrilla warfare.

**Third Question :** On whom to rely for waging guerrilla warfare ?

To this question the revolutionary peasant struggle of India has given the clear-cut answer that the development and expansion of guerrilla warfare is possible only by relying on the poor and landless peasants ; no other class is able to wage this struggle. This is because it is the poor and landless peasants that have the most intense hatred against the feudal class. This class hatred of the poor and landless peasants can be roused by inspiring them with revolutionary politics -the politics of establishing the state power of the peasant masses. And it is only they who can develop the guerrilla warfare by conquering death, by undergoing boundless self-sacrifice and through the most arduous labour. Their class hatred helps them to remain steadfast in their struggle and they alone can bring about a high tide of revolution by uniting the whole of the peasantry. Our experience shows that wherever the petty bourgeois intellectuals tried to lead the struggle, guerrilla warfare failed to develop, the aims of the struggle were not pursued, guerrilla warfare could

not be linked with class struggle, the ludicrous tendency to purchase guns in the name of collecting arms increased, resistance to attacks by police could not be organised and, what is more, even self-defence was not possible. The failures in big 'actions' generated frustration.

### **Role of the Revolutionary Intellectual**

In India, which has been subjected to imperialist exploitation for two hundred years, the intelligentsia have an important role to play. This is so because the broad masses of the poor and landless peasants in our country are unable to read or write. But in order to develop the revolutionary peasant war and bring firmness and steadfastness into the struggle it is necessary to spread and propagate *Quotations from Chairman Mao Tsetung* among the peasants, to help them go through again and again Chairman Mao's "three constantly read articles" and take lessons from these articles, and to help them study everyday the "Three Main Rules of Discipline" and the "Eight Points for Attention" for fighters. Today, the intellectuals must undertake this task. Moreover, it must be remembered that these writings are necessary today not only to develop the struggle of the peasant masses. Whoever thinks in terms of revolution, be he a worker, a peasant or a petty bourgeois individual, must necessarily study these writings repeatedly and take lessons from them. Only in this way the level of political consciousness of the fighting masses will be raised. We shall be able to learn ever newer lessons and raise our consciousness if we study these writings repeatedly linking them with the experience of life. Therefore, these are the only things for the revolutionaries to read. So, the revolutionary intellectuals must shoulder the responsibility of emphasizing the importance of these writings and creating the urge for learning lessons from them not only among the peasant masses but also among the revolutionary masses of all the other classes. It is only by working in this way that they will be able to apply the Thought of Chairman Mao creatively and develop as good communists. The revolutionary intellectuals must fulfil another task, the task of propagating among the peasant masses the experience of the revolutionary war that is now going on in various countries of the world, and of spreading and propagating the lessons of the great Chinese revolution among the peasants. It is only by carrying out these tasks that the revolutionary intellectuals can integrate with the poor and landless peasants and thus become good revolutionaries.

### ***Fourth Question* : How to start guerrilla warfare ?**

To this question the revolutionary peasant struggle of India has given the answer that guerrilla warfare can be started only by liquidating the feudal classes in the countryside. And this campaign for the annihilation of the class enemy can be carried out only by inspiring the poor and landless peasants with the politics of establishing the political power of the peasants in the countryside by destroying the domination of the feudal classes. That is why the annihilation of the class enemy is the higher form of class struggle while the act of annihilating class enemies through guerrilla action is the primary stage of the guerrilla struggle. The annihilation of the class enemy does not only mean liquidating individuals, but also means liquidating the political, economic and social authority of the class

enemy. The revolutionary peasant struggle of India has conclusively proved that once the guerrilla fighters deviate from the campaign of annihilation of class enemies, politics loses its place of prominence among them resulting even in moral degeneration of the guerrilla units. The petty bourgeois, the intellectual, the middle peasant or the peasant of any other class in the village is unable to assume leadership of this struggle, because the class hatred among them is not nearly as intense as that among the poor and landless peasants. The poor and landless peasants can establish their leadership over the whole of the peasant masses only through the campaign for the annihilation of the class enemy.

The revolutionary peasant struggle of India has also conclusively proved that in order to be able to wage guerrilla warfare and to persist in armed struggle we must daily and constantly carry on struggle against revisionist ideas. We must evolve a new style of work through our struggle against revisionist ideas. Only thus can we fulfil the heavy responsibility that lies on our shoulders today. We must make our links with the revolutionary masses firmer and deeper at every stage of the struggle, must improve the level of our political propaganda and application of the Thought of Chairman Mao. We seek the co-operation of the masses not merely in struggle; we must adopt the method of holding discussions and exchanging opinions with the revolutionary masses in conducting Party work also and even in deciding the policy of the Party. We should not hesitate to accept the views of the revolutionary masses, because the Party has no interest other than that of revolution.

The fight against revisionism is not a matter of our inner-Party struggle alone, it must also be carried on among the broad masses. Creating a high tide in struggle depends on the extent to which we can spread the fight against revisionism among the broad peasant masses. Revisionism is the main enemy of this era. Therefore, the struggle against revisionism both inside and outside the Party will be our main struggle.

### **Sectarian Tendency**

Sometimes a sectarian tendency creeps into this struggle against revisionism. Our Party members must be vigilant about this tendency also. The form in which this sectarian tendency is expressing itself at present is the sort of thinking among us that after the formation of our Party we have become the sole revolutionary force in the country. Of course, there can be no doubt whatsoever that ours is the only revolutionary Party in India. Naturally, this tendency weakens our reliance on the revolutionary class, which results in isolation from it. Let us cite an example. The decision to form a guerrilla squad was adopted at a certain *baithak* [group meeting] of poor and landless peasants. When the assembled poor and landless peasant youths raised their hands for enlisting themselves as guerrillas, the Party leader enlisted in the squad only those who were connected with the Party organization and did not admit the poor and landless peasants who were not connected with the Party organization, because he thought that the latter were not revolutionary enough. This incident clearly proves that this sectarian tendency

exists in our struggle against revisionism. It has been seen on many occasions that we form the guerrilla squads only with those who are connected with the Party and do not enlist those revolutionary poor and landless peasants who happen to be outside the Party. Even in places where we are forming such guerrilla squads, the Party leaders have been found to be not enthusiastic in enhancing the initiative or raising the political consciousness of those new squads. As a result of this these squads remain inactive in many cases. These are sectarian tendencies.

Many revolutionaries are breaking away from different groups and parties to join us. There may be hesitation on the part of our comrades to work in co-operation with them, because they were opposing us until recently. But this hesitation is a sectarian tendency. We must get accustomed to working in co-operation with all others. But this does not mean that we should take those who are coming from other groups or parties directly into the folds of our Party; no, we are certainly not going to do that. This is because as a result of working in those groups or parties they have acquired many wrong and revisionist ideas which run counter to Chairman Mao's Thought and these ideas cannot be rectified overnight. That requires experience, education and time, and in order to enable them to have experience and education we must work in co-operation with them. Only in this way can we educate them with new experience and transform them. So, in order to ensure that our main struggle against revisionism will continue to be firm and vigorous, we must also wage struggle against these sectarian tendencies.

Under cover of revolutionary phrase-mongering quite a few people are raising the question : Well, the Central Organizing Committee is all right and we obey it, but as for the other committees, we don't recognize them. Though garbed in Left phrases this is a bourgeois individualist tendency, pure and simple, and as such, a revisionist tendency. Any attempt whatsoever to undermine the democratic centralism of the Party that is led by a revolutionary leadership strengthens only the reactionaries and harms the revolutionary struggle. We must keep in mind the fact that in this era of revolutionary struggles faith in the Party and faith in the masses are the only weapons with which we can overcome the severest trials in the course of the struggle. Lack of faith in the authority of the Party breaks the backbone of the struggle. This is why the reactionaries always spread slanders against the Party in an attempt to destroy that faith of the Party members. The history of the October Revolution has proved it; this has also been proved in the course of the Chinese Revolution. The imperialists tried to weaken the authority of the Bolshevik Party by depicting Lenin in a most vile manner ; they tried to weaken the faith of the Chinese people in the Communist Party of China by 'killing' Chairman Mao time and again. The Soviet revisionists destroyed the authority of the Soviet Party by depicting Stalin in a most vile manner and succeeded even in usurping its leadership.

We must always remember that the revolutionary people of India repeatedly participated in the communist movement, fought, made untold sacrifice and laid down their lives. We are the heirs to the glorious tradition which the heroic martyrs



of Punnapra-Vayalur, the heroic fighters of Telengana and the fighting peasants and workers of every province of India established by sacrificing innumerable lives ; we must be true to them and carry forward their tradition. The heroes of Kayur went to the gallows with the name of the Communist Party on their lips ; it is that Communist Party which we represent. This Party has become today's Communist Party of India (Marxist-Leninist). In order precisely to carry forward that tradition it is necessary for us to sum up their great experience and create the most intense class hatred against wrong ideas.

Comrades, let us not forget that India , our motherland, is a country of countless martyrs and that the peasant masses of India have repeatedly fought and made enormous sacrifices. Therefore, we can possess a vast power and carry our revolution to victory if we rely on the fighting peasants and march onward resolutely. Repudiate all ideas that weaken the revolution and learn to recognize them as wrong ideas. Every tendency that overestimates the strength of the enemy is a revisionist tendency; learn to recognise it as such and fight against it. Learn to respect the revolutionary peasants of India, the poor and landless peasants of India. We can never be led into a wrong path if we have reliance on them.

*Long live the Indian Revolution !  
Long live Chairman Mao !  
A long, longlife to Chairman Mao !*

*-December, 1969*



## MAKE THE 1970'S THE DECADE OF LIBERATION

### CHARU MAJUMDAR

The year 1969 has ended. What a year it was, what great victories the revolutionary masses of India won during the year! The spring thunder of the Naxalbari struggle in 1967 came as the happy augury. The revolutionaries of India listened to the radio broadcasts from Peking to understand the significance of this event. In November of that year was formed the All India Co-ordination Committee of Communist Revolutionaries. What vacillation and obstacles, what distrust and treachery, were there both inside the Committee and outside. Gradually, the Committee became the meeting-place of the revolutionaries, overcame vacillation and won recognition. Attempts to follow the directives of the Committee were noticed everywhere and it was this that made possible the Srikakulam struggle. As this struggle developed beyond the scope of the Co-ordination Committee, the Communist party of India (Marxist-Leninist) was formed to meet the historical necessity. A new high tide appeared in the struggle with the formation of the revolutionary Party.

The peasant armed struggle is already raging everywhere, that is, in Tripura, Assam, West Bengal, Bihar, Uttar Pradesh, Punjab, Himachal Pradesh, Orissa and, above all, in Andhra. Red political power in rudimentary form has come into existence in Srikakulam. The struggle may spread to Tamil Nadu and Kerala any moment. Active Party units have been formed in every province. And all this has happened in the space of just one year. We must certainly learn to recognize this tremendous advance of the revolutionary peasant armed struggle as an uncommon phenomenon. This is why I have said that 1969 was a year of great victories of the revolutionary masses of India.

How was this uncommon advance possible? This advance was possible because the Indian revolutionaries received the guidance of Chairman Mao Tsetung's leadership every day through the radio broadcasts from Peking. This made it possible to arrive at a unanimity all over India regarding the general line and the main task of the Party. The experience of our struggle every day is constantly smashing the revisionist ideas in us and the unity among us is growing firmer in the light of this experience. The Party ranks are becoming self-reliant and their confidence is growing.

The ruling clique of India is caught up in a severe crisis and the revolutionary peasant armed struggle is daily accentuating the internal conflicts of the crisis-ridden ruling classes. It was in 1969 that the Congress party got split. All the governments at the State level and at the Centre are in the grip of instability. In

Bihar the instability is such that no cabinet whatsoever can be formed. The so-called United Front is proving incapable of standing on its own legs as the alternative to the Congress. Both in Kerala and West Bengal the conflicts among the parties of the United Front are taking the form of open clashes. The revolutionary situation in India is daily becoming more excellent. The year 1970 has arrived with the promise of the birth of a disciplined people's army and the emergence of extensive liberated areas

Beset with crises at home and abroad, imperialism and social-imperialism have come to their wits' end. To save themselves from these crises they are stepping up war preparations. Imperialism means war. The danger of a war is most acute today. This is precisely because imperialism and social-imperialism are in grave crisis. No matter where it breaks out the war will inevitably be directed against the great socialist China, because China is today the pivot of all the revolutionary struggles the world over, the source of inspiration for them and their reliable base area.

Today, imperialism and social-imperialism are openly threatening to use nuclear weapons. Hence, the possibility of the use of nuclear weapons in this war is real, because this war will bring about the destruction of world imperialism. While greeting the 1970's, the great Communist Party of China has pointed out: "The emergence of Soviet revisionist social-imperialism is but an episode in the course of imperialism heading for total collapse. "Chairman Mao has taught us that the reactionaries will never **"step down from the stage of history of their own accord"**. Hence, the danger of the use of nuclear weapons in the war, and the danger is very real, too.

The danger of a war has never been so real since World War II as at the present moment. This is why Chairman Mao has given the call to the world's people; **"People of the world, unite and oppose the war of aggression launched by any imperialism or social-imperialism, especially one in which atom bombs are used as weapons! If such a war breaks out, the people of the world should use revolutionary war to eliminate the war of aggression, and preparations should be made right now!"** To be able to respond to this great call of Chairman Mao's we must make preparations - both theoretical and material. To be prepared theoretically means raising the level of our study and application of Mao Tsetung Thought. We must constantly study *Quotations from Chairman Mao Tsetung* and his "three articles" and judge our own activities in the light of these teachings and try constantly to apply them correctly. To be prepared materially means, first, to carry on propaganda about the danger of a war not only among the members and sympathizers of our Party but also among the broad masses. The possibility of a nuclear war breaking out must be clearly pointed out during this propaganda. We must, however, be careful and see that our propaganda does not turn into the scaremongering of the revisionists. Our propaganda should be such as to create confidence among the masses and help them see that the horrifying picture of destruction of a nuclear war assiduously propagated for so long by imperialism and social-imperialism is false. The nuclear weapon is also a paper tiger. Nuclear weapons can do no harm to people staying in underground rooms or tunnels.

There is a limit to the power of destruction of every weapon. Once we know this limit we can find ways to protect ourselves from it. The spectre of radiation effects and such other things, which imperialism and social - imperialism have publicized widely, is sheer nonsense concocted by them with a view to stifling the struggle of the revolutionary masses. We fear neither war nor the nuclear weapons. The confidence must be strengthened among the masses that in case the war breaks out it will bring our liberation as well as the liberation of mankind nearer. No force whatsoever can ever prevent the victory of the people and the onward march of the world.

Secondly, we must prepare the *materiel* for carrying on a revolutionary war. And what constitute our *materiel*? Are they the dynamites, explosives and fire-arms? Certainly not. Man is the main *materiel* in a revolutionary war. Once inspired with the revolutionary theory, that is, Mao Tsetung Thought, men turn into spiritual atom bombs which are more powerful than thousands of atom bombs. Ours is a country of 500 million people. Once we can rouse them with Mao Tsetung Thought so that they participate in revolutionary activity, we shall be able to put into effect all kinds of daring plans, carry the revolutionary war against the war of aggression through to victory, and even face a nuclear war.

Comrades, a great responsibility lies on our shoulders. Let us overcome all our vacillations and recall Chairman Mao's teaching that true revolutionaries are those who voluntarily **"take the heavy loads themselves."** Think of the poor and landless peasants of our country and the boundless misery, endless oppression and grinding poverty, which for thousands of years have oppressed and are still oppressing them cruelly. Comrades, it is you who possess **Mao Tsetung Thought** - the great magic weapon - with which you can end the exploitation and oppression weighing them down heavily, and bring happiness to the tens of millions of our countrymen. There is nothing more sacred and worthy than being able to lay down one's life for this great cause, and we are fortunate to have the privilege of being among the first to sacrifice everything for this great cause. This is precisely why we are Communists, why we are disciples of Chairman Mao.

The battle of annihilation, started by our Party and led by the poor and landless peasants, must be carried forward for the establishment of Red political power in various areas, and must spread to every state and throughout India. The poor and landless peasants will become self-reliant and politically conscious, and their creative power will develop through waging the guerrilla warfare. What seems impossible today will become possible tomorrow, and a new man, who fears neither the most arduous hardship nor death, will be born in the course of this struggle. Faced with such men, imperialism, social-imperialism and all their lackeys are certain to flinch and flee in dread like beaten curs. The people of the world will then chase them, frightened rats scurrying along the street, and beat them to death; the imperialist system will be buried and a new world without exploitation will arise.

The emergence of social-imperialism is but an episode in the era in which the world imperialist system is heading for total collapse. So, the various groups in India today, that have united to oppose the battle of annihilation by using the

name of Chairman Mao, are also bound to fail in their attempt. This is the law of history. World revisionism is trying to unify these groups under the banner of spurious politics. This attempt of theirs is also bound to fail. We must intensify further our struggle against these spurious theories of theirs. Only thus can we enhance the vigilance of the members and sympathizers of our Party and prevent the infiltration of the agents of imperialism and social - imperialism into the Party.

Comrades, this is not the time to scatter our forces for carrying on propaganda. Select a particular area, a particular unit and a particular squad and then proceed to carry out successfully the battle of annihilation . Then select another unit and another squad, and carry on as before. In this way concentrate your work in one third of your selected area and, after our forces are consolidated in that part of the area, spread the struggle to the remaining parts. This is the method pointed out by Chairman Mao, and this is the only correct method. Let us not indulge in aimless political propaganda; the political propaganda must serve the aim of carrying out successfully the battle of annihilation.

Organization means cadres. Therefore, we must exert ourselves to the utmost to raise cadres from the masses of poor and landless peasants. Learn how to apply Chairman Mao's cadre policy in every field of work. The rearing of cadres is closely related to our giving them increasingly more responsibility. Try to promote the poor and landless peasant cadres to higher committees and teach them how to carry out the responsibilities of the higher committees. The poor and landless peasant cadres will be able to organize work in a much better way.

Stop holding big conferences and meetings of cadres. Start consulting and exchanging opinions with the cadres at all levels as well as with the revolutionary masses on all matters. Encourage criticism inside the Party. Self-reliance and confidence are no doubt very good qualities but these may also give rise to self-complacency and arrogance, the two most harmful vices for a revolutionary. These vices can be rectified only through criticism. That is why in the present period we must encourage the comrades in making criticism. We have many things to learn about criticism also. We should always encourage criticism on the basis of work.

We must lay special stress on our work among women and children. Our attitude to the children should be such as to help them realize their dignity. We must educate them in Mao Tsetung Thought. Only thus can we safeguard the future of the revolution.

Comrades, never belittle the work you are doing. Who else, if not you, made the victories achieved in 1969 possible ? Who else, if not you, dealt a telling blow to bourgeois nationalism by declaring that "China's Chairman is our Chairman" ?

The 1970's is here. Let us make this decade the decade of liberation of the vast exploited and oppressed masses of India. With Chairman Mao as our leader, we will surely triumph !

*From Liberation , February 1970*



# A FEW WORDS ABOUT GUERRILLA ACTIONS

CHARU MAJUMDAR

*[This article is based on notes taken at a meeting of revolutionary peasant cadres at which Comrade Charu Majumdar spoke. According to Liberation, the notes are approved by the author]*

*1. How to form guerrilla units:* Complete secrecy must be observed in forming a guerrilla unit. The unit should be kept secret from those among the local people whose vigilance has not yet reached the required level, and even from those Party units which have not yet fully mastered the methods and discipline required for illegal work.

The method of forming a guerrilla unit has to be *wholly conspiratorial*. No inkling of such a conspiracy should be given out even in the meetings of the political units of the Party. This conspiracy should be between individuals and on a person-to-person basis. The petty bourgeois intellectual comrade must take the initiative in this respect as far as possible. He should approach the poor peasant who, in his opinion, has the most revolutionary potentiality, and whisper in his ears : "Don't you think it a good thing to finish off such and such a *jotedar* ?" This is how the guerrillas have to be selected and recruited singly and in secret, and organized into a unit.

However, before proceeding to do all this it is imperative to propagate to a fairly considerable extent the politics of seizure of political power by armed force among the masses and, in particular, among the masses of poor peasants. But it would be wrong to put too much stress on the importance of carrying on an intensive propaganda before starting the guerrilla attacks. The point that political power has to be seized by armed force must be made very clear, that is, the peasants must be roused, and emphasis must be put on liberating their own villages. The peasants have to seize power *locally* in their respective areas so that the peasant masses themselves, instead of the feudal exploiters, become the sole authority in settling all their local affairs. This is precisely why we must begin by *eliminating the local class enemies*. Once an area is liberated from the clutches of class enemies (some are annihilated while some others flee), the repressive state machinery is deprived of its eyes and ears making it impossible for the police to know who is a guerrilla and who is not, and who is tilling his own land and who tills that of the *jotedars* (this makes it possible even to carry out the work of land reform under the supervision of a revolutionary committee which is a part of the people's state power).

The guerrilla units must be small, well-knit and mobile. So, a guerrilla unit should not, in general, have more than seven members. Generally speaking, the yardstick to judge the members of a guerrilla unit is whether or not they can annihilate one or two persons by a sudden attack with the help of ordinary traditional weapons.

The following information must not be known outside the guerrilla unit. They are :

- (a) the names of the guerrillas;
- (b) the identity of that particular class enemy for whose elimination conspiracy has been made ; and
- (c) the time and date of the guerrilla action.

**2. Leader :** It is necessary to appoint a commander after the unit is formed.

**3. Investigation :** We should rouse the hatred of the majority of the local peasant masses against the particular class enemy marked out by us. And it is for this reason that we should arrange an investigation on a small scale with a view to knowing their opinions. In other words, the point is that we should not be guided by subjective thinking in determining our target ; on the contrary, we should be guided by the will of the majority of the people. Once the target is determined we must keep watch over the movements of the class enemy in a thorough-going manner so that we can fix the best possible time and place for the attack. This part of the investigation should be done especially by the leader of the unit himself.

**4. Shelter :** The most important job before the guerrilla action is to make arrangements for safe shelters. This job must be done with utmost care and attention. Every guerrilla must *himself* arrange for his own shelter in the house of a person he relies upon most. None else should do it for him.

It is possible for a peasant to live in hiding among the peasant masses. But this is not easy at all for a petty bourgeois intellectual comrade who is a suspect to the enemy. He faces great inconvenience in this regard. Therefore, great care should be taken in finding a shelter for him in a safe place.

The shelters should be separate and located in *different* villages far removed from the place where a guerrilla action is to take place. In the town it is possible for one to live in hiding in a house without letting even one's next-door neighbour know about it. But it is an altogether different matter in the village. Therefore, in the village the house in which a comrade has taken shelter should have around it the houses of people who have sympathy with our work.

**5. Weapons :** We should not use any kind of fire-arms at this stage. The guerrilla unit must rely wholly on choppers, spears, javelins and sickles. The tendency to lay stress on making or purchasing locally-made guns and on capturing guns from the class enemies may arise. We must fight this tendency and patiently explain to the comrades that, even if we manage to get hold of a few guns, at this stage we shall not be able to retain them, and these will, almost inevitably, fall into the hands of the police. If, however, we come to possess a few guns in spite of this, surely we are not going to destroy them or hand them over to the enemy; we must *hide* them for use *in future* and resist any attempt to make futile use of them now.

The petty bourgeois intellectual cadres and those leaders who have to travel far and wide may, however, carry small pistols with them to frighten away, disperse or kill the enemy, if they find themselves suddenly surrounded by him. But we should never give unnecessary importance to fire-arms, because that might encourage us to put our reliance not on the *people*, but on *weapons*, which is dangerous.

**6. Planning :** The petty bourgeois intellectual comrade must then sit together with the guerrilla unit and, basing himself on the findings of the investigation, proceed to work out a plan of the whole thing, including the paths of retreat, and when and where they are to meet next. This plan must be made carefully and in great details.

**7. Attack :** The guerrillas should come from different directions pretending, as far as possible, to be innocent persons and gather at a previously appointed place, wait for the enemy and, when the opportune moment comes, spring at the enemy and kill him.

We must never be impatient or hasty, especially so in the case of the first attack which has the greatest importance. We should rather be prepared to make several attempts than make a hasty attack and fail. It may be difficult in the first few actions to raid the house of the class enemy and confiscate his movable property ; so, it would be better to lay more stress only on killing him. Later, when the masses are roused and take part in various kinds of work, and the attacks become regular, easier and more powerful, the enemy can be killed even in his stronghold and his property confiscated. The conditions will gradually become so favourable that after carrying out a guerrilla action, the guerrillas themselves will be able to address the masses, explain before them the importance of such actions and, with arms in their hands, even inspire the masses by making fiery speeches.

Before the first attack is carried out successfully, we must remove the rich peasant cadre, if there be any, from the guerrilla unit even if he is willing to stay on. The middle peasant cadre and the petty bourgeois intellectual comrades should also be removed, if possible. When guerrilla actions become more frequent we have to gradually bring in these willing fighters. In fact, a time will come when the battle cry will be, "He who has not dipped his hand in the blood of class enemies can hardly be called a communist."

**8. Dispersal :** After an attack is made the guerrillas must be ordered to disperse and go to their respective shelters. Every thing that may serve as a clue must be destroyed.

The guerrilla unit must be visited frequently, regularly and in secret in order to keep up the morale of the fighters. The fear that invariably grows in their minds after the first action has to be dispelled with the help of politics and inspiring stories.

**9. Political Work :** Even though completely calm outwardly, the atmosphere will be charged with the expectancy of some impending event. Though the people will invariably be elated they will still remain hesitant and neutral. At this time the political cadre and the guerrilla units will have to work their way forward secretly and with great caution. Through verbal propaganda and by explaining the



programme of guerrilla action they will have to gradually remove the indifferent attitude of the masses, win them over firmly to our side and enlist their sympathy and active support for us.

The political cadre will rather pose to be a neutral person, and start a whisper campaign like this : “ So, that devil of a man has got killed after all, a good riddance, eh ? Can’t find enough words to praise those who have done it. They have done a heroic thing, haven’t they ? Wish they would carry on with this business until the whole pack of those blood -suckers is finished off. Oh, how fine will be everything then ! Just think, when they are gone all this area will belong to us, all this land, all this crops, all the riches will be ours ! Because, once these scoundrels are gone how can the police know who is tilling whose land ? ” The moment the masses begin to respond to such propaganda the political cadre must gradually become much bolder and hold small group meetings.

Then the petty bourgeois intellectual comrade, who had so long been hiding and watching the developments, should come out boldly with his group of courageous fighters and hold meetings to rouse the masses. This stage is a very important one. For, in spite of all his efforts till then to drive off fear from the minds of the guerrillas, it had not been possible for him to succeed wholly in his efforts. But, when the heroic fighters begin to *stay among the masses* where their class brothers praise them, cooperate with them and love them and pat them on their shoulders in warm appreciation of their work, they are fired with a new wave of enthusiasm and their hatred against the enemy increases manifold. It is then that they work out new plans of action, find out new targets and form new units. Then each of them becomes tempered like steel and is able to kill ten enemies single-handed.

**10.Re-mobilization :** At this stage the morale of the guerrillas is higher than ever and they become eager for new actions. The masses also begin to awaken, and rally around their heroic group of fighters and extend their hands of cooperation to them. They also want new guerrilla actions and eagerly point out their enemies, give advice about new targets of attack, come forward to keep watch over the movements of the enemy and provide important information to the guerrilla unit. Naturally, all subsequent activities can be carried on with a higher morale, in a more favourable condition, and will enjoy a more powerful mass support. Even then we must never violate the rules of secret work.

The guerrilla group then meets and, guided by the advice of the masses and relying on the information provided by them, works out plans for further annihilation of class enemies.

Further guerrilla actions take place and the steady expansion of such actions gives rise to new guerrilla units and the targets of attack spread steadily to ever newer areas- such is the process which goes on repeating itself. The masses become more active and their participation increases with every new guerrilla action and a reign of terror is imposed firmly on the local class enemies.

After some offensive actions take place and the revolutionary political line of annihilating the class enemy is firmly established, the political units, through

their practice and work, raise, through a whispering campaign, the broad economic slogan : "Seize the crops of the class enemy." This works like a magic in the villages and even the most backward peasant comes forward and joins the battle. Thus, the fight for the seizure of political power initiated by a few advanced sections is nourished by the tremendous initiative of the masses and mass actions, and the flames of people's war engulf the whole of the countryside.

*[ From Liberation, Feb, 1970]*



## A NOTE ON PARTY'S WORK IN URBAN AREAS

### CHARU MAZUMDAR

We cannot occupy Calcutta and the different towns right now and that is not also possible. Therefore, the Party members who are in the urban areas cannot directly participate in the struggle for seizure of power. But they have to live in urban surroundings. As a result, they will repeatedly be subjected to the influence of the ruling classes. There are ups and downs in a struggle. Therefore, various sorts of confusions arise when the struggle suffers a setback. All such confusion may be greater among comrades in towns. That is why the comrades who will live in towns must give greater emphasis on politics. They must steadfastly work among the working class and the poorer classes and must repeatedly try to form Party units by propagating our politics among them. Our object is to form Party units among the working class and to help develop Party organisers from among workers. Of course, we shall always support the workers and co-operate with them in their struggles. If there are a large number of politically conscious Party units, the working class will, on its own, conduct many struggles. Thus the Party's task is to form more and more units among the working class and to raise the workers' political consciousness. The influence of revisionism on the working class is still great. It is our task to free the working class from that influence. The working class is ceaselessly conducting struggles, big and small. Our political work among them will help them in those struggles and draw the broad sections of the working class into the fold of our politics. The class-conscious worker will then voluntarily go to the villages and participate in the peasants' armed struggle. It is in this way that the firm unity between the workers and the peasants will be established.

(Liberation, July 1971-January 1972, Vol. 5, No. 1)



# A NOTE ON PARTY'S WORK IN RURAL AREAS

CHARU MAJUMDAR

(Nov. 18, 1971)

The movement for seizing crops is a mass movement. This is the first time that we are leading a mass movement since we started our armed struggle. The aim of this movement is to make even the backward peasants participate in our struggle. Without conducting this mass movement we can in no way realise our objective-the objective of making every peasant a fighter. Otherwise, this all-embracing character of People's War can in no way be attained.

This movement will be directed against the class enemy, i.e., the *jotedar* class. It will also be conducted against such rich peasants as may be actively co-operating with the police. All other classes are allies in this struggle.

The Party will conduct this struggle through Revolutionary Committees. It is in this way that the Revolutionary Committees will be established as the new State power. The guerilla squads will always help Revolutionary Committees.

If the party is to discharge this responsibility, the Party cadres will have to be much more conscious politically. Efforts must always be made to raise political consciousness of Party cadres. The Party cadres and the guerillas must study the Three Main Rules of Discipline and the Eight Points of Attention. They must try to observe them to the very letter.

[Liberation, July 1971-January 1972, Vol. 5, No. 1]



## FORGE CLOSER UNITY WITH PEASANTS' ARMED STRUGGLE

CHARU MAJUMDAR

For the last few months the students and youths of Calcutta and West Bengal have declared war against Gandhi and bourgeois leaders and have been celebrating a festival -the festival of idol-smashing. They have launched their attack on the colonial educational system : undaunted by repression, they are spreading the flames of their struggle throughout West Bengal. What the students and youths are doing is , without any shadow of doubt, just and proper; for, no revolutionary educational system and culture can be created in India without destroying the colonial educational system and without demolishing the images raised by the comprador bourgeoisie.

The people of India fought to overthrow British rule ; many heroes laid down their lives in the course of the struggle. But they have not been depicted as models, their images have not been installed ; on the contrary, it is those who have served and defended the interests of imperialism that are held up before the students and the people as models and whose images have been built. That is why those who accuse the students and youths of waging war against the national tradition are in reality singing hymns in praise of the tradition created by imperialism's lackeys. A genuinely patriotic, revolutionary India cannot be built unless the images of these lackeys are swept away. That is why these deeds of the students and youths are, without doubt, revolutionary deeds and are, without doubt, preparing the path of india's progress.

But this struggle waged by the students and youths is no isolated struggle nor a struggle that is complete in itself. Unlike the Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution in China, this struggle is not aimed at demolishing the entire cultural superstructure nor can it be carried forward to that stage. This struggle is taking place because the armed agrarian revolution has emerged as a real fact in this state of West Bengal. The base is crumbling under the blows of the peasants' armed revolutionary struggle ; as a result, the superstructure too is and shall be pounded by blows. The very process of smashing the base inspires this attack on the superstructure ; this attack on the superstructure in its turn accentuates that process. It is the call of this agrarian revolution which has made the students and youths restive and they are directing their attacks against the images of those persons who have ever tried to put out the flames of armed revolution of the peasant masses by preaching the message of peace and reforms. That is why this struggle of the students and youths is part of the armed peasant struggle.

During the last few months, peasant guerrillas have annihilated about one hundred and fifty class enemies in different parts of West Bengal; thousands of poor and landless peasants have joined guerilla squads, gone underground leaving their homes, initiated themselves in the ideal of self-sacrifice, taken the pledge to carry the revolution through to victory and have been trying to grasp Mao Tsetung Thought. These thousands of revolutionary poor and landless peasants have not merely been able to save themselves by relying on millions of other peasants but are also launching their attacks on the enemies and destroying them. Refusing to be daunted by all the repressive measures of the enemies, these valiant revolutionaries are carrying the class struggle forward day after day and are spreading the flames of the struggle to newer and newer areas. They themselves have grasped the importance of the seizure of political power by armed force and are making other peasants realize it. As a result , the uneducated, ignorant, poor and landless peasants are today educated in the highest of all teachings and have emerged as the most advanced section, as the vanguard, of the people of West Bengal. It is this that marks the beginning of a new age. Never before has India seen such revolutionaries who have renounced all for the cause of revolution. All these revolutionaries making every sacrifice provide eloquent proof of the fact

that one can love the people of the country by giving up all in this manner. Their struggle is rousing not only the people in the countryside but also the revolutionaries in urban areas. The revolutionary students and youths have responded as a contingent of the revolutionary masses : they are smashing into pieces every prop of reactionary ideology.

The revolutionary struggle of the peasantry has inspired not only the masses of students and youths but also the masses of workers. The working class is celebrating the festival of hoisting the Red Flag on the top of factories; the panic that has gripped the exploiting class is a matter of enjoyment to them, they are enjoying the helplessness of the police and the military. Students, youths and workers of the towns and cities refuse to submit quietly to the oppression by the police and the military : they are launching attacks on the police, they are annihilating police officers. The ruling class is powerless to stem the tide of this struggle however ruthless they may be in the urban areas; for, the source from which the tide of this struggle rises, is the revolutionary upsurge of the armed peasantry in the countryside. Neither the Indian government nor any other government in the world can suppress this revolutionary struggle in the rural areas; for, Chairman Mao's Thought has today entered deep into the minds of West Bengal's peasant masses. According to the inexorable laws of history, this struggle will suffer temporary setbacks in certain areas and the struggle will seem to have ebbed away. Again, according to the laws of history, newer and newer men will enter the arena of struggle and a new high tide will set in. Today, the Communist Party (Marxist-Leninist) has been founded : this Party is a revolutionary Party. So long as this Party exists, revolutionary struggle will continue, revolution will forge ahead. This is not the worship of spontaneity, this is the law of history.

Today, the peasant, exploited and oppressed for thousands of years, has found out the road to liberation ; he has tasted power. The man who has always been despised in history has, today, become before our very eyes the maker of history. The wrath that has accumulated for thousands of years is about to cause a tremendous explosion : this explosion will shatter to bits every pillar of exploitation and out of this destruction will arise a new India, an India free from exploitation. This destruction is inevitable, no force on earth can prevent it.

The struggle that the workers, students and youths of urban areas are waging should be seen as complementary to the revolutionary peasant struggle .And, in this way, through protracted struggle, will be built the united front of the working class, the peasantry and the petty bourgeoisie. As India is not under the direct rule of imperialism, revolution must advance only along the path of class struggle, that is, through civil war. At this phase of the struggle no section of the bourgeoisie will unite with us. We may expect that when the unity of the working class and the peasantry has been achieved in the course of civil war, a section of the bourgeoisie will join hands with us. We shall call that section 'the national bourgeoisie'. So, today, during the civil war, we shall receive no help from bourgeois nationalism : rather, we shall face opposition from it. At this phase of the struggle, bourgeois

nationalism weakens the intensity of the struggle. So, we shall fail to carry forward this civil war unless we attack bourgeois nationalism. That is why we have shown scant regard for bourgeois nationalism and raised the slogan "China's Chairman is our Chairman ". Today, revisionism is also directing its attacks on us taking its stand behind bourgeois nationalism. So, without attacking bourgeois nationalism we are unable to attack revisionism. That is why the students and youths are fulfilling a task that is historic.

But the students and youths should always bear in mind that they cannot preserve their revolutionary character unless they integrate with workers and poor and landless peasants. This integration will give them new strength and this will again raise a new high tide in the struggle.

Chairman has taught us that it is not hard for one to do a bit of revolutionary work but what is very hard is to remain ever a revolutionary. The students and youths will become so only by integrating with poor and landless peasants.

The students and youths have not waged this struggle in vain. It has had its impact on the working class ; it has enthused the fighting peasantry in the rural areas. Today, the working class is coming forward to fight in defence of their self respect. The strikes of the workers of the North Eastern Frontier Railways and the South Eastern Railways mark the beginning of a new age in the history of working class struggle. They fought the strike-battles not to realize any economic demand but to defend their dignity and forced the ruling class to respect it. The greater is the progress achieved in uniting the revolutionary fighting peasantry with the workers, students and youths, the vaster will be the high tide of struggle and the newer and fresher will be the victories attained. So Chairman has said that the peasants' armed struggle will inevitably strengthen the democratic movements in urban areas. These struggles of the students, youths and workers show how this prediction of his is coming true before our very eyes.

Today, in this era of inevitable collapse of imperialism, the tide of revolution will swell and swell and will lash the towns and cities of India. Every struggle will perhaps have its own distinctive character but, essentially, it will be a part of the armed peasant struggle. The Party must consciously try to integrate the workers, students and youths with the poor and landless peasants. It is by propagating resolutely the politics of seizure of political power among workers, students and youths that we can convince them of the necessity and significance of the struggle to create liberated areas in the countryside and can send inspired workers, students and youths to fight shoulder to shoulder with the peasants in their armed revolutionary struggle. Only thus will arise in future the united front of the working class, the peasantry and the petty bourgeoisie.

*August 5, 1970*



## MARCH ONWARD, DAY OF VICTORY IS NEAR

CHARU MAJUMDAR

*[This article is based on a report of a speech at a meeting of Party cadres.]*

The present era is the era of the total collapse of imperialism. Look at India and you will see every corner of it is just like a volcano about to erupt. The exploiting classes are battered in the dog-fight among themselves. Even if we look at the world at large, the same situation prevails everywhere : in Asia, Africa, Latin America, armed revolution is spreading like wild fire. The 700 million people of Chairman's China, tempered in the Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution, have made Socialist China a great fortress against imperialist war. Today, while trying to create Red areas during the revolutionary war, we must take note of these facts. During the Chinggang years, one could not think of creating extensive red areas except in mountainous and forest regions. That is why it was possible to mobilize an army of three hundred thousand men and carry out the 'encirclement and suppression' campaign against the first Red base of China in the Chinggang region. That is why the revolutionaries then took time to crush this 'encirclement and suppression' campaign and to spread the struggle of different regions. But today, while every corner of India is like a volcano, the armed struggle of Srikakulam cannot remain confined within that region only. And this struggle is spreading and will spread very fast into different areas of our country. Today, it is therefore impossible for the reactionary Indian government to carry out the 'encirclement and suppression' campaign even by mobilizing five hundred thousand soldiers against the armed struggle of Srikakulam. If they mobilize more men in Srikakulam, the guerrilla war will instantly flare up with greater intensity and the enemy will be powerless to quell the struggle in Midnapur or that in Mushahari. If the revolutionaries of West Bengal declare today, "We are ready to sacrifice our blood, we are prepared to lay down our lives: put down, if you dare, our armed struggle", and if the reactionary government tries to put down this struggle with all its might, who is going to stop, who is going to extinguish, the red fire of Koraput?

### ***Conditions for Establishing Red Areas :***

The establishment of a red area means the establishment of the revolutionary authority through a revolutionary committee after the destruction of the feudal regime of the landlords and *jotedars*. The first condition for the establishment of

a red area is to form guerrilla squads under the leadership of the Party, to carry on the battle of annihilation of the *jotedars* and usurers, to form revolutionary committees with common landless and poor peasants, and to unite the broad masses and mobilize them in the people's war with the help of this revolutionary authority. That the revolutionary peasant authority has been established after the destruction of the authority of the enemy is proved by the fact that the people mislead the enemy by various means. For example, when a big action is going to take place, the enemy is to be tied up through minor harassing raids far away from the place of action. The enemy should also be supplied with false information about the whereabouts of the guerrillas.

I do not indulge in day-dreaming when I say that by 1970-71, the People's Liberation Army will march across a vast area of West Bengal. By and by, the vast masses of people will be inspired with Mao Tsetung Thought. Remaining loyal to the revolutionary committees, they will take part in the struggle by supplying wrong information to the enemy, and at a certain stage, they will feel the urge to snatch away rifles from the police and the military. [ On October 26, six rifles were snatched away by a squad of landless and poor peasant guerrillas in Kishanganj, Purnea district (contiguous to Naxalbari area), after they had attacked a police camp and annihilated a policeman. This event is a significant pointer - Ed. Liberation.] The formation of the People's Liberation Army will begin when a landless peasant will snatch away a rifle from the police or the military. The rifle in the hands of a landless peasant will roar like a thousand cannon. Can the E.F.R.\* and C.R.P fight that tremendous force? A revolutionary tempest will rage over such a wide area in India that the reactionary government will not be able to supply more than a few rifles to each of the police stations. And it will be a very easy task for the peasant guerrillas to snatch away those few rifles. Once the landless peasants are armed with rifles, the panic stricken reactionary police and military will come in batches and surrender their rifles to the guerrillas. There will be extensive defections from the enemy camp. It is only then that thousands of soldiers of the peasant stock will become class-conscious. Chairman Mao has said to us: "Carry on your struggle, you will never suffer from dearth of rifles." When I find that a landless peasant woman of Gopiballavpur is snatching away a rifle from a C.R.P. man after hacking him to death, I realize how correct are Chairman's words. The Chinese People's Liberation Army under the leadership of Chairman plunged into the revolutionary struggle with only 320 rifles. It may be we shall at first build our Liberation Army with 60 rifles and 200 pipe guns.

#### ***Day Of Victory Is Near***

When I say "Make the 70's the Decade of Liberation", I cannot think beyond 1975. The idea of today's armed struggle was first born in the mind of one man. That idea has now filled the minds of ten million people. If the new revolutionary consciousness, born only in 1967, can permeate the minds of 10 million people in 1970, why is it impossible then for those 10 millions to rouse and

---

\* *Eastern Frontier Rifles, a paramilitary force like the C.R.P.C or Central Reserve Force.*



mobilize the 500 million people of India in a surging people's war by 1975 ? We can realize the correctness of the assumption when we find that the people's war that started in Gopiballavpur in September 1969 has already spread extensively to the whole of West Bengal barring only two districts.[When Comrade Charu Majumdar said this, the peasants' armed struggle had not developed in two districts of West Bengal. But by this time it has spread to all the districts -Ed. *Liberation*].

Today, imperialism, faced with total collapse, is trying to strike its final blow against the revolutionary forces. There is, therefore, a genuine possibility today that Chairman's China may be attacked. And in this anti-China war the imperialists will try to use the Indian people as cannon-fodder. The armed struggle in India will certainly create such a mighty storm of revolution by 1971 that the imperialists and the social-imperialists will not dare attack China after that year, for they will then find this storm of revolution raging behind them. This is perfectly clear to the bandits, Nixon and the Kosygin clique, and so there is a strong possibility that Chairman's China may be attacked by 1971. Yet there is no reason for the revolutionary Indian masses to feel despair. Even if this fear comes true, India will surely be liberated by 1975. Indeed, the armed struggle in India will suffer a temporary setback, if Socialist China is attacked, because the imperialist powers will then oppress and persecute the Indian people with extreme savagery and try, at the same time, to divert them from the path of class struggle by creating an atmosphere of bourgeois chauvinism. But this is the era of Mao Tsetung Thought, the era of the rapid collapse of imperialism, the era of the victory of world revolution. So, in this era it is impossible to repeat the performances of Hitler and Mussolini, it is impossible to launch a savage attack on the revolutionaries, which Hitler and Mussolini did against the revolutionaries of Germany and Italy. And this is also not the year of the great famine of 1943. Today, famine-ravished landless peasants will not flock to the city to beg from door to door for the left-overs and to perish. If imperialist war lets loose very severe, frightful, terrible exploitation on the peasants, whose bodies are already lean and shrunken, the exploited landless peasants will need no rifle in their hands; they will tear off the throat of the war-monster with their teeth and nails. The mass upheaval that this fierce exploitation will create, will help overcome the temporary set-back, and a new high tide of people's war will bring about a quicker end of the imperialist monster. This is why I believe that it is by the end of 1975 that the 500 million Indian people will complete writing the great epic of their liberation.

*[From Liberation, September-December, 1970]*



## IT IS THE PEOPLE'S INTEREST THAT IS THE PARTY'S INTEREST

CHARU MAJUMDAR

We have suffered a setback after the armed struggle in our country reached a stage. It is our task now to preserve the Party. In order to preserve it we have to build the Party among the broad masses of workers and peasants. We shall be able to get over the setback and raise the struggle to a stage higher than before, if we can build a party politically united. I hope we shall be able to do this within a short time.

Chairman has said that there is still the possibility of a world war. Imperialism and social-imperialism are today enmeshed in various crises at home and abroad. Because of the political and economic crises, they are at their wit's end. To capture each other's market and expand their own they now resort to different underhand means and, as a result, the contradictions among them are becoming sharp. They seek to shift the burden of their own crises on to the underdeveloped and undeveloped countries. That is why those countries too are today assuming a role of opposition to the two superpowers -U.S imperialism and Soviet social -imperialism. In their vain efforts to escape from the crises they may start a world war. In the beginning we shall, indeed, have to face difficulty, if a world war begins. But that difficulty will not be there for long. A vast, widespread, revolutionary upsurge will bring our victory near.

Within a short time there will be a spontaneous outburst in our country and this will take the form of a national uprising. Our India is a vast country. The people of this country are groaning under exploitation and oppression. Gradually these two camps-the exploiters and the exploited-are moving towards a confrontation.

Discontent is smouldering among the exploited people. They will refuse to submit to oppression for a long time. There will be spontaneous outbursts of the people's resentment in different places. When the resentment of the people of this vast country will explode, no reactionary government will be powerful enough to put it down. That is why the fall of the reactionary government is inevitable. So the reactionary Indira government has been trying to build up a strong Centre, for they can anticipate the future awaiting them. This vast country has many problems. Moreover, they have created another problem- 'Bangladesh'. Tamil Nadu has already raised the demand for autonomy. The vast land between Bihar and Gujarat is inhabited by *adivasis*. There is no limit to the exploitation of the *adivasi* masses. The workers in the industrial areas of Maharashtra are victims of severe exploitation. Terrible is the exploitation of the peasantry of Mysore; the same is true of the other regions in the south. One cannot calculate and predict beforehand when the unrest among the oppressed people of our country will find its expression

and in what form. Chairman has said that in the next 50 to 100 years there will occur many events which were inconceivable before. In our country, too, such events as cannot be conceived of beforehand will take place.

On the other hand, the heroic people of Vietnam are providing courage and inspiration to the people of the entire world. They are waging a struggle that has no parallel. If Vietnam is liberated, fire will blaze up throughout South-east Asia. With Vietnam as the central issue, the governments of Asian, African and Latin American countries, together with those of other countries, are clamouring against U.S. imperialism. Besides, they have established relations with Socialist China, the great citadel of world revolution. In our country the Nagas and the Mizos were waging entirely national struggles to realize their demand for separate states, but they forged relations with China when they observed the struggle of the heroic people of Vietnam.

An upsurge is coming- a country-wide upsurge. We must keep this upsurge in view. Only then shall we have confidence in ourselves. In days before, we witnessed upsurge in one or two districts. The upsurge that is coming will spread over a far wider area and will attain a still higher stage than in the past. One should bear in mind that the advance of struggle is not evolutionary but revolutionary. Our country will not be liberated even by the year 2001, what to speak of 1975, if we take into consideration only the pace in which the struggle led by our Party is advancing. It is because the progress and development of struggle is revolutionary that the upsurge which occurred in a small area yesterday will not remain confined within that area and that the struggle will attain greater intensity and reach a higher stage in the coming days than before.

Is it possible for us to lead everywhere the coming upsurge? Certainly not. The struggle in those areas where it will be led by our Party's conscious leadership will set an example to the struggles in other areas where there will be no such leadership. If, today, we can implement agrarian reforms in some areas, these may take place spontaneously in many other areas during the revolutionary upsurge. Our conscious leadership will bring about an armed revolutionary upsurge and through this armed revolutionary upsurge our leadership will gradually be established everywhere.

It is our duty today to forward the work of building the Party among the basic masses and set up a joint front with the broadest sections of the people on the basis of struggle. It is possible to build the broadest joint front against Congress rule. Today the "leftist" parties refuse to provide leadership to the common people in the struggle against the oppression the Congress perpetrates on them. The worker-peasant masses who are within the folds of those parties feel resentment against their leadership. We have to carry on efforts to unite with them on the basis of united struggle. Even those who once acted as our enemies will come forward in special circumstances to unite with us. We must have the largeness of mind to unite with such forces. Largeness of mind is a quality of the Communists. Today, it is the people's interest that demands united struggle. It is the people's interest that is the Party's interest.



## TO WIN VICTORY IN THE REVOLUTION WE MUST ESTABLISH REVOLUTIONARY AUTHORITY OBSERVER (SOUREN BOSE).

Our great Indian revolution is advancing irresistibly. The flames of armed peasant revolution are already raging in nine states of our great motherland. The basis of our Party has been established in all the states and Red political power has appeared on the soil of our country, the red banner of which is flying high in Srikakulam.

In its irresistible onward march the great Indian revolution has not only provided us with extremely valuable experience and lessons, it has at the same time produced great heroes of the new era, the inheritors of the glorious tradition of the long anti-imperialist struggle of our great country, genuine communists imbued with Mao Tsetung Thought and reared by the teachings of our respected and beloved leader Comrade Charu Majumdar, and heroes who have laid down their lives in the struggle against revisionism and native and foreign reactionaries.

The onward march of the great Indian revolution is making the prospect of our victory brighter with every passing day but we are, at the same time, called upon to pay an increasingly heavy price for this, and we have to pay this price. Chairman Mao has taught us that we must give something in return for what we get. The happiness of millions of people can be won only by sacrificing the lives of a few. This is precisely the law of dialectical development of history. As we think of these great martyrs we are **"moved to song and tears."** While we cannot but mourn the death of our class brothers, it fills our hearts with pride at the same time and we feel like raising our clenched fists and declaring that our comrades have been able to take their place among the fighting communist heroes of the rest of the world, and that our revolution has produced Chairman Mao's good soldiers. The shedding of blood by our martyrs further intensifies our class hatred and spontaneously we take the vow : **"We will avenge your murder by stepping up daily the battle of annihilation of the feudal class enemies in every corner of the vast countryside of India."**

The 1970's have arrived with great promise. The great ,glorious and correct Communist Party of China has declared; **"The 1970's will be years in which the storms of the people's revolution will rise still more vigorously throughout the world, years in which the collapse of imperialism will be hastened in the midst of countless contradictions."**

The tremendous momentum that the Indian revolution is to gather during this decade is likely to surpass even our boldest imagination. But we shall also be confronted during this period with new problems and new contradictions, without resolving which it will not be possible for the revolution to forge ahead.

In the beginning of 1970 Chairman Mao issued the call : **“be prepared against war.”** Comrade Charu Majumdar has called on us not to make the mistake of treating this call of Chairman Mao’s lightly.

Faced as they are with their total collapse, imperialism and all reactionaries will make a last desperate strike before meeting their doom. This is so because the great, glorious and correct Communist Party of China with Chairman Mao as its leader and Vice-Chairman Lin as its deputy leader has dashed all the hopes of imperialism, social imperialism and all reactionaries to stage a comeback in China by victoriously carrying out the Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution and by consolidating the gains of that revolution through the historic Ninth National Congress.

Our revolution will also have to go through severe trials. The great, glorious and correct Communist Party of China has given the directives : **“heighten our vigilance”**; **“the principles of ‘self-reliance’ and ‘hard struggle’ set forth by Chairman Mao should be put into practice in every province, every country, every basic unit and every undertaking”** and **“the people of the world must heighten their revolutionary vigilance a hundredfold! ... We must be fully prepared both ideologically and materially. The centralized leadership of the Party must be strengthened”** (Our emphasis).

To be able to carry out this instruction we must be prepared for more arduous struggle and more bitter sacrifice, and must go forward by laying down many more revolutionary lives. There is no easy way to achieve our goal, no shortcut to avoid these hardships. We must know the enemy better and more concretely and heighten our revolutionary vigilance every moment against the possibility of all the attacks of the enemy both open and secret. And the sole condition for being able to do this is to establish firmly the revolutionary authority at every level of the Party and at every stage of revolutionary struggle.

### ***New Tactic of Revisionism***

Comrade Charu Majumdar has pointed out: “Today, after the Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution, revisionism which has turned into social-imperialism, has become the enemy of every revolution. That is why no revolution in any country can win victory without fighting revisionism.” The great, glorious and correct Communist Party of China has pointed out : **“The Soviet revisionist renegade clique -- the centre of modern revisionism -- is heading for total bankruptcy at an accelerated tempo. Khrushchev the clown, who swaggered like a conquering hero not long ago, is now a heap of dirt beneath the contempt of mankind.”** The real face of modern revisionism is increasingly getting exposed in various countries of the world with the passage of time. That is why modern revisionism has begun to adopt new and more subtle tricks both internationally and nationally to meet the requirements of imperialism. Today, modern revisionism in its new form appears

on the stage with the name of Chairman Mao on its lips and dons the deceptive cloak of allegiance to the Communist Party of China.

The excellent situation of world revolution and the tremendous advance of the great Indian revolution have frightened and struck panic in the hearts of the imperialists and their domestic lackeys. Realizing that they cannot prevent the revolution from advancing by 'encirclement and suppression' alone, they have ordered their loyal lackey- revisionism- to create confusion inside the revolutionary Party and among the revolutionary masses and to try to divert their attention from the main task.

Acting under orders from their masters, individuals like Asit Sen, Parimal Dasgupta, T. Nagi Reddy, Kunnikal Narayanan and Utpal Datta, and groups like "Dakshin Desh" have started their foul business in our country, while in the international field it is being done by the new-type revisionists donning the cloak of revolutionaries.

In some cases their actions are quite apparent and clear and they attack us openly, but in many other cases they do it quite subtly sometimes using the name of our Party and even by pretending to support our Party line.

In their periodicals they attack us and the theme is invariably this : The CPI(M-L) is not following Chairman Mao. Their main target of attack is Comrade Charu Majumdar, who, according to them, is acting in a way which runs counter to Mao Tsetung Thought. They draw analogy by quoting passages from the works of Chairman Mao arbitrarily and demand that things should happen in India exactly in the same way as they did in China. They want to find similarities between the China of 1927 and the India of 1969. But this is never possible, neither now nor later.

This is how they attack our Party from the outside. A simultaneous attack is also being launched within the Party in a more subtle way. It consists in creating mutual distrust among the Party comrades, and weakening the authority of the Party, that is, the authority of Comrade Charu Majumdar by such talks as : 'Comrade Charu Majumdar is all right and, of course, we follow him. But, as for the others, we simply do not recognize them, not to speak of following them.' And, of course, there is no dearth of arbitrary quotations in this case also. Just at a time when the battle cry of revolution is : "Have faith in the masses and have faith in the Party", they are raising the cry of 'doubt everything'. Their subtlety is turning increasingly into vile devilry aimed at confusing the simple-minded comrades and leading them astray. Basing on the theory that the **"development of things should be seen as their internal and necessary self-movement"**- the main thing in materialist philosophy-Chairman Mao has said : **"Communists must always go into the whys and wherefores of anything, use their own heads and carefully think over whether or not it corresponds to reality and is really well founded ; on no account should they follow blindly and encourage slavishness."**

Completely distorting this vitally important instruction of Chairman Mao's, they are introducing into the Party the slogan: 'doubt everything'. This is a fascist slogan. It was Hitler who preached "trust none but yourself". At a time when in our struggle against the ferocious enemy we need most of all a fraternal unity in

the Party based on iron discipline, this slogan renders the Party passive and disarms it in the face of the enemy, exposes the Party organization before the enemy and nullifies this teaching of Chairman Mao's :**" We hail from all corners of the country and have joined together for a common revolutionary objective... Our cadres must show concern for every soldier, and all people in the revolutionary ranks must care for each other, must love and help each other."**

All of them have the same objective. Summing up the experience of the practice of the Indian revolution, Comrade Charu Majumdar taught us in April 1969 the method of expanding guerrilla warfare in the Indian conditions. He pointed out that this method consisted in forming guerilla squads under the leadership of the poor and landless peasants and annihilating the class enemy (the feudal class and its agents). The tremendous significance of this teaching of Comrade Charu Majumdar's has already been demonstrated in Srikakulam and by the rapid expansion of guerrilla war in eight states of India. It is the great credit of Comrade Charu Majumdar that he has successfully applied Vice-Chairman Lin's famous theory of guerrilla war in the Indian conditions . This is a matter of great pride for us and has been upheld time and again by the international communist leadership- the great, glorious and correct Communist Party of China with Chairman Mao as its leader and Vice-Chairman Lin as its deputy leader. This is the way to overthrow feudalism in India and march onward to seize political power by armed force, the way to lay the foundation for the successful completion of the democratic revolution, and to ensure the destruction of imperialism, social-imperialism, bureaucrat capital and feudalism. This is precisely why the revisionists have taken it up as their most sacred task to concentrate their attack against this revolutionary line. Their battle cry is what their masters have laid down for them : 'Spare no efforts to stop this battle of annihilation.'

They cannot afford to do so openly or they would be exposed. So they are resorting to all sorts of subterfuges which are well - planned and have connections with one another.

Khrushchev the clown taught them that destruction of the faith of the revolutionaries should be the first step towards laying the foundation of revisionism, and that the way to do this was to attack the revolutionary authority. This is precisely what that clown did in his own country by launching a poisonous attack against the great Stalin.

These new -type revisionists have, from the very beginning of the revolutionary struggle, consistently obstructed the establishment of revolutionary authority; frantically opposed the creation of one centre and vainly tried to turn the Co-ordination Committee of Communist Revolutionaries into a meeting - place of various open and clandestine factions. Whenever there was any suggestion for building the Party these people loudly opposed it under all sorts of pretexts : 'It is not yet time for building the Party'; 'the Party will grow of itself from below'; 'who do you think can lead it if we set ourselves to build the Party now?' and so on. But all the same, in the face of their joint and active opposition, 'the Marxist-Leninist Party was born out of struggle' because of historical necessity. And as soon as the Party won recognition from the great, glorious and correct Communist Party of

China these people quickly changed their tactics, and started fresh attacks against the Party by using the name of the Party. Their sole purpose in doing all this is to "prevent the battle of annihilation and thus to obstruct the onward march of the agrarian revolution."

Quite recently a pocket-size pamphlet allegedly "published by a local unit of the Communist Party of India (Marxist-Leninist)" is being circulated within the Party in Calcutta. It is needless to mention that no local unit of our Party has anything to do with this pamphlet. Along with profuse references to Marx, Engels, Lenin and Stalin, it carries quotations from Chairman Mao also. Wherein lies its devilish trickery? All the dirty tactics that the revisionists are capable of employing have been used in it and it provides a measure of the extent to which they can degenerate. Let us consider a few of their tricks: (1) There are in it any number of quotations from the writings of Comrade Charu Majumdar but his name has not been mentioned anywhere. This means only one thing- defy the revolutionary authority. (2) On page 12 it says: "after this comes the annihilation of the class enemy through guerrilla action," but immediately after this, on page 13, it hastens to add "the guerrilla unit is equipped with modern weapons captured from the class enemy." This is nothing but to deliberately create confusion about who are our class enemies, and thus basically, to put obstacles in the way of the battle of annihilation. (3) On page 21 it quotes Lenin to the effect that whoever rejects the slogan of revolution and democratic dictatorship, of a revolutionary army and of a revolutionary government **and revolutionary peasant associations** is pitifully incapable of understanding the revolutionary work. On page 28 there is a quotation from Chairman Mao that every communist must be a friend of the masses in a mass movement, and so on. This is nothing out an attempt to attract people towards open mass organizations and mass movements.

This new-type revisionism has become active in the international field also. Its cry is: follow Chairman Mao but reject Lin Piao; it is all right to accept the Chinese revolution, but only up to that and no farther, and refuse to treat the Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution (which is the third great revolution of world-wide importance) as anything more than a mere internal affair of China.

Why are the new-type revisionists resorting to this tactic? The reason for this is Comrade Lin Piao's famous thesis that Chairman Mao Tsetung's theory of people's war, establishment of rural revolutionary base areas and encirclement of the cities from the countryside constitutes today the only tactic of armed struggle for all the countries of the world, that is, for the capitalist countries, for the semi-colonial and semi-feudal countries and for the colonial countries alike. The Great Proletarian Cultural revolution has firmly established this thesis of Comrade Lin Piao's radically changed all the old concepts about the revolutionary party and world revolution which were current before the Cultural Revolution, and established new Marxist-Leninist concepts which are the contributions of Mao Tsetung Thought.

In the international field also, these new-type revisionists are trying very subtly and cautiously to build up alternatives to the great Communist Party of China and the great leader of the world's people-Chairman Mao Tsetung. As opposed to



Chairman Mao's call "Preparations should be made right now !" against the "war of aggression launched by any imperialism or social-imperialism", the new-type revisionists are advancing their alternative slogan : "China is so powerful that imperialism will not dare attack her. So, there is not going to be any more war." With such diversionary slogans they are trying to weaken the firm unity and vigilance of the international revolutionary camp and provide some breathing space for dying imperialism and social-imperialism.

### **Establishment of Revolutionary Authority Is the Only Condition for the Struggle Against Revisionism**

There can be no revolution without a revolutionary authority. The history of the great, glorious and correct Communist Party of China shows us how the Chinese revolution began to win success to the extent Chairman Mao's revolutionary authority was established and how, after his authority was fully established at the Tsunyi conference in 1935, the Chinese revolution surged forward irresistibly, overcoming both the Right and the ultra-Left deviations.

In our country the establishment of revolutionary authority proceeded in a rather unique manner which has probably not been seen anywhere else in the world.

Unlike the Party of Lenin and Stalin, which enjoyed the advantage of the direct leadership of the great Lenin, and the great, glorious and correct Communist Party of China, which enjoyed the benefit of Chairman Mao's direct leadership, we, in India, lacked any Marxist-Leninist leader of such outstanding personality. As a result, though a struggle between the two lines has been going on in the Party for long forty-six years, we were not able to turn the old Party itself into a revolutionary Party by driving the traitorous spies and agents out of it. So, we had to lay the foundation of a new and genuine Communist Party by first basing ourselves on the experience gained from applying Mao Tsetung Thought on the soil of India, and then to advance by establishing step by step revolutionary authority.

From the initiation of the Naxalbari struggle to the building of the Party, the strengthening of the Party by fighting against the hidden enemies in it and the leadership given by the Party over the armed struggle all over India—each of these events bears the indelible imprint of the able, correct and successful leadership given by our respected and beloved leader Comrade Charu Majumdar, leadership which has grown still richer and firmer through the summing up of the experience of the Indian revolution.

Our task today is to establish firmly the authority of the leadership of Comrade Charu Majumdar at all levels of the Party and revolution. We shall be able to strengthen the authority of the Party and turn the Party and the revolutionary forces into an iron bastion in the face of all the attacks of revisionism and the reactionaries to the extent we succeed in establishing this authority.

This, by no means, is an easy task. If every one of us reviews his work in the light of Comrade Charu Majumdar's article "March Onward by Summing up the Experience of the Peasant Revolutionary Struggle of India", we shall find how at different times and in different ways we violated, knowingly or unknowingly, the instructions of Comrade Charu Majumdar and invariably got stuck, and the revolutionary struggle suffered as a result of this. Even today, when the Party

leadership and the rank and file are unanimous about guerrilla struggle, we still suffer from confusion and vacillation regarding the relation between mass struggle and guerrilla struggle and their respective importance, are still yielding to the tendency towards economism in approaching every class and section of the people in spite of Comrade Charu Majumdar's repeated instructions to the contrary, are still proving unable to integrate with the poor and landless peasants in spite of Comrade Charu Majumdar's repeated instructions and are still proving unable to promote the poor and landless peasants to leading positions in the Party, to give expression to the intense class hatred against the feudal class in our writings, songs and speeches, which shows that the poor and landless peasants, who have taken upon their shoulders the heavy burden of carrying forward the great Indian revolution, are still not able to influence our consciousness.

Today, the situation is such that, if we are to advance the revolution in the face of the attacks of revisionism and reaction, we must conscientiously and seriously wage a struggle to establish the revolutionary authority of Comrade Charu Majumdar. Our slogan is : "Internationally, we must follow Chairman Mao, Vice-Chairman Lin Piao and the great, glorious and correct Communist Party of China as well as implement the world lessons of the Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution; nationally, we must be loyal to Chairman Mao, Vice-Chairman Lin Piao and the Communist Party of China and must fully accept the revolutionary authority of the leadership of Comrade Charu Majumdar." Only thus can the revolutionary unity be built and the revolution win victory.

Our great Indian revolution has developed to a new stage and is on the verge of bursting forth with a tremendous force which we are not even able to think of now. Our armed struggle has qualitatively changed from the stage of primary guerrilla activities to the stage of guerrilla warfare against the armed forces of the reactionary government. All the indications of this qualitative change are present in Srikakulam today. The situation in Srikakulam today is full of the birth-pangs of the new that is about to be born. Reaching this new stage means the beginning of the stage of founding the Indian People's Liberation Army and its active participation in the civil war-an event which would bring about a qualitative change in the all-India politics and in the relations and balance of forces between ourselves and the enemy.

In the editorial "Usher In The Great 1970's" the great, glorious and correct Communist Party of China has declared : "The revolution is forging ahead and the people are marching forward. The dawn of a new world without imperialism, without capitalism and without the system of exploitation is ahead. Workers of all countries, unite ! Proletarians and oppressed people and nations of the world, unite ! **Be resolute, fear no sacrifice and surmount every difficulty to win victory !**"

History will not forgive us if we fail to carry out our tasks resolutely in spite of such an excellent situation.

*[From Liberation, Feb 1970]*



## CM'S LAST LETTER

*[This is the summary of a letter published after Charu Majumdar's death in the July 1972 issue of DESHABRATI, a Bengali mouthpiece of the CPI(ML). It is popularly known as his last writing. It bears the date 9.6.72.]*

A broadest united front against the congress rule can be established.

Today the 'leftist' parties are not giving any lead for struggling against the oppression the Congress is perpetrating on the ordinary people. The worker-peasant masses within these parties have resentment against their leadership. We have to carry on efforts to be united with them on the basis of united struggle. Even those who at one time practised enmity towards us will in special circumstances come forward to be united with us. We must have largeness of mind to be united with all these forces. Largeness of mind is the quality of the communists. It is the people's interest that today demands united struggle. It is the people's interest that is the Party's interest.

The armed struggle in our country has, after reaching a stage, suffered a setback. Our task at this time is to keep the Party alive. We will have to build the Party among the broad worker-peasant masses. If only we can build a politically united Party we shall be able to overcome this setback, to raise the struggle to a stage still higher than before. I hope that we shall be able to achieve it within a very short period.

An upsurge is coming. A countrywide upsurge. We must keep this upsurge in view. Then only we will have self-confidence. Before this we witnessed upsurges in one or two districts. The upsurge that is coming will be spread over a still wider area, it will be of a still higher stage than before. It has to be remembered that the progress of struggle is not evolutionary but revolutionary. If we consider the way in which the struggle under the Party's leadership is progressing and calculate on that basis, our country cannot be liberated even by 2001, what to speak of its being liberated by 1975. Since the progress and development of struggle is revolutionary, the upsurge in the coming days will no longer be confined within a small area in which it occurred yesterday, and the struggle in the days ahead will be still deeper and of a still higher stage than that of the past.

Shall we be able to provide leadership everywhere during the upsurge that is coming? Certainly not. The struggle in areas where there will be our conscious leadership will act as an example to areas where our Party leadership is not present. If we are able today to accomplish the work of land reforms in some areas, the work of land reforms may be done spontaneously in many areas during this revolutionary upsurge. Our conscious leadership will give birth to armed revolutionary upsurge, it is through this armed revolutionary upsurge that our leadership will be gradually established everywhere. In a short period, a spontaneous resentment will develop in our country and it will ultimately take the character of a national upsurge. India is a vast country. The people are crippled by torture and exploitation. The exploiters and exploited are now living in two distinct camps and face each other. The hatred is generating among the exploited masses. They will not allow torture to continue. Their growing resentment will soon lead to spontaneous explosions in different parts of the country. When the people of this vast country will explode no reactionary government will be able to control it.



VII

**ON DIFFERENCES  
IN THE COMMUNIST  
REVOLUTIONARY  
MOVEMENT**

# OUR CO-ORDINATION AND UNITY WITH THE AICCCR : UNITY AMONG THE COMMUNIST REVOLUTIONARIES IN ANDHRA AND INDIA

## OUR EFFORTS AND EXPERIENCE

[ From the POLITICAL-ORGANISATIONAL AND MOVEMENT  
REPORT (Oct 1968 to March 1969) OF THE APCCCR adopted by  
the AP STATE CONVENTION held in April (10-12), 1969]

Our State Co-ordination committee was formed openly in June 1968. Later, within a short time, the Co-ordination Committees were formed at taluka and district levels too. With this, our struggle against Neo-revisionism, our effort to mobilise the people for armed struggle have reached a new stage - the second stage. Till that time, we have conducted serious and extensive discussions and debate within the party on the ideological questions. Now we have reached a stage where we must formulate a programme necessary to put the party members and cadres who have organisationally broken away from the revisionists into field of work.

In AP, ours is a special situation. Here, overwhelming majority of party members and cadre have come over to us. Majority villages- hundreds of villages- have come over to us. The armed- resistance has already come on the agenda in Srikakulam. The task of extending, intensifying and developing this movement into an armed struggle has come to the fore in girijan areas. In plain areas, the task of moving the party members and cadre towards mobilising the oppressed masses into class struggles has come to the fore. The task of moving the party members and cadre into action, raising their ideological and political level, laying the foundations for party Organisation by dropping those who cannot be moved and by encouraging those who are prepared to go into practice has come to the fore. It is necessary for all the Communist revolutionaries in AP work unitedly to carry on these tasks.

But it is a matter of regret that the attitude of AICCCR comrades towards our Committee has become one of erecting hurdles at every step of our programme and efforts to carry out these tasks.

The Naxalbari Comrades were the first to openly begin the ideological struggle against Neo-revisionism. So from the beginning, the APCCCR has been striving to maintain relations with the AICCCR. We have been striving to join the AICCCR from the day we broke away from the neo-revisionists.

We met the representative of the AICCCR even before 1968 Burdwan Central Plenum. We explained to him about our activities in AP. At that time, the AICCCR's representative did not even suggest to us to immediately break from and come out of CPI(M).

In the context of Burdwan Plenum, the members of our State Co-ordination Committee met the representatives of AICCCR twice and had discussions. There we gave the Document of DV ( on Ideological Issues ); Our alternative (AP Plenum) Documents, the Notes of speech made by Pulla Reddy in the Burdwan Plenum to the representatives of AICCCR. We requested to publish all of them in that order, or, if all the documents cannot be printed, print, at least the alternative documents written by Nagi Reddy, Pulla Reddy and Kolla Venkaiah.

In this meeting too the AICCCR's representatives did not ask us to immediately come out of CPI(M). More over, we were told that some CR Committees in UP have made it clear that they were still carrying on their activities by remaining themselves within the organisational frame work of neo-revisionists.

At that time, the All India representatives requested us to attend the meeting of AICCCR. We made it clear to them that in AP we are going to break from the neo-revisionists soon and we would join the AICCCR soon after the completion of this break. We also made it clear that, even in the meantime, our abiding by the organisational principles of neo revisionists does not at all arise. We have informed them that we have already formed the State Co-ordination Committee (March 1968) and are only carrying out the decisions of this Committee. We also told that we are going to defy the neo-revisionist principles of organisation. Our representatives also suggested that the State Co-ordination Committee and the AICCCR can have possible mutual consultation in the meantime, i.e., before we formally join the AICCCR. The representatives of AICCCR have agreed to this.

Therefore, even at this stage, the representatives of AICCCR did not suggest to us to break immediately from the neo revisionists. More over, they did not also raise any question which indicate that they were differing with us on the ideological questions.

In these conditions, our PC members as well as the representatives from the districts met in June 1968, organisationally broke away from the neo revisionists and formed a State Co-ordination Committee.

While we were in this meeting, unimaginably for all of us, the comrades of AICCCR made some criticisms against us in the 7-8 issue of the Liberation, 1968. In this, they wrote that we are continuing work without organisationally breaking ourselves from the neo revisionists. They declared that the attempt to bring out as greater number of people as possible from under the influence of neo revisionists is a needless exercise and it is not necessary to give importance to bring them out since most of them in that organisation have already become opportunists. They criticised that it was wrong on our part to call for the Party congress in the Burdwan Plenum.

Not only this. They have published DV's document on Ideological questions in the *Liberation* with an Editorial Note. In this they made some criticisms on us. This Note criticised that we do not have a clear opinion on the social-imperialist character of Soviet revisionism; that our document, instead of clearly stating that the liberation of Indian people is possible through armed struggle alone, is creating illusions in peaceful methods; that it did not subject the Madhurai Document to criticism and that we are hesitating to organisationally break from the neo revisionists.

Astonishingly, none of the two All India representatives raised these issues when they had a talk with our representatives. It is also surprising that a general principle did not occur to their mind that it was proper for them to discuss the above mentioned points with the APCCCR and remove the misgivings, if any before writing a criticism in the *Liberation* and before circulating DV's document together with a Note.

A recollection of some facts make it clear that the criticisms made by the AICCCR leaders till then are totally baseless.

It is travesty of truth to write in the Note that we did not criticise the Madhurai Document while at the same time, keeping our two documents with them which contain criticism on Madhurai Document.

The fact that our break from the neo revisionists was over much before their criticism show how the criticism that we were opportunistically hesitating to organisationally break from the neo revisionists is meaningless.

The fact that the representatives of AICCCR and the APCCCR agreed in their discussions held in Oct 1968 that both are in basic agreement on the question of Soviet revisionism as well as on the path show how the AICCCR is baseless in its criticism of APCCCR's attitude on these two questions.

Thus the representatives of AICCCR resorted to open criticism against us basing themselves on nothing but apprehensions and suspicion. In this criticism there is nothing but an artificial attempt to show that we are opposed the AICC and Mao's Thought.

Baseless criticisms against us carried on by the leaders of AICCCR at a time when we could rally the majority of the party members and the Communist Movement with us and when we were required to unite all the CRs in AP and make a serious effort to develop our movements into armed struggle has caused a serious setback to our efforts in this direction in AP. Apprehensions and doubts were sown in the minds of party members and cadre about our programme and aims at a time when all of us had to work unitedly. These criticisms were useful only to keep aside the programme which was to be put into practice and engage ourselves in needless discussions on the questions raised by the comrades of AICCCR.

We encountered difficulties as these criticisms came just before the joint meeting of our State Committee members and the representatives of the District Committees. There manifested some ambiguity about the attitude of AICCCR

towards us. Therefore, we declared in the Resolution adopted by the Joint Meeting that the unification of all CRs as our aim. Basing on this, we decided to discuss with the representatives of AICCCR.

Our representative discussed all these questions with the representative of AICCCR in July and August 1968. We have clarified the positions of our Committee. We also explained to them our State Committee's view on the question of Election boycott. The representative of AICCCR gave no reply what so ever. He only said 'let us discuss all the questions in the meeting of AICCCR which was scheduled to meet shortly.'

Our State Committee, which met after this meeting, has discussed all these things, keeping in view the propaganda in the state by some factionalists that we are going to form another AICCCR. State Co-ordination Committee adopted a Resolution on the question of co-ordination. In this Resolution, we made it clear that it is our aim that all the CRs in India must merge in the AICCCR and the allegation that we are striving to form another centre is nothing but a slanderous propaganda. We have published this statement in our Party Organ, Janashakti.

In the meanwhile, the AICCCR's criticism as well as its attitude engendered some apprehensions and doubts among the party members in Andhra. Purposeless and unending discussions have begun instead of going into practice. The 'Naxalbari solidarity Committee', which was already formed in Guntur, made use of it to its own advantage and unleashed an intensive slanderous campaign against the State Co-ordination Committee.

Right in these conditions, two representatives of AICCCR came to Guntur. They gathered some students who were working as the 'Naxalbari Solidarity Committee' and reported that there are basic differences between the State Co-ordination Committee and the AICCCR and the SCC is opposed to Mao Tse Tung Thought. They gave a report to them on the then ongoing discussions between the AICCCR and APCCCR. They advised the Guntur student to put down on the paper, which according to them, the differences between the two committees and put the same in propaganda.

The SCC took this unwanted situation to the notice of All India Centre. We pointed out to the centre that it was not good for them to take the essence of discussion together with even technical aspects which came in the course of discussion between the AICC and SCC to down below while at the same time carrying on discussions with us and to encourage an open controversy. The centre sent a reply to us justifying their own actions. This letter asserted that they recognise the Guntur 'Naxalbari Solidarity Committee' as their Committee; they reported on the talks (with the SCC) because it is their task to report the things to down below and the method adopted by them was correct. It also said that the State Co-ordination Committee must discuss the question of unification of CRs in AP with it as it was given this responsibility and the doors of AICCCR are open to the State Co-ordination Committee for merger.

A new thing has come to the fore with this letter. The letter said that already AICC has recognised a committee with no concern to the State Co-ordination



Committee, and this committee was entrusted with the task of uniting all the CRs in Andhra. Never in the course of earlier discussions, they brought this thing to our notice.

With this, those belonging to Naxalbari Solidarity Committee (Guntur) unleashed a state-wide propaganda against the APCCCR through leaflets, etc. spreading all cock- and bull stories and with direct blessings from the representatives of AICCCR.

In the same period, the AICCCR established relations separately with the Srikulam District Committee and encouraged it to revolt against the State Co-ordination Committee. During March 1968 and Sept 1968, the Srikulam DC has never said that it was differing with the SCC's guidance to Srikulam Movement. It never said that it was differing with us on ideological questions. It was only in Sept(1968) they came to the fore for the first time with the talk like that the SCC is betraying the Srikulam Girijan Movement. [APCCCR's Document on "*Some Problems Connected to the Srikulam Girijan Movement*" has dealt these questions.]

It was only in Oct 1968 the Srikulam DC has adopted a Resolution to merge itself directly with the AICCCR.

The State Committee met and discussed the entire situation.

We have adopted a clear Resolution on the question of merger with the AICCCR. We have resolved to merge with the AICCCR by making our differences ( the question of elections, etc. ) clear to it and even with differences. We have decided to, once again, discuss with the AICCCR on the question of merger.

The leaders of Srikulam DC directly went to various districts and carried on an intensive slander campaign that the SCC has betrayed the Srikulam Movement. They have done so even after they were informed about the decisions of the SCC (to merge with the AICC) and going against their own promises to the State representatives.

Thus there was disunity among the CRs in AP by Sept 1968. The seeds of factionalism were sown.

In this situation, our four Secretariat Members have discussed the question of merger with the central leaders.

The discussions made it clear that th two committees differed on two questions.

The SCC made its view clear on the question of Election boycott.

In the same way, the SCC expressed the view that relentless efforts must be made to bring all those CRs who are working in various states on the basis of Mao Tse Tung Thought but have not yet joined the AICCCR into one platform - the AICCCR by resolving the differences through mutual discussions and practice.

Similarly, it also expressed the view that a friendly attitude must be adopted towards those groups and individuals who are still in the neo revisionist party but are waging a principled struggle for Mao Tse Tung Thought and encourage them to come out of that party.

But the AICCCR comrades are opposed to this view. They are of the view that such a method will only give scope for the opportunists to enter the ranks of

CRs and with this the party, one again, will turn into an election party. They said that there is no need to give any significance to this.

We have mutually clarified that there is a basic agreement between the two committees on the questions like the social-imperialist character of Soviet revisionism; China's role as the centre for world revolution; Mao Tse Tung Thought being today's Marxism Leninism ; the peoples war as the path for the complete liberation of Indian people. On this basis, the APCCCR has merged with the AICCCR.

In this context, the comrades must keep two things in view :

Firstly, the representative of Naxalbari Solidarity Committee, Guntur as well as the representatives of Srikakulam district were also present at the time of talks and merger of SCC with the AICCCR. The merger has taken place only in their presence. At that time, they did not express any difference of view on the decision for merger.

Secondly, our representatives demanded that we must discuss on the way the representatives of AICCCR behaved with the APCCCR; the way they openly criticised us and the way they encouraged the Naxalbari Solidarity Committee, Guntur to work against the APCCCR. But the representatives of AICCCR were not ready for this. They only advised us 'let us forget the past'. Thus they evaded to discuss, as we proposed, on the correctness or incorrectness of the organisational methods adopted by them.

In any case, the problems that arose during June 1968 and Nov' 1968 on the question of merger were overcome and the merger was achieved between the two committees.

One can hope and, in fact, we hoped that as a result of this the CRs in various states as well as in AP would get united.

But our hopes were belied. We have already said that the seeds of factionalism were sown before the merger. After the merger too these methods continued in a more poisonous manner. Neither the Srikakulam DC nor the AICCCR have taken any steps to stop this factionalist propaganda. In this period, the leadership of AICCCR continued to maintain separate relations with the Srikakulam District Committee leadership as well as with the Guntur Naxalbari Solidarity Committee.

Not only this. In their correspondence with us as on Jan 4, 1969 the central leadership, on one side was congratulating us. After the merger, they never talked with us about difference on any question. But, on the other side, they dropped the name of JANASHAKTI ( our Party's State Organ) in Liberation from the list of papers propagating Mao Tse Tung Thought. They did not also show any reason whatsoever for this.

In the meanwhile, i.e., the AICCCR has sent us its Resolution (Feb 7, 1969) removing the APCCCR from the AICCCR.

Even this Resolution was adopted in a peculiar manner. AICCCR met on Feb 7, 1969. While sending an agenda they informed us that the AICCCR will meet on Feb 6 and 7, 1969. They included in it the "Developing Peoples Movements in

Various States- Our Tasks" as one item of the Agenda. But without taking up this item of the Agenda for discussion, they mentioned three points as the points of basic difference between the SCC and the AICC. Our representative replied to all these points. He made it clear that these questions were never discussed in the past, it is totally wrong for the AICC to unilaterally resolve to expel us without giving any opportunity for such a discussion and this will cause a serious harm to the peoples movement in the State and it will bring more disunity among the Communist Revolutionaries.

Yet, after a discussion for two hours, the AICCCR adopted a Resolution expelling the APCC from their Committee.

An examination of reasons shown by them for this Resolution also make it clear how irrelevant these reasons are :

Here is the AICCCR's Resolution:

### **AICCCR's Resolution on Andhra State Co-ordination Committee**

*February 7, 1969*

"After discussions with the representative of the Andhra Co-ordination Committee, AICCCR (All India Co-ordination Committee of Communist Revolutionaries) is of the opinion that there are basic differences between AICCCR and the Andhra Co-ordination Committee . AICCCR therefore decides to part with Andhra Co-ordination Committee and to treat them as friends and comrades outside AICCCR.

These differences relate first and foremost to the question of loyalty to the Communist Party of China. AICCCR thinks Comrade Nagi Reddy's press statement on the Kerala incident and his failure to revise it, which is tantamount to adherence to it, even after the Chinese comrades' clear and categorical pronouncement is a clear proof that Comrade Nagi Reddy and the Andhra Committee, which supports his stand, are not loyal to the CPC.

The second question relates to the attitude to the Srikakulam struggle. AICCCR holds that instead of owning and glorifying it, the Andhra Committee simply accords it at most lukewarm support. The politics behind this attitude is basically different from the politics of AICCCR.

The third question is the question of Boycott of Elections. With AICCCR it is a basic question of revolutionary struggles for a whole period but the Andhra Committee still persists in taking it as a matter of tactics. Moreover, Comrade Nagi Reddy's failure to comply with AICCCR's resolution by not resigning from the Andhra State Assembly within the specified time, that is, within two months from the end of October, 1968, issues out of this basic political difference.

AICCCR thinks that with this political difference all along the line, that is, difference regarding loyalty to the CPC, difference regarding people's armed struggle, and difference regarding boycotting elections, AICCCR and the Andhra Committee cannot and should not continue in the same Co-ordination. AICCCR should henceforth treat the Andhra Committee as friends and comrades outside

the Co-ordination and should try to maintain non-antagonistic relations with them."

*-From Liberation, Vol.II, No.5 (March 1969).*

Here there are three things in the main.

First, the loyalty to Chinese Party: It is most improper to raise question like this at this stage. Right from the begining, our SCC has been declaring beyond any doubt what so ever that the CPC is playing a leading role in the World Communist Movement; working as the revolutionary centre for the world revolutionary movement and Mao Tse Tung Thought is today's Marxism Leninism. In Oct 1968 both the committees agreed that they have no difference on this question. Yet, it is meaningless to attempt to characterise the SCC as not being loyal to the CPC.

Then what happened in the case of Kerala incident?

Soon after the occurance of Kerala incidents, Charu Majumdar declared that attacks on police stations is not a part of our programme. Later, a report appeared in the bourgeois press that T.Nagi Reddy, in an interview, characterised this incident as an act of Govt's agent. Our JANASHAKTI published Charu Majumdar's statement, but not the statement of Nagi Reddy.

Later, Charu Majumdar wrote a clarification in Liberation correcting his earlier view on Kerala incidents. We published this too in our Janashakti.

We cannot understand why we should publish a correction of Nagi Reddy's statement in our paper when we did not publish his earlier statement.

There is one more difficulty in this. We have not yet seen the Peking Radio's comment supporting Kerala actions. Therefore, the State Committee did not yet get the opportunity to discuss the entire question taking the comments of Peking Radio in its consideration.

Though such a difficulty was there, APCCCR met on Feb 21, 1969 and discussed the question basing on the Liberation articles and arrived at the following view :

The SCC is of the view that it was wrong for Nagi Reddy to characterise the Kerala incidents as the acts of Govt's agent without knowing all the related details. Kerala incidents are a reflection of serious economic and political crisis and revolutionary conditions prevailing in the country. These incidents point out that today's youth are courageously coming to the fore to overthrow the present exploiting system through some sort of daring actions. At the same time, these are not the incidents that have taken place at a time when some class struggle or people's movement was going on there. These incidents have taken place with no relation to the mass movement. The incidents such as this which have no relation to the mass movement only cause serious harm to the people's movement. Such actions are not in line with Mao Tse Tung Thought.

These incidents have taken place in Nov 1968. The AICCCR didnot raise this question in its Jan4, 1969 letter to our Committee. They could have brought this question to our notice on some other occasion too and sought for our Committee's opinion. It is most surprising that neither they raised this question in their Jan 4,

1969 letter, nor discussed about it with our committee in the Feb 7, 1969 meeting of AICCCR, but took action against our State Committee.

### Second Question

The question of Election Boycott. It is clear that it remained a point of difference between our Committee and AICCCR. We made our difference clear right at the time of our merger. AICCCR agreed to our merger inspite of our difference with it on the question.

During four months since our merger, the AICCCR has never discussed this issue with us. In the meanwhile, they published an article in Liberation characterising the boycott of elections as a strategic stand applicable to the entire stage of revolution. Publishing articles on such an important question without discussing in the committees is indeed a peculiar organisational method.

### The question of Nagi Reddy's resignation to the membership of State Assembly :

We made our difference clear to the AICCCR on the question of Election Boycott when we discussed with it. At the same time, we made it clear that Nagi Reddy will resign to the membership of State Assembly as a matter of discipline if it is decided so. We told them that we would let them know our final decision after discussing the question in our Co-ordination Committee.

When the matter has come for discussion in our SCC, the AICCCR's resolution was not with us. We asked the AICCCR comrades to send a copy of it. We are yet to receive it.

In the meanwhile, keeping in view the discussions in the AICCCR Nagi Reddy himself has said in an interview that he is thinking of resigning to the membership of Assembly.

On this, the AICCCR has sent a letter welcoming Nagi Reddy's decision. They asked about the decision of the SCC on this question.

In reply to it, we wrote to the AICCCR that Nagi Reddy himself has taken a decision to resign in the coming Budget Session ( of the Assembly ) and soon the SCC will meet and adopt a formal resolution approving the same. In reply to this, the AICCCR representative has sent the Jan 4, 1969 letter congratulating Nagi Reddy's decision in the following words: "We are happy to know from your letter that Com. Nagi Reddy himself is thinking of resigning to the State Assembly in the Budget Session. Our earnest greetings to him. We wish you adopt a decision. Comrades, this act will surely enthuse the revolutionaries through out the country. It raises the revolutionary prestige of the All India Co-ordination Committee."

Already, i.e., in Dec 1968, the SCC has adopted a resolution on Nagi Reddy's resignation to the membership of Assembly in Budget Session.

One thing will be clear from the above letter. The SCC has agreed to Nagi Reddy's resignation to the State Assembly inspite of having a difference of view with the AICCCR on the question of Election Boycott. AICC was informed of the proposed resignation in the Budget Session. The centre too has sent a letter to SCC ( Jan 4, 1969 ) commending this decision. It is curious that inspite of all this,

AICCCR has taken the action against SCC on the plea that Nagi Reddy has not resigned within two months time limit as told in the meeting of AICCCR in the first week of Feb 1969. They never informed the SCC about their so called decision on Nagi Reddy's resignation within two months time.

Now the last question.

It is a travesty of truth to allege that the SCC is not whole-heartedly supporting the Srikakulam Girijan Armed Struggle.

The relations were strained between the SCC and the Srikakulam DC. We are not getting the comprehensive information in time regarding this movement; Some individuals are engaged in an intensive slander campaign on behalf of Srikakulam DC against our SCC. Despite all this, the SCC is making all efforts to take the Srikakulam Girijan Armed Struggle among the people. Janashakti, through an editorial, welcomed the Srikakulam struggle. Every week, it is publishing the reports of the movement prominently.

Not only this. The people in the areas of girijan movement under its leadership are being extensively explained about the origin and development of Srikakulam Girijan Movement, i.e, the issues which led to its development; conditions in which it developed into an armed struggle ; the political aims of the struggle and all such things.

The main reason for the lack of more extensive mass mobilisation in Andhra on the Srikakulam Girijan Movement lies in the general lull and the factional approach adopted by the Srikakulam DC towards the SCC. The fact must be kept in mind here that never since the beginning of armed struggle in Srikakulam girijan areas there happened the things like the Srikakulam DC asking for the specific help from the SCC or our rejecting it.

The central leaders know that there were differences between the SCC and the Srikakulam DC by the time the SCC joined the AICCCR. The AICC has never made any attempt to discuss and resolve the differences between the SCC and the DC. More over, AICC continued to maintain relations seperately with the Srikakulam DC. It is curious that the AICC has taken action without knowing what effort the SCC has been doing and just by listening to the version of one side alone.

What conclusions we can draw from the examination of the kind of relations that developed between the AICCCR and the SCC and the kind of attitude taken by the AICC from the beginning towards our Committee?

It is clear that the attitudes adopted by the AICC, instead of being helpful, were only helpful to create hurdles at every turn in our efforts to develop the peoples movement into an armed struggle in AP.

By Jun 1968 i.e., at a time when concrete steps were needed to be taken to orientate and turn the majority of party members, party cadre who have broken away from neo revisionism in AP as well as the peoples movement towards the armed struggle, the central leaders, instead of helping through proper suggestions, unleashed open criticism against the SCC in the name of differences between the

two committees and even without discussing with us. At a time when there was need for all the CRs to concentrate themselves in the practical work, they have raked up needless internal discussions and thereby only contributed to the retardation of practical programme. It only led to the growth of disunity and prejudices among the party members and cadres.

While, on one side, discussing with the SCC about the merger, the central leaders have encouraged those belonging to Naxalbari Solidarity Committee in Guntur to work against the SCC. As a consequence, the seeds of factionalism were sown in the state.

The central leaders have taken no step what so ever to put an end to the factional trends even after the merger of SCC with the AICC. We must note the fact that some have further intensified their factional activities and poisonous slanderous campaign after the merger of our SCC with the AICC.

Now, our movement in AP is facing a serious situation. On one side, the armed struggle has begun in Srikakulam district. On the other side, in the meanwhile, overcoming many hurdles, the girijan movement has newly extended in Khammam, Warangal and Karimnagar districts in an area of about 7000 Sq. miles and inhabited by 7 lakh people. The girijan masses are coming into the struggle with a new consciousness. Similarly, right in this period, the movement has extended in two taluks of East Godavari district. Serious efforts are being made to prepare the people for armed struggle in Warangal, Khammam, Karimnagar and East Godavari districts. The efforts are being made to, once again, bring the people in Nalgonda district into action in the face of barbarous repression being perpetrated by the landlords - goondas and the police.

On other side, the government is trying to brutally suppress these peoples movements. It is setting up the police camps where ever the people have moved into action.

In these conditions, when it is necessary to intensify our efforts to unite all the CRs and mobilise the people for armed struggle the AICCCR has come out with a resolution expelling the SCC from AICCCR. We wish to make it clear that this act will be useful only to divide the peoples movement and develop disunity in Andhra.

One more thing must also be kept in mind here. What ever may be the reasons the CRs in West Bengal who are upholding the Mao Tse Tung Thought are compelled to work divided into about 7 groups. There are two groups in Madras. Till now, there were three groups in Kerala. They have recently merged into one and formed a SCC. This SCC has not yet joined the AICCCR. Kashmir unit has not yet joined the AICCCR. Now, because of the attitude of AICC, there is a danger of two committees emerging in our state. In fact, they have already come into existence.

We wish to make it clear that the attitude adopted by the Central leaders towards our SCC at a time when there is a dire need to unite all the CRs in various states will only further divide, rather than uniting the CRs.

All the CRs who have broken away and came out of Neo revisionist party agree that Mao Tse Tung Thought is today's Marxism Leninism. They agree that, in conditions of India, the NDR can be completed only through people's war. Then why inspite of this basic agreement on these questions, there is disunity among the CRs? This is a matter that needs deeper study. We must also examine what role the factional trends are playing in this. Here, we must probe into the political reasons, in the main, for this situation.

Firstly, the struggle against neo revisionism is mainly a revolt of party members from lower level to various levels. Overwhelming majority of old CC Members have betrayed Marxism Leninism.

The ideological struggle in various states was carried on in accordance with their own concrete conditions. The state leaderships are taking a shape. In this situation, the leadership of one state is not having direct experience, assessment and mutual confidence regarding the leadership of another state. Mutual confidence and understanding are to be and can be developed only in the course of development of struggle, patient and mutual discussions. It takes some time.

Secondly, we are striving to apply Mao's Thought to the conditions of India. In the concrete conditions obtaining in various states, there can manifest differences on the question of application of Mao Tse Tung Thought. Some mistakes are unavoidable. A correct line will emerge in the course of applying Mao's Thought to the concrete conditions of India, by correcting the mistakes; learning from the experiences of struggle and through mutual discussions.

The differences are bound to manifest when we are striving to apply Mao Tse Tung Thought to the Indian conditions and the conditions in various states. We can achieve complete unity among the CRs only through the development of struggle and patient discussions.

Here the SCC wants to make one thing clear. It has become unavoidable for us to work seperately for the time being only because of the attitude adopted by the AICCCR towards us. At the same time, we also make our firm determination clear that we would strive to the best of our ability to unite all the CRs who are working on the basis of Mao Tse Tung Thought.





## INDIAN MAOISM-TWO SHADES ?

MALLIKARJUNA RAO

The first recorded debate in the world communist movement on the legitimacy of Mao Tsetung's theories as part of Marxism-Leninism took place in India in 1948-49 and the first open denunciation of these theories as alien to Marxism-Leninism came from the General Secretary of the Communist Party of India, B.T. Ranadive, in 1949. In the wake of the "Left sectarian" deviation at the Calcutta (Second) Congress of the CPI, early in 1948, the Andhra communists, who were already leading an armed struggle of the Telengana peasantry, turned to Mao Tsetung's New Democracy (published in 1944) in their search for revolution based on a four-class alliance and the tactic of peasant partisan warfare. Ranadive, who advocated the new-fangled theory of the "intertwining" of the two stages of revolution and wanted the entire bourgeoisie to be fought, had to extend his polemic to reach the very source of the Andhra communist heresy-Mao-Tse-tung himself. Ranadive wrote : "...we must state emphatically that the Communist Party of India has accepted Marx, Engels, Lenin and Stalin as the authoritative sources of Marxism. It has not discovered new sources of Marxism beyond these. Nor for that matter is there any communist party which declares adherence to the so-called theory of new democracy alleged to be propounded by Mao and declares it to be a new addition to Marxism." Ranadive was equating Mao Tsetung with Tito and Earl Browder when he said it was "impossible for communists to talk lightly about new discoveries, enrichment, because such claims have proved to be a thin cloak for revisionism." The Andhra communists were invoking Mao Tsetung in June 1948, when what now is regarded as Mao's theories or known as Maoism had not been formalised under this nomenclature. The Chinese revolution had not yet triumphed fully and the People's Republic of China had not been founded when the Andhra communists hailed Mao Tsetung's *New Democracy* and regarded him as a new source of Marxism.

Twenty years later, the wheel has turned a full circle. The Communist Party of India split into two in 1964. The Communist Party of India (Marxist), formed in 1964, rejected at its Eighth Congress (December 1968) an amendment to its political resolution requiring it to accept Mao Tse-tung's thought as the Marxism-Leninism of the present epoch. Later, in May 1969, its Politbureau suggested that the analysis of the world situation contained in the main document of the Eighth Congress of the Communist Party of China had nothing to do with Marxism-Leninism.

With this the polarisation in the Indian communist movement was complete. The CPI and CPI(M) constitute the non-Maoist or anti-Maoist wing. The Communist Party of India (Marxist-Leninist), formed in April 1969, is the only organised Maoist party in India though it cannot claim to represent the majority of Maoists in the country. The revolutionary Communist Committee of Andhra Pradesh as well as other formations have chosen to keep out of the new party. The Communist Party of China conferred "recognition" on the CPI(ML) by reprinting excerpts from its political resolution in the People's Daily (July 2 1969). But there are two principal shades of Maoism in India—one represented by the CPI(ML) and the other by the Andhra Maoists.

There is broad agreement among the various Indian Maoist groups on the international general line. There is also broad agreement among them on the stage of the Indian revolution, though the CPI(ML) identifies it as the people's democratic stage [semantically this is in agreement with the CPI(M)'s] while the Revolutionary Communist Committee of Andhra Pradesh calls it the new-democratic stage.

The first point of difference begins with the very beginning. The manner in which the CPI(ML) was formed has not met with approval of many of the Maoist groups. The first countrywide co-ordination of Maoists took place in the form of the All India Co-ordination Committee of the Revolutionaries of the CPI(M) in November 1967 and it included Maoists who had left the CPI(M) or had been expelled, as well as those still in the party. The Co-ordination Committee was not a party or even the nucleus of a party, and its sponsors wanted a party and programme through a process of revolutionary struggles. After the Burdwan plenum of the CPI(M) in April 1968, the majority of the party's membership in Andhra Pradesh was in revolt and the Andhra Pradesh Co-ordination Committee of Communist Revolutionaries was formed. It sought affiliation to the All-India Co-ordination Committee a few months later. But in February 1969, following serious differences with the Andhra Pradesh unit, the All-India Co-ordination Committee disaffiliated the unit.

Alongside, at the same meeting (February 1969), the AICCCR decided to go ahead with the formation of a new party, contrary to its own views earlier against any hasty step towards the goal. For instance, in May 1968, the AICCCR, reviewing the year since Naxalbari, renewed its call for building a "true communist party" in the course of Naxalbari-type struggles, for "revolution can not be victorious without a revolutionary party". But Charu Majumdar, the principal theoretician of the AICCCR, was not sure that the time had come for the formation of a new party. He wrote that "the primary conditions for building up a revolutionary party is to organise armed struggle in the countryside" and that a Maoist party cannot be formed merely by gathering together "the various so-called Marxists who profess the thought of Chariman Mao Tsetung and revolt against leadership of the party..."

But in February 1969, the AICCCR leadership decided on the immediate formation of the party. Its resolution said that an excellent revolutionary situation existed in the country and there was growing unity of revolutionary ranks. The

political and organisational needs of a fast developing struggle could no longer be met by a co-ordination committee because *"without a revolutionary party, there can be no revolutionary discipline and without revolutionary discipline the struggles cannot be raised to a higher level."* Its earlier idea that a party should be formed only *"after all the opportunist tendencies, alien trends and undesirable elements have been purged through class struggle is nothing but subjective idealism. To conceive of a party without contradictions, without the struggle between the opposites, i.e. to think of a pure faultless party is to indulge in idealist fantasy."* Thus the CPI(ML) was formed from above. Kanu Sanyal said at the Calcutta Maidan rally on May 1, 1969, that those who speak of building a party through struggle are indulging in petty-bourgeois romanticism.

In contrast, the Revolutionary Communist Committee of Andhra Pradesh (formerly the State Co-ordination Committee of Communist Revolutionaries) believes in building a party in the course of revolutionary struggle. It has taken a decision in principle to form a party but thinks, as its journal, *Janasakti*, made clear, that revolutionary action should precede the formation of a revolutionary party.

But the differences between the CPI(ML) and the Andhara Maoists relate primarily to the tactical line. The first difference is over the principal contradiction in India. The second difference, obviously an off-shoot of the first, relates to the form of struggle. Or, more specifically, to three sub-issues : Is guerilla warfare the only form of struggle in the present stage in India ? Is there any need for mass organisation to carry on the democratic struggle ? Should a Maoist party be a secret organisation ?

These are the issues being debated within and among the various Maoist groups in India, including the Andhra Maoist group.

The CPI(ML)'s political resolution identifies the principal contradiction in India as between feudalism and the masses of the peasantry, and the immediate task as people's democratic revolution, the main component of which is agrarian revolution to end feudalism. *"Comprador-bureaucratic capitalism and United States and Soviet imperialism"*, being the main props of feudalism, have to be fought too. Some of the other groups think imperialism is the main enemy and feudalism and comprador bourgeoisie survive only with the help of imperialism. The *Immediate Programme* of the RCC of Andhra says that India is a "neo-colony" exploited by the U.S., British and Soviet imperialists and along with imperialism, feudalism is also an exploiting force. *"The task of the new-democratic revolution is to destroy imperialism, feudalism, comprador bourgeoisie and the bureaucratic capitalism i.e., the big bourgeoisie and then to establish a new-democratic State"*.

The CPI(ML)'s class strategy is one of a *"revolutionary front of all revolutionary classes"* according to its political resolution, which commends Mao Tsetung's theory of people's war as the only means of struggle. It says, *"If the poor and landless peasants, who constitute the majority of the peasantry, the firm ally of the working class, unite with the middle peasants, then the vast section of the people will be united and the democratic revolution will inevitably win victory."*

*It is the responsibility of the working class as the leader of the revolution to unite with the peasantry-the main force of the revolution-and advance towards seizure of power through armed struggle. It is on the basis of worker-peasant alliance that a revolutionary united front of all classes will be built up.*" But the party does not seem to be clear as to how to achieve the task of building a "revolutionary front of all revolutionary classes". The CPI(ML)'s documents repeatedly emphasise guerilla warfare waged by the peasantry against the landlords as the only form of struggle in the present stage of revolution. There is little mention of the need for mass organisations or for an agrarian programme as a concomitant of peasant struggle.

To go by published material, an article by Charu Majumdar in *Ghatana Prabaha* (Vol.II, No.1) is revealing, rejecting the ideas of a mass organisation, he advocates the building of a secret organisation through which the poor and landless peasants can establish their leadership of the peasant movement. "Obviously all the peasants do not at first wage guerilla war ; it is started by the advanced, class conscious section. So at the beginning, it may appear to be the struggle of a handful of people. It is not the Che (Guevara)-style guerilla war because this war is started not by relying on weapons but on the co-ordinate of the unarmed people. So this struggle could be started only by propagating the politics of seizure of power among the peasantry and this task can be achieved by the party unit formed of poor and landless peasants. *The party unit can fulfil this task only by organising guerilla war by poor and landless peasants..... Guerilla war is the only tactic of the peasants' revolutionary struggle.* This cannot be achieved by any mass organisation through open struggle." (Italics added)

The main criticism by other Maoist groups is that the CPI(ML)'s line of thinking is opposed to Mao Tsetung's thought because by considering armed struggle by the peasantry as the *only* form of struggle, it is minimising or even ignoring the role of the working class and the tasks in the urban areas and the role of mass organisations.

As for the Andhra RCC, the emphasis is not on armed clashes with the landlords and the State authority through a handful of revolutionaries but on mass armed struggles. A statement on armed struggle (July 1969) notes that "only through mass revolutionary rallies, revolutionary organisation and mass armed struggle we can dissolve the present big landlord-big bourgeois imperialist system."

The contours of the revolutionary front the Andhra RCC has in view are : "The working class will lead the united front. Along with workers and peasants, middle classes and (the) national bourgeoisie will also be in this united front", to achieve the new-democratic revolution. The line is based on the inseparable relationship between the party, armed struggle and united front.

A document, devoted to examining the RCC's differences with the Srikakulam unit affiliated to the CPI(ML), on the conduct of the Girijan armed struggle in Srikakulam tribal tract, clearly declares that to begin guerilla struggle participation of the masses is a necessary condition. An agrarian programme is the basis of all peasant struggle. According to the RCC, the starting, development, consolidation

and extension of all the struggles of the peasantry would have to be based on an "agrarian revolutionary programme". Liberation for the peasantry means liberation from the landlord-imperialist system. Though complete liberation is possible only after the establishment of base areas, seizure of power throughout India and after the establishment of new-democratic government, "liberation begins with the starting of class struggles, with the starting of anti-landlord struggles, with the starting of the Agrarian Revolutionary Programme", according to the document.

On the call for boycott of elections the RCC's *Immediate Programme* urges action to implement the RCC's earlier decision to boycott the panchayat elections in Andhra Pradesh. It is not a mere question of the Revolutionary Communists boycotting the poll but one of persuading the people not to participate in the elections. "To achieve this we must mainly depend on the consciousness and organising capacity of the people. No short-cut methods are to be allowed or treaded", it warns, because "we must specify that the issue at hand is not mere boycott of elections by the people" but one of convincing them that people's war is the path for them and that the village soviets and people's committees would constitute the foundation of the "new people's democratic revolutionary State" in the villages and provide the leadership for implementing the agrarian programme.

The RCC thinks that its attempt to give a positive content to the slogan of election boycott at the grassroots level gives a new dimension to the concept of organising the peasantry for action. Where the RCC commands the majority following in a panchayat village, boycott of elections would lead to an unprecedented situation. The majority will be outside the government-sponsored panchayat committee and form their own parallel "people's committee". The people's committees in the "boycott" villages will function in competition with the government-sponsored committees, the sanction coming from the majority of the people. These committees will undertake law, revenue, village defence (against attacks of landlords or government machinery) tasks and when the peasant struggles move to higher forms, would become the village soviets. These committees would also work as the united front committees, initiate and carry out agrarian reform and will play their role in the armed struggle. Revolutionary Communists would dominate these committees and provide the leadership but these would have the participation of agricultural labour and the poor peasants and others. As the movement goes ahead, a few representatives of the rich peasants might be taken in. But these committees are to have a clear class outlook and ideology.

The *Immediate Programme* clearly emphasises the role of mass organisations for the peasantry, working class, students and other sections of the people. In contrast, the CPI(ML) seems to have a distrust of mass organisations and urban areas in general.

July 4, 1970

[Reproduced from FRONTIER ANTHOLOGY-2]



## A FEW WORDS ABOUT CPI (ML)

The Naxalbari movement of May 1967 added a new dimension to the revolutionary politics of Bengal. The bankrupt leadership of the C.P (M) was exposed to the advanced section of the party cadres. The C.P (M) cadres in large number cut off their relations with the new revisionist party and began to rally behind Naxalbari movement which kindled a new hope in their minds. Many leaflets, pamphlets and articles were published on local initiative. All the reactionaries grouped together to condemn the Naxalbari movement. Down-trodden and wretched common people saw a ray of hope in Naxalbari movement and were encouraged. They became eager to know in details about the happenings of Naxalbari and developed a keen interest to study about it. The name of Kanu Sanyal and Jangal Santal were on the lips of the people. But long before the Naxalbari politics was fairly spread among the people a new and wrong tendency was in the offing. It was a tendency to create a Party with a new sign board, but without a proletarian class basis and without having Marxism-Leninism and Mao Tsetung Thought as its guide.

Long before the advent of Naxalbari movement many groups were formed inside the C.P(M) and they launched a relentless inner-party ideological struggle. It was confined mainly among the advanced section of the party cadres. But there was no co-ordination of works among these groups. The strong necessity of some sort of co-ordination was felt by these groups to spread the politics of Naxalbari Movement.

But when an All-India Co-ordination Committee was formed many of the groups remained outside it retaining their independent entities. Subsequently, the people who formed themselves as a definite entity centering Charu Mazumdar regarded themselves the only revolutionary men. Others were being regarded non-revolutionaries or counter revolutionaries. A sectarian effort was made to project Charu Mazumdar as the "authority" of Indian revolution. Moreover, in following Marxism-Leninism and Mao's Thought in the Indian context the revolutionaries were boastfully asked to follow everything in the light of Charu Mazumdar's view. He was regarded to have added a new chapter to Marxism-Leninism after Mao Tsetung and hence this science acquired a new epithet, Marxism-Leninism Mao Tsetung's Thought and "*Charu Mazumdar's teachings*".

The programme and process of works set by the Co-ordination Committee declared to unite both the underground and open activities as far as possible to spread the Thought of Mao Tsetung. Programme regarding the student movement and mass work reflected Mao Tsetung's Thought.

After the transformation of Co-ordination committee into a new party C.P.I (ML) on May 1, 1969 the politics of Naxalbari started undergoing some qualitative changes. The newly-formed party led by Charu-Mazumdar began to take a stand opposed to that as set by the Co-ordination Committee previously. This new line was hardly backed by dialectical logic. In support of the new line, therefore, half truths and distorted news started spreading (e.g. Charu Mazumdar has kindled the flame of Naxalbari in Srikakulam with his own hands, 300 villages of Srikakulam have been liberated, many villages in Midnapore are liberated, Radio Liberation is on the air etc.) in order to create an illusion about Mr.Charu Mazumdar. This illusion was created among the cadres of all provinces. This helped him to gather a large number of youths brimful of revolutionary energy and vigour.

Mr.Mazumdar's article "*A few words about Guerilla Actions*" in no uncertain terms put his theory of individual annihilation in black and white for the first time though it was set in motion long before in practice. This theory was an admixture of Narodism and Guevara's petty-bourgeois romantic theory of revolution. It interpreted 'Guerilla War' as the "*only*" means to arouse the people.



# LEFT TREND AMONG INDIAN REVOLUTIONARIES

Oct 1970

*[This is an APRCC's document. It made a comprehensive study and criticism of the ideological-political line advocated and practiced by the leadership of AICCCR and CPI(ML) during 1967-70. It also elaborated the APRCC's understanding of various questions concerning Indian revolution in the light of Marxism Leninism, revolutionary mass line and the revolutionary experiences, significantly, of China and Telangana, Naxalbari, Srikakulam and other peasant revolutionary movements in India. -EC ]*

It is imperative that the Indian Communist movement, after comprehensive discussion about right and "left" deviations, will have to arrive at proper conclusions. Notwithstanding this, it is undeniable that the leadership of the Communist Party of India has failed to lead the Indian Revolution. The revolutionaries in the country hoped that, when the All India Co-ordination Committee of Communist Revolutionaries was formed, it would organise itself into a party, and be able to lead the Indian Revolution under the guidance of Marxism-Leninism and Mao's Thought. But even the leadership of this committee did not take long time to deviate itself into "left" line. Even though this "left" trend could be seen even before they formed themselves into CP (ML), it became crystal clear and very dangerous only after the formation of the party. It is natural that the revolutionaries in the country are anxious to understand the phenomenon fully.

We have made our stand clear on all these questions through the press statements and the documents of our State Convention. Further, it has also been explained in our article "Some Problems of Peoples War" in reply to their tirade against our "Immediate Programme". Yet, they refuse to rectify their incorrect policies and practice. What is more they are baselessly slandering us as "revisionists" in spite of the fact that we are conducting the armed struggle on the one hand and simultaneously striving to develop the revolutionary movement into armed struggle on the other in accordance with Marxism-Leninism and Mao's Thought. In their view there appears no difference



what so ever between those who are conducting armed struggle and are striving to overthrow the ruling classes and those who are pursuing the parliamentary path and defending the very same ruling classes. It has, therefore, become essential to thoroughly examine their wrong policies.

These are the important questions under discussion today.

1. The principal contradiction at the present stage of the People's Democratic Revolution and its relation to other non-principal contradictions.
2. What is a revolutionary situation?
3. Economism and the revolutionary mass struggles.
4. Problems of armed struggle.
5. The problems of nationalities in India; The movement for separate Telangana.
6. Unification of the Revolutionaries.

These are not questions for academic discussions.

These are the questions of theory and practice arising in the course of armed struggle and the building of revolutionary movement, on the correct solutions of which the advance of the revolution depends.

The analysis of the concrete Indian conditions advanced by the leadership of the Indian Communist movement in the past was totally erroneous. Further, their work was neither based on revolutionary practice nor on the universal truth of the basic principles of Marxism-Leninism-Mao's Thought. Merely chanting them or attempting to mechanically implement them with utter disregard for the revolutionary practice, or revising them in the name of creative Marxism was, in general, what the revisionist leadership has been doing all along. Analysing the concrete Indian conditions in the light of Mao's Thought and on the basis of the experiences of the Telangana armed struggle, the Andhra Communist leadership had, during the Telangana armed struggle (1946-51), proved the applicability of the Chinese revolutionary path to India. The ideological struggle for a correct Marxist-Leninist path has once again come to the fore with the Naxalbari armed struggle.

The Communist revolutionaries within the Communist Party (Marxist) led this ideological struggle. Some of these communist revolutionaries formed the Communist Party (Marxist-Leninist). But they have failed to make a comprehensive analysis of the concrete Indian conditions and to apply them to their revolutionary practice. They are merely chanting the basic principles of Mao's Thought. Thus while themselves pursuing incorrect policies, they are deliberately distorting the correct policies pursued by the Andhra Pradesh Revolutionary Communist Committee. They claim that they alone are the followers of Mao's Thought in India today. While failing to unify the revolutionary forces, this attitude of theirs has only led to further division and disruption of the revolutionary movement itself. It has therefore become imperative for the revolutionaries to grasp this erroneous and harmful attitude and to carry on a determined struggle against it.

However, it should be clearly understood that they did not have these erroneous tendencies at the time of the formation of the All India Co-ordination Committee of the Communist Revolutionaries. In the beginning they also had correct attitudes on some questions. But gradually they have drifted towards this wrong line.

Though the differences on some of the questions of armed struggle have not yet come to the fore at the time of discussing these problems, it is essential that they should be discussed on the basis of their practice. We hope that the experiences put forward here would be of use to the revolutionaries.

### **1. Contradictions:-Principal Contradiction:**

The Indian revolution must go through two stages-the bourgeois democratic revolution in the first stage, and the socialist revolution in the second stage. Today the Indian revolution is in the stage of the bourgeois democratic revolution. India is a semi-colonial and semi-feudal country. Therefore ours is an anti-imperialist, anti-feudal revolution under the leadership of the proletariat. Hence the people's democratic revolution. The contradiction between the anti imperialist, anti-feudal democratic revolutionary character and the semi-colonial, semi-feudal character is the fundamental contradiction for the entire stage of the people's democratic revolution. This will remain unchanged until the completion of the people's democratic revolution. Only by smashing imperialism and feudalism and establishing people's democracy through the people's democratic revolution can this fundamental contradiction be resolved. This revolution will be an armed revolution in the form of protracted war.

A number of contradictions appear in the course of the Indian bourgeois democratic revolution. Important among them are:-

1. The contradiction between imperialism and the oppressed classes of Indian society.
2. The contradiction between feudalism and the broad masses of Indian people.
3. The contradiction between the bourgeoisie and the working class.
4. The contradiction between the bourgeoisie on one side and the peasantry and urban middle class on the other.
5. The contradiction among the groups of the reactionary ruling classes.

Since there are a number of contradictions, not only do they appear in a complex form, but also some additions and alterations are taking place and have taken place among them. It is, therefore, essential to bear this in mind.

Only the British imperialists were directly ruling and oppressing the country prior to 1947. British imperialists exploitation did not come to an end in the subsequent period. On the contrary, it has been going on just as before and even more so.

That is not all. The American imperialists and the Soviet Social imperialists have also stepped in and are plundering the country. The policies of the Government serve the political and economic interests of these imperialist powers.

West German and Japanese imperialists come next in the order of plundering the country. Of all these imperialists, the American imperialists and the Soviet Social imperialists are the most aggressive. They support and safe-guard the reactionary forces of India. Thus they stand as the main enemies of the Indian revolution. The ruling classes of India, namely, the big bourgeoisie and the land lord classes, are serving them as their agents.

Until 1947, feudalism had been serving as the agent of British imperialists. There after it has been and is still serving as the agent of American imperialism and other imperialists. By converting a part of their wealth into capital and aligning themselves with foreign bourgeoisie and the Indian big bourgeoisie, many of the feudalists have themselves become big capitalists. Even though the Princely states and the Zamindaris have been abolished, the same class, as the big land lords and big bourgeoisie, occupy an important place in the ruling set up. By aligning itself with the big bourgeoisie, this class is ruling and plundering the masses. Thus India is plundered by imperialism the big bourgeoisie, and the land lord classes.

Since India is a country with a vast population under the capitalist system, the world imperialist powers are competing among themselves to plunder its wealth and the people. It is possible that in future these inter-imperialist contradictions might become intensified and burst in India. We should, therefore, closely watch these developments closely. In view of the above, it becomes clear that the principal contradiction at the present stage of the people's democratic revolution is the contradiction between feudalism and the broad masses of people.

The entire Indian bourgeoisie is not a national bourgeoisie. It includes the big bourgeoisie which is an ally of imperialism. This class of big bourgeoisie comprises of 1) comprador, 2) bureaucratic and 3) feudal bourgeois classes. The comprador bourgeoisie are those who depend on the foreign imperialists for loans, technical know-how, exports and imports and who act as their collaborators. The bureaucratic bourgeoisie are those who depend upon the Government budgets and plunder for their profits. Those of the feudal landlords and princes who have converted a part of their hidden wealth into capital are the feudal bourgeoisie. All these three types of the bourgeoisie are allied with and acting as lackeys of imperialism and feudalism. All of them are the enemies of the Indian people's democratic revolution. There are no contradictions between this section of the bourgeoisie and imperialism and feudalism, Leaving this section, the other section of Indian bourgeoisie is the national bourgeoisie. When the section of Indian bourgeoisie, namely, the big bourgeoisie has joined the camp of imperialism and feudalism that is exploiting the people, the second section, namely, the national bourgeoisie is likely to join the revolution against the former. Imperialism and big bourgeoisie suppress the national bourgeoisie without allowing it to grow. Therefore there will arise a situation where it would become inescapable for the national bourgeoisie to unite with the people in the anti-imperialist national liberation struggle.

The contradiction between the working class and the bourgeoisie operates subordinately to the above. At the stage of the people's democratic revolution, the working class overthrows the big bourgeoisie as well as imperialism and feudalism. But as far as possible it endeavours to draw the national bourgeoisie into the united front.

The contradiction between the bourgeoisie on the one hand and the peasantry and urban middle classes on the other is also of the same type. The bourgeoisie is exploiting not only the working class but also the peasantry and the urban middle classes. But the big bourgeoisie having allied itself with imperialism and feudalism is ruthlessly exploiting the peasantry and the urban middle classes. The liberation of the peasantry and the urban middle classes depends upon the overthrow of them from power. Therefore they should unite under the leadership of the proletariat, build the united front to the extent possible with the national bourgeoisie to overthrow imperialism, feudalism and the big bourgeoisie and seize the political power in their own hands.

The Indian ruling classes are divided into different parties and groups. Some of these parties and groups are leaning towards American imperialism while some are leaning towards Soviet social imperialism. The contradictions among these Imperialist camps are reflected in the contradictions among these groups and parties.

Prior to 1947, the British imperialists stationed their armed forces in India and directly ruled our country. The principal contradiction at that time was the contradiction between imperialism and the oppressed classes of India. After 1947 there is no direct rule by the British imperialists. Yet the British, American and other imperialists as well as the Soviet Social imperialists are preserving their interests through the present ruling classes. Instead of military they are making use of political, economic and cultural means. Thus an alliance is formed between imperialism and big bourgeoisie, big land lord classes. As a result the contradiction between imperialism and the oppressed classes of the country was temporarily relegated to the secondary place, thus occupying an auxiliary position.

This does not, however, mean that the contradiction between imperialism and the oppressed classes of the country has disappeared or been resolved. This contradiction will disappear only when imperialism is totally absent in the country or when it is nominal or weak. (In the present situation the imperialist domination is prevailing in all the oppressed countries.).

It is from this point of view, the formulations of the leadership of CP (ML) should be examined.

They write that:

*".....The principal contradiction in our country at the present phase is between feudalism and the masses of our peasantry".* (Political Resolution, Liberation May 1969).

This formulation is undoubtedly wrong. Role of the peasantry in the overthrow of feudalism is, no doubt, principal. But this does not, however, mean that the

peasantry alone can fulfil this task all by itself. The peasantry, as a part of the broad masses of people under the leadership of the proletariat, plays the main role in the armed struggle and in the overthrow of feudalism. The people's democratic revolution is otherwise known as the agrarian revolution only because this revolution is mainly a peasant revolution. The leadership of the CP (ML), who refuse to recognise this, is equating the peasantry with the broad masses of people, and the agrarian revolution with the people's democratic revolution.

After a while (perhaps after some discussion) they write that:

*"In brief, out of all the major contradictions in our country that is the most important contradiction is between the landlord and poor peasants, i.e., between feudalism and the broad masses of the Indian people".* (Draft Programme, Para 29)

Though there appears to be some difference between this formulation and the formulation seen in their Political Resolution, the content of these two formulations is one and the same. The poor peasantry does not mean entire peasantry, let alone the vast masses of people. Instead, the poor peasant is a part, a main part, of the peasantry as well as of the Indian masses and will continue to remain as such. To look at the contradiction between feudalism and the peasantry as only between the poor peasantry and feudalism and to understand this as the contradiction between feudalism and the broad masses of the Indian people- all this clearly shows how defective their understanding is. Further it is clear that a broad perspective of the people's democratic revolution- a revolution in which the peasantry, as the main force unites itself with the broad masses of people under the leadership of the proletariat and overthrows feudalism- is also absent in their understanding.

Similarly, in their writings there is no mention of the contradiction between imperialism and the oppressed masses which has been temporarily relegated to an auxiliary position. Thus the struggle against imperialism, i.e. mainly the struggle of the working class and the urban middle classes, is completely ignored by them. Only by conducting armed struggle against feudalism and then present ruling classes, on the one hand, and by simultaneously organising and intensifying the struggle against imperialism, on the other, would we be able to mobilise the revolutionary classes to seize the political power.

In this respect Com. Mao's formulation should be borne in mind. Com. Mao says that:

*"In a semi-colonial country such as China the principal contradiction and the non-principal contradictions present a complicated picture".* ("On Contradictions")

Thus he pointed out that the non-principal contradictions also exist side by side with the principal contradiction and it is essential to grasp the relation between the two. But it does not mean that we should only take note of the principal contradiction and should refuse to recognise or totally ignore the non-principal contradiction. At the same time Com. Mao had explained that *"the*

*principal contradiction existed between feudalism and the broad masses of the people", but not between feudalism and the peasantry, or between land lords and the poor peasantry and nowhere did he say that this and the contradiction between feudalism and the broad masses of the people, is one and the same.*

Com. Mao explained the contradiction between feudalism and the broad masses of people as follows:-

*"But in another situation, the contradictions change position. When imperialism carries on its oppression not by war, but by milder means- political, economical 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 often 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 the semi-colonial countries to oppress the people, and thus the internal contradictions become particularly sharp". (On Contradiction S.W. Vol, P,331-332).*

**What does this mean?**

In the absence of war, imperialism applies political, economic and cultural means to plunder the semi-colonial countries. When the people resort to civil war, the imperialist would, in addition, send military aid to the countries, ruling classes and help to suppress the revolution. Thus the feudal classes of a semi colonial country enter into an alliance with imperialism and plunder the country. With the imperialists aiding the reactionary ruling classes to suppress the revolution, the internal contradictions would become especially sharp.

Does this formulation of Com. Mao apply to our country as well?

Surely it applies. Just because the British have left and their armies have been withdrawn from our country, British imperialism has not come to an end in our country. On the contrary British imperialist capital remains as always in our country. What is more it has further increased many times. Added to it, American imperialist and Soviet Social imperialist capital has entered the country and become dominant. Today our country is entirely dependent upon foreign countries for technical know-how. The country's political policies are in keeping with the interest of the imperialists and the social imperialists. Thus the imperialists of all kinds have turned the country into their neo-colony by using political, economical and cultural means and are ruthlessly plundering it. They are fully supporting the reactionary ruling classes to suppress the people's revolution. Since the ruling classes are allied with imperialism, the internal contradictions have become especially sharp.

This means that the internal contradiction is between feudalism and the broad masses of people.

Is there any comparison between this and the contradiction between feudalism and the poor peasantry that the leadership of the CP (M.L.) is advancing?

Together with the principal contradiction in the Indian semi-colonial, semi-feudal society at the present stage of the revolution, we should also take the

non-principal contradictions into consideration and strive to build the revolutionary movement. Only then would this revolutionary movement, without confining itself to feudalism and the big bourgeoisie, extend itself against imperialism and take the shape of people's democratic revolution. This revolutionary movement would go on in the form of armed struggle and political and economic struggles in the countryside and in the form of political and economic struggle in the urban areas. Together with the peasantry the broad masses of people would also be mobilised. Thus only when, making use of the present contradictions, the broad masses of people are fully mobilised into the revolutionary movement and firmly unite against imperialism, feudalism and the big bourgeoisie would the revolution achieve all round progress.

## **II. What is a Revolutionary Situation?**

Today there are no differences of opinions among the revolutionaries on the question of the existence of a revolutionary situation in the country.

The fact that we should adopt new tactics (forms of struggles, slogans and forms of organisation) to build the revolutionary movement while there is a revolutionary situation in the country is indisputable. The peasantry in the countryside, the urban working class, the students, the youth, the middle classes and the other sections of the people in the cities are increasingly participating in the struggles in different parts of the country. These struggles are going on for both political as well as economic demands. The anti-feudal peasant revolts have become a common feature in the countryside. The use of fire arms, the shooting and killing of people by the dastardly government has become a part of the country's daily life.

Armed struggle of the peasantry has started and is continuing in our country. It has started in Naxalbari of West Bengal in 1967. It has started and is continuing in Srikakulam district of Andhra Pradesh in 1968, and in Telangana in 1969.

By this it is evident that there is a revolutionary situation in the country and that it has already taken the form of armed struggle. The old and new revisionists who argue that there is no revolutionary situation in the country, or that it is only gradually maturing must have either failed to see this objective reality or they must be willfully, hoodwinking and betraying the people. Evidently it is the latter.

Here we should also note the fact that neither all nor even a majority of the struggles being carried on against the ruling classes all over the country are taking the form of armed struggle. The people in the vast areas of the country are yet to join the revolutionary struggles. Even though this is due to lack of revolutionary leadership in some areas, the experience in some other areas also shows that the people have not yet joined the revolutionary struggles despite the existence of a revolutionary leadership.

This is mainly due to the unevenness in the development of the revolutionary mass movement in the country. In some areas the revolutionary mass movement has already reached the stage of armed struggle, while in some it is still at the

stage of only anti-government political and economic struggles. Yet in some other areas it is either in its very primary stage or there is not any mass movement. Besides the vastness of the country, the parliamentary path pursued by the revisionist parties cloaked in communism and masquerading as the genuine communist parties is also mainly responsible for this. The specific economic conditions obtaining in some areas can also be responsible for this situation to some extent.

The feudal relations are strong in the vast rural areas of the country and the worst kind of feudal exploitation in various forms is going on. When revolutionaries adopt the correct agrarian revolutionary programme and tactics and work among the masses of these areas, the revolutionary movement would rapidly develop into armed struggle. This is what the experience of the areas where the armed struggle is going on today shows. There are also some areas where the worst feudal relations are not obtaining. In such areas it will take some time for the revolutionary movement to reach the stage of armed struggle.

Similarly in some areas, the movements of peasant, landless labour, youth and the middle classes are under the influence of old and new revisionists. In some areas they are under the influence of casteism, religion and regionalism. All these are legal and reformist movements. However, in the present revolutionary situation, the masses participating in these movements are gradually realising the pro-ruling class policies of these various leaderships and are in quest of a revolutionary path. The armed struggles that have been launched recently are awakening these people.

The sum and substance of all this is that today:

- 1) The revolutionary situation is ripe in the country.
- 2) The development of the revolutionary movement in the country is uneven.
- 3) Among the masses of various classes, some are adopting the form of armed struggle, while some, under the influence of revisionist, reformist and communal parties, are, through their own experience, gradually leaning towards the revolutionary path.
- 4) In some areas there is no movement at all.
- 5) Excepting in a few areas there is a lack of revolutionary leadership in vast areas of the country.

Only when the revolutionaries properly grasp these concrete conditions will it be possible for them to carry on the armed struggle, on the one hand and, simultaneously build the revolutionary mass movement and develop it to the stage of armed struggle in the other areas on the other.

The leadership of the CP(ML) is lacking such a comprehensive understanding of the revolutionary situation. Further they think and act as though there is a revolutionary movement throughout the country and that it has already reached the stage of armed struggle.

To quote them, this is what they say:

*"TUs serve as training schools for the proletariat only when there is no revolutionary situation, in a country...."*



*"..... in such a revolutionary situation, the party organisation becomes the only class organisation of the proletariat".*

*".....So. When we say that revolutionary situation now prevails in India, it necessarily follows that in India, our task today is to build underground revolutionary party organisations and not mass organisations". (Liberation, September, 1969) 'Guerilla warfare is the only tactic for carrying on peasant revolutionary struggle". (Liberation, July, 1969)*

We will separately explain our stand on the relation between the armed struggle and other forms of struggle and the mass organisations. All the above quotations only mean one thing—that is, since there is a revolutionary situation in the country there is no need for the working class to realise through their own experience the need for armed struggle; that the working class does not need trade unions; that, likewise, the peasantry and other masses of people do not need any mass organisation; that the revolutionary mass movements are not needed, and that the peasantry is directly adopting the armed struggle as the form of struggle and hence they have adopted this as their tactics.

This line of thinking is opposed to the objective reality that the level of revolutionary movement in the present revolutionary situation is uneven. Further, this line of thinking also implies that the general mass movements as well as the revolutionary mass movements have reached the stage of armed struggle throughout the country. This is not only theoretically wrong, but also it is contrary to the objective reality. The very fact that many of the State units of the CP (ML) are still unable to start armed struggle only prove this.

If we see what Lenin, Stalin and Mao had, in the course of the mighty Marxist movement, said in this respect it would be fully evident as to how utterly wrong their line of thinking theoretically is.

Lenin, in his speech on the revolution of 1905, has said that:

*"The real education of the masses can never be separated from their independent political, and especially revolutionary, struggle. Only struggle educates the exploited class. Only struggle discloses to it the magnitude of its own power, widens its horizon, enhances its abilities, clarifies its mind. Forges its will".*

**—(Collected Works, Vol, 23, Page 241)**

Lenin explains here how the masses in the revolution of 1905 became conscious through struggles, how they got trained, tempered and steeled and how they were prepared for the insurrection. This equally applies to us as well. We should also help the masses to realise their own revolutionary potential through revolutionary struggles, especially political struggles and to exhibit their united might and will to fight. Only then would they, through their own experience, be prepared to recognise the need for the armed struggle.

Stalin also speaks, as follows, about the necessity of people learning through their own experience.

*"The point here is not that the vanguard should realise the impossibility of preserving the old order of things and the inevitability of its overthrow. The point is that the masses, the millions, should understand this inevitability and display their readiness to support the vanguard. But the masses can understand this only from their own experience."*

**(Fundamentals of Leninism P.75)**

The necessity to overthrow the old order should be learnt not only while there is no revolutionary situation but also while there is a revolutionary situation. In a revolutionary situation people can learn quickly. In any situation, learning is a must. Therefore what Stalin has said applies to us as well.

Mao speaks as follows about the unevenness in the development of the Chinese revolution:

*"As China, at the present stage, is a large semi-colonial and semi-feudal country dominated by a number of powerful yet conflicting imperialist countries and by the feudal forces of China, her economic and political development is extremely uneven and lacking in uniformity. This determines the extreme unevenness in the development of China's new-democratic revolution and renders it necessary for the revolution to go through a protracted, tortuous struggle before nationwide victory can be achieved". (Revolution, China Communist Party, 6<sup>th</sup> Central Committee, 7<sup>th</sup> Plenary Sessions).*

As in China, the economic and political development of our country is also uneven. Today when the armed struggle is in its primary stage, the development of the revolutionary movement in our country is also uneven. Just as Mao stressed the unevenness of the Chinese revolution, even when the Chinese Communist party under the leadership of Mao had already built the people's army, established liberated areas and was marching forward, the unevenness of the revolutionary movement in our country should be of special significance for us. The formulation of the leadership of the CP (ML), which, without taking this aspect into consideration, says that since there is a revolution in the country the armed struggle can be launched directly without preparing the masses for it, is, therefore, theoretically wrong.

From this it is clear that in the present revolutionary situation, we should realise the necessity of mobilising the masses into revolutionary struggles, especially into political struggles, and helping them to realise through their own experience the necessity of overthrowing the present semi-colonial, semi-feudal society and establishing the people's democracy in its place and that we should strive to fulfill this task while at the same time carrying out the armed struggle.

### **III. Is it Economism to Mobilise the Masses into Revolutionary Movement?**

Economism has become predominant in the Indian revolutionary movement, in the working class which should lead the revolutionary movement, and in the Communist Party (undivided) that should be the Vanguard of the working class

and it is playing the main role in impending advance of revolution. It is indisputable that the progress of revolution depends upon waging a bitter struggle against the remnants of economism among the revolutionary ranks, against the deep rooted economism that still has its roots in the revolutionary movement, and rooting it out completely.

The Trade Union movement as well as the peasant and landless labour movements in the country today are reformist movements. Even the struggles on economic demands are rare under their leadership. We see that to an extent the struggles for wage rise and other demands related to it are going on under the leadership of the trade unions and winning partial success. Recently the so called "Land grab" movement was launched under the leadership of the peasant organisation. The main feature of the movement was the courting of arrests by the cadre as soon as they reached the lands of the landlords and the government. Some of the trade union cadre courted arrests in this movement and christened it as the "alliance of working class and peasantry". These actions led by the Right Communist Party are not revolutionary struggles. They are not only reformist movements, but also individual satyagrahas.

Such movements, if they are movements at all, are being led by the old and new revisionist parties and SSP. All these parties are representing the social democracy in India. Whether some of them are supporting or others apparently opposing the ruling classes, they are all pursuing the parliamentary path. Therefore the policies they preach to the working class, peasantry and the middle classes are only reformist and class collaborationist politics and not revolutionary politics.

Thus what they follow is economism. The concrete form of economism is to strictly confine their own activities as well as the struggles of the working class, peasantry and the landless labour within the limits of winning economic demands while preaching class collaborationist politics.

To combat economism, it is not enough to merely point it out. The mass movements of various classes should be organised for political as well as economic demands. The masses who participate in these struggles should be helped to realise through their own experience the need to overthrow the present ruling classes and to build a new society in place of the old. Especially when the backward sections of society join the economic struggles, we should strive to make them politically conscious. We should not confine ourselves to general political propaganda alone. To prepare the peasantry for armed struggle, to lead the peasant armed struggle wherever they are ready and to propagate about this armed struggle, the path of people's war and Mao's Thought among the masses—this is what is meant by propagating revolutionary politics among the masses. This is what Communist revolutionaries should do.

The masses, including the peasantry, will not be prepared for armed struggle with the propagation of revolutionary politics alone. By the propaganda of revolutionary politics and by realising the need for armed struggle through their own experience in the political and economic struggles, the masses will become

ready for armed struggle. The revolutionaries should lead them in such a way that these struggles develop as armed struggle or as Auxiliary struggles to the armed struggle. All struggles confined to economic demands without the perspective of armed struggle are merely economic struggles. Their perspective is nothing but the perspective of economism. But the leadership of CP (ML) does not view economism from this angle. They are formulating differently.

**This is what they say:**

*".....economism.....according to which the workers and the poor and landless peasants will be unable to accept revolutionary politics, unless they are led into open struggles on economic demands. This line of thinking weakens all our work like propagating revolutionary politics, propagating the politics of seizure of power and building revolutionary base areas in the countryside."*

**(Charu Majumdar, Liberation, Sep.1969).**

We agree that economism is an obstacle in the way of the propagation of revolutionary politics and the politics of seizure of political power and the building of the revolutionary base areas. Similarly if the struggle is confined merely to the economic demands, not only the building of revolutionary base areas is not possible but also the propagation of the politics of armed struggle would become nominal. Therefore only when the revolutionaries, while carrying on the economic struggle give importance to the political struggles and thus help the masses to realise the need for the path of armed struggle through their own experience, would it be possible for them to prepare the masses for building revolutionary base areas.

This is not the line of thinking of the leadership of CP (ML). Their line of thinking is that the armed struggle could be carried on with the mere propaganda of politics of armed struggle without the need for the political and economic struggles. Even though they say here and there that they are not opposed to economic struggles, they are in actual fact propagating and practicing the same line as above.

Due to the political and economic struggles that the people have already waged in some areas and due to the realisation of the betrayal of the old and new revisionists the reformists and the reactionaries in some other areas, the masses of people there realise the correctness of the path of armed struggle. In such areas the armed struggle can and should be straight away launched without the need of political and economic struggles. But in the other vast areas of the country, the masses might accept the politics of armed struggle as 'good' when propagated. Yet, they would not accept them in actual practice. Only when, they participate in political and economic struggles and thus realise through their own experience the need for the path of armed struggle, would the masses adopt the armed struggle in actual practice.

The experience of the revolutionary movement in the areas where the armed struggle is launched is also testifying this as correct.

By the time the armed struggle was launched in the Naxalbari area, the people became politically conscious through political and economic struggles which were going on there since some time before. As a result the people could realise as to who were their friends and who were their enemies. Further they could also realise the utter futility of the parliamentary path and take up the path of armed struggle instead.

In the Srikakulam agency area the revolutionary movement was built through political and economic struggles before the launching of armed struggle. The masses realised from their own experience in these struggles, realised the futility of legal methods and then adopted the path of armed struggle.

Since there was already the influence of the armed struggle in Telangana area, the people, with the propagation of the politics of peoples war while developing the economic struggles, could realise through their own experience the futility of old legal methods and take up the path of armed struggle.

Then they, through their own experience, realised the utter futility of the legal methods. They came fully under the influence of the politics of armed struggle that we were already propagating. They had easily accepted the path of armed struggle.

Had there been no place for revisionism in the party, and had we been pursuing the path of armed struggle from the beginning the masses in these areas would have taken up the path of armed struggle even earlier than the other areas. It is totally wrong to say that with mere political propaganda the people would accept the politics of armed struggle. The fact that in many of the areas where the cadres of the CP (ML) are working, the masses are not yet ready for armed struggle is enough of a proof for this.

The leadership of CP (M.L), who refuse to recognise the role of political and economic struggles in preparing the masses for armed struggle, is completely ignoring the revolutionary role that the land question had played in the Naxalbari armed struggle.

In accordance with their one way of thinking, they are formulating about Naxalbari Peasant struggle as follows:

*"If the Naxalbari peasant struggle has any lesson for us, it is this: Militant struggles must be carried on not for land, crops etc., but for seizure of state power."*

**(Charu Mazumdar, Liberation 8, 1968)**

*"The struggle of the Terai Peasants is an armed struggle -not for land, but for state power."*

**(Terai Report, Kanu Sanyal, 1968)**

Here they are claiming that the Naxalbari armed struggle was not a struggle for land but for political power alone. Thus they are counterposing the struggle for land and the struggle for state power to each other as though they are mutually exclusive. Because of this erroneous line of thinking, they failed to grasp the importance of land question for the development of armed struggle. They have

failed to implement the programme of land distribution on a large scale. They have admitted their failures in the Naxalbari armed struggle as follows.

*"Our failure in establishing the revolutionary political power and in carrying out revolutionary land reforms blunted the edge of the class struggle both during and after the struggle."*-(Terai Report, Kanu Sanyal)

Here they say that the edge of the class struggle was blunted due to their failure in implementing the revolutionary land reforms and thus accept the loss suffered for not having realised the importance of the land question. At another place they say that the Naxalbari struggle was not a struggle for land. Which of these two do they believe?

The land question and the armed struggle are not opposed to each other. On the contrary the land distribution strengthens the armed struggle. The land question occupies the main place in the agrarian revolution. Agrarian revolution is the axis of the people's democratic revolution. The armed struggle is the main form of struggle for completing the agrarian revolution. Therefore the land question and the armed struggle are closely interlinked. If the land distribution is the main issue of the agrarian revolution, the armed struggle is the main form of struggle for achieving it. The leadership of CP (ML) who fail to grasp this is counterposing these two as if they are mutually exclusive.

In this connection, it is very essential to take note of the comments of CPC on the Indian peasant revolutionary armed struggle.

*"They (i.e., Indian peasants-author) are unfolding struggles to seize land and dealing heavy blows at the foundation of feudal rule".*

*"They (Indian revolutionaries, Naxalbari-author) pointed out the Naxalbari peasants struggle is a struggle not only for land but also for political power". (Liberation, July, 1969).*

These comments were made by the Chinese comrades even before July 1969. In spite of these comments of the Chinese comrades, they refuse to realise their mistakes. They argue that the question of land is an economic demand and, therefore, organising struggle on the question of land is nothing but economism.

The struggle for land is not same as the struggle of the factory workers for wage rise. The workers carry on the struggle within the capitalist system, defend themselves from the onslaught of the capitalist class as well as for rise in wages and other benefits. But the struggle for land is a struggle to overthrow feudalism. In this stage of people's democratic revolution, the distribution of land is implemented as an important item of agrarian revolution. When coordinated with the armed struggle for seizure of political power, and when carried on for strengthening the armed struggle, the land distribution would acquire special significance. The land question, which is of such a revolutionary significance, is equated with the workers economic demand for wage rise, is solely due to the failure to grasp the present stage of the revolution, the principal contradiction, the revolutionary programme and their inter-relation.

In the agrarian revolutionary programme, not only the question of land but also militant struggles carried on by the rural masses on the problems such as

forced labour, feudal atrocities and suppression etc., would be of much revolutionary significance. If the revolutionaries adopt proper tactics and lead these struggles with proper understanding, these struggles would develop as struggle for the distribution of land and take the form of armed struggle. Thus the entire agrarian revolutionary programme has to get a great revolutionary significance.

In the present revolutionary situation the urban masses, the working class, the students and the middle classes are often coming into the economic struggles and political struggles in a lesser degree. By propagating the politics of people's war among the urban masses, especially the working class and the students, we could not only win their support and solidarity for the armed struggle in the country side, but also we would be able to mobilise them to participate in the armed struggle in various forms.

While leading the political and economic struggles of urban masses, the revolutionaries should at the same time, give importance to the political struggles. To mobilise the urban masses into anti-ruling class struggles on various political issues and to propagate the politics of armed struggle and rousing revolutionary consciousness among them should be the main task of the revolutionaries.

The Telangana armed struggle (1946-51) started as a militant struggle against feudal –landlords forced labour, feudal atrocities and procurement of grain (forced procurement of grain from the peasantry by the government during the second world war) even before 1946. The other sections of the people had also participated in the struggle along with the rural peasantry. All the sections of rural masses were united against the feudal land lords. On the other hand the working class and the students came into struggles in the urban area. Influenced by the armed struggle, the urban masses themselves joined the struggles after 1946. They stood in support and solidarity of the struggles in the countryside as well as armed struggle. The students joined the armed struggle in large numbers and strengthened it. Thus the experiences of Telangana armed struggle only confirm the significance of the anti-feudal struggles as well as the political and economic struggles of the urban masses. They do not in any way reduce their significance.

It would be immensely useful if we try to grasp the following from Com. Mao's 'United front in Cultural Work.'

*"All work done for the masses must start from their needs and not from the desire of any individual, however well-intentioned. It often happens that objectively the masses need a certain change, but subjectively they are not yet conscious of the need, not yet willing or determined to make the change. In such cases, we should wait patiently. We should not make the change until, through our work, most of the masses have become conscious of the need and are willing and determined to carry it out. Other-wise we shall isolate ourselves from the masses."*

The meaning of this is very clear. The problem is not solved if we alone realise that there is no need for political and economic struggles for the masses and that the armed struggle is the only correct form of struggle. The masses should realise this. They should become conscious. They should come forward with determination. This would become possible only when the people realise the need for armed struggle through their own experience.

About the inter-relation between the political and economic struggles during the period of a revolution, Com. Lenin has said as follows:

*"A distinctive feature was the manner in which economic strikes were interwoven with political strikes during the revolution. There can be no doubt that only this very close link-up of the two forms of strike gave the moment its great power."*

(Collected Works, Vol.23, Page 240-1)

This equally applies to us, who are in the era of revolution and who follow the path of people's war. This makes it clear that the political and economic struggles are necessary for the people not only to reach the stage of armed struggle, but also they are essential to effectively carry on the armed struggle. Our experience also confirms this.

It seems from their writing the leadership of the CP (ML) is afraid that if they accept the necessity of political and economic struggles, their party might get bogged down in the mire of revisionism. A party based on the theoretical foundations of Marxism-Leninism and Mao's Thought need not be frightened of this. By participating and leading these struggles, the party cadres would acquire theoretical knowledge as well as the experience in practical work, and become capable of leading the armed struggle. Having witnessed the organised strength and the revolutionary potential of the masses, they would fulfil their tasks with greater self-confidence. Instead if the political and economic struggles are given up for fear of revisionism, there is the danger of the people who simply talk of politics without any practical experience in the building of revolutionary movement, joining the party and turning out to be cadres that merely keep chanting Mao's Thought, but could not endure the stresses and strains of the armed struggle.

Let us hope that the leadership of the CP (M.L.) have already had this kind of experience.

Thus both in the name of the revolutionary situation and economism, the leadership of the CP (ML) refuses to mobilise the masses into revolutionary movements. They refuse to lead the people in such a way which can help them realise the need for armed struggle through their own experience. They are propagating a queer sort of theory that just the propagation of the politics of people's war alone can make the masses ready to participate in the armed struggle. It is clear that this queer sort of a theory is neither based on Marxism-Leninism and Mao's Thought nor does it conform to the experience of the revolutionary movements that the revolutionaries have carried on hitherto.



#### **IV. The Problems of Armed Struggle:**

We have shown as to how in the name of the revolutionary situation as well as opposing the economism, the leadership of the CPI (ML) refuse to recognise or under-estimates the necessity of mobilising the masses into revolutionary movement. Now let us examine their understanding of the armed struggle.

##### **I. Indian Conditions:**

For a correct understanding of the armed struggle, we should have a correct assessment of the Indian conditions. What are the conditions obtaining in India today?

Internationally, the revolutions are marching ahead in the countries of Asia, Africa and Latin America. The revolutions were successfully completed in North Vietnam, Algeria and Cuba after the second world war. The world revolution has not halted with it. The armed struggles are victoriously advancing in the South-East Asian, African and Latin American countries. South Vietnam, Cambodia, Laos, Palestina, Congo and Angola are important among them. The people of India are very much influenced by these revolutions. They are being inspired by them.

The great Chinese revolution has profoundly influenced the Indian revolution. The great Cultural revolution of China which has successfully concluded recently has also greatly influenced the Indian people. The experiences of the Chinese revolution are available to the people and the revolutionaries of India today as never before. There are tremendous opportunities today to advance the Indian revolution in the Chinese path of people's war basing on these experiences. As a matter of fact it is only in the Chinese path that the Indian revolution is advancing today.

Together with the experiences of the Chinese revolution, the experiences of the revolutions going on in the various countries are also available to the people and the revolutionaries of India today. It is very essential for the Indian revolutionaries to study these experiences in the light of Marxism-Leninism and Mao's Thought and to draw correct lessons from them.

Besides this favourable situation, the revolutionary situation is also mature in India. Despite the ruthless repression let loose by the ruling classes against the revolutionary movements, the struggles of the peasantry, working class, students and the middle class people have become a common feature of the country's daily life. Besides, the armed struggle has begun and is advancing. The main obstacle in the way of advance of revolution is the disunity, and the organisational weakness of the revolutionaries who are leading or should lead the revolution. It is imperative that the revolutionaries should overcome this obstacle.

Even though the Indian revolution has begun, in such a situation when the world revolution has reached an advanced stage and taken a serious form, we should understand that ours is a revolution which has commenced very late. The armed struggle that developed in Telangana as well as in other areas during the period of 1946-51, were called off owing to the betrayal of the then reformist

leadership of the Communist Party. This revolution once again commenced with the Naxalbari armed struggle of West Bengal in the year 1967. Making use of the time thus gained, the ruling classes who had inherited the armed forces at the time of transfer of power, further expanded these forces on a very large scale. In the name of strengthening the country's defence against China, defence of borders, and the central reserve police, they have enormously increased the strength of the armed forces. Today we find them using their central reserve police as well as the military to suppress the revolution of the Indian people.

We should understand here that in one respect the situation is not as favourable to us as it was to the Chinese revolutionaries. By the time the Chiang-kie-Shaik gang joined the imperialist camp betraying the revolution and was out to suppress the Chinese Communist Party and the Chinese revolution in 1927, the Communist Party of China has already had about 40,000 people's army under its leadership. It had become possible for the communist party of China to strengthen its position on all fronts including the military because of its participation of the bourgeois democratic revolution. Thus establishing and safeguarding the base areas with the help of the 40,000 people's army, the Communist Party of China had marched forward under numerous odds and led the revolution to a victorious end.

We were not having such an army either in the year 1968 when we commenced the armed struggle, or are we having it today. We have no other way of building the revolutionary army except building it from the people in the course of the revolutionary movement. Without being confined to any single area, it should be built in various areas out of the raising revolutionary struggle and the armed struggles of the people. The revolutionary army thus developed alone would be capable of facing the armed forces of the counter revolutionary ruling classes.

The development of revolution in the country is uneven. The peasant revolutionary movements are vigorously going on in the areas where the feudal relations are strong. The mobilisation of the masses would not be so vigorous in the areas where the feudal relations are comparatively weak (such areas are very few and far in between). If there is a proper revolutionary leadership there is the possibility for the revolutionary movement to advance in the vast areas where the feudal relations are strong, and class contradictions got intensified. Thus the lack of revolutionary leadership is also one of the main reasons for the uneven development of our revolution. Having a strong Communist Party which we do not have to lead the revolution is a specific feature of China. However, there is a similarity between us and the Chinese revolution on the question of uneven development of the revolution. It would be possible to at least reduce if not totally eliminate this unevenness by simultaneously developing the revolutionary movement in various parts of the country.

At the time of Chinese revolution all the highways and big cities were concentrated in the coastal areas and the rest of the vast areas of China were either totally devoid of any roads or negligible if there were any. As a result the counter revolutionary armies had to face numerous difficulties in encircling the

revolutionary base areas and attacking the revolutionary people's armies. Yet the revolutionary people's armies had to face big attacks from the enemy forces and fight fierce battles to smash them.

Contrary to this, the roads, railways and the highways in India are more developed than in China of revolutionary period. They are spread over in different parts and states in the country. Various cities, valleys, plains as well as the areas where commercial crops are grown are linked by roads. While the roads were already there at the time of the direct rule of the British imperialists, the Indian ruling classes had, with the aid of foreign imperialists further developed them very much. It is therefore the reactionary ruling classes are provided with greater opportunities to swiftly depatch large numbers of their counter-revolutionary armies to attack and encircle the revolutionaries and the revolutionary masses. The roads are not developed in the girijan areas and some other backward regions.

Under the circumstances, despite the fact that the areas with-out roads have importance in terms of development of the revolutionary movement, the revolutionaries should also give due importance for the building of revolutionary movement in the regions where the roads are developed. The working class should play a major role in building the revolutionary movements, safe-guarding and conducting the armed struggle in such areas.

As our country was under the rule of British imperialists for a very long time, as the national movement against imperialism was headed by the reactionary big bourgeoisie, land lord classes, as the bourgeoisie class has not at any stage played any revolutionary role, and as the revolutionary influence of the working class movement which was in the grip of economism and the Communist Party, upon the masses is feeble while the influence of the foreign imperialists as well as the bourgeoisie's reformism in the country is stronger than what it was in China during the revolution. (The Indian national bourgeoisie has not played the revolutionary role such as the Chinese national bourgeoisie played under the leadership of Sun-Yet-Sen). After 1947, with the strengthening of the American imperialism in the country, with the adoption of parliamentary path as well as revisionism by the Communist Party, with the influence of the Soviet Social imperialists in the country the influence of bourgeoisie reformism has further strengthened on the masses. In the present stage when the imperialism is in its last stage, and when the world revolution and with it the Indian revolution are on the ascendance, the bourgeoisie reformism does not have any future. Despite the fact that the armed struggle would smash away the bourgeoisie reformism with its foundations, its influence upon the people should not be under estimated. It is very essential to conduct the revolutionary movement so as to smash its influence upon the masses.

After the end of the direct rule of the British imperialists, the American imperialists and the Soviet Social imperialists had stepped in and become predominant in our country. The German and Japanese imperialists have also followed them. All of them are plundering the country. Main among them are the

American imperialists and the Soviet Social imperialists. Even though the Indian ruling classes are generally linked with all these imperialists, the American imperialists and the Soviet Social imperialists are predominant among them. Though the inter-imperialist contradictions are fundamental, they have not yet sharpened. Due to the changes that would come about in the international situation, and due to the advance of Indian revolution in future the advance of the Indian revolution would itself undoubtedly bring about major changes in international situation. These contradictions would become intensified. In view of the principal contradiction between the feudalism and the broad masses of the people, while concentrating on the development of the agrarian revolution, the revolutionaries should also at the same time strive to develop the anti-imperialist revolutionary struggles.

It is a fact that these differences do exist between the conditions of China at the time of People's democratic revolution and the conditions of India today. Yet in the present situation when the world revolution has greatly advanced even though we do not have conditions that were present in China the Indian revolution should march forward basing itself on the maturity of the revolutionary situation in India. This is the most favourable situation which has never been before. This is the only correct line.

The old and new revisionists refuse to recognise semi-colonial, the semi-feudal and neo-colonial character. They refuse to accept the experiences of the Chinese revolution on the plea that there is a fundamental difference between the conditions of China at the time of revolution and the conditions of India. Adopting the parliamentary path and defending the ruling classes, they have christened this revisionist path of theirs as the "Indian Path".

The neo-revisionists have also adopted the parliamentary path not withstanding the fact that they appear to be alternately supporting and opposing the ruling classes. They too argue that there is a fundamental difference between the Chinese conditions and the Indian conditions and thus refuse to accept the experience of the Chinese revolution.

Thus both of them display an identity of out-look in adopting the parliamentary path and rejecting the path of people's war. Here lies the basis for their revisionism.

Since India is a semi-colonial, semi-feudal country, since the world revolution is far advanced and since the revolutionary situation itself is ripe in India, the Chinese path of People's War applies to India as well. By adopting the path of the People's War alone would the Indian revolution become victorious.

In the specific conditions obtaining in India today, the revolutionary people's army capable of carrying out the path of people's war would emerge and grow from the revolutionary mass movement. Hence the revolutionaries should build the mass movements and advance them to the stage of armed struggle. We should in the course of these struggles form the people's army and implement the path of people's

war. The revolutionaries would have to adopt a new line applicable to the specific conditions of India. The revolutionaries should therefore be prepared for this.

## **2. The Revolutionary Peasant Movement is the Foundation for the Revolutionary Mass Movements:**

What are the movements that constitute the revolutionary mass movements? The Peasant revolutionary movement is the main thing and the Basis for revolutionary movement in the stage of people's democratic revolution of India. As the proletariat is to lead the revolution, the revolutionary working class movement is important. In view of the revolutionary role that the students and youth can play in the semi-colonial and semi-feudal countries, their revolutionary movements would also be important. Besides, all the movements against imperialism, feudalism and their lackeys, as well as the movements carried on by the middle class and other revolutionary classes would also constitute revolutionary mass movements. As these revolutionary movements for the seizure of political power and merge in a single current and advance, culminate in the completion of people's democratic revolution with the seizure of political power by the revolutionary classes.

Since seventy to eighty percent of the rural masses in the country are mainly the peasantry and form the main base for the revolution, the revolutionary peasant movement can alone form the base for the revolutionary movement. The other revolutionary movements would become auxiliary to this movement. However the importance of these movements can not be underestimated.

The revolutionary mass movements should be built by mobilising the masses on the political and economic demands. The concentration should centre mainly on the political demands. Only when the revolutionary movement reaches the higher stage, it would take the form of armed struggle.

The leadership of CP (ML) do not have this understanding. They are giving no importance for building revolutionary movement. They argue that we should start and carry on the armed struggle irrespective of the revolutionary movement. They have, actually started the armed struggle and are carrying it on these lines.

## **3. Armed Struggle: the Main Form of Struggle:**

The leadership of CP (M.L), who fail to grasp the importance of revolutionary mass movement as well as the importance of building it, also fail to grasp the inter-relation between the tactics and forms of struggle; the main form of struggle and the other forms of struggles. As a result they fail to make use of them for the revolutionary movement as well as the armed struggle. They write:

"Guerilla Warfare is the only tactic for carrying on peasant revolutionary struggle."

(Liberation, June 1969)

The form of struggle alone does not mean the tactic. The form or forms of struggle, the forms of organisation, the slogans etc., which the leadership adopts in a particular struggle to achieve success would, as a whole, form tactics. For instance, we adopt forms of struggle such as processions, protest demonstrations

etc., before the people's movement takes the form of armed struggle. We would adopt organisational forms such as the secret and open party organisation, the revolutionary mass organisations etc. We adopt slogans such as "Down with the atrocities of the land lords", "Refund of illegal levies" etc., We build secret party organisation while carrying on armed struggle. We advance the slogan of distribution of land to the landless and poor peasantry. We refer to all this, as a whole as tactics.

The leadership of the CPI (ML) who are lacking this understanding have reduced tactics to a mere form of struggle. They have equated the form of struggle, which is but a part of tactics with the whole of the tactics itself and formulated that guerilla warfare is the only tactic for the peasant revolutionary struggle. (Here both armed struggle and the guerilla warfare are used in one and the same meaning.)

In actual fact, in the present situation when the revolutionary situation is ripe and the Indian revolution has begun, armed struggle would be the main form of struggle of the people, especially of the peasantry. This is what is meant by this.

Wherever the peasant struggle has not reached the stage of armed struggle owing to the unevenness in the level of the revolutionary movement, the other necessary forms of struggle should be adopted with a view and the aim of taking the peasant revolutionary movement to the stage of armed struggle.

Wherever the revolutionary peasant movement has reached the stage of armed struggle, the peasant struggle should be carried on there adopting the form of armed struggle.

Even in the areas where armed struggle is going on, there also other necessary forms of struggles should be adopted to mobilise the backward section of the peasantry.

Thus, only when the armed struggle is combined and co-ordinated with the other necessary forms of struggles, it would not only strengthen the armed struggle but also help the peasantry, who have not yet taken the form of armed struggle; to raise their consciousness and adopt the form of armed struggle.

Here, when it is said that other necessary forms of struggles should be adopted, it does not, however, mean that every form of struggle should necessarily be adopted. It means that we should adopt all the forms of struggles necessary for the peasant revolutionary movement. Any form of struggle which is not necessary for the revolutionary movement should not be forced upon the peasantry. This principle equally applies not only to the peasantry but also to the other sections of the people.

In this connection, it is essential to study the following passage, from an article by Mao published in a monthly, 'Communist' during the year 1939.

"The second stage was the war of the agrarian revolution. By that time our party had already built up its own independent armed forces, learned the art of fighting independently, and established people's political power and base areas. Our party was already able to achieve direct or indirect co-ordination of armed

struggle, the principal form of struggle, with many other necessary forms, that is, to co-ordinate it on national scale with the workers struggle, the peasants struggle (which was the main thing), the struggle of the youth, the women and all other sections of the people, the struggle for political power, the struggles on the economic, the anti-espionage and the ideological fronts, and other forms of struggle. And this armed struggle was the peasant agrarian revolution under the leadership of the proletariat.”

Com. Mao says that though the importance of armed struggle in the first phase was recognised, it was not understood comprehensively, that is, it was not understood as the principal form of struggle. He explained the importance of the second stage as above.

In this, Com. Mao has not said that the armed struggle is not the main form of struggle even in the second stage. On the contrary, he has pointed out armed struggle as the principal form of struggle and stressed the need for co-ordinating other forms of struggles with the armed struggle.

He further says that these struggles should be not only of the peasantry but also of the workers, youth and women. They should be carried on not only for political power but also for economic demands. They should be carried on in the economic and ideological fields as well as for political power. The armed and the other forms of struggles should be co-ordinated both indirectly and directly. Thus he stressed the importance of the other forms of struggles and their co-ordination with the armed struggle even in the second stage.

By the time Com. Mao wrote this article in the year 1939, the armed struggle, under the leadership of the Communist Party was in a greatly advanced stage. The people's army was formed. The base areas were established. Political power was established in those base areas, Even though the armed struggle was in such an advanced stage, Com. Mao did not, in the least, minimise the importance of the other forms of struggles, as well as the necessity of co-ordinating them with the armed struggle. On the contrary, he has emphasized the importance of other forms of struggles.

We are still in the primary stage in building the revolutionary movement as well as conducting armed struggle. The importance of what Mao has said would therefore be all the more greater for us here. By giving due importance to the struggles of the working class, youth and other people along with the struggles of the peasantry, and by giving due importance to the other forms of struggles as the secondary forms of struggles along with the armed struggles we can strengthen the armed struggle. Moreover it is very essential, indeed, a must to co-ordinate other forms of struggles with armed struggle in order to build the revolutionary movement and to advance it speedily to the stage of armed struggle.

The experience of the Telangana armed struggle (1946-51), as well as the experiences of the armed struggles that are being carried on today amply prove that what Mao has said here fully applies to our revolution as well as to our armed struggle in its primary stage. We adopted various other forms of struggles in

Telangana before it reached the stage of armed struggle, During the period of armed struggle too, we adopted other forms of struggles in both urban and rural areas where the armed struggle was not yet commenced. Even in the areas of armed struggle, while adopting the form of armed struggle against the main enemy, we at the same time adopted other forms of struggles, (Such as processions, demonstrations, strikes on agricultural and forest cooli rates.) Against others who were not the main enemy. They proved very useful for strengthening and extending the armed struggle.

Not realising the importance of building the revolutionary movement as well as the importance of the secondary forms of struggles, essential for it, the leadership of the CP (ML) has formulated that for this stage armed struggle is the only form of struggle. Thus they are depriving the armed struggles, that they carry on, of its revolutionary base. They themselves are weakening the armed struggle and making it nominal. Thus their understanding of the armed struggle, not as the main as sole form of struggle, is different from Mao's Thought.

#### **4. The People's Revolutionary Armed Struggle itself is the Guerilla Warfare.**

It is indisputable that the armed struggle is the main form of struggle when there is a revolutionary situation in the country. We have explained that in the vast areas, where due to the uneven development of the revolutionary movement, the revolutionary movement has not yet taken the form of armed struggle, other forms of struggles should be adopted and that they should be coordinated with the armed struggle. How should we conduct the armed struggle when the revolutionary movement has reached the higher stage and taken the form of armed struggle? Is the "annihilation of the class enemy" an armed struggle? Is the "annihilation of the class enemy" correct in the areas where the revolutionary movement has not yet reached the stage of armed struggle? These questions are worth examining.

It is necessary to examine the following passage of an article published in the Liberation, January 1970.

*".....Guerilla warfare can be started only by liquidating the feudal classes in the countryside. And this campaign for the annihilation of the class enemy can be carried out only by inspiring the poor and landless peasants with the politics of establishing the political power of the peasants in the country side after destroying the domination of the feudal classes. That is why the annihilation of class enemy is the higher form of class struggle while the act of annihilation of class enemies through guerilla action is the primary stage of the guerilla struggle."* (Page, 56-67)

We have already explained that by inspiring speeches and door to door propaganda we would only be able to acquaint the peasantry with the politics of armed struggle, but that the peasantry can not be prepared for armed struggle by mere propaganda alone. Only when mobilised into the revolutionary struggles on political and economic issues would the peasantry, through their own experience, get prepared to overthrow the present ruling classes. We have also



explained that today when there is a revolutionary situation in the country, this would not take long and that depending on the intensification of class contradictions as well as the class consciousness of the masses, the masses would in a short time be ready for the armed struggle that smash the domination of feudal classes.

Even in their passage above, the leadership of the CP (ML) does not show this understanding. On the contrary, they only exhibit their usual line of thinking that the peasantry should be inspired through the propaganda of the politics of people's war among them. Besides, they are advancing the following formulations:

- Guerilla warfare can be started only by liquidating the feudal classes.
- The annihilation of class enemy (Feudal Classes) is the higher form of class struggle.
- Annihilating class enemies through guerilla action is the primary stage of the guerilla struggle.

The very basis of these formulations is wrong. It is totally opposed to Marxism-Leninism and Mao's Thought.

In any revolution, the people and the revolutionaries leading them would come to power not by annihilating all or majority of the counter revolutionary class or classes but by smashing up their state machinery. They would build the new state machinery on the ruins of the old.

This is what is to be done in the people's democratic revolution which has begun in our country today. The fundamental task of the revolution is to smash the state machinery of imperialism, feudalism, and the big bourgeoisie who are the enemies of the people's democratic revolution and to establish the people's democracy in its place.

As a first step towards the fulfillment of this task, we should start the revolutionary movement, basing on the peasantry to liberate the rural areas. The armed forces of the government would step into the field to suppress this revolutionary movement. If the people's democratic revolution has to fulfill its fundamental task, successfully, this revolutionary movement should be defended from the armed forces of the ruling classes. It should be extended to the new areas and various parts of the country. Even in the areas to which the revolutionary movement has extended, it has to be safeguarded from the armed forces of the ruling classes. It is only to fulfil this task that the people adopt the form of armed struggle. It is only through the armed struggles that the people destroy the armed forces of the ruling classes, smash the state machinery and establish the People's Democracy. In this programme, abolition of the feudal system ( and the feudal class) is the important component.

Thus the people's armed struggle would begin with the defence of the revolutionary movement, the revolutionary gains, the revolutionary organisation etc., from the attacks of the armed forces of the ruling classes. But in the primary stage, the strength and the skill of the armed forces of the ruling classes would be many times greater than that of the armed forces organised by the

people. The form of armed struggle adopted by the people at this stage is the guerrilla warfare. As the people's armed forces grow in number, and the strength of arms and skill at a certain stage become favourable to the revolutionary masses, armed struggle would reach the higher stage. Then the armed struggle would take the form of mobile warfare and later the form of positional warfare.

To defend their annihilation programme leadership of the CP(ML) often cite the following quotation from Lin Piao.

"Guerrilla warfare is the only way to mobilise and apply the whole strength of the people against the enemy". (Long Live the Victory of People's War.)

It should be understood that Com. Lin-Piao has not said this in order to defend the annihilation programme of CP (ML) but to stress the superiority of guerrilla warfare over the mobile Warfare as well as the positional Warfare.

Viewed thus, it would become clear that the people's armed struggle that begins in the form of guerrilla warfare, begins against the enemy's armed forces and not with the annihilation of class enemy.

But how to destroy feudalism?

Only by means of smashing up the state machinery which is safeguarding feudalism, establishing the people's democracy, abolishing feudalism, distributing the lands under the possession of the landlords to the poor peasantry and abolishing all forms of feudal exploitation, would we be able to destroy feudalism. This would become possible only when the people's democratic revolution is completed.

It is practically impossible to annihilate every individual class enemy or at least a majority of the class enemies belonging to the feudal classes. Even assuming for a while that it would be possible, we should not lose sight of the fact that as long as the state machinery safeguarding them is intact and feudal relations are dominant, feudal exploitation as well as the feudal atrocities would continue to be perpetrated by their heirs or some body else if not by themselves. Feudalism would not be abolished and the feudal state would not be destroyed. This is the universal truth, the basic principle of Marxism.

Before the peasant revolutionary movements had taken the form of armed struggle, there were peasant revolts in the past in our country as well as in other countries. In these revolts, the despots from among the feudal classes were killed by the peasantry. But feudalism was not abolished by this. The state machinery that safeguards feudalism had not been smashed. This being the lesson history teaches us, the outcome of 'the annihilation programme' of the leadership of CP(ML) can not be otherwise.

But, would the counter-revolutionary feudal classes sit back with folded hands during these revolutions? Should the revolutionaries and the people remain mere spectators when the feudal classes, joining hands with the armed forces of the government, are perpetrating atrocities on the people; aiding government's armed forces in suppressing the revolutionary movement and in capturing or shooting down the revolutionaries: and while the landlords themselves are participating in all these atrocious actions and continuing the exploitation and the atrocities that they have been hitherto perpetrating ?

As a class the feudal class depends upon the government's armed forces to suppress the revolutionary movement. Therefore the abolition of this class or its political liquidation depends upon the capacity of the guerilla armies and the revolutionary masses to successfully face the government's armed forces. When the revolutionary movement begins and takes the form of armed struggle, it is possible that some from among the feudal classes, especially lower ranks among them who are not capable of bearing the brunt of the revolutionary movement, would play a neutral role. They do become neutralised.

While this being so, the despot or despots of a particular village or area would arm themselves, form a part of the government's armed forces and carry on attacks against the revolutionaries as well as the revolutionary movement. Treating them as part of enemy's armed forces, revolutionary masses would implement the programme of annihilation against them through the guerilla warfare. As the enemy's spy-wing also forms a part of the enemy's armed force, the people's revolutionary armed forces would as well attack this wing. It is inescapable for those of the feudal classes who thus arm themselves and serve the enemy's spy-wing from becoming the targets of attack by the revolutionary armed forces.

With this perspective, it would be incorrect to annihilate an individual or individuals of the feudal classes on the plea that they are carrying on the feudal exploitation. When they form a part of the enemy's armed forces and partake in its activities, the annihilation programme which applies to the enemy's armed forces should also be applied to those of the feudal classes who become part of the enemy's armed forces. The exploitation of those of the feudal classes who do not participate in these activities should be abolished and the state machinery protecting the feudalism should be smashed through the revolutionary movement, and the revolutionary programme.

The same attitude would apply to the goonda gangs of the feudal classes. Unable to bear the brunt of the revolutionary movement, these goonda gangs are likely to be disintegrated in the very beginning itself. As far as possible the revolutionary masses themselves should wipe out these gangs. If it is not still possible, they should be wiped out through guerilla warfare. The feudal classes and their agents fighting either as individuals or groups, some of them armed and some of them as secret agents, against the revolutionary masses and the people's armed forces is not a thing that happens only in the beginning. Their counter-revolutionary struggle would go on as long as the armed struggle goes on. Hence, as long as people's armed forces exist and armed struggle goes on, these counter-revolutionary elements need to be fought.

Therefore it would be wrong to formulate that annihilation of such elements as the primary stage of the guerilla warfare. Under certain circumstances, depending upon the actions of the counter revolutionaries this programme might have to be given importance in the beginning. But the revolutionaries should generally adopt only the attitude explained above.

When the annihilation programme adopted by the leadership of the CP (ML) is incorrect even in the areas where the peasant revolutionary movements had reached the stage of armed struggle, it would as well be wrong in the areas where the revolutionary movement has not yet commenced and where it has not yet reached the stage of armed struggle. The activities based on this annihilation programme would cause serious harm to the revolutionary movement of these areas.

As the revolutionary movement has not yet commenced in these areas, it would not be clear as yet as to who among the rich and feudal classes would become neutralised and who would work as counter-revolutionaries. Here, since the antagonism towards many of the "rich" is lacking among the masses, since the antagonism even towards the individuals of the feudal classes is also lacking in some cases or whatever antagonism is there being merely nominal, and since the consciousness of the masses has not yet reached the stage of armed struggle, the masses cannot understand the programme of annihilation with a revolutionary perspective. Often they also misunderstand it. In such a situation the "actions of annihilation" such as this serves no purpose.

Owing to the wrong understanding, there is the danger of youth adopting such actions in these areas as an alternative to the building of revolutionary movement. Instead of helping them to take the difficult but sure path of mobilising and organising the masses on political and economic demands and building of the revolutionary movements, this understanding would only be useful to spread among the youth the easy notions that the revolution could be brought about with the annihilation of a few 'class enemies'. These notions are opposed to Marxism-Leninism and Mao's Thought.

They argue that even though there is no revolutionary movement, such actions are necessary to prevent the concentration of the enemy's armed forces in the struggle areas or to divert them. They think that in this way it is possible to prevent the enemy from sending the armed forces from different parts to the struggle areas. This is very un-realistic.

Today in the absence of a country-wide revolutionary movement, the enemy is able to concentrate his armed force in a large number in the struggle areas. The enemy need not concentrate his armed forces in large numbers in order to suppress such actions that are unconnected with any mass movement or revolutionary movement. Therefore such actions can't reduce the enemy's concentration on the struggle areas. The only and the best way for revolutionaries to reduce the concentration of enemy's armed forces in the struggle areas is to go to the masses in the areas where the revolutionary situation is ripe, build the revolutionary movements, and take them to the stage of armed struggle. As a result, the enemy's armed forces would be locked up in the areas where the revolutionary movement is going on and thus would not be in a position to move to the other areas. This development would be favourable for the revolutionaries and the revolutionary movement. Only those people who fail to grasp this would resort to such armed actions unconnected with the mass movement.

They argue that the people of a particular village or a region would become inspired by the actions of annihilation against the despotic landlords and thus these actions are a means of rousing the masses. It is no doubt a fact that the people of a village or an area would be glad if a despot of the village is annihilated. But that action would not be useful to develop the revolutionary movement in that village or the area. At least it would not be useful even to begin such a movement. These actions that take place in a situation where the masses are not even conscious to unitedly resist the atrocities of the despots, let alone the consciousness of overthrowing the ruling classes through armed struggle, would not have any importance from the point of view of the revolutionary movement. Therefore, owing to the absence of the conscious and organized resistance against repression that would be let loose by the ruling classes following these actions, the masses would become disorganised. The opportunity for starting the revolutionary movement would suffer and become remote.

Further they argue that the masses would become conscious with the repression let loose by the ruling classes. As a result of repression let loose by the ruling classes against an organised struggle on political and economic demands, the masses would become more and more organised and conscious and reach the stage of armed struggle. But they never become conscious as a result of repression that follows this kind of "actions" without any movement.

Again some people argue that to carry out some "action" would be better than sitting back with folded hands. Some "action", even though incorrect, may be pardonable in the absence of a correct path, but it could never be a correct "action". Therefore the revolutionaries should carry out a correct "action" and not some "action". This is the building up of revolutionary movement. It is the only path for the armed struggle, however arduous it might be.

Thus the programme of "annihilation of the class enemy" without the revolutionary movement or unconnected with the revolutionary movement would not raise the political consciousness, the organised strength and the revolutionary consciousness of the masses. On the contrary, it would only cause a serious set back to the building up of the revolutionary movement. It would come in the way of making the masses conscious that they have to achieve their own liberation. On the contrary it would create illusions among the masses, that without themselves playing any revolutionary role they would gain their liberation from the exploiting system by the heroic actions and sacrifices of some individuals even if they are heroic and self-sacrificing. This is opposed to Marxism-Leninism and Mao's Thought.

In the Telangana armed struggle (1946-51), the revolutionary movement had taken the form of armed struggle only after it had reached the higher stage. In the beginning the Volunteer squads had, with whatever arms available for use in their daily life, faced the armed despotic landlords as well as their armed goonda gangs. To some extent they had also resisted the armed police bands of the government. As armed forces had increased, the guerilla squads were formed

and the resistance was carried on by them. The guerilla actions were only carried on against the despotic landlords and their agents who joined hands with and formed a part of the government armed forces and the secret services. The revolutionaries had provided the leadership for this entire programme.

Armed resistance was also carried on in the Círcar districts (A.P) during the same period. The congress government, the land lords, and their agents had let loose severe repression against the mass movement under the leadership of the Communist Party in Círcar districts which was helpful for the Telangana armed struggle. They resorted to repressive measures such as arresting and torturing the people, shooting and killing the militants and the cadre etc., There arose a situation where the mass movement and the Party could not be safe-guarded unless the repressive measures are resisted. The party had given a call to face the force of the ruling classes with force. The Communist Party and the people had, through numerous hardships, carried on the resistance against the atrocities of the ruling classes. So far it was correct.

But after some time, especially after the police action (1948), armed struggle was launched in Círcar districts even before the mass movement had reached the stage of armed struggle. It was wrong to have launched the armed struggle in these districts, to assist the Telangana armed struggle and to prevent the congress government from concentrating its armed forces and armed police on Telangana or diverting from it. It was wrong only because the mass movement in this area had not yet reached the stage of armed struggle. As a result, this movement could not withstand the severe repression let loose by the ruling classes. The armed struggle had suffered a serious set back. The party and the mass movement had suffered serious losses.

Losses are inevitable for the party during any repression. But what the leadership of the party should and could do is to minimise the losses as far as possible by adopting a correct policy. It would have been a correct policy during that period to keep only the cadre essential for safe-guarding the mass movement, the party as well as the party's contact with the masses in círcar districts and to shift the remaining cadre to the agency areas in various districts and concentrate on developing the mass movement in those areas. The cadre could have been saved by this. The movement in the plains areas could have been safe-guarded with a very few losses. New mass movements could have developed in the agency areas. Instead, with the launching of armed struggle the movement had suffered a serious setback.

We should examine the form in which this policy has appeared in the Srikakulam armed struggle which had begun in the end of 1968. The movement of the district had reached the stage of armed struggle only after adopting all forms of struggles. As such, this had begun as a people's armed struggle. All the armed actions of the guerilla squads against the landlords and their agents who had joined with and formed a part of the Government armed forces and the secret services are correct. To what extent had these guerilla actions exceeded these limits, and whether the landlords who had not joined hands with the

government armed forces and the secret service were also considered as “class enemies” and whether armed actions were carried out against them also are the questions to be examined. Besides, it was also attempted to rouse the masses through armed actions on “the class enemies” instead of the implementation of revolutionary mass programme, the distribution of land etc., Though the masses were temporarily glad with this, their enthusiasm had gradually waned away. Instead of expanding to wider areas, the armed struggle had shrunk confining itself to the limited areas. As a result it had suffered serious losses. It should also be noted that after it was launched, the armed struggle was carried on based on the policies of leadership of CP (ML).

In the same period some armed actions were also carried out under their leadership in the Círcar and Rayalaseema districts. They had with great pride propagated this as an armed struggle, as “the annihilation of the class enemy”. Even though the targets of all the raids were land lords and the rich, it could not be said that they were all despots. The mass movement of these areas had not reached the revolutionary stage in which the land lords and the rich would be directly confronted. The situation wherein it would become possible to demarcate as to who would join the government armed forces and the secret service and who would not had not yet arisen. Only a few could be said to be despots depending on their role. Nothing useful has accrued to the mass movement of these areas due to the raids of “annihilation” carried out against them. As they claim the masses were not roused. What is more, there is nothing to show that the masses have atleast helped them. All the actions that do not have any connection with the mass movement are nothing but the naked acts of terrorism.

During the same period, some cadres of this party went to the agency areas of Visakhapatnam and carried on the propaganda of the politics of people’s war for some time among the masses. The masses had naturally appreciated these politics. But the masses could not withstand the police raids when they were actually launched. Some of the cadres were arrested. The remaining cadre had left the agency areas. Their experiences in the agency areas of Visakhapatnam speak for themselves as to how unrealistic is their formulation that without getting trained and tempered through the political and economic struggles, the masses would become inspired and be ready for the armed struggle by mere propaganda of the politics of people’s war. The experience would prove valuable for those who are willing to take the lessons from them. But what would be their use for those who are unable to take lessons from their own experiences?

Naxalbari struggle was a people’s armed struggle. Before launching the armed struggle in that area, the masses began political and economic struggles, recognized the need for armed struggle through their own experience and thus carried on the armed struggle. The leadership of CP (ML) had, in their own report (Kanu Sanyal’s Report), however uncomprehensive it might be, very clearly stated as to how the leadership had failed in providing leadership for this struggle. But this report remains a mere formality. Had they understood and rectified the shortcomings in their understanding, basing on the experiences of

Naxalbari it would have been of a great help to the Srikakulam armed struggle as well as to the revolutionary movement of other regions.

In this connection, Mao writes as follows regarding the attitude that should be adopted towards the enemies.

*"With regard to politically alien elements we should not be off our guard. But neither should we be unduly apprehensive of treachery on their part and adopt excessive precautionary measures. Distinction should be made between the landlords, the merchants and the rich peasants, and the main point is to explain things to them politically and win their neutrality, while at the same time organising the masses of the people to keep an eye on them. Only against the very few elements who are most dangerous should stern measures like arrest be taken". (Strategy in China's Revolutionary War)*

In another context Mao, in his "Strategic problems of guerilla Warfare", writes that when resisting enemy's attacks on the base areas, the traitors should be suppressed declaring Martial law in the base areas. Mao explained as above regarding the attitude that should be adopted towards the not so dangerous enemies during the period of anti-Japanese war and when base areas were in existence. We have to apply it to our conditions, where the armed struggle is in its primary stage. Those that could be neutralised should be neutralised by showing necessary differentiation and explaining our political line. Only under unavoidable circumstances should we adopt stern measures. We should adopt the same attitude for the entire stage of armed struggle. There is no comparison between the formulation of the leadership of CP (ML) that all feudal classes as well as all the class enemies should be annihilated and that this itself is the first stage of the armed struggle and what Mao has said. These two are opposed to each other.

### **5. The Importance of the Slogan of Defence**

The armed struggle that the people carry on against the ruling classes is by itself an offensive struggle. And the guerilla warfare is more offensive than any other war. Yet, when compared to the armed forces of the ruling classes, the numbers, the arms as well as the skill of the people's guerilla forces would not only be inferior but also would continue to remain so for a long time. Hence we would be in a defensive position. In this period we would have to advance the revolution defending our guerilla areas. We would therefore at this stage advance the slogan that the armed struggle is essential for the defence of the revolutionary gains of the masses as well as the self-defence of the revolutionaries. By this it would be easy to mobilise the masses not only of struggle areas but also the people of the country in support of the armed struggle. We would have the advantage of mobilising broad masses of people, including the backward masses on the slogan of defence of revolutionary gains.

Even though the overthrow of the Nizam rule prior to police action and the overthrow of Indian ruling classes after the police action was declared as the



aim of the revolutionaries during Telangana armed struggle, the slogan that we were carrying on the armed struggle in defence of the people's revolutionary gains was used to convince the masses in the country and to win their support and solidarity to the armed struggle.

Besides this slogan, Mao also explained the importance of the defensive position as follows:

*"With the slogan of defending the revolutionary base areas and defending China, we can rally the overwhelming majority of the people to fight with one heart and one mind, because we are the oppressed and the victims of aggression. It was also by using the form of the defensive that the Army of the Soviet Union defeated its enemies during the Civil War. When the imperialist countries organised the Whites for attack, the war was waged under the slogan of defending the Soviets; even when the October Uprising was being prepared, the military mobilisation was carried out under the slogan of defending the capital. In every just war the defensive not only has a lulling effect on politically alien elements, it also makes possible the rallying of the backward sections of the masses to join the war."*

#### **(Strategy in China's Revolutionary War)**

The Chinese as well as Soviet comrades were many times stronger than us at the time of giving the defensive slogan. Their revolutionary movement was also many times stronger. Those comrades would have been more fit than us to give the slogan that "the annihilation of the enemies is alone our aim". Yet they had not given such a slogan. They launched, carried on and victoriously concluded their armed struggle, civil war and the anti-imperialist war with the same defensive slogan.

For the leadership of the CP (ML) who refuse to recognise the importance of the revolutionary movement for the launching of armed struggle, it is but natural to refuse to recognise the necessity of defending the revolutionary gains as well. It is only in consequence of this that they are advancing the slogan of "annihilation of the class enemy" instead of the slogan of the defence of the revolutionary gains. What Mao has said above clearly shows as to how far removed is this from Mao's Thought.

In order to mobilise all the people of the country in support of the armed struggle which is in its primary stage it is very important to place the slogan of self-defence and the defence of the revolutionary gains before the country. Only those who are blind to the interests of the revolution would refuse to recognise the importance of the defensive slogan.

Though the aim of the armed struggle which is going on today in Telangana is the overthrow of the ruling classes, it is going on the slogan of the self-defence and the defence of the revolutionary gains.

#### **6. The Importance of Terrain:**

While summing up the experiences of armed struggle that they carried on hitherto, the leadership of the CP (ML) concluded that there is no need for a

favourable terrain, mass movement, mass organisation, as well as mass participation and that the armed struggle could be straight away launched without any of them. We have already explained that though there is a revolutionary situation in the country, the masses would gain revolutionary experience by carrying on political and economic struggles and adopting armed struggle as the form of the struggle. Let us now see as to what would be the importance of terrain for the armed struggle.

Since the guerilla warfare is an armed struggle which should be based upon the masses, the formulation that wherever there are masses armed struggle could be launched and carried on is correct. Since our masses, the majority of rural peasant masses at that, are living in the plain areas the question of guerilla warfare is simply unthinkable without considering the plain areas. Telangana armed struggle (1946-51) began in the plain areas. Organised peasant movement (more or less majority of it is reformist movement) of various states is only in the plain areas.

Our task would not be over merely with the launching of guerilla warfare. It should be able to sustain and develop for a long period of time and be useful to build the base areas which is our strategic aim. Though there are conscious peasant masses and powerful peasant movements in the plains areas, due to the concentration of roads the danger of enemy forces quickly penetrating into the rural areas, encircling and wiping out of the guerilla forces is great. Only when there is a revolutionary organisation and a revolutionary movement capable of containing the movement of the enemy's armed forces, would it be possible here to carry on uninterrupted guerilla warfare. In view of the fact that next to the cities, plains are the strongholds of the enemy, we should carry on our activities giving priority to these areas in building up of revolutionary mass movements as well as the revolutionary mass organisation capable of resisting the enemy's attacks. Guerilla warfare should be launched in these areas as the revolutionary movement reaches the stage where it would take the form of armed struggle. It would be incorrect, if the struggle is not launched thinking that it might not be able to sustain for a long period of time. After launching the struggle, when an unfavourable situation develops due to the concentration of the enemy's armed forces, we would have to adopt appropriate tactics and safeguard our guerilla squads.

If we select the areas where the enemy is politically, economically and socially weak, build the revolutionary movement and launch the guerilla warfare when the revolutionary movement reaches the stage of armed struggle, it would lead to the building of base areas where the guerilla warfare could sustain for a long period of time. Hills, forests and plains without roads are such areas. When we speak of such areas, we mean only the areas where there is habitation of people. If there are only hills and forests without people, there would be no guerilla warfare for us to carry on. Such areas are not therefore useful for guerilla warfare.

The armed forces of the enemy can enter the hills, forests and the plains without roads with great difficulty. The feudal relations being strong and the

people being subjected to the worst kind of exploitation, the masses in these areas would quickly revolt as a result of the efforts of the revolutionaries. Such areas would be useful to carry on the guerilla warfare for a long period of time to defeat the enemy's armed forces and to build the base areas. As such we give priority to the hilly and forest regions. The guerilla warfare in these regions would be greatly useful for launching and carrying on the guerilla warfare in the plains areas with roads. When the pressure from the enemy's armed forces increases in the plains areas, some of the guerilla squads could be transferred to the nearby hilly and forest regions. Whenever the situation in the plains areas becomes favourable the guerilla squads could once again go back into the plains areas. Thus co-ordinating the two areas, guerilla warfare could be developed.

Prior to police action (1948) the girijan armed struggle during the period of Telangana armed struggle was carried on in the forest areas of the present Khammam district. With the intensification of raids in the vast girijan areas of Warangal, Karimnagar and Adilabad districts, it became impossible for the revolutionaries and guerilla squads to stay in the plains areas. It had therefore become necessary for them to move in large numbers into the forest areas. Going into the forest areas, they worked among the girijans, built the revolutionary movement and prepared them for armed struggle. The armed struggle had also started and continued to the end in these areas. Had there been armed struggle from the beginning in the forest areas, it would have been easy to retreat or to advance co-ordinating the guerilla warfare of both these areas. Many of the losses suffered could have been avoided.

Though there is a strong peasant movement in the plains areas, in view of these experiences we have built the revolutionary movement in the areas where there are hills and forests and launched the armed struggle in the Telangana districts where the revolutionary movement had reached the stage of armed struggle. It does not however, mean that we are not going to conduct armed struggle in the plains areas. We would also develop the revolutionary movement in the plains areas and launch the armed struggle when it reaches the stage of armed struggle.

Com. Mao in his "strategy in Guerilla warfare" explain the importance of mountain regions for the guerilla warfare as under:

*"In places surround by the enemy on all sides or on three sides, the mountainous regions naturally offer the best conditions for setting up base areas...."*

Our experiences of guerilla warfare also testify to the correctness of what Mao has said above. But the experiences of the leadership of CP(ML) speak otherwise!

## **7. Need of the Mass Movement:**

The leadership of the CP (ML) has come to yet another conclusion that no mass movement is necessary to launch the armed struggle. When the annihilation of the class enemies is their only aim, they would naturally have no need for any

mass movement in order to merely to kill the class enemies by either raiding their houses or by waylaying them. We have already said that in order to make the masses realise the need for armed struggles through their own experience, we should mobilise them into revolutionary struggles on political and economic demands. There was mass movement in Naxalbari by the time the leadership of the CP (ML) launched the Naxalbari people's armed struggle. The revolutionary girijan movement was already there in Srikakulam district by the time the armed struggle was launched there. Struggles were also carried on against the despotic landlords before the launching of "armed actions" in the Mushahari area of Bihar state. While the truth is such, why should they want to distort their own experiences and formulate that there is no need of any mass movement for the armed struggle? What do they mean by all this?

They have not stopped here. They have even gone a step further and formulated that there is no need for the participation of the peasantry in the guerilla warfare.

This is what they say:

*"Obviously, the peasantry as a whole does not participate in this guerilla warfare. What happens is that the advanced class-conscious section of the peasant masses starts the guerilla war. For this reason guerilla war, at its initial stages, may appear as struggle of only a handful of people."*

**-(Charu Majumdar, Liberation, July 1969)**

Here they clearly admit that all the peasantry would not participate in the guerilla warfare that they launch, that it would appear as a struggle carried on by a few people and that as a matter of fact the class conscious people would be very few. Then how is it that the guerilla warfare they launch would be a people's guerilla warfare? How hollow and worthless is their unceasing talk of relying upon the masses to carry on the armed struggle!

The objective reality is that they are not mobilising the peasantry into the revolutionary struggle on political and economic demands, especially on agrarian revolutionary programme. As a result, the majority of the peasant masses are not becoming conscious. Consequently it has become necessary for them to depend only upon the few conscious individuals. Their guerilla warfare has therefore come to be deprived of the mass base. From this, they have propounded the formulation that *"in the beginning the participation of the peasantry is not necessary"* in the guerilla warfare, which is opposed to Marxism-Leninism and Mao's Thought, and are propagating it. They would not have got themselves into this predicament had they taken up the task of building the revolutionary peasant movement.

Majority of the peasantry would participate in the guerilla warfare which is launched on the basis of the revolutionary movement. As repression from the ruling classes starts and as it goes on intensifying, the forms of people's participation in the guerilla warfare would also go on changing. To secretly lend direct as well as indirect support to the guerilla warfare would be the main

form of people's participation in the guerilla warfare. The joining of the militants from among the peasants in the volunteer and guerilla squads in appreciable numbers would be a touch stone for the people's participation in the armed struggle.

They are advancing yet another argument that there is no need of the mass organisations to launch the guerilla warfare and that the mass organisations should be only in the base areas. When there is no need for the participation of the peasant masses in the guerilla warfare, (even if it is in the initial stages) what would be the purpose of the peasant mass organisations?

We could very well agree if it is said that there would be no need for the reformist mass organisations, since they are impediments to prepare the masses for the guerilla warfare. But the sum and substance of their argument is that there is no need for the mass organisations themselves. If there are no revolutionary mass organisations, there would be no organisational form for the revolutionary movement itself. The revolutionary mass organisations are therefore essential.

The question of whether a mass organisation is functioning openly or secretly should not be an yardstick to decide whether a mass organisation is essential or not. If they are functioning with a reformist programme under the reformist leadership, they would, as reformist mass organisations, become impediments to the armed struggle and the revolution. If they are functioning with a revolutionary programme under the leadership of the revolutionaries, they would, as revolutionary mass organisations, become useful for the armed struggle and the revolution. Therefore, we should strive to build only the revolutionary organisations in the struggle areas which would be useful for the armed struggle. When the movement is in its primary stage and when the mass organisations could not function even secretly owing to the severe repression from the enemy, we should make use of ordinary mass organisations to establish daily contacts with the masses. Especially we have to examine as to how we should work in the cities and rural areas where the movement has not yet reached the revolutionary stage and formulate our programme.

The question whether a mass organisation should function openly or secretly need not be a point of discussion. Since revolutionary mass organisations would be built as part of the revolutionary movement, there would be severe repression on the revolutionary mass organisations as well. It would therefore become necessary to function secretly. Unable to face the problems that the organising of secret revolutionary mass organisations would pose, the leadership of the CP (ML) decided for themselves that they have no need for the revolutionary mass organizations.

Girijan organisation of Srikakulam district served as a revolutionary mass organisation. Though it had openly functioned in the beginning, it has functioned secretly during the period of repression and armed struggle and assisted the armed struggle.

*"Andhra Mahasabha"*, the then revolutionary mass organisation, had functioned secretly during the period of Telangana armed struggle (1948-51). It had functioned openly when there was no repression.

Efforts are being made to build revolutionary mass organisations in the countryside of Telangana where the armed struggle is going on today. Such work has been carried on in East Godavari district (circular districts) in connection with the building of Girijan movement.

As these experiences clearly show, at this stage the building of revolutionary mass organisations in the rural struggle areas is not only possible but also necessary. They might be disrupted when there is severe repression. But the building of these organisations should not be given up just because of this. We need not wait until the formation of liberated areas.

In his "Report on Hunan Peasant Movement" Mao explained that in the peasant organisations that functioned in Hunan during the period of peasant revolutionary movement the membership of the peasant organisations has increased many times and these peasant organisations were having authority and that their decisions were carried out by the peasantry. The experiences of the Indian revolution are also in line with this.

The principles formulated by Com. Mao as well as experience of the Indian revolution clearly show that the peasant masses have to participate in the guerilla warfare, that for this the revolutionary peasant organisations and the other revolutionary mass organisations are essential and that only then would the guerilla warfare be able to sustain as a protracted war. Those who think that *"the annihilation of the class enemy itself is the armed struggle"*, would not find it necessary.

#### **8. The Agrarian Revolutionary Programme:**

The building of revolutionary peasant movement is possible only by carrying out the agrarian revolutionary programme. And distribution of the landlords' land is the main item of the agrarian revolutionary programme. Thus the question of land as a revolutionary demand would have immense importance in the agrarian revolution. The struggles against the atrocities of the landlords, illegal levies, and for agricultural labourers' wages are all partial struggles, yet it would not take long for the peasant masses to take up the struggle for the distribution of land, provided these struggles are led with a revolutionary perspective.

The feudal system will be abolished all over the country only after the establishment of the people's democratic government. Only by implementing the agrarian revolutionary programme would we be able to mobilise the peasant masses into the armed struggle in the base areas. It does not however mean that we should not implement any programme until the establishment of the base areas. Depending upon the preparedness of the peasant masses, we should implement the agrarian revolutionary programme including the distribution of land. It would strengthen the armed struggle. It would provide the armed struggle with the support and solidarity of the peasantry, especially of the poor, middle,

and landless peasantry. It would not be possible to distribute all the lands of the landlords in the beginning itself. We should, depending upon the extent of preparedness of the masses, implement it as far as possible and we would be able to wholly abolish feudalism only after the formation of the base areas. In order to implement this programme, we should base ourselves on the poor and landless peasantry and unite with the middle peasantry. It is the poor and the landless peasantry who gets land in the agrarian revolution. Also it is only these people that are to a greater extent subjected to the feudal exploitation as well as the atrocities of the landlords. Therefore they would stand in the forefront to successfully complete the agrarian revolution.

Since the domination of the landlords would come to an end with the abolition of feudalism, the middle peasantry would unite with the poor and landless peasantry as against the landlord class.

The leadership of the CP (ML) are advocating that the guerilla warfare "is not for land, but for political power". This clearly shows that they do not attach any importance to the agrarian revolutionary programme. When they say that we should rely on the poor and landless peasants, they do not mean that we should do so in order to implement the agrarian revolutionary programme. On the contrary, it is only to propagate the politics of people's war and to win their support for their programme of 'annihilation of the class enemy'.

In our view, Srikakulam armed struggle is a peoples armed struggle which is based on the revolutionary mass movement. The revolutionary activities such as establishment of local authority, people's courts etc., were correctly implemented in this revolutionary movement. But owing to the wrong line of thinking of the leadership, the implementation of the agrarian revolutionary programme has not been given importance. As a result, the mobilisation by the masses has gradually waned away. We hope that the leadership while reviewing this movement would give due importance to this and other similar questions and draw proper lessons from it.

During the Telangana armed struggle (1946-51), the armed struggle gained strength solely due to the implementation of the agrarian revolutionary programme, in that especially the distribution of land. With the support and solidarity of the peasantry, the guerillas could face the armed forces of the Nizam in the beginning and the armed forces of the Congress Government there after.

In the armed struggle which is going on in Telangana today, the revolutionaries are implementing the agrarian revolutionary programme as far as possible. Consequently, the peasantry is participating in the armed struggle in various forms and thus lending their support and solidarity to the revolutionaries. This clearly shows that the experiences of Telangana armed struggle are applicable even today.

#### **9. Party Organisation: Revolutionary Mass Movement:**

The party organisation is essential to prepare the masses for the armed struggle, as well as to carry on armed struggle wherever the masses are ready for the

armed struggle. The party would gain strength and get steeled only in course of armed struggle. Since a revolutionary party would be under attack from the ruling classes, it would naturally be a secret party. While functioning as a secret party, they should make use of all legal opportunities, however limited they might be.

In the beginning, the leadership of the CP (ML) was not of the view that the party organisation is essential to carry on the armed struggle. They used to be of the opinion that armed struggle could be carried on under the leadership of the Co-ordination Committee itself. Srikakulam armed struggle was launched under the leadership of the Co-ordination Committee.

Later on, realising the necessity of the party organisation, they began to organise the party. Acceptance of the "Programme of annihilation of the class enemy" in the name of Mao's Thought or atleast not opposing it was the basis on which this party was organised.

They too want to build a secret party organisation. They are also striving for it. But a party without the revolutionary mass movement can not be in live contact with the masses. It can not sustain for a long period of time. At best their party organisation could remain as mere groups that carry on limited propaganda among the people and squads that carry on the programme of annihilation of the class enemy. This is what the organisational position of their party today.

The same defect is found even in the 'technique' they are adopting in the implementation of the "programme of annihilation of the class enemy". The sum total of this technique is to implement this programme with the strictest secrecy, discipline and caution even without the knowledge of the masses.

As we have already stated, the class enemies are of two kinds. Some carry on exploitation and commit atrocities. The masses would be sick of them. Such class enemies should be tried in the people's courts and duly punished. Some would become part of the enemy's armed forces and the secret services and thus join hands with them in torturing and murdering the revolutionaries, the guerillas and the people. Our attitude towards such class enemies should be stern and we should take stern action against them. Otherwise guerilla warfare cannot go forward. Such class enemies, as a part of the ruling classes would remain under the constant protection of the enemy's armed forces. Therefore we should be well organised, disciplined and cautious when we have to take stern measures against them.

In this respect, the revolutionaries should understand that despite the strictest of secrecy adopted, it would be an illusion to think that there would be no repression or at least less of repression. The enemy would only intensify repression as it becomes difficult for him to secure the secrets. To think that with the mere propagation of the politics of people's war, the masses would become capable of resisting this repression, is only to betray the utter lack of experience. There should be a mass movement capable of withstanding the repression. If the masses have become conscious that they should achieve their own liberation, they would become capable of withstanding any amount of repression.



## 10. Extension of the Revolutionary Movement:

The leadership of the CP (ML) does not recognise the necessity of revolutionary movement as well as the necessity of extending it to new areas, for launching armed struggle. On the contrary, they think that the extension of the programme of annihilation of the class enemy itself is the extension of the armed struggle.

According to their understanding if 'at the rate of one per district' twenty 'actions of annihilation of the class enemy' are carried out in the twenty districts of a state, it means that armed struggle is extended to all the twenty districts. By such actions the armed struggle can easily be extended to any length. But such an armed struggle can never be a people's revolutionary armed struggle. Such actions would merely remain as the 'actions of annihilation of the class enemy' which have nothing to do with the people or the people's revolution.

The peasant movement should not be confined to any one area. Our organisational strength would also grow while building the revolutionary movement in an area. The strength of our cadre would also grow so that they could go and build the movement in other areas. Seeing the struggle in one area, the peasantry of the near and adjacent areas would also come forward to join the anti-feudal struggles. The cadre newly developed in the peasant movement should, with their experience, go and build the movement in the new areas. Thus the movement should be constantly expanded. This would enhance the self confidence of the fighting peasantry. The movement would be able to advance even in the face of ruthless repression from the enemy.

If the peasant movement is expanded and the armed struggle is launched in the vast areas, the guerillas could in the face of the enemy's attacks escape from one area to another and resist the enemy's armed forces. This would greatly help to defend the revolutionary movement.

This is not all. Once an armed struggle is launched, it should never be confined to any single area. It should be continuously extended to new and adjacent areas. Thus the armed struggle should be extended to new areas. If the armed struggle has to be extended to the new areas, the mass movement would also have to extend to the new area.

By the time our cadre and the guerilla squads go to the new and adjacent areas, often the main section of the landlords would be armed and united and be ready to face the masses. Whatever be the demands on which the masses are mobilised, they would come down with severe repression.

Whenever the situation is not as above it would be easy for us to extend the peasant movement. But wherever there is armed enemy concentration, we should carry on resistance in self-defence on the one hand, and simultaneously build the peasant movement on the other. Such self-defence by the revolutionaries and the guerilla squads should not be taken as an alternative to the peasant revolutionary movements. The revolutionaries and the guerilla squads would defend themselves until the peasant revolutionary movement reaches the stage of armed struggle in

the new areas. Thereafter they would arm themselves and fight in defence of the "revolutionary movement. In other words, the armed struggle in the new areas is for building of the revolutionary movement in the first stage and for the defence of the revolutionary movement in the second stage. The tactics to be adopted in different stages would also conform to this.

While carrying on the resistance and building the revolutionary movement in the new areas, the old areas should not however be given up. We should go on continuously consolidating them retaining the cadres necessary in these areas. We should intensify this especially when the concentration of the enemy's armed forces is eased.

In the beginning, the girijan movement in Srikakulam was confined to the central areas of the Parvathipuram, Palakonda and Pathapatnam taluqs. Prior to the beginning of the armed struggle, the movement was extended to Tekkali and Sompet Taluqs. Even though decision was taken to extend the movement to still wider areas, no work was carried in this direction. The armed struggle did not gain the strength which it would have otherwise gained had the movement been extended to vast areas.

We should march forward consolidating the revolutionary movement and guerilla war on the one hand and simultaneously expanding it on the other.

#### **11. Co-ordination between Struggle Areas and Other Areas:**

Our cadre is working in the areas of armed struggle as well as other areas. The leadership of the CP (M.L) which is not for adopting any other form of struggle excepting the armed struggle does not have an understanding of the tasks that should be carried out in these areas.

In these areas, our cadre should carry on extensive propaganda among the masses of people of our programme, the betrayal of the revisionists and the necessity to prepare for armed struggle.

They should mobilise the masses into struggles on political and economic demands wherever, whenever and on whatever issue there is preparedness among them. They should, through these struggles, mobilise the masses to take up the form of armed struggle.

They should build the secret party organisation and develop it extensively.

They should send the assistance necessary for the armed struggle areas.

They should explain to the masses as to how the masses in the struggle areas are defending their gains through armed struggle, as to how heroically they are fighting and marching forward and win their support and solidarity for the armed struggle.

We should organise movements in support and solidarity with the armed struggle. We should expose the repression unleashed by the ruling classes. Thus we should co-ordinate activities of the struggle areas with the activities of other areas.

There is a danger of those sitting back talking about the news of struggle areas when they think that there is no form of struggle other than the armed struggle. Because of this, not only cadre turn inactive but also fail to prepare the people of other areas for armed struggle.

## 12. Co-ordination Between the Struggle Areas and the Cities:

Today our cities are the centres for imperialism, big bourgeoisie and the rich classes. It is in these cities that the Government machinery as well as the armed forces of the ruling classes are concentrated. These cities are also the centres of the reactionary parties and the ideologies.

At the same time it is also in the same cities the revolutionary class, the working class, the students and middle classes are concentrated. And these are the classes that would march in the fore front of the anti-imperialist struggles. As the economic and political crisis is getting accentuated, these classes of people are coming into political and economical struggles. The ruling classes are unable to suppress these struggles even by unleashing severe repression. On the contrary, struggles have become a daily feature. While concentrating our attention on the development of armed struggle and other peasant struggles in the countryside, we should at the same time develop the revolutionary movement in the cities. We should organise the revolutionary movement so that the armed struggle would gain its support and solidarity.

The leadership of the CP (ML) has no programme what so ever for fulfilling of this task. They direct the students and youth to go to villages and integrate themselves with the peasantry. This is not the kind of task that could be achieved by mere directives.

Of late, this leadership has been giving the programme such as throwing of bombs on schools, colleges and primary health centres, burning of the portraits of the bourgeois leadership etc., These actions would not be useful to mobilise the discontented masses into the revolutionary mass struggles. They would not be a support to the rural peasant struggles. Therefore these struggles are futile.

Militant workers and students who are steeled in the revolutionary struggle should be sent to the areas of armed struggle. We should give them the tasks of party cadres as well as military responsibilities and ensure that they integrate themselves with the rural masses. Besides this, we should have a programme for building revolutionary movement in the cities.

While mobilising the working class and the students on their own issues, we should at the same time mobilise them mainly into the political struggles. We can organise anti-government struggles on a number of issues which are daily coming up continuously. The economic struggles could be used as a means for making the backward sections of the working class politically conscious.

While carrying on the propaganda of the armed struggles going on in the rural struggle areas, the gains that the masses are achieving in this struggle, the repression that the ruling classes are unleashing and the heroic resistance of the masses among the urban masses, especially working class and the students, we should win their support and solidarity for the armed struggle and also explain to them, that the armed struggle is the only path for their liberation as well.

Liberate the villages, encircle the cities and gradually liberate them this is the sum and substance of the path of people's war. For this, we should build the revolutionary movement and prepare the masses in the cities. We should build a

secret party organisation capable of fulfilling this task. We should build mass organisations suited to the prevailing conditions and develop close contacts with the masses.

Thus we should develop close contact and co-ordination between the revolutionary trade union movement and the revolutionary student movement in the cities on one side and between the armed struggle and the revolutionary peasant struggles in the rural areas on the other.

### **13. Establishment of Base Areas and their Development:**

We have already stated that though there is a revolutionary situation in India, the guerrilla warfare takes a tortuous path of development owing to the uneven development of the revolutionary movement, the disunity among the revolutionary ranks, and the ability of the ruling classes to concentrate large numbers of their armed forces against the guerilla warfare. Only when we have a correct and realistic assessment of this actual situation, would we be in a position to prepare ourselves and surmount these difficulties.

Without such a realistic assessment, if we delude ourselves into believing that the guerilla warfare would advance with great strides winning success after success, we would be overwhelmed by unforeseen difficulties and get clouded upto the point of suffocation. But this is what is exactly the assessment of the leadership of the CP (ML). Look at their line of thinking.

*"The revolutionary situation in India is daily becoming more excellent. The year 1970 has arrived with the promise of the birth of a disciplined people's army and the emergence of extensive liberated areas."*

**(Charu Mazumdar, Liberation, February 1970, Page-5)**

This is not merely a formal speech meant for the occasion of new year's day, nor is it meant merely to inspire the cadres. This is their assessment on the Indian situation as well as on the immediate future of the armed struggle. This same line of thinking is reflected even in their other writings. But the experiences of 1970 have proved that these assessments and the astrological predictions are totally unrealistic. The Indian revolution does not and is not traversing on a straight line. It is going through a tortuous path, full of ups and downs, full of obstacles. The losses that the revolutionaries have suffered as well as the consequent disasters that have befallen the revolutionary movement during the year are themselves a clear proof of this. No doubt the revolutionaries would certainly overcome these setbacks, develop the armed struggle and carry it forward. But what the leadership of the CP (ML) says above only betrays the chief defect in their grasp of the Indian situation as well as the question of building of base areas and the peoples army.

It is essential that we should grasp as to what is a base area and how it is established.

Com. Mao says as follows:

*"What then, are these base areas? They are the strategic bases on which the guerilla forces rely in performing their strategic tasks and*

*achieving the object of preserving and expanding themselves and destroying and driving out the enemy. (Military writings, Page 167).*

If we have to fulfill the main tasks which should be fulfilled in order to successfully carry on the armed struggle for achieving the people's democratic revolution, we should base ourselves on this kind of base areas. Base areas can not be established by conducting sporadic raids here and there. Mao called the tendency to conduct this kind of raids as the tendency of "roving rebels". Mao says that the guerilla forces would begin to build the base areas only when a struggle is carried on against this tendency and it is rooted out from among the guerilla forces. The wrong attitude adopted by the leadership of the CP (ML) today is also similar to this 'Roving Rebel' tendency.

Mao says that the base areas are of three types: 1) in Mountainous and forest regions, 2) in plains areas, 3) in the areas of river lake estuaries. The mountainous and forest regions are the most favourable of all and that there the guerilla warfare could be carried on for the longest of period. The river lake estuary regions are comparatively less favourable than these areas. The plains areas are still less favourable. But yet it is not impossible to develop guerilla warfare and establish base areas in these regions also. For the armed struggle in the plains areas, we should also bear the season in mind. It would be better if the leadership of the CP (ML), who argue that there is no importance for the regional as well as seasonal factors in developing guerilla warfare, study Comrade Mao's directive.

*"We must develop guerilla warfare and set up base areas in all the mountainous regions behind the enemy lines."*

**(Strategy in Guerilla War)**

Com.Mao says as follows regarding the basic conditions that should be secured for the establishment of base areas.

*"A base area for guerilla war can be truly established only with the gradual fulfillment of the three basic conditions i.e., only after the anti-Japanese armed forces are built up, the enemy has suffered defeats and the people are aroused."*

**(Problems of Strategy in guerilla War).**

In this, the fundamental task is the building of armed forces. At this stage, we could only build these armed forces from the youth of the poor and the landless peasantry who are steeled in the agrarian revolutionary struggle as well as struggles against the enemy's armed forces. Though the propaganda of the politics of people's war is essential, the youth would not come forward in sufficiently large numbers to join the people's armed forces with this propaganda alone. Even if they happen to come forward, their numbers would only be very less.

In the beginning these armed forces would only be in the form of guerilla squads. As the struggle gets intensified, the guerilla squads grow increasing in the number.. We should gradually build the regular army. Thus we would be in a position to establish base area only when we could build the armed forces capable of defeating the enemy in an area. This task can not be fulfilled by merely

forming a few squads with a few people drawn from the petty-bourgeoisie, the poor and the landless peasant classes. It would be possible to build a people's army only when the guerilla warfare begins and advances to a certain degree in a wide area.

The second condition is that the people's armed forces should, with the support of the masses, be capable of defeating the enemy.

Here defeating the enemy means the defeating of the enemy's armed forces in the armed struggle. But by this it does not mean the annihilation of all the landlords, the class enemies. This would become possible only when the majority of the enemy's armed forces attacking the guerilla armies are annihilated. The annihilation of the enemy's armed forces and the annihilation of the class enemies is not one and the same thing. We should bear in mind what Mao has said here.

The third condition is the rousing of the masses into struggle against the enemy by applying all our strength including our armed forces.

Here also Mao says that with the launching of armed struggle, the masses also should be mobilised into struggles. The mass organisations should be built in the course of the struggle. He has nowhere said that we should build the mass organisations and mobilise the masses only after the liberation of a particular area. In China it became possible for the Communist Party which was conducting armed struggle with regular armies. In our country where such a regular army is not yet present, the revolutionaries should build the base areas by building the guerilla armies through people's struggles, in that mainly the peasant struggles by building the revolutionary mass organisations, by rousing the masses through revolutionary programmes and by defeating the enemy's armed forces. Ours is a protracted war. Besides the victories, it is also a path of many ups and downs. In spite of the existence of a revolutionary situation in the country, in spite of the mounting crisis among the ruling classes, and the weakness of the ruling classes being more clearly seen in Bengal, still the enemy when taken on a country wide basis is much more stronger than us in terms of this armed forces. Taking advantage of the uneven development of the revolution in the country, they are able to concentrate a very large number of their armed forces in the states of West Bengal and Andhra Pradesh.

To think that we would build the people's army and go on from there to the building of base areas under these conditions would be nothing but merely indulging in utopian ideas, and in day dreaming. Our experiences in the first half of 1970 have already confirmed this.

However we need not get discouraged by this. The ups and downs that we have already faced and are still facing are but natural in course of an armed struggle. We should surmount these difficulties and develop the peasant revolutionary movement in the vast areas of the country. We should take them to the stage armed struggle. Then the armed struggle would be launched and carried on simultaneously in all these areas. The areas where the guerilla warfare is carried on are the guerilla areas. When such guerilla areas are established throughout the country, the enemy would become weak in terms of the armed

forces. Then the situation would become favourable for the establishment as well as the expansion of the base areas in one or two areas. The academic discussions as to whether it is possible to build the base areas before that or not are unnecessary for us. This would depend upon the relative strength of the revolutionary forces and that of the enemy. If some fundamental changes take place in the situation in favour of the revolutionary forces, and if the revolutionary forces have the organisational strength to take advantage of these favourable changes and press forward, it might in such a situation become possible to establish base areas even before that.

Viewed from this angle, it would become clear that it is nothing but wishful thinking to presume that the base area has already been established or the conditions for its establishment have been created because of the peasant revolutionary struggles, guerilla squads, disputes among the local ruling classes, and the dislocation of the Government machinery. No doubt we have to take advantage of the weaknesses and the cracks which have thus developed among the ruling classes as well as the government machinery and develop the revolutionary movement and the armed struggle. But at the same time, the revolutionaries should understand that an area should pass through many stages of development before it reaches the stage of a base area. When the ruling classes fail to suppress the people's armed struggle with the state police forces, they would deploy the central reserve police forces to suppress it. Today it is this same central reserve police which is ruling in West Bengal and Andhra Pradesh. They are police only by name. But in actual fact they are the military forces built for the purpose of suppressing the revolutionary people's struggles. As soon as the guerilla forces are in a position to face the central reserve police, the regular armies would step into the field in larger numbers and with more sophisticated weapons. It would be possible to establish base areas only when the guerilla forces could face and defeat them as well. The revolutionaries would be able to fulfill these tasks only when they concentrate on the armed struggle on the one hand and simultaneously start building country-wide revolutionary movement. It is a wonder if the leadership of the CP (ML), who lack such a comprehensive understanding, forget the tasks which should be carried on in all the fields for building of base areas and wish to build the people's army as well as the base areas in 1970 itself.

Similarly they are propagating that the frequent shifting of their guerillas from place to place is what is mobile warfare. This is also wrong. Mobile warfare is the form of warfare conducted after guerillas have developed in terms of their numbers, weapons and training and formed into regular armies. We are far away from this stage of mobile warfare.

#### **14. Mao's Thought and the Telangana Armed Struggle**

During the period of 1946-51 the armed struggle was carried on under the leadership of the Communist party in Telangana. In the beginning it was carried on against the Nizam's military and against the Congress military after

September, 1948. The people of Telangana as well as the revolutionaries were very much influenced by the Chinese revolution. Also it was the first attempt to apply the experiences of the Chinese revolution to the Indian conditions. Basing on the experiences of the Telangana armed struggle, the then Andhra Communist Committee, which led the Telangana armed struggle, had made it clear that like the Chinese revolution the Indian revolution has to be a protracted war, that the political power can not be seized as in the case of Russia through insurrection in the semi-colonial and semi-feudal India and that as in China the New Democracy has to be established in India. This is anybody's knowledge (an important document connected with this was even published in "Liberation"). It was in Telangana itself that the Mao's Thought was for the first time applied to the Indian conditions. Therefore it should be said that the Telangana armed struggle is the form of people's war in India.

The leadership of the CP (ML) who refuse to recognise this historical truth say that the Mao's Thought was for the first time applied in India in the Naxalbari armed struggle. This is what they say.

*"Naxalbari represents the first ever application of Mao's thought on the soil of India. It was in Naxalbari that the peasants, for the first time, launched their struggle for the seizure of state power. For this reason, Naxalbari symbolises the path of liberation for exploited masses of the Indian people. Thus ushering in a new era in the political history of India."*

**(Charu Mazumdar, Liberation, September, 1969)**

It is indisputable that the Naxalbari armed struggle has got historical significance. The Naxalbari armed struggle has clearly proved that the parliamentary system has become outdated in India, that there is a revolutionary situation in the country and that the conditions for armed struggle are matured in several parts of the country. It has also reiterated the fact that the Chinese path is the only path for the liberation of India and that it is the path of people's war. This served as a warning for all the Indian revolutionaries and on this warning they started to prepare the masses for armed struggle in their respective areas. Thus the Naxalbari armed struggle has not only heralded the present Indian revolution, but also it has once again proved that the Mao's Thought is applicable to the Indian conditions. It was only after the Naxalbari armed struggle that the armed struggle was launched in Srikakulam and Telangana, and is being carried on now. While such is the significance of the Naxalbari armed struggle, the leadership of the CP (ML) don't view it from this angle. They say that what was followed by the revolutionaries and the masses during the Telangana armed struggle was not Mao's Thought, and that the pursuance of Mao's Thought began only with the Naxalbari armed struggle and thus refuse to recognise the historical truth. During that period, based upon Mao's Thought, the armed struggle was carried on not only in Telangana but also in the princely state of Tripura which was closely linked with West Bengal.

In the course of this armed struggle, the people under the leadership of the revolutionaries established village Soviets (Grama Rajya) in 3000 villages of



Telangana. They organised the people's armed forces. They distributed 10 lakh acres of land of the landlords among the poor and landless peasants and introduced many revolutionary reforms in the interest of the masses. They laid foundations for the Peoples Democracy. In Telangana it was proved in practice that the Indian revolution would be in the form of protracted war to achieve the people's Democracy (then known as New Democracy).

Just because the then leadership of the Communist Party of India betrayed the revolution in 1951 and took to the parliamentary path the significance of the Telangana armed struggle does not become unimportant in any way. The valuable experiences gained by applying Mao's Thought in the armed struggle are also very essential for the revolutionary struggles and the armed struggles going on today. To refuse to accept them is to refuse to learn the lessons of the Indian revolutionary struggles. This is a thing that no revolutionary should do.

The Naxalbari armed struggle which has so much of significance has not however continued as a protracted war. They have even accepted the mistakes that have led to the failure of this struggle as follows:

1. Lack of strong party organisation.
2. Failure to rely whole-heartedly on the masses to build a powerful mass base.
3. Ignorance of military affairs.
4. Thinking on old lines and a formal attitude toward the establishment of political power and the work of revolutionary land reform.  
(While we accepted the teachings of Mao in words, we persisted in revisionist methods in practice. Party Organisation in every area actually remained inactive.)
5. Party members were all active at the beginning of the struggle but they were swept away by the vast movement of the people.
6. "We did not politically assess, nor did we propagate among the people, the significance of the 10 great tasks performed by the heroic peasants. We now admit frankly that *"we had no faith in the heroic peasant masses who were swift as a storm, organised themselves, formed revolutionary peasant committees, completed the 10 great tasks and advanced the class struggle at a swift pace during the period from April to September 1967"*.  
(Kanu Sanyal Report on Terai)

At another place they wrote as follows:

*"Our failure in establishing the revolutionary political power and in carrying out revolutionary land reforms blunted the edge of class struggle both during and after the struggle."* (Ibid)

It is a good thing that they own their failures in Naxalbari at least to this extent. The sum and substance of their failures is that the struggle was spontaneous and that they could not give it an organised form. The main points that they have accepted are as follows.

The leadership of CP (ML) accepted Mao's Thought in words and followed revisionism in practice. Even today this leadership is merely chanting Mao's

quotations but they are not in actual fact applying Mao's thought to the Indian conditions. (We have already explained as to how they are not taking the Indian conditions into consideration and working contrary to Mao's Thought.)

They themselves admit that they did not rely on the masses. The position with them is same even today. The experiences of Naxalbari show that no leadership can successfully lead the peoples struggles without fully relying on the masses. Inspite of their loud talk about relying on the masses, they are not in actual fact still prepared to undertake the revolutionary mass mobilisation. Therefore this self criticism of theirs has come to be nothing but formal. On the one hand they admit that they did not realise the significance of revolutionary land reforms. But on the other hand they are formulating that "the Naxalbari struggle is not a struggle for land but for political power". They have gone back on this question which is one of the items of their own self-critical report and thus refuse to admit it.

The Naxalbari leadership could have in fact avoided these mistakes, had they studied and correctly grasped the experiences of the Telangana armed struggle. They could have redoubled the organised strength of the Naxalbari peasants with the distribution of land, establishment of the village Soviets and building of peoples armed forces and be in a position to carry on the protracted war. It was solely because of their failure in fulfilling these tasks that they have failed to provide leadership to the Naxalbari struggle. They fail to recognise this main defect. They are at the same time denying the historical truth that the Telangana armed struggle was based on Mao's Thought. When we say that the Telangana armed struggle was based on Mao's Thought, we do not however mean that no mistakes were committed during the armed struggle. Despite certain mistakes, the Telangana armed struggle could go on for 5 years, only because it had the organised might of the masses behind it, together with Mao's Thought as its guide.

It is clear that it is only for the purpose of refusing to take the experiences of Telangana armed struggle that they are refusing to admit the fact that the Telangana armed struggle was guided by Mao's Thought. It is indisputable that the revolution today would also be guided by Mao's Thought. But for a revolutionary to reject the experiences of the armed struggle, especially the Telangana and Tripura armed struggles that went on during the period of 1946-51, under whatever pretext, is unpardonable. Similarly, drawing correct lessons from the experiences of the Naxalbari, Srikakulam and other armed struggles going on today, the revolutionaries should enrich their revolutionary experiences. Only then would they be able to provide correct leadership to the armed struggle going on in their respective areas.

Formulating and implementing our programme and policy based on the experience of the Telangana armed struggle, we could in a short time build a revolutionary movement, launch the armed struggle and even win some victories. We are able to defend our revolutionary gains and carry on the armed struggle.

We would always strive to utilise the experiences of the Telangana armed struggle as well as the experiences of the struggles going on in other parts of the country.

The leadership of CP (ML) have failed to take correct lessons not only from the experiences of Telangana armed struggle but also from the experiences of struggles under their leadership. They have given up the task of building the revolutionary mass movements. They are portraying their "annihilation of the class enemy" as guerilla warfare, and thus depriving the armed struggle of its necessary mass base or atleast weakening it.

#### **15. A Deviation -Marxism-Leninism - Mao's Thought:**

If we have to correctly understand this deviation in the Indian revolutionary movement, we should study what Mao has said about the "*Roving Rebel Bands*" during the armed struggle in China as well as what *Lenin* has said about "*terrorism*".

In saying that "*Some People want to increase our political influence only by means of roving guerilla actions but are unwilling to increase it by undertaking the arduous task of building up base areas and establishing the peoples political power.*" Mao explained one of the characters of the Roving Rebel Bands. In order to rectify this tendency, he says that we should, besides conducting propaganda about this deviation in the party and the revolutionary peoples army, "*Draw active workers and peasants experienced in struggle into the ranks of the Red Army so as to change its composition*".

#### **(Correcting Mistaken Ideas in the Party)**

We have explained that though the leadership of CP (ML) wish to build the base areas and establish peoples political power, the slogans that they advance are in no way useful for this purpose. On the basis of the momentary enthusiasm that their "actions of annihilation of the class enemy" create among the masses, they have claimed in unmistakable terms that such actions would rouse the masses and enhance the influence of the revolutionary forces. Thus the "actions of annihilation of the class enemy" that they carry on disregarding the building of revolutionary mass movements are similar to the actions of the Roving Rebel Bands that Mao pointed out. Mao says that the active workers and peasants with struggle experience should be drawn into the revolutionary peoples army in order to rectify this tendency. For this reason Mao attaches great significance to the struggle of the peasantry and the working class.

Besides what Mao has said above about the Roving Rebel Bands, it is essential to study what *Lenin* had said about "*terrorism*".

On "*terrorism*", one of the resolutions of the *Second Congress of the Russian Social Democratic Labour Party*, *Lenin* writes thus:

*"The Congress decisively rejects terrorism, i.e. the system of individual political assassinations, as being a method of political struggle which is most inexpedient at the present time, diverting the best forces from the urgent and imperatively necessary work of organisation and agitation destroying contact between the*

*revolutionaries and the masses of the revolutionary classes of the population and spreading both among the revolutionaries themselves and the population in general utterly distorted ideas of the aims and methods of struggle against the autocracy."*

**(Collected Works, Vol.6, Page 474)**

While writing about the struggle of the Bolshevism against the petty bourgeois semi- anarchical revolutionarism, he explains the struggle within the Socialist revolutionary Party on this question as follows:

*"---This party considered itself particularly "revolutionary" or 'left', because of its recognition of individual terrorism, assassination-something that we Marxists emphatically rejected. It was, of course, only on grounds of expediency that we rejected individual terrorism...."*

**(Collected Works, Vol.31, Page 33)**

*"Without in the least denying violence and terrorism in principle, we demanded work for the preparation of such forms of violence as were calculated to bring about the direct participation of the masses and which guaranteed that participation".*

**(Collected Works, Vol.6, Page 195)**

This is what Lenin has said about the struggle against individual terrorism that stood in the way of preparations for the 1905 insurrection. Notwithstanding the fact that we are now following the path of peoples war and not insurrection, the basic principle that there should be mass participation in the revolution and that we should prepare the masses to this end remains the same in both the cases. The insurrection is a form of struggle in which the working class seize the political power through an armed insurrection, while the peoples war is the form of struggle in which the political power is seized through protracted (peasant) war. Viewing from this angle and analysing our experience we should find it inescapable to prepare the masses, the party and the armed forces in order to launch and carry on the armed struggle. It is on this that our victory solely depends.

Lenin did not reject violence and terrorism as a matter of principle. He directed that all Marxists should reject violence in the form of individual terrorism. He point out that while not being useful it is extremely harmful to the revolution. Thus he denounced it as unacceptable.

Like all the other revolutions, our peoples war is also undoubtedly a violent revolution. All the peoples armed struggles going on in different parts of our country today are also like-wise violent struggles. Not only we accept violence in principle, but also we actually practice the revolutionary violence. We have already explained this problem while discussing the problems of armed struggle. It is only the actions which are going on in the form of "actions of annihilation of the class enemy" that we are opposing. We oppose this form because, in our opinion, the indiscriminate actions without preparing the masses for armed struggle would be harmful for the armed struggle.

Not only the “actions of annihilation of the class enemy”, carried out by the followers of the CP (ML) in the Citar, Rayalaseema and Telangana districts of Andhra Pradesh, possess the characteristics of “Roving Rebel Bands” and terrorism as pointed out by Mao and Lenin, but also they have yielded exactly the same results. These actions were carried and based upon the line of thinking of CP (ML) leadership on the “programme of annihilation of the class enemy”. They have caused irreparable losses to the revolutionary movement as well as to the armed struggle in Andhra Pradesh. It cannot be said that this wrong line of thinking of the CP (M.L.) leadership has been implemented in Andhra alone. It is clear that the revolutionary movement in different parts of the country has suffered to the extent this programme was implemented by their cadres.

We have explained that the “programme of annihilation of the class enemy” does not reflect a correct understanding of the armed struggle and that it is opposed to Marxism Leninism and Mao’s Thought. We have also shown that it does not conform to what ever experiences of armed struggle we have. The experiences that have already been acquired clearly show as to how harmful is this deviation. There is no doubt what so ever that this deviation of theirs is close to the concept of “Roving Rebel Bands” and “individual terrorism” described by Mao and Lenin. If they fail to analyse their own experiences in the light of Marxism-Leninism and Mao’s Thought, and rectify this deviation, they would travel in the same wrong path and ultimately become divorced from Marxism-Leninism and Mao’s Thought.

#### **16. Common Points Between the Revisionists and the Leadership of CP (M.L.)**

We have so far analysed the wrong views as well as the incorrect practice of the CP (M.L.) on various questions concerning the armed struggle. Their failure in realising the need for the revolutionary mass movements as well as the struggles for the development of armed struggles has become evident. This has ultimately resulted in the annihilation of the land lords in the name of “annihilation of the class enemy” and claiming it as the armed struggle.

An interesting thing here is that the leadership of the CP (M.L.) have got a main point in common with the old and new revisionists the very same revisionists whom they are vehemently denouncing day in and day out. The old revisionists who support the ruling classes, who follow the parliamentary path, and who assert that the social changes could be brought about without a revolution, have given up the revolution as well as the revolutionary struggles of the workers and peasants. Though the neo-revisionists sometimes appear to be hesitating in supporting the ruling classes, they are also following the parliamentary path on the plea that there is no revolutionary situation in the country and had given up the peasant and working class struggles. Thus both the revisionists have thus given up the building up of revolutionary movement through revolutionary struggles as well as leading of the revolution.

The leadership of the CP (M.L.) who accept the necessity of armed struggle for the revolution and claim that the masses could be roused through their

programme of "annihilation of the class enemy" has also given up the task of building the revolutionary movement through the revolutionary struggles of the workers and peasants.

Thus the old and neo revisionists and the leadership of the CP (M.L.) completely agree on the question of giving up the task of building the revolutionary movement through the revolutionary struggles of the workers and peasants.

The leadership of the Communist Party of India followed a 'Left' line during 1948. The theory which this leadership propounded was that since there was a revolutionary situation in the country, the political power could be seized through the "insurrection" by the working class without revolutionary struggles. Following this line of thinking they rejected the path of peoples war. They Vehemently denounced the Andhra Communist Committee as reformist for having proposed the path of peoples war. Similarly the leadership of the CP (M.L.) have also given up the peasant revolutionary struggles, but they have done so in the name of the very peoples war itself. They are denouncing the Communist Revolutionaries of Andhra, who are organising peoples war through peoples revolutionary struggles, as revisionists. Thus what they follow is nothing but the 'Left' line. The difference between the Left deviation of 1948 and that of present day lies merely in their slogans of insurrection and peoples war and not in their character. One was advanced in the name of Leninism while the other is being advanced in the name of the Mao's Thought.

There is nothing to wonder about the Left deviation of 1948 as well as the Left deviation of the present day. But what is really surprising is the glaring similarity between the present day revisionism and the leadership of the CP (M.L.) on the fundamental question and on the question of rejecting the peoples revolutionary struggles. Yet this is an objective reality. Both these deviations stem from one and the same source. The only difference is that while the revisionism is outside the revolutionary ranks, the Leftism is within the revolutionary ranks.

When there are no differences on the fundamental points between the old and new revisionists and the CP (M.L.) leadership, why should the old and neo revisionists denounce the leadership of the CP (M.L.)?

For the old and new revisionists who defend the ruling classes, or follow the parliamentary path- the peoples revolutionary struggles, the resistance in self-defence, the armed struggle- all would appear as terrorism. It is exactly for this reason that the old and new revisionists are denouncing all the revolutionaries as terrorists. While the old and new revisionists are denouncing the left deviation of the leadership of CP (M.L.) from a revisionist stand point, we are pointing out their 'LEFT' deviation in the light of Marxism-Leninism -and Mao's Thought and on the basis of the experiences of peoples revolutionary struggles in India. We do so because as Mao says we have to take the lessons from our past mistakes in order not to repeat them in future. The reason for this is to cure the disease in order to save the patient.

We should carry on a serious ideological struggle against revisionism as well as 'left' deviation and march forward taking all the aspects of armed struggle in to consideration and properly co-ordinating them, if we have to take advantage of the existing revolutionary situation in the country and lead the Indian revolution to a victorious finish. We should mobilise the masses into peoples revolutionary struggles and simultaneously carry on the armed struggle.

#### **V. The Question of Nationalities: Separate Telangana Movement:**

The people of India are not of one nationality as the ruling classes of India claim. There are several nationalities in India. The Peoples Democracy recognises the right of self-determination of all these nationalities. "National Integration", the counter revolutionary slogan of the ruling classes, denies the right of self determination of the nationalities. Giving it their own interpretation, the old and new revisionists are supporting this counter revolutionary slogan of national integration. The Communist Revolutionaries unconditionally support the right of self determination of the Nationalities. Though the leadership of the CP (M.L.) declare that they recognise the right of self determination of the nationalities, their understanding as well as their practice is opposed to Marxism-Leninism.

Though a comprehensive study of the problem of nationalities in India is very essential, we would however confine ourselves to the question of Telangana region which is a part of A.P a state of India.

Their understanding of the struggles of various nationalities is as follows:

*"..... Communists should not be leaders of national struggles. The communists should, however, forge unity with national struggle but the duty of the communists is to develop class struggle and not national struggles. In order to prevent disruption of class struggle, the communists (declare) that every nationality has the right of self-determination including right to secede. Such a declaration will assure the nationalities that by uniting they will not fall into the clutches of a new set of exploiters. And only when they feel assured of this will they participate in the class struggle. We, communists can never become leaders of national struggles even if we try. By trying to become leaders we can only reduce ourselves into mere appendages of the bourgeoisie of various nationalities."*

*".....as we march forward as the leader of the class struggle, the character of various national struggles itself will begin to change. And on the eve of victory, every national struggle will ultimately be transformed into class struggle."*

**(Charu Mazumdar, Liberation Nov.9 1968)**

This is the sum and substance of the above:

- 1) The right of self-determination of the nationalities has to be recognised since the class struggle would be disrupted otherwise.
- 2) The Communists should lead the class struggle, but they should not however, lead the struggles of the nationalities.
- 3) We should strive to unite with the struggles of the nationalities.
- 4) Every national struggle would in its final stage transform itself into a class struggle.

When the leadership of the CP (M.L.) speak of a class struggle, let us assume that what they mean by a class struggle is revolutionary struggle for the seizure of political power. Then what are the classes that participate in a national struggle? Under whose leadership do they participate? And against whom do they fight? What is the relation between the peoples democratic revolution and the right of self-determination of the nationalities? They have no reply for these questions as well as many other questions.

Today to a great extent the linguistic states have been formed in India. The whole of "Hindi" speaking region has not been formed into a single state. Besides, there are also sub-states, the union territories-and the agitations for the formation of separate states are going on.. However all these agitations are based on the principle that these states should necessarily form a part and parcel of the Indian union and be under the strict confines of the Constitution. In keeping with their class interests, the Indian ruling classes are solving these problems in what ever form and to what ever extent it is necessary to solve them. It is going on endlessly.

The ruling classes have not taken any measures to unite the people on the basis of language even to the extent the linguistic states are formed. The administrative affairs are not being conducted in the popular language. The medium of instruction is not in the popular language. The existing economic and cultural disparities between different regions are not removed. On the contrary, they are further increasing. As a result the agitations for small separate states for each region are going on. The agitations for separate Telangana (Andhra), Mahavidharbha( Maharashtra)-all these are of this type. Though these are for linguistic states, they are not however based on the unity of nationality. The desire behind these agitations is the formation of smaller separate states within single linguistic states. These states also wish to remain as a part and parcel of the Indian Union.

Though the Indian ruling classes are not so favourably disposed towards these reforms today, it would however be wrong to think that they would oppose these reforms even in the future. If necessary, they might in some form or the other accept the demands for the formation of such small states, in order to safeguard their own class interests.

Such agitations are being led by the feudal and bourgeois classes of these areas. Some section or the other of the big bourgeoisie are behind them. Apart from these agitations, the struggles for the right of self-determination of nationalities are also going on in our country. The struggles of Naga, Mizos and the people of Kashmir are of this type. These struggles are going on against the Indian ruling classes. As the Indian ruling classes are dependent upon imperialism for their existence, these struggles are also against imperialism. The local national forces are leading these struggles.

As the agitations and struggles for the right of self-determination are today going on in these areas, similar agitations and struggles may also begin tomorrow in some more states. Thus the right of self-determination is not a local problem.



This is an all India problem. This problem has arisen solely due to the domination of imperialism, big bourgeoisie and feudalism in India. This problem would be solved only when these classes are overthrown through Peoples Democratic Revolution. As the leadership of the CP (M.L.) say, this is not merely a question that saves the class struggle from getting disrupted. But this is a question of great importance for the successful completion of the peoples democratic revolution.

While leading the peoples democratic revolution, the Communist Revolutionaries also, at the same time, lead the struggles for the right of self-determination of the nationalities. It is evident from the experiences of the people of Kashmir as well as Nagas and Mizos that the reactionary ruling classes would not accept the right of self-determination of nationalities. Yet it is not the Communist Revolutionaries but the national forces who are leading the struggles for the right of the self-determination in these areas. As the peoples democratic revolution advances under the leadership of the Communist Revolutionaries, they would as well take up the leadership of the struggles for the right of self-determination in other states as well as in the whole of India. This would form united front with the national forces. Then they would not only be the leader of the struggle for the right of self-determination but also of the united front.

In another situation, when the national forces are leading the struggle for the right of self-determination of a particular nation or nationalities, the Communist revolutionaries, while leading the revolution would at the same time form united front with the national forces. In such a situation where the national forces would be stronger the Communist Revolutionaries may not be in a position to play the role of leadership. But, they can attain, can such a position in the course of advance of revolutionary movement. In both the situations, as a part of the revolution, the communist revolutionaries would also lead the revolutionary movement for the right of self-determination of the nationalities. Therefore it is wrong to say that the communist revolutionaries should not lead such movements. It is equally wrong to say that when we decide to lead them we would not be in a position to take the leadership into our hands. By our taking up the leadership, the national forces including the petty bourgeoisie would come into the united front, thereby under the leadership of the communist revolutionaries. But the question of communist revolutionaries going under their leadership and becoming appendages to them does not arise. It would be nothing but underestimating the latent revolutionary potentialities of the right of self-determination of the nationalities and keeping the communist revolutionaries away from them. By this we would only be isolating ourselves from the masses and handing over the leadership to the petty bourgeoisie and other such forces.

It is not so difficult to understand the inter-relation of the class struggle and the national struggle. Since the peoples democratic revolution is not only directed against the imperialists but also against the big-bourgeoisie, this becomes a national revolution for the whole of the peoples as well as for the people belonging to each of the nationalities of the country. Since it is directed against feudalism

and reactionaries that collaborate with feudalism, this becomes a democratic revolution. Thus the national character and the democratic character are inter-linked in the Peoples Democratic Revolution. Since Peoples Democratic Revolution, in the stage of agrarian revolution is not only directed against the feudalism, but also against the big-bourgeoisie and the Imperialism, this would also have the national character. The leadership of the CP (M.L.) who fail to see the identity between these two are formulating that the class struggle under the leadership of the revolutionaries would in the process take the form of national struggle, that this national struggle would ultimately take the form of class struggle and conclude victoriously.

It would be better if we study what Mao says in this respect.

*"In a struggle that is national in character the class struggle takes the form of national struggle, which demonstrates the identity between the two". (Independence and initiative within U.F.)*

This was said in respect of anti-Japanese war. In our case, when the peoples democratic revolution is in the stage of agrarian revolution the national character of our struggle would be subordinated to the agrarian revolution. The domination of imperialism together with the domination of the big bourgeoisie belonging to the other nationalities and the use of the military and the central reserve police belonging to one nationality against the people of other nationalities by the ruling classes from other nationalities to perpetrate their rule would lead the peoples revolutionary struggles to take the form of national struggles. Therefore at this stage what Mao says would apply to us also. Failing to grasp this, the leadership of the CP (ML) are distorting what Mao has said in this respect and misinterpreting it by formulating that the class struggles would at certain stage take the form of national struggles and that the national struggle would in the end take the form of class struggle.

Now let us examine the Telangana problem.

All the Telugu speaking people are Andhras. They live in Telangana (9 districts), in Circar districts (previously 7 and now 8 districts) and in Rayalaseema (4 districts) and in the neighbouring areas. Prior to 1953 the Circar and Rayalaseema districts were part of the Madras state, while the Telangana districts were a part of the princely state of Hyderabad. With Circar and Rayalaseema districts the Andhra state was formed in the year 1953. Afterwards Telangana districts were included in this and Andhra Pradesh was thus formed in the year 1956.

The feudal classes, a section of the traders, businessmen and the employees belonging to Telangana opposed the formation of the Andhra Pradesh. They opposed it on the ground that their interests would not be safe under the political and economic domination of the upper classes of the developed Circar districts.

The then Communist Party (united) declared that 'the Peoples Raj in Visalandhra' was their aim. It claimed that Visalandhra was the national aspiration of the Andhras, that it would strengthen the democratic forces and thus carried

on a big agitation for the formation of Visalandhra (Andhra Pradesh is the name given to Visalandhra).

It was at this time that the Communist Party had withdrawn the Telangana armed struggle, given up the revolutionary path and taken up the parliamentary path. Taking advantage of this opportunity the Indian ruling classes took steps to form linguistic states, as one of the political and economic measures to strengthen their position. As a result, the ruling classes could strengthen their own position even in Andhra Pradesh where the position of the Communist Party was very strong. Gradually the Communist Party lost even the strength that it gained before 1951 when it was pursuing a revolutionary path. This is solely due to the parliamentary path pursued by the Communist Party. Failing to recognise this, the old and new revisionists, CPI and CPI (M) started to argue that democracy would flourish in Andhra Pradesh, and that if Telangana is separated there would be nothing but the fascist dictatorship of the landlords in Telangana. They alone should know as to how there would be democracy at one place and the dictatorship at another place as long as the ruling classes remain to be one and the same.

After the formation of the Andhra Pradesh even the national spirit that all the Telugu speaking people are one has not been strengthened, not to speak of the strengthening of the democratic forces. The main reason for this is the absence of any democratic and progressive measures in the political, economic, as well as the cultural fields. Owing to the bankrupt policies of the ruling classes, the position of the middle classes has deteriorated. The fear of unemployment has spread among the students. The development in the state remains as ever. This is but the situation obtaining throughout the country today. Besides the ruling classes are divided among themselves. Taking advantage of the discontentment among the middle classes, students, tradesmen as well as the businessmen, the sections of ruling classes who are excluded from power have launched an agitation against the sections of the ruling classes in power. They have given shape to the agitation basing on the slogan of separate Telangana.

Hyderabad, Secunderabad and other towns in Telangana joined this movement. Further a strong section of the landlords has also joined and assumed the leadership of the movement.

In short, it is a struggle of the middle class people and the students led by a section of the land lords and the other upper classes of the ruling classes deprived of power. Separate Telangana state is the aim of this movement. It has also been supported by a section of the big-bourgeoisie.

While such is the objective reality, the understanding of the leadership of the CP (M.L.) on the Separate Telangana movement is as follows:

“Heroic Telangana is again in revolt”. (Liberation, May 1969)

In saying “again”, the leadership of the CP (M.L.) is comparing the Separate Telangana movement with the heroic Telangana Armed Struggle of (1946-51). They are only betraying the bankruptcy of their own revolutionary perspective by comparing the heroic Telangana armed struggle which heralded the Peoples

Democratic Revolution in India with the narrow regionalist Separate Telangana Movement. They are hiding the fact that the peasants and workers of Telangana have not participated in this 'revolt' and that this has not got the character of a peasant revolt. True, the people in some of the towns fought heroically facing even the bullets from the police. Even then, it is wrong to compare this separate Telangana Movement with the heroic revolutionary Telangana Armed Struggle of 1946-51.

Look at their understanding of the Separate Telangana state:

"The APSCCCR (The ML authors) have supported the just struggle of the Telangana people and issued a call to them to intensify their struggle against feudalism, and the rule of the landlords and the comprador bureaucratic capitalists, overthrow them and establish their own peoples state of Telangana."

"No, the people of Telangana will not allow their fate to be decided at Delhi by their sworn enemies.....They are taking to the path of armed struggle to overthrow the rule of the land lords and other exploiting classes and establish their own state."

(Liberation, May 1969)

We have already stated that the peasants and workers have not participated in the Separate Telangana Movement. They remained neutral. Therefore, however militant this struggle might have been, it had only remained a struggle of the middle class people. It was because of the fact that this struggle was led and supported by a section of the same big-bourgeoisie and feudal classes who are exploiting them.

The "Peoples Raj" in Telangana or in any other part of the country without the overthrow of the ruling classes is inconceivable. Such being the case, the people who advanced such a slogan should alone know as to how could there be "Peoples Raj" in Telangana alone. In the past the Communist Party advanced the slogan of "Peoples Raj" in Visalandhra". Visalandhra has been formed, but there has been no "Peoples Raj". On the contrary we have got the big landlord, big bourgeoisie rule. In the light of these experiences, it could be easily said that the fate of the slogan of "Peoples Raj in Telangana" would not be different from this. Separate Telangana could be formed now. But there could be no "Peoples Raj". Once again there would be the rule of the big land lords and the big bourgeoisie.

In the peoples democratic revolution, it is the nationality and not a part of a nationality which would be the basis for the right of self-determination. The people of Telangana form only a part of the Andhra nationality and not a separate nationality by themselves. Therefore, it is the nationality of Andhra as a whole that has the right of self-determination and not the peoples of Telangana separately by themselves.

No peoples struggle can take the path of armed struggle without the participation of the peasants and workers. Hence it can not be victorious. Similarly the Separate Telangana movement which came up as a middle class revolt could not take the path of armed struggle.

Together with the opposition towards the sections of the ruling classes in Andhra Pradesh, the hate against the people of the Andhra region had also become the basis for this movement. To call upon the peasants to participate in such a movement is nothing but tailing behind the upper classes leading the movement. This is nothing but rank opportunism.

It is wrong to think that the present ruling classes are opposed to the formation of Separate Telangana or such other small states. In order to strengthen their own position, they would never hesitate even to divide a linguistic region into a number of small states. The formation of such small states has already begun in other forms, "Meghalaya" is an example of this. Giving additional powers to Telangana Regional Committee is also an aspect we should bear in mind.

In pursuance of the directives, the followers of the leadership of the CP (M.L.) had participated in the Separate Telangana movement. What were the results that they had achieved? How far could they advance the revolutionary movement? How far could they march forward?

Today the ruling classes are caught in a crisis and there are splits among them as a result. The break-away groups are coming out with many slogans, in order to take advantage of the discontentment among the masses, divert them from the revolutionary movements, bring them in to their hold and thus enhance their own influence. Separate Telangana is one such slogan. They are also able to mobilise people, especially the urban middle class people on such slogans. Even after seeing all this, if the revolutionaries still support these slogans and the movements, there could not be any betrayal worse than this.

In all cases such as Separate Telangana movement, the revolutionaries should unmask the counter-revolutionary and reactionary nature of these movements and thus demarcate themselves. We should warn the people of Telangana that they, as a part of the people of Andhra and of India, would only be able to achieve their own liberation by overthrowing the ruling classes through agrarian revolution, and that they should not waste their energies on the diversionist slogans such as this. Taking advantage of the splits and the internal struggle among ruling classes, we should formulate proper programme and take the revolutionary movement forward. If we do not immediately intensify our struggle against the sections of exploiting classes fighting the government, and concentrate our struggle against the sections of the ruling classes supporting the government we would be able to easily develop the revolutionary movement.

By pursuing such a line the Communist Revolutionaries could develop the revolutionary movement in the districts of Telangana. On the contrary the leadership of the CP (M.L.) actually aided the reactionary classes by supporting the slogan of Separate Telangana. They failed to give a revolutionary programme to the people of Telangana.

While the CPI and the CPI (M) were supporting the section of the ruling classes in the name of integration, the leadership of the CP (M.L.), under the

cover of their revolutionary phrase mongering and in the name of "Peoples Raj" in Telangana supported the reactionary leadership of the Separate Telangana movement which is but a part of the reactionary ruling classes. This is nothing but rank opportunism.

#### **VI. Unity among the Revolutionaries:**

Today all the followers of Mao's Thought are not in a single party in India. One group has formed the Communist Party of India (Marxist-Leninist). The other group is the Communist revolutionaries. They have not yet formed an all India Party. There are also groups other than these two in some states.

Today the development of the revolutionary movement is uneven in the country. The revolutionaries are working based upon this. Majority of the revolutionaries who are having mass contact and building the revolutionary movement, are being subjected to repression by the ruling classes. It has therefore become imperative for them to carry on their work secretly.

There is confusion among the revolutionaries on the ideological, programmatic and tactical questions facing the Indian revolution. They are able to realise the past mistakes to an extent. But still they are not in a position to come to a correct understanding. It is the duty of the leadership not only to point out but also to correctly solve the problems facing the revolutionaries.

It is with this view that we have formulated our Immediate Programme. While incorporating in it the main points of the general programme, we have at the same time given to the revolutionaries the necessary programme for developing the agrarian revolution in the countryside. We have also given a programme for implementation in the cities. Mainly we have kept the experiences of Telangana armed struggle (1946-51) in view in formulating this programme.

This is not a programme meant for scholarly discussions. It is only aimed at helping the immediate activities of the revolutionaries. The revolutionary movement has developed to the extent the revolutionaries have implemented this programme. Reaching the higher stage today the movement has taken the form of armed struggle in some areas. Thus this is a programme of armed struggle as well. The experiences of the past one and half years have proved the correctness of this programme. We realise that this effort also is not sufficient. We have to examine the experiences of various revolutionary groups in the past two or three years and take correct lessons from them. Though the Telangana armed struggle (1946-51) is important among all struggles, yet we have to review the other peasant revolutionary struggles. We have to a greater extent base ourselves on the experiences of these struggles to explain the wrong attitude of the leadership of the CP (M.L.) on various issues.

Side by side with this there is a need for serious ideological struggle among the revolutionaries. We should for this purpose examine our past experiences and ensure that the past mistakes are not repeated. Conducting ideological struggles after the fashion of academic discussions without any relevance to the revolutionary practice is not new for us. However the ideological discussions

that went on during the period of Telangana armed struggle (1946-51) were not of this nature. Basing itself on the problems of the armed struggle of that day, the Andhra Communist Committee resolved that our revolution also should follow the path of the Chinese revolution and placed it before the party for discussion. The then all India leadership which had nothing to do with the revolutionary practice, rejected the Chinese path as revisionism. Since the ideological struggle carried on thereafter was conducted only within the confines of parliamentary path, naturally it had no relation whatsoever to the revolutionary practice.

Today all the revolutionaries accepting Mao's Thought as the Marxism-Leninism of this era are not of one opinion on the problems and practice concerning the Indian revolution. The revolutionaries would have come closer had they correctly grasped their experiences of the past two years in building revolutionary movement as well as conducting revolutionary armed struggle. But the group leading the CP (M.L.) is not able to correctly apply Mao's Thought to the Indian conditions. This leadership is failing to properly understand its own experiences and to take correct lessons from them. In order to hide this fact, they are purposely slandering the fellow-revolutionaries as revisionists, counter-revolutionaries, so on and so forth. Merely chanting Mao's quotations, they claim themselves to be the sole heirs of Mao's Thought. They are revising the fundamental principles of Marxism-Leninism and Mao's Thought in the name of learning lessons from the so called new experiences. In the discussions on various questions, we have so far tried to apply these principles correctly.

Let us examine some of their formulations that stand in the way of unity among the revolutionaries.

### **1. Is Mere Chanting of Mao's Name –Internationalism?**

They are trumpeting that they are internationalists and that Mao is their party's Chairman. This trumpeting of their's has got nothing to do with the proletarian internationalism. Our proletarian internationalism should possess the following main characteristics:

1) We should to a greater extent make use of the experiences of the Chinese revolution to successfully complete the Indian revolution. We would be able to fulfil this task only by applying Mao's Thought to the Indian conditions and conducting the revolution. We should examine the experiences of the revolutions that went on so far, as well as the revolutions still going on in various countries and apply them to the extent they are applicable to us.

2) We should defend Marxism-Leninism and Mao's Thought from the attacks of Revisionism and Left Sectarianism.

3) We should face the attacks of the Imperialists and the Social Imperialists and defend the policies of the Communist Party of China.

4) We should expose the war preparations and the conspiracies of the Indian ruling classes against China and Pakistan with the overt and covert support of the imperialists and the social imperialists. We should mobilise the masses against these war preparations and conspiracies. If the Indian ruling classes launch a war

of aggression against China, we should intensify the revolution, convert it into a Civil War and hasten the overthrow of the ruling classes.

5) Successfully completing the peoples democratic revolution, which smashes the imperialism and social-imperialism in India by itself is the greatest of our international duties. This would not only liberate the Indian people from imperialism but also it would weaken the chief architect of imperialism as well as its ally, prevent the world war and pave the way for world peace.

This is what ought to be our proletarian internationalism. Distorting this revolutionary outlook, the leadership of this group has reduced it to the few words, "*the Chinese Chairman is our Chairman*". They thought that they need not in actual practice follow Mao's Thought if they keep repeating these few words. They are only saying this for the purpose of defending their own wrong theories.

As they have distorted the armed struggle and reduced it into their "Programme of annihilation of the class enemy", they have also distorted the Mao's Thought and reduced it into the few words, that "*the Chinese Chairman is our Chairman*".

This and their claim that Mao himself is personally leading them only shows that they have no confidence in their own policies. Further, it is clear that in their own party the ordinary cadre and the party members are not prepared to accept them unless they are said to be Mao's policies. They should be prepared to bear the responsibility for their own wrong policies. They should take lessons from their experience and rectify them. But it is unpardonable to cash on them in the name of Com. Mao.

This is nothing but a deliberate attempt at silencing the criticism of their wrong policies from the ordinary cadre and the fellow revolutionaries or at evading the responsibility of answering the criticism of their own ranks if any. Just because of this the revolutionaries would not go back to criticise them. The ranks are fast realising through their own revolutionary experiences, as to how utterly wrong are the policies of the leadership of the CP (M.L.) and are criticising them. We believe that this criticism of ours would help them in their endeavour.

In the name of suggestions and directives from International leadership, the All India leadership had, on many occasions in the past forced their wrong policies, especially their reformist and revisionist policies on the party and betrayed the Indian revolution. The leadership of the CP (M.L.) is now traveling in the same path. They are forcing their wrong policies on their cadres and party members in the name of Com. Mao.

## **2. United Front with the Followers of Mao's Thought:**

In their draft programme and other articles they have suggested united front with the other groups of Communist Revolutionaries in the country who were carrying on the armed struggle.

Today there are people, other than the Communist Revolutionaries in the country, who are also carrying on armed struggle in the Naga and Mizo areas. They are conducting armed struggle against the Indian ruling classes for their right of self-determination. It would have been correct, if they had proposed united



front with such groups. But it is not with them that the leadership of the CP (M.L.) proposes the "united front".

We have already mentioned that there are groups other than CP (M.L.) who are following Mao's Thought in India today. "The Revolutionary Communist Committee of Andhra Pradesh" is one of them. In Telangana the armed struggle is going on for the past 18 months under the leadership of this committee. In the beginning, the leadership of the CP (M.L.) carried on a verification campaign against the leadership of the "Revolutionary Communist Committee of Andhra Pradesh" stating that the leadership of the "Revolutionary Communist Committee of Andhra Pradesh" was opposed to armed struggle, and that they were revisionists, thereby trying to defend themselves for not having admitted "the Andhra Pradesh Revolutionary Communist Committee" into their committee. Within a short time afterwards, the armed struggle was launched in Telangana under the leadership of the "APRCC". With this they should have atleast realised their mistake. Instead they tried to bluff that "In opposition to the anti-armed struggle the leadership of Andhra Pradesh local cadres started it". The fact is, we have never recognised "the programme of annihilation of the class enemy" by the squads as an armed struggle. Our policy is to prepare the masses for the armed struggle and to carry on the peoples armed struggle basing on the experiences of Telangana armed struggle (1946-51). This is fully in accord with Mao's Thought. It is on this basis that we are working in Andhra Pradesh to prepare the masses for armed struggle. We have launched and are carrying the armed struggle in a vast area of Telangana where the masses were ready for armed struggle. There are no differences among the leadership nor are there any between the leadership and the cadre on the question of armed struggle. They must be dreaming of such differences.

In any case, as the launching of armed struggle in Telangana is an objective reality, probably unable to withstand the pressure from their cadres the leadership of the CP (M.L.) is giving this slogan of "united front" in order to show that they are adopting a positive attitude towards the armed struggle launched by the Communist Revolutionaries. This is nothing but rank opportunism.

In India today, armed struggle is the deciding factor between Revisionism and Mao's Thought. Whoever follow Mao's Thought and lead armed struggle could not be revisionists nor could they be petty-bourgeois revolutionaries. They are the communist revolutionaries who follow Marxism-Leninism and Mao's Thought.

It is evident that there are differences on the question of how to conduct the armed struggle. It would be possible to resolve these differences through experience. We strongly believe that by now most of their followers have realised the incorrectness of the armed struggle policy of their leadership, that it is terrorism and also that the peoples revolution could not be developed by this. All of them should follow the path of peoples armed struggle sooner or later.

Instead of admitting and rectifying their mistakes, a very serious mistake, and uniting with the communist revolutionaries, the leadership of the CP (M.L.) are giving the slogan of "united front" with the local cadres only to carry on

their wrong policies in another form. Thus they are prolonging the division among the revolutionaries.

The united front, we build during the peoples democratic revolution would also be the united front to carry on the armed struggle. The bourgeois groups as well as the petty-bourgeois groups that carry an armed struggle would also find a place in it. Such groups would have separate ideologies of their own class. They would also have separate programmes of their own. They would accept the peoples democratic programme, join the united front, and carry on the armed struggle along with the revolutionaries. The communist revolutionaries would lead the armed struggle as a party. Who ever carry on armed struggle on the basis of Mao's Thought can not be bourgeoisie or petty-bourgeoisie. They are the communist revolutionaries. For this reason, all those who are following the Mao's Thought and conducting the armed struggle should form one single party and not a united front. They should resolve their differences through inner-party discussions. Abandoning this basic principle which would strengthen the unity among the revolutionaries, the leadership of the CP (M.L.) is proposing the principle of "united front" which would only increase the divisions.

At the same time, it is essential that they should understand another thing. Many of the cadres and units of CP (M.L.) are not conducting the armed struggle. It is not so difficult for some of the cadres and militants to form themselves into squads and carry on 'the programme of annihilation of class enemy.' Yet their followers are not implementing this programme. They should have either refused to implement "the programme of annihilation of the class enemy" despite the directives of their leadership or the leadership should have retained them in the party in order to boost numerical strength even though they refuse to implement this programme. Why is it that this leadership is not openly denouncing these units and cadres who are not implementing "the programme of annihilation of the class enemy" as revisionists? Is it not opportunism? Why the double standards?

### **3. From Non-antagonistic Contradiction to Antagonistic Contradiction:**

With the formation of the All India Coordination Committee of the Communist Revolutionaries in 1967, all the revolutionaries were happy about the possibility of all the revolutionaries following Mao's Thought coming together and forming a revolutionary party. The communist revolutionaries throughout the country did not come out of the CPI (M) all at a time. On one side they were carrying on the inner-party struggle against the neo-revisionist leadership and at the same time mobilising the communist revolutionaries in their respective states for coming out of the CPI (M).

The leadership of the All India Co-ordination Committee who did not understand the importance of mobilising all the revolutionaries under one single Centre, openly criticised this as "opportunism". Instead of allowing the communist revolutionaries who came out of the CPI(M) in each state forming a single Co-ordination committee, they started forming separate Co-ordination committee with their supporters.

In some of the states the majority of the revolutionaries refused to join these committees which had become the centres of various opportunist forces. Through their group in the states they carried on propaganda against such of those revolutionaries who refused to join them as revisionists. Thus, having left with no alternative, they formed separate committees. Thus in many states the attitude of this leadership itself had led to the formation of two separate centres. Andhra is one among such states.

At the time of joining the AICC, the representatives of the APCCCR had frankly expressed that the attitude of the leadership on the question of nationalities as well as the elections was also not acceptable to them. At the same time, they expressed the opinion that they could, being in the same committee, resolve these differences through internal discussions and experiences. They had also pointed out that it would not be possible to conduct the armed struggle if the revolutionaries, preparing the masses for armed struggle did not form a party and therefore urged them to take necessary steps for the formation of a party. They had joined the All India Co-ordination Committee with these views.

But this did not yield the results that the revolutionaries hoped for. This merger became merely nominal since the leadership of the AICC had continued to carry on their group politics in Andhra as well as other states. Making use of the already existing differences as well as the differences cropping up just then, they carried on a propaganda that the Andhra leadership was opposed to armed struggle, misled the Srikakulam committee which was already leading the armed struggle; took them to their side and formed the Communist Party of India (Marxist-Leninist) with the groups they had under their leadership by them in various states. They had expelled the APCCCR from the AICC in Feb 1969 itself and announced that they would maintain 'non-antagonistic' relations with them. Thus they laid the foundations for the formation of two or more separate centres of the revolutionaries in India.

In spite of their announcement that they would maintain 'non-antagonistic' relations with the APCCCR, they had in actual practice pursued antagonistic relations with them. Their followers had tried to disrupt and wipe out the communist revolutionaries with blind hatred and antagonism. But they had utterly failed in their attempts. In 1969 the armed struggle was launched in Telangana under the leadership of the communist revolutionaries. Some efforts towards this end were also made in other districts. The groups of communist revolutionaries from various states who refused to join the CP (M.L.) wished to work along with the "Andhra Pradesh Revolutionary Communist Committee".

The leadership of the CP (M.L.) did not welcome this development. This served as an eye opener for many of their followers whose aim was armed struggle, and also made them realise the need for rethinking about their attitude towards the Andhra Pradesh Revolutionaries. Yet their leadership has not recognised their mistake and did not try to rectify it. They have been making a vain bid to isolate the Andhra leadership and to win over their cadre.

Thus even the armed struggle launched in Telangana could not become a basis for unity. It could not at least help for a return from antagonistic relations to non-antagonistic relations. Finally two centres have taken the organisational form.

Not only the organisational functions of these two centres is separate, but also they are following two separate lines. We have already discussed these questions and expressed our views. It is possible to be in one party and to resolve these differences through inner party discussions. But with the leadership of CP (M.L.) who are incorrectly implementing the Mao's Thought who are denouncing the APRCC who are correctly implementing the Mao's Thought as revisionists, and forming a separate party, the two centres came into existence.

The leadership of the CP (M.L.), whose aim is not the unity of the revolutionaries on the basis of Mao's Thought, have gone from the non-antagonistic relations to antagonistic relations with the leadership of the "Andhra Pradesh Revolutionary Communist Committee" who are carrying on armed struggle following the Mao's Thought. This is nothing but the direct result of their own policies.

#### **4. The Revolutionary Authority is established only when correct leadership is provided to the Revolution**

We have already shown as to how the CP (M.L.) has failed in the field of ideology, armed struggle as well as achieving the unity among the revolutionaries. Unmindful of such serious mistakes at the very outset, they are now striving to establish their "Revolutionary Authority". They are openly declaring that the recognition of their "revolutionary authority" is the prerequisite for the revolutionary unity.

See what they are saying:

*"Today, the situation is such that if we are to advance the revolution in the face of the attacks of revisionism and the reactionaries we must conscientiously and seriously wage a struggle to establish the revolutionary authority of comrade Charu Mazumdar. Our slogan is, internationally we must follow Chairman Mao, Vice Chairman Lin Piao and the great, glorious and correct Communist Party of China as well as world-lessons of the Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution. Nationally, we must be loyal to Chairman Mao, vice-Chairman Lin Piao, and the Communist Party of China, and must fully accept the revolutionary authority of the leadership of Comrade Charu Mazumdar. Only thus can the revolutionary unity be built and the revolution win victory."*

**(Liberation, February 1970, Pages 49-50)**

We, the communist revolutionaries, accept Mao's Thought as the Marxism-Leninism of this era. We accept it as a guide for our revolutionary practice. We firmly believe that only by correctly applying Mao's Thought to the concrete conditions of India and leading the revolution would the Indian revolution become victorious. The kernel of Mao's Teachings, Lin Piao's writings, the revolutionary experiences of the Proletarian Cultural Revolution itself is the Mao's Thought.

Contrary to this, the leadership of the CP (M.L.) is merely chanting the names of Mao, Lin Piao and the Chinese Communist Party. They have totally failed in applying Mao's Thought to the concrete conditions of India. While this is the truth, they are making use of these names to make their wrong policies attractive to their cadre as well as to escape from the responsibility of answering their criticisms.

This leadership has failed in leading the Naxalbari armed struggle. The recent experiences show that they have also failed in leading the Srikakulam armed struggle. In Bengal, when ruling classes are enmeshed in a serious crisis and when the revolutionary situation is ripe, this leadership has confined itself to "the actions of annihilation of the class enemy", instead of mobilising the masses for armed struggle through revolutionary mass programme and revolutionary mass movement. This leadership has completely failed in leading the armed struggles, in the very primary stage. It is clear that they are chanting the names of Mao and others solely for the purpose of hiding this utter failure of theirs.

The revolutionary authority of the leadership could be established only in the course of revolution and by providing correct leadership to the revolution. Similarly the revolutionary unity also could only be achieved in the course of the revolution. By providing correct leadership the revolutionaries should successfully complete the revolution. For a leadership which has failed to fulfill all these tasks, it would be ridiculous to bring up the question of establishing their revolutionary authority.

We might, in the beginning commit mistakes owing to our limited or lack of experience in conducting the revolutionary struggles. Drawing correct lessons from these mistakes, we should strive to provide correct leadership. This is what a humble leadership should do.

There are no leaders in India who can even sit along side Mao and Lin Piao. The Indian revolution has yet to produce such a leaders. The sooner the leadership of CP (M.L.) realises this the better for them.

They are denouncing us as revisionists. But they have failed to point out even a single formulation either in our thinking or in our practice, which revises Mao's Thought. It is clear that they are adopting this method for the purpose of misleading their followers.

From this it is evident that the unity of the revolutionaries is possible only through serious ideological struggle. The experiences show that the unity of the revolutionaries would become possible only when the revolutionaries within the CP (M.L.) carry on an uncompromising struggle against the erroneous 'Left' policies of this leadership and unite with the revolutionaries outside the CP (M.L.) on the basis of Mao's Thought.

We have discussed here the main differences between us and the leadership the CP (M.L.), shown where they are making mistakes and put forward our stand. The following is the sum total of these discussions.

1. The principle contradiction in the present Indian Society is the contradiction between feudalism (and big bourgeoisie) on the one hand and the broad masses of the Indian people on the other. It is wrong to show this as a contradiction between feudalism and the poor peasantry. Due to this, the revolutionary nature of the struggle against feudalism would degenerate to the nature of economic struggle and narrow down. While carrying on the armed struggle for the seizure of political power and abolition of feudalism, the masses would also carry on revolutionary struggle to resolve the contradiction between them and the imperialism.

2. There is a revolutionary situation in the country. But at the same time the development of the revolutionary movement is uneven in the country. Basing on this, we should mobilise the masses into the revolutionary struggle and prepare them for armed struggle. Just because there is a revolutionary situation, it would be wrong to abandon the revolutionary struggle and take up the "programme of the annihilation of the class enemy" in the name of armed struggle.

3. As it is wrong to confine the masses to economic struggles, (which is known as economism), it is also wrong to refuse to mobilise the masses on political and economic demands, especially on political demands in the name of economism. Through these struggles the masses would, out of their own experience, realise the need for armed struggle. In the present revolutionary situation, the masses in different parts of the country would quickly realise the need for armed struggle depending upon the level of the mass movement of the respective areas.

4. The armed struggle which has got the basis of the revolutionary mass movement would alone become successful. For this, the building of revolutionary mass organisations, the implementation to the extent the masses are ready of the agrarian revolutionary programme which is a peoples revolutionary programme is essential. When we say that the armed struggle is the main form of struggle in the present revolutionary situation, it would be wrong to say that the armed struggle is the only form of struggle and to reject all the other necessary forms of struggles. Likewise it is also wrong to equate the "programme of the annihilation of the class enemy" with the armed struggle. Based upon the peoples democratic revolutionary programme, the masses would take up the armed struggle as the main form of struggle to overthrow the ruling classes, would defeat the armed forces of the ruling classes and seize the political power into their own hands. In any stage of the armed struggle-even in the primary stage - the programme of annihilation of the class enemy could not be a programme of the armed struggle. Similarly it is also wrong to say that we should rouse the masses through "the programme of annihilation of the class enemy". Like "economism", terrorism also gives up the task of building the revolutionary movement through revolutionary mass movements. Both "Economism" and "Terrorism" are one in this respect. There is terrorism in the armed struggle outlook of the leadership of the CP (M.L.).

5. The support of the leadership of the CP (M.L.) to the separate Telangana movement is wrong. They tailed behind one of the groups of the ruling classes. The people of Telangana do not form a separate nationality. The separate Telangana movement was not a struggle for the right of self-determination. This is not a national struggle for the unification of the nationality of Andhra. Further the very slogan of "Peoples Raj" in Telangana is opposed to Marxism-Leninism. It is impracticable. The "Peoples Raj" in India and in Andhra- a part of India could be established only when the ruling classes are defeated through Peoples War. But to advance a slogan of "Peoples Raj" in Telangana alone would be a fraud on the masses. When the ruling classes are fighting among themselves, we should make use of their contradictions and advance the revolution but should not tail behind one of the groups of the reactionary ruling classes. This is nothing but opportunism.

6. The question of recognizing the revolutionary authority of the leadership of the CPI (M.L.) does not arise. They have failed in fulfilling of the main tasks- the task of leading the revolutionary struggles as well as the task of unifying the revolutionaries. The leadership that could fulfil these tasks would alone can become the revolutionary authority. This would be possible only in the course of the revolution. We would be able to fulfil this task only when we apply Marxism-Leninism and Mao's Thought to the concrete conditions of India, unite the revolutionaries on the basis of the armed struggle and leading the revolution. It is essential to do this as early as possible.

These are the differences on the fundamental questions. Based on our limited experiences, we have endeavoured to analyse them in the light of Marxism-Leninism and Mao's Thought. The essence of this wrong trend of the leadership of CP (M.L.) is 'Left opportunism'. It is due to this deviation that they refuse to recognise the decisive role of the revolutionary mass movement for the overthrow of the ruling classes through armed struggle. In the organisational field, they are adopting groupism and thus obstructing the revolutionary unity of the revolutionaries on the basis of Mao's Thought.

'Left' opportunism is not new in the Indian revolutionary movement. The Communist Party fell into the hands of the 'Left' opportunist leadership in 1948. Through its 'Left' policies this leadership did irreparable damage to the party. On some of the main issues, there is a similarity between the policies of the two. With the slogan of insurrection, in the name of Marx, Engles, Lenin and Stalin, the then 'Left' leadership rejected the protracted war based on the Mao's Thought and agrarian revolution. The present 'Left' leadership refuses to apply Mao's Thought to the Indian concrete conditions in the very name of Mao, Lin Piao and the Chinese Communist Party. In the name of "annihilation of the class enemy", they are taking the armed struggle on a wrong path. Both of them reject the decisive role of the revolutionary mass movement in the seizure of political power by the people. Both refuse to take the experiences of the Telangana armed struggle for formulating the path of armed struggle in India. In the name of the

suggestions from the International leadership, both forced their 'Left' policies on the party. Though these two 'Left' policies belong to two different historical periods, it is interesting to note the similarities between the two.

When the Chinese Communist Party was under the influence of the 'Left' opportunism, Com. Mao waged a serious struggle and defeated it and carried forward the Chinese revolution creating a glorious history. Today in India also, it is essential to carry on a serious struggle against both revisionism and 'Left' opportunism. Only then would the Indian revolution march forward.

The Indian revolution that has begun very late and facing many ups and downs is going on under a very favourable national and international situation. The victory of the proletarian cultural revolution in China, the advance of the revolution in Indo - China, Africa, Latin America and Arab countries, the imperialism caught in the crisis and leading towards its end, and the exposure of the anti-people, pro- imperialist policies of the Soviet Social imperialists all these offer us internationally favourable conditions. The remarkable role of Peoples China as the centre of the world revolution stands as a powerful safe-guard for these favourable conditions. Due to the divisions and controversies growing among the ruling classes of the country, they are enmeshed in a serious crisis. There is not only a revolutionary situation, but also there are revolutionary struggles raging throughout the country. The experiences of the Chinese revolution as well as the experiences of various revolutions are available for the revolutionaries in the country. The bankruptcy of the parliamentary path of the social democratic parties is getting exposed. Nationally these are the favourable conditions. Yet the disunity among the Indian Revolutionaries stands as an impediment to the progress of the Indian revolution. Though the revolution had suffered losses due to the fascist repression unleashed by the ruling classes and as a result the advance of revolution has to some extent suffered a temporary setback, the revolutionary forces would undoubtedly overcome these setbacks and march forward.

We hope that our criticism would prove useful to the Indian revolutionaries to conduct a healthy discussion on all the problems facing the Indian revolution today.

## **LET US UNITE ON THE BASIS OF MARXISM-LENINISM AND MAO'S THOUGHT**

**ANDHRA PRADESH REVOLUTIONARY  
COMMUNIST COMMITTEE**

**1-10-1970**

**( translated from Telugu original)**





## TWO DEATHS

S.Roy

Comrade Sushital Roy Chowdhury died last week and so did Comrade Ashu Majumdar.

They died because of the dangerous and destructive line put forward by a section of the CPI(ML) leadership. They have used the blind, dedicated, passionate allegiance of our petti bourgeois youth to lead the party into a line where death is the only reward and blood the only sign of success. Sushital Roy Chowdhury died fighting against this line, Ashu Majumdar died implementing it. Both died because of it.

The CPI(ML) carried the seeds of 'Left' and Right deviation from its birth. This was inevitable. Right opportunism was the main danger. It still is, except that one must remember that in revolutionary times, during passages if revolutionary advance, after every success in the battle against revisionism-right opportunism manifests itself in the guise of 'left' adventurism and tries to wreck the party. In the beginning, in the CPI(ML) the signs were there. But they were few : isolated bits of unreason, sudden short bursts of fanaticism, over-reliance on conspiracy, a tendency to stick to the city, repeated instances of directing appeals mainly to youth and students rather than directly to the toiling masses, thereby shifting the emphasis. These piled up and collected and a whole range of "theories" appeared. The "theory" began, qualitatively, by describing the mechanics of individual assassination to be achieved by a conspiracy. In the beginning, this was to be a take-off point, a link between political propaganda and organisational work and the formation of guerilla forces and liberated zones. This was in March 1970. In April/May it was raised to the level of being the *only* way, the *only* link. Immediately thereafter it was announced to be the *strategy* for all the stages of the People's Democratic Revolution. Those who accepted this theory in March failed to see that by making conspiracy the only method of organisation, by placing the conspiratorial organisation outside the control of the party unit and by *narrowing the definition of 'annihilation' to mean only the slitting of throats*-this 'theory' was fundamentally against Mao Tsetung Thought. The rapid success of this line-measured in terms of throats slit-made all questions evaporate or appear revisionist. As long as the pre-conditions laid down by the original article were maintained, "successes" were few and the sphere of activity remained confined to the village, the deviation was not alarming. It was capable of correction. But then came the city 'actions' followed by the city annihilations. New 'theories' began to gush forth from the fountainhead :

1. The theory that all Indian bourgeoisie were comprador.
2. The theory that all intellectual or petti bourgeois leaders of the past respected by the present society were agents of imperialism.
3. The theory that more you study the more stupid you become.
4. The theory that destruction of statues and schools, colleges, laboratories was correct, revolutionary and akin to the great proletarian cultural revolution of China.

5. The theory that *one* activist represents his entire class. Thus the participation of one landless poor peasant in one annihilation means that the *entire* landless poor peasant mass is ready to participate in the annihilations.
6. The theory that propaganda, organisation etc. are unnecessary, that only by annihilation would all these be achieved. Annihilation must come first.
7. The theory that oppression is necessary to revolutionise the people. Also the theory that every murder of the enemy must be paid back by a murder. Instant revenge became the credo.
8. The theory that the urban petty bourgeois youth need no longer go to the villages. By destroying statues, schools colleges etc. they were integrating with the rural masses.
9. The theory that in India, in the present age, city and village, town and countryside are the same indivisible. The work in both is the same, tactics in both shall be the same. The only work in the cities is armed guerilla attack. :
10. The theory that Comrade Charu Majumdar is the only authority, only he understands Mao Tsetung Thought, that he is the Party, that he must be obeyed *unconditionally* and not to obey him is not to be a communist.
11. The theory that to attack only when one is sure of winning is revisionist.
12. The theory that the rich peasant is an enemy and can be annihilated.

Sushital Roy Chowdhury fought all this. His hopes and revolutionary discipline kept him silent for a long time. Then when he began to speak he was insulted, isolated and abused as a centrist, a revisionist, a coward.

Ashu Majumdar made up for his inexperience by his fiery zeal, his fantastic courage and his capacity to organise. He obeyed the party. In this obedience he put everything he had; in the end, his life.

But to what purpose?

It is time the people and revolutionaries asked this question. What happened? Why do so many fear us? Why whenever there is an unreasonable murder do all of us tremble and hope that it was not the work of 'our boys'? where is the working class, who will lead our revolution? Where is the roused peasantry? Where is the People's Army so flauntingly announced in 1970? Why did so many vote so overwhelmingly in spite of all the threats, the bombs, the pipeguns? Shall we be blind to all this?

Now, this leadership, decimated by arrests, death and expulsion, is again changing its line. Economic work among the peasantry, concentration upon the urban classes (working), building of rural bases, downgrading of annihilation of the class enemy—all these are being put forward. But there is no accompanying analysis, valuation, self-criticism. Thus this leadership goes on, sowing confusion and reaping death. Sushital Roy Chowdhury and Ashu Majumdar were the latest harvest.

March 20, 1971

Calcutta

[Reproduced from *FRONTIER ANTHOLOGY-2*]



## POLITICS OF NAGI REDDY

- A Journalist

[This is a criticism of IMMEDIATE PROGRAMME - a document of APRCC- published in the Oct' 1969 issue of Liberation, the central organ of the then CPI (ML) - EC ]

It should not be difficult for one who has gone through the so-called "Immediate Programme" of Nagi Reddy and company adopted at a conference held on April 10, 11 and 12 this year, to know them in their true colours.

A major weakness of the "programme" is that it has entirely ignored the question of *destroying the class enemy*. Quite understandably Nagi- Reddy and company chose not to say anything about annihilating the main class enemies in the villages without which it is impossible to create a liberated area. On the contrary, they advocate measures aimed at protecting the class enemies. For example they say:

Do not hurt the usurer if he is agreeable to accept "reasonable" rates of interest. By hurting him you merely deprive the helpless peasants of the source of obtaining usurious loans.

- Build 'revolutionary' *panchayats* in the villages, if you must, but do it with a view to *competing* with the official *panchayat* dominated by the landlords.
- It is not practicable now to launch struggles in the irrigated areas in the plains.

To cover up this weakness in their "programme" they had to cook up a new 'theory' for waging people's war. According to this 'theory' *hills* and *jungles* constitute the "key" to and the *main* area for waging people's war. And what does this mean? It means that struggles cannot develop at present in vast areas of India. According to this 'theory' therefore, it would be a sheer waste of energy to try to develop struggles in the plains of West Bengal, Bihar and U.P.

It is on basis of this 'new' and demoralising 'theory' of theirs that Nagi Reddy and company have directed their ranks and cadres to-

- go to jungles [ not to villages] :
- carry out and take lessons from "limited guerrilla resistance" in the non-irrigated areas in the plains and then go to jungles.

The "programme" is silent over the police repression on the people that would invariably follow every such "limited guerrilla resistance."

- the fighters in the irrigated areas of the plains are required to go straight to jungles after undergoing some "training". This is because there are to be no struggles in those areas.

And these people, the authors of this most absurd 'jungle theory' dare decry our Party for allegedly getting "isolated from the masses" !

We ask our ranks and cadres to go to the people -the peasants and workers, and not to the jungles. We ask them to stay on among the people after guerrilla actions, and continue revolutionary propaganda among them. We say that only the masses, and the masses alone, can help us get rid of our fears, can provide us with shelters and give advice and information for carrying out further actions, and can increase our confidence and strength. We can be "fish" only when we remain among the people-the "sea". This is what Chairman Mao teaches. This is what has been borne out by the experience of struggle in Srikakulam. The tragic results that invariably follow by pursuing the line to zealously advocated by Nagi Reddy and company can be clearly seen from the pages of Guevara's "Bolivian Diary ". And yet- according these wise- acres it is we who are the "followers of Guevara line".

This 'jungle theory', this theory of keeping away from the masses spring from petty bourgeois ideology. The petty bourgeois impotency characteristic of Nagi Reddy and company is clearly evident from their 11 *basic principles*, which, as they claim, will remain valid till socialism is achieved. These principles include:

-Distribution of the land owned by *big landlords* among the poor and landless peasants. (What about the land owned by non-cultivators, i.e., the usurers and jotedars ? Should that land be left alone? In that case, how can feudalism be overthrown?)

-Taking over the foreign capital in industry and banks. (Does it mean that foreign capital in trading etc. would not be touched ? As far as we know, "loans" constitute 80 per cent of foreign investments in our country, and only 20 per cent as 'capital'. The "programme" is silent over these foreign loans).

*Working class* : The "programme " states : "The increase in the wages and facilities regarding working hours and other conveniences to the working class will be implemented". ( How generous of Nagi Reddy and company! They promise to make available to the workers after revolution those "facilities" and "conveniences" which the British imperialists and their successors, the Congress rules allowed them to have but did not 'implement'. What a bright prospect indeed, they hold out before the workers!).

"The proletarians have nothing to lose but their chains.They have a world to win ". This stirring call given out by Marx-Lenin -Mao Tsetung aroused the proletariat who made revolutions and shed their own blood to lead the revolution of the oppressed people. In contrast to this, Nagi Reddy and company have now advanced their new slogan: 'all the facilities and concessions hitherto approved by wage-boards, pay commissions etc. will be *implemented* after the revolution'!

All in all, the Reddys seem quite firm about promising things to the petty bourgeoisie. Section 5 of their "programme" promises the petty bourgeoisie guarantee of service. Further, section 10 promises to *annihilate completely* unemployment among the petty bourgeoisie. Naturally, all these assurances are meant for the *urban petty bourgeoisie*.

We do not run down Nagi Reddy and company simply because they are so solicitous of the urban petty bourgeoisie. The revolutionary united front definitely includes urban petty bourgeoisie. But the great importance which they attach to the petty bourgeoisie raises one question in our mind: Have they forgotten that unemployment among the petty bourgeoisie can be 'annihilated completely' *only when* the rural poor gets land and the city worker gets jobs, political power is wielded by the workers and peasants, and production is increased?

Such guarantees, biased in favour of the petty bourgeoisie, as Nagi Reddy and company have given, tend to perpetuate the contradiction between the people and the bureaucracy, and between the intelligentsia and the labouring people. To do such things means to reject the lessons of the Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution of China. It springs from such utterly un-Marxist ideas as 'Let us not bother about contradictions now. Contradictions can be tackled later, after the revolution'. As we know learning from the experience of the proletariat of one's own country and of other countries is a major requirement of proletarian internationalism. It is our duty to learn well Mao Tsetung Thought in order to be able to resolve gradually the contradictions among the people *in course of revolution*.

We do not propose to hold out before the urban petty bourgeoisie any false promise of so-called "guarantee of service" to induce them to remain in the cities -which would continue to be the stronghold of reactionary forces till they are finally defeated. On the contrary, we ask them to go to the villages among the people, to live, work and integrate with them. We ask them to learn from the people in order to be able to teach them. This is how the urban petty bourgeoisie can take part in the revolution and transform themselves. Nagi Reddy and company do not, however, want to change the urban petty bourgeoisie. On the contrary, they try to lull the urban petty bourgeoisie into complacency with false promises like "guarantee of service" and "complete annihilation of unemployment."

Marxism-Leninism-Mao Tsetung Thought is a science. And like all sciences it does not admit of any ambivalence in the use of words or terms. Every word here carries a definite meaning. However, true to their petty bourgeois line of thinking, Nagi Reddy and company do not mind turning Soviet social-imperialism into "Soviet revisionist neo-colonialism," and declaring that a "new people's democratic government," will be established in India after the "new democratic revolution." India's biggest imperialist exploiters are U.S imperialism and Soviet social-imperialism. To this their "programme" adds a third name-British imperialism. They have added things to accepted formulations without caring to justify the same. No, we have no desire to make small things look big. But the

question is: Are they trying to push a new analysis *different from* that of the CPC? They are free to do that, but should say so openly. [We cannot forget that decrying the CPC comes easy to Nagi and company. One of their leading lights, C.Pulla Reddy, in a letter dated August 8, 1967, addressed to the C.C. of the CPI (M) openly stated that the CPC was 'mistaken' in its analysis of the character of the Indian Government, of the Indian situation etc., that the CPC's statements on Naxalbari struggle were "tactless" and accused it of adopting "pressure tactics to browbeat the Party [CPI (M)] into acceptance of their line on the Indian situation." In true revisionist style he stated : "We must demarcate ourselves, and demarcate sharply, from the CPC on this question," meaning the Indian situation. This letter was published in CPI (M)'s organ *People's Democracy*.

Nagi and company do not propagate the necessity of creating liberated areas in the countryside by annihilating the class enemy, by depriving the police of their 'eyes' and 'ears', and by getting rid of the local tyrants. Their programme for the village includes works like : (1) studying land relations ; (2) propagating the importance of the distribution of land; (3) getting prepared for seizing land *next year*, making *lists* of lands to be seized, organizing meetings and demonstrations of the rural poor, and preparing them for the coming seizure of land; (4) collecting information about and making *lists* of the property belonging to temples; (5) getting ready for launching struggle for acquiring plots of land to build dwelling houses. This is how Nagi and company are trying to divert the peasant masses from the path of revolutionary armed struggle: on the one hand they keep silent over the great political role the peasants are to play in the Indian revolution, while on the other, they try their hardest to keep the peasant masses bogged in the mire of economism. (Sri Reddy would have been saved all this labour if he could become the Minister for Land and Land Revenue of Andhra. He could then have his "lists" prepared by JLRO's and use the police force as the "volunteer force" of his party. That would be right in the tradition of the CPI(M) bosses of West Bengal !)

If the class enemy survives and has the power to come back, how long can the peasants retain the land distributed to him? He would be dispossessed of the land in no time by the usurer-jotedar. It has happened in West Bengal. Large tracts of land which were seized by the peasants are now found lying fallow.

Nagi and company propose to seize the land, animals and farm implements of "big" landlords (their "programme " does not say how this 'bigness' is to be judged) and distribute the same among the poor people. Do they expect these landlords not to call in the police ? And when the police comes these landlords and other reactionaries would help in every way to get the fighters arrested. How then is it possible to seize and distribute land when the landlords and other reactionaries are allowed to move about freely doing mischief. Moreover, setbacks are likely to demoralise a section of the peasantry, or, as is happening in West Bengal, one group of land-hungry peasants is set against another by the revisionist and reformist parties of the UF and while party funds continue to swell the poor people are made to shed their blood in fratricidal strife.

Nagi and company's "programme" talks of liberated areas, land distribution etc., but carefully avoids mentioning the overriding importance of annihilating the class enemy. It is evident, therefore, that they are using these words only to deceive the people. Their "programme" may be able to bring peasants to attend meetings or take part in demonstrations, but is absolutely incapable of unleashing the revolutionary initiative of the masses.

This weakness in their "programme" forces them to say ridiculous things like:

- The Girijans should be given the rights to *sell freely* and the Government purchasing -bodies should be abolished. (They seem to forget that after 1898 no one was able to sell "freely". To give that right now to the Girijans is to force them into the arms of the rapacious traders).
- The people should, *on their own*, begin *revolutionary work* to abolish the *muthabhari* system (a tyrannical feudal system) [Comment is unnecessary]

Nagi Reddy leads those who are deeply concerned about mass organizations and bitterly curse Comrade Charu Mazumdar and the CPI (M-L) for being 'indifferent to mass organizations'. Nagi and company propose in their "programme" to build mass organizations on a 'new line'. The old method of subscriptions and receipt books is given up. They would now admit only those *who raise their hands*. Where people are afraid to do so owing to repression, they would recruit members by making a *door to door approach* (see p.11 of their "programme"). Those who have read Comrade Charu Mazumdar's article "On Some Current Political and Organizational Problems" (Liberation, July 1969) will at once realize how correct CPI (M-L)'s stand - point is and how mistaken the Reddys are:

Nagi and company have also criticized our Party in respect of 'work in the cities'. And what is their "active and revolutionary" programme for 'work in the cities'? They say :

- the cities are also important;
- the help of the workers are needed ;
- attention must be given to the students ;
- the city people should be prepared to run their affairs when the time comes for finally seizing the cities from the countryside though it is only a distant perspective now... etc.

These are only empty talks and nothing else.

Nagi and company's "revolutionary programme" was prepared in Andhra but does not mention the historic Telangana peasant struggle, nor even the current militant nationalist struggle going on there .Their whole energy is consumed in preparing an outline for the struggle of the toddy-tappers of Telangana -a struggle that is yet to be launched! They refer to the Srikakulam struggle saying that it has reached the stage of armed struggle. But who led this struggle to this stage, which Party has been giving leadership to this struggle ? Nagi and company say nothing about this.

The "programme" produced so hastily by Nagi and company is a revisionist (confusing and cowardly document. More, it is cunning and deceptive. The Dange

clique and the CPI(M) revisionists have almost completely lost their hold on the masses in Andhra, while the Srikakulam struggle has spread to 7 districts of the State. Large contingents of troops have been deployed to stamp out this raging fire of revolutionary struggle. But now-a-days, revolutionary struggles cannot be suppressed by White terror alone. Counter-revolution desperately needs disruption within the revolutionary ranks without which it cannot succeed. That is why counter-revolutionaries relied so heavily on the Dange clique and the CPI(M) revisionists, and now, when these renegades have been reduced to virtual impotency, counter-revolutionaries are relying on the Nagi Reddy and company.

The swift advance of revolution quickly unmasks the hidden traitors. Nagi Reddy and company will also be exposed fully before long. They hope to mislead and confuse the revolutionary and fighting cadres with their so-called "immediate programme". But their hopes will be dashed and their counter revolutionary tricks will be exposed.

For them time is running out. And they seem apprehensive about it. The announcement of the formation of the CPI (M-L) would have cost them many, if not most, of their cadres and followers. So, in their desperate anxiety to forestall this, they came out with this wretched document on April 25, that is, six days before the announcement was made on May 1, of the formation of the CPI (M-L). How anxious they were, becomes evident from the fact that in their document published on April 25, they instruct their cadres to step up the struggle against contractors by "the end of April"! And yet you dare call us "adventurist"!

**-[From Liberation, October, 1969]**





## THE ANDHRA PRADESH REVOLUTIONARY COMMUNIST COMMITTEE'S REPLY TO THE CRITICISM ON 'THE IMMEDIATE PROGRAMME'

-December, 1969

For some time, articles are being published in the *LIBERATION* criticising the statements and activities of the leadership of APCCCR. Recently, the *Liberation* (Oct, 1969) published a criticism by a 'journalist' on our IMMEDIATE PROGRAMME under the title, 'THE POLITICS OF NAGI REDDY'.

We would have considered their criticisms and accepted the correct points, if any, if they were made on the basis of experiences and the writings of Mao. But this is not the case. They are expressing wrong views on various questions. As part of this, they are carrying on a false propaganda against us distorting our views. So, we consider it necessary to answer their criticisms.

Here, we must make one point clear. As alleged, the declaration of our IMMEDIATE PROGRAMME has nothing to do with the emergence of CPI(ML). We had no knowledge of the proposed formation of this party till it was announced by them. Our representative was not present in the meeting where the decision for the formation of this party was made. We held our State Convention in April (10-12), 1969 and adopted our Programme in it.

Our state leadership and various District Committees were carrying on work in the light of understanding contained in this programme even before it was formally adopted in the State Convention. We have concentrated our work, in the main, in Warangal, Khammam, Nalgonda and East Godavari districts and made efforts to extend it in other districts too. The "Immediate Programme" was aimed at continuing this work and providing a programme to develop the revolutionary movement as a preparation to start the armed struggle in various areas. This programme did not attempt to discuss the tactics to be adopted either on the eve or after the beginning of armed struggle as it was not the aim of the programme. The armed struggle has begun and is continuing after the adoption of this programme. With this, the attacks on the enemy and other programmes are continuing. Therefore there is no scope whatsoever to say that we have no programme to counter the enemy.

While working out and carrying out this programme we had in our view the experiences of Telangana Peasant armed struggle. We base ourselves on the same experiences even in our present reply to the criticism of the Marxist Leninists.

Now let us examine the criticism.

## **I.MAIN POINTS OF GENERAL PROGRAMME**

The second point of the basic points of General Programme clearly said: *"Feudalism should be abolished. The land of the landlords should be distributed among the poor peasants and the agricultural labour."*

But the *liberation* critique distorted this and criticised that we are for 'the distribution of the land owned by the big landlords' alone and we propose to leave the lands owned by the usurers and jotedars untouched.

The abolition of feudalism carry no other meaning than the abolition of landlordism in all its forms. It applies to all- cultivating or non-cultivating landlords. Who told these critiques that the usurers and jotedars are not landlords?

Foreign Capital : It is our view that the foreign capital must be confiscated in all its forms-be it in industries, banks and in other forms.

Soviet Social - imperialism : In our 'Basic points', we said:

*" The basis of the foreign policy should be the formation of a united front against the world imperialists, especially American imperialism, British imperialism and their collaborator, the Soviet social- imperialist clique. India should be a part of this UF."*

Here, we have clearly characterised the soviet revisionist clique as 'soviet social-imperialist clique'. But the critiques closed their eyes to this fact only to falsely blame us that we are not seeing the social-imperialist character of soviet revisionists. At another place, we used the word, "the soviet revisionist neo colonial exploitation" only to expose the real face of soviet exploitation. On an occasion, referring to the soviet revisionists, the CPC wrote : *"It is surprising that the leaders of CPSU are not only yearning to become a part of neo-colonialism, but also are proud of being one."* We referred to the soviet revisionists as one among those who are carrying on the neo-colonial exploitation in India. There is nothing objectionable in this. In an article, the Peking Review No.30, 1969 said : *"....What is claimed as a 'model' is nothing but a definite example for neo-colonialism pursued by the soviet revisionists in the areas of Asia and Africa. Here, both the words - 'soviet revisionism' and 'neo colonialism' - were used. The Peking Review article also wrote: "After the US and Britain, the soviet revisionists have become the third biggest creditors of all." (Liberation, Sept 1969).*

What is wrong in our mentioning the Britain as one of the chief enemies when it is in a second place among the creditors after the America and bigger than the soviet revisionists? We have done a correct thing here. By opposing this, the Marxist- Leninists are only concealing the British imperialists and refusing the struggle against them.

British imperialism : The Marxist Leninists are angry at our mentioning the British imperialists as one of the imperialists who are engaged in neo colonial exploitation in India. What is the real status of British investment in India? How they are carrying on their neo colonial plunder here? What should be our policy towards it? The Marxist Leninists are angry at us. This shows that they have no answers to these questions. It is our view, the British imperialists too constitute a

part of the main enemies as the British imperialist capital too occupy a key place even today. Therefore, the Indian revolution aims at overthrowing the British imperialism together with American imperialism and soviet social-imperialism.

No where in the chinese literature it was said that the British imperialism has quit India all together and the struggle against it is not needed to eliminate it. There are many instances contrary to this. With their untenable arguments, the Marxist Leninists only made a futile attempt to portray us as opposed to the CPC.

**WORKING CLASS:** They are phoooh - phooohing the programme of "wage rise; reduction in working hours, provision of other facilities and the resolution of unemployment problem" suggested by us for the working class. The CPC, in its 10-point programme adopted in the Sixth Party Congress included: "*the 8- hours work a day; rise in wages; prevention of unemployment and provision of social insurance, etc.,*" In the stage of Democratic Revolution, Lenin included '8-hours work a day' as one of the demands of working class in the programme. Had they too followed the British imperialists in doing so as the Marxist Leninists say? Are they also not phoooh-phooohing the CPC and Lenin by phoooh-phooohing us?

**MIDDLE CLASS PEOPLE:** We included the eradication of unemployment as one point in our programme. It concerns the middle class people. The Marxist Leninists agree that these people are a part of the revolutionary classes who take part in the New Democratic Revolution. But they took objection to the above point of programme. Then, what is the programme they propose for these people? Can a call to 'go to villages' to all these people and 'to integrate among the peasants and make the revolution' be a programme?

As there is imperialist and feudal exploiting system in our country, not only the middle class, but also the working class in the cities, the rural poor and toiling people are the worst victims of the ghost of unemployment. The NDR which overthrows this system also puts an end to the problem of unemployment in urban as well as rural areas. Ending the unemployment is an important part of the revolutionary programme. The urban middle class people who are suffering from the problem of unemployment can be drawn into the revolution basing on this question. By refusing to take up this programme, the Marxist Leninists are only refusing to mobilise the masses of middle class into the revolution.

We strive to send the conscious and advanced sections of them to rural areas and make them a part of agrarian revolution. We encourage the masses of middle class in the rural areas to integrate themselves among the peasants. It is impossible to send the entire masses of urban middle class to the villages. We must mobilise them on their problems, especially on the problem of unemployment, direct against the ruling classes and see that they become a part the revolutionary movement and take part in the revolution. Then alone our revolution will be victorious.

The Marxists Leninists are resorting to one more argument. They are saying that the contradictions would grow among the workers, peasants and the middle classes if all are provided the employment. These are the contradictions among the people and they are to be handled as such.

This is our reply to the criticisms made by the Marxist Leninists on some points general programme. It does not mean that we would not further improve it in the light of experiences. We make it a comprehensive one in the course of time and march ahead building the revolutionary movement and continuing the armed struggle on the basis of this programme.

## 2. THE ANNIHILATION OF CLASS ENEMY

The revolutionary movement in certain areas has reached the second stage—the stage of armed struggle as a result of our work among the people in the light of the '*Immediate Programme*'. The armed struggle is going on in these areas. The guerrilla squads are taking actions against the atrocious landlords and their goondas who are in collusion with the armed police. The Marxist Leninists need not take trouble to teach us on the need of wiping out the enemy. We are already marching along the road of armed struggle.

The '*Immediate Programme*' explained the programme concerning the first stage of revolutionary movement. In this stage, our aim is to prepare the people for the armed struggle. The people would realise the need of armed struggle through their own experience and adopt the form of armed struggle if we implement the programme of agrarian revolution to the extent possible and carry on the propaganda on the necessity of armed struggle. Then, the guerrilla struggle carried on by us not only will have support from the people but also be participated by the people in various forms in the guerrilla struggle. Some may annihilate some people's enemies through actions with no relation to the implementation of the agrarian revolutionary programme. But they cannot be a people's guerrilla struggle.

Here is what Mao said about the mass character of guerrilla struggle:

*"The guerrilla war devoid of the political aim is bound to fail. Its failure will be complete if its political aim does not correspond with the political aim of the people as it lacks their support, participation and people's co-ordinated action. The guerrilla war is mainly organised and sustained by the people."*

We are propagating among the people about the necessity of overthrowing the ruling classes, the establishment of New Democratic Republic and adopting the path of armed struggle to realise this. But the people need to earn the experience to adopt this path. They can earn it only in the course of implementing the agrarian revolutionary programme. In this course, they would realise through their own experience the need of armed struggle to defend the fruits of their own struggle from the armed attacks of the ruling classes. Therefore, it is necessary to implement the agrarian revolutionary programme to prepare the people to take part in the armed struggle.

The people cannot develop the consciousness of armed struggle just by the annihilation of a few peoples enemies. True, the people would be happy if peoples enemies are eliminated. They may even co-operate in the actions of annihilation. But we cannot think of people becoming conscious of taking part in the guerrilla struggle against the armed attacks of the ruling classes just because these actions. Instead, the implementation of agrarian revolutionary programme will make the

people conscious, own the guerrilla war as their own struggle and take part in the organisation of it. They would also come to the fore to sustain it.

It is in line with Mao's teachings that we are giving importance to the programme of agrarian revolution. But the Marxist Leninists are negating these principles. They argue that the people can be moved by the acts of annihilation. They think that it is enough to carry on propaganda about the necessity of armed struggle. This is a point of basic difference between them and us.

The experiences of even the Marxist Leninists in various areas prove the correctness of our views.

They have carried on some armed actions in Guntur, Warangal and Vishakha districts in AP. Here, they have done nothing to prepare the people for armed struggle. As a consequence, these actions had no support among the people. They got themselves isolated from the people and were arrested.

In the agency areas of Vishakha, they propagated about the necessity of armed struggle among the people. But they did not organise the people on their problems. The police carried on attacks on the cadre. Some were arrested and some had gone back to their own areas. They encountered this situation only because they had no people's support when the enemy had unleashed the attacks.

On the contrary, in Mushahiri area of Bihar, they first mobilised the people in the anti-feudal struggle. They began the armed struggle when the people's struggle has reached a higher stage. As a result, it had people's support.

The Marxist Leninists have failed to take lessons even from their own experiences. They are arguing that they must start with the acts of annihilation of class enemies. They are blaming because we are not doing so.

The experiences of Telangana Peasant armed struggle too had proved that the implementation of agrarian revolutionary programme only make it possible for the people to take part in and extend their support to the armed struggle. In the first stage, there developed militant peoples struggles against the landlords. In the second stage, the struggle had taken the form of armed struggle. In both these stages, the programme of agrarian revolution that suited to the respective stage was implemented.

The main aspect of Che Guvera's line was to carry on armed struggle with no relation to the people and people's revolutionary movement. This is opposed to Mao Tse Tung Thought. The Marxist Leninists, who are following the Che's line, are advocating armed actions with no relation to the people and people's revolutionary movement. Not only this understanding but also its practice are alien to Mao Tse Tung Thought. Even their own experiences in Guntur, West Godavari and Vishakha prove this. While the facts are like this, they are criticising us as the followers of Che. Is it not amusing!

### **3. LIBERATED AREAS**

They are criticising that ours is a "Jungle Theory" because we have given importance to the forest areas in view of the importance to develop the armed struggle. Distorting our views, they have alleged that we are ruling out the possibility of armed struggle in plain areas.

They are blaming us that we are asking the cadre to go to the forest areas but not to the people.

The Marxist Leninists must know that our forest areas have villages. These villages are inhabited by the people. Our cadre who had gone to the forest areas went to these people. They have built and continuing to build the peoples revolutionary movement. In some areas this movement has reached the stage of armed struggle. Today, the armed struggle is going on there. Our aim is to develop the armed struggle in these areas and develop these areas into liberated areas. We are only moving in this direction.

Mao divided the liberated areas, mainly, into three types namely, (1) those in the mountainous regions, (2) those in the plain areas and (3) those in the river-lake-estuary regions. Among these three areas, the mountainous regions occupy a place of prime importance.

Mao said :

*"The advantage of setting up base areas in mountainous regions is obvious..... We must develop guerrilla warfare and set up base areas in all the mountainous regions behind the enemy lines." (SW, Vol II p 94-95)*

Let us hope, the Marxist Leninists donot blame us because Mao did not talk about people here. When Mao said so much about the importance of mountainous regions we have done nothing wrong in doing the same.s The Marxist Leninists themselves are acting against Mao Tse Tung Thouht by negating the importance of forest and mountainous regions, of-course, in the name of plain areas.

Mao said :

*"Ofcourse, the plains are less suitable than the mountains, but it is by no means impossible to develop guerrilla warfare or establish any base areas there." ( Vol II, P 95 )*

Here is what we said in our programme about the plain areas:

*"Despite the fact that in terms of armed resistance this area is less favourable than the forest and mountainous regions it would be wrong to conclude that this area would not be useful for resistance. Under the present conditions, a limited guerrilla resistance is possible even in these areas. Though it would take time for incessant resistance to take off in these areas, these are highly important since they include areas adjacent to forest areas and the Telangana area where the armed struggle was carried on in the past."*

Even though we explained about the importance of plain areas in such clear terms, the Marxist Leninists are failing to understand the same. They are falsely alleging that we have totally negated the possibility of armed resistance in the plain areas.

When we used the word "wet areas" we had delta areas in our mind. Here is what we wrote about this :

*"In view of social conditions and geographical features, there are no possibilities for immediate development of guerrilla resistance in these areas. Yet*

*the cadre, funds and other help would have to be sent from these areas to the areas of resistance. Ceaseless class struggle against the exploitation of the people should be carried on in these areas. These areas would be liberated gradually."*

We have already said what experiences the Marxist Leninists had from their 'guerrilla actions' in delta areas. These experiences too show that there is no immediate possibility of developing the guerrilla resistance in these areas. We do not object if those who are not prepared to learn from these experiences wish to, once again, carry on the guerrilla actions and taste the results - good or bad. They are free to do so.

We have clearly said that we must lead ceaseless class struggles in these areas. The question of organising such class struggle does not at all arise for those who think that we must either carry on the "guerrilla actions" or sit idle. Therefore, there is no surprise if they do not see its importance.

There are areas of resistance within the reach of these areas of resistance within the reach of these delta areas. So, we suggested to send cadre and other help from these areas. In the given situation here, there is scope for developing struggles locally and, at the same time, send some cadre to the areas of resistance. So, we made such a suggestion. The work was carried on accordingly. There are good results too. It is totally irrelevant to link it with 'training.'

These Marxist Leninists have another wrong understanding about the base areas. They think that the base areas would come into existence once the class enemies are annihilated.

Mao has pointed out three main conditions for the establishment of base areas. (1) anti-Japanese armed forces, (2) defeating the enemy and (3) consciousness of the people.

Defeating the enemy is one of the three conditions for the establishment of base areas. The Marxist Leninists do not utter even a single word about the other two conditions. According to Mao, defeating the enemy means defeating him with the co-operation of people and by the peoples armed forces. But the Marxist Leninists are vulgarising the 'defeat of the enemy' as 'the annihilation of class enemies.' According to them, an area turns itself into a base area once the landlords are annihilated in that area. But it will never happen so. The armed police and the army of the ruling classes would be there to protect the landlords. The base area can come into existence only by defeating these armed forces of the enemies in a war. For this, it is necessary to build the people's army. The people are to be made conscious of it by mobilising and organising them. The base area can be established only by fulfilling the three conditions pointed out by Mao.

Thus their understanding of base areas is opposed to Mao Tse Tung Thought.

#### **4. LAND DISTRIBUTION**

Agrarian Revolution is the axis of New Democratic Revolution. The distribution of landlord's land is key issue in the agrarian revolution. In our programme, we have briefly explained in what forms the land question is presenting

itself in rural areas. The Marxist Leninists, who confine themselves to slogans, may not need to study the question in a concrete and objective manner. But, it is necessary for us.

We have already explained the principles pointed out by Mao regarding the establishment of base - areas. Mao said, in order to be able to establish the base area, it is not enough to defeat the enemy, but we must also build up the people's army and develop the necessary consciousness among the people. Just the propaganda about the need of armed struggle is not enough to develop the consciousness among the people and build the people's army. We must also implement the programme of agrarian revolution.

The implementation of agrarian revolutionary programme make the people realise about the necessity of carrying on the struggle not only for land, but also for their liberation. Thus their struggle for liberation will be strengthened. Any struggle for liberation devoid of this will be weak and cannot withstand the onslaught of the enemy.

The peoples army can be formed only with the class conscious militants who come to the fore in the course of the implementation of agrarian revolutionary programme. The armed struggle by the people's armed forces and the agrarian revolution would thus get strengthened and advance.

The CPC led by Mao carried out the programme of agrarian revolution while, at the same time, carrying on the armed struggle. In the period of anti-japanese war, the party called upon the people to carry out the agrarian revolutionary programme in the form of specific programme formulated by it.

This specific programme said :

*" Introduce reforms in rural areas, reduce land rents and the interest rates ; ensure proper protections to the rights of tenants, provide loans at low rates of interests to the poor peasants; help the peasants to get themselves organised."*

This is a part of the programme of co-alition Govt. in the period of anti-japanese war. The CPC has implemented this programme in the liberated areas even before the formation of Coalition Government.

In his New Democracy, Mao said:

*" The Republic will take certain necessary steps to confiscate the land of the landlords and distribute it to those peasants having little or no land..... " ( Vol II, P 353 )*

The CPC has implemented this programme in the liberated areas much before the formation of New Democratic Republic.

Here one question may arise: Since the CPC implemented this agrarian revolutionary programme in the liberated areas, we too must wait till that time for the implementation of this programme.

We must be clear that the implementation of the entire programme of agrarian revolution is possible only in the liberated areas. But it doesnot mean that we cannot implement it before that and to whatever extent the masses of rural people are prepared for it. We must implement it. Then alone the people would realise through their own experience that the base areas are necessary not only to defend



the fruits of their struggle, but also to complete the agrarian revolution and achieve the liberation. They would come to the fore to take part in the armed struggle, support and strengthen it.

Viewed in this light, the propagation about the necessity of armed struggle and the implementation of agrarian revolutionary programme would not only quicken the maturity of conditions to begin the armed struggle, but also greatly strengthen the armed struggle that has already begun. This programme will help the establishment of base areas.

The Marxist Leninists are abandoning the programme of agrarian revolution, in practice, while talking about its importance. They are showing the 'guerrilla actions' carried on in the name of the 'annihilation of class enemies' as a way out for everything. They are moving away from the agrarian revolution.

Now let us examine the which arise in the course of implementation of agrarian revolutionary programme.

It must be clear that we kept the conditions in AP in view, in the main, while preparing our Immediate Programme. In AP, we, often, find the landlords engaged in 'self-cultivation.' They are carrying on the cultivation by employing the farm servants in accordance with the extent of land in their possession. Some of them lease out a portion of the land to the poor peasants. The same landlords would often be contractors. It is these landlords who keep the government banzars and temple lands in the villages.

Who is a landlord? It is not difficult to determine who is a big landlord when there are more than one landlord in a village. If a landlord is wielding influence in some villages, he becomes a big landlord even though there are no small landlords or no other landlords in those villages.

The big landlords would normally be exercising influence in the Govt. and perpetrating atrocities against the people. They would be extracting money illegally from the people. Some would also be engaged in usury. They grab the Govt. banzars and temple lands. All these big landlords are the enemies of the people. Our struggle presently is concentrated against this part of the landlords.

Where all the landlords are atrocious and oppress the people our struggle too will be concentrated against all of them.

How long the peasants can retain the lands distributed to them? Would not the landlords dispossess them? Some pose these questions.

The peasants would retain the land as long as they can. But it is wrong to abandon the programme of seizure and distribution of land on the plea that they cannot retain it for ever. The peasant would come to the fore to defend the land which they own as their own. On some occasions, the land may change hands and the peasants may lose the land temporarily. Then, they would strive to seize it back.

Will not the landlord unleash attacks against the rural people with the help of police? This is another question.

We have taken up the programme of organising the volunteer corps and the local squads in the villages. It is a part of agrarian revolutionary struggle. We

would resist the attacks from the landlord goondas through the volunteer corps. We would resist the police attacks through the local squads. Gradually, we form the guerrilla squads- a higher form and put up the resistance. No where we told that the agrarian revolution will go on in a peaceful manner ?

In the distribution of land in the villages, we strive to rally all the peasants who are in need of land. Thus we establish unity with them against the landlordism. Therefore, the question of landlords pitting the peasants against each other does not arise. No doubt, the people would encounter ups and downs and difficulties in the course of their struggle. But they march ahead learning from their own experiences and overcoming the difficulties. It will not take much time for the people to get themselves prepared for struggle provided there is a correct leadership for them.

In some areas, the landlords are occupying and enjoying the Govt's banjar lands. The seizure and distribution of these lands is an important part of anti-feudal struggle. This, in no way, will deviate us from the agrarian revolutionary programme.

The girijans are facing many difficulties because of the loot by the Girijan Corporations. The girijans lose nothing by selling their products with all freedom and as they wish. Defying the big traders, the small traders come forward to buy these products at reasonable prices. Our movement which has reached the level of armed struggle can fix the prices and get them implemented.

Under the Muthadari system, the muthadars are collecting various types of illegal taxes from the girijans. These taxes can be abolished if the girijans refuse to pay them. The party must provide the leadership to this struggle.

The tilling and sowing can take place only in rainy season. It is not possible in other seasons. There will be a particular season for tilling of land even in irrigated areas. Our preparations must also be accordingly.

We find some difference in feudal exploitation even in different areas in the same state. It can take and; in fact, it will be different forms in various states. We must adopt and carry out the slogans which are suitable to each situation.

While this is the attitude to be adopted towards the question of land, the 'journalist' is refusing to understand this. He is blaming us sitting in his room.

## **5.MASS ORGANISATIONS**

Mass organisations are necessary to organise the people. True, the agrarian revolution and NDR cannot be achieved through the present reformist mass organisations. But it does not mean that we must not organise revolutionary mass organisations too. The Marxist - Leninists are arguing that even these revolutionary mass organisations are not necessary. They say, "*the task before us today is to organise the secret party organisation, but not mass organisations.*"

This talk makes it clear that the Marxist - Leninists need no other organisation other than the secret party organisation. This understanding is opposed to Marxism Leninism Mao Tse Tung Thought.

In his "*Hunan Report*", Mao wrote:

*"..... last November, organisations with a total membership of 13,67,227 have been set up in thirty seven of the province's seventy*

*five counties. Of these members about one million were organised during October and November when the power of the associations rose high, while upto September, the membership had only been 3,00,000- 4,00,000. Then came the two months of December and January, and the peasant movement continued its brisk growth. By the end of January the membership must have reached atleast two million. As a family generally enters one name when joining and has an average of five members, the mass following must be about 10 million. This astonishing and accelerating rate of expansion explains why the local tyrants, evil gentry and corrupt officials have been isolated, why the public has been amazed at how completely the world has changed since the peasant movement, and why a great revolution has been wrought in the country side. This is the first great achievement of the peasants under the leadership of their associations." ( Vol. I, P 35 )*

The above quoted extract make a few points clear. There were peasant associations in Hunan State. They had 13,67,727 members in 37 of 75 taluks in the state. The membership has grown when the power of peasant associations rose high. Earlier, the membership was only between 3-4 lakhs. Only one person per family entered the name as the member. It would have grown had all the members of family entered their names in the peasant associations. Later, the membership rose to 20 lakhs.

The above facts show what importance was given to the peasant organisation before as well as on the eve of armed struggle. We must also build up such peasant organisations. This kind of revolutionary organisations can be organised in the course of mobilising the peasants into the struggles. It is not possible to recruit the members openly in the conditions of repression. So, we suggested in our programme that we must meet the peasants individually or in groups and draw them into the peasant organisations.

### **WORK IN CITIES**

The Marxist Leninists have no work to do in cities. Therefore, they are trying to cover up their bankruptcy by commenting on the programme given by us for the work among the urban people as nothing but an empty talk. The CRs must be present where ever there are people. There are masses of workers, middle classes, etc., in the cities. It is our task to work among these people and build up the revolutionary movement. We must organise the working class and prepare them to take the leadership of agrarian revolution which is going on in the rural areas. For this, we must mobilise not only the advanced sections of working class to directly take part in the agrarian revolution but also the support of the working class as a whole. In the same way, we must also work among the middle class, mobilise their conscious sections into the revolution and also the support and solidarity of the middle class masses for the revolution. Ignoring this task means weakening the revolution. This is what the Marxist Leninists are doing.

### **SEPERATE TELANGANA MOVEMENT**

The Marxist Leninists had taken an anti-Marxist Leninist attitude towards the seperate Telengana Movement as they have done in the case of other issues.

Here is what they wrote about the Seperate Telangana Movement :

*" The APSCCCR ( i.e., the Marxist Leninists ) supported the just struggle of Telangana people. It called upon the people to intensify the struggle against feudalism, the rule of landlord-bureaucratic capitalists, to overthrow them and establish their own people's raj in Telangana."*

(LIBERATION, May 1969, p-32 )

They have also given it the name, "a militant national movement."

The students and the masses of middle classes - the victims of the ghost of unemployment - had taken part in the seperate Telangana Movement in a massive way. But we must not forget here that this movement is led by a section of ruling - classes. This clique supports Indira Gandhi at the centre. This clique is only a part of feudal, landlord and comprador - bureaucratic capitalist clique. It came to the fore with the slogan of Seperate Telangana because of its factional quarrels. Extending support to Seperate Telangana only amounts to tailing behind this section of the ruling classes.

It is a mockery to raise the slogan of 'overthrowing the ruling classes while, at the same time, supporting a movement led by the representatives of a section of the same ruling classes in Telengana.

The seperate Telangana Movemen is not aimed at overthrowing the ruling classes. Their aim is to create one more state within and as part of the present Indian Union. The Marxist Leninists may use any amount of revolutionary jargon in their slogan. But, its consequence can be nothing but supporting the formation of such a state.

It is wrong to raise the slogan, "*People's Raj in Telangana.*" Our slogan is : "*Peoples' Raj in India.*" The Andhra republic with the right of self - determination will be an integral part of Indian New Democratic Republic. But it will not be a people's raj either in Andhra or in a region of Andhra.

The Telangana is not a national region. Telangana people are not a nation. They are a part of the people of Andhra. Thus the Andhra people as a whole can become the Andhra Nation. The Telangana people cannot become a separate Nation. The Andhra people, as part of Indian people can unite in the revolutionary struggle against the Indian ruling classes and overthrow them.

We the CRs donot keep quite when the two sections of the ruling classes are openly clashing and the masses of urban middle class and the students are participating in a massive way in a movement led by a section of the ruling classes. More over, we have set ourselves on the task of intensifying the class struggle and preparing the people to overthrow the ruling classes through armed struggle.

Some may ask : How can we keep ourselves away from a movement participated by the people in such a massive way? We would not keep quite. In fact, we did not keep quite. We are explaining our attitude to the people. We moved the people into action on the basis of our own slogans. We are leading the people into militant class struggles in some areas and mobilised the people into armed struggle with the aim of overthrowing the ruling classes from power.

## SLANDER CAMPAIGN

They have unleashed a slander campaign that we are opposed to the armed struggle and the armed struggle, which is going on in Khammam and Warangal districts, was started by the local comrades and we did not welcome it. Our Immediate Programme was formulated with the aim of starting the armed struggle in the near future. Accordingly, the armed struggle has begun and is continuing in the state. Here we are giving the text of the statement ( Resolution ) released by the APRCC hailing it. It shows how their propaganda is baseless and false. (see the APPENDIX)

## CONCLUSION

To day, we are coming across many who claim themselves as the followers of Marxism Leninism Mao Tse Tung Thought. But they are failing to apply it to the concrete conditions of Indian revolution. Same is the case with the Marxist Leninists. They are interpreting it in a distorted way.

We are of the view that the confiscation of British imperialist capital must also be a task of Indian revolution as it constitutes an important part of the imperialist capital in India. But in their criticism against our Programme, the Marxist Leninists argued that there is no need to include this in the tasks of Indian revolution.

We are of the view that we must organise the people in revolutionary mass organisations and build the revolutionary movement on the basis of their problems. But the Marxist Leninists say that there is no need to organise the mass organisations and work among the revolutionary classes- the workers and middle classes in the cities.

We are of the view that we must implement the agrarian revolutionary programme to what ever extent the people are prepared for it, lead the anti-feudal struggles and build the peoples- revolutionary movement before the beginning of the armed struggle. The Marxist Leninists say that all this is not necessary and we can begin with the armed actions."

We are of the view that we must establish the liberated areas by developing the consciousness among the people, building the peoples army together with the annihilation of atrocious class enemies who are in collusion with the armed forces of the state and defeating the enemy through the peoples armed forces. The Marxist Leninists say that the liberated areas can be established by the annihilation of class enemies and landlords.

Thus, they are totally negating the role of peoples revolutionary movement which is basic principle in developing the guerrilla struggle. It is totally opposed to Marxism Leninism Mao Tse Tung Thought. Here lies our main difference with them.

The article written by the 'Journalist' under the title, "The Politics of Nagi Reddy" is betraying at every step lack of confidence in the people. It shows their helplessness in moving the people into action. It shows their belief in the armed actions without people's participation. They are refusing to see the key role being played by the British imperialism in the exploitation of India. Therefore, we reject this entire criticism as opposed to Marxism Leninism Mao Tse Tung Thought.

Let the Marxist Leninists heap on us any amount of slander. We go ahead applying Marxism Leninism Mao Tse Tung Thought to the concrete conditions of Indian revolution and providing leadership to the armed struggle.

## **APPENDIX**

### **RESOLUTION OF THE ANDHRA PRADESH REVOLUTIONARY COMMUNIST COMMITTEE HAILING THE PEASANT ARMED STRUGGLE IN ANDHRA PRADESH**

The peasant armed struggle has begun in AP under the leadership of Communist Revolutionaries.

The peasants in AP, particularly in Warangal, Khammam, Karimnagar, Nalgonda, East Godavari and other districts had been carrying on the struggles for some time on their just demands. They were being exploited and looted by the forest officials and forest contractors. They were being exploited by usurious traders. The landlords evicted them from their own lands. All of them had subjected the peasants to various forms of plunder and atrocities. The Govt. only stood by these exploiters and oppressors and extended all its support to them in exploiting the people.

The people became conscious as a result of work carried on by the CRs among the people. Especially, the girijans in the tribal areas who were experiencing the worst conditions of life got themselves organised and prepared for struggle against this exploitation. But the landlords, contractors and their goonds unleashed attacks against the masses of girijans who were fighting for their just demands. The armed forces of the Govt. had entered into the scene in support of them. They are arresting and torturing the cadre and the people. They are resorting to firings each day against the people.

In this situation, left with no other alternative, the people in the tribal areas came to the fore to defend their own movement and its victories by arming themselves. Thus they are defending their revolutionary movement through armed struggle. They are solving the problem of land by seizing back their own lands from the landlords and by bringing the forest land under the cultivation. They had freed themselves from the exploitation by chasing out the exploiters. These were no small victories for the girijan peasants. There is no other way for the people except defending the gains of revolutionary movement by armed means when the state resorts to suppress the revolutionary movement and foil its victories by using the armed forces.

The Andhra Pradesh Revolutionary Communist Committee hails the armed struggle being carried on by the girijan peasants. It extends all its support to it and strives to make this struggle a success.

In India, all the imperialists, the big bourgeois- big landlord classes who are in collusion with them are the main exploiters. Today's constitution is protecting them. The masses of Indian people are carrying on the struggles for the last more than two decades to liberate themselves from the rule of these classes. The revisionists of all hues had been preaching that the parliamentary system is a means of this struggle.

But the people realised through their own experience that all this a hoax. They came to the conclusion that the elections and other parliamentary activities can neither solve their problems nor change the present system. Therefore, they have taken the revolutionary path and are carrying on the struggle.

The armed struggle carried by the Naxalbari peasants was only of this kind. Same is the case with the Srikakulam peasant armed struggle. The peasant armed struggle in Khammam, Warangal and Karimnagar districts too is a struggle to defend the revolutionary movement and the revolutionary victories and to change the present system.

The Telangana Armed Struggle of 1946-51 was a people's struggle to liberate India from imperialism and feudalism. There is no doubt that the ideals, aims and experiences of these struggle would continue to guide the present struggles.

We make it clear that the CRs would provide the leadership to the armed revolutionary struggle aimed at overthrowing imperialism, feudalism and big bourgeoisie and establishing the New Democratic System in India.

We can make the Indian revolution successful in the light of and by applying the Mao Tse Tung Thought, which guided the Chinese people's revolution to victory to the concrete conditions of India. The victory of people's liberation struggle is assured.

In this context, some are carrying on attacks against the landlords and other exploiters by forming themselves into groups with no relation to the people and peoples movement. Here we want to make it clear that it is neither possible to end the feudal system nor to advance the revolutionary people's movement by the attacks of this kind which have nothing to do with the people's revolutionary movement. We can put an end to the present imperialist, big landlord and big bourgeoisie system only by people's revolutionary mobilisation, revolutionary organisation and people's armed struggle. This is what the Marxism Leninism Mao Tse Tung Thought teaches us. This is binding to all the revolutionaries.

Viewed in this light, their actions are opposed to Marxism- Leninism- Mao Tse Tung Thought and harmful to the revolutionary movement. They must take a correct road.

The CRs would strive to build a broad united front by mobilising all the forces opposed to imperialism, big landlord and big bourgeoisie classes. The working class will provide the leadership to it. This UF will be composed of working class, peasantry, middle classes and the national bourgeoisie. Through this, they would strive to achieve the New Democratic Revolution.

We are confident that all the well wishers of the country would join the revolutionaries in this endeavour.

Let us march ahead in the foot steps of the countless martyrs who had laid down their lives in the Telangana revolutionary and other revolutionary struggles. Let us rededicate ourselves to their ideals. Victory is ours.

(JANASHAKTI, Telugu organ of CRs, July 27, 1969)



## AN APPROACH TO NAXALBARI : HISTORICAL PERSPECTIVE

ASIT SEN

*[Asit Sen, a Communist for nearly six decades died on 18th February 1996 at the age of 76. He earned reputation for his role in the LIC movement. He was a rebel inside the CPM and cofounder of 'committee for inner-party fight against revisionism' and after Naxalbari he was one of the main propagandist and organiser of the All India Co-ordinations Committee of the Communist Revolutionaries.*

*His book 'An approach to Naxalbari' was published in 1980. Here we are reprinting the First chapter of this book as it deals with problems of early period of CRM. - EC ]*

The great commotion created by Naxalbari does not correspond to any high sounding intellectual conjecture, nor does it oblige most of the scholastic estimations or appraisals available so far in black and white. What then is Naxalbari really ?

Geographically, of course, Naxalbari is the name of a small village in a police station area bearing the same name in the Terai Region in the district of Darjeeling. Politically, however, it has been carrying with its name a specific connotation since May, 1967. To understand this it is not enough to recall what happened there in 1967. In fact, there is nothing new in the episode itself, so far as the struggle of the Indian peasantry is concerned. On many occasions in the past, more intensive struggles on a much broader scale were waged by the peasant masses on Indian soil. But, then, facts show that the struggle of Naxalbari, a tiny village in a tranquil desolate corner of West Bengal State, had undoubtedly caused an unpredictable stir that not only shook the nation's political life, but also transcended the national boundary to reverberate over the entire globe.

The explanation of this profound impact lies not in the movement with its subsequent development itself. It lies in the complex development process of the Indian political scene, a product of which it really is. In other words, the Naxalbari movement was no accidental outburst, nor was it the brain child of any utopian romantic individual or group of individuals. It was the concrete manifestation of the battle of opposed classes that pervaded the ideological sphere of the communist



camp itself. In fact, Naxalbari appeared as a historical necessity already overdue but which has earlier failed to gain ground.

It is a fact of history that India could not follow the normal course of Social development owing to its total subjugation by the British colonizers. During their two hundred year's rule the foreign imperialists perpetually and purposefully stunted the socio-economic growth of India and preserved the country as an under developed backward agrarian entity. As a result, the Indian people destined to tear off the shackle of feudal relations for the impending industrialisation of the country had to confront also the historical task of liberating their land from the yoke of intruding foreign imperialists. That is, the struggle for national liberation and the struggle for democratic revolution became an inseparable and integrated task to be taken up for completion by the Indian masses. As was natural in the specific historical context the nascent Indian bourgeoisie had to take the lead for accomplishing this twin task. But this class failed to play the positive role assigned to it by history.

As has been said, along with the national emancipatory struggle, the agrarian revolution constitutes the axis of the bourgeois democratic revolution in a colony like India. Consequently, the new-born weak bourgeoisie should have followed with the greatest attention the development of the agrarian crisis and the internification of class contradictions in the village. From the very beginning they should have given a conscious -revolutionary direction to the incipient peasant movement, directing it against imperialist exploitation and bondage, as also against the yoke of various pre-capitalist (feudal and semi-feudal) relationships. But the nature and extent of the development of the Indian bourgeoisie did not allow them to adopt a uniform attitude towards imperialism. A part of this bourgeoisie, especially the trading bourgeoisie, directly served the interests of imperialist capital (the so-called comprador bourgeoisie). In general it more or less consistently defends the anti-national imperialist point of view directed against the whole nationalist movement, in common with the feudal allies of imperialism and the more well paid native officials. Alongside, from among these forces a privileged and parasitic landed gentry had been created by British imperialists. Simultaneously, under the impact of Western education sponsored by the imperialists themselves, an educated middle class elite also grew up. Most of the members of this class invariably represented the privileged strata. Naturally, the intellectual elite could not think of any radical line in the anti-imperialist national movement. The remaining portions of the native bourgeoisie, especially the portion reflecting the interests of native industry, supported the national movement and represented a special, vacillating, compromising tendency which may be termed as national reformism.

Notwithstanding all this, a growing spirit of nationalism, nonetheless, began to engulf the vast masses of Indian people that cherished independence above all. The independence of the country, being to the advantage of the whole people, corresponds also to the interests of the national bourgeoisie. But an independent rule, a future of "free" independent capitalist development, hegemony over an

“independent” people - this imperialism would never voluntarily yield to the national bourgeoisie. In this respect imperialism would rather demand capitulation of the national bourgeoisie.

The British Imperialists, therefore, started acting in their own way. It is they who, though unconsciously and inconsistently, played a progressive role in our country by creating a material basis that fostered the evergrowing spirit of nationalism in our people. While the British rule drowned the Indian people in general, and the vast masses of peasantry in particular, into an ocean of poverty and misery, its ruthless oppression and exploitation made the material basis for an impending revolution. This historical reality had time and again been manifested even under early British rule in the form of a series of armed peasant revolts, though mostly spontaneous in character, and later in the form of political struggles by the Indian working class as well as other strata of working people. In the face of this inevitable sequel to their sin the British imperialists had to take up the task of forestalling a prospective national upsurge. In an endeavour to convert the surging national discontent into a nonvenomous bite they successfully manipulated and manoeuvred by initiating the formation of a nationalist organization with the predominance of a moderate bourgeois leadership who by the very nature of its birth and development could not but be of a vacillating and reformist character.

Thus sponsored, naturally the Indian National Congress started treading a track not to any real embarrassment of the British imperialists. The imperialists themselves saw through it. True, there appeared an extremist trend, so to say, within the nationalist organization, that represented the interest not only of the relatively uncompromising national bourgeoisie, but also of the toiling people in general. But by far the main position of leadership was usurped by the compromising reformist section of the bourgeoisie. Even the path adopted by the more radical section, known as extremist, was not at all conducive to organizing the vast strata of peasantry and other toiling millions. Their radicalism rather found expression more in religious revivalism or in spiritual rebirth that often gave a new lease of life to the most backward social relations and social consciousness. Added to all this was the fact that after the Russian Revolution of 1917, even the champions of extremist trend began to give in and started taking refuge in a religio-mystic world. To be precise, the impact of the Russian Revolution forced the national bourgeoisie as a whole to the path of compromise and capitulation once and for all. The Indian bourgeoisie became permanently disabled to play any positive role in solving any contradiction that objectively existed between them and the imperialist bourgeoisie let alone the national contradiction as a whole in relation to the imperialist power.

The logic behind this new development was simple enough. Under the impact of the Russian Revolution the workers, peasants and other strata of toiling millions began to grow class consciousness to a considerable degree that was being felt within the national liberation movement. In fact, this growing class consciousness among the toiling masses made the national bourgeoisie so apprehensive that they not only shunned the path of any revolutionary measure whatsoever, but also

became active in retarding the growth of any revolutionary struggle that might pose a real danger to the imperialist power. They were apprehensive that such revolutionary movement would sweep away every citadel of exploitation and oppression of which they also were the custodians though the imperialist baton was in full swing over their heads.

Thus, even the task of bourgeois democratic revolution intertwined with national liberation had to be taken up by a new leadership represented by a new revolutionary class. As historically destined this new class could be none other than the working class in the era of modern imperialism. But the working class could play its historic role of leadership only through its political party, the communist party, the highest form of its class organization, and only by forming a united front of revolutionary classes and groups under its own leadership. In other words, in the post Russian Revolution era, it is solely the working class that is destined to lead the twin task of national liberation and democratic revolution. And this is true not only for India but also for the entire colonial and semicolonial world.

Now, as for India, in spite of the existence of a communist party, supposedly the highest form of class organization of the working class, it could never establish or assert its leadership over the national democratic revolutionary movement. The reason is obvious. The name notwithstanding the Communist Party of India fell far short of becoming a genuine working class party. It remained basically a petty-bourgeois liberal democratic party for all practical purposes. Nonetheless, it often turned to be most effective in mobilizing under its banner millions of fighting proletarians in alignment with the fighting peasantry and other toiling masses. Times without number the revolutionary masses of people throughout the country showed their readiness to respond to the fighting call of the communist party, apparently for the cause of revolution. They fought numberless pitched battles with indomitable will and valour.

Thus, the revolutionary Indian masses not infrequently rose to the occasion of launching necessary struggles in their respective fronts, which at times, reached the level of real revolutionary class struggles and as such assumed the character of political struggles. But each time, at the very moment these struggles should have passed on to the next higher phase in the course of revolution, the petty bourgeois leadership of the working class party drew the rein. In short, in spite of all the essential elements of struggle prerequisite for a total revolution in this land of total subjugation, the leadership always backed out at crucial turns. On the other hand, the proletarian masses steeled in class battles were kept subjectively blind. Never were they given an intense political training so that they could with adequate political consciousness be raised to the level of the vanguard and could effectively play the leading role that they were historically destined to play. This petty bourgeois orientation of the Communist Party and its leadership, this lag between subjective and objective factors, hindered the establishment of the independent leadership of the working class and its party over the impending

revolution. The party being of a petty bourgeois character, consistently indulged in unabashed tailism of the bourgeoisie.

The difficulties of building up and development of the communist parties in colonial countries were pointed out at the Sixth Congress of the Communist International. In fact, it was a reiteration of the validity of Lenin's "*Theses On The National And Colonial Questions*". The Sixth Congress went on to say, "*Experience has shown that, in the majority of colonial and semi-colonial countries, an important if not a predominant part of party ranks in the first stage of the movement is recruited from the petty bourgeoisie and, in particular, from the revolutionary -inclined intelligentsia, very frequently students. It is not uncommon that these elements enter the party because they see in it the most decisive enemy of imperialism, at the same time not always sufficiently understanding that the Communist Party is not only the party of struggle against imperialist exploitation and oppression, but is the party which, as the party of the proletariat, leads a decisive struggle against all kinds of exploitation and expropriation. Many of these adherents of the party in the course of revolutionary struggle will reach a proletarian class point of view, another part will find it more difficult to free themselves to the end from the moods, waverings and half-hearted ideology of the petty bourgeoisie. It is precisely these elements of the party that find it especially difficult at the critical moment to estimate correctly the role of the national bourgeoisie and to act consistently, and without any kind of vacillation, in the questions of the agrarian revolution etc. The colonial countries do not possess social-democratic traditions, but neither do they possess Marxist traditions. Our young parties in the process of struggle, in the process of building up the party, will have to overcome the relics of national petty bourgeois ideology in order to find the road to Bolshevism*". And precisely here the petty bourgeois leadership of the Communist Party of India remained ever callous. They ignored these vital directives of the Sixth Congress that "*The Communist Parties in the colonial and semi-colonial countries are bound to exert all their efforts for the creation of a cadre of party functionaries from out of the working class itself, utilising members of the party -intellectuals -in the role of leaders and lecturers for propagandist circles and legal and illegal party schools, so as to educate from the leading workers the necessary agitators, propagandists, organizers and leaders permeated by the spirit of Leninism*". The Communist Party of India exerted all their efforts to the contrary. The result was that, while the Sixth Congress urged, "*The communist parties in the colonial countries must become genuinely proletarian parties also in their social composition*," the Communist Party of India became a genuinely petty bourgeois party, in its social composition. The communist organization here, from the very beginning, instead of devoting special attention to the training of leading party cadres from the ranks of the workers, as suggested by the Sixth Congress, devoted no attention to the bringing even any leading cadre from the ranks of the workers. The petty bourgeois leadership did not even take any measure to make the best elements of revolutionary intelligentsia steelled in the process of the daily struggle and of big revolutionary fights. And the inevitable followed.

The basically petty bourgeois composition of the party led to an incorrect estimation of the basic national-reformist tendency of the national bourgeoisie giving rise to serious errors in strategy and tactics of the Communist Party. The non-understanding of the difference between the national reformist and national revolutionary tendency, a difference that was deliberately blurred by the national bourgeoisie by means of empty nationalist phrases and gestures to keep the petty bourgeois masses under its influence and to induce imperialism to grant certain concession, led the party to a policy of railism as has already been mentioned. Simultaneously, the underestimation of the special significance which the bourgeois national reformist possesses owing to its mass influence on the ranks of the petty bourgeoisie, peasantry and even a portion of the working class led at times to a policy of sectarianism and isolationism, of course, it is the former deviation that construed the basic feature of the party policy here. And this being the case, the task of unmasking the reformist nature of Satyagraha or passive resistance was substituted by the adoption of the very same methods even in the sphere of working class struggle.

But though this has been the basic character of the communist party, it by no means covers India's communist movement in its totality. Under pressure of stern objective conditions as militant struggles were often carried on by the working class and other toiling strata, they could not but have their due ideological reflection within the party. As a result, with an apparent monolithic character, the party still was often overburdened with intense ideological feuds. During and after the Second World War this ideological battle became far more acute and took a very serious turn resulting in the removal of P.C Joshi, the then general secretary who had been holding office for nearly twelve years. The substitute who had been Ranadive. Obviously, the change in the leadership was inseparably connected with a change in the entire policy of the Party. Precisely speaking this change had been the starting point of a new and allround orientation of the party the impact of which in the Communist movement in India was far-reaching.

But why did it start at that particular juncture? What went wrong with the routine of regular ideological feuds that were being carried on inside the party hierarchy since the party's inception? The reason, in the main lay in the objective conditions that were prevalent at the time. In the post Second World India a tide of mass struggle was surging ahead with unprecedented fury and in all pervading dimension. On the one hand it became almost an impossibility for the alien rulers to stem the tide of this upsurge through coercivment, is alone, on the other, the established bourgeois leadership of the national movement also, unlike that in the past, failed to curb the concrete manifestations of the mass indigration against foreign domination and all sorts of foreign and indigenous oppression and explotation. Pitched and uncompromising as they were, these mass struggles could not be integrated into one great national upheaval for lack of effective leadership. Thought the need of the hour was for an alternative leadership, the Communist Party of India, toeing so far the bourgeois reformist line in the national movement, naturally failed to impart such a leadership.

The pressure of reality gave birth to confusion and controversy within the party hierarchy. On the one hand there was the line of submitting memorandum to the British imperialists, the line of strengthening the hands of Nehru. On the other hand there emerged the line representing and uncompromising fight against imperialism and its indigenous lackeys organisationally being represented by the Indian National Congress and the Muslim League. The first line considered the transfer of power as a great achievement towards independence, the second line reflected the idea that the transfer of power was nothing but a cunning retreat of imperialism to continue its onslaught on the Indian people under the cover of independence that was sham in essence. The giving away of independence by the imperialists was nothing but a ruse to discover some subservient classes in this country that would act as a screen for concealing the policy of colonisation is not a very new way. The demonstration of this technique of formal independence took place for the first time in Egypt in 1922. Subsequently, many such cases of transfer of power followed in respect of many other countries. Far from withdrawing from these countries made formally independent, imperialism retained and even strengthened its hold over them employing the new technique. The essence of imperialist colonial policy consists in :

- 1) Economic exploitation of the colonial country, its resources and man power in the interests of the big monopolists of the imperialist country.
- 2) Strategic domination of the colonial country and making it join the world imperialist camp;
- 3) Maintenance of a political system which can serve these objectives of the imperialist country.

Thus, the adherents to the second line of thought inside the party succeeded for the time being, atleast, in bringing to the surface the fake nature of the independence granted by the imperialists in 1947. Their case was further strengthened by events. Since the interim government was formed in July, 1946, the workers' movement that numbered 1115 strikes in the first half of the year became still more intensified. On all other mass fronts were noticed intense struggles by the toiling masses. But now the repressive measures to deal with this mass upsurge were left to the indigenous interim government. And instead of fighting shy of using the repressive machinery of the state, it began to crush the popular upsurge with more vengeance and virulence than its predecessors. So much so that every vestige of Nehru's progressiveness began to fritter away. Consequently, the December, 1947 Central Committee Meeting of the Communist Party of India, having reviewed the entire situation took up the task of breaking away from revisionism and reformism. The Second Party Congress in 1948 then made the reorientation complete by adopting a programme of People's Democratic Revolution.

The Second Congress was an important step in the history of the Communist Party of India and a big political event inside the country. The Congress advanced as the most important task in the new stage, The struggle for the consolidation by all means of the people's democratic front, which must be the embodiment of the

alliance of the working class, the peasantry and the urban petty bourgeoisie under the leadership of the working class. The Congress proclaimed the following demands as the central slogans of the people's democratic front at the stage of the national liberation movement in India :

- 1) Complete national independence, severance from the British Empire and the Anglo-American reactionary bloc, and the establishment of class economic, political and cultural ties with the genuinely democratic countries and above all, with the Soviet Union.
- 2) Abolition of landlordism without compensation and distribution of land among the tillers of the soil.
- 3) A determined democratisation of India and its conversion into a Union of National People's Democratic Republic on the basis of the principles of national self-determination; the abolition of Princely States.
- 4) Nationalisation of the key branches of industry and the confiscation of foreign and above all, British enterprises, a radical improvement in the position of the working class.

"History does not repeat itself", thus runs an axiom. But, then, particular historical phenomenon often finds parallels irrespective of time and space. Thus, much of the Naxalbari Movement with its aftermath had already found some expression immediately after the Second Congress of the CPI. But while during the 1948-50 period submerged into the morass of adventurism was along established party with multiple mass organizations or disorganized cadres detached from the general mass of people, plunging into the quagmire of adventurism. The activities of the later period too were done in the name of a centralized party, CPI (ML), but as we shall see later, it was by no means a communist party.

Back again to the erstwhile communist movement we shall see that the party in 1948 made a vital breakaway from longstanding revisionist and reformist line only to make way for a swing to the other extreme. And that was due to the same petty bourgeois character of the party. But this time it fell to the second variety of deviation, namely, sectarianism and isolationism, mentioned earlier. However, subsequent errors and blunders notwithstanding, the party rightly projected the then historical necessity of establishing people's democracy through the indispensable path of armed revolution. It definitely unleashed the revolutionary potentiality of the people on all fronts. In fact, the programme of people's democracy was being put to practice with some success in Telengana by the Andhra state leadership of the CPI. The pressure of local people's struggle, particularly of the peasantry, was so high that the Andhra leadership of the party could not but plunge themselves into the vortex of events which in turn enabled them to take more or less a correct stand.

But when things were just beginning to take shape, the then central leadership of the party headed by Ranadive, muddled up the problems of revolution in such a manner that the rising revolutionary forces were led to an utterly wrong direction and in no time were completely disarrayed. Taking cue from the wrong approach to the question of alignment of class forces, the seed of which was already there it

an otherwise correct programme, the leadership soon skipped the people's democratic stage of revolution to advance the strategy of a socialist one. It disastrously affected the whole of tactical procedures. Simultaneously, the method of party organization too suffered a serious setback. In the sphere of practical movement certain allies of revolution were taken for enemies of revolution and in the sphere of organization the imperative for creating a proletarian basis of the party was wrongly conceived to make room for the workers in an absolutely mechanical manner. In spite of utter political immaturity workers and peasants started replacing the petty bourgeois cadres as party functionaries. The sole criterion taken was the class origin of birth, the level of political consciousness did count little. In fact, such an atmosphere was created that a virtual mistrust about the petty bourgeois party ranks began to grow among workers and poor peasants with ever increasing dimension. Alongside, in the name of vulnerability before white terrors, the scope of collective decision-making was severely narrowed down, giving rise to the development of bureaucratic authority at all levels. The Political Bureau itself was reduced to a mockery of collective leadership making it a three men show.

But long before the erroneous political-organizational line could become a real menace to the cause of revolution, the Andhra leadership, already moulded in the fire of revolutionary mass struggle, came out with the pointer. Referring to the formulation of the party programme they rightly reiterated the people's democratic stage of revolution for India at the time, denying any validity of the socialist stage. They further asserted that the axis of peoples' democratic revolution being agrarian revolution, the impending revolutionary war would basically be a war of the peasantry to be fought under the leadership of the proletariat and its political party. Accordingly, the Indian revolution should tread along the path of the Chinese revolution and not that of the Russian one. Discarding therefore, the feasibility of the urban insurrectionary model of revolutionary war, they upheld the model of protracted peasant partisan war. However, not only was their whole contention turned down, but they were also condemned as outright reformists and were severely reprimanded. The arrogance of the central bureaucratic core of the party went so far that B.T. Ranadive did not spare even Mao Tsetung to call him names as he had been the chief protagonist of peasant partisan war.

More than two years of adamant adherence to a political organization line violating the correct one needed at the hour was more than enough to pave the way for wrecking the revolution, for wrecking the party. The pointer then came from a different quarter. Before further deterioration of the situation, 'FOR A LASTING PEACE, FOR PEOPLES' DEMOCRACY', the mouthpiece of the Communist Information Bureau, intervened to make it clear that the immediate stage of India's revolution was not a socialist one and that dangerous deviations were being made in respect of alignment of class forces as well as the major tactics of revolutionary war. The journal, at the same time, brought out Mao's epoch-making dissertation, 'ON THE PEOPLES' DEMOCRATIC DICTATORSHIP', suggesting thereby the universality of its efficacy for the entire colonial and semi-colonial world.



As was natural, after this, Ranadive & Co. were dethroned. A new Central Committee was formed with Rajeswar Rao as General Secretary, that took at earnest pledge to take up and carry forward the struggle launched by Telengana peasants to its historical destiny in a message of greetings to the fighters of Telengana, issued on July 17, 1950, by the new CC, it was stated that, *"The Central Committee realizes that it was the sectarian line pursued by the old Political Bureau that prevents the adoption of your path in other parts of the country. This enabled the enemy to concentrate his forces in Telengana, and thus inflicts severe losses on you. It is all the more glorious of you that you withstood this assault unaided and defended your gains. It was the experience of your struggles that enabled us to understand the new line in the concrete. The Central Committee now pledge itself to extend the armed struggle to newer and greater parts of our land embracing the entire country, so that the hated Nehru-Patel government is overthrown and peoples' democracy established."*

Referring to Cominform Bureau's directives the message earlier said. *"It is your heroic and armed struggle that stands as a striking proof, and can proclaim boldly and confidently that India is no exception to the generalisations and directives of the Cominform Bureau that in the present conditons, as shown by the experience of China, armed resistance to the imperialist plunderers is the most effective form of the national liberation movement in the colonial countries."*

Before the Cominform Bureau's appearance with its 'directives', a joint session of the Academic Councils of the Institute of Economics and of the Pacific Institute of Academy of Sciences, USSR, Devoted to the problems of the national liberation struggles of the peoples of the colonies and semi-colonies and dependent countries after the Second World War was held in June, 1949. Among the reports submitted in this connection was one by V. V Balabushevich under the heading, *"The New Stage in The National Liberation Movement of The Peoples of India"*. In his report commenting of the Telengana Struggle, Balabushevich said, *"The events in Telengana are the most striking instance of the revolutionary struggles for land and democracy and represent the first attempt at creating People's Democracy in India... The struggle in Telengana is the harbinger of the agrarian revolution and constitutes liberation struggle."* Similiar appraisal of the Telengan movement was made by A. M. Dyakov in his report *"New Stage in India's Liberation struggle,"* that went on to say, *"The peasants in revolt have captured the land of the landlords and in 3,000 villages with a total population of more than five million, they have created committees of peoples' power and armed detachments for the self-defence. It was on the territory of Telengana... that a people's power was created for the first time in the history of India. In Telengana, it was the communists who stood at the head of the peasant and the national movement. Thus, the alliance of the working class with the peasantry has been established here with the leading role of the working class."*

But in spite of all this, in spite of the new CC's assertion that, *"The Central Committee is pledged to extend armed struggle all over the country. In these conditions, it is only a matter of days and months that your isolation (i.e., your*

single handed armed resistance) is to disappear and the rest of the territories where our revolutionary movement is strong will fight shoulder to shoulder with you against the fascist-mediaeval barbarous military onslaughts of the reactionary Nehru-Patel government," the armed peasant struggle of Telengana was made to surrender to bring the politics of ballot box as a substitute for the gun and the rifles for long time to come.

In fact, by the time Cominform article was published (27th Jan, 1950) to throw light on Ranadive's disastrously erroneous line and on the future course of India's communist movement, the party stood disrupted politically, organizationally and financially. The adverse objective condition became the breeding ground for different shades of opinion within the leadership. Such had been its repercussion on the party as a whole that a secret circular was issued by the Polit Bureau on 16th September, 1950, to take note on the fact that,

*"This emergence of the opposing political trend and other intermediary opinions and divergence of views has its repercussions on the organizational functioning of the party which was already on the verge of collapse and in a state of chaos due to past mistakes of the party leadership. A state of semi-paralysis leading to lack of mass activities is now the general picture inside the party, though exceptions are also there. Since the last CC meeting in May, the inner party crisis has further accentuated and it has assumed the most acuteform leading to organizational deadlocks and extreme financial crisis at all levels of the party organization."*

And in these circumstances mutual allegations continued to be bandied about within the party hierarchy. Subsequently, therefore, a team of four consisting of Dange, Ajoy Ghosh, Basava Punniah and Rajeswara Rao went on a political mission to Soviet Russia. They allegedly met Stalin and discussed things with him. Their return was followed by the publication of a party programme in 1951. A simultaneous document on the tactical line was also there but it was never brought above board. Obviously to force the party to the path of reformism as will be seen from later reference to the contents of the document.

As to the programme, among other things, it stated, *"While adhering to the aim of building a socialist society, the Communist Party is not demanding the establishment of socialism in our country in the present stage of our development. in view of the backwardness of the economic development of India and the weakness of the mass organizations of workers, peasants and toiling intelligentsia, our party does not find it possible, at present, to carry out socialist transformations in our country. But our party regards as quite mature the task of replacing the present anti-democratic and anti-power government by a new government of people's democracy created on the basis of a coalition of all democratic anti-feudal and anti-imperialist forces in the country....."*

Through this programme, *"The Party calls upon the toiling millions, the working class, the peasantry, the toiling intelligentsia, the middle classes as well as the national bourgeoisie interested in the freedom of the country and the development of prosperous life -to unite into a single democratic front in order to*

*attain complete independence of our country, the emancipation of the peasants from the oppression of the feudals, improvement in the life of all working people..... "*

Regarding the question of leadership of the United front, the programme said, *"the people of India led by its working class and its communist party guided by the teachings of Mark, Engels, Lenin and Stalin firmly allied with the million headed peasantry of our land will achieve this programme."*

But if not supplementary by a major tactical line a programme fails, to become meaningful and reduced to some lifeless formulations. And such a tactical line along with the programme, therefore, was invariably there as has already been referred to. Now, what was there in this tactical line that apparently made it necessary to hush it up? In respect of the objectives set forth in the draft programme, it said at the very beginning. *"These objectives cannot be realized by a peaceful, parliamentary way. These objectives can be realized only through a revolution, through the overthrow of the present India state and its replacement by a People's Democratic state."* It did not, however, confine itself to such generalised terms only, but more categorically it stated.... *"the Communist Party has always held that in the present colonial set-up in India and in view of the absence of genuine democratic liberties, legal and parliamentary possibilities are restricted and that, therefore, the replacement of the present state upholding the imperialist-feudal order by a people's democratic state is possible through an armed revolution of the people"*. This unequivocal statement was then followed by an elucidation of the nature and extent of this armed revolution, emphasis being laid on peasant partisan war.

When such a tactical line was not allowed to see the light of day it is easy to surmise what the then leadership was actually after. But how they could manoeuvre in setting arise the question of implementing the 1951 programme- that is the point to be focussed. In an adverse situation when the forces of reaction had already got some upper hand, when the question of reorganizing and consolidating the disarrayed party had vitally been on the agenda the old revisionism-reformism found it as a golden opportunity to come out of its hibernation and assert itself anew. In the melee, sharp differences within the party had by no means lessened. Contrary to the pledge taken by the new CC to spread the Telengana struggle throughout the country, attempts were now being made to grope for legality. At the CC meeting of May, 1951, Rajeswar Rao resigned as secretary, the new - found being Ajey Ghosh. In September, 1951, the party issued a statement that contained some challenge to the government of India. It said, *"Let him (Rajagopalachari) have the ban on our party withdrawn in all these states where it exists, let him give up the practice of detention without trial.; let him release political prisoners; let him end the military-police terror in Telengana and other areas. He will then find us working openly as any other political party and join other democratic parties, organizations, groups, and individuals, in a mighty democratic moment against his government and their bosses-Anglo American imperialism and Indian reaction."* Thus between the two lines, one groping its way for legality with an assurance of submission to the government; the other

carrying on armed struggle in Telengana, North Mymensingh, Manipur, Tripura, Cachar and other parts of Assam, the former ultimately held its way over the party. The government of India was assured and the armed struggles were withdrawn; participation in the 1952 first general election followed.

Now, taking in to consideration all the factors, whether the then existing reality was conducive to the spreading of the fire of revolution kindled in Telengana is a matter still to be scrutinized in a proper historical context. But even if it was not within the range of possibility, it should have been postponed only to bide time and not abandoned permanently. But what happened actually was the latter and that, of course, in the name of binding time. In fact, the year 1952 witnessed the communist movement of India ushering in a new era, the era of total and complete submission to the politics of liberal bourgeois democracy. And the 1951 programme went into oblivion, let alone the question of armed struggle for its implementation. Since then the same old excuse is being reiterated tirelessly that it is necessary to participate in parliamentary elections to make people disillusioned of it.

Thus, long sixteen years had already elapsed before Naxalbari broke the ice in 1967 to raise anew the question of India's unfinished revolution. But the lull of the intervening period was not without discord and the party could never stand absolutely free from the fight between two lines. Rather, such fight had been a persistent phenomenon within the party. And that being the case Naxalbari could so easily become the embodiment of the politics of total revolution. It needs to be emphatically pointed out that all the major aspects concerning the question of India's unfinished revolution has already been projected more than once prior to the Naxalbari movement. It will therefore be an evasion of historical truth to say that it is the Naxalbari movement of Charu Majumdar as its creator and instigator who first brought the question of revolution to the fore in the history of India's communist movement.

In fact, the stage of revolution the question, of leadership, the question of united front on the basis of worker-peasant alliance, the semi-feudal and semi-colonial character of Indian society incorporated in the CPI(ML) programme were all there in the earlier documents of the Communist Party. The question of armed seizure of political power as against the peaceful parliamentary method had also been raised in earlier periods. It is not, therefore, the lack of any correct programme supplemented by effective tactical line, that is responsible for the incompleteness of India's impending revolution. The reason lies elsewhere and for a correct appraisal of it the above assertion is called for not, however, to undermine the importance of any phenomenon, nor to underestimate the role of any individual.

Anyway as has been pointed out, in 1952 the path of Telengana was abandoned and was substituted by peaceful parliamentarism. Since then the party has been systematically indulging in parliamentary cretinism, of course, to the accompaniment of persistent inter-party fight between the two lines. But never did the protagonists of the two diametrically opposed lines think it necessary to break away from each other even when the questions pertaining to fundamental

principles of Marxism-Leninism were involved. Instead, they always reduced the struggle over principles into infantile factional quarrels and tried to retain the party's apparent monolithic character.

Then came 1962. On the one hand, an acute ideological feud within the international communist movement ensued fostering a great debate throughout the world communist movement. It had its repercussion on the Indian communists also. On the other hand, raising the bogey of 'Chinese Aggression' the government of India launched an all out offensive against the Communist Party. Far more dangerous was an instigation of national chauvinism and fanaticism within the country, every communist should know that the ruling bourgeoisie goes for national chauvinism as the most effective weapon. When others fail, to obliterate all class antagonisms. Still, the majority of the CPI leadership led by Dange did not hesitate to line up with the government branding and vilifying China as aggressor. A minority within the leadership, however, held a different view according to which the lines adopted by the majority was anti-Marxist and tantamount to adhering to opportunist principle of bourgeois nationalism. But did they at the same time uphold proletarian internationalism? Did they try to find out the fallacy of Dange resolution? Did they try to analyse or expose the reality behind the myth of Chinese aggression? Nothing of the sort. Ramamurthi brought an alternative resolution at the National Council only to say that the two great neighbouring countries, India and China, should not indulge in a mutual war that was sure to bring disaster only to both the countries. With an opportunist manoeuvre, they thus meticulously, refrained from branding anyone aggressor. But even this much of 'revolutionism' of theirs did not pay. Instead of sparing them the government threw them into prison.

Now, for the first time, perhaps in the history of the communist movement the great debate acquired an unprecedented dimension drawing almost the entire party ranks into its fold. The issues were peaceful co-existence, peaceful competition, peaceful transition which Khrushchov imported during the Twentieth Congress of the CPSU (B). As is known to everybody the Communist Party of China opposed the Khrushchov line and presented an alternative general line for the International Communist Movement. Those who found the Khrushchov line as sheer revisionist and at the same time found the bulwark of world revolution in CPC could not overlook the fact that the bogey of Chinese aggression was not a phenomenon in itself. It was, for them inseparably linked with the question of accepting or rejecting the revolutionary line. With this enlightenment the majority of the militant party ranks courageously fought against the sinister move of national chauvinism by penetrating deep into the mystery of Sino-Indian border clash. They considered this a part of their continuing task of asserting and propagating the revolutionary line. To uphold the purity of revolutionary Marxism they, however, were not contented with, nor confined in readymade ideological debates. In Calcutta, for instance, a mammoth gathering on the Maidan was held followed by a huge street demonstration. One of the slogans voiced in the demonstration was, *"Those who raise the China-bogey are the agents of imperialism"*. The bulk

of the leadership opposing the official party-line being in jail the entire initiative rested with the ranks. While 'Swadhinata', though at the command of the anti-officialdom, remained silent over these critical issues, the indomitable will and effort of the ranks resulted in a new weekly, 'DESHAHITAISHI' and a monthly, 'NANDAN', to speak loud and clear the truths of the time. The purity of Marxism was thus being protected by militant ranks who never hankered after any party position of prestige. Their sole prestige lay their dedication to the cause of revolution.

Things now began to take a different turn. The leaders came out of the prison only to find themselves in a situation that was beyond their capacity to understand. In jail they had already had some differences among themselves. Before going to jail they all were identified with the Chinese line in international politics, though they themselves did not profess to be so. Inside jail, however, some began to argue that neither the Soviet nor the Chinese Party was correct, while others held to the Chinese line in the main. Outside jail all of them could now feel the pulse of the ranks that ran high and a pressure was on to precipitate a split with the Dange-led official majority. Through the questions involved were of some fundamental principles of Marxism and though these were precisely formulated in a document by 'PRITHWIRAJ' (a name that stood for a section of the leadership who could escape arrest to form an underground Provincial Committee of the party), it can in no way be asserted that these leaders were willing for such split. They started acting in a different way. Samar Mukherji, now an MP, a constituent of the Prithwiraj Unit had already made it clear to the ranks that they were not going to take the onus of making a split. Now they brought out an old letter of Dange written to the government of India, hitherto preserved in the national archives. This letter was circulated among the ranks with much fanfare evidently to divert their attention from ideological battle over questions of fundamental principle. The trick, however, failed miserably and the ideological struggle became more pronounced. No alternative was now left to these leaders but to take step towards forming a new party. For the purpose a convention was called at Tenali in Andhra. But ironically enough, even when the stage was thus set, Jyoti Basu flew over to New Delhi to meet Bhupesh Gupta and Rajeswara Rao with a mission of a rapprochement. He proposed that if the next Party Congress was held on the basis of the 1962 membership the rebel leaders would not venture on forming a new party. But unfortunately for Jyoti Basu, they turned down his representation leaving no choice for him and his ilk other than submitting to the long awaited aspiration of the militant revolutionary ranks.

Thus in 1964, a Party Congress was convened in Calcutta. But is it not already clear that this ultimate split by such a leadership was more a factional split than a political one? Had it been really a political parting of the ways over fundamental marxist principles, it would have been made right at the moment when the Dange resolution branding China as aggressor was adopted by the National Council or, at the latest, when the Prithwiraj document was formulated by the representatives of this bunch of leaders. For even a cursory glance at the Prithwiraj document will

immediately reveal that if the composers of this document belong to an organization upholding Dange-line of politics, it is quite possible for a snake and a mongoose to co-exist peacefully.

But not withstanding this opportunist stance of the leadership, the ranks consolidated around it obviously with serious misgivings about, it from the very outset. They further noticed to their astonishment that a leadership intending to pursue an uncompromising revolutionary line openly assembled at a Congress when the entire repressive machinery of the state was bent on eradicating any such possibility. What followed was only its logical corollary. All the front rank leaders known as left or atleast, as against the anti-official line were picked up by the police and peacefully placed behind the bar.

How far then such a leadership would play a genuinely revolutionary role had already become clear to the ranks fighting so long to held high the banner of Marxism-Leninism. Their misgivings were further strengthened on going through the draft party programme circulated prior to the Party Congress. Though it spoke of people's democratic revolution, indispensability of working class leadership, urgency of forming united front on the basis of worker-peasant alliance and though it correctly pointed out that the axis of the people's democratic revolution was agrarian revolution, at the same time it contained multiple seeds of revisionism and reformism and many loopholes to give way in future to total abandonment of the revolutionary line. In short, it was a document intended to dupe the militant ranks but it could not escape the vigilant eyes of many of them. So, at all levels of party conference preparatory to the Party Congress sharp debates were raised and at the Party Congress itself even an alternative draft was submitted. But the old bureaucratic method was in full operation along with manipulated majority to turn down every radical criticism. The result was that with insignificant minor alterations in some wordings the draft was passed as the party programme.

As was natural, right from the very birth of this new party, CPI(M), inner party discontent and debate became a regular feature giving rise to occasional violation of even formal party discipline. Booklets, bulletins and other forms of document criticizing the party leadership were in clandestine circulation among party ranks. A periodic paper, 'Chinta' (Thought) was possibly the very first of such publications. It consistently laid stress on agrarian question and agrarian revolution.

It can be seen then, that the question of people's democratic revolution with agrarian revolution as its axis, the question of leadership of the working class and many other important questions concerning people's democratic revolution had once more been raised even in the programme of CPI(M) that kept the door wide open for revisionism. This apart, the paper 'Chinta' began to systematically project not only the question of agrarian revolution but also the question of indispensability of resorting to armed struggle for the consummation of agrarian revolution. The historical facts thus once more corroborate that a long and complex process had been in unceasing operation prior to the Naxalbari movement. Against this backdrop came the 1966 food movement, the traditional leaders being in jail, a

new leadership with almost all new and young faces was constituted at the state level in West Bengal to steer the party activities. In the wake of the food movement, this leadership came forward to form a united front with other left parties under its own leadership. As is known, the food movement first broke out somewhat spontaneously and was mainly concentrated in and around the city of Calcutta. Though the newly formed left front took charge of the movement subsequently, the very nature of the outburst with a leadership trailing behind it at the outset made it fizzle out quickly in the face of severe repressive measure. But taking lessons from this mass upsurge that revealed the mood and potency of the masses, the new leadership core of the CPI(M) now started thinking anew. After much consideration, it decided to launch a preplanned and widespread movement that should embrace the rural expanse in particular. A part of the plan was to put the slogan of forcible seizure of hoarded crops into operation and to set up necessary organizations with preparation of effective resistance.

In the meantime, however, the leadership that was so long behind the bar, was released by the state government. Immediately after their release, these leaders held a meeting on the Maidan hailing warmly the people for their courageous struggle during the food movement. Gratefully acknowledging that it was only due to the people's valiant struggle that they came out of prison, the garlanded leaders unequivocally pledged to carry on the struggle still further. Ironically enough no sooner they shouted out this pledge than they started closed-door negotiation with the CPI for a possible alliance to fight the Fourth General Election, totally ignoring thereby the mood and temperament of the ranks. At the time, almost the entire ranks of the CPI(M) had already reached such a state of mind that they could not think of the CPI as anything less than an enemy. They had just seen how the CPI leadership tried to convert the militant character of the food movement into a hunger-strike show of the Gandhian vintage. So, the militant cadres now took no time to realize that their erstwhile leaders were after making a mockery of the revolutionary politics they had dedicated themselves so. The real face of this masquerading leadership became wholly unveiled before them. But more was yet to come. They could gradually see the leadership issuing off and on strictures over the conduct of the editorial board of 'Deshahitaishi' and 'Nandan', which had been trying to carry on propaganda in keeping with the radical revolutionary line. The leadership also asked to withhold the circulation of 'Anashaner Darshan' (Philosophy of hunger-strike) a pamphlet written in the wake of the food movement and was published on behalf of the Institute of Marxism-Leninism. Surprisingly, this institute was sponsored by the same leadership before going to jail. In the face of the CPI's bungling of the militant food movement, the pamphlet sought to analyse the reformist character of the hunger-strike tactics as introduced into the Indian political movement by M.K Gandhi, obviously with the intention of containing the people's revolutionary wrath within a framework of protest without potency. It further made clear that the revolutionaries should refrain from adopting such tactical procedure even in local partial struggles conducive to the unleashing of the revolutionary potentiality of the masses.



Aside from all this the leadership started reprimanding the substitute leadership formed during its stay in prison, for pursuing a militant policy during the food movement. Simultaneously, they started issuing mandates to various locals that had been holding systematic classes in basic Marxism to suspend such activities. Thus, even knowledge of basic Marxism-Leninism became a matter of concern to the leaders of the CPI(M). According to them classes could be held only to explain the validity of the formulations of the party programme. All these measures taken concertedly by the leaders immediately after their release, could not but accentuate the inner-party struggle that had already been going on since the very inception of the CPI(M).

In the meantime the Fourth General Election duly took place. The CPI(M) leadership, though failed to make any alliance with the CPI before election, started fresh negotiations, after the election, to make some adjustment, if not a firm alliance. The reason was nothing difficult to understand. The election results revealed that only such a unity, unprinciple though, would enable the CPI(M) to form a non-Congress ministry in the state. And this time they succeeded easily. Obviously, the bait before all the constituent parties was the ministerial guddi.

In support of this nefarious policy of theirs the only argument vociferously paraded by the CPI(M) leaders was that such a ministry would accelerate the tempo of class struggles and would protect the toiling classes from bureaucratic repression and suppression. They, therefore, enthusiastically entered into the ministry on the basis of an unprincipled coalition with almost all the non-congress parties including the Bangla Congress (A recent breakaway faction of the erstwhile Congress.)

The urge for revolution had just forced them to sever all organizational links with the CPI that turned anti-revolutionary to them and they had just started using 'M' parenthetically to differentiate their identity as genuine Marxists when they could find a close ally in the CPI to advance the cause of revolution. So, in less than three years they managed to make their revolutionism dance to the tune of their pretentious manipulation.

But soon the mask of their pretence was torn asunder when a peasant struggle really broke out in Naxalbari. The struggle, at the outset, was over the question of right of possession of the vested land. In a dispute over such an issue, Bigul Kisan, a landless peasant, got the decree of enjoying right on some vested land from the government. So what? The natural right over all rural lands should definitely belong to the jotedars, notwithstanding the verdicts of any court. Bigul must be evicted then. While attempts were being made to give effect to this, Begul was severely beaten up. A diary was made in the local police station on behalf of Bigul, but it failed to move the police to his protection. Therefore, unlike in the past, the local peasants themselves took up their case. In the scuffle that followed during resistance, men sent by Iswar Tirkey, a local jotedar, to tackle the peasants were rebuffed. As was natural, a police force came to teach the resisting peasants a lesson. This time too, the peasants, instead of being intimidated, continued their

resistance movement resulting in the death of Sunam Wangdi, a police officer. Can the establishment put up with such audacity on the part of some unpropertied rural simpletons? By no means. So, the peasants had to pay dearly by laying ten lives mostly of women and children in the face of barbarous atrocities launched by a mighty armed reinforcement. The 25<sup>th</sup> day of May 1967 thus marked the beginning of the consummation of the CPI(M) leadership's boisterous claim of accelerating the pace of class struggle with ministerial machinery.

What followed was that the police virtually ran amok to ravage and ransack the entire rural locality. In this turmoil how could the promoters of class struggle allow themselves to waste time in slumber? So Harekrishna Konar, the then Land and Land Revenue Minister, rushed to the troubled area. He had then just returned from Vietnam with rich experience of revolutionary class struggle and naturally he had the right to know better than anybody else how to tackle such a grave situation. He put up at the Sukhna Forest Bungalow, seven miles off from Siliguri town. Instead of having any talk with his party's District Committee or with the local Kisan Sabha leaders not to speak of the Central figure of the dispute, Bigul Kisan, a party member himself, Konar thought it wise to hold secret talks with top police officials there. On the other hand, the CPI(M) state leaders started paying frequent visit to Siliguri to make the underground peasant leaders surrender. They had the same old plea: when they were in the ministry everything would be set right if only the struggles were called off by the peasantry. They, therefore, meticulously refrained from expressing any sorrow over the police action let alone any condemnation of the brutal killing of the peasant women and children. Logically, they could not raise the demand for release or more than hundred peasants or for withdrawal of numerous warrants against peasants. On the contrary, Promode Dasgupta, in a statement sought an excuse for the excess of police action by saying that possibly it was an act of vendetta on the part of the police for Wangadi's death.

But by then all the hypocrisy of the leaders became transparent to a vast number of party cadres in the light of the concrete struggle between classes. In fact the struggles carried on by Naxalbari peasants did not run counter to the declared policy of the CPI(M) leadership as a constituent of the United Front Government. It definitely declared the policy of distributing vested lands to the landless peasants. In addition to this, Konar as Land and Land Revenue Minister pronounced the policy of organizing peasant movements against all sorts of exploitation. He further declared that no police force would be deployed against any such movements. But hardly had the peasants initiated a movement in line with this when they witnessed the volte-face of the leaders. The same leaders now started accusing the peasants, interpreting their movement as an endeavour to topple down the U.F. ministry. Thus the CPI(M) leadership itself made its position clear enough, at last, in respect of the ideological feud going on since the inception of the party. Naxalbari had become identified with the radical revolutionary line in communist movement so long carried on at the theoretical level only. It became

the yardstick of measuring the degree of unabashed capitulation of the CPI(M) leaders to the vested interests and at the same time a symbol of the revolutionary kernel of the people's democratic revolution still to be accomplished in India. Naxalbari broke the barrier of party discipline to such a degree that a vast number of militant party cadres rose in open revolt against the leadership of the CPI(M).

It can now be seen, why a mere local and partial struggle in a remote desolate corner in the Terai Region of a West Bengal district had succeeded in making so great an impact throughout the country. Having been almost in oblivion for long fifteen years, Telengana, the harbinger of people's democratic revolution, reappeared in Naxalbari in 1967. Whatever had been the fate of Naxalbari movement during the subsequent years, the politics it brought to the fore still stands and is ever gaining ground. It is the politics of scientific revolutionary path against the political path of parliamentary cretinism persistently pursued by all hues of revisionists, the latest of the bunch being the CPI(M) leadership. Its much vaunted peoples' democratic revolution under the leadership of the working class, the formulation that apparently made them distinct from the CPI leadership, suddenly collapsed like a house of cards by a single stroke of peasant movement in Naxalbari.

Obviously, the problem of building a genuine Communist Party to carry forward the task of the long overdue and much aspired for revolution to success once again stirred in the minds of revolutionary ranks. But before all else the question of consolidating the revolutionary ranks themselves that had hitherto remained isolated and unorganized could not but appear as a crucial one. The All India Co-ordination Committee was formed in November, 1967 with a view to having the most preliminary prerequisite necessary for any advance along the required line.



## WHITHER REVOLUTION (MARXISM OR ANARCHISM)?

-PROMODE SENGUPTA

*[Here, we are reproducing a part of the book, NAXALBARI AND INDIAN REVOLUTION together with author's "preface". Originally, it was written and published in Bengali in May, 1970 with title, Biblab Kon Pathe. The english version of this book has come out only in 1982. The author was the Chairman of Naxalbari - O - Krishak Sangram Sahayak Committee which was formed in West Bengal in June 1967 -EC]*

### PREFACE

Why is it that the Communist movement in India, the movement for people's democratic revolution, is being repeatedly defeated despite the stern struggle and self - sacrifice by the general party members and the masses? Why is it that the Right revisionist as well as dogmatic Leftist leaders are being able to misguide it again and again? Why is it that the Naxalbari movement, despite its success in indicating once more the revolutionary path is heading towards failure under the influence of petit- bourgeois revolutionism? Is not the ideological weakness of the Indian Marxist revolutionaries the prime cause of all this?

History teaches us that the European bourgeoisie had prepared public opinion through an ideological campaign against the feudal classes over many years before it waged the revolution and seized power. Marx and Engels had started the campaign for scientific socialism to prepare the working classes to seize state power more than a hundred years ago. In Russia and China, Lenin, Stalin and Mao, before they seized power, had to wage an uncompromising and enormous ideological battle against revisionism on the one hand and Left adventurism on the other for almost three decades.

Just as revolutionary theory is essential for revolution, so is the Communist Party of the working classes based on revolutionary theory. It must, not be an ersatz, 'Marxist' Party which considers victory in elections and forming a United Front Ministry as its aim or devotes all its energies to this end. It must be a party which upholds the seizure of state power through armed revolution and the establishment of the dictatorship of the proletariat and hastens the work of reaching this goal by preparing the masses through day to day struggles. The revolutionary

uprising in France in 1967 proves that a revolution cannot succeed without a proper Marxist Party. The French revolutionaries had captured all the factories, railways, ports, government and private officers, banks, courts, schools, colleges and universities but this immense rising failed in no time because of the absence of a revolutionary Communist Party.

How far have our revolutionaries tried to learn from these lessons?

When half of this book had been printed, the police took away the manuscript after a search. That is why there has been a delay in publishing this book.

### **1. IDEOLOGICAL STRUGGLE IS NECESSARY**

We support active ideological struggle because this is the weapon which makes certain the unity within the Party and the revolutionary organisations in the interests of our battle. Every Communist and revolutionary must use this weapon. But liberalism avoids ideological struggle ..... Liberalism is an expression of opportunism and is fundamentally opposed to Marxism. It is negative and in a concrete situation it helps the enemy...

The life-force of Marxism is positive; we have to use Marxism to prevail over this negative liberalism. A Communist must have a broad mind, he must be dedicated and hard-working, he has to value the interests of the revolution like his own life and he must subordinate his personal interest to the revolution. Everywhere and always he must obey principles, he must fight tirelessly against wrong ideas and actions so that the collective life of the Party may be well-organised, the relations between the Party and the masses may be firm..... Only then he can be regarded as a Communist.

Those persons among us who have liberal tendencies must be resisted and for that all faithful, honest and active Communists must unite to bring them over to the correct path. This too is a task of ours on the ideological front. (Mao : Combat Liberalism, II, 31-33) The armed rising of Naxalbari peasants was a most significant episode in India's revolutionary mass movement. Naxalbari started a new era in the liberation way of the Indian masses. This rising has rejuvenated the Thought of Mao Tse-tung-today the highest phase in Marxism-Leninism-in India's liberation struggle. The greatest contribution of the armed peasant rising of Naxalbari is that it has unmasked the revisionist, parliamentary leadership of the Indian Communist Parties and upheld the prime necessity for armed revolution before all.

The Thought of Mao which is the driving force behind today's world revolution had first manifested itself in the struggle of the Indian workers and peasants during the great Telengana peasant movement. Inspired by Mao's thought and led by Communist revolutionaries, the heroic peasants of Telengana succeeded in liberating a large area through armed struggle and protected this liberated zone for a few years by fighting with the enemy. Many of us have a fair idea as to how the revisionist leadership of the CPI betrayed this movement, so at present there is no need to discuss it.

After Telengana the Party once again fell into the revisionist trap. Both the Right and the Left Wing leaders in the Party made a bureaucratic deviation from

the path of revolutionary mass struggle and began to direct the Party towards economism and parliamentarianism. There was partially no scope for ideological conflict, criticism and self-criticism inside the Party. Increasingly it got bogged down in sectarian scuffles among Right and Left Wing leaders. In this situation, discontent among many party members against opportunist leaders began to simmer. Many started to protest against revisionism, Parliamentarianism, economism and sectarianism among the leaders and to press for a correct Marxist-Leninist orientation. But due to the petit-bourgeois form of organisation, the lack of Marxist-Leninist theoretical knowledge and many other weaknesses, this discontent was not channelled properly to show them the way.

When the CPI was going through this immense crisis, the 1962 Sino-Indian border clashes took place and its impact split the Party. A "Marxist" Party was organised through imposition from above in a bureaucratic manner in the midst of internal squabbling, vitiated by the personal interests of the leaders. None of the basic internal problems of the Party-ideological conflict, establishing democratic centralism within the Party, self-criticism, criticism, avoiding bureaucratism-could be solved for the personal and factional interests of the leaders were given primacy. Those old leaders who had repeatedly misguided the Party, who had again and again betrayed the revolutionary mass movements like the RIN mutiny, Telengana, *Susang*, Kakdwip, retained leadership. But for all their spurious arguments and parroting of revolutionary slogans, they could not conceal the revisionist, Parliamentarian character of the programme which they adopted.

After its defeat in the China War the India Government took revenge on the Marxist Communist Party. The Party was more or less declared illegal and many of the cadres and leaders went to jail. In February-March 1966, at the time of the food movement and the campaign for prisoners' release, a mass upheaval erupted in Krishnanagore and soon started spreading all over West Bengal. This movement was led by revolutionary Communists and youth and student leaders. There was no need for any Party leaders. The leaders were released because of this movement but just after their release they began a dialogue with Congress leaders. None of the demands that had led up to the movement were fulfilled. The leaders devoted themselves to preparations for elections.

In the United Front that won the West Bengal elections and formed the United Front Government, the Marxist party was the most powerful constituent. At the time of the election the party leaders had promised the peasants that they would support their struggle for land. As soon as the Naxalbari peasants began this struggle, trusting in their promise, the neo-revisionist treacherous character of the "Marxist" leaders manifested itself. The Promode-Harekrishna clique played the role of butchers. Harekrishna Konar, the General Dyer of Naxalbari, revealed the heights of his revolutionary actions by murdering peasant women and children.

But the influence of the Naxalbari movement began to spread everywhere. It crossed the borders of West Bengal and spilled all over India and transcending India, appeared as the symbol of India's peasant movement in front of the whole

world. It got wholehearted support from the Chinese Party. As in Telengana, the heroic peasants of Naxalbari once again indicated the correct revolutionary path to the revolutionaries, stimulated the articulation of their already existing discontent and brought about a qualitative change in India's revolutionary mass movement. A great upheaval began within the Party and the masses. The revolt of Communist revolutionaries against neo-revisionist "Marxist" leaders and their anti-Marxist-Leninist policies had begun.

The neo-revisionist leaders of the "Marxist" Party expelled many Communist revolutionaries in a bureaucratic manner and many revolutionaries left the Party. These revolutionaries started publishing the weekly *Deshabrati* from 6 July 1969 in support of the Naxalbari movement. They formed groups in different areas, following the Thought of Mao and started a great movement in support of Naxalbari. Many new youth and student comrades joined them. The "*Naxalbari O Krishak Sangram Sahayak Samiti*" was formed to provide a united leadership to this movement.

Comrade Charu Majumdar appeared before the masses as the leader of the Naxalbari movement. He had been the Secretary of the Darjeeling District Committee of the Party for a few years. He played a crucial role in the Naxalbari peasant movement. When this movement grew increasingly militant and the neo-revisionist leaders of West Bengal tried to crush it, Comrade Charu Majumdar confronted them with firmness. When the movement entered the phase of armed struggle Comrade Charu Majumdar naturally had tremendous influence over Communist revolutionaries. So when the Co-ordination Committee was formed with promises of uniting all Communist revolutionaries, everyone felt very hopeful. Communist revolutionaries had thought at the time that Charu Majumdar was the fittest person for uniting the various revolutionary groups. In that situation the first task was to unite the scattered revolutionary groups.

The second task at the time was to proceed towards building up a true Communist Party based on Marxism-Leninism and the Thought of Mao. But Charubabu as well as other leaders in the Coordination Committee decided that Party could spontaneously be formed through a mass movement. They thought that the revolutionaries should first engage in spreading the revolutionary mass movement. In this situation the first declaration of the Coordination Committee was published in November, 1967.

The declaration proclaimed (1) the revolutionary struggles, especially those like Naxalbari, should be brought under the leadership of the working classes and should be unified (2) to direct the movements towards a peasant revolution through a struggle against economism (3) to fight uncompromisingly against revisionism and neo-revisionism, to spread the Thought of Mao among the masses and "to unite all revolutionaries inside and outside the Party on its basis" (4) to prepare a revolutionary programme and a tactical line based on a realistic analysis of the Indian situation according to the Thought of Mao. The declaration also said that "the time has come for us to begin to form a truly revolutionary Party." (*Liberation*, December 1967)

It is a matter of deep regret that Charubabu and the Coordination Committee failed completely in the task of establishing unity. They entirely lacked the broadmindedness and revolutionary flexibility necessary for carrying out this crucial task. On the contrary they leaned towards sectarian narrowness in an attempt to prove their revolutionary firmness. They could not get rid of the revisionist outlook and bureaucratic mentality that was the characteristic of their old Party. Ideological struggle was not even considered. Though they would frequently chart about the necessity for the other revolutionary virtue needed for this task—that is, self criticism—they showed no eagerness to actually apply it. All those defects that they had brought as a carry over from the old Party could have been overcome through self-criticism.

At first they had said that the Party would be formed through mass movement. But now they became eager to form a Party and tried to convert the Coordination Committee into the Party.

The second declaration that came out six months after the first declaration by the coordination Committee, told Communist revolutionaries in a clearly bureaucratic manner that all the pamphlets and journals that they were bringing out would have to be stopped and the Coordination Committee would have to be obeyed without a murmur. In their words : *"We appeal to all revolutionaries who firmly believe in the Thoughts of Chairman Mao and have rebelled against revisionist and neo-revisionist leadership but who still maintain their separate groups to break up their groups and unite with the All India Coordination Committee of Communist Revolutionaries"*.

Needless to say that despite its impressive nomenclature this Committee was nothing more than a group like all the other groups. But in this second declaration they demanded that they were more equal, so the others should kowtow before them. The group interest of this Committee became the greatest obstacle in the way of uniting all Communists. Its leaders had mugged up the Thoughts of Mao but they had not really assimilated them. The second declaration proclaimed the leaders' demands for monopoly rights in revolution, revealing the heights of an arrogance appropriate to petit-bourgeois revolutionism and narrow mentality.

The second declaration had made it clear that the Coordination Committee leaders had taken their clique to be the Party and this was publicly proclaimed at the Maidan meeting on 1 May. They went back on the promise held out in their first declaration that they would unite Communist revolutionaries and formulate a programme. Instead, they formed the Communist Party of India (Marxist-Leninist) flouting the Marxist-Leninist methods of party formation. It is necessary to see whether this Party was a truly Communist Party or another petit-bourgeois faction.

During the two years between the formation of the Coordination Committee and the "Party" formation, the entire ideology of this "Party" concerning mass organisation, trade union movement, peasant movement, student movement, the national problem, party formation and other problems has been clearly revealed in the writings of Comrade Charu Majumdar and the *Deshabrati* as well as through their activities.



Charubabu has firmly and clearly stated that they will not go in for mass organisation. In his own words : *"If one accepts that a revolutionary situation exists in India, one has also to accept that the first task today is to organise a secret revolutionary Party and not a mass movement. This secret Party will lead the class struggle. We must remember the words of the Chairman, 'Never forget about class struggle' and it is through this class struggle that the broad working class will realise the necessity and inevitability of destroying the state machinery and the need for a peasant revolution to capture state power. Only then can working-class leadership be established in the peasant movement". (To the Comrades and Other Writings, p. 40)*

These lines excellently expose the contradictions in the "thoughts" of Comrade Charu Majumdar and their deviation from Marxism-Leninism and Mao's Thought. In the first place he has entirely ignored the close interconnections between Party formation and mass organisation. There cannot be a strong Party without a powerful mass organisation and viceversa. A strong Party does not drop from the skies but grows from the country's soil. In the second place Charubabu sees the Party as an alternative to mass organisation - there cannot be a mass organisation if one goes in for the formation of a revolutionary Party and vice versa. Actually Charubabu sees the Party and mass organisation as contradictory elements not as interdependent and complementary to each other. In the third place, in his opinion, it is possible to capture state power without the active support of the masses, just by forming a revolutionary Party. Fourthly, Charubabu relies on mass spontaneity, not on conscious Communist programme of action. (The masses have been waging class struggle since ancient times, they have revolted many times but before the birth of Marxism they never considered the need for capturing state power. This consciousness does not come to them by a realisation of necessity and inevitability; for that the long drawn out, conscious efforts of the revolutionaries through the Party and various mass organisations are needed.

The masses will automatically join the revolution just because they are aggrieved-this sort of cult of spontaneity flouts the conscious revolutionary programme of action upheld by Marxism. Whether the adherents to this cult want it or not, they help in spreading bourgeois influence among the masses and they move away from socialism.

While arguing about why we must not go in for organising or leading any form of mass organisation, trade union, Krishak Samitis etc, Charubabu says : *"We know that when we were most under the influence of revisionism we had formed many organisations and used the Party units as complements to trade union work, that is why we failed to draw the working classes behind our politics."* (ibid. p. 29)

This is just dumping the responsibility of one on another's shoulders. They are making mass organisation responsible for their own mistakes. He has not raised the fundamental questions as to why revisionism became dominant in the Indian Party, or why the Party leadership succeeded in drawing the Party to the revisionist

path. He has concluded his arguments by blaming mass organisation for everything. Is it not the real truth that the Party leaders failed to spread the correct, revolutionary Marxist-Leninist politics among the mass organisations ? And, at present, is this not just what the Communist revolutionaries have got to do ? Instead of that, now that the revolutionaries are seeking the right way according to Marxism-Leninism and Mao's Thought and are in revolt against revisionism, Charubabu is directing them to swing like a pendulum from one extreme to another and telling them to throw the baby out with the bathwater. The most dangerous thing of all is that Charubabu is trying to pass off these ultra leftist "thoughts" in the name of the Chairman. He seldom mentions Mao Tse-tung by name, but keeps on saying Chairman and goes on to say that the Chairman has taught us this or that *ad infinitum*. The title of a *Deshabrati* article is "China's Chairman is our Chairman - Charu Majumdar." One dominant characteristic of Charubabu is that he always flings scattered quotations around in the name of Mao without mentioning the context, discussion or analysis in which Mao had used them. This is entirely Charubabu's personal style of work, not the scientific style of work based on Marxism-Leninism or the Thought of Mao, Charubabu has much distorted Mao's teachings in this manner and has created a lot of confusion among the revolutionaries through his own "thoughts". It is essential now to see whether these novel thoughts of Charubabu are at all in harmony with Marxism Leninism and Maoism. So the first task would be to grasp how Marxist-Leninist as well as Mao's Thought regarding mass organisation, trade union, peasants' movement and the national problem and their interconnections have developed over more than a century. Only then shall we understand whether Charubabu's thoughts are in line with Marxist thinking or not. Also the touchstone of this Marxist theory will enable us to understand the shape of the coming revolution in India and the task of the Indian revolutionaries in this context.

## 2. MARXISM AND ANARCHISM

At the time of the First International of the working classes, there was a tremendous impact of anarchism on the masses. Many sects had emerged in different European countries, based on anarchism and they had quite a lot of influence on not only the petit-bourgeoisie and the peasantry, but on the workers as well. Marx and Engels had to lead a difficult ideological struggle for a long time to consolidate the scientific theory of working class revolution. At first it was directed against Weitking and Proudhon and then against Bakunin in the International.

Anarchists were striving hard to spread their influence under Bakunin's leadership. Mikhail Bakunin was a well known, aristocratic, Russian revolutionary. He possessed many revolutionary virtues. He had sacrificed everything in the cause of the revolution. He had indomitable courage and exceptional energy and on top of everything he was an excellent orator. These virtues helped him to become highly influential among revolutionaries in all the countries.

In Bakunin's opinion the state is the enemy of the workers and the reason for their slavery. The first duty of the revolutionaries is to demolish the state machinery

totally and this would immediately lead to the liberation of the oppressed. Since he believed that the state was the reason for man's slavery he violently opposed the idea of the dictatorship of the proletariat and the state of the proletariat. He had no faith in political organisation and discipline as he believed that these too were chains. Bakunin had faith in the individual, not in class. His faith in the Will Force of Man arose out of this individualist philosophy. A few men with staunch determination can bring about a revolution and liberate the masses by destroying the state machinery of the ruling classes, there is no need for a class organisation of the workers or a political party to bring about a revolution. The difference between Marxism and anarchism is one of fundamental principles, not merely of tactics. Bakunin wrote about his ideal in his *God and the State* (1882) : *"We revolutionary anarchists are the enemies of all kinds of states and state organisations.... We believe that all kinds of state rule and all governments are by their nature external to the masses and so naturally they will evolve rules, regulations and aims which will be totally against the masses. Therefore we declare ourselves as the enemies of all forms of state organisation and we believe that the masses will be happy and free only when they will be able to build up a self-governed, entirely independent organ without falling under anyone's guardianship."*

In Bakunin's opinion, greatest revolutionary strength resides not in the working-class but in the "lumpen proletariat" (thugs, thieves, beggars and criminals) - the poorest and most deprived section in society. He saw "revolutionary spirit" in lumpen elements and a reactionary "labour aristocracy" among the workers. He never used the term 'working class' but said 'labourers' instead. To put in a nutshell, the basis of Bakunin's social revolution was totally opposed to Marxism.

In the earliest stage of Marxism, Marx and Engels had referred to the necessity for and mutual relationship between the immediate or minimum and maximum demands of the working classes in their Communist Manifesto. *"The Communists do fight to realise temporary demands in order to look after the minimum demands of working class interests but even in the immediate struggles they represent the future of the movement."* Anarchists have no minimum demand but they go straight to the maximum demand- to revolution; for this reason they assume no responsibility for the day-to-day struggles of the working classes. In this way they lose touch with the masses. There is total and fundamental difference between the two outlooks - Marxism is a revolutionary movement of the masses, a movement to bring about a fundamental revolution in the entire society whereas anarchism is a petit-bourgeois, sectional, adventurist movement, alienated from the masses. One characteristic of the Anarchists is to go in for extreme revolutionary slogans. Marx and Engels could not stand such petit-bourgeois revolutionists, given to phrase-mongering.

Marx considered that the economic and political struggle of the working class were inextricably woven together. Bakunin had opposed political organisation by the working class because he thought leadership and authority, which were the reasons behind the servitude of the workers, would inevitably come in the wake of

political party formation. Bakuninites see a contradiction between politics and economics. Every country should have some secret groups for making the revolution. When the call for revolution comes, revolutionaries would smash the administrative machinery of the ruling classes. There would be no serious problem after this, everything would sort itself out and socialism would also be established. He tried to use the workers' International as a platform for unity among revolutionaries of different countries as well as for the propagation of socialism.

Bakunin was not opposed to the economic struggles of the workers but he never recognised the revolutionary role of working class organisations. According to him trade union should restrict themselves to economic demands like collecting funds, reducing daily working hours, increasing wages and so on. After the revolution these trade unions would emerge as basic organisations for directing production. Actually two contradictory attitudes should be noticed about the whole thing- Marx had a deep faith in the working class, which he saw as the real revolutionary power which would bring about the revolution and establish a society free from exploitation. Bakunin had hatred and lack of faith in the working class. He thought that workers did not understand politics and could not play any revolutionary role.

In 1871 the London Congress of the International accepted Marx's resolution on trade unions to resist Bakuninism. The resolution said that in workers' movements "*economic struggle and its political duty are inseparably united.*" Next year in 1872, the conference at the Hague (this was the last conference of the First International) passed Marx's resolution on the close links between the economic and political struggles of the working class.

One can say that the history of the First International was primarily a history of the conflict between Marxism and anarchism. Anarchism evolved as the real enemy of Marxism. This petit-bourgeois revolutionism infiltrated into working class struggles using the name of revolution and socialism. Bakunin and his followers had created a lot of confusion in the International and the First International came to an end because of the extremist politics, adventurist activities and factional differences introduced by anarchists. At the same time, it was through this debate, this ideological conflict, that Marxism was consolidated within the international socialist working class movement.

Marx and Engels repeatedly emphasised the great significance and importance of the economic struggle of the trade unions but at the same time they also said that politics should be placed above economics. *Economic and political struggles are both unavoidable for revolutionaries.* They had also pointed out the mutual relationship between the two struggles- that is, between the trade union and the party. They were always careful so that Right-wing reformists would not be able to transform economic struggles into economism on the one hand, and on the other hand, extreme revolutionaries would not be able to neglect the economic struggles of the masses in the name of revolution.

This invaluable lesson of Marxism was later the guide for the Bolshevik Party under the leadership of Lenin and Stalin, for the Communist International and the

parties within it, particularly the Communist Party of China under the leadership of Mao Tse-tung. It is also significant that Lenin, Stalin and Mao too had to fight, as Marx did, against Right-wing opportunism as well as Leftist adventurist petit-bourgeois elements on the question on the relationship between economic and political struggle.

To attach primary importance to politics does not mean that the trade union should be transformed into the political party, or that it should adopt the true party programme or that all differences between the trade union and the party should be eradicated. Trade unions are the organisational centres and assembly of the broad working masses. Apart from their own collective duties they also have broader political duties. The political party of the working class too must clearly declare its economic duties in its programme and accept the responsibility for directing the struggles of trade unions, peasant associations and students' movements.

### 3. MARX AND TRADE UNION

When the modern working class first emerged in Europe after Industrial Revolution, the workers enjoyed no democratic rights, had very small wages and their daily working hours were as much as twelve to fourteen hours. They could not vote and neither did they have the right to form trade unions or any other organisation. They came to win these democratic demands through bloody struggles over many years.

Marx began his working life under these circumstances. New problems such as the organisation of working class struggle against capitalist exploitation, the demolition of capitalist society and the establishment of a socialist order- all these were extremely complex then. There was no scientific theory at that time for leading these movements that had passed the test of actual struggle. Marx and Engels could establish the scientific theory of revolutionary workers' movement and socialism only through a long struggle. The yardstick for measuring the progress of the revolutionary workers' movement in any particular country is the capacity of these movements for absorbing the tenets of Marxism.

Working class movement at that time had split up into a number of Right-wing sects and the splits were obstructing the movement. Marx and Engels had to establish Marxism through waging an ideological battle against these sects. But although Marxism was established as the revolutionary theory of the working class, sectarian ideologies repeatedly come back in different guises in class-divided societies of different countries to distort working class movements. Marxism has to wage an unending ideological battle against this.

From the beginning Marx attached a lot of importance to the trade unions as the general assembly of the working class in the struggle against ruling-class exploitation and as "organising centres of the working class". Marx and Engels repeatedly referred to trade unions as the central focus of working-class unity, the centre for basic lessons and training in class and socialism, as schools of communism. Marx and Engels could visualise from the beginning that workers

would be unitedly confronting the ruling classes after eliminating all competition from among themselves: and it would be in this way that the working class would occupy its place on the political platform as a liberated class and would undertake the responsibility for forming the socialist society of the future.

It was for this reason that Marx and Engels were extremely interested in trade unions. They directed this movement from its infancy by observing its every step, correcting its mistakes, applauding its strong points, showing up its weaknesses, and indicating political and tactical lines. At that time many used to see the trade union movement as the only form of workers' struggle, many others tried to restrict it to economic demands outside the pale of politics and, again, many others used to consider transforming the trade union into a political party.

Just as liberalism is the ideology of the bourgeoisie, so is socialism the ideology of the working class. In 1864 the First International of the working class was formed to organise the workers and disseminate socialist ideology among them. The basic questions considered by the First International were the unified trade union movement of the workers, their politics and the political party, the formation of socialism and a social order without exploitation and the international unity of the working class. In his famous inaugural address to the International, Marx gave a call to the workers to mobilise themselves in three types of organisation in order to reach the socialist goal- trade unions, the political party and the International. Marx had a deep faith in the revolutionary role of the working class. That is why he wrote to Engels on 18 February 1856: "The working class is revolutionary or nothing".

Three main trends can be noticed from the beginning of the working-class movement- reformism, anarchism and Marxism. Among these only Marxism is scientific socialism. Marx and Engels had to struggle hard against Right-wing reformism as well as Left-wing anarchism for many years to establish scientific socialism. Reformism was expressed through the leaders of British trade unions in the First International. The militancy that characterised British labour leaders during the Chartist movement in the fourth decade, was missing in the sixth decade. They were now turning into the hangers-on of British imperialism. They were emerging as advocates of narrow sectional craft unionism and restricting the trade unions to economic demands with no links with politics. Marx fought against such opportunist and reformist trade unionism all his life. Most particularly, he repeatedly demanded that poor workers and agricultural labourers be also included in the trade unions. Again and again he warned the workers in the International that the trade union movement must not be "narrow and egoistic", it must fight for the complete emancipation of the oppressed millions.

The resolution that Marx had made the First International pass in 1866 in order to protect the trade union movement from the clutches of opportunist economism, has served as the guide for all communist revolutionaries in all countries from then on. Marx never belittled economic struggles of the workers but at the same time he drew their attention to the greater duty of the organised working class to liberate entire humanity from exploitation.

Marx and Engels established Marxism by fighting long and intense against both Right-wing and Left-wing sectarian ideology. In this context one can cite the correspondence between Marx and Engels and then correspondence with Bebel, Liebknecht, Schweitzer, Lassalle, Kngelman, Kautsky and others to show with what integrity, firmness and dedication they had to wage a lifelong uncompromising ideological and organisational struggle against sectarian ideas.

Marx and Engels saw the trade unions as an essential weapon in the hands of the workers in the class war against capitalist exploitation. They teach us the lesson that the working class has to continue with its day to day economic struggle through trade unions etc, but at the same time they must realise that without capturing political power they can never establish their dictatorship and end the exploitation and slavery under capitalism.

In Germany Lassalle had prepared a "programme" for the political party of the working class but he did not refer to *"the organisation of the workers as a class through trade unions."* Engels in a letter to the German labour leader Bebel in 1875 pointed out that this was a very important question, since trade unions were the true class organisations of the proletariat through which it carries on the day to day struggle against the capitalists and train itself for class struggle (*Correspondences*, p. 356 ).

Engels referred to not two but three types of class struggle in the labour movement. He spoke not only of economic and political struggle but also of ideological battles, which the working class through its party would have to wage in a planned and co-ordinated manner ( *Peasant War in Germany* p.33 ).

To sum up, Marxists will have to combine ideological, political and economic struggle in the class war for the proletarian seizure of state power and the establishment of a society free from exploitation.

#### 4. ECONOMIC STRUGGLE AND ECONOMISM

Capitalism is rooted in commodity production. A commodity is an object which in the first place satisfies a human want, i.e., has use-value and in the second place it is something which can be exchanged with another object. Millions of commodities are being exchanged every day according to laws that are not arbitrary. Commodities are exchangeable because they have something in common. This common element is human labour.

Marx showed that at a certain level of social development money gets transformed into capital to carry on production, capital buys not only raw materials or machinery but also human labour power. Labour-power also becomes a commodity like any other. The owner of capital after buying labour-power uses it in the work of production. The worker is compelled to sell his labour-power because he has no other way of earning his livelihood. It is this labour that produces commodities that have value- a value which is expressed in the price of the commodity.

Now the question is, at what rate does the owner of capital buy labour-power. Not arbitrarily surely, but according to certain criteria. This is the value that is

absolutely necessary for the survival of the worker and his family and therefore for the continuation of production. Marx called this the "necessary labour time."

Let us assume that the worker labours for eight hours a day. The value that he creates in four hours of work is sufficient for his subsistence. This is his wage. The remaining four hours that he works is "surplus labour time." The commodity and the value that he produces in this surplus labour time is "surplus-value." The capitalist appropriates this surplus-value, of which the worker gets nothing-he receives only his wages.

Thus "surplus-value" is the value of the unpaid labour of the worker. This "surplus-value", unpaid value appropriated by the owner in the basis of the owner's profit. "Surplus-value" gets divided into three components-capitalist's profit, landlord's rent and interest to the supplier of money who are the owners of the instruments of production. The appropriation of "surplus-value" by the capitalist class is the source both of the exploitation, wage slavery, poverty and oppression of workers and the profits, wealth and power of the owners of capital. In the secret of "surplus-value" lies the basic reason of the class struggle of the modern age.

One part of "surplus-value" gets transformed into capital and increasingly the wealth of society gets concentrated in progressively fewer hands. Thus emerges monopoly capitalism another name for which is modern imperialism. This is the economic basis of contemporary capitalist society. In the same period the use of machinery in industry steadily increases requiring greater use of science and larger numbers of skilled workers and employees. In this way capitalist production takes on a social character, and the whole world gets absorbed into the capitalist market. With the growth of monopolies, exploitation steadily increases. By enormously expanding productive forces in this manner, capitalism digs its own grave. The private ownership of the means of production is contradicted by the social character of the capitalist productive forces, and the class struggle becomes more intense. Then as Marx said, "the knell of capitalist private property is sounded. The expropriators are expropriated."

The class struggle begins because the owner of capital appropriates "surplus-value." The workers are compelled to start economic struggles against exploitation by capital, for survival, for improving living standards. They carry on long-drawn-out movements against exploitation for increasing wages reducing working hours and for other demands. They organise trade unions in factories, mines, docks and railways and become united against the owners. In this way the working class becomes a definite social force.

Initially these labour struggles were mainly economic conflicts against exploitation by owners. But workers come to realise that whenever they raise demands the entire state machinery-army, police, law courts, jails etc. is used against them to protect the interests of the owners and so they come into conflict with the state. In this way economic struggle develops into political struggle. It is through economic struggles that workers realise that strikes can win some specific concessions from capitalists (i.e. a recovery of a small part of the "surplus-value") but they cannot end capitalist exploitation or wage slavery. For that, political



struggle is also necessary. The European revolutions of the nineteenth century taught this lesson to the workers.

But along with this understanding there developed two political tendencies within the working class : Right-reformist politics and revolutionary politics.

In the second half of the nineteenth century capitalism expanded rapidly in Europe and America and developed into monopoly capitalism (i.e. modern imperialism ). Big industries and business concerns, banks and insurance companies, railways, ports and shipping companies arose which employed large numbers of clerks, skilled labourers and white-collar workers. Imperialists through the enormous wealth they had acquired by looting the entire world were able to give a few concessions to the workers in their own class interests-wages increased somewhat, working hours were reduced, primary education spread, trade union rights were established etc. All this of course was not the result of imperialist generosity. The working class was able to win some democratic demands only through long struggles. However, this kind of capitalist development led to the emergence within the working class of a petit-bourgeois minded "labour aristocracy" and the growing influence of bourgeois ideology. In all countries this has been the class basis of economism, reformism and revisionism.

An American labour leader described very well the ideals of workers influenced by such petit-bourgeois ideal: *"We do not have any ultimate ideal. We fight only for such immediate demands which can be obtained quickly. We want to dress a little better, live a little better and in general, become good citizens"* ( Lazovsky, p.124).

Though the Social Democratic Parties of the Second International had accepted Marxism, Right-wing opportunism gradually developed among their leaders taking the ideological forms of economism and parliamentarianism. Bornstein (himself a bank clerk) was the leader of this trend. He tried to "revise" Marxism. He believed that capitalism could be ended by economic struggles alone, that socialism could be reached through peaceful reformist parliamentary legislation, that violent revolution was not necessary anywhere, nor was it possible.

The other political trend within the labour movement was Marxist revolutionary politics. The ultimate objective of this politics is proletarian revolution, seizure of state power and proletarian dictatorship. Marxists have never neglected economic and trade union movements but to them economic movements are not synonymous with economism. They are opposed to economism, not to economic struggles by workers against capitalist exploitation. Lenin, in his *What is to be Done* has shown how economism can be fought and how the workers' revolutionary consciousness can be aroused through trade union movements. In Marxism-Leninism and the Thought of Mao there is no conflict between economic struggle and revolutionary political struggle. One complements the other. In a revolutionary situation economic struggle quickly develops into political struggle, and political struggle may be transformed into revolution (Lenin, *Left Wing Communism*, p.26). Hence in their *Communist Manifesto* Marx and Engels stated that every class struggle is a political struggle and Lenin cleared

that the present class struggle is the sum *total of economic and political struggles*. Lenin also stated that only he is a Marxist who accepts class struggle as the struggle to establish proletarian dictatorship (Bijon Sen, *Communist Manifesto O Shiksha*).

In this connection we have to be careful about one thing. A militant economic struggle is not necessarily revolutionary. Economists can also wage militant struggles. Under the present United Front Government in West Bengal, the strikes, gheroas, and land-grab movements by workers and peasants under the leadership of the "Marxist Party", the CPI and other Leftist Parties are all militant and violent class struggles. The political struggles waged by these parties can also be very militant. Class struggles may be waged by many groups- bourgeois liberals, revisionists, reformists, Gandhians, petit-bourgeois parties etc. At times they may become very militant too. But class struggles under their leadership, however militant, remain confined within economism and parliamentarianism. The difference between these movements and Marxist class struggle and economic struggle is that Marxists take class struggle beyond the confines of economism and transform it into revolutionary political struggle, directing it towards the destruction of capitalism, wage labour, and all forms of exploitation, towards the seizure of state power by the working class, proletarian dictatorship, and the establishment of a socialist society free from exploitation. In countries where Communist revolutionaries have been able to give leadership to the class struggles and economic movements of workers and peasants and succeeded in raising the consciousness of the toilers from militant economic struggle to the level of political seizure of state power, revolution has succeeded, as in Russia and China. Where such efforts have failed, revolutionary attempts have also failed as in India.

## 5. LENIN AND "LEFTISM"

In all class divided societies there exist social roots of not only revisionism but also of anarchism. So revisionism and anarchist or adventurist Leftist trends have arisen in the liberation movements in various forms. They still appear today and create a lot of confusion. Under certain circumstances revisionism becomes the major threat, at other times ultra Leftism becomes the main danger and opposes the revolution from within the working class itself. Hence Marxism has to fight continuously against both these tendencies. Lenin, Stalin and Mao Tse-tung have often said that every Communist has to be always cautious and carry on ideological struggle against these two trends.

As in other countries, the Russian labour movement was also considerably influenced by opportunism. Lenin built up the Bolshevik Party as the revolutionary party of the working class only through a long and bitter struggle against opportunism and it was because he did this that Lenin was able to seize state power with the help of the party and establish proletarian dictatorship.

In this context Lenin's *A Letter to a Comrade on Our Organisational Task* (1902) is a very important document. Here Lenin stated that we have to work in every industrial enterprise and teach the militant section of the workers how to lead the workers in all matters and how to attain the qualities needed for becoming

members of party committees. Lenin in this article discussed in detail how to build up a secret party and labour organisations, the nature of both secret and open work, and the interconnections between labour movement, trade union and party building.

Lenin has said that the Bolshevik struggle against revisionism is well known, but very few are aware of the hard struggle the Bolshevik Party had to wage against another enemy within the working class movement. This enemy was "petit-bourgeois revolutionism", or in other words, "anarchism."

After the defeat of the Russian Revolution of 1905-07 Tsarist repression against the labour movement and Bolsheviks intensified, while inside the labour movement, too, Rightist and Leftist factions carried on anti-Bolshevik propaganda and activities. Lenin at this time had to fight both 'Liquidators' as well as Leftist "Otzovists". The Otzovists in the name of fighting Right-wing opportunism began campaigning against work in trade unions, cooperative and other mass organisations and demand the resignation of Bolshevik members of the Duma( Parliament). They argued that only a secret party was needed for revolution and indulged in violent revolutionary talk. In reality refusal to work in mass organisation means giving up the effort to establish working class leadership over the masses. The Otzovists created so much confusion among the workers and party members through such adventurist and anti-Marxist propaganda and activity that the Bolsheviks had to call a conference in 1909 which expelled them from the party and instructed party comrades "to carry on determined struggle against all such deviations from the path of revolutionary Marxism" (*History of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union*, 1948, p.167). At this time the Bolsheviks had to fight also against the "Left" politics of Trotsky. Trotsky's methods were more clever- acting in the name of the party, pretending to support the party, he preached anti-party ideas and, claiming to be above factions he carried on the worst kind of factional activity. Lenin's comment about Trotsky this time was: "He is loyal to the party in words but his behaviour is worse than that of the basest factionalists". Afterwards too Trotsky repeatedly endangered the Party through his incorrect "Left" politics, and the stern ideological struggle that Lenin and Stalin had to wage against him occupies an important place in the history of Marxism.

Lenin pointed out that there is no labour or trade union movement without politics. Trade unions may be of various type but they can be broadly classified into proletarian or bourgeois (revisionist and reformist). The crucial question is whether the trade unions accept the leadership of the proletarian political party, and this question is connected with important struggle for leadership over the labour movement being waged between the proletariat and the bourgeoisie. The Communist Party is the highest organisational form of the working class. Only under the leadership of the party can the proletariat fight against bourgeoisie exploitation and slavery and become an independent political force. After the seizure of political power working class organizations can serve as pillars of the socialist proletarian dictatorship only under the leadership of the party.

After the First World War a tremendous revolutionary situation had emerged in Europe and particularly in the defeated countries and bourgeois rule had become very unstable. The influence of the Bolshevik revolution was spreading fast like a tidal wave. Soviet power had been established in Hungary and Bavaria, Communist Parties were emerging in all countries and workers were flocking into revolutionary struggles. In such a situation some "Left" Communist groups appeared in all countries. These "Leftists" caused enormous confusion and danger for the Communist and revolutionary labour movement through ultra-revolutionary slogans and many kinds of adventurist activities. The history of all countries shows that in such a revolutionary situation an honest but misguided petit-bourgeois group emerges which is impatient, wants revolution overnight and becomes influenced by anarchism. At the same time, the ruling class too tries to defeat the revolution from within by sending into the movement large numbers of agents disguised as revolutionaries, and such people often easily influence petit-bourgeois revolutionaries.

At this time when the European revolutionary movement was being led into such dangerous paths by adventurists spouting Marx, Lenin had to write about this in his famous *Left-wing Communism : an Infantile Disorder*. Lenin in this book analysed certain basic features of revolution and this book is by no means outdated and should be read repeatedly by Indian revolutionaries in the Indian revolutionary situation. The "Left" Communists chose as their main targets, trade unions, economic struggles, movements around day to day demands, parliamentary elections etc. They declared all these to be "reactionary" and "reformist". They called for the boycott of trade unions, elections, mass organisation- boycott of everything. They filled the walls of city streets with slogans about revolution and the masses. They filled the air with their violent slogans. They remained indifferent towards the economic demands and grievances of the workers. They carefully kept away from the unromantic, routine organisational work through which alone the masses can prepare for revolution and through which revolutionary cadres are created.

Lenin at that time bitterly attacked such Left adventurism as "an unpardonable and dangerous error", "opportunism", "petit-bourgeois social-chauvinism". He repeatedly emphasised that revolutionaries are obliged to work wherever the masses may be, even inside very reactionary trade unions.

In this context he also declared that a revolution cannot be made to order by a handful of people selected by ourselves. Revolutionaries cannot depend on abstract human material which has developed within capitalist society and transform it in their own way. The task is very difficult but there is no other road. This applied to trade unions, the party and all other fields.

## 6. STALIN AND TRADE UNIONS

Stalin pointed out in an article that the first task of a Bolshevik Party had been the winning for the party the vanguard of the working class. Its second task had

been to draw into the ranks of the supporters of the proletarian vanguard party, the mass of the workers and peasants. He also drew attention to the important role trade unions played in this task.

Towards the end of the civil war in the Soviet Union in 1920, when the Soviet government was beginning the work of economic reconstruction, Trotsky demanded that trade unions should be militarised. Stalin replied by emphasising the natural democratic role of trade unions and the importance of trade unions in the building of the Socialist Soviet State. Trotsky also argued at this time that politics should not be allowed to interfere with the work of trade unions in economic reconstruction. Stalin replied : *"In general, to separate politics from economics is laughable and foolish"*.

Both Lenin and Stalin ( and also later on Mao Tse-tung ) realised that to establish the dictatorship of the working class the party would have to become the "decisive" force within the proletariat and the masses and to achieve this it will have to participate with responsibility in all types of struggles of mass organisations and in this way, win the respect and the faith of the masses.

The Communist Party cannot hang in a vacuum. There must be an inextricable interconnection between the masses, the working class, mass organisations and the party; one derives its life's blood from the other. Marx, Engels, Lenin, Stalin, and Mao have all taught us this truth. Marxism does not teach us to build the party alone, ignoring mass organisations- this is petit-bourgeois anarchism.

Trotsky and other ultra-Leftists in the Soviet Union created a lot of confusion in the party by indulging in ultra-revolutionary phraseology about Soviet economic reconstruction, trade unions, peasant questions, the world revolution, the Chinese revolution, etc. Stalin had to fight always an ideological battle against these groups.

## **7. MAO TSE-TUNG : TRADE UNIONS AND LABOUR MOVEMENT IN CHINA**

Charubabu and his associates preach in such a way about Mao Tse-tung and the Chinese revolution that it seems that the Chinese Party and ideology never did anything else but peasant revolution and guerilla warfare all its life, as if it never went anywhere near the labour and trade union movement. But Chinese history teaches us that down to 1927 the Chinese Party and particularly Mao Tse-tung laid great emphasis on building up trade unions and directing the labour movement in order to establish proletarian leadership over the Chinese democratic revolution.

The Chinese Communist Party was established in 1921 with 57 party members and 12 delegates at the First Congress; one of them was Mao Tse-tung. Right from the beginning the Chinese Party took on the responsibility of building trade unions and leading the labour movement. In the single year 1922-23 there were a hundred strikes, big or small, involving 300,000 workers. All the strikes were under the leadership of the Party and all were victorious. Workers began joining trade unions in large numbers.

The First Party Congress sent Mao as Secretary to organise the labour and peasant movement in Hunan Province, one of China's principal revolutionary

centres. A central trade union secretariat was formed with branches in the various provinces soon after the First Party Congress and Mao was appointed Chairman of the Hunan branch. The trade union movement in Hunan advanced rapidly under Mao's leadership. Twenty unions of railwaymen, miners, press employees and others were organised within a year. A number of strikes took place in Changsha, the capital of Hunan and in the famous lead mines of Saikosan. In September 1922 there was a strike of 12,000 coalminers at Anyuan, which is an important landmark in Chinese revolutionary history. Like other Chinese workers these miners were brutally exploited and had no democratic rights at all. They were kept under control by hired thugs. The Party organised schools to teach Marxism to these workers and a few months later formed the first trade union of miners. The owners stopped paying wages in order to smash the trade union, and the warlords sent in the army when the workers went on strike. But the troops, influenced by workers' propaganda, refused to open fire. Mao Tse-tung had sent Liu Shao Chi to conduct this labour movement and strike. The owners tried to arrest Liu while pretending to carry on negotiations. Thousands of workers surrounded the representatives of the mine owners, and on the fifth day of the strike, all the demands of the workers had to be conceded.

The trade union and revolutionary labour movement spread rapidly all over China under the leadership of the Communist Party. The Chinese rulers and their foreign imperialist masters were frightened. In February 1923 there was firing on striking railwaymen of the Peking-Hankow line, and 50 workers were killed and 500 injured. There was a massive popular protest and an all-China general strike. The feudal ruling class of China with the help of the imperialists began a tremendous repression on workers and peasants, but despite this the trade union and labour movement emerged even stronger within a short time.

The fourth Party Congress met at Shanghai in 1925. At that time the party membership was only 980, and the delegates to the Congress numbered 20. This Congress again emphasised the importance of the trade union movement in order to establish working class leadership in the national liberation struggle. The labour movement from now on was directed against foreign capitalists, particularly Japanese and British.

On 1 May the Second National Labour Congress met at Canton under Communist leadership and set up the All China Trade Union Federation which joined the International Red Trade Union. This Congress instructed the workers to take a more active and leading part in the national democratic revolution and regard the peasants as the main ally and support the peasant movement.

At this time the *economic and anti imperialist movements of the workers got entwined*. On 28 May 20,000 workers at a Japanese textile mill at Shanghai went on strike. On 30 May Japanese and British soldiers fired on a procession of these strikers and killed and injured many. There were countrywide protests, strikes in all cities innumerable demonstrations by workers, peasants and students. 200,000 workers of Shanghai went on an anti-imperialist strike, and the strike wave reached lakhs of workers in Canton and Hong Kong. The June strike at Hong Kong involved

250,000 workers and lasted 18 months till October 1926. There are few examples in world history of such a strike.

The Chinese Communist Party established its working class base only by organising and directing such bitter economic and political struggles by the proletariat, and it was trying to establish proletarian leadership over the Chinese national liberation movement in this way.

As a result of the revolutionary labour movement, the influence of the Communist Party spread rapidly throughout the country and party membership multiplied. From only 900 members at the Fourth Congress in 1925 it went up to 57,000 at the Fifth Congress of April 1927. The Party at this time entirely controlled 2,800,000 organised workers and 9,000,000 organised peasants ( Ho Kauchi, pp. 1552-55 ).

By the middle of 1926 as soon as the northern campaign started, a revolutionary upsurge began among the workers in the cities and the peasants in the villages in its support. In March 1927 when at the climax of this campaign the forces of Chiang approached Shanghai city, the heart of imperialist exploitation in China, the workers of Shanghai under Communist Party leadership paralysed the city by strikes and occupied a part of the port under Chou En-lai's leadership. The capitalists and landlords of China were panic-stricken by such revolutionary activities of the workers and peasants. On 12 April their representative Chiang Kai-shek suddenly entered the city with his troops and attacked the workers without any warning. With full support from the imperialists China started a counter revolution and established a region of white terror. The Right-wing ideas of the Party leadership were a primary reason for the defeat of the revolution.

It was through this mass struggle that the Chinese Communist Party realised that it was impossible to defeat the armed forces of reaction without armed, powerful revolutionary forces. It is also true that because the Party led a broad mass struggle that it was able to build up powerful armed forces so quickly.

The Communist Party learnt another lesson from this struggle- if the working class has to perform the role of the leader it must establish an alliance with the peasants and petit-bourgeois elements.

Two contradictory trends of thinking emerged within the Chinese Communist Party over these questions-one was the Bolshevik thinking under Mao's leadership and the other was the Menshevik thinking under Chen Tu-hsien.

Among Chinese Communist leaders at that time only Mao had started to realise through his experiences in the Hunan peasant masses under the leadership of the working class. *Mao's Hunan Report* written at this time is a path finding document in the Communist movement.

After the defeat of the 1848 revolution in France and Germany and again after the fall of the Paris Commune, Marx and Engels drew the attention of Marxists towards the role of peasants in revolution. On its basis Lenin and Stalin later established the theory of worker-peasant alliance under working-class leadership. On the firm ground prepared by Marx, Engels, Lenin and Stalin, Mao further

enriched the theory of the revolutionary role of the peasantry under working class leadership in colonial and semi-colonial countries through its application in the Chinese revolution.

The establishment of worker-peasant alliance under working-class leadership and through revolutionary struggle, the establishment of new democracy under the dictatorship of the worker and the peasant and then passing on to socialism—these are the basic lessons of the Chinese revolution under Mao's leadership.

In 1927 Chiang Kai-shek reached a compromise with imperialism, betrayed the national liberation movement and declared war against Communists. Communists had not yet built up their own armed forces. Chiang wanted to take advantage of this and totally destroy the Communists who had been able to forge close links with workers and masses.

Communists began to build up troops with workers and peasants and attack the forces of reaction wherever possible. In August at Nanchang, the provincial capital of Kiangsi, Chou En-lai fought against Chiang with troops composed of workers and peasants like Chu Teh, Ho Lung, Yeh Ting, and others. In September the Autumn Harvest Uprising took place under Mao's leadership. The Province of Hunan was the Centre of this uprising. At this time Mao built his first regiment of troops with the famous coalminers of Anyuan ("The first regiment was formed from the Anyuan miners", Snow : *Red Star Over China*, p. 163). After a short while the Red Army was formed with some other regiments and it was called "the first division of the first armed regiment of the workers and peasants". The troops were composed of elements like (1) coalminers and other labourers from Anyuan, (2) selected peasants from the Hunan Peasant Association, (3) rebellious soldiers from the Kuomintang.

After a few battles Mao occupied the Chinggang mountains in October and established the first revolutionary centre there. Within a short time Lin Piao and Chen Yi with the peasant guerrilla troops came to join Mao. Divisions of lead miners of Shui Kusan in Hunan province also joined Mao.

On 11 December 1927 there was a workers' upheaval in Canton. Workers founded a commune after occupying the city but the revolutionaries were defeated. The Canton commune proved the power of the enemy when the latter got all sorts of support from imperialists and it also showed that as long as the revolutionary armed forces are not well organised, it was not possible to occupy any big city. The survivors from the Canton Commune also joined Mao on the Chinggang mountain. From 1928 began the second phase in the Chinese revolutions— the phase of peasant revolution under Mao Tse-tung's leadership.

But this peasant revolution did not include only peasants. Its most important aspect was working-class leadership and this leadership did not mean just the ideology of the working class but the physical presence of this class as well. In the Chinese Party, both among leaders and the cadres, petit-bourgeois elements were fairly strong. This is inevitable in all colonial and semi-colonial countries. Peasants are basically petit-bourgeois and their aim is to own land. In this situation if there



is no powerful working-class leadership existing both ideologically and physically, then there are strong chances of deviation in the leadership of the peasant revolution and the trend towards petit-bourgeois revolutionism becomes powerful ( and, in fact, this happened in China). That is why from the beginning of the peasant revolution. Mao emphasised equally the ideological and physical aspects of working-class leadership.

## 8. MAO TSE-TUNG AND PETIT-BOURGEOIS REVOLUTIONISM

Upto 1928 the leadership of the Chinese Party was in the hands of Right-wing opportunists like Chen Tu-hsien. Which class was to provide leadership in the democratic revolution in China- on this fundamental question Chen argued that the bourgeoisie and not the working class ought to lead. The Right-wing leadership did not think in terms of worker-peasant alliance, it laid stress on cooperation with the Kuomintang. Such Right-wing ideas of the Party leadership was the primary reason for the defeat of the 1928 revolution. At that time the "Leftists" within the Communist Party under the leadership of Kuo Tao talked only of workers' movements and they too had no faith in the revolutionary role of the peasantry.

In this situation Mao, in his *Analysis of Classes in Chinese Society*, said that the working class was the leader of this revolution which was to take place on the basis of worker-peasant alliance. Although Mao was then a member of the Central Committee, Chen refused to publish the booklet in the name of the Committee. The Party leadership had also paid no attention to Mao's *Hunan Report*. During his movement and organisational work among the Hunan peasants, Mao realised the tremendous revolutionary force of the peasantry and in his *Hunan Report* he had suggested a new revolutionary principle and programme about the peasants to the party. This was: accept the revolutionary role of the peasants in the Chinese revolution, establish the political power of the peasants in the villages as soon as possible and build up armed forces of peasants.

It was because Mao was able to build up a powerful party and establish worker-peasant alliance under working-class leadership by following these fundamental tenets of Marxism-Leninism and by waging a long drawn out ideological battle against Right-wing and ultra-Leftist tendencies, that the Chinese masses could completely eliminate imperialist feudalism and bureaucratic exploitation and rule in China.

After the defeat of the 1927 revolution Chen Tu-hsien was expelled from the Party for not admitting his blunder. The Party accepted the principle of peasant revolution and resisting the Kuomintang, but still it did not move in the right direction -it left the Rightist path only to go over to ultra-"Leftism". *"Inspired by hatred at the massacre by the Kuomintang and anger at the surrender of Chen Tu-hsien, petit-bourgeois sentiments entered the Party and 'Leftist' thinking spread rapidly within the Party"* (Mao, III, p.181).

In the Sixth Party Congress in 1928 some mistakes were rectified but the "Leftist" trend still remained very strong. Within two years this trend began to dominate the Party under Li-Li San's leadership. In the meantime after the first revolutionary centre had been established on the ChingKang mountain under Mao, many other strong revolutionary centres and Soviets has been formed in large areas of different provinces by 1930 and the strength of the Red Army had reached one lakh.

At this time a strong adventurist tendency manifested itself within the Red Army. This was Putschism ( that is "the principle of blind attacks irrespective of mental and actual conditions"- Mao, I, p.115 and *Roving Rebel Bands*). Mao then had to fight severely against this dangerous "Leftist" tendency.

In the meantime the Communist Party again started crystallising illegally within the territory ruled by Chiang and there was a revival in trade unions and labour movement. At this time a war broke out between Chiang and some warlords and this gave a handle to the Communists.

In this situation Li Li-san popularised an adventurist line inside the Party. He said that the revolution was about to break out throughout the world (at that time the capitalist countries were going through an intense economic crisis) and that the revolution would begin in China. The entire masses were restive under Chiang's despotism. If a call for revolution was to be sent out, they would join in the armed uprising and as soon as the revolution would start, the Chinese Communist Party would capture state power. Li also said that the big cities and not the countryside were the centre of the Chinese revolution. So the task of forming Soviets in the rural areas should be suspended, the Red Army should attack the cities, and foreign imperialism as well as the bourgeoisie would have to be destroyed through the armed uprising of the workers. Li ignored the fact of uneven development within the country and declared that an equally revolutionary situation was present in all cities and villages.

Followers of Li denied the necessity of accumulating organisational energy and complete the preparation for the revolution. They thought that since revolutionary forces were progressing and the warlords were fighting among themselves, therefore the situation was ripe for a countrywide call for revolution. They assumed that as soon as the Party gives the call for the revolution, the masses will join the armed uprising. They demanded that the masses should not go in for economic strikes but only for armed uprising and that they should not take any part in small "actions" but only in big ones (Ho Kan-chih: *A History of Modern Chinese Revolution*).

(What a strange similarity exists between the thoughts of Li Li-san and the thoughts of Comrade Charu Mazumdar! Since there is a revolutionary situation in the country, go in for "actions". There is no need for preparations as the masses will respond, inspired by our "actions" and the spark will automatically become a conflagration! Even before, this had happened under Ranadive.)

The first thing about the revolution is to mobilise its organisational forces through correct ideas- or, in other words preparations. It is adventurism to give a

call for revolution without any preparation. Such a trend is particularly strong among petit-bourgeois revolutionaries. ( On the other hand, the revolutionary preparations that revisionists talk of - such as the Promode-Jyoti-Harekrishna-Ranadive-Basavapunnaiya clique- is sheer fraud. Their politics of parliamentarianism and economism is the exact opposite of revolutionary preparations. There is no end to their preparations-they are preparing for the last forty years. Their preparations go in the direction of Fascism, not towards working-class revolution and socialism. As a reaction to this eternal preparing Charubabu and others have gone over to the other extreme. They think that there is no need for preparations.)

Mao's line to counter Li's adventurism was-"Over a long period we shall have to concentrate our basic strength in building up base areas in the countryside. Then these bases will have to be used for surrounding the cities and for unleashing the tidal forces of a countrywide revolution" (Mao, p.148 ). At that time the followers of Li had criticised Mao's line as "Rightist deviation." What was even more dangerous was the fact that Li's Leftist adventurist ideas had also influenced a portion of the Red Army.

Following Li's suicidal policy, some crazy campaigns were defeated and the Party suffered very heavily. Li had to face severe criticism from the Party cadres. Within four months the Party had dropped this line but still Leftist sectarianism survived within the Party and its leadership. In December 1930 Chiang began his "surround and destroy" operations to crush the liberated areas of China and the Red Army. Mao defeated him by adopting the correct policy.

Wang-Ming, Po-Ku (Chin Pang-hsien) and others now came back from Moscow where they had been staying all this time and occupied positions of leadership. They had not been able to assimilate Marxism but they had learnt a lot of revolutionary phraseology. Also, they had little knowledge about the real conditions within the country.

The very first theory forwarded by them stated that Li Li-san's ideas were not Leftist but actually Rightist and such Rightist and such Rightism is the enemy of the party. Having said this, the line that they proposed was for more Leftist than Li's, far more dangerous, violently revolutionary, dramatic and "theoretical". It is easy to preach such adventurist revolutionism in a revolutionary situation when petit-bourgeois revolutionaries come under its way. Marxist-Leninists find it very difficult to fight against this tide.

At that time, Japan had occupied Manchuria (19 September, 1931) and this was Japan's first step towards occupying all of China. Due to this event, there occurred a qualitative change in the Chinese situation. Instead of civil war, Mao advocated the policy of a united front with the Kuomintang against Japanese aggression. Leftist leaders opposed this and stated that Chiang would have to be removed first in order to resist Japan. They underestimated Chiang's power and claimed that he could be destroyed by a hard blow. They reversed Mao's military principles and tactics as they argued that these constituted the "rich peasant line"

and "serious Rightist opportunism". Like Li they too said that instead of guerilla warfare, preparations should be started for an all out attack on the main enemy base- the cities. The Leftist line about areas under Chiang and the Kuomintang was even more dangerous. So far the Party had combined with its secret work, legal and open work wherever it was possible to spread the Party's influence on the masses. Leftist leaders declared that taking advantage of laws was a variant of opportunism. So the Central Committee of the Party was located in the Kuomintang area. But due to the adventurist policy of the Leftist leaders, the Central Committee had to be shifted secretly to the Soviet area.

The booklet that Wang-Ming wrote at this time to explain this new Leftist policy had a very significant title-'The Two Lines or the Struggle for the Further Bolshevization of the CPC.' This was a trick to inject Bakuninite and Trotskyite adventurism into the communist movement in the name of Bolshevism.

When in October 1933 Chiang with a lot of help from the imperialists and with ten lakh soldiers started his fifth campaign to "surround and destroy" the Communists, the disastrous results of the adventurist policy of Leftist leaders of the Party became obvious. Mao, who had been able to defeat four "surround and destroy" campaigns so far was now set aside by the Leftist leaders who now assumed responsibility for directing the war themselves. They abandoned Mao's guerilla and mobile warfare tactics and went in for positional warfare and defensive tactics. Although the Red Army did win a few battles, they were defeated in most cases, Chiang began gradually occupying their bases and it became impossible to defend their main base and Soviet area in Kiangsi. Only one lakh remained out of a total of three lakhs in the Red Army. In this situation, in October 1934, the decision was taken under Mao's leadership to leave Kiangsi and undertake the "long march" over 12,000 Kilometres.

On 6 January 1935, during this "long march", the Red Army occupied the Tsunyi city and there at a special session of the Party Polit Bureau the Leftist leadership was made to resign. Mao Tse-tung was elected to highest leadership and his policy was accepted.

China's Party history teaches us that Rightist thinking, Leftist adventurism and petit-bourgeois revolutionism were responsible for repeated deviations from the correct Marxist-Leninist policy and they endangered the existence of the revolution. For fifteen years Mao had to stand on the basis of Marxism-Leninism and through ceaseless revolutionary work and severe ideological fighting had to combat those two dangerous trends. It was through this long-drawn out conflict over theory and practice that Marxism-Leninism and Mao's Thought could be consolidated.

## **9. COMRADE CHARU MAZUMDAR AND TRADE UNION**

Charubabu has created tremendous confusion among Communist revolutionaries by his numerous, contradictory statements about economic struggle. He would say at one that: "If one agrees that a revolutionary situation exists in

India, one also has to agree that the task in today's India is to build up a secret revolutionary party and not *mass organisation*. It is this secret party organisation that will lead the class struggle. We must remember the words of the Chairman : "Never forget about class struggle". We will not remain within mass organisations like trade unions, peasant Samitis etc. through which the people wage their mass struggle (since if we remain there, we will be ensnared by revisionism!) but do not forget class struggle. We shall only build a secret party- "This secret party organisation will lead the class struggle !" Do not go into mass organisations, do not take any responsibility for the day-to-day struggle of the masses but simply preach class struggle among them, build a secret party and start guerilla warfare- and the masses will join us.

Guerilla warfare is an advanced level of class struggle and it is puerile to think of reaching this more advanced stage through by-passing lower stages. This does not mean that guerilla warfare should not be started where the situation is ripe for it. Certainly it should be started there. But to strengthen those wars, to achieve victory for them it is necessary to have countrywide powerful democratic movements in their support and economic as well as political struggle. Lenin, Stalin and Mao have said again and again that not thousands or lakhs but millions of people must actively strive to make the revolution successful. Mass organisations of workers, peasants and students are essential for mobilising the vast masses and the task of revolutionaries is to assume responsibility for directing these mass organisations. That is why Mao commanded: "Build up firmly class based trade unions". The "revolutionary" party that Charubabu talks of in utter disregard for such lessons, is certainly not a Marxist-Leninist revolutionary party, whatever else it may be.

It is crass irresponsibility to say that we shall not engage in economic struggle, trade unions, Krishak Samitis in a country like India where most workers peasants do not get even one square meal a day and no education, where economic struggle is so necessary because capitalists, landlords, jotedars and moneylenders so openly and massively exploit the masses. Snobbery about such things is a characteristic of petit-bourgeois revolutionaries in all countries.

After having said that mass organisations and trade unions will be avoided, Charubabu suddenly came out with: "*We shall not engage in movements for economic demands but we do not say that political propaganda and political party formation is not our first and main task*" (*Deshabrati*, 4 September 1969).

This is another example of Charubabu's many self-contradictory statements. He will not go in to mass organisations or trade unions, but how then is he to organise an economic struggle in the vacuum? Charubabu sees economic and political struggles as two separate and contradictory aspects: he does not see that the two are inextricably joined together and mutually interlinked. This is eclectic thinking and eclecticism is always opportunist and anti-Marxist.

No doubt that as in other capitalist countries, in India too most trade unions are under the control of some corrupt, economist, opportunist, revisionists. These

trade union leaders believe in class cooperation and are agents of the owners. To say that the revolutionary party will not engage in trade unions is tantamount to escaping from the battlefield with the entire working class left to the wolves. A more serious problem is that the Indian working class is divided up into a number of conflicting unions. What does this situation in the trade unions prove? It proves that the impact of revolutionaries on the working class is very limited. If this is the condition of the working class, then how is the working class to lead the peasant movement in the national liberation movement? (Of course, Charubabu seldom talks of working-class leadership as he does not believe in it, still, it looks bad if he does not occasionally refer to it, so he does his duty by a few ritual mentions.)

Indian trade unions had developed in a militant manner and the heritage of the revolutionary struggle of the Indian working class is quite substantial. As an example, we may consider the historic labour movement of 1928. A strike wave spread all over India and five lakh workers from the big industries of those days joined it. Workers from Bombay, Nagpur and Sholapur Cotton Mills, Calcutta Jute Mills, the Tata Iron & Steel Works at Jamshedpur, the East India Railway, Calcutta Corporation, Lillooah Railway Workshop and many other industries from one end of the country to another joined the strike. In Bombay one and half lakh workers of the Gimi Kamgar Union under Communist leadership continued the strike for six months against the exploitation by Indian and British capitalists in the cotton textile mills despite the savage repression and lathi charge by the police and the army. (Due to the revisionist policy of the leaders, that revolutionary Gimi Kamgar Union in Bombay which used to be the centre of activities of all-India leaders like Ranadive-Dange-Adhikari and Mirajkar is now the centre of violent, fascist operations of the Shivsena.) In this context we should also mention the eight month long strike of the Lillooah railway workers and the six month long strike at Bauria and some other jute mills. Muniram and some other labour leaders of Lillooah were given ten year prison sentences (Bijon Sen, "Bharater Communist Partir Ruprekha," *Kalpurush*, Nos. 4-5, 1969).

It was in 1928 that the Comintern gave the following instructions to the CPI- (1) working class and peasant leadership in the anti-imperialist struggle will have to be strengthened and unified, (2) the Communist Party must be strengthened, (3) the masses should be liberated from reformism and bourgeois influence, (4) trade union work must be emphasised. *"The essential task of Indian Communists in organising trade unions of workers are (a) to expose the real nature of the national reformist leadership marciallessly, (b) to drive out reformists from trade unions in order to build them up as the true class organisation of the workers and in their place to take in revolutionary representatives with firm determination from among the working masses."*

The Indian Party never obeyed these instructions, either then or now. Even Charubabu now considers these instructions to be dated.

But just at that time, following this Marxist policy, Mao was forming the Red Army with Communists and under working-class leadership on the Chingakang mountains and establishing Soviet liberated areas.

Even at later times, waves of militant labour movement had swept over India. At Sholapur, workers had even set up a commune but due to the betrayal of the revisionist leadership such movements never achieved fruition. Muzaffar Ahmed once came out with a significant statement about the 1928 labour movement and its revolutionary potentialities: *"In 1928 a wonderful opportunity had arrived to transform the CPI into a powerful Communist Party through a workers' (!!!) struggle. A vast number of workers (!!!) had the chance to join the Party. Workers (!!!) had become conscious about the political party on account of the speeches during the strikes. At that time our influence had reached even the ordinary labouring masses. If we had started work then, a large number from their ranks would have joined our Party"* (Communist Party Garar Pratham Yug, p.32).

Just as that "work", the work of bringing a large number of revolutionary workers into the Party, had not been done "then", at later times too it was not done after Muzaffar Ahmed and others built up the "Marxist" Party. Both the CPI and CPM leaders deliberately did not take in revolutionary workers into their Parties. As a result, the two Parties had become petit-bourgeois and Kulak parties. The CPI(M-L) formed by Comrade Charu Mazumdar too has very few worker revolutionaries. He has repeatedly stated that he was going to have a village-based party with "poor and landless peasants". Therefore he would not engage in mass organisations or trade unions- this is the natural result of his anarchist political outlook. .

Charubabu is raising the slogan innumerable times-"Do not forget the mass line." Do not engage in trade unions, peasant Samitis or any form of mass organisation but engage in class struggle, apply the mass line! We do not have the key to the magic as to how one can have class struggle without mass organisation.

Another slogan of Charubabu is- "Serve the masses". What does that mean? - Massaging their limbs? He has never explained anywhere as to how one can serve the masses. It is just an empty phrase with him as "engage in class struggle" is. Mao has talked of serving the people but in his opinion that means participating in their day-to-day struggle, to wage economic struggle, to provide for education through which political consciousness can reach a higher level. Charubabu has no faith in any of this. He just wants the formation of a secret party and guerilla warfare.

In explaining why they do not engage in trade union work Charubabu and his associates argue that at the time of Marx, Lenin and Stalin the trade unions were necessary as an elementary class association and centre for education. But there is no longer any such need. Now trade unions are old fashioned, they have turned into their "opposites" as bases of reaction, capitalists are using them as their weapons, they are working against working class interests and so on. They entirely ignore the fact that trade union matters there is a big divergence between the aims of revisionist union leaders and the aims of ordinary workers within the union.

Such anti-Marxist-Leninist and anti-Maoist ideology has been beautifully expressed in the writings of an Australian revolutionary and this piece has been published in both *Liberation* (Aug '69) and *Deshabrati* of Charubabu's group. The

author says: "In Australia trade unions and parliamentary politics are the two main obstacles that are responsible for the working class and other labourers' deviation from the path of revolution...30 lakh Australian workers are members of these trade unions... This gives rise to the notion that trade unions and parliamentary politics can lead to social change through constitutional means. (What an awful discovery!!!)... Today capitalists need such trade unions. These constitute a burden for the working class and we do not want to add to it." Then he advises avoiding trade unions and engaging in revolutionary politics. "Our task is not to strengthen trade union organisations for this strengthens the capitalists rather than the working class. Our task is to smash the trade unions through Marxism-Leninism and the Thought of Mao." The idea is that workers should boycott trade unions but at the same time trade union bureaucracy has also to be destroyed, that is all very well, but how is this to be done? By hitting the bureaucrats on the head from outside? The second question is; after getting rid of the bureaucrats what happens to the trade unions? Should they be smashed up as well? There is no reply to these real questions. This is an example of Bakuninite, negative, petit-bourgeois revolutionism. And such anarchist ideas are being circulated in the name of Marxism-Leninism and the Thought of Mao!

*Liberation* and *Deshabrati* had taken this Australian article from the journal *World Revolution*. This journal had published another article side by side with the Australian one. The latter criticised trade union work, while the former was written by the Ceylonese Party leader Comrade Sammugnathasan in support of trade unions. *World Revolution* was correct in publishing both views as both exist among revolutionaries of different countries and both badly require discussion. *Deshabrati* and *Liberation* had previously published many articles by Sammugnathasan but it did not publish this one. They have also published many articles from PL(*Progressive Labour*), the journal of American revolutionaries, but not those on trade union programmes or to the reply to the Australian article. *Deshabrati* did not publish Lindar's reply to the Australian article which appeared in the PL (*Laljhanda's* 7th and 8th issues came out with Lindar's article). The reason for this surely is that Charubabu's group is unwilling to enter into any polemics about ideology and they want to impose their opinion on the comrades in a bureaucratic manner. This bureaucratic manner is evident in their handling of peasants', workers' and as well as students' organisations.

Even on a crucial question like the elections, we found the same bureaucratic note. There were two groups of opinion among Indian revolutionaries on that question- one was in favour of election boycott and the other supported participation in elections. Marxists have used both tactics, choosing either of them at times according to the circumstances. Lenin had boycotted elections in one situation and in a different situation, had taken part in it. This is the correct way, since Marxists should make concrete analysis of a concrete situation and then decide on their tactics. And here we find ideological conflict among Marxists. Opportunity has to be provided for a discussion of both the views, comrades have to discuss



both at every level and then take a decision. But the Coordination Committee did not do so. The boycott decision was imposed in a bureaucratic manner from above and leaders also used many dishonest devices to enforce this decision. The article that Stalin once wrote in support of election boycott in Russia appeared in the *Deshabrati*, but it remained silent about all the later articles that he had written advocating participation in elections. Is this not extreme opportunism?

There is another issue. What does the statement mean that "there was a need for trade union in Marx's time but there is none today"? Does this not mean that the capitalism that existed in Marx's time has ceased to exist today and capitalist exploitation, too, is at an end? Does this not ask us to revise Marxism?

They have also discovered another startling "argument". "We are now at the stage of mass war, not at the stage of ordinary mass struggle." (Satyanarayan Sinha, *Deshabrati*, 28 August, 1959). Charubabu's group no longer sees any difference between economic struggle ( trade union ) and revisionism. That is why Sinha roars that he will never allow us "to direct present armed struggles in India along the old blind alley of economic struggle". Our humble question to the violent revolutionary Comrade Sinha ( as well as to Charubabu) is: Are you the first to engage in armed struggle in this world? Had Marx never heard of armed struggle ? Did Lenin, Stalin or Mao never engage in it? Not only did they engage in it but they were also victorious. They could be victorious mainly because of the fact that as soon as they entered the "old" mass organisations, they had followed the Marxist revolutionary policy of economic and political struggles and also had fought against revisionism and opportunism. That is why a fundamental lesson of Marxism is that the working class cannot be detached from democratic and economic struggle and then put to the service of the revolutionary movement. Lenin had said in his Left Wing Communism that the first task of the party is to "initiate the vanguard of the working class in Communism" and that its second task is to bring over the vast masses of workers and peasants to the side of this vanguard, the Party. Lenin, Stalin and Mao had proved that the only way to do this was to work through mass organisations. Has the situation in India changed so radically, has capitalism disappeared from India that the lessons taught by Marx, Lenin, Stalin and Mao about class struggle and workers' revolution have become old fashioned and invalidated?

Charubabu's group talks all the time about the fight against revisionism. But where is this fight to take place? Should this significant battle be waged through phrase-mongering, or should it be extended to all those spheres where revisionists influence the vast masses by their reactionary ideas- that is, to trade unions, to peasant Samitis and to students' unions? Have not Marx, Lenin, Stalin and Mao repeatedly instructed us that we have to work wherever these vast masses are present? Did Mao Tse-tung not instruct Chinese revolutionaries that work must be done among "yellow" trade unions even in areas of white terror under Chiang, making use of whatever legal scope was offered there? Whether within the unions or outside them, if a day-to-day ideological struggle against revisionist labour

leaders can be waged through work then the working class will become aware of their longterm objectives and will become conscious.

Certainly there is the danger that excessive involvement in day-to-day trade union work may lead to the possibility of neglecting politics, of thinking exclusively in terms of trade union struggle, or becoming a part of capitalist corruption. Communist revolutionaries must be careful about such dangers and consciously fight them. On the other hand, such work provides enough scope for learning from the workers, to take Marxism-Leninism and the Thoughts of Mao to them and to earn the experience of waging class struggle against the exploitation of owners. So one cannot argue that trade union work should be avoided because of the risks that go with it. Sell-out is not inevitable if one takes part in struggles for immediate economic demands of trade unions. If that had been the case then the teachings of Marx, Lenin, Stalin and Mao would have been proved wrong. The Russian and Chinese revolutions have proved the validity of Marxism-Leninism.

When Mao was engaged in armed struggle against Chiang in the revolutionary situation in China and was establishing liberated zones and revolutionary bases, he sent out a call to strengthen the countrywide democratic movement: *"It is now necessary to start a political and economic struggle in the interests of democracy and in order to make the powerful revolutionary tide sweep over the whole country"* (*Struggle in the Chingkang Mountain*, 1928, Vol-I, p. 99).

And Charubabu says: *"If one acknowledges the existence of a revolutionary situation in India, one also has to accept that the task of today is to build up a revolutionary party organisation, and not a mass organisation."*

There is a fundamental difference in the two points of view—one is the Marxist viewpoint of the working class and the other is the anarchist point of view of the petit-bourgeoisie.

## 10. THE REVOLUTIONARY POLITICS "FROM OUTSIDE" OF CHARU MAZUMDAR

Charubabu's group says: *"The working class will never realise the necessity of peasant revolution through its movement for economic demands. It must be taught this necessity from outside the trade unions. For this we need revolutionary worker cadres who are trained in political education and the Thought of the Chairman. Such cadres are prepared through the organisation of the secret party"* (*Comradeder Prati O Anyanya Rachana*, p. 39).

Such statements may sound quite revolutionary but they constitute petit-bourgeois revolutionism, not Marxism-Leninism. At the start of the revolutionary movement in Russia and during the first phase of the Bolshevik Party building, Lenin had discussed in his book *What is to be Done* (1902) the process of taking revolutionary theory and consciousness "from outside" to the labour movement. Charubabu has distorted this famous statement in order to establish a anti-Leninist theory.

At that time the trend towards economism and revisionism in labour and socialist movements had become powerful in Russia as in European capitalist

countries. Lenin had then stated that an exclusive and perfect trade union or economic movement does not give birth to revolutionary theory. Revolutionary theory, that is, the theory of working-class revolution, of the seizure of state power, of the establishment of proletarian dictatorship, has to be brought to the working class from outside. One has to stay with them too, to share in the day-to-day struggles and assume responsibility for them; and through these means the spontaneous economic, trade unionist consciousness of the workers has to be transformed into revolutionary consciousness and the genuine trade union movement. It is in this way that worker cadres will assimilate revolutionary theory and prepare themselves for leading the working-class revolution.

Lenin had stated in this context: *"No revolutionary movement can exist without a revolutionary theory."* We see in the history of most countries that at the first stages of the labour movement, the movement and socialist theory develop separately and independently. But that cannot remain separate for very long as one cannot progress very far without the other. The task of revolutionary Marxists is to inextricably bind together the socialist movement and the spontaneous labour movement (economic movement). It is through the mutual relationship between theory and practice that the working class leadership in the democratic and socialist revolution emerges in our time.

It happened in this manner not only in Europe but also in Asia. *"In China Marxism-Leninism first spread extensively among primarily intellectuals and young students"* (Mao, Vol.II, p. 322). In India too, revolutionary intellectuals were the first to accept Marxism-Leninism and they began to take it to the working class.

Lenin had also stated in this context that trade unions and labour movements develop on the basis of the relationship between the worker and the owner, whereas socialism and revolutionary theory develop on the basis of the relations between the classes and the state, government as well as the mutual relationship among the classes. In reply to the question as to what is to be done at the first stage of the Russian labour movement he had said that the revolutionary theory had to be carried to all classes. The revolutionaries *"must go among all classes of population, they must despatch units of their army in all directions"* (Ibid, p. 422).

Lenin had said that revolutionary theory had to be brought to the workers "from outside" but he never said that workers would be told some revolutionary statement and then the revolutionaries will leave them and again come back, or that they should simply play hide and seek with the workers and "only" engage in building the revolutionary party. In fact he had said just the opposite—that they should come "from outside" but then stay on with the workers, building up a revolutionary "core" from among them. This was done in Russia by the Emancipation Group and the Bolshevik Party and in China the Party also did the same. It was mainly because of this that the revolution had succeeded in Russia and China. In India this was never done at all, and as a result there had been no revolution. Revolution is dependent on cause and effect, it does not happen spontaneously.

When Lenin wrote *What is to be Done*, Russia was at the first stage of the revolutionary labour movement and work was progressing spontaneously through class struggle, strikes etc. and the task of Bolshevik Party building had just started. The entire country was going through a revolutionary phase and within a few years a revolution did take place there. When the people were spontaneously advancing towards the revolution, the revolutionaries were lagging behind on theory and organisation. Lenin had then said that the more the mass and labour movement would progress spontaneously, the more the revolutionaries should concentrate on their task of building up their organisations, and guiding them. If they do not do so, then they will lose their movement and organisations to the influence of the bourgeoisie. That is why Lenin had said that revolutionary theory must be brought from outside by the revolutionaries who then should merge themselves with the workers and carry on organisational activities ceaselessly and permanently. It is in this manner that the revolutionary theory of socialism would come to belong to the working class and the theory itself will be further enriched through the experience of the labour movement.

Therefore *"the worker will have to be taught the politics of peasant revolutions from outside the trade union movement... the task of today in India is to build up the secret party organisation and not mass organisation"*- such a theory of Charubabu is totally opposed to Marxism-Leninism. Such politics "from outside" is the sectarian "Leftist" politics of petit-bourgeois revolutionism, the theory of Bakunin's anarchism.

Who is going to explain the theory of peasant revolution "from outside" to the workers? Comrade Charu Mazumdar says in reply: "For that we need revolutionary working class cadres trained in political education and the Thought of the Chairman and such cadres are prepared only through the secret party organisation." This is sheer petit-bourgeois romanticism. We have to ask- where is the revolutionary working class cadre to come from? Will they fall from the skies or will they come, tested and prepared, to working-class struggle, workers' organisation, etc.? It is through the spontaneous struggles of the working class that a vanguard is set up. If it is trained then this vanguard can provide cadres for the secret or the open Communist Party and organise working-class leadership. Charubabu considers revolutionary theory to be the alternative to class struggle and not its complementary aspect. Thus the theory that he establishes may sound extremely revolutionary but it actually puts the cart before the horse. The progress of revolution stops if it follows the direction of this theory. Revolutionaries are isolated from the people and ultimately they have to take the path of terrorism.

We shall not go in for economic struggle, for mass struggle, we shall only engage in the revolution and set up a secret party- this trend used to exist in Russia as well. It did not escape Lenin's notice that in one field there was a similarity between revolutionaries of this sort and counter-revolutionary economists. He did not hesitate to lash out against them.

Charubabu has supplied an amazing argument to prove how dangerously reactionary trade unions and other mass organisations are. He says: "Those who

work in trade unions have experienced that the workers used to come to the Communist leaders when it was a question of winning economic demands but they used to vote for the Congress during elections". What fantastic revolutionism! Where Marx, Engels, Stalin and Mao had boundless faith and trust in the revolutionary force of the working class, Charubabu has such extraordinary contempt, hatred and lack of trust for the workers. This is not surprising as the instinctive hatred and disbelief of Bakuninite Anarchist, petit-bourgeois revolutionaries towards the working class is beautifully revealed in Charubabu's thinking. The mistake is theirs, but we lay the blame at the door of the working class. Marx never said that the workers are ignorant, they do not understand politics or anything beyond their day to day grievances - these are Bakunin's words.

Charubabu has also said : *"We know that when we were suffering most from revisionism, we had set up many mass organisations and established party units among them. But we had used the party units to complement our trade union activities and therefore we had failed to draw the working class into our politics"*.

Charubabu has perfectly realised that revisionism was responsible for our past mistakes in our work in trade unions, peasant movements and other mass organisations. What then is the remedy? That will be to get rid of revisionism and to take the politics of peasant revolution under working-class leadership to the masses through their organisations. But Charubabu says : *"No, mass organisations are useless."* We should only set up the secret party! This secret party will reach the message of peasant revolution to the workers 'from outside'."

Charubabu considers trade unions and all other mass organisations as revisionist and therefore to be avoided on principle. So far so good. But immediately after this he asks: "If everyone is preoccupied with setting up mass organisations then who is to work for organising the secret party? Can mass organisations accomplish the peasant revolution?" So this become a tactical, and not an ideological issue. The number of our comrades is limited, so should they work in mass organisations, or just in the secret party? This is sheer opportunism of a petit-bourgeois revolutionary to confuse ideological issues with tactical issues. Again Charubabu thinks that the working of party-building in secret and the work in mass organisation are two different even contradictory alternatives. But there is no place for such notions in Marxism-Leninism or the Thought of Mao, although this is the most important characteristic of Charubabu's politics.

The amount of hatred that the leaders of Charubabu's Party have for trade unions, mass organisations etc. is often expressed in their organ *Deshabrathi*. One such example is : *"Truly, who else remains in the Party? Only those remain who are just talking of peasants and revolutionary peasant war as well as guiding it while those who leave the party are those who have devoted themselves, body and soul, to make trade unions blossom with revolutionary cadres"* (31 July, 1969).

It is the aim of the working-class and its Communist Party to seize state power, to demolish the administrative machinery of the exploiting class and to set up dictatorship of the proletariat. It is possible to reach this goal only through armed

struggle and not through the parliamentary politics of revisionism. The people's war is the final phase of class struggle and revolution is its climax. The greatest task of the Communist Party is to prepare the working class organisationally and ideologically so that it can lead this revolution. In the present context of world revolution, the working class cannot afford to restrict itself to its own class organisation, it has also to organise the peasant revolution. It is not possible for a petit-bourgeois revolutionist party to perform this crucial task-only the party of the working class, firmly rooted in Marxism-Leninism and the Thought of Mao can do this.

The more the crisis of capitalism and its state machinery deepens and the mass movement becomes militant, the more the working class realises that it is not able to advance at all without armed forces. The revolutionary politics of the working-class takes it towards armed struggle and forces it to become organised. The peasants too, advance towards armed struggle through their own experience of class struggle. Only the working class guided by the revolutionary Communist Party is capable of performing the great and difficult task of building up armed forces, for this class is the class which is most conscious, militant, well organised and experienced in class struggle. The fundamental power behind the armed forces has to be the working class naturally. Peasants will supply the main force and the revolutionary working class and its Communist Party will direct them. This lesson is valid for all semi-colonial and semi-feudal countries. So Charubabu fully opposes the teachings of Mao when he talks of "peasant leadership" or says that "Our party will have to base itself primarily among the peasants". Instead of directly opposing it he continually spreads anti-Mao theory in the name of the Chairman. The theory that he spreads is the guerilla theory of Che Guevara.

## 11. COMRADE CHARU MAZUMDAR AND THE THEORY OF "PEASANT REVOLUTION"

We saw in the previous chapter that Charubabu's thinking about workers' movement is entirely opposed to Marxism-Leninism and the Thought of Mao. Now let us examine what his ideas are about "peasant revolution" and whether they fit in with Marxism or not.

He has said : *"If the entire peasantry is taken as one class and a mass organisation is set up accordingly then it inevitably becomes a peasants' association led by rich and middle peasants. Apart from this the trend towards open movement will increase among the peasants through open mass organisations and as a result we shall become the leader of another revisionist mass organisation. Only through building a secret party organisation among peasants can the leadership of poor and landless peasants be established within the peasant movement"* (Ghatana Prabaha, May, 1969).

Here Charubabu raises two questions about "peasant revolution" and also answers them- how is that revolution to take place and who is to lead it? Like a *bhadralok*, Charubabu too, is a man of a single idea- just as we are not to work for

mass organisations among workers, so we must also avoid all open mass organisations among peasants. We shall talk about revolutionary theory of them "from outside", we will not go "among" them, since those are all revisionist affairs. But surprisingly enough, although we will not remain within peasant mass organisations or fight about their grievances and demands or take any responsibility, we shall establish the leadership of poor and landless peasants in these organisations through forming a secret party. This is sheer infantile imagination or black magic, having no bearing on Mao's Thought. There is another question in this context - are these mass organisations suspended in a vacuum? If we do not remain within them, will they not come under the sway of revisionist leadership? If that is so then shall we be able to establish our leadership there on poor and landless peasants "just" by forming the secret party while the others look on passively? Is this the theory of class struggle or is it petit-bourgeois romanticism?

The secret party of peasants may be set up. Now what will be the work of this party? Their task will be to engage directly in guerilla warfare. So it is clear that in Charubabu's opinion, guerilla warfare is the only tactic for conducting the revolutionary struggle and the party unit that he will set up with poor and landless peasants will lead "the entire peasant masses". There is nothing about worker-peasant alliance or working class leadership in the peasant movement. At times he does talk formally about working class leadership but his main argument is: "Our party should be set up mainly among peasants" (*Deshabrat*, Autumn Number, 1968). Upto now we used to think that the Communist Party belongs primarily to the working class. No doubt the concept of setting up the party "basically" with peasants is an original contribution of Charubabu. He has used the word "the peasant class" seven times in this context. When did peasants constitute a class for Marxists?

But Mao has taught us that in the revolutionary struggle of the masses, armed warfare is not the "only" tactic, any other means must also be used along with it. But here Charubabu is preaching thoughts opposed to the Thoughts of the Chairman in the name of the Chairman as he does on many other issues. If armed struggle is isolated from the masses then it gets changed into Putschism and its failure becomes inevitable. Armed struggle needs a close relationship with the masses and such a relationship can only be established through trade unions, peasant associations, youth organisations, students' unions etc.

Mao had gone to Hunan Province in China in 1925 (that is, a year before the armed fighting, guerilla warfare and the battle to capture power by peasants had started) to organise the peasants. What was his basic slogan there? "Get Organised" (Mao, I, p.24). We see in the Hunan Report that from January to June all peasants got organised in Peasant Committees under the leadership of the Communist Party. Membership figures were four lakhs, that is, more than ten lakhs peasants came under the leadership of the Communist Party. Peasants had not started the movement for land grab in that phase. They participated in the northern campaign lasting from July to September. The second phase in the peasants struggle started in Hunan after Chiang Kai Shek's betrayal. The land grab movement lasted from October to

January 1927. The membership of Peasant Committees went up to 20 lakhs and 1 million peasants came under the Party's control. Mao had said that this organisation was the "first great contribution" of peasants. The phase of the establishment of Red power in China started from then onwards.

In a previous chapter we had noticed that when the first Red Army was set up in China's Chinggang mountain, the workers were its backbone. When the Red Army began to suffer very heavily under continuous attacks from Chiang's forces, Mao began to ask for workers for the Red Army from the Hunan Provincial Committee of the Party. He had then written : "*Proletarian leadership is the only key to success in the revolution.*" He was then acutely aware that it was vitally necessary for the working class to take an active part in the peasant revolution and that just proletarian leadership or ideology will not suffice. So he stressed more work in the big industrial units of China and the despatch of an increasing number of workers to the Red Army in the villages. He had given maximum emphasis on working class leadership and participation by workers in the peasant revolution in his *A Single Spark can Start a Prairie Fire*.

The "Hunan Report" has been translated into Bengali. Either Charubabu has not read it or he is deliberately neglecting it, revising it and making it out of date. In any case he says the exact opposite of what Mao had said: "*Is guerilla warfare possible without mass movement and mass organisation? The revolutionary peasant class(?) has proved through its struggles that neither is indispensable for guerilla warfare. What is indispensable is revolutionary politics, that is the spread of the Thought of Chairman Mao. This is possible only through a secret party organisation. It is also possible to unite the masses and have guerilla warfare by setting up guerilla squads through secret organisation and using it against the class enemy and by giving top priority to politics... Mass organisations and movements strengthen the trend towards open movements and expose revolutionary workers to the enemy.*"

*Whom can we depend on for guerilla warfare? ...the development and spread of guerilla warfare depend only on poor and landless peasants; no other class can direct this struggle"* (Deshabrati, 4 December, 1969).

Charubabu's message is amply clear- only "poor and landless peasants" will lead his peasant revolution - "no other class can direct this struggle". In other words Charubabu by a single statement, totally discarded the role and leadership of the working class. But to deny working-class leadership in the democratic revolution means denial of Marxism-Leninism and the Thought of Mao. To deny working class leadership, to replace it with petit-bourgeois leadership means Bakuninism or Guevarism of to-day. There is one difference between Guevara and Charubabu. Although the former's politics was wrong, he himself was honest and he never used Mao's name to spread his own politics, whereas Charubabu is spreading Guevara's politics in the name of the Chairman.

Charubabu has provided an "argument" as the reason behind his desire for exclusively poor and landless peasants' leadership but this argument is totally



invalid. He does not care for Marxist logic but he wants to sweep away everyone by Bakuninite will power and emotion. *"Because poor and landless peasants nourish the maximum amount of hatred against the feudal classes...This fire of class hatred can be stoked among poor and landless peasants through revolutionary politics and the politics of seizure of state power by the peasant masses. Only they can develop guerilla warfare by conquering death and accepting boundless self-sacrifice"*.

Since Charubabu has no faith in the revolutionary role of the working class which he denies, then the party that he has set up with the name of Communist Party of India (Marxist-Leninist) is anything but Marxist-Leninist and neither it is a Communist Party. It is but a new edition of the old petit-bourgeois terrorist party of Bengal.

At the beginning Charubabu and his group occasionally used the term "working class" but now it is falling into disuse and in its place they are increasingly using the term "have-nots". For some time they used to say "the class of the have-nots" and now instead of working class only the have-nots are referred to. Proletariat or working class means workers in Bengali, it cannot mean have-nots at all. Actually the working class is not made up of have-nots. The revisionists of India and particularly of Bengal had circulated the term have-not to indicate the working class and it had created a lot of confusion. Bakunin had found revolutionary enthusiasm among vagrant have-nots and he thought that they provided the main revolutionary force. Charubabu knows quite well the difference in meaning between the two terms and he has quite deliberately used the term "have-not" to spread his Bakuninite ideology which is opposed to Marx, Lenin and Mao.

One example will suffice. The *Deshabrati* of 27 November 1969 quotes a statement by Mao in its front page. In English it goes like this: *"Proletarian leadership is the sole key to victory in the revolution. But building a proletarian leadership for the party and setting up party branches in industrial enterprises in key districts are important organisational tasks for the party at present..."* (*A Single Spark*., p. 122).

Charubabu repeatedly says that he is going to build up a village-based party with "the proletarian peasant class". "Our Party has to be set up basically among the peasants"; the working class will not lead the peasant revolution, it will be the poor and landless peasants who will lead it, "no other class can direct this struggle." Actually the landless peasant is proletarian and the poor peasant is practically that. Charubabu and his group are building the basis of their "secret party" with such have-nots. All these things fit each other splendidly and very subtly they have transformed even Mao into a petit-bourgeois revolutionist by using the term "have nots" for "working class".

Recently they have been using another sentimental and unscientific term—that is, the poor. They promise that they will build their party with all the poor brethren in the country. A booklet published by the *Deshabrati*—*"Start an armed struggle against the exploiters and eliminate class enemies"* (10/10/69)—says: *"We the poor brethren have decided to fight and that is why we have decided to build*

*up our own group and our own party. We call out to all field labourers, all poor and middle peasants, blacksmiths, potters, weavers, middle and small shopkeepers, poor teachers and clerks of the locality"-* in other words, to all poor and labouring men to join this party. Everyone from a locality has a place in the party except for the working-class men who work in the factories. Such a party might be everything else except a Marxist-Leninist party. Even Mao Tse-tung has warned us against such petit-bourgeois, sentimental revolutionaries.

Charubabu and his group are forming a village-based party with landless and poor peasants and the poor in general but the working class has not much place there. But they call their party the Marxist-Leninist Communist Party. This is nothing but deceit.

A Marxist-Leninist Communist Party is the party of class-conscious, forward looking workers and led by their scientific socialist ideology. Men from other classes who believe in this ideology and participate in the workers' revolution can also join this party. Long ago Marx and Engels had defined the working class in their "*Communist Manifesto*".

Already Charubabu and his group are demanding that the poor and landless peasants are changing into workers through peasants' struggles: "*Through a bloody class struggle with the landlords and their state they (poor and landless peasants) are getting proletarianised.*" (Satyanarayan Sinha in *Deshabrati*, 25 September 1969). In Algeria poor and landless peasants had waged bloody guerilla warfare and class struggle for ten years. Where else has such a battle taken place except in China and Vietnam? Were the Algerian poor and landless peasants proletarianised through this battle? Even after it won such a war, how could Algeria become a semi-colonial country so quickly? This could not happen in China and Vietnam mainly because there the working class had been powerfully organised by the Communist Parties and could establish their leadership in the democratic revolution.

Charubabu is circulating another term. They are saying that the physical leadership of the working class is not necessary in a peasant revolution, its ideological leadership is sufficient and that they will provide this ideological leadership. If the working-class does not take an active part in the party and the movement then its leadership cannot be established. The main reason why a true Communist Party had not been set up in India is that the number of workers had been negligible there and bourgeois, petit-bourgeois and kulak elements had predominated. Even among them the number of true Marxist theorists was extremely small. The faction set up by Charubabu and others hardly has any workers and within this short time the ideology and the bureaucratic style of work that they have revealed have very little to do with Marxism-Leninism and the Thought of Mao. The ideology that they will bring to the peasant revolution without working class leadership is not Marxist ideology but the ideology of petit-bourgeois revolutionism.

The issues that we have discussed in relation to the peasant revolution are also related to a fundamental question and unless this is always kept in the forefront, the peasant revolution may get distorted.

Poor and landless peasants hanker after land and the ownership of land. This is a legitimate demand in the present situation. Landlords have deprived them of their land and they have been fighting for land for a long time. The programme of the democratic revolution means return of land to their hands. But a democratic revolution also aims at advancing towards socialism where there will be no private ownership of the means of production. Only if there is a strong working class leadership in the democratic revolution and if proletarian dictatorship can be established, can this conflict be resolved and the entire agrarian and industrial system advance gradually towards socialism. But unless the working class leads the democratic revolution, the land problem cannot be solved; if the peasant revolution does occur under poor and landless peasants' leadership as Charubabu wants it to occur then kulak power will be strengthened and as a result the basis for counter-revolution will be established instead of socialism. Only if a strong working class leadership exists, can the poor and landless peasants strengthen themselves against the kulaks.

Peasants and the petit-bourgeoisie have dual character. Collectively they are going through a transition. The better and revolutionary side of most of them wants; a democratic revolution and unity with others: they are prepared to come under the sway of working class politics, organisation and even ideology. They are also prepared to advance towards socialism along with the working class in future. But they also have a bad and regressive side. From the ideological point of view they have many confusing feudal and contradictory elements of thinking which make them weak and vacillating. If they do not get the strong, correct and revolutionary leadership of the working class they may lean towards many forms of opportunism, revisionism and even facism.

Therefore the issue of leadership is the most crucial issue for the united front in a democratic revolution. The success or failure of the revolution, whether it will move towards socialism in the future or strengthen capitalism, depends on which class is going to lead it.

In their "political resolution" Charubabu and others have said: "In the present phase, the main conflict in our country is between feudalism and peasant masses".

This too is one of the many achievements of Charubabu's group. At one stroke of the pen it has totally denied the present state and social system of India, its semi-colonial situation and taken us straight back to medieval time!! India's conflict is "the conflict of the peasant masses under feudalism"- that is, the main conflict of the feudal, not of the imperialist age.

When India was a colony of British imperialism, its support came from feudal chieftains, landlords and the compradore bourgeoisie. When after the British left and India became a semi-colonial and semi-feudal country, the same two classes continued to be the main support and allies of imperialism.

What Mao had said about China in 1926 and Stalin in 1927, is also valid for India today.

In the British age, British imperialism had kept feudalism alive in India. Today this feudalism is kept alive by global imperialism, especially American imperialism.

Feudalism could not have survived in India without the predominance of imperialism. The main ally and support of imperialism is feudalism. They are inextricably linked with each other. one cannot be seperated from the other. If one is dealt a blow the other too is damaged. The twin forces of imperialism and feudalism have jointly exploited the Indian masses and kept alive the present semi-colonial, semi-feudal rotten social system. At every attempt to "eliminate" the jotedar, the police, the army, the entire administrative machinery immediately turn up. In the ultimate analysis what is at the basis of the Indian state machinery? - Imperialism. India is a semi-colonial, semi-feudal country and these two terms indicate the many enemies of Indian people; imperialism and its main ally feudalism. These two forces are the biggest obstacles to India's progress and the first task of the Indian democratic revolution is to destroy these two enemies.

If India is a semi-colonial, semi-feudal country, then Charubabu's definition that "our country's main conflict lies between feudalism and our peasant masses" is dangerously mistaken. If we accept this then the term semi-colonial also becomes meaningless and we have to deny the importance of imperialism in India.

Another question crops up in this context- is feudalism an enemy of peasants alone, and not of the workers? It is true that peasants are directly exploited and opposed by feudalism and they provide the main force for uprooting feudalism. But if they are not directed by working class leadership against feudalism then their leadership falls into the hands of the bourgeoisie and its agents and in that case it will become impossible to liberate them. Even though the working class is not directly exploited by feudalism, it knows that unless feudalism is destroyed along with imperialism their own liberation as well as the liberation of the entire Indian people is impossible and equally impossible will be India's industrial progress and advance towards socialism. The united front that will be formed for the Indian democratic revolution with workers, peasants, the petit-bourgeoisie and the national bourgeoisie will have to be led by the working class. Charubabu's basic theory that India's "main conflict lies between feudalism and the peasant masses" naturally takes them towards building a village-based party under poor and landless peasant leadership. Such theory denies the role of working-class leadership. This is the theory of petit-bourgeois, anarchist "peasant revolution" and not of the democratic revolution formulated by Marxism-Leninism and Mao's thinking.

## **12. THE NAXALBARI MOVEMENT- WHY HAS NOT THERE BEEN A CORRECT ANALYSIS?**

May contradictory statements have come out about the peasant movement in Naxalbari. All the facts of this movement have not been made public so far and neither has there been a Marxist analysis. What Charubabu and other leaders have said about this movement contradict one another. What is even more confusing is that the theory about this movement forwarded by Charubabu is totally irrelevant. Their main theory is that open mass organisations and movements are revisionist and revolutionaries should avoid them. We have already seen that it's theory is

totally anti-Marxist and it has no relevance to any revolutionary movement in any country. The practice in Naxalbari also proves Charubabu's theory to be wrong as the movement in Naxalbari had been an open one and its organisation (that is, the peasant association) too was open.

Charubabu has also said : *"The lesson that the Naxalbari struggle has taught us is that the peasant did not join it for land or crops but to capture state power" ("Reap the harvest from the Indian revolutionary peasant struggle and go forward", Deshabrati, 4 December 1969).* We have to see whether the claim is justified or not.

Comrade Jangal Santhal, a prominent leader of the Naxalbari movement and the Chairman of the Shiliguri Sub-division Peasant Samiti gave a statement on 24 May 1967, which describes how the movement had developed. There we can see that (1) the movement was entirely "open", (2) it developed through an open mass organisation, that is, the Peasant Samiti, (3) it started with economic demands like land and crops, (4) although it was open and based on economic demands, it was not a revisionist movement.

Comrade Jangal Santhal has said in his statement that there is a lot of vested land (Khas land under the Government) in the Naxalbari area which the jotedars tride to hold on to illegally. From 1959 onwards peasants began to cultivate this sort of land. The jotedars tried to evict them forcibly and brought many cases against them. Conflict raged between jotedars and peasants on this issue with the police assisting the jotedars. When the jotedars failed to evict the peasants through legal processes, they began to "sell" a lot of land to their agents. This intensified the struggle over land. *!"The Samyasthan tea garden episode with which attempts are being made to stir up struggle happened as the tea garden owner was trying to evict peasants of twenty years' standing from the vested land and settle newcomers for whom house were being built on the peasants' land. This was leading to struggle. In the Naxalbari episode, conflict began over the attempt to beat up and evict Bigul Kisan, who had got his rights from the Diwani Court...It is noticeable that in the entire area the tea garden authorities and land-owners were trying their best to evict poor peasants with police assistance. If ever the peasant protests, it is described as anarchy. But apart from attacks by jotedars, there is no instance of peasant violence"* (Kalpurush, No.4, 1967).

It is clear from Comrade Jangal Santhal's statement that the Naxalbari movement began as a spontaneous economic movement.

The more the oppression of jotedars intensified with police assistance, resistance by peasants too began to sharpen and their struggle for land began to acquire political dimensions.

Comrade Kanu Sanyal shares with Charubabu the eagerness to deny or underestimate the economic basis of the Naxalbari movement. As a result, Kanubabu is so deeply involved in contradictions that he has been making many ridiculous attempts to save face. Of the ten great tasks of the Naxalbari Peasant Association that Kanubabu mentions in his report, the first four are economic- to

sieze land from jotedars, to distribute land among peasants, to destroy all old documents, plans, deeds etc., to cancel debts of peasants to money lenders and jotedars, to confiscate hoards of rice, cattle etc. of jotedars and to distribute them among peasants. Actually the peasant movement starts from demand for land and other economic demands. This is only natural and should not be denied. But Kanubabu denies this economic aspect and says: "The peasant movement in the Terai is not an armed struggle for land but for state power" (*Report on the Peasant Movement in the Terai*, p. 12 ). All economic struggles are revisionist - a wrong notion such as this is confusing Kanubabu as well as Charubabu.

After a few lines Kanubabu says again: "We all know that every class struggle is a political struggle and the goal of political struggles is the capture of state power." It is not very clear as to what Charubabu and Kanubabu mean by class struggle. They do not talk much of economic struggle, but is it not class struggle? Also, where did Kanubabu learn that the goal of all political struggles is to seize state power? Do revisionists and opportunists also not engage in political struggle and is the aim of such politics the capture of state power?

Comrade Kanu Sanyal has also said: "Without this [revolutionary] consciousness the struggle for land, however militant, is a militant economist movement. A militant movement for land creates opportunism within the peasant movement and plunges the great and struggling part into despair as had happened in the movement about benami land. So this militant economist movement ultimately loses its way in the blind alley of revisionism" (*Ibid*, p.14). Kanubabu, like Charubabu confuses economism with economic struggle. A militant movement for land does not create opportunism by itself, that depends on the leaders controlling the movement. If opportunists are in control then the movement degenerates into economism, and if Marxist revolutionaries are in control then it is transformed into a struggle to seize state power. Examples of both kinds abound in history. In the words of Lenin (which we have quoted earlier), in a crisis situation an economic struggle can be transformed into a political and revolutionary movement. It all depends on the leadership.

Just because revisionists and reactionaries called the Naxalbari movement merely a struggle for land by peasants, it is also ridiculous to protest by calling it entirely a struggle to capture state power. Actually the Naxalbari movement began as a militant peasant struggle for land, but it was gradually transformed into a political movement through struggle. But it could not become a movement for the capture of state power due to the mistakes of Charubabu and others.

How did this militant peasant struggle for land advance towards revolution? After the 1959 Peasants' Conference a struggle for land was launched in this area under the leadership of the 'Marxist' Party. In the 1967 general elections Jangal Santhal stood as a CPI(M) candidate and lot of revolutionary propaganda was done among the peasants. Before the elections were over the struggle became extremely intense. The jotedars killed some peasants like Shobhan Ali, Ishan Ansari, Bigul Kisan and some others. Peasants began to prepare for battle against the jotedars.

Comrade Kanu Sanyal has beautifully described this in his report: *"Between the end of March and April 1967 almost all the villages were organised. Where the membership of Krishak Sabha never was more than 5000, even there membership figures shot up to nearly 40,000. From 15 to 24 thousand peasants became wholtime activists. Krishak Samitis were formed in every village. At incredible speed revolutionary peasants set up Krishak Samitis through hundreds of meetings and made them into armed bands of village volunteers"* (Ibid, p. 17 ).

The United Front won the elections and formed its ministry. The United Front Government, especially the Minister for Land Reforms, Harekrishna Konar, declared their policy of giving land to landless peasants and organising movements against exploitation. But these promises were not fulfilled. Promode, Harekrishna and other leaders arrived on the scene of action but instead of assisting this movement they tried to suppress it and made no moves towards stopping the oppression of the police and the jotedars.

*"On 18 March 1967 the Shiliguri Subdivision Peasants' Conference declared (1) obey the instructions of the Krishak Samiti in all village matters, (2) organise with arms to crush the resistance of the jotedars, (3) break up the jotedar's monopoly over land and start redistribution through Krishak Samitis"* (Ibid, p.6).

On 24 May Jangal Santhal's ( the Chairman of the Krishak Samiti ) statement was published. On 25 May the Jallianwallabagh massacre was repeated- the police of Harekrishna and the United Front Government savagely murdered 10 women and children. In this way, the peasant struggle that had started off as an economic movement was gradually transformed into an armed peasant struggle and a revolutionary struggle against the reactionary government.

Comrade Kanu Sanyal has further stated that the Naxalbari peasants had overthrown feudalism and "had established the political power of the peasants by setting up local revolutionary committees in every locality and a central revolutionary committee... the leadership of this struggle was naturally in the hands of the most militant section of the peasantry- the landless peasants. That the scope of such revolutionary activities could become so far-flung and extensive was due to the fact that among the peasantry 70 percent of the landless peasants led this struggle" (Ibid, p. 9-10 ). "In their own localities they had set up a new political power based on armed revolutionary forces, that is, rule by the revolutionary peasant committee was established" (Ibid, p.13).

Kanubabu is making two claims here quite forcefully : (1) the peasants had overthrown feudalism, (2) they had set up their political power. Undoubtedly, as a result of the peasant revolt, most jotedars and mahajans had fled from the villages, the peasants had occupied land and had set up some sort of rule in the villages. But are these sufficient for seizing political power? The centre of the political power of the ruling class in the countryside are police stations. Were those attacked and destroyed? No, those were untouched. At most, their operations were much more restricted than earlier. Enemy penetration is impossible in a liberated area and in that sense no liberated areas had been set up although this movement had

aimed at that. Therefore, is it not an exaggerated and unreal claim to say that political power had been captured?

There is another question. This was a movement that had achieved so much, had brought a reawakening among Indian revolutionaries and masses, had organised 40,000 peasants and armed a large number of them, the movement that had shown the true way to democratic revolution. But despite the existence of a revolutionary situation in India, such a revolutionary movement could not spread to other areas and died down within a few months without a fight. Why did this happen?

Comrade Kanu Sanyal has also asked this question and tried to answer it: *"Even though our defeat is temporary, why have we failed to advance the struggle of the heroic Terai peasants? It is because we lacked a powerful party organisation, and a deep confidence in the masses, the failure to develop a powerful mass base, total ignorance about military matters and thinking along old lines, and only a formal analysis of the task of seizure of state power and revolutionary land reform"* (Ibid, p. 17).

*"We failed to take the struggle firmly to a higher phase because we failed to have a firm confidence in the masses and to build up a powerful mass base. Between April and September 1967 the heroic peasant masses organised themselves at a fantastic speed, set up the revolutionary Peasant Committee, performed ten great tasks and took class struggle forward at a tremendous speed. But now we fully admit that we had no confidence in them..."*

*"Even though we said otherwise from April to September, actually our petit-bourgeois leadership had imposed itself on the masses. Whenever the heroic peasant masses tried to do something on their own, we the petit-bourgeoisie prevented it. This was because we did not understand the work of the people and neither did we try to understand it"* (Ibid, p. 19).

"We had failed to take up the struggle of the heroic Terai peasants"- only Comrade Kanu Sanyal had so openly admitted this failure. But even he has not really analysed the reasons for the failure and neither has he shown the way to their remedy.

In his opinion the first reason was the lack of a powerful party organisation; but a party should have emerged through a revolutionary movement like the Naxalbari movement. Why did such a party not come into being despite the presence of all the ingredients and such a great opportunity? This was because of the wrong politics of Charubabu and other leaders that ran counter to Marxism-Leninism and the Thought of Mao, their Bakuninite petit-bourgeois revolutionist politics. It is not possible to build up a strong party by following such wrong politics. They have not corrected this wrong politics even now.

A burning example would be the mass meeting at the Calcutta Maidan of 1 May of this year. Not just the Coordination Group but all other Naxalites had gathered there. When at the instigation of the treacherous leaders of the "Marxist" Party their goondas attacked the Naxalites, then all Naxalites had resisted it and had defeated that hateful conspiracy. Kanu Sanyal declared the set up of the Marxist-



Leninist Party from the forum of that meeting. The call of 1 May is "Workers of the world, unite". But Kanu Sanyal did not utter this call for unity, although the most crucial task then (as now) was to unite all Communist revolutionaries. How can those who cannot unite Communist revolutionaries of the same way of thinking, those who do not have the outlook for performing this elementary task and rise above petit-bourgeois sectionalism, build a "powerful" party and direct a revolution with lakhs and millions of people?

At the 1 May Maidan meeting the aggressive, arrogant and narrow outlook that Comrade Kanu Sanyal expressed was totally opposed to the set-up of a "powerful" party. He had said: "Even though the revolutionary situation in our country is extremely ripe and the people have a revolutionary outlook and boundless loyalty to the great leader Chairman Mao and the Communist Party of China, middle-class revolutionism in various shades is springing up all over India taking advantage of these factors. Whatever they do, consciously or unconsciously they are creating obstacles in the way of the advance of the revolutionary struggle by denying the control of the revolutionary party, which is a major condition for the revolution. This is a trend within the revolutionary movement. We shall have to fight against this trend and mobilise the true revolutionaries around our party" (*Deshabrati*, 8 May 1969).

What emerges clearly from Kanubabu's words is that Kanubabu and Charubabu and such others have established a monopoly over the revolution. If anyone else talks of the revolution, then it is the upstart middle-class revolutionism in many shades and those who talk about it are all counter-revolutionaries. What is the meaning of acknowledging the control of the "revolutionary party" that they had set up in an undemocratic, un-Marxist and bureaucratic manner? It does not mean the acceptance of certain principles or any programme (this "Party" has not provided any programme!). To accept the personal "control" of certain individuals means the abandoning of the ideological struggle, of Marxism-Leninism and the Thought of Mao. The "Party" set up by Charubabu and Kanubabu and others by accepting the bureaucratic control of certain individuals has actually become a tremendous obstacle to the building of a "powerful" Communist Party.

According to Comrade Kanu Sanyal, the second reason behind the failure to take the Naxalbari movement forward was the "petit-bourgeois leadership" of the movement. This is no new discovery as this has been an old characteristic of all the Communist and Leftist parties of India. The problem is how to remove this weakness and establish working-class leadership over the democratic revolution. But there is no sign of removing this weakness by the "Marxist-Leninist" leadership. The lack of faith and respect that these leaders have for the working class and the way in which they talk about a village-based party with poor and landless peasants, the un-Marxist manner in which they had set up the "Party" and the dramatic way in which Kanubabu himself declared it at the Maidan meeting, that is, "imposed it on the masses"- all these expose the character of their "petit-bourgeois leadership" and their politics of petit-bourgeois revolutionism.

Kanubabu's third reason is: "We had failed to take the struggle firmly to a higher phase because we lacked a deep faith in the masses and could not build up a powerful mass base... We now fully admit that we had no confidence in them". Confidence in the masses is not something subjective, it has to be established through day-to-day work. We shall not engage in economic movements or trade unions, or peasant associations or students' unions in the interests of the masses- no powerful mass base can ever develop by following such negative, petit-bourgeois revolutionist politics. The mass line that Charubabu talks about is merely petit-bourgeois phrase- mongering.

The fourth reason is: "Our failure in the task of establishing political power and revolutionary land reform... The revolutionary peasants at their own initiative and through mass mobilisation had performed two tasks, which were forming central and local revolutionary peasant committees and redistribution of land. We had made of these two tasks the most formal of all. Our petit-bourgeois dreams were working behind this. We never seriously considered the deep significance of these two tasks" (Ibid, p. 23-24). It is clear from Comrade Kanu Sanyal's words that the leaders of the Naxalbari movement had become isolated from the masses and this had happened because of wrong and petit-bourgeois revolutionist politics. In this context one has to accept a fundamental tenet of Marxism-Leninism and the Thought of Mao which is that there is a qualitative difference between the revolutionary economic movement and economism and that all economic movements are not revisionist. If Charubabu and Kanubabu had followed this Marxist tenet then they would not have "neglected the task of revolutionary land reform" during the Naxalbari movement.

Charubabu and others had failed to take the revolutionary Naxalbari movement forward because of wrong politics. Their petit-bourgeois revolutionist politics has become even more blatant to-day.

The peasant movement in the Naxalbari area became quiet by September. There were no attempts at correcting the mistakes through self-criticism, reviews and criticism. Charubabu and others spread the word that tremendous preparations were going on in Naxalbari and soon guerilla warfare would spread far and wide. Before anything could happen *Deshabrati* declared with a great fanfare that the "second phase" of the Naxalbari movement was about to commence. On 7 September 1968 Comrade Babulal Biswakarmakar fought singlehandedly and heroically and lost his life in a fight with the police. This was the beginning and the end of the "second phase".

During the period of the "second phase", Comrade Sushital Roy Choudhury suddenly came out with the following statement: "The history of the nine months under the United Front Ministry is just this that they had crushed the Naxalbari peasant movement and had very faithfully performed the task of a watch dog of imperialism, Soviet social revisionism and the interests of feudal and bureaucratic compradore capital" (*Deshabrati*, 25 January 1970). In the next issue the "mistake" was corrected - one should read it as "the attempt to crush"!

Two years after the Naxalbari movement had quietened down, the truth which had been concealed so far came out willingly, or unwillingly in a *Deshabrati* report. But even here the arrogance of petit-bourgeois revolutionism was boundless "The armed peasant struggle in the Darjeeling district after a long silence had plunged into the soil of Dinajpur most forcefully, crossing the boundaries of Darjeeling...Above all this is guerilla warfare under poor-peasant leadership [The news that was given out showed that the peasants had "eliminated" one jotedar-such is guerilla warfare]. They have applied the respected Comrade Charu Mazumdar's teaching - we can build up a guerilla organisation today without a mass organisation- and through this they have forcefully exposed middle-class vacillation about "action" and revisionist thinking about setting up mass organisation without guerilla warfare" (*Deshabrati*, 18 September 1969).

The most crucial question about the Naxalbari movement was- how far was an attempt made to establish working class leadership over the movement? Workers have a long tradition of militant struggle against tea and cincona estate owners in Darjeeling, Jalpaiguri and the Dooars. The close links between the workers and peasants of this area too have a long history. In August 1966 almost 2 lakhs of workers went on strike in Darjeeling and the Dooars and in many cases the workers had also advanced towards armed struggle. Just afterwards, in November the peasants began a battle for the harvest against the jotedars. There would have been no difficulty from any side to establish a worker-peasant militant alliance and working-class leadership in this area.

When the Naxalbari movement began, workers from some tea-estates spontaneously went on strike in its support, ignoring the opposition from their revisionist and opportunist leaders. Comrade Kanu Sanyal has said that the tea garden labourers "occupied a place in the front ranks of the peasant struggle. From 24 May 1967 onwards they had armed themselves and had participated in every fight and had gone on strikes. Despite opposition from so-called Communist trade union leaders they had helped the Terai peasant struggle and the tea garden workers to escape from the quagmire of exclusive trade unionism and economism. It was from this anti-feudal struggle that the front based on worker-peasant alliance under tea workers' leadership had developed" (*Ibid*, p. 15).

There is no doubt that bands of workers had spontaneously come forward in support of the peasants. The revisionist leaders of their Union were cornered and in the heated atmosphere of the peasant revolt these leaders ceased to have any influence. So this was a wonderful opportunity for the establishment of working-class leadership. But Charubabu and others made no attempts at all in that direction. On the contrary, one can even say that they deliberately did not try to exploit the situation because of their wrong politics of petit-bourgeois revolutionism.

It was on the question of leadership that Comrade Kanu Sanyal had tried to create a lot of confusion by saying many contradictory things. "The peasants had established political power" (*Ibid*, p. 9). "The leadership in the struggle was in the hands of 70% of landless peasants" (*Ibid*, p. 10). "Peasants had set up the rule of

the revolutionary peasant committee", (*Ibid*, p. 13). A crucial aspect of this struggle was the support from the tea garden labourers and others from the working classes. That meant further intensifying of the struggle by setting up a united front in the anti-feudal struggle. The struggle of the heroic Terai peasants had solved this problem" (*Ibid*, p.15).

"A front based on true worker-peasant alliance and under tea-workers' leadership had developed from this anti-feudal struggle" (*Ibid*, p. 15). "The problem of leadership of this front has been solved...it will be led by the party of the proletariat" (*Ibid*, p. 16).

"In actual fact the workers and peasant comrades were working under petit-bourgeois leadership and in every locality the party organisation was inactive". (*Ibid*, p. 18). "We the petit-bourgeois leadership in the struggle had actually imposed ourselves on the masses" (*Ibid*, p. 19 ).

At the same time that landless peasants led the Naxalbari peasant movement, the worker-peasant front was set up under workers' leadership and the petit-bourgeois leadership imposed itself on the masses - what sort of politics is this? In actual fact the leaders of the Naxalbari movement have only very hazy ideas about leadership, or they had a lot of differences of opinion with some of them formally acknowledging working-class leadership without trying to apply it. Leadership does not emerge in a day; it has to be built up deliberately through struggle. Again, there are some like Charubabu who do not want working-class leadership. Instead of coming out with it directly, they say it in a roundabout manner with special emphasis on peasant leadership, especially the leadership of poor and landless peasants. Charubabu has proudly stated when discussing the lessons of the last two years' peasant movement : "The lesson that we have got from the Naxalbari struggle is that the peasant did not depend on anyone else but he had fought standing on his own legs" ("Come forward by reaping the harvest from the experience of the Indian revolutionary struggle," *Deshabrat*, 4 December 1969).

It cannot be doubted at all that the Naxalbari fight was a heroic one, that it was advancing along the revolutionary Telengana path, that it had struck a severe blow at the vested revisionism of the last twenty years of the Communist Party, that it created great panic among the exploiting classes of India and opened up a new chapter in the Indian democratic revolution. What may be questioned is the correct leadership. What stands out is that because Charubabu and others could not provide correct leadership in the movement, they failed to take it to a higher phase despite its many possibilities. This was the main reason behind its failure.

It is not unusual for leaders to make mistakes in revolutionary movements. But what is unforgivable is not to admit it after criticism and not to rectify it. Three years have gone by but Charubabu and others have not made any criticism and self-criticism about the mistakes of the leadership in the Naxalbari movement. On the contrary, we see that they glorify these mistakes day after day in a planned manner and follow the politics of their petit-bourgeois revolutionism.

What is the meaning of the above statements of Charubabu? Does it not mean that peasants do not depend "on others", that is, on the working class, that they themselves will bring about the revolution? This implies a denial of working-class leadership in the Indian democratic revolution. Also Charubabu always says that he will build up a village-based party with peasants and establish the leadership of poor and landless peasants. Charubabu's theory of petit-bourgeois revolutionism is opposed to Marxism-Leninism and the Thoughts of Mao.

Naxalbari failed, and so did Srikakulam and Debra-Gopiballabhpur because of this adventurist theory.

One can only deceive oneself, distract oneself with slogans like "200 villages liberated near Srikakulam" and "20 liberated village zones set up" near Calcutta etc: The class-enemy is not at all affected by that.

But the Indian democratic revolutionary movement was not exhausted in Naxalbari, Srikakulam, Debra-Gopiballabhpur. The Indian revolutionary crisis is deepening every day. The spark from Naxalbari is spontaneously travelling everywhere, bringing lakhs and millions of peasants, workers and students into the movement and inevitably pushing them in the direction of armed revolution. The problem is which is the way to its preparation- the path of petit-bourgeois revolutionism of Charubabu or the path of Marxism-Leninism and the Thoughts of Mao?

### **13. SOME MORE CHARACTERISTICS OF THE "THOUGHTS" OF CHARUBABU**

A dominant characteristic of the faction called the Indian Communist Party (Marxist-Leninist) is its sky-high arrogance. They have made it known through their writings, conversation, propaganda and behaviour that they have got monopoly rights over the revolution and there are no other Indian revolutionaries except from them. They are not even prepared to acknowledge as revolutionaries those Comrades who had participated in the Telengana peasant movement and other Communist revolutionaries. They consider them all to be counter-revolutionaries. Whoever has any difference of opinion with them are cowardly intellectuals, conservative "pundits", enemy agents, etc. None but they has the right of taking Mao's name. The main reason why all the revolutionary groups of Bengal could not unite was the arrogance of Charubabu and the bureaucratic viewpoint of his group.

Before the Naxalbari episode, they never had much contribution to make in their long party careers either in work or in theory. They spent most of their time in factional politics. They were staunch followers of Ranadive in the Ranadive period. They emerged as revolutionary leaders after the Naxalbari movement. Without having any truck with any kind of warfare they became experts in guerilla warfare. They never tried to overcome their old faults and weaknesses through self-criticism and these increased into arrogance bureaucracy, commandism, imposing decisions from above, etc. Commandism and bureaucracy became

extremely strong among them in the name of "secret party" and "revolution". There was no longer any room for a democratic attitude or self-criticism.

This arrogance has so swelled them up that they do not hesitate to deny history. Charubabu has written, completely denying Telengana : "Naxalbari was the *first* instance of the Thoughts of Mao on Indian soil. It was in Naxalbari the peasant came out for the *first* time on the battlefield to seize power" (*Deshabrati*, 4 September, 1969). He simply dismissed the great historical truth that it was in Telengana that Mao's Thought was *first* applied and the peasants seized power for the first time. It is the irresponsible, petit-bourgeois anarchist who expresses his own arrogance in this manner ignoring historical truth. It seems that Charubabu does not even care for the assessments made by the Chinese Party. Did not the *Peking Review* say when the Naxalbari movement began that "that torch of revolutionary struggle of Telengana has been re-lit in Darjeeling"? It does not seem that Charubabu cares for his own party resolution. His party had said in its "political resolution" - "The executive body of the Andhra Provincial Committee which was then directing the Telengana struggle has correctly stated then that only the path shown by China, that is, the path of peoples war can bring success to the Indian revolution. Even though the Ranadive clique was following a wrong and suicidal policy, the heroic peasant revolutionaries of Telengana did not deviate from the path of fighting. They took their fight forward by adopting guerilla warfare tactics" ("Political Resolution", 20 April '69, *Deshabrati* Publication, p.7). It was in Telengana that Mao's teaching was *first* applied outside China. By following this lesson and under Communist leadership, peasants had set up a truly liberated area over large parts of Telengana and had fought against the powerful enemy for five years in the *true* manner of guerilla warfare. One does not have to belittle the Naxalbari movement to ask whether a truly liberated area had been established in Naxalbari and whether true guerilla warfare had taken place to protect it. Is it not arrogant of Charubabu to distort a revolutionary mass movement and ignore Telengana to give first place to Naxalbari?

Another good example of the petit-bourgeois arrogance of Charubabu and such others is the expulsion of the Andhra Co-ordination Committee from the All India Co-ordination Committee. The Andhra Committee was the strongest among all the others that had been set up in the different Indian States by Communist revolutionaries. It included many comrades who had participated in the Telengana peasant struggle.

On 7 February 1969 at a meeting of All India Co-ordination Committee, the Andhra Committee was expelled in a purely bureaucratic manner. The Andhra Committee was not invited to this meeting and three reasons were shown for its being expelled without having a chance to defend itself : "After discussions with the Andhra Pradesh Co-ordination Committee representative, the All India Communist Revolutionary Co-ordination Committee feels that there are fundamental differences between the All India and Andhra Committees. They have decided therefore to break off relations with the Andhra Co-ordination Committee,

and consider them from now on as friends and comrades outside the All India Co-ordination Committee.

"The difference relates primarily and principally to the question of allegiance to the Chinese Communist Party. The All India Co-ordination Committee thinks that Comrade Nagi Reddi's statement on the Kerala incident and his refusal to modify the same even after the clear and unequivocal statement by the Chinese Comrades reveal that Comrade Reddi and the Andhra Pradesh Co-ordination Committee supporting him are not loyal to the Chinese Communist Party. The second issue concerns a struggle in Srikakulam. The All India Communist Co-ordination Committee feels that this struggle is being given only lukewarm support by the Andhra Committee and is not being regarded as their own struggle. Such an attitude springs from a political line which is basically different from the political line of the All India Committee. The third dispute is about election boycott. The All India Committee considers election boycott to be the basic political line for an entire epoch; the Andhra Committee still regards it just as tactics. The All India Co-ordination Committee had decided that Nagi Reddy should resign within a specific period i.e., by the last week of October 1968. He has not accepted this decision, and this refusal follows from his basic political attitude" (*Deshabrat*, 13 March 1969).

The first comment to be made about this resolution is that Charubabu and two or three other leaders had decided beforehand to expel the Andhra Committee to preserve their own personal, bureaucratic leadership, for the Andhra Committee had raised the demand for democratic centralism. Only an upstart Committee and not any responsible democratic organisation can expel an entire Committee without giving it a hearing on the basis merely of a discussion between one representative and another.

The question of "the Andhra Committee's allegiance to the Chinese Party" has been used in a very cunning and dishonest way. What does "allegiance" mean? The Communist Parties of the different countries of the world are all independent, equal believers in proletarian internationalism. No Communist Party demands the allegiance of a Party of another country. and the Chinese Party certainly does not make any such claim since this is opposed to Marxism-Leninism and the Thought of Mao. If allegiance means ideological allegiance, then it must be stated that long before the Naxalbari events and the emergence of Charubabu and others on the Indian revolutionary, political scene, the Andhra Committee leaders had been following Marxism-Leninism and the Thought of Mao and they had joined the Co-ordination Committee precisely because of this.

Certain facts should be recalled about the Kerala incident which was made the occasion for expelling the Andhra Committee. An armed popular attack was made on Tellichery thana on 22 November 1968 under the leadership of Comrade Kunnikal Narayanan and his daughter Ajitha. (Comrade Narayanan, it must be remembered, had already been expelled from the Co-ordination Committee). Many adivasis lived in the Pulpalli area, and their lands were being grabbed by supporters

of the Congress and the United Front. The UF Government had done nothing about it, and the adivasis had started a movement against such oppression.

After this incident Comrades Charu Majumdar and Nagi Reddi issued two statements condemning it. Charubabu told a *Statesman* correspondent at Siliguri on 27 November: "Isolated attacks on thanas would serve no purpose. The Narayanan group is not working according to the ideals of the Naxalites". Charubabu also stated that the incident could have two interpretations- it may have been staged by the Namboodiripad Government itself or the Central Government may have incited it in order to discredit the Kerala UF Government.

Within a couple of days of this statement, Peking Radio described the incident as an armed struggle of the enraged masses against a reactionary Government. Charubabu naturally accepted the Peking Radio view but he refused to admit that he had made a mistake about the Kerala happening.

On 5 December *Deshabrati* carried a statement from Charubabu entitled "From our special correspondent, Siliguri, 22 November (received late)". The statement within brackets is significant, because Peking had not expressed any view before 27 November. The implication was that Charubabu was giving his own original views when he declared in his statement that "the courage shown by the poor people of Kerala has inspired the revolutionary masses of the whole of India who have acclaimed their action".

Having read the Chinese journals, Charubabu in *Deshabrati* on 26 December wrote pompously : "We have to evaluate who is participating in a particular struggle and against whom the struggle is being conducted...The participants in this revolt was directed against a reactionary state power...Politics has definitely been put in command in the Kerala revolt. The weakness has been that class struggle has not been given sufficient emphasis. Neglect of class struggle makes politics superficial and weakens the entire struggle". The man who had declared mass-organisations, trade unions and Krishak Samitis unnecessary and had talked exclusively of guerilla war was now giving a lecture to the Kerala revolutionaries criticising them for ignoring class struggle and going in for guerilla war alone! It should be noted also that the Charubabu group made no protest when the United Front Government of Namboodiripad brutally tortured the adivasi inhabitants of Pulpalli, Comrade Narayanan, and particularly Comrade Ajitha.

The Andhra Committee had criticised Comrade Nagi Reddi's statement and Comrade Reddi had accepted this criticism. So the first charge has no basis. Again, the statement was made by one Comrade, but an entire Committee was expelled. This was the political style at one time of the terrorist leaders of Bengal. The second charge of the Co-ordination Committee can be described by only one word - impudence. About the third charge it can be stated that the Co-ordination Committee had never taken any decision before on the question whether election boycott was the revolutionary strategy for an entire period or a question of tactics. The Andhra Committee had accepted election boycott and everyone knows that Nagi Reddi had resigned from the Assembly.



What does this arrogant and arbitrary expulsion of the Andhra Co-ordination Committee prove? It proves that the All India Co-ordination Committee which later change its name to CPI(M-L) is only a narrow faction headed by self-appointed leaders who are every bit as bureaucratic, arbitrary and undemocratic as the CPI(M) and CPI leadership. The characteristic feature of the leaders of this faction is that they recklessly carry on all sorts of misdeeds in the name of secrecy. The revolutionaries that they have been able to attract are generally honest but totally inexperienced in the tactics and trickery of the old leaders who have come from the revisionist party. The leaders of the "secret" party are utilising this situation to establish their bureaucratic leadership. To sum up, expulsion on such trivial grounds is a major crime against Marxism-Leninism and the Thought of Mao.

Many feel that when a "revolutionary" party has been formed it is the duty of all revolutionaries to join it irrespective of its defects and to try to bring it to the correct path through internal ideological struggle; did not Mao do this? Yes, Mao did do this. But despite deep differences with the leadership Mao had never been expelled from the party and so he got the chance to carry on ideological struggle within the party. But there is no such scope within this terrorist secret party of India. Here expulsion is the order of the day. Whatever political line Charubabu imposes from the top has to be accepted blindly, any kind of questioning means immediate expulsion. Not just the Andhra Committee but many other comrades have been expelled from the party. There is no difference between these leaders and the leaders of other "Communist" parties so far as bureaucracy goes. Another point may be raised in this context. CPI(M) leaders also indulge in extreme revolutionary talk, there are many honest revolutionary cadres in the party, they too have carried on many bloody struggles of peasants for land- why did we not carry on the ideological struggle from within that party?

The political resolution of Charubabu's party claims not once or twice but five times that "our policy is correct, our analysis is valid". Where is the scope for ideological struggle, criticism and self-criticism since the correct line has already been found? But we have seen that their views are neither correct, nor valid in matters of mass organisation, trade union, peasant movement, national movement, student movement, etc. This claim is only petit-bourgeois revolutionary arrogance. It is not without reason that many passages were left out from the text of this resolution when it was published by *Peking Review*. (The recent second edition of this resolution has not corrected these errors).

The political analysis made by the Charubabu group from this arrogant point of view is often not only incorrect but also dangerous. Thus the resolution says right at the beginning : "We broke with the neo-revisionists 18 months ago. During this period the Indian people have realised clearly the total opportunism and complete political bankruptcy of all bourgeois revisionist parties. They have lost faith in all bourgeois and revisionist parties and have no doubts now about the total futility of the parliamentary path". (This section, too, was left out by *Peking Review*).

These sentences beautifully express the anti-Mao, Bakunin-Guevara line of thinking of the Charubabu group. To assert that the people have lost faith in bourgeois and revisionist parties and realised the futility of the parliamentary path-at a time when lakhs and crores vote for these parties in elections, join their meetings and processions on various issues, while the party and mass organisations of the Communist revolutionaries have not crystallised and remain full of confusion-such statements are sheer arrogant, futile, irresponsible, petit- bourgeois revisionist wishful thinking. Such a 'theory' assumes that the people are already free of illusions, that there is no need for any more ideological struggle. Yet Marx, Engels, Lenin, Stalin, Mao have all taught us that the class-struggle, ideological struggle and the need to free people of illusions would remain as long as different classes exist in society. Otherwise, there would have been no need for the great Cultural Revolution in China 20 years after such a mighty revolution. The full-scale leadership of the working-class cannot be established without bitter ideological struggle. Mao Tse-tung had to give instructions again for ideological struggle and mass organisation to free people from illusions in 1945, after 25 years of bitter armed struggle led by the Communist Party against the Chiang government and the Japanese invasion.

The Indian people "have definitely realised the complete futility of the parliamentary path". What do such phrases mean? More people have voted in the recent mid-term elections than ever before. More than 70% of the electorate cast their votes in Naxalbari itself ( i.e., Kharibari, Naxalbari, Phasideoa- the three thanas that make up the Phansideoa centre) and they voted not even for the anti-Congress parties but for the Congress. Is this a proof that our vote-boycott slogan has led to the people losing all faith in the bourgeois and revisionist parties?

Comrade Kanu Sanyal declared in his Maidan speech on 1 May : "The people have kicked out their old party- the Congress" (*Deshabrat*, 8 May 1969 ). Kanubabu is pleased and thinks that the people have done a good thing by kicking out the Congress. But is Kanubabu not then under electoral illusions? We gave the slogan of election-boycott. The people, instead of listening to us, voted in their millions and kicked out the Congress. Is not this a significant event? For a whole year election boycott has been our principal slogan. Have we reviewed this slogan in terms of its results i.e., have we made a concrete analysis of concrete conditions?

Where lies the root of Charubabu's theory that the people have become free of illusions? The root lies not in Marxist realism but the narcissistic thought of petit-bourgeois revolutionism. Assume that the people have become free of illusions, then jump directly into people's war, start guerilla war, the people will spontaneously come over to our side, the spark will of itself kindle a flame- there is no need for preparations for mass organisation, trade unions, Kisan Sabhas, student-unions, etc. Such anarchist politics which rests on wishful thinking, weakens and does not strengthen the revolutionary front, even though a revolutionary situation exists.

Another side of the arrogance and impudence of the Charubabu group is abuse. It is one thing to abuse and hate the enemy. But Charubabu forgets the difference between enemies and friends and starts vulgar abuse of any Communist revolutionary, any friend with whom he may have a slight difference of opinion. He does not go in much for ideological debate and rational analysis.

The Co-ordination Committee resolution which expelled the Andhra Committee had declared that the latter would be regarded as "friends and Comrades outside the Co-ordination Committee with whom efforts would be made to preserve non-antagonistic relations". But soon after the expulsion the Andhra comrades and other expelled members began to be abused as "renegade enemy agents", "intellectuals afraid of revolution", "conservative pundits", "intellectuals as cowardly and frightened as rats". Abuse became for them ideological struggle. Comrade Nagi Reddi had criticised the Charubabu group on some matters of military tactics. He had had it. "Once upon a time he mixed with his rice, the ghee of the Telengana struggle and now he is going around asking everyone to smell his hands and so get together a party" (*Deshabrati*, 21 February, 1969). "The agents and renegades who had gathered around a dung-heap, attracted by the stink" etc. (*Deshabrati*, 31 July 1969). At least the polite verb form was used initially but after a couple of weeks even this was dropped, and we had phrases like "Nagi Saheb Says". (How would Charubabu like it and to what depths will the language and politics of revolutionaries descend if anyone says in reply "Charu Sahib Says", "Charu Company has done this"?)

'Sasanka' of *Deshabrati* is a champion of revolutionary politics by abuse. It is difficult to hold him back when he gets into his stride. Among innumerable examples of his politics of abuse is the following: "When the reactionaries were busy suppressing the Indian and particularly the Andhra revolutionary peasant struggle by using Nagi, the Nagas rose in another part of the country. Andhra can be checked by Nagi but how to stop the Nagas? Nagi is no good there" (*Deshabrati*, 14 August 1969).

There is no connection at all between Nagi Reddi and the Naga struggle, the two have been brought together only to abuse Nagi. 'Sasanka' the great revolutionary did not stop even here. Advancing still further in his "revolutionary thought" he declared that both the imperialist fronts in India- the Congress and the United Front Government- were crumbling and therefore a third defence front was needed- "this third front they are building now with the Nagi Reddi clique". Such is the "non- antagonistic relationship" of the petit-bourgeois revolutionists.

Lenin had stated that many comrades take recourse to abuse merely to hide their own failure in the ideological struggle.

It may be recalled here that mutual abuse among comrades had increased very much in China during the ultra-Left domination of the party after the failure of the 1927 revolution and Mao had to fight against this tendency. "Political adventurism was accompanied by sectarian organisational policies of attacking Comrades" (Mao, vol III, p. 182). Mao had then to patiently explain to comrades

that such abuse, quarrels, intolerance, vindictiveness and narrow sectarian attitudes were entirely opposed to party and class interests.

The Charubabu group is second to none in their ability to make enemies out of friends without any reason or on the slightest pretext. This is not surprising since here we have two or three men who have taken out a copyright for revolution and do not give a damn for others. Suprakash Ray is the author of the famous *Bharate Krishak Vidroha O Ganatantric Andolon* as well as many other books ( *Mao Tse-tung, Vidrohi Bharat, Marxiya Abhidhan*, etc.). *Bharate Krishak Vidroha*, the product of like long labour, is an indispensable weapon for the Indian peasant movement. In the long history of the Indian Communist movement very few can claim to have done work of equal importance. But upstart petit-bourgeois revolutionists have no respect for such work. So suddenly Suprakash Ray was declared to be an enemy in a long article in *Deshabrati* (21 August, 1969). His crime is that in the preface to his *Kakdwip, Sonarpur, Bhangarer Krishak Sangram* (1967) he had written : "Telengana, Kakdwip and Naxalbari- these are like three columns of flame. The first two had first spread the flame throughout India...Naxalbari is another name for today's flame". This is Suprakashbabu's great crime since "to equate the Kakdwip struggle with Telengana and Naxalbari is to cause confusion". So "we have to be careful" about Suprakashbabu.

In the India of to-day, many honest intellectuals have realised the need for democratic revolution, peasant revolution. Such an understanding is by no means the monopoly of Naxalites alone. Such supporters of the revolution will increase rapidly, provided we follow the correct path and the correct policy. Mao has taught us that in a neocolonialist country all those who show sympathy for the peoples' democratic revolution are also revolutionary, they are our friends. Many articles sympathetic towards the democratic movement have been published in the *Frontier*. But the petit-bourgeois revolutionist disease of the Charubabu group has become so virulent that they discover a terrible conspiracy behind such sympathy.

Charan Gupta in *Frontier* had condemned the setting up of police camp at Debra and Gopiballabhpur by the Police Minister Jyoti Bose and the barbaric repression going on there on peasantry. Charan Gupta here had made no adverse comments on Naxalites. On the contrary, he had been sympathetic towards them. This became a big crime in the eyes of the great revolutionary 'Sasanka'. He challenged Charan Gupta in *Deshabrati* ( 13 November, 1969) - "What right does he have to show sympathy for Naxalites?" There is no trace of politics in Sasanka's long article, only the cheap, vulgar abuse, typical of petit-bourgeois revolutionism. When Bengali abuse ran out, he borrowed the term 'tout' from English. 'Such advocacy by Jyoti Bose's tout Charan Gupta may cause confusion among revolutionaries and spread the lure of an easy life in the midst of the harsh life of revolutionaries". So we must beware of such a "really dangerous" man. "We know the open enemy but we must be a thousand times more wary of the secret enemy who poses as a "friend". With a revolutionary like 'Sasanka' in our country, it is surprising that we have not yet had a dozen or more revolutions.

'Sasanka' thundered again in next week's *Deshabrat*. Now he reduced to ashes Rafikul Islam who had ideologically criticised Charubabu's politics in an article named "General Line in Colonial Revolution" (*Frontier* 18 October, 1969). 'Sasanka' did not reply to any of these criticisms possibly because he could not; he merely declared that these were "attacks" and "slander". It was said threateningly- "We know this renegade agent hiding under a false name". Having run out of the usual abuse he declared that Rafikul Islam was a coward, since "he had not the courage to write under his own name". The courageous revolutionary had completely forgotten in his revolutionary enthusiasm that 'Sasanka' was also a pseudonym.

Abuse like "swine" "renegade" flows freely from 'Sasanka's' pen. He equates ideological struggle with the use of vulgar language. What does "renegade" mean? When the CPI(M) was formed, CPI leaders condemned it as a party of renegades. When Communist revolutionaries left the CPI(M), "Marxist" leaders denounced them as renegades. (Is leaving a party such a crime? Did not Lenin leave the RSDLP to build the Bolshevik Party?). Such abuse is characteristic of petit-bourgeois revolutionists of all countries, a way of proving cheaply one's revolutionary valour.

Charubabu's group does not stop with abuse; abuse is followed by threat and intimidation. Satyanarayan Sinha had been a jawan, a military hero. He is now an ideological leader of *Deshabrat*. He has threatend: "Every renegade should remember that if the party is sought to be brought down in this early phase, if the attempt is made to throttle it at birth, such attempts will be smashed and there is woe in store for all types all brands of renegades" (*Deshabrat*, 28 August, 1969).

We have had IPS ( inner-party struggle) at one time in the Indian Party. This had little of ideology in it, and consisted mostly of mutual abuse and slander by leaders. The Charubabu group is reviving the tradition of IPS. 'Sasanka', the *enfant terrible* revolutionary in particular, is following the style of work of the Ranadive period and has already become famous as a champion of abuse. Unfortunately, the poisonous atmosphere they have created is by no means healthy for the revolutionary movement.

The arrogance of Charubabu and Sasankababu come partly from their assumption that the revolution is their monopoly, no one else is a revolutionary except them. Such arrogance is one main enemy of revolutionaries. Mao has warned revolutionaries repeatedly- "It is wrong to think of oneself as 'the only revolutionary'." Mao Tse-tung, right from the beginning followed a policy which assumed that there are many revolutionaries and their friends in the country who must all be unified to attack the real enemy"- "unite our true friends to attack our real enemy" (Mao: *An Analysis of Classes in China*, 1926). There is another side to the arrogance of the Charubabu group. The first statement of the Co-ordination Committee had fixed four main tasks for the Communist revolutionaries in India. Among these, popularising Marxism-Leninism and Mao's Thought through uncompromising ideological struggle against revisionism and neo-revisionism and

uniting all revolutionaries on this basis- was placed as the third task instead of the first. When *Peking Review* published a statement it put this task in the first place. The second statement of the Co-ordination Committee quietly followed suit and corrected the error. But the leaders said nothing in public, never admitted that they had committed such an enormous mistake and never did any self-criticism.

*Deshabrati* had made many statements opposed to Mao's Thought in connection with the Black Power question raised by Utpal Dutta's *Manusher Adhikar*. These errors too, have never been admitted by Charubabu's group. Utpalbabu wrote a sharp rejoinder to *Deshabrati's* criticism which completely silenced it. Charubabu had criticised the revolt in Kerala under Kunnikal Narayanan and Ajitha. He changed his line when Peking Radio expressed sympathy for the rising a few days later but did not admit its mistake.

*Deshabrati* did not say a word when the people of Pakistan had risen all over the country against Ayubshahi, because Peking Radio had said nothing about it. Peking Radio had enough reasons not to comment on these event. But *Deshabrati* had no reason at all not to support the heroic struggle of the Pakistan people. They have neatly combined arrogance with slave mentality.

*Deshabrati* thinks that no one else has the right to translate Mao's books in Bengali and publish them. Many others have published Mao's books but *Deshabrati* never prints their advertisements. It is not even as if their own translations are good or accurate. They contain disastrous errors,- "socialism" becomes "imperialism".

Another dangerous characteristic of the Charubabu group is their failure to consider Marxism-Leninism and Mao's Thought as a totality. A tendency is getting stronger among them to separate Mao's Thought from Marxism-Leninism and consider it in isolation. They are attempting this in a sly manner. They have begun to whisper that the conditions and the age in which Marx and Lenin lived have all changed, that our situation is quite different, etc. When other Communist revolutionaries talk of Marxism-Leninism they are abused as 'conservative pundits'. It should be remembered that Bernstein tried to introduce revisionism inside the labour movement on the pretext of changed circumstances. Krushchev too used the plea of change in situation to establish revisionism in Russia and declared that the situation in which Lenin wrote *State and Revolution and Imperialism : the Last Phase of Capitalism* no longer existed. But the Marxist theory of class struggle, proletarian revolution, dictatorship of the proletariat can never change as long as capitalism exists and wherever it exists. These are external truths for the capitalist era; what can change are the tactics of class struggle and revolution in different countries and different situations. Mao stood on the firm scientific basis of Marxism-Leninism. He correctly and successfully applied Marxist-Leninist policies against the enemy in the specific situation of China and defeated the party's internal enemies- both Right revisionism and Left sectarianism through the weapons of Marxism- Leninism. "Marxism-Leninism and the Thought of Mao" have grown up in this heroic struggle of fifty years. Mao has extended Marxism-Leninism

through this struggle through practice and 'concrete analysis of concrete situations'. He has enriched it, and developed in particular the theories of people's democratic revolutions against Imperialism in present day semi-colonial, semi-feudal countries. The weapon of Marxism- Leninism has become sharper in the hands of Mao.

Generally Charubabu's group does not refer to Marxism-Leninism except for some hasty, purely formal acknowledgements. In his 24-page long report Kanu Sanyal has not referred once to Marx, Engels, or Stalin, has talked only once of Lenin, twice of "Marxism-Leninism and the highest point of Marxism today -the Thought of Mao". But 23 times he has referred to the "Chairman". This brave lion mocks all those revolutionaries who talk of Marxism-Leninism as "conservative pundits"! Although they call their faction "Marxist-Leninist" there is little sign of this in their writings and activities.

Let us take up one or two examples, Charubabu has written: "They have resolved at this meeting that they are going to set up a all-Andhra revolutionary party which will be based on the Thought of Mao. They have declared that whatever is happening in Srikakulam follows the Thought of Mao" ("Is Srikakulam going to be India's Yenan?" *Deshabrati*, 13 March 1969). In another article in the same journal (4 September 1969), Charubabu has said that his party's sole task was to carry on revolutionary civil war- "This revolutionary civil war can be carried on only on the basis of the Thought of Chairman Mao and by creating a new style of work".

But the theories propounded and the style of work created by Charubabu's group in the name of Mao are soon going to make Mao's Thought just as backdated as Marxism-Leninism.

From the beginning Charubabu has expressed contempt and hatred for ideology and he has always stressed "action". His action means the "elimination" of the class enemy- the jotedar. For example : "We have also to be careful about whether an attempt is being made to crush active work in the name of 'political struggle'. Our political consciousness and style of work constitute a weapon with which we can resist imperialist infiltration into our party" (*Deshabrati*, 4 September 1969). It should be noticed how these statements express petit-bourgeois revolutionist arrogance.

Another example: The *Deshabrati* representative on going to Srikakulam was ecstatic at seeing the fulfilment of "Comrade Charu Mazumdar's prediction" and wrote that the militant peasants there were extremely eager to see Mao. What more was needed? Immediately a great revolutionary theory was propounded: "How was this high level of political consciousness achieved by the backward, illiterate, simple-minded tribals? They never passed through the grades of mass organisation, nor did they take any part in any economic movement. How then was it possible? They did not listen to the lessons of any 'invincible theorist' with folded hands. What about it then?" In his excess of enthusiasm the revolutionary author has forgotten that Charubabu had not started the movement of the Girijans, it had begun long back. The Girijans had been involved in quite a few economic struggles and had been influenced quite substantially by political movements.

The *Deshabrati* representative has further said : "We realise now through experience that the new theory that the great revolution has upheld in place of old ideas or organisation in the field of mobilising the masses had a deep significance for world revolution as well as for the Indian revolution. It can be realised after the 9th Congress that the endeavour of the people inspired by revolutionary political consciousness becomes limited by the bounds of traditional organisation however revolutionary its formation might have been. Set up revolutionary committees through discussions with the people about the lessons of the great Chinese Cultural Revolution and the will of the people can be expressed only through these committees- the validity of these instructions from Srikakulam is being proved. Another very valuable lesson derived from our new experience in the field of the application of Mao's Thought in the Indian revolutionary situation is that we have to make fundamental changes in our ideas about mass organisation- Party, Guerilla Warfare, Revolutionary Committee".

Let us take a few examples of the "peasant revolutions" that are being manufactured in the "Deshabrati factory" in Calcutta and in other places, under the inspiration of Charubabu's "new" revolutionary theory: "Do you know that 300 villages have been liberated in Srikakulam?" "Red political power has been established in Srikakulam". Maps have been on Calcutta walls to show that guerilla war and armed struggle started in hundreds of places from one end of the country to another. During the Ranadive era too, revolution used to be similarly manufactured.

Such statements by Charubabu's group are excellent examples of what Lenin had long back described as immature, infantile disorder! The horrid disease of their petit-bourgeois revolutionism, their undigested revolutionism, has crossed all limits and have gone so far astray that they do not hesitate to distort horribly and completely reverse the lessons of Mao, of the Cultural Revolution, of the 9th Party Congress.

What is the meaning of statements like- "mass endeavour limited by the bounds of traditional mass organisation"? All their lives Lenin, Stalin and Mao had worked in "traditional" mass organisations and that is why they could make the workers' revolution successful. What else did they do but the "traditional" works of revolutionary Marxists mass movement, mass organisation, the Communist Party, trade unions, peasant associations etc.? Mao has repeatedly stated that there can be no mass movement without mass organisation and without these the revolutionaries become isolated from the masses and no revolution can succeed in such a situation. Mass organisation and the party, mass movement and revolution- all these are inextricably linked up with one another.

We have already seen how the influence of extreme Leftists spread in China after the defeat of the 1927 Chinese Revolution as a reaction against the former Right-wing party leadership, how the party was becoming estranged from the masses due to their adventurism and how hard Mao had to fight to direct the party along the right channels.



Now we are told that the lesson of the Chinese Cultural Revolution and the 9th Party Congress is that we have to change our old ideas about mass movement and mass organisations "fundamentally". If this is correct then we must also believe that the Cultural Revolution and the 9th Congress have not only invalidated the lessons of Marx, Lenin and Stalin but the lessons of Mao as well. In actual fact the Cultural Revolution and the 9th Congress have further revived the "old" lessons of Marx, Lenin, Stalin and Mao in the context of Soviet revisionism and the present world revolution. Lin Piao has stated in the Report of the 9th Congress: "An unprecedented and great revolutionary mass rising has emerged in the 'heart of capitalism'- in Japan, Western Europe and North America. The people are waking up in increasingly greater numbers". So we see that the thinking of Charubabu's group is opposed to the teaching of Lin Piao as well. Where the Chinese leaders are openly welcoming all movements, whether political or economic, against imperialism and vested interests in South East Asia, West Asia, Africa, Latin America as well as in Western Europe, Charubabu's group is rejecting all this as "old" ideas.

Charubabu's writings will have us believe that even guerilla warfare is an invention of his own. Guerilla war is nothing new in Indian history. The Maratha people had crushed the most powerful Mughal forces under Shivaji's leadership by adopting guerilla tactics. We should remember that local tribal people showed great expertise in that guerilla war. Towards the beginning of British rule the peasants in Bengal fought with the help of guerilla tactics during the "Sanyasi Rebellion". During the great Revolt of 1857-59, after the Sepoy Divisions were defeated in Delhi, Lucknow and Kanpur, peasant, artisan and tribal masses had started peoples' war and guerilla warfare. The guerilla wars waged by Kunwar Singh, Tantia Tope, Amar Singh, Feroz Shah, Maulvi Ahmadullah of Faizabad are immortal episodes in Indian history. During Bengali's fiery decades too, Bagha Jatin and the heroic warriors of Chittagong had adopted to some extent the tactics of guerilla warfare. We have a lot to learn from these guerilla and mass wars. In a changed historical context the present Indian mass movement has revived the question of peoples' war and guerilla warfare for the workers and peasants.

Following Marxist-Leninist principles Mao has placed the theory of peoples' war and guerilla warfare on a scientific basis in today's context. As a *first* rehearsal of Mao's scientific principles in this age in India, guerilla war and peoples' war had occurred in widespread areas of Telengana. Charubabu's group does not even acknowledge this burning historical truth.

Undoubtedly the episodes that Charubabu's group presents in a thrilling and exaggerated manner in the pages of *Deshabrati* do constitute an aspect of peasant struggle but it is ridiculous to announce them with great fanfare as guerilla war. Charubabu's "guerillaism" is nothing but a new edition of our old terrorism. What sort of guerilla war is it to suddenly attack a "particular individual" and "eliminate" him? Does not guerilla war mean an attack in a distinctly military manner on the *enemy divisions*?

The flames of Charubabu's "guerilla" war are spreading all over India- Bihar, Orissa, U.P., Punjab, Assam are all coming under it. Everywhere we see the same result- the "elimination" of one class-enemy, of one jotedar: "We have tried to learn humbly at the feet of the poor peasant, we have tried to understand the significance of the instructions of our leader Comrade Charu Mazumdar, we have accepted the teaching of Chairman Mao- do not set up open organisations before liberated areas are established" (*Deshabrati*, 18 December, 1969).

No one can object to the worship that disciples offer to their guru, but it is unforgivable impudence to drag Mao into that. Apart from this, wherever has Mao said- do not set up open organisation before liberated areas are established? Mao had repeatedly said just the reverse and the name of a chapter in his *Human Report* is - Get organised. Organisation has to come first, followed by action.

Charubabu has said: "One can conduct the campaign for eliminating the class enemy only by inspiring the poor and landless peasants to crush the overlordship of the feudal classes in the countryside and to *consolidate the state power of the peasants*. That is why the elimination of the class enemy is a higher stage of class struggle and the task of elimination through guerilla tactics is the first stage" (*Deshabrati*, 4 December, 1969).

We have to ask here whether feudalism can be destroyed by "eliminating" a few class-enemies, a few jotedars and mahajans and can the "state power of the peasant" be established in the countryside in this manner? Our old terrorists also thought along similar lines- get rid of a few police officers, some lieutenant governors and viceroys and British imperialism will crumble, making way for Swadeshi rule. Actually the theory of "eliminating" the class enemy that Charubabu's group is propounding is not at all the theory of Maoist guerilla warfare or peoples' war. It is merely an anarchist-terrorist theory.

Another question is- how can guerilla war be the 'higher form' as well as the "first stage" at the same time and in the same phase of class struggle? This is another instance of the original dialectics of Charubabu's group.

Charubabu's guerilla action means stabbing a class enemy from behind and eliminating him. It is not guerilla war to eliminate a class enemy in this fashion. Guerilla is a French term which means a particular form of battle. Mere killing is not a battle, whatever else it might be. A campaign of such elimination might have been called guerilla war. But, Seleukus, what a strange country this is! Everything is Ersatz, everything is false- a false Renaissance, a false saint, a false democracy, false parliament, constitution, planning, Communist Party. But do not all these falsehood suffice, must we add a false guerilla war as well to increase the extent of deception?

A fundamental tenet of Marxism which Lenin, Stalin and Mao have always stressed is that Marxists have to work on the basis of "a concrete analysis of a concrete situation", that they have to advance step by step, keeping alive the links among the manifold activities of the party. Petit-bourgeois, anarchist revolutionaries have to faith in this, they believe in subjectivism. I want a revolution, so I can start

off with a few youths, form a secret party, mobilise them in the task of "eliminating the class enemy" and call this guerilla warfare - and this will bring the disaffected masses to my side. Belief in spontaneity emerges from such subjectivism from the rejection of reality. Charubabu also believes in spontaneity like the anarchists. Marxists never believe in this, they place their faith in the organised strength of the working class and the people, in mass organisation and the party, in raising the level of mass consciousness to the revolutionary stage.

Charubabu instructs : "Those comrades who are working in peasant areas must never underestimate the necessity of a general economic slogan along with them political propaganda. Unless the broad peasant masses are brought into the movement backward peasant will not be mobilised at the stage of political understanding and the hatred against the class enemy cannot be sustained. From now on we should spread the slogan- 'We must stake our claim on the next crop'...This slogan must be spread...This slogan will bring the broad peasant masses to the movement and transform the character of our conscious political propaganda and movement' (*Deshabrati*, 1 August, 1968).

This is another good example of Charubabu's subjective thinking. He has taken a lot of things for granted. Long ago Bakunin had prescribed this path for petit-bourgeois revolutionaries but not a single revolution came out of it anywhere on the world. As its opposite, Marxism has taught us that mere propaganda and movement and slogans are not enough (though these too are necessary)-organisation is even more important. The more the mass organisations of workers, peasants, students, and the minority communities are strengthened, the more the democratic movement spreads under revolutionary leadership, the better the field for armed struggle will be prepared. Revolutionaries have got to understand these interconnections in order to fulfil the revolution.

#### **14. COMMUNISTS WILL NOT LEAD THE NATIONAL STRUGGLE!!!**

The far-ranging thinking of Charubabu naturally has not ignored the national question and here too he has startled everybody with some contradictory and virulently revolutionary statements that come so easily to him. As on every other question, on the national question too his thinking is un-coordinated, full of half-truths, errors and petit-bourgeois wishes and ideas.

He has said: "A revolutionary party will set up the United Front through armed struggle and that party can unite the different national upsurges..On the basis of this principle (that every nationality must have full rights of self-government, to be independent and autonomous) a revolutionary party may easily unite with the national struggles of the Nagas, the Mizos and others... Many think that the Communist Party will lead the national movement of different nationalities...This is a wrong idea. *The Communists will not lead the national movement*. But wherever national struggle exists, they will unite with them. Their responsibility is to build up class-struggle, not national struggle" (*Deshabrati*, 30 May 1968). A lot of

confusion inherent in petit-bourgeois revolutionism has been splendidly revealed in such statements.

The Indian national problem is a most complicated issue. India is the homeland of numerous nationalities with so many languages, religions, cultural traditions and habits. Due to uneven development they are all at different stages of development; some are at a relatively advanced stage, some are very backward. Due to the partition of India some have been (like the Bengali nationality) divided. On account of such a situation a number of conflicts arise among the people and the ruling class tries to encourage them in order to ensure its own rule and this creates divisions within the peoples' democratic and liberation movement.

Without any attempt at a realistic analysis of such a complex, real problem, Charubabu ended his task with reiterating some old formula and assumed that the very voicing of these slogans (for example, every nationality must have the right to be independent and autonomous, etc.) will spontaneously bring about unity in the national struggle and solve this problem. That same Charubabu who instead of bringing about unity among a handful of Communist revolutionaries of the same line of thinking, created so much more disunity among them, will establish unity in such a vast and complex field with the help of mere slogans! What extraordinary faith in black magic!

There are two distinct characteristics of the Indian national movement. One is the freedom movement of all the people all over India against imperialism, the other is the question of self-rule and self-determination of the numerous national minorities in India. Although Stalin had drawn our attention to this dual national problem of India forty or fifty years back, the Indian Communist leaders never thought much about it.

The fundamental enemy of all the Indian nationalities is imperialism. If the national liberation struggle does not follow the right path and does not get correct leadership, then there is a lot of possibility of its being diverted to a wrong course. This struggle may forget its main enemy and can degenerate into a suicidal fighting among the nationalities themselves. The conflicts among Bengalis and the Assamese, the Biharis and the Bengalis, the Punjabi Hindus and the Punjabi Sikhs point to that. Today when class struggle is intensifying among the nationalities, the agents of imperialism and Indian vested interests are exploiting the national liberation struggle for their own reactionary purpose. The Shiv Sena movement in Maharashtra and the "Seperate Telengana" movement are clear examples of that. Everyone knows how Christian Missionaries had tried to exploit the Naga national struggle in the interests of imperialism. Missionaries are very active among most Indian tribals. The reactionary Jharkhand Party in Bihar, Orissa and West Bengal is attempting to divert the Santhal liberation struggle into inter-nationality conflicts. They are demanding a seperate state with parts of Bankura, Birbhum, Midnapur and Purulia as well as Chota Nagpur. This Jharkhand movement is being directed by foreign imperialists and the representatives of Indian compradore capitalism and feudalism. They are trying to smash the militant unity against the common

enemy that has been forged between the Santhal people and Bengali, Bihari and Oriya peasants and workers.

The national liberation movement cannot exist in a vacuum. Either the working class or the bourgeoisie has to lead it. Both the revisionist Communist parties have failed to lead this struggle. It is not surprising that in this situation, bourgeois (and petit-bourgeois) elements will come forward to lead it and to use it in its own class interests. In this context even Charu Mazumdar, the leader of the "Marxist-Leninist" Communist Party, tells us straight : "Communists will not lead the national movement". This only means giving up the national movement to the reactionaries. Just as Charubabu has made a gift of trade unions, peasant samitis and students' unions to the revisionists, so too he is surrendering the national movement to the fascist reactionaries.

In the statement quoted above Charubabu has said: "The revolutionary party will lead and set up the United Front through armed struggle and that revolutionary party will be able to unify the different national upsurges". Here Charubabu has assumed two things as granted on account of his Bakuninite great "will power". If a revolutionary party leads the armed struggle even without a clear Marxist programme of action, there will be (1) the formation of the United Front, (2) the national upsurges will be unified. Marxist scientific reasoning is totally absent here. There is something else to be noticed, Charubabu is always talking of a "revolutionary party". Very seldom does he refer to the working class. The revolutionary party that he has built up has an insignificant place for the working class. It is not at all surprising that such a party will avoid the concrete analysis of a concrete situation and depend on "will power".

Charubabu has further said: "The precondition for setting up such a United Front is that every nationality must be engaged in armed struggle...Every nationality must have the right of self-determination and even the right to secede". For Charubabu armed struggle is the primary criterion for assessing national movements. The Shiv Sena is not totally opposed to armed struggle. A better example would be the lackeys of America in South Vietnam who have not only broken away from North Vietnam but are also waging a powerful armed battle against it. Does not the 10 year long armed struggle in Algeria provide another such example? Does not Charubabu's statement explain further that those nationalities that are not engaged in armed struggle have no place in the United Front visualised by Charubabu? They may as well go to hell for all that Charubabu's "revolutionary" party cares, they have no responsibility for them.

Charubabu is prone to mechanical phrase- mongering. "Every nationality has the right of self-determination, and even the right to secede". Just because that right exists it does not mean that Marxists must always and unconditionally *support* it as their duty. Marxists believe that every individual has freedom of worship but they themselves do not support religion as they are materialists. Every nationality has the right of self determination and secession but whether or not Marxists will support that depends on concrete situations. This right is inextricably linked up

with the class-struggle of the workers, it is subordinate to the question of class struggle. Dalai Lama of Tibet not only wants national autonomy but desires breaking away from China as well. All the reactionary imperialists of the world uphold his demand. The Tibetan working class and labouring men too want national autonomy but they also want to continue the struggle against their main enemies- imperialism and feudalism- together with the Chinese workers and masses. The working class is the main force behind popular unity against imperialism and feudalism in all countries. The task of Marxists everywhere is to mobilise the forces of the working class within all the nationalities, or in the words of Lenin to organise them in a *centralised organisation*. That is essential for the success of the working class revolution. A centralised Communist Party with vanguard workers from all nationalities is the key to solving the problem of nationalities (Lenin : *The National Question in Our Programme*, 1903, vol. VI, p.463).

There is no contradiction between Charubabu's thinking and Marxism on the mutual relationship between the advanced and oppressed nationalities in a country and the Communist Party. A few months before the Bolshevik revolution, Stalin had given a clear answer to this question and had indicated the way of solving the national problem.

Another implication of Charubabu's statement is that unless the national struggles of the Nagas, Mizos, Santhals etc. are united with his revolutionary party, they will remain separate and autonomous. Charubabu's group calls their party the Communist Party of India (Marxist-Leninist). The rigid demarcation line that he has drawn up between his party and the nationalities seems to imply that his party has no place for them. Are the Nagas, Mizos, Garos, Santhals, Mundas etc. not Indian? If they do belong to India, then why do they no place in the "Indian" party? And if they do find a place in the party then is it not their particular duty to direct these national struggles under the party leadership? (We must also remember that the working class of today has also emerged from the ranks of the tribals. Many tribals work in mines and industries. This is a significant factor in the Communist movement). The true Marxist party does not forge unity with the national struggle "from outside", it enters into it and unites the entire people against the common enemy.

The statement that "Communists are responsible for building up class struggle, not national struggle" is a veritable Koh-i-noor among all the gems of Charubabu's thoughts. He has mistakenly visualised a conflict between class struggle and national struggle. Here too he is spreading ideas opposed to Mao in the name of Mao. Has not Mao said: "In the final analysis the national struggle is a theme for class struggle"? (Mao's statement in support of the Negro struggle in America 1965). Has not Stalin said that the peasant problem is the problem of every nationality? If it is peasant problem then is it not class struggle as well?

Mao never talked in terms of an abstract unity "from outside" between Communists and the national movement, but he has clearly instructed that the Communists must actively help the struggles of the national minorities (Such

help and not some slogans is the only way to establishing leadership and true militant unity).

The opinion of the Chinese Party on the national question has often been published. Even the other day *Deshabrati* has published Liu- Chun's article "The National Question and Class Struggle" from *Peking Review* ( 19 June 1969). Here Liu Chun clearly says that the Communist Party must lead the national struggles of the minority nationalities. Charubabu opposes the Chinese Party when he says that "Communists will not lead the national movement".

The question of India's democratic revolution is deeply related to the national problems. It was because of the ignorance, neglect and errors of the revisionist leaders of the Communist Parties that the struggles of the Indian national minorities could not become a part of the Indian revolutionary movement.

Today we have an era of the destruction of imperialism and national liberation. The national question in the imperialist era is a part of the general question of workers' revolution and proletarian dictatorship. In order to achieve national unity and complete liberation, the people of the oppressed nationalities must firmly make the national democratic revolution successful, destroy imperialism and uproot the rule of its agents. Then they will progress towards socialist revolution and destroy the entire class of exploiters and the system of exploitation. Mao has taught us that today's struggles for the establishment of national rights must never be surrendered to any part of the bourgeoisie. The Communist Party which is the vanguard of the working class must accept full responsibility for it.

## 15. CHARUBABU'S "THOUGHT" ON STUDENT AND YOUTH MOVEMENTS

As in his statements on peasant's and worker's movements, so about students and youths too Charubabu has come out with some startling virulent revolutionary utterances. He has said: "The imperialists and the reactionary ruling class had tried to nip the possibility of revolution in the bud and has put up the bait of college unions" (*Deshabrati*, 21 August, 1969).

The unusual ability that Charubabu has for evading historical truth is again borne out by this. From the very beginning of India's freedom struggle, students' organisations and their unions and movements have had a glorious role which they have even now to perform. But Charubabu has summarily dismissed this revolutionary heritage. Are student unions "baits" set up by imperialists? In that case we have to discard the entire Marxist-Leninist theory of dialectical materialism, which teaches us that in the present social system there are two fundamental, conflicting forces- imperialism and the entire people. The people build up different organisations to fight against imperialism- the party, trade unions, peasant associations, students' unions, youth associations etc. Imperialists are forever trying to capture or influence these mass organisations through their agents and sometime they do succeed. But are these mass organisations responsible for this, or is the lack of revolutionary leadership responsible? The task of the revolutionaries is to

establish revolutionary leadership over these mass organisations and students' unions. Charubabu's theory of "bait" is not at all Marxist but Bakuninite petit-bourgeois revolutionism, an attempt to escape revolutionary responsibility in the name of revolution.

Charubabu has made many confusing statements about the student movement but we can discuss only a few of them here. Charubabu has said that the college union "basically uphold an economist attitude in front of the revolutionary student body. So the college unions destroy the revolutionary genius of students and youths and these are great obstacles in the way of their identifying themselves with workers and peasants. As a result in most cases opportunism overwhelms union leadership, 'careerism' raise, its head, the desire for leadership draw them towards opportunist 'unity' of many kinds and destroys their revolutionary principles". Inspired by these words of Charubabu his party put up posters in Calcutta- "Those who are involved in student unions are reactionaries".

It is perfectly true that revisionism is quite powerful among the students' unions. But is it the revolutionary path to discard them for that reason? Should we not rather fight against revisionism and opportunism from within? Does not the rejection of unions imply an escape after giving these student organisations up to the revisionists? Has Mao Tse-tung taught us to escape from our battle fields? Does not this principle isolate the revolutionary students from the general body of students?

Will such politics of anarchist isolationism transform petit-bourgeois students into responsible revolutionaries or will they rather give scope to their inherent petit-bourgeois anarchist tendencies?

Such sectarian politics is being spread in the name of "peasant revolution". There is no doubt that it is better that an increasingly larger number of students and workers should go to the villages to work for the peasant revolution. Already quite a large number of youths have left well paid jobs and gone to the villages. Some brilliant students have given up prospects for well-paid jobs and are working among the peasants and many others preparing to follow suit. But can every revolutionary student and worker go to the village despite their best intentions? Many are forced to stay back in the cities. Those who stay in the cities, at least for the time being, also have innumerable revolutionary tasks to perform here- for example, movements about students' problems, democratic and cultural movements, the trade union movement as well as movements in factory and slum areas. All these are essential for the success of the peasant revolution. The negative programme of action that Charubabu's group has adopted is neither strengthening the revolutionary peasant movement nor helping the democratic movement in the city.

Is not the factional politics of Charubabu's group responsible for the disunity and isolation among students, especially the Naxalite students? They have not been able to overcome their narrow, factional attitude during the task of party-building and they have failed to unite all the groups. Among the



students too, they brought this factional politics. Wherever they have gone among the students they have created a number of factions with some hand-picked students of their own. On account of their own anarchist viewpoint they have not been able to provide any positive programme of action to the student movement. As a result a lot of confusion is being created among the students, their determination is breaking down and internal feuds are gaining in strength. As an example we may refer to the "armed struggle" between the students of two Medical Colleges on 25 August 1969.

Most of the students come from petit-bourgeois families having imbibed such ideas. Imperialist oppression makes them turn towards the revolutionary camp. Anarchist thinking such as Bakuninism, Trotskyism, Guevarism is quite strong among many of them although interest in Marxism too is no less strong. Revisionism and fascism also attract many of them. They may lean towards fascism in the absence of revolutionary leadership, but again if they do get inspired by revolutionary thinking then they may perform a very crucial function in the democratic revolution. That is why a positive programme of action for students based on Marxism-Leninism and the Thought of Mao is so essential.

Starting from the university authorities, all the governing bodies of schools and colleges are centres of reaction and corruption. They actively help to keep alive the semi-colonial, semi-feudal social order in India. Many of the university teachers frequently go to America and are closely linked with American imperialism. An important task of the students is carrying on ceaseless campaign against these strongholds of reaction. Students' movement is also necessary against their syllabus, an outdated examination system, etc. 80-90% of the peasants in India are illiterate. The spread of universal free education should become an important part of the students' movement. Instead of drawing attention to such positive, organisational activities in the context of the democratic revolution, Charubabu's group has brought petit-bourgeois revolutionism, a negative point of view among the students which destroy their revolutionary strength and qualities and help the reactionaries in the final analysis.

It is undoubtedly an "original" concept of Charubabu that the student unions are responsible for crushing the students' revolutionary genius, for injecting economism into them and for preventing them from identifying themselves with workers and peasants. But there is no reason that the concept should be valid just because it is original. About three or four years back the student movement had become very strong in West Bengal. Students in Calcutta University, Jadavpur University, North Bengal University, Presidency College and Krishnagore College had opened up a new chapter full of great possibilities in the revolutionary movement and had started to move forward keeping pace with the revolutionary student movements in France, America, Germany, Japan and Italy. At that time the Naxalbari peasant movement began. It had a great impact on the entire body of students and inspired all the students. The hold of revisionism and neo-revisionism over the students was eroded. This was a golden opportunity for mobilising a

unified movement of all the students in the context of the peasant revolution and on the basis of students' problems, the problems of education and the problems of the cultural movement. But Charubabu's group failed to take advantage of this situation. They could not rise above their narrow sectarianism even in this new revolutionary atmosphere.

The question is why, despite a favourable situation, the student movement in West Bengal was shattered. And this happened at a time when the international student movement was daily becoming more and more revolutionary and the example of the revolutionary student movement in East Bengal was also in front of us! Why have the Naxalite students split up today into different groups? Why could they not unite themselves and then unite all the students? Why are students today divided into so many groups and are fighting suicidally among themselves with bombs and pistols and are helping the class enemy? Who is responsible for that?

If the students are united, then they can constitute a tremendous force in the democratic revolution. But how Charubabu hates unity is clear from his above statements. Let him avoid opportunist unity by all means, but is there no such thing as revolutionary unity? Is it not a main task for revolutionary students to fight for revolutionary unity against revisionism? Can that task be performed if the student unions are given up to revisionism? Charubabu himself has said repeatedly that a splendid revolutionary situation exists in India today. If that is so then it is only natural that millions of students, workers and peasants will be united under revolutionary leadership. How else can the absolute leadership of the revolutionary party be established among the people?

Finally Charubabu has given a clear call to the students: "Identify yourselves with poor and landless peasants and with workers, become as one with them." Where he failed to unite students of the same way of thinking, failed to mobilise all the students, where he teaches students who follow him in the belief that apart from themselves no other revolutionary exists, all others are reactionary- it is mere anarchist romanticism in this situation to think that the students with all their sectarianism and arrogance can identify themselves with workers and peasants. The mobilisation of millions of workers, peasants, students and tribals is necessary for the democratic and peasant revolution. The main task for Communist revolutionaries today is to unite the workers, peasants, tribals and students together and with one other. The students' slogan for solving their problems and for the democratic revolution should be - "Unite, unite, unite". Only then can they become as one with workers and peasants.

## 16. WHITHER REVOLUTION

Revolutions have occurred in many countries and as a result those countries have progressed very far. But no revolution has occurred in India even though it is so necessary here. A primitive social order, a semi-colonial, semi-feudal political and economic order, massively block India's path to progress and constitute the

main reason behind the exploitation, poverty and misery of the masses. That is why the main and the greatest task of the Indian masses today is to utterly demolish this reactionary social, political and economic order and to establish in the interests of the masses, a new social order free from exploitation. Such an order can be established today only through a democratic revolution under working-class leadership and proletarian dictatorship.

There had been many opportunities for having a revolution in India. The great revolt of 1857-58 failed because of the lack of correct leadership despite the valour, heroism and self-sacrifice of millions of men and women-peasants and labouring people. After the Second World War, the R.I.N. Mutiny and the peasant revolts in Telengana, the Hajong region and in Kakdwip had again brought the possibility of a great revolution near us. But because of the betrayal of the leaders, and especially of the revisionist and ultra-Leftist leaders of the Communist Parties, it was not possible to fulfil the promise of these opportunities.

The entire world is divided into two warring camps today- one is the international reactionary camp under the leadership of American imperialism and the other is the international revolutionary camp under China's leadership. After the death of Stalin the revisionist leadership of the Khrushchev-Kosygin-Brezhnev clique has transformed the Soviet Union into a social-imperialist state that follows the imperialist policy of the Tsar. Soviet Union's invasion of Czechoslovakia and the border clashes with China are examples of that. This reactionary clique in the Soviet Union regards China as the main enemy and carries on military preparations as well as intrigues with America to crush China's revolutionary power. For many other reasons too, the internal crisis of the Soviet Union is gradually intensifying.

American imperialism has been struck a massive blow by the heroic of Vietnam and is now facing final defeat. As a result the American people too is revolting. Asia, Africa, Latin America- nowhere can American imperialism keep the masses subdued and world revolution is moving step by step towards final victory.

Just as day by day imperialism is being trapped by the deepening crisis, China the centre of world revolution, has strengthened the basis of socialism and proletarian dictatorship and has internally moved towards rapid progress. Workers' Cultural Revolution in China and its 9th Party Congress are the guarantee for Marxism-Leninism, national liberation struggles and socialist movements not just in China but all over the world.

As a part of this total revolutionary situation, the revolutionary crisis in India too is deepening again and greater possibilities for revolution are drawing near. Indian economy, dependent on foreign imperialist capital, is now facing a deadlock. In the semi-colonial, semi-feudal Indian social order, on the one hand the rich are becoming richer, and on the other hand the poor are becoming poorer; unemployment is increasing, the exploitation of poor and landless peasants is growing, not much effort is being made to remove mass illiteracy and the country's education, the state of health and housing are all declining rapidly.

This deep-rooted crisis in India is not just restricted to the economic sphere but is a total one. Indian administration is gradually breaking down and coming to a standstill. Corruption is growing and spreading from top to bottom. Every political party is shattered by this crisis. The Congress, the main party of the ruling classes, is now split up and is in disarray. The Jana Sangh, the Swatantra and other reactionary parties are also facing a great crisis. The two revisionist and neo-revisionist parties and other so called Leftist parties have been totally swamped by parliamentarianism and economism. Their leaders can find no other way but to be the appendages of the owning classes, to go in frequently for elections or to form the effeminate United Front ministry. The bankruptcy of these parties, torn apart by internal feuds is now becoming increasingly clear to the masses who are realising that there is no way out of this crisis except for a total, revolutionary solution.

A hallmark of the current revolutionary situation in India is that the struggle of workers, peasants, tribals and students is advancing rapidly and millions of people who have never before participated in politics have woken up from their age-long slumber and are taking an active part in the mass movement with their own demands. But the main weakness of this great and all-encompassing mass struggle is that it lacks revolutionary leadership. When the masses are progressing at a tremendous pace, the revisionist and opportunist leaders are drawing back in fear and are putting the brake on the mass movement. These corrupt leaders are trying their best in their own narrow, personal interests, to keep this movement restricted within the bounds of parliamentarianism and economism.

The Communist Party of India has been formed to bring about the revolution in India, to effect a fundamental change in Indian economic, political, social and cultural life, to establish a social order without exploitation, to eradicate all social differences like caste, religious and class differences, to create equality among all human beings. May of India's greatest intellectuals, workers and peasants were attracted by this great ideal, had joined this Party and had sacrificed themselves for the Party and the revolution. But the Party leadership had repeatedly betrayed this ideal, had sacrificed mass interests and basic principles to compromise with vested interests and instead of building up the Party as a revolutionary one, it has made it into a revisionist Party to direct it towards parliamentarianism and economism. The revolt against these treacherous Party leadership in 1962 by Party cadres and the "Marxist" Communist Party that was set up had also failed to solve the basic problem. A band of opportunist, phrase-mongering leaders captured the leadership of this "Marxist" Party as well. There is not much ideological difference between the Communist Party of India and the "Marxist" Communist Party- both are restricted to parliamentarianism and economism, there is no place for the problems of the coming revolution in the thinking of their leaders, and all subjective and objective preparations for the revolution and the capture of state power are totally absent. The leaders and the programme of both the parties have made them into electioneering parties. Their aim and all their activities are directed towards going from one election to another, to from the United Front Ministry, to occupy

the seats of the ministry which have been sold out to vested interests, to feud among themselves like cats and dogs about the share of ministerial power. They also aim at spreading the factional interests and feuds of the leaders like an infectious disease among the masses, to turn students against students in clashes, attacks and murders and at clearing the way for President's rule, rule by the military and the police, by fascists.

The peasant revolt at Naxalbari again showed the revolutionary path to Communist revolutionaries and to the masses. Among the thinking and militant cadres of the "Marxist" Communist Party, among students and youths and many others, it created a tremendous stir. Many Communist revolutionaries left the Party but many remained in the Party. This was a golden opportunity to unify this tremendous force and build up a revolutionary Marxist-Leninist Party. Why revolutionaries could not exploit the opportunity and failed to form a Marxist-Leninist Party has been discussed in this book. It has also been shown that the very first reason behind this failure was the weakness of revolutionaries in Marxist ideology and their interest in petit-bourgeois revolutionism.

Wherever the petit-bourgeoisie is numerically strong and the revolutionary organisation and ideology of the working class have not been firmly established, there petit-bourgeois revolutionism, anarchism etc. become powerful in different forms and become even more dangerous for the labour movement than revisionism. When Lenin was forming the Bolshevik Party in Russia he had to wage a powerful ideological struggle against the Socialist Revolutionary Party, the Narodniks and other forms of petit-bourgeois revolutionism. In China too, Mao had to face the same problem and he too fought severely against it to establish the revolutionary ideology of Marxism within the Chinese Communist Party.

In the present day, in almost all countries of the capitalist world, there has been another powerful wave of petit-bourgeois revolutionism against the revisionism of the Communist Parties, based on The Guevara's theory of guerilla war. These revolutionaries have adopted the principle of armed struggles and guerilla war. They have denied working-class leadership and its revolutionary role and as an alternative to Marxism-Leninism and Mao's principles, they have talked of a new kind of revolution. (The "Marxist" Party leaders today in India too are using Che Guevara as an alternative to the Thought of Mao.)

A hallmark of one part of the Indian revolutionaries is that they are influenced by Guevarism- the Bakuninism of today- whether consciously or unconsciously and they spread it in the name of Mao. We have given many examples to how their leaders are trying to destroy Marxist theory and ideology by wrong and false propaganda. Let us take up another recent example:

Charu Mazumdar has written: "The Chairman has said; the more study the more foolish you become" (*Deshabrati* 5 March 1970). Mao Tse-tung never said anything like this. He has said just the opposite, not once or twice but innumerable times. Like Marx, Engels, Lenin and Stalin, Mao too has said repeatedly that a fool cannot make a revolution, one has to critically acquire all the knowledge of

the social sciences that the revolutionaries have access to. This was how Marxist theory, world's best social science, has developed. Mao has asked us again and again to absorb this universal truth through the history of our own countries and through revolutionary struggle. They have also said that Marxism is a science that has to be studied ceaselessly and this weapon has to be sharpened all the time for revolution, for socialism.

Charubabu has further said that in the present situation there is no need for reading theoretical literature, just two or three writings of Mao will be enough; then go into "action" and start the politics of "elimination". These words mean Charubabu's cult of personality, commandism, and what Stalin used to call "yes-manship"- blind obedience. Charubabu has ruled out what is most necessary for the revolutionaries today- ideological discussion.

Such irresponsible anarchist statements by a revolutionary leader is a great crime in a country where the revolutionary theory of Marxism has practically never crystallised, where in the absence of revolutionary theory, opportunities for revolution have failed again and again. This attitude is extremely harmful for the revolutionary movement and constitutes an unhealthy, unfortunate, anti-Marxist trend in it. The major reason why in the past the leaders could for forty or forty-five years lead the party along revisionist, opportunist or ultra-Leftist adventurist lines was that Marxist revolutionary ideology was ( and still is) extremely weak among party cadres, however honest and militant they might be.

The essence of Lenin's lifelong struggle is that there can be no revolution without a revolutionary theory. He has said: "*Without a revolutionary theory there can be no revolutionary movement.* This truth has to be stated most emphatically since today propaganda for fashionable opportunism is going along with illusions about the narrowest aspect of practical activities" (*What is to be done*, 1902, Vol. V, p.369). Lenin has further said about ideological struggle: "Russia could acquire the only correct revolutionary theory of Marxism through a half a century long, incomparably painful mental struggle and self-sacrifice, a unique revolutionary heroism, great capacity for work, through failure and dejection assessment and reassessment and through a comparison with this European experience" (*Left Wing Communism : An Infantile Disorder*, 1920, Vol XXXI. p. 25).

In order to have a revolution in India one has to study the only scientific theory of revolution which is Marxism-Leninism, to assimilate it through the experience of class struggle in Indian history, to consolidate it on Indian soil, to derive lessons from the history of revolutions in other countries and to apply it through a concrete analysis of the concrete situation in India. This is what Lenin had done in Russia and Mao in China. Our store of revolutionary theory is negligible. The influence and tradition of Gandhism, revisionism and religion is quite old and very powerful in India and workers, peasants and intellectuals are not free from them. Our party leaders had never fought them ideologically. From the beginning of Russian and Chinese labour movements and from the first stages of party building there, Lenin, Stalin and Mao's leadership had directed them along

the lines of revolutionary struggle and as a result in these countries a revolutionary tradition had been initiated from the beginning. India has no such powerful heritage. There have been revolts in India, too, against revisionism but we had gone over to Leftist sectarianism in order to forget it, and to check this Leftist sectarianism we have once again come back to revisionism. Then having revolted once more against revisionism we have let ourselves be carried away by extreme petit-bourgeois revolutionism. Once Ranadive had sent out the slogans of a Trotskyist, Titoist revolution! Today Charu Mazumdar is again calling out revolutionary slogans of a Bakuninite nature! Then we had failed to check Ranadive's adventurism. Will that happen again? Many honest revolutionaries have joined the "Marxist-Leninist" Party, they cannot avoid answering this question.

There is no short-cut to revolution, there can be no revolution without hard work. Revolution cannot be made with some slogans, hush-hush talk can lead to the terrorist politics of "elimination" but not to revolution. Revolution needs the dedicated endeavour of hundreds and thousands of revolutionaries, the unity between revolutionary theory and practice. A revolutionary programme of action can only succeed where the revolutionary theory is correct. Revolution needs the mobilisation of not thousands or lakhs, but of millions of people and their united struggle.

We can mention in this context that Marx's *Das Kapital* was first published in German in 1867. The first translation in a foreign language that came out five years later was in Russian. Lenin has said about the keen eagerness with which contemporary Russian revolutionary intellectuals were assimilating Marxism- "One after another many Marxist book had come out, Marxist journals and new papers were started and almost everyone called himself a Marxist. Marxists were flattered and honoured and because Marxist books were sold out extraordinarily quickly publishers were delighted" (*What is to be Done*, Vol.V. p.361).

It was not without reason that the first successful workers' revolution took place in Russia. This was due to a strenuous assimilation of revolutionary theory, uncommon capacity for work, self-sacrifice and firm determination. A similar long struggle lay behind the Chinese revolution as well. In contrast how little Indian "Communist" leaders had tried to acquire revolutionary theory, how meagre is their work and self-sacrifice. In this context, remembering the prospects of the coming revolution we have first to realise the amount of dedication in theory and practice that is required from the Indian Communist revolutionaries today.

Naxalbari has once again shown us the path of revolution and has liberated many Communist revolutionaries from crippling revisionism.

The great contribution of Naxalbari is that like Telengana it has (1) taken revolutionary politics to the villages and has reached it to millions of peasants, (2) has upheld before the masses the battle for the capture of state power through armed struggle. The explosion which was the work of Telengana and Naxalbari peasants had its roots in the Indian revolutionary situation. Many such explosions are in store. It is the task of Communist revolutionaries to earn the capacity to

lead them ideologically, to direct them along the right lines and to guide them towards a successful conclusion.

The first task of Communist revolutionaries in the present revolutionary situation in India is to unite themselves on the basis of revolutionary theory and practice. The arrogant petit-bourgeois attitude that "we are the only revolutionaries" is the main obstacle to unity. Charubabu is instructing students and youths- "say this proudly- only the central leadership of this revolutionary party understand Marxism- Leninism and the Thought of Mao and applies it correctly. No one else understands anything, no one else can possibly understand a thing" (*Deshabrati*, 5 March 1970 ). Such arrogance, such rigidity, such a crude mentality of the upstart petit-bourgeois revolutionary is the main enemy of a revolutionary attitude, the main obstacle to the building of a revolutionary party. Revolutionaries have first to discard this pernicious attitude in order to follow the revolutionary path, they have to carry on criticism and self-criticism in thought and action on the basis of ideology and to build up the party in this manner on the basis of the unity of revolutionary groups and classes. Many of the Communist revolutionaries who are outside the CPI(ML) believe in unity. Many of us talk of unity, advise the masses to unite but our handful of revolutionaries do not unite. We too do not go in for self-criticism- mere abstract slogans for unity are not enough, we must find out an effective way for giving it concrete shape, we must always strive for it.

Apart from Communist revolutionaries, among the Communist Party of India within the United Front, the Forward Bloc, the RSP, the SUC and particularly among the "Marxist" Communist Party, there are many honest and militant workers, peasants and intellectuals revolutionaries. Many of them have not yet realised the extent of opportunism, parliamentarianism and economism among their leaders, they are not even aware of the revisionist character of their programme. But it will be wrong to think that they will remain in this state forever and blindly follow their opportunist leaders. They have acquired adequate experience from the last two United Front Governments, from mass-struggle, movements for land and crop grabbing, and they are having many doubts and queries and their illusions are beginning to disappear. The internal contradictions within these parties, particularly the "Marxist" Party, are becoming sharp. Communist revolutionaries have to work in unity with these cadres in the mass movement and they have to initiate these cadres in revolutionary ideology and in the politics of the capture of state power.

In Vietnam the Communist Party under Ho Chi Minn's leadership has shown how on the basis of revolutionary ideology, the entire masses can be united for the democratic revolution against imperialism and feudalism. He has also shown how it is possible to fight against the powerful military forces of the mighty American imperialism and its deadly weapons of every kind to conduct a long-drawn-out guerilla and mass war and how to finally and irrevocably defeat the enemy.

Communist revolutionaries in India too have to prepare for the coming revolution. The way to prepare for the democratic revolution is to understand : (1) that the main enemy of the Indian masses are imperialism and feudalism, (2) that



we have to give top priority to Marxism-Leninism and the ideology of the Thought of Mao, we have to wage ideological warfare and build up a true Communist Party on the basis of this ideology, (3) that all Communist revolutionaries have to be united within this Party on the basis of ideology, (4) that we have to take up peasant revolution as our central task, we have to set up revolutionary bases in the villages and concentrate on building liberated zones, (5) that we have to organise working-class leadership in this democratic revolution and prepare it for capturing state power, (6) that we have to organise a united democratic and cultural movement of the entire people for the revolution, (7) that we have to take part in trade unions, peasant associations, students' unions, to transform economic consciousness into revolutionary consciousness, to fight against revisionism and for unity, (8) and that we have to take part in the different national struggles in India and establish working-class leadership over them.

We have failed many time in the past. We have to remove the reasons that were responsible for our failure in order to prepare for the revolution. We have to build up a true Communist Party and come forward with firm determination- this time we are going to win.



## NAXALBARI AND AFTER : AN APPRAISAL

### PRABHAT JANA

The armed struggle of the Naxalbari peasants upheld the truth that political power grows out of the barrel of a gun and marked the beginning of the Indian revolution. It showed the revisionists in their 'true light'-lackeys of imperialism, social-imperialism and domestic reaction, whose sole mission is to divert the people from the path of violent revolution. It correctly assessed the stage of the Indian revolution and the role of the peasant in it. It successfully aroused the masses ; led by Communist Revolutionaries, the peasants masses, armed with whatever they could lay their hands on, took part in the struggle and tea-plantation workers there and in neighbouring areas actively supported them. The economic struggle for confiscation of the jotedars' lands and cancellation of the peasants' debt was closely linked with the political struggle for the overthrow of the reactionary ruling classes. Here, legal struggle was combined with illegal struggle and the mass organisation of peasants was linked with and led by the underground party organization-the organization of the Communist Revolutionaries who had rebelled against the revisionist leadership of the CPI(M).

Though the political line of the Naxalbari struggle was correct, it suffered a setback chiefly because of the smallness of the area, inexperience of the revolutionary leaders and peasants, their inability to spread it to wider areas and to develop an appropriate military line. It was a temporary setback but no defeat ; rather, it marked an advance for the revolution forces of the country as a whole. It aroused people in various places, from the Terai region in the northeast of India to Kerala in the southwest and Kashmir in the north-west and helped to unite a majority of the Communist Revolutionaries of the country. Thousands of them rebelled against revisionism and chose the path of armed struggle. Many went to the rural areas to educate the peasantry in Mao Tsetung Thought, the science of revolution in colonies and semi-colonies, and to organize them. The support of the Communist Party of China was of immense help in bringing the Communist Revolutionaries together, first, within the All India Co-ordination Committee of Communist Revolutionaries and then within the Communist Party of India (Marxist-Leninist). Sparks of armed struggle flew from Naxalbari to Srikakulam, Musahari, Lakhimpur-Kheri, Debra-Gopiballavpur-Baharagora, Punjab, and later to different parts of West Bengal, especially Birbhum. Naxalbari did promise a new dawn.

But the dawn did not break. The darkness of reaction blotted out the first streaks of light. The ruling classes and the minions of the law may congratulate

themselves on their performance, but it is not their efficiency in perpetrating diabolical crimes but the weakness of the Party's line that is to blame for the present defeat and disarray of the revolutionary forces. It is the Party line that determines success or failure of revolutionary struggles.

The richest source of strength for revolutionary wars lies in the people. "Only by mobilizing the masses of workers and peasants, who form 90% of the population, can we defeat imperialism and feudalism." This Maoist teaching was applied in Naxalbari and Naxalbari proved to be a turning point. But later, from about the end of 1968, this lesson was ignored and the Communist Revolutionaries were gradually led away from the path of Naxalbari. A "left" opportunist line that was gradually introduced from about this time did immense harm.

What were the concrete manifestations of this "left" opportunism ?

1. First, in the name of combating economism, the party abandoned the mass line. Instead of trying to forge close links with the masses through different mass organisations and different forms of struggle dictated both by their immediate and long-term interests, the Party led by Charu Majumdar withdrew from all mass organisations like peasant associations, trade unions and youth and student associations, and from all mass movements on the plea that they breed economism, dubbed them revisionist and described them as obstacles to the growth and spread of revolutionary struggle. This marked an abrupt change in the line of the Communist Revolutionaries. That the usefulness of mass organisations and mass movements had been acknowledged would be evident from the resolution on trade union work, adopted by the All India Co-ordination Committee of Communist Revolutionaries in its session of May 1968, and from various writings published in its journals, including those of Charu Majumdar. But, from 1969, the Party gradually withdrew into its own shell and relied not on the masses but on small, secret squads of vanguards for waging revolutionary struggle.

It is true that mass organisation and mass movements have for a long time been utilized by reactionaries and revisionists in the interest of class collaboration and for blunting the revolutionary consciousness of the people. To confine mass organisations and mass movements within narrow, economic bounds was certainly economism. It was not the mass organisations and mass movements but the Right opportunist and revisionist leadership of the CPI, the CPI(M) and other so-called socialist and communist parties that were to blame. Even now revisionists of all hues are busy trying to divert all mass struggles and the wrath of the people along peaceful, constitutional channels. While people, even their own supporters, are driven away from their homes, robbed of their jobs or assassinated by the police, they take upon themselves the task of organizing petitions and prayers to the ruling classes.

Nevertheless, to withdraw from mass organisation and mass movements is to be guilty of "left" opportunism. It actually means abandoning the patient and painstaking political struggle and arousing the masses and winning them over from the influence of the counter-revolutionaries and ends in a fatal divorce between

the underground Party and the people, between the revolutionary vanguard and the masses.

In a country like India, the main force of the revolution must be peasantry and one of the main tasks of the Party is to arouse the peasants. It is necessary to link closely the peasants' struggles for land and for annulment of debts with the struggle for seizure of power. It was "left" opportunism on the part of the CPI(ML) to issue a call for a struggle for seizure of power in rural areas without linking it with the peasants' struggle for land and cancellation of usurious loans. The peasants were aroused and the movement gained in intensity and acquired a mass character only in those areas where and when the two struggles became one and inseparable.

From about the middle of 1969, the CPI(ML) began to withdraw its cadres from unions and all other mass organizations. In practice it also withdrew from mass movement on international issues. The mass line that had been followed in Naxalbari was abandoned. So, the inevitable happened : the divorce between the underground Party and the masses of workers and peasants gradually became complete and the revolutionary vanguard became easy targets of the reactionaries for arrest, torture and assassination.

Another manifestation of "left" opportunism was to equate class struggles with "the battle of annihilation of class enemies". It was insisted that "the battle of annihilation of class enemies" was the only *form* of struggle at this stage and party cadres were instructed to form small squads of poor and landless peasants in a secret, "*conspiratorial*" manner-secret from the people and secret even from the Party units not accustomed to underground conditions of work-and to carry out annihilation of hated class enemies one after another. Politics of seizure of power was to be propagated, not widely, but with the sole purpose of carrying out successful annihilation of individual class enemies. It was argued that "the class struggle, that is, this battle of annihilation, could solve all the problems facing us"; it would unleash the initiative of poor and landless peasants, carry the struggle forward to a higher stage, raise the level of the people's political consciousness, create new men, build the People's Army, ensure the creation of stable base areas and bring about a revolutionary upsurge ending in a countrywide victory.

These arguments were not based on any concrete analysis of the conditions in this country but were wholly subjective. Because of the lack of a dialectical approach on the part of the CPI(ML) leadership, the 'battle of annihilation of class enemies' has, instead of solving any of our problems, made them much more difficult than before. The initiative of poor and landless peasants was roused and the struggle reached a higher stage only in those areas where the struggle for the confiscation of the *jotedars'* land and other possessions and for cancellation of usurious loans was combined with the struggle for seizure of power-for instance, in Naxalbari in 1967 and in Srikakulam and Musahari. On the other hand, when the class-enemy-annihilation line was imposed, it gradually disorganised the revolutionary forces, snapped their links with the people, and led to the degeneration of the struggle in some areas and to the suppression of the militants by the police

and the army. Instead of raising the level of the people's political consciousness, this line actually spread demoralization among them. Whatever people's army appeared in an embryonic form is today faced with extinction. Neither any 'stable' (or unstable) base area nor any countryside revolutionary upsurge could be created by the class-enemy-annihilation line.

In his writing *Some Questions concerning Methods of Leadership*, Mao Tsetung said : "However active the leading group may be, its activity will amount to fruitless effort by a handful of people unless combined with the activity of the masses." He also said : "Communists must never separate themselves from the majority of the people or neglect them by leading only a few progressive contingents in an isolated and rash advance, but must forge close links between the progressive elements and the broad masses." (*The Role of the Chinese Communists Party in the National War*)

The Party leadership did not heed this warning, ignored the teachings of all great Marxist-Leninists and mistook terrorism for revolutionary violence. Naturally, terrorism practised by groups of its militants failed to accomplish what the revolutionary violence of an aroused people can.

The Party leadership believed that annihilation of class enemies could be carried on, one after another, in an area (some of them would be killed and some would flee), the rural areas could thus be liberated from class enemies and Revolutionary Committees, organs of people's power, could be established there. The very existence of the State machinery, the purpose of which is to protect the class enemies and their regime of oppression and exploitation, was overlooked and the fact that organs of the people's power could not be established in any area without contending with the State machinery was ignored.

To equate secret annihilation of individuals with guerrilla war is not correct. Guerilla war can be waged only by relying on the people and their active help and co-operation. But annihilation of class enemies is carried out secretly, "conspiratorially"-without involving the people. Guerilla war is war between the People's Army and the enemy's armed forces ; it is a form of people's war. So there is a basic difference between guerrilla war and secret assassination of individuals.

Why do Marxist-Leninists reject individual terror, secret assassination of individuals, as one of the main forms of struggle ? This is not a question of abstract morality. It is not certainly immoral to annihilate certain mass-murderers-men responsible for the murder of many workers and peasants. But, in using individual terror-in special cases, the Party should be guided not by its own wishes but by the wishes of the masses and by a proper analysis of the actual conditions at the given time and place. As a main form of struggle, individual terror-secret assassination of individuals-does tremendous harm to the cause of revolution instead of helping it. First, it diverts the Party from the path of class struggle, from the path of people's war. It is petty-bourgeois subjectivism to dream of creating mass upsurge through individual terror by a handful of militants. Secondly, this belittles the enemies'

strength from the tactical point of view. A handful of militants isolated from the people can easily be suppressed by the enemy. This terrorism endangers the Party's very existence, severs its links with the masses and renders all political work impossible. Lenin said : "In principle we have never rejected, and cannot reject terror. Terror is one of the forms of military action that may be perfectly suitable and even essential at a definite juncture in the battle, given a definite state of the troops and the existence of definite conditions. We, therefore, declare emphatically that under the present conditions such a means of struggle is inopportune and unsuitable ; that it diverts the most active fighters from their real task, the task which is most important from the standpoint of the interests of the movement as a whole; and that it disorganizes the forces, not of the government, but of the revolution.... Is there not the danger of rupturing the contact between the revolutionary organizations and the disunited masses of the discontented, the protesting, and the disposed to struggle, who are weak precisely because they are disunited ? Yet it is this contact that is the sole guarantee of our success." (*Where to Begin*)

From about the middle of 1970, the annihilation of police-men, spies, bureaucrats, corrupt traders and petty mill owners became the main form of struggle in urban areas. In the course of this struggle even traffic constables, educationists, judges, trade union leaders and leaders of different political parties were attacked and some of them annihilated. Instead of working underground in urban areas for a long time to co-ordinate the struggle of the workers and other working people with the struggle in the countryside, the Party's militants rushed into head-on collisions with the enemy's organised forces of violence. The Party cadres showed utter selflessness and great heroism. But the inevitable happened : while a large section of the people were antagonised, thousands of cadres were tortured, maimed and imprisoned and several hundreds-both leaders and cadres-died.

The Party militants were involved in another bloody struggle. The political struggle between the CPI(ML) and the CPI(M) degenerated into a tragic feud-a war of annihilation between the cadres and supporters of the two parties-a war that bewildered the people and served only the interest of the ruling classes. The CPI(ML) failed to distinguish between the CPI(M) leadership and the large section of its cadres and supporters, did not wage any persistent political struggle to win over the latter and did little to try to stop this mutual, senseless killing.

It is right to rebel against the education system in our country, which is semi-colonial and semi-feudal. Today, chaos reigns in the educational sphere because of the utter rottenness of the system. But as Mao Tsetung said, it is always necessary first of all to create public opinion, to do work in the ideological sphere. But when CPI(ML) cadres and lumpen elements systematically attacked schools and colleges with bombs, destroyed their offices, laboratories and libraries and set some of them on fire, the Party leadership supported all these anarchic nonpolitical acts instead of guiding this revolt along a political channel and doing some work in the ideological sphere. Thousands of teachers felt that they were the targets of this attack.

It was also right to rebel against the long dominance of the cultural and political influence of the leaders who represented comprador-cum-feudal class interests. The "heroes" of the so-called Bengal Renaissance, able representatives in the realm of culture and education of the new comprador-cum-feudal class fathered by the British rulers, were children of the British colonialists spiritually and found salvation of the country in its imperialist fetters at a time when India was being rocked by anti-imperialist and anti-feudal peasant uprisings and the First War of Independence. The anti-imperialism of many great national leaders, who flourished in this century, was indeed sham while their role as servitors of imperialism or fascism was quite real. The new democratic politics and culture of the working class, the peasantry and the petty bourgeoisie, led by the working class, can not win in the struggle against the pro-imperialist and feudal politics and culture that still dominate the life of the country without unmasking its real character. But the manner in which the revolt took place, the burning of portraits and smashing of statues, bewildered and shocked the petty bourgeoisie which has been brought up to revere the pro-imperialist cultural and political leaders. Compared with the enormity of the task, very little was done in the ideological sphere. In this case, too, the Party failed to guide the revolt along the correct path and this failure was fully exploited by the enemy.

Thanks to the Party units, the activities of gangsters and hoodlums were curbed to a great extent in many areas and people enjoyed some sense of security. But some oppression was perpetrated on the people in the name of the Party in some areas. In a few areas the local Party committees, on their own initiative, took measures to stop it, but in most areas nothing was done to check it or to demarcate the Party from the elements that were utilising its name for their own sordid ends.

Early in 1971, the slogan that those who would seek votes (for election to the West Bengal Legislative Assembly) and those who would cast their votes were to be annihilated, was raised in some areas. Even the political struggle for boycott of elections and against parliamentarism degenerated into a 'battle of annihilation.' This was another extreme and dangerous manifestation of "Left" opportunism.

It was wrong on the part of the CPI(ML) leadership to characterize all other political parties as parties of the ruling classes. Different small parties represent the interests of the small and middle bourgeoisie or the interests they may help the ruling classes and go against the interest of the people at certain times, but there are also contradictions between them and the ruling classes. To see only one aspect, the aspect of their unity with the ruling classes, and to overlook the other aspect, their contradictions, is contrary to dialectics and, so, un-Marxist.

The All India Co-ordination Committee of Communist Revolutionaries had expressed the hope in a resolution adopted in May 1968 that its contradictions with the groups that believed in armed agrarian revolution and professed loyalty to Mao Tsetung thought would remain non-antagonistic. But, later, these groups were unjustly abused as agents of imperialism and international revisionism on the ground that they were opposing annihilation of class enemies. This was a

manifestation of extreme “left” sectarianism. Indeed, an extreme “left” sectarian line that isolated and weakened the revolutionary forces, was pursued by the Party. Even the study of Marxist classics was discouraged and Marxism-Leninism-Mao Tsetung thought was made to degenerate into a cult of ‘bhakti’, into a blind, unquestioning faith in the revolutionary authority of a leader, and similar anti-Marxist trash. All this was the work of a petty bourgeoisie with a long feudal tail.

The emergence of “left” opportunism during the last three years was perhaps historically inevitable. Isn’t as Lenin pointed out, anarchism infrequently a sort of punishment for the opportunist sins of the working class movement ? In this country the Communist Party never became the party of the working class nor was its Marxist - Leninist ideological foundation ever firm. Both in ideology and in composition it remained overwhelmingly petty bourgeois and trailed behind the pro-imperialist, compromising bourgeoisie. The CPI, as well as the CPI(M), led not even by a labour aristocracy but by a petty bourgeois and landlord or ex-landlord aristocracy, has throughout its long life, pursued a policy not of class struggle but of class collaborations- apolicy of treachery against the people. At particular places and particular periods there have been revolt against right opportunism, for example, in Telengana in the forties. But right opportunism has dominated the communist movement in this country. Revolt against right opportunism started along the correct path in Naxalbari . But afterwards, in the course of the bitter struggle against right opportunism , this revolt degenerated into “left” opportunism a punishment for the many right opportunist sins, hypocrisy servility and treachery of the communist movement in this country.

When we are criticizing deviations, it would be wrong to suppose that the entire work of the last five years was utterly fruitless and all wrong, and had no positive aspect. Nothing can be more untrue. The work of the last years has a positive aspect of immense significance. What is that aspect ?

First, the Naxalbari peasant struggle as we have said before, marked a turning point in India’s history . In view of the long reign of right opportunism in this country, it was no easy task for the revolutionaries and peasants of Naxalbari to uphold the great truth that force is the midwife of the old society pregnant with a new one. No force on earth can wipe out the new revolutionary force that Naxalbari represents.

Second, the Naxalbari struggle could begin only by raising high the banner of Mao Tsetung Thought and by waging a bitter fight against revisionism and right opportunism. For the past few years Communist Revolutionaries have carried on an uncompromising struggle against sham parliamentarianism and other manifestations of revisionist ideology and politics as well as against revisionist practices.

Third, it was the All India Coordination Committee of Communist Revolutionaries that unmasked for the first time in India the character of Soviet revisionism. The CPI(ML) also exposed the real character of the “Treaty of Friendship and Cooperation”.



Fourth, the CPI(ML) has waged struggle against bourgeois chauvinism and upheld proletarian internationalism . When all reactionary and revisionist parties tried their utmost to poison the minds of the people with hostility and hatred for socialist China, the CPI(ML) carried on almost single-handed a struggle against the anti-China campaign. It also exposed and denounced the Indian expansionists when they invaded and dismembered Pakistan.

Fifth, the brief history of the CPI(ML) is the history of struggle, heroism and self-sacrifice . The cadres and leaders of the Party never hesitated and do not hesitate to lay down their lives in the interest of the people . Here lies the basic difference between the leaders and cadres of the CPI(ML) and the revisionists. When the former are essentially self-sacrificing the latter are essentially self-seekers and careerists . The CPI(ML) has set examples of courage to fight, self-sacrifice and devotion to the cause of revolution at a time when sham militancy , rank opportunism, careerism and servility masqueraded as socialism, communism and Marxism in this country.

*May 12-19, 1973*



**VII- 11**  
**DOCUMENTS OF NORTH**  
**ZONAL COMMITTEE**  
**- R C U C (M L)**

## POLITICAL DRAFT [AMENDED VERSION]

*[This is the new, amended version of the Political Draft prepared by the Northern Zone Committee of the Revolutionary Communist Unity Centre (Marxist-Leninist). This draft was circulated among the units of the respective Organisation for discussion, criticism, amendment and suggestion for improvement.]*

With the defeat of the fascist forces and the victory of the Soviet Union led by Stalin during the Second World War, the balance of class forces throughout the world underwent a revolutionary change. There was an upsurge of revolutionary struggles throughout the world, particularly in the countries of the East. Imperialism entered the era of rapid and total collapse. With this a very favourable situation was created for freedom-loving peoples of the world, particularly for the oppressed peoples and nations. The revisionist renegade Soviet Party leadership, after having deserted the camp of the International Communist Movement during the last decade, turned the party into a bourgeois fascist party and the first socialist state into a social-imperialist state. This, however, could not alter the international situation. On the contrary, the situation has become more favourable to the world proletariat, as well as the oppressed peoples and nations.

During the First World War a revolutionary situation was created in a number of countries. But owing to the degeneration of the parties under the Second International into a revisionist social-chauvinist parties the revolution could not be successful in these countries. Only in Russia, did the Bolshevik party, founded by Lenin, successfully, complete the great October Revolution and establish the dictatorship of the proletariat.

During, and after the Second World War, the Chinese party led by Com. Mao-Tse-tung, and some other genuine Marxist-Leninist parties, successfully completed the revolution in their countries. In certain other countries, there was a vigorous advance in revolutionary struggles. But in some countries, where the party leadership was in the hands of revisionists, the revolution could neither succeed nor advance. India occupies an important place among these latter countries.

After the Second World War, India was swept by a revolutionary big tide. The Naval Mutiny in Bombay, Rashid Ali Day, and above all the peasant war in Telengana, are events worth mentioning. In Telengana about 2500 villages were liberated. This had a tremendous impact all over the country. These events paved the way for the seizure of political power by armed struggle. But the great struggles of the people were betrayed by the revisionists and capitulationist leadership of the party and Telengana failed.

British imperialism realised that unless a formal transfer of power was made to the Congress leadership a genuine communist leadership might seize power in the country. That is why at the cost of partitioning the country a formal transfer of power was made and the Gandhi-Nehru leadership was installed.

The peoples' struggle for freedom against the Moghul Emperors undermined the Moghul Empire and led to its disintegration with the declaration of independence by nationality after nationality (for e.g., the struggle of the Mahrattas against Aurangzeb under the leadership of Shivaji). The breakdown of the centralised administration of the Moghuls resulted in a period of chaos because the various princely states and feudatories were neither strong enough on their own nor united enough internally or externally to maintain stability and order. This situation provided a golden opportunity to the British to convert their trading initiative into political initiative. Exploiting the contradictions and weaknesses, both within and outside the various states, they intervened directly, and most often, forcibly, both against the already alienated French and Portuguese interests and by playing one raja against another, soon seized power and control of the states in India. A new centralised administration was raised on the ruins of the old one, under British control. Forcibly and arbitrarily uniting the nationalities, who had their own independent language, culture and economy, this vast sub-continent was converted into a British colony.

The crisis of British manufacture found a solution in the massive export of raw materials from the new colony. The finished goods were sold in the Indian market and in this way, the destruction of the Indian cottage industry was begun. To export raw material and to import finished goods into India, the British built railways, docks and opened up communications in India. With this the working class in India was born. Realising the value of a cheap labour force along with raw materials on the spot, the British began to export finance capital to set up some industries and factories, locally. Thus was the industrial proletariat born. Before the British seized power, India has self sufficient economy, of the old feudal type where there was no money exchange or production for the market. The barter system prevailed and products were exported all over India and to other countries as well. Tax was collected in kind, e.g., grain, and in normal conditions the peasants were able to produce enough for themselves and for the tax. With the advent of British rule, the old system was destroyed and a new form of feudalism was imposed in the interests of the new rulers and the eventual ruin of the peasantry.

1. The permanent Land Settlement created a new class of lackeys who were responsible for the collection of rent and tax, namely, the Zamindars, Jotedars, ryotwars etc., and these people robbed the people mercilessly, collecting vast tracts of land in the process.

2. In some parts of India the rajas and maharajas retained some powers but being under the full control of the British, they exercised no responsibility other than to collect taxes and administer the native laws etc. This crippled their own initiative and led to their total degeneration. As a result they did nothing but exploit the people and oppress them ruthlessly.

3. The British also established a new administrative judiciary.

4. Money economy was introduced and the old barter system was destroyed.

5. In order to safe-guard their interests the imperialists suppressed the development of the culture

and language of the intellectuals and educated sections, thus creating a unique petty bourgeoisie in this country, alienated from its own roots and a slave to British culture.

In order to strengthen imperialist exploitation, the British imperialists strengthened feudalism on one hand, and made some industrialisation with British capital, on the other. In India, a new parasite bourgeoisie was born. This bourgeois class however, could not develop independently because industrialisation was made primarily with British Finance Capital. Thus, it could not play a genuine anti-imperialist role. Moreover, after the October Revolution, in which the proletariat seized power in one-sixth of the globe, the emerging bourgeoisie in the east completely abandoned the tasks, of the bourgeoisie democratic revolution and went over to the camp of imperialism. The Indian bourgeoisie was no exception. As Stalin said in 1925, "Fearing revolution more than it fears imperialism and concerned more about its money-bags than about the interests of its own country, this section of the bourgeoisie, the richest and the most influential section, is going over entirely to the camp of the irreconcilable enemies of the revolution, it is forming a bloc with imperialism against the workers and peasants of its own country!"

A review of the Indian Independence Movement shows that the Congress leadership could never adopt any concrete programme to overthrow imperialist exploitation. On the contrary, it is clear that whenever there was an upsurge of anti-imperialist struggle, this leadership betrayed the cause of the movement, collaborating and compromising with the imperialists. That is why even after the transfer of power in 1947, imperialist exploitation remained unchanged. The monopoly of British imperialism, however, yielded place to U.S imperialism and, more recently, Soviet Imperialism has penetrated powerfully into India.

The transfer of power made some changes in the super structure without affecting the basic social structure. The Indian constitution is nothing but a white-wash of the 1935 Government of India Act. Under these circumstances, the concept that India is an independent country and, that the big bourgeoisie is building up capitalism, is erroneous. Colonial India has changed into semifederal, semi-colonial country.

Throughout its history the communist Party leadership remained in the hands of revisionists and opportunists, as a result of which, despite a favourable situation obtaining, the politics of seizure of power by armed struggle could not be carried through to the end. Either right opportunism or left adventurism did great damage to the communist movement. Working class leadership could not be established, and due to this the revolution remained incomplete.

In order to make revolution it is of prime importance to ascertain who are the real enemies and who the real friends of the people. Under the banner of working

class leadership, it is necessary to unite the real friends against the real enemies and to carry forward struggle.

The various imperialist powers, such as the US, Britain, Japan, West Germany and the Soviet Union are severely exploiting our people. These imperialist powers are the enemies of the people. US imperialism and Soviet revisionist social imperialism are the main enemies. "US imperialism and Soviet revisionist social imperialism are bagged down in political and economic crises, beset with difficulties both at home and abroad, and find themselves at an impasse. They collude and at the same time, contend with each other in a main attempt to redivide the world." (From the report of the Ninth Congress of the CPC.) At present these super-powers are competing with one another. India occupies an important place in their competition. With the intensification of Soviet "AID" in the economic and military spheres, and with the signing of the INDO-SOVIET MILITARY TREATY, Soviet influence over India has increased considerably. With this, there is also a growing contradiction between the two super-powers. The recent Indo-Pak war and the so-called Bangladesh war are glaring examples. This increasing contradiction however, is opening up new possibilities for the revolutionary forces and the people. In the sphere of relations, there is the feudal form of exploitation. It can be said that there have been some changes here and there, some differences in land relations from state to state, but this has not put an end to feudalism. The jotedars, moneylenders and other types of landlords continue to ruthlessly exploit the vast peasant masses. Feudalism serves as the main social base of imperialism. So feudalism is one of the main enemies of the revolution.

The comprador bourgeoisie, born and developed under the aegis of imperialism, has now been converted into a monopoly bourgeoisie with the merger of Banking Industrial Capital. This is known as Finance or Bureaucratic Capital. This Bureaucratic Capital has further developed into State Capital as well, the whole being controlled by the Comprador Bourgeoisie in the interests of Imperialism. With this there is also state capital controlled by the bureaucrats. So Comprador Bureaucratic capital is also one of the main enemies of the revolution.

Therefore, the main enemies of the Indian Revolution are: US imperialism, Soviet social-imperialism, Feudalism and Comprador-Bureaucratic capitalism. These four big mountains are weighing heavily on the back of our people. The various exploited classes, i.e., the working class, the various strata of oppressed peasantry, the petty bourgeois students, youth and intellectuals are friends of the revolution. The national bourgeoisie which is also being exploited, is in this case an ally too.

With the above class analysis of Indian society, the present stage of Indian revolution is clearly indicated. Because imperialism and feudalism have formed a bloc, the main form of exploitation is obviously that of imperialist-feudal oppression. Therefore, national liberation from imperialism, and democratic revolution against feudalism, are the principal tasks of the Indian revolution. This we call the New Democratic or the Peoples' Democratic Revolution, the main axis being the agrarian revolution.

The imperialists and their lackeys did not allow the productive forces in our country to develop. They actively obstructed this development. Moreover, rather than trying to solve the complex problem of the various nationalities in India, they deliberately intensified the problem by creating communal, caste and regional conflicts and antagonism. This was in keeping with their divide and rule policy in order to safe-guard and further their exploitation in the country. Today these problems are still with us. In order to release the productive forces and to solve the problem of nationalities by developing them fully and equally, it is essential to successfully complete the New Democratic Revolution under the leadership of the proletariat. Working class leadership alone can solve these various problems. If the leadership of the struggle goes into the hands of any other class, it will degenerate into a separatist, reactionary, counter-revolutionary movement which will only help the cause of the imperialists and their lackeys. The working class and the working class alone can exercise leadership over the New Democratic Revolution. This is because it is the motive force of the revolution. Not only is the proletariat the most advanced and organised class in society but in the colonies and semi-colonies, where the comprador bourgeoisie has been created by imperialism and so cannot take an anti-imperialist stand and, moreover, after October 1917, when the workers leadership had seized power in Russia, even the national bourgeoisie, fearing a working class take-over in the anti-imperialist anti-feudal struggle, vacillates between the forces of liberation and the forces of imperialism and is thus rendered incapable of leading the Democratic Revolution to victory. The working class can lead the revolution to victory only when it succeeds in forging a firm alliance with the peasantry which is the main force of the revolution, and also by uniting all the other exploited classes under its banner. This United Front is one of the three magic sticks necessary for the successful completion of the New Democratic Revolution.

The working class and the working class alone can exercise leadership over the revolution. That is why the working class is the basic force of the revolution. The revolution can succeed if the working class can form a firm alliance with the peasantry, which is the main force of the revolution, as well as a broad-based front with the other exploited classes.

The Indian revolution is part and parcel of the world revolution initiated by the Great October Revolution. But the Indian revolution cannot succeed by the method of insurrection, the path of the October Revolution. The socialist revolution can be successful and the dictatorship of the proletariat can be established only when the New Democratic Revolution is carried through to the end. To bring about this we must follow the path of armed struggle and a protracted peoples' war.

The question of armed struggle and the dictatorship of the proletariat are things which the revisionists fear most. Throughout history it has been seen that in all countries without exception, the revisionists have negated the revolutionary content of Marxism, i.e., the politics of seizure of power by armed struggle and the settlement of the issue by war. Thus they discard the revolutionary content of Marxism, but by wearing the garb of Marxism, they have made efforts to make

themselves acceptable to the ruling classes. So, in order to make revolution, it is necessary to lay utmost emphasis on the basic concept of seizure of power by armed struggle. Stressing armed struggle however, does not mean undermining or abandoning other forms of struggle. Armed struggle is the highest form of class struggle. Therefore without organising the various forms of class struggle, it would be impossible to organise the various forms of class struggle. (It is necessary to remain alert about such manifestations of left deviations.) It should be remembered that every movement of partial interest must have as its final aim the seizure of political power by armed struggle. In the present phase of Indian revolution, the villages are the nerve centre of organising and conducting armed struggle.

To develop armed struggle we must build base areas in the countryside. Establishing base areas through struggle is vital and indispensable and should on no account be underestimated in the unequal development of our country. It is not possible to start the armed struggle everywhere at the same time. In order to protect ourselves and to defeat the enemy ultimately we must build base areas. However, the armed struggle should not begin until a sufficiently large area has been prepared, politically, economically, militarily and culturally, to enable retreat, manipulation and proper cover. Otherwise the revolutionaries will become isolated and the base areas will be easily encircled and suppressed by the enemy. We must be on our guard against this manifestation of left adventurism. Where the people are ready to take arms before the conditions for armed struggle have matured, communists should not hold them back. But we must learn from the experiences of past mistakes and guide the masses correctly and build our armed struggle properly. In order to capture state power war is necessary. In order to fight the war a peoples' army is necessary. To win the war the peoples' army will have to wage regular war at the final stage. But, at the present stage we do not have even a peoples' army, and we must develop the struggle much further before we can wage regular war. In the initial stage our method of war is guerilla war. This is linked with and developed from the class struggle at its higher stages. Guerilla war protects the base area and liberated zones and helps to form the peoples' army. Gradually, in the course of the peoples' war, the guerilla struggle will develop to the stages of mobile, positional and regular warfare.

In order to wage a peoples' war it is necessary to abandon the parliamentary road. Since India is a semi-feudal, semi-colonial country where the democratic revolution is yet to be completed, it cannot be said that there exists such a thing as a bourgeois parliament. With the advance of the peasants war in Telengana and the peasant struggles in other parts of the country, with the unprecedented advance in the International Communist movement and with the successful completion of the New Democratic Revolution in China, the panic-stricken imperialists and their collaborators, in order to hoodwink and misguide the people, imposed on them the fraud of parliamentary democracy. Unfortunately, however, abandoning armed struggle, the communist party leadership accepted the fraudulent parliamentary road. Thus the Indian revolution was betrayed.

In order to make a revolution it is necessary to have a revolutionary party. In India there is no genuine revolutionary party, it could not be built as the working



class was prevented from exercising its leadership over the communist movement. It can be seen that persons of petit bourgeois class origins who did not integrate themselves with the working class and did not change their class character, have remained in the positions of highest leadership all through. Hence the fundamental principals of Marxism could not be grasped by them and neither could proper lessons be learnt from the great historic struggles of the Indians and the people of the world. This petit bourgeois leadership did not study the social, economic political and cultural history of India and did not apply the Marxist-Leninist teachings in analysing the concrete situation. They made in the name of "directives" from the international leadership, persistent efforts to impose the sectarian outlook of their 'cliques' on the movement. Hence the great struggles of our people could not reach their culmination.

In today's context, the international and national situation is more favourable to the Indian revolution. Owing to its policy of war and aggression, the US imperialism has become increasingly isolated and has suffered serious defeats in the hands of the people of the world, particularly the people of Vietnam, Laos and Cambodia. Equally they could not prevent China's entry into the UN. Soviet social imperialism has also been unmasked by their rape of Czechoslovakia. It actively supported the Indian expansionists in their war of aggression against Pakistan. The national situation is more favourable than ever before. Although with the help and support of the revisionists the main political party of the ruling classes has revived and strengthened, the strength is only temporary: there remains the inherent contradiction in the people. With the passing of each day the ruling classes become more and more dependent on armed repression. The fraud of democracy is being exposed and its fascist character is being unmasked. The CPI(M), the main political party of the revisionists, is still a powerful factor, but they have been much weakened and isolated. The CPI(ML) had neither a mass line or a mass base due to its policy of individual terrorism. Hence they could not uphold the banner of the Naxalbari peasants' armed struggle.

Under the present circumstances, the communist revolutionaries have been entrusted with a task of great historic importance. The immediate task is to unite, for we must remember that "in its struggle against the collective power of the propertied classes, the working class cannot act as a class except by constituting itself into a political party, distinct from and opposed to all old parties formed by the propertied classes".

If this task is to be undertaken, then the ideological struggle against revisionism should be intensified and conducted, recognising that Mao Tse Tung Thought is the guide-line and the CPC, at this stage, is the leader of the international communist movement. The main attack should be directed against Soviet revisionists and their local agents. While fighting revisionism we must guard against sectarianism

Organising ideological struggle should not mean undermining concrete practice. As we know, without a revolutionary theory there can be no revolution. Similarly, we also know that theory becomes meaningless unless co-ordinated with revolutionary practice. Therefore, with the concrete analyses of the concrete

situation, a concrete programme for organising and developing partial struggle must be adopted. Of course, the final aim of these struggles must be the seizure of power by armed struggle.

No body can claim leadership of the communist movement today. In the present situation our task is to unite the vast masses of the people in our country, Correct leadership will emerge only through this struggle. In the fight against left and right deviation the correct line must be put forward correctly in practice. The cadres and the masses will recognise what is right and what is wrong in the class struggle. The wrong will stand exposed soon enough because the people are not fools. They will quickly distinguish between what is right and what is wrong. We must always keep in mind the whole problem and the main contradictions. If we become bogged down in localism, or if we overestimate secondary contradictions, we will not be able to develop our work correctly and we will become isolated from the people. The CPI, CPI(M), CPI(ML) must all be struggled against. However, this struggle should not take the form of more argument, criticism and abuse. It is only by putting the correct line into practice before the cadres and the people that the wrong line of the revisionists will stand exposed.

The bourgeoisie wants to keep a revolutionary party an open, legal party for they know that it will then be possible for them to utilise as well as suppress the party. While, maintaining that every legal opportunity should be exploited, we firmly believe that the party should remain underground. It is therefore necessary for the party to adopt itself to the principles of an illegal party organisation. While taking advantage of the legal opportunities, care should be taken to ensure that the party does not degenerate into a legal party.

Of course it is not possible to form a party at the moment but is entirely possible to undertake the task of creating the prerequisites for a party. It is necessary to study and grasp the basic principles of Marxism -Leninism -Mao Tse Tung's Thought, the co-relations of class forces and apply them to the concrete analyses of the concrete situation. The best sons of the working class should be given positions of leadership, comrades should be sent to the villages and contacts with the masses should be established. In the sphere of democratic and mass movements concrete slogans are to be issued. They may be as follows:-

- To oppose fascist repression and individual annihilation,
- Banning of lay-offs, lock-out and automation etc.,
- To oppose taxation on the people & increase in war budgets,
- Certification of foreign and monopoly capital,
- To oppose eviction and moneylending,
- To demand land to the tiller etc.

## ORGANISATION DRAFT

“Without a Revolutionary Party there can be no Revolution.” In India today there is no Revolutionary Party. The primary task, therefore, is to build a genuine Revolutionary Party.

What is a genuine Revolutionary Party? The Communist Party is the highest form of organisation of the proletariat. It is the advanced detachment of the working class. It is a well-disciplined organisation, based on a scientific understanding of reality, based on Democratic-Centralsim, armed with Marxist-Leninist theory, tested in the practice of concrete struggle, using the method of Criticism and Self-criticism and losely integrated with the masses of the people.

Why is it that in India such a Party has not been built ? A revolutionary party could not be built in India because instead of taking inspiration from the historic struggle of the Indian working class and the workers of the world, the leadership of the communist movement remained petti bourgeois, both in class origin and in class interest. It lacked firm proletarian conviction and faith in the people. As a result it failed to declass itself, to become integrated with the masses and to build up a genuine proletarian leadership. In other words the leaders failed to understand the fundamental principle of Marxism-Leninism. Moreover they could not correctly analyse the concrete situation in India, and thus failed to lead the people to ultimate victory, falling inevitably into the morass of either Left or Right deviation.

As a result the Indian communist movement, instead of uniting all the revolutionary classes and groups, has split again and again, and, plagued by opportunism and sectarianism, has betrayed the revolution.

Where to Begin ? Remembering that our fundamental task is to disseminate (i.e. to spread) Marxist-Leninist politics the mass of the people; remembering that in the life of a revolutionary, the authority is the revolution itself and not the revolutionary party, it is clear that the completion of the revolution is the aim and the Revolutionary Party's the indispensable organisational means to this end. A Party is formed not for the sake of formation, but for the completion of the revolution. If this is so, then we must acknowledge the hard reality that the birth and growth of a genuinely revolutionary party can never come into being merely through ideological struggle, or by a decree, or a decision, or in a meeting. Such ideological struggles, decrees, decisions, meeting etc., divorced from all revolutionary class struggle, are not struggles at all. They are reduced to mere phrase-mongering. The relation between Revolution and the struggle for a Revolutionary Party must be understood.

In the present situation in India there are numerous revolutionary groups and individuals working in different parts of the country. It is absolutely necessary that these various groups and individuals are united. But we must clearly understand the basis for this unity. Unity can be forged only through the process of ideological understanding, combined with the revolutionary class struggle. This means that the ideological struggle should not degenerate into mere debate or verbal criticism, slander and personal attack, but should be tested in the practice of the class struggle which alone will expose what is right and what is wrong. Tactically, this means that each group should work with utmost sincerity to develop the class struggle on the basis of its own political understanding and programme. For this it should have a well-disciplined organisation. Unity with others will be developed on the basis of mutual political agreement and a minimum programme of work. The people alone will decide which line is correct.

The question of leadership can only be solved on this basis. At present no single group or individual can claim leadership over others. Leadership will emerge through a process of revolutionary class struggle and cannot be imposed arbitrarily.

### **On Organisation :**

“With a strong organisation skilled in waging political struggle under all circumstances and at all time, there can be no question of that systematic plan of action, illumined by firm principles and steadfastly carried out, which alone is worthy of the name of tactics.”

“The primary and imperative practical task “being to “establish an organisation of revolutionaries capable of lending energy, stability and continuity to the political struggles”, the Northern zone Committee of the RCUC (M-L) resolved to establish such an organisation. The principle features of such an organisation according to Lenin are :-

“1. That no revolutionary movement can endure without a stable organisation of leaders maintaining continuity.”

2. That the broader the popular mass drawn spontaneously into the struggle, which forms the basis of the movement and participates in it, the more urgent the need for such an organisation, and the more solid the organisation must be, (for it is much easier for all sorts of demagogues to sidetrack the more backward sections of the masses)

3. That such an organisation must consist of people professionally engaged in revolutionary activity.

4. That in an autocratic state the more we confine the membership of such an organisation to people who are professionally trained in the art of combating the political police, the more difficult will it be to unearth the organisation, and

5. The greater will be the number of people from the working class and from other social classes who will be able to join the movement and perform active work in it.”

As pointed out in our political Draft, a stable organisation of revolutionaries is essential in order to initiate, guide and develop the mass movement. It is also

pointed out that under the growing fascism in our country it is essential that this organisation be secret. This secret organisation will act as the leading core of the mass movement in order to develop and to raise it to the level of revolutionary class struggle.

The ruling classes in our country want all political organisations to be as open and broad as a possible so that they utilise as well as crush them easily. For this reason it is of the utmost importance to be very clear about the link between open and underground work. (See : On the Method of Work ? COMMUNE 2)

### **ORGANISATIONAL STRUCTURE :**

The Northern Zone consists of Delhi, Madhya Pradesh, Rajasthan, Punjab, Haryana, Uttar Pradesh and Himachal Pradesh. In order to develop work in all these states, the Northern Zone Committee, consisting of comrades from all these states, on the basis of their development of their mass work and their political understanding, felt the need to unite and consolidate their activities into a single organisation. This organisation is called the Revolutionary Communist Unity Centre (Marxist-Leninist). The first task was to organise the state and district units on the basis of the Political Draft. The method of work adopted has been delineated in Commune.

The organisation is based on the following principles :-

1. Ideology and Political Understanding : The revolutionary organisation should be based primarily on ideological and political understanding. This means that Marxism-Leninism and Mao's Thought is the guideline of all our activities and we must apply its universal principles to the concrete situation in our country.

We have seen how in the past, the various parties (CPI, CPI-M, CPI-ML) have subordinated the primary question of revolutionary ideology to that of the organisational tasks and unity of the party. We emphasise that ideological and political understanding is the determining factor in our organisation.

2. Underground Organisation : Realising that if we are to raise the mass struggle to the level of political struggle on the broadest possible basis, it is of the utmost importance to have a secret organisation consisting, in the main of professional revolutionaries. It is clear that the organisation must remain secret. However, it is equally necessary to understand correctly the relation between a secret organisation and open mass work. The two are inter-connected.

As we understand it, the communist organisations in India have suffered from two basic weaknesses. Firstly, the entire organisation being open, led to the confusion of the relation between Political organisation and Mass organisation. The entire party became a mass open party and the result, in the face of government repression, was Opportunism and Revolutionism (eg. CPI and CPI-M). Secondly the correct relation between secret and mass organisation was again confused by the CPI-ML, and a number of other revolutionary groups. The mistake here was that the entire work became secret and isolated from the masses—from the mass organisation and the mass movements, and the result was alienation from the people and the development of left Adventurism.

The relation between the Mass line and the Secret Organisation must be clearly grasped. In a word, "Underground means that the Mass is the ground under cover of which the Secret Organisation is built". Initially, however, until the "ground" has been sufficiently prepared, i.e., until the masses have been sufficiently politicised, the revolutionary identity of the organisation must be kept secret even from the people. But in the main, our work will not be divorced from the people and the masses.

3. Democratic Centralism. The Organisation should be based on democratic rather than Bureaucratic Centralism. The Bureaucratic methods employed by the leadership of the communist parties in India led to the degeneration of the parties and the demoralisation of the cadres. The party became the victim of bourgeois reason and as a result, all sorts of idealist, anarchic and autonomist tendencies have grown in the ranks. A genuine Communist Organisation must be based on the principles of Democratic Centralism. That is, the correct relationship between freedom and discipline democracy and centralism should be clearly understood.

To conduct revolutionary struggle an organisation must have iron discipline. But in order to establish this iron discipline, it is necessary to create conditions of genuine democracy based on the right to positive criticism from the highest to the lowest and the lowest to the highest bodies of the organisation under centralised guidance correct centralised guidance can only be developed..... political understanding and close ties with the lower bodies of the organisation and the masses of the people. All decisions from the higher bodies should be promptly transmitted and explained to the lower bodies. These should then be thoroughly discussed and cleared and the lower ranks should be properly guided in their implementation. Only by this method can Democratic Centralism be developed in the Organisation, and the confidence of the leadership be established.

4. Criticism and Self-criticism. Criticism and Self-criticism is feared by all revisionist and reactionaries. Communists do not fear it because the truth is on our side and the basic masses, the workers and peasants are on our side.

Criticism and Self-criticism is Marxist-leninist weapon with which we can correct our past mistakes in order to strengthen our organisation and our fighting capacities.

"To check up regularly on our work and in the process develop a democratic style of work, to fear neither criticism nor self-criticism, and to apply such.....maxims as "Say all you know and say it without reserve", and "Correct mistakes if you have committed them and guard against them if you have not", and "Blame not the speaker but be warned by his words", this is the only effective way to prevent all kinds of political dust and germs from contaminating the minds of our comrades and the body of our Party."

We must at all times be fearless in our criticism and Self-criticism. If we fail in this we shall be guilty of Liberalism which stands for unprincipled peace and leads to the degeneration of the entire organisation.

“But our aim in exposing errors & criticism the short-coming like that of a doctor curing sickness, is solely to save the patient & not to doctor him to death.” We should also remember that criticisms should not degenerate into personal attacks, but should be based on facts and stress the political side.

“If we have shortcomings, we are not afraid to have them pointed out & criticised, because we serve the people. Anyone, no matter who, may point out our shortcomings, if he is right, we will correct them. What as he proposes will benefit the people, we will act accordingly.

1972

NZC, RCUC(ML)



## ON METHOD OF WORK

The 'Method of Work' is especially meant for new areas, but generally meant for all areas as far as the basic principles are concerned. More such work will be necessary in consonance with our new and growing experiences, and some alterations and additions may be necessary on the basis of experience. But the basic principles laid down in this document always remain unchanged.

### ON THE METHOD OF WORK

In order to expand, develop and complete the New Democratic Revolution beginning to take shape in India, the communists in this country must effect a radical change in their style of work. A correct analysis and programme is not enough ; if the process and implementation is wrong, even a correct programme will be rendered ineffectual and futile. Hence the imperative need of a correct style of work in today's revolutionary conditions.

The main axis of the New Democratic Revolution, that is, the Agrarian Revolution, has to be completed. For this the masses have to be mobilised under the leadership of the Proletariat. A people's Army has to be forged, Base Areas have to be established in the rural belt, and, by waging a relentless armed struggle, the cities have to be encircled from the countryside and state power has to be seized. If we are to successfully accomplish this enormous task we will have to abandon our hitherto petty bourgeois methods of work and adopt a truly proletarian style and method of work. This is an immediate task for Marxist-Leninists in our country. If we are to prepare and mobilise the peasant masses for the people's War, if we are to arouse and develop the working class to take its historic place at the head of the class struggle, if we are to build a People's Army and to establish Red Bases all over our country, we will have to build up that revolutionary organisation, steered in proletarian methodology, without which we can never achieve our goal.

The most serious problem facing the Indian revolution today is that we do not have a revolutionary party with a correct programme and methodology to guide and lead the class struggle in our country. To build such a party is the primary task of revolutionaries in India. Our Party must be a working class party, comprising mostly the advanced detachments of the proletariat, having close connections with the working class movement and steered in the discipline of an basically underground organisation. The trend to install a petty bourgeois leadership, to prevent working class cadres from taking leading positions in the party, and making the party a mass, open organisation, is the most dangerous of all the trends in the Indian communist movement and must be fought resolutely. However, there are



no short cuts to party building. A correct process must be followed. The communist revolutionaries in our country must organise and consolidate themselves on the basis of their integration with and work among the masses. We must arouse the masses, consolidate and mobilise them and lead the class struggle forward, correctly analysing the concrete situation and correctly understanding the relation between mass, open organisations and secret; political organisations. Note: this should not be confused with the notion of "Building the party from Below". We must understand the dialectical relation between Party Building and Mass Work.

We know that it is not the party which makes the revolution but only the revolutionary masses, guided and led by the party, which can make the revolution. "However active the leading group may be, its activity will amount to fruitless effort by a handful of people unless combined with the activity of the masses. On the other hand, if the masses alone are active without a strong leading group to organise their activity properly, such activity cannot be sustained for long, or be carried forward in the right direction, or be raised to a high level." - Mao Tsetung.

As pointed out above, the political organisation and the struggle of the masses are closely related. For any mass struggle to be meaningful, an organisation which can lead it correctly, give it strong guidance and politicise the people in the process, is essential. But the first step is to go to the masses, become integrated with them, understand their problems thoroughly, and then, and only then to initiate and organise their struggles. It is this process of work, this methodology which we must put into practice. How to Begin ?

In practice we have to take up and fulfil the following tasks :-

1. To select an area of work and to place suitable cadres.
2. To integrate with the masses in the area selected and to participate in their struggles.
3. Gradually to build up and develop various mass organisations and to lead them, forming secret cores with the advanced sections of the masses in struggle and, to politicise them. To develop and expand these secret cores as the basis of the underground political organisation in the area.

**1. To select an area of work and to place suitable cadres :-**

**(a) TO SELECT AN AREA OF WORK :**

Our line is based on Marxism - Leninism - Mao's Thought. China's revolution was carried out on these lines. All the wars of national liberation since then, such as have been won in Korea, Vietnam, Cambodia Laos etc, have been and are being fought on these same principles. These are: to unite and mobilise the peasant masses; build up a people's army and establish red bases in the rural areas; by waging a people's war to gradually encircle the cities from the countryside; ultimately to capture political power in the country. In this struggle the villages are the focal point and nerve centre of the revolution.

This is so in India as well. 82 % of our population lives in the villages and the vast majority is groaning under semi - feudal oppression. Feudalism is the social base of Imperialist exploitation in our country. It is also the weakest link in the

Imperialist chain. The vast rural areas of our country are almost totally untouched by any kind of organised political activity. The revisionist and reactionary forces have bothered little about these parts. Going there once every five years for elections, these forces and parties have been content to organise themselves in the cities.

In the countryside the masses of the people are being ruthlessly exploited by the landlords, moneylenders corrupt officials etc. Their consciousness and ideology remains deeply feudal. Because the countryside constitutes the most backward section, economically, politically and militarily, that is, because it is the weakest link in the chain of imperialism, this is where we will build our base areas; this is where the people will form the liberation army. Thus the villages are our basic field of work.

But this does not mean that we should neglect work in the cities, as these are the home of the industrial workers the vanguard of the revolution. It would be suicidal to abandon work here, but we must keep in mind that the cities are also the stronghold of imperialism and its lackeys. Thus, the tactics in each area will differ according to the balance of forces that prevails. This is why it is essential to exercise great care in the selection of our areas of work and in the selection of cadres who will be sent to these areas.

Broadly speaking, there are two areas for selection

1. Rural areas

2. Urban areas

### **RURAL AREAS :**

In selecting a rural area, strength of population, rate of exploitation and topography have to be considered (especially for the selection of a base area.) After this, an extensive investigation must be carried out in the selected area. Objectives in this investigation are -

1. to make a thorough class analysis
2. to make a topographical analysis
3. to ascertain the level of consciousness of the people in the area.

The level of consciousness of our people is not uniform because of the uneven social and economic development of our country. Keeping in mind this fact, and also the protracted nature of our struggle, we must exercise great patience, gradually integrate ourselves with the local people and only then begin political work.

### **URBAN AREAS :**

Unlike the villages, the urban areas in our country have been thoroughly penetrated and polluted by political parties of all kinds. Not only the workers, but all sections of the petty bourgeoisie, like the students, youth and intellectuals, are heavily influenced by the culture, politics and economy of imperialism and revisionism. Moreover, the military and bureaucracy are strongly entrenched in the towns and cities.

The urban area can be divided into (i) Working class and (ii) Petty bourgeoisie.

### **THE WORKING CLASS :**

There are many political parties in the trade union movement, but these can be broadly divided into two groups (1) Revisionists and reformist trade unions,

and (2) Reactionary and counter revolutionary trade unions. (3) Trade union led by reformist, revisionist and counter - revolutionary parties. In our country, the working class is , in the main, bogged down under these two trends and the revolutionaries have no hold anywhere. For this reason the working class has not been able to free itself from economism and opportunism, to advance to a higher stage of class struggle and to establish working class leadership over the movement. As we know, the communist party is the highest form of class organisation of the proletariat, and only under the leadership of such a party can the New Democratic Revolution be completed in India, only under the leadership of such a party can the working class seize power and establish the dictatorship of the proletariat in our country. So, to organise the working class is a fundamental task for the communist revolutionaries.

The history of the Indian communist movement shows that all along working class struggle has either been bogged down in Right opportunism, i.e., reformism and militant economism, or in "Left" opportunism, i.e, sectarianism and insulation from the masses. "Left " sectarianism has denounced trade union organisations and economic struggle as revisionist and reformist, and has always avoided these. In this way it has boycotted mass organisation and ultimately , it has boycotted the people altogether ! The walls of the towns and cities have been filled up with " Revolution ! Revolution !" and "Masses ! Masses ! " The 'left' sectarians were totally indifferent to the genuine grievances and needs of the workers. They avoided the painstaking day to day, unromantic work of organising the masses for revolutionary struggle, and developing the revolutionary cadres out of this struggle. In this way the petty bourgeois, romantic revolutionaries obstructed the formation of a working class party and working class leadership.

Lenin also had to fight against these tendencies and, in his "Left -wing Communism, an Infantile Disorder", he makes a frontal attack on the sectarians:

"If you want to serve the people, and if you want to win the faith of the masses..... you must absolutely work wherever the masses are to be found. Trade unions and worker's co-ops are those organisations where the masses are".  
(*Lenin, Vol. 31, P. 53*)

In this regard, Lenin further says that a few individuals, on the basis of their personal inclinations, cannot make revolution. For this the participation and consciousness of the masses is essential and this can only come about through mass struggle and mass movement.

We firmly declare that without working class leadership, the struggle cannot advance. It is therefore necessary sections of the vast masses of the peasantry and all other to unite the exploited people under the leadership of the working class.

Regarding this, Mao Tse Tung in his "Struggle in the Ching Kang Mountains" says that ", ... .... In our opinion, the ideological leadership of the working class is a question of fundamental importance. In the border areas where the population is almost entirely composed of peasants, if the party leadership is not in the hands of the working class, the revolution will go astray. In the towns and large cities we must pay great attention to the working class movement. A part from this, we

must increase the strength of working class representation in our government bodies. At every level in our party, and in the leading bodies, we must increase the ratio of workers and poor peasants". (Vol . 4, P.97)

This statement is true for India, also. Before we begin work in the urban areas, we must conduct extensive and thorough investigations regarding the class, level of consciousness, and nature and rate of exploitation of the people. Here, as in the rural areas also, integration with the local people is the pre-requisite for launching mass struggles and building mass organisations.

#### **(b) TO PLACE SUITABLE CADRES :**

To achieve countrywide victory, a correct theory is not enough. It has to be tested in practice through the course of struggle . This depends on the correct placing of cadres and regular checking , by senior comrades, of their work and discipline. Even if they are few in number, if the placing of cadres is correct ,after some time, thousands of cadres can be developed from that area. A small force will develop into a big one - if this small force arouses and inspires self-sacrifice, is able to solve problems independently , is steadfast during any danger or obstruction, and has faith in the people and works honestly. Success does not come by itself , it comes from continuous hard struggle.

To accept good and correct proposals and to declare them- is just the beginning, not the achievement of success. Success needs a correct Method of work and in this , the placing of cadres is an indispensable factor.

Generally, there are three types in an organisation :

1.Experienced cadres -who have worked with the masses over a long period of time and are steeled in revolutionary patience and discipline.

2.Less experience cadres - who have participated in mass movements but are more-or -less new to Marxism Leninism.

3.New cadres- who have no experience but are full of enthusiasm and are ready to make sacrifices for the revolution.

After selecting the cadres from these three categories , they must be sent to the various fronts. It is up to the local and higher committees to ascertain a cadre's reliability, capacity and sincerity and to appoint him to a given task.

Only mature cadres , who have been steeled in mass struggles , who are disciplined and can take independent decisions, should be sent to the base areas.

Other cadres will work in the various mass fronts of the workers, peasants, students, petty bourgeois etc. They will take part in these movements and gradually gather experience. To develop them , senior comrades will have to constantly help them and scrutinise their work.

If the selection of cadres is made on this basis, then however small the organisation may be, from the mass struggles which will arise, thousands of cadres will develop and our work will proceed at a rapid pace.

Thus the selection of areas and the placing of suitable cadres is the first task of the revolutionary organisation.

**2) To integrate with the masses in the area selected and to participate in their struggles.**

There is a unity of opposites in all things. Two opposing forces co-exist for a certain period. Of these one is revolutionary and the other is counter-revolutionary. So in class struggle - the revolutionary class co-exists with the counter-revolutionary class for a period. The worker and the capitalist co-exist (temporarily). Hence the existence of the capitalist system. The tenant/s sharecropper and zamindar co-exist (temporarily). Hence the feudal system prevails.

Why is this unity temporary? Because this unity is based on the contradictions of opposing forces. Admitting that the struggle between opposite forces is a perpetual one in the law of development, this temporary unity can be destroyed and a new system can emerge. The contradiction between these two forces will have to be sharpened by the party organisation and the development of the revolutionary forces. Thus temporary unity can be destroyed and a new system may emerge.

Thus in the class struggle, it is the duty of the communist revolutionaries to arouse the masses who are masses in (temporary) co-existence with the ruling classes. They have to arouse the opposing force - the revolutionary force.

What does "to arouse" mean?

It means to shake from the roots the present unity of the two opposites - to sharpen their contradiction - then to draw out the progressive force, and finally, to sever the revolutionary force from the counter-revolutionary force. Till the revolutionary force is absolutely severed from the counter-revolutionary, the fighting capacity of the revolutionary force, its capacity to destroy the decadent, counter-revolutionary force - will not emerge, or develop. Its genius to construct the new society will remain dormant.

By merely shouting "Arise!" and "Awake!", the revolutionary force will not awaken and take to arms. There are many obstacles: the decadent social system puts many barriers in the path to freedom. The revolutionary masses many-a-times are unable to recognise obstacles and barriers.

Why are they unable? In the old social system in which they have lived for centuries with their exploiters (the counter-revolutionary ruling classes), they have imbibed and been forced to imbibe, the culture and traditions of these classes.

Thus the real barrier is in the mind - the mind of the revolutionary masses: their ideas and notions, their custom and superstitions, their traditions.

The counter-revolutionaries of the present day, neo-colonial India, are constantly hammering into the people that India is a free country. The counter-revolutionaries claim to the people that democracy is the slip of paper they vote on every five years; that government is a super-class organisation; anybody can win the elections and whoever wins the elections forms the government; the exploiters have no role to play in this; the law is impartial and unbiased and there is equal justice for all, the rich and poor, exploited and exploiter, oppressor and oppressed.

Even today, a large section of the revolutionary masses believes these blatant lies. The acceptance of these lies is the biggest block in the path to freedom. The communist revolutionaries must remove these false notions from the minds of the people. They have to show- to prove to the people , that all this is a colossal hoax. It is only when the people learn to change themselves by the revolutionary process that they will become a revolutionary force capable of liberating themselves from the yoke of the old, rotten society -only then will they be able to build a new order for themselves.

Similarly the communist revolutionaries should develop themselves by the revolutionary method: i.e., by the Leninist style of work, which as Stalin has pointed out, combines the "Russian revolutionary sweep " with "American efficiency in work ". (Stalin :The Foundations of Leninism . P. 110-111. Moscow Edition 1953). Only then will they be able to become worthy revolutionary leaders and help the people to complete revolution.

To develop a genuine revolutionary leadership, the first step is to disregard certain wrong ideas which prevail among us. That communists are appointed by some ' higher authority 'to liberate the masses and ' relieve' them of their worries . That communists are there to deliver 'help' and the masses should be ' grateful' for this.

A communist organisation is not a social service league and communist revolutionaries are not missionaries. "We must do something for the poor people", this incorrect thinking leads to economism in mass struggle and revisionism in politics. We mean well, but however good our intentions, wrong methods will give negative results.

But this does not mean that communist revolutionaries must not organise economic struggles . They must, but by giving these correct leadership, they must raise these to the political level.

If we can disregard these mistaken ideas , we shall then be able to really rely on the masses, discover their genius and unleash their extra- ordinary capacity, which is now lying unexpressed and dormant.

A precondition of all revolutionary work is that the comrades must rely on the people, have faith in them and serve their interests devotedly and objectively.

" The people and the people alone are the motive force in the making of world history ".

" The masses are the real heroes , while we ourselves are often childish and ignorant. Without this understanding it is impossible to acquire even the most rudimentary knowledge" . Mao Tse Tung.

With this realisation we will be able to understand that until and unless the politics New Democracy are accepted by the masses as their very own politics, no revolution will be possible. It will remain merely a paper plan with no material reality. Until the masses actively take part in and propagate the politics of New Democracy , until they build up their own organisations and the people's liberation army, neo-colonialism and exploitation will continue unabated.

But the question remains -How will the toiling masses become conscious ? The consciousness and participation of the masses will not come in one day. It is a slow and gradual process. To raise the level of consciousness of the masses , the communists have to go to the masses.

"We communists are like seeds, and the people are like the soil. Wherever we go, we must be with the people take root and blossom among them." Mao Tse Tung.

Thus we must discuss how to integrate with the masses, to initiate work among them, and to develop this on the basis of our principles.

1. The first condition is that the revolutionary must link himself with the masses and must act in accordance with the need and wishes of the masses. All work done for the masses must start from their needs and not from the desire of any individual . On the one hand we are teachers of the masses , but more, we are their pupils. We must work patiently and gradually we will win them over.

Programmes have to be taken according to the level of consciousness of the masses. Where consciousness is low or undeveloped , we should deal , in the primary period, with individual and collective problems , such as helping the people with their medical and educational problems and developing local social service schemes to help themselves in both their individual and domestic problems. In this way the people will accept us as their friends. After this, we can tackle their social problems collectively , by setting up medical aid centres, night schools , libraries recreation facilities and other self- help schemes which will teach them to rely on themselves.

At the next stage we should take their economic problems and organise democratic and legal movements. For example , Indira Gandhi has announced a land ceiling programme . The communist revolutionaries will organise a movement in the rural areas to impliment this programme - through legal channels . At the same time, they will educate the people on how to distinguish between their real friends and their real enemies. If Indira Gandhi helps our struggle she is our friend , if she obstructs it (through her administrative machinery) she is our enemy. Centring our struggles on issues like these , we will be able to unmask the government and expose the real nature of the state machinery to the people. Whatever demands are granted under the pressure of our organised struggle will educate the people about the need and strength of unity and organisation.

2.Today, discontent among the people is increasing sharply. Spontaneous movement of protest and resistance are spreading Rising prices, unemployment , retrenchment, lock-out , starvation and semi -starvation are the order of the day. We revolutionaries must seize this opportunity. We must associate ourselves actively with the masses in these situations and , in the course of struggle, we must help them to realise and express their revolutionary strength. Whatever the movement, whatever the demands, we must remain with the people in their struggle against the existing situation and try to guide them into the correct path so that their spontaneous struggles can take on an organised form, and develop into a really revolutionary movement. This is possible only if we go to the people with a definite programme of action.

3. Mass organisation should be built up at all levels ; in the working class, the peasantry , the petty bourgeoisie and among the students and youth. Revolutionary leadership must be established in these organisations. The mass organisation should be as broad as possible and as open as possible. The revolutionaries must not divided the toiling people, and will work even in the reactionary led mass organisations, where such organisations have a mass following. They will try their level best to expose and dislodge the reactionary leadership and establish working class leadership in these organisations. There revolutionaries should not forget that the major section of the organised working class is still under the influence of INTUC, AITUC, CITU etc., and they must pay serious attention to these organisations. We must try to build up mass organisations , not only in the factories but also in the basti areas. In the villages, we can build up our own mass organisations more easily , because here, political penetration by other parties is scant.

The communist revolutionaries must, through well planned steps, participate in all mass struggles, spontaneous or organised. They must seize the leadership of these struggle and guide them into the correct path. It is our revolutionary duty to participate in the masses struggle, not to boycott them. We must throw off the reactionary and revisionist trade union leadership and establish the control of the revolutionary working class. While initiating as well as participating in the mass struggles , the revolutionaries always try to put forward various political slogans along with the democratic demands. These will cause the reactionary and revisionist leadership inconvenience and in this sustained politicisation the masses will expose the character of the revisionists and reactionaries and thus the revolutionaries will be able to throw off their leadership and provide it themselves. Unless we participate in the mass struggles in which thousands of workers, peasants, petty bourgeois student and youth are involved, we cannot expose them. Hence our effort at all times should be to bring forward the political struggles along with economic struggles so as to raise the struggle from the lower level to the higher level.

4. In the course of the struggle to identify the enemies and unite the people, the various forms of propaganda work should be taken up. Many think that there are not enough cadres to organise the movement and take up propaganda work as well. This is incorrect. If a small force continues to work on the correct path , then from the masses themselves will emerge thousands of cadres - agitators, propagandist and leaders. Not having enough cadres is no excuse to sit idle. Lenin has pointed out that there are many fit for the 'cause' , only we are unable to put them to use ;

There is a mass of people, because the working class and increasingly varied social strata , year after year, produce from their ranks an increasing number of discontented people who desire to protest, who are ready to render all the assistance they can in the struggle, against absolutism, the intolerableness of which , thick , though not yet recognised by all, is more and more acutely sensed by increasing masses of the people. At the same time, we have no people because we have no leaders, no political leaders, no talented organisers capable of arranging extensive and



at the same time, uniform and harmonious work that would employ all forces, even the most inconsiderate. Lenin, "what is to be done" P 125, Moscow Edition 1967.

Lenin's words should be a guideline of our day to day work. We have to find out and contact various workers peasants, students, and intellectuals during the course of struggles such as strikes, protests, demonstrations, agitations etc.

Lenin has said that for revolutionaries, theory is not just high sounding empty words. This theory is the guideline of our revolutionary work. Our cadres need such theory just as they need air, water and food. Thus we must master the methods of propaganda work. Why is this ? In order to propagate Marxist -Leninist theory and educate the cadres; in order to implement this theory in the practice of the class struggle and to educate the masses, it is essential to master the correct forms and methods of agitation and propaganda.

There are two methods of propaganda for the two social classes : Bureaucratic methods for the Bourgeoisie and Democratic methods for the proletariat . In the first method, the leaders deliver fiery speeches while the people look on silently. The leaders make high sounding proclamations and the people applaud and say, " It is well said, but we are fools, we did not understand". This is the bourgeois or bureaucratic style of work and propaganda. The leadership of the communist movement being in the hands of the petty bourgeois elements, such is the practice there, as well. This bureaucratic method creates a great distance between the leadership and the people , and because the same method pervades the party literature and communications as well, this distance is created between the leadership and the cadres. The comrades who have been party members know this only too well. Those who regard the people as machines and not as the makers of history, do not think that this distance is a bad thing.

This bureaucratic method cannot solve the contradictions among the people . Their revolutionary consciousness cannot develop and their revolutionary energy cannot be released by this method.

The bureaucratic method has become a habit with many 'leaders' who work along these lines. They think that they are superior to the common cadres and the ordinary people. They want special attention and prestige . They cling to office and fulfil their responsibilities by issuing orders over the telephone . They seldom bother to go to the people, and regard each political unit and each mass organisation as their exclusive 'zamindari'. In other words these leaders have failed to understand the essence of Marxism, i.e., the combination of theory with practice without which there is no Marxism.

Unfortunately, the masses have been drawn into the movement by these bureaucratic methods of propaganda.

But their participations is not because of and development of revolutionary consciousness, but only because of a desperate hope that they will get some relief from their unbearable misery. Thus , bogged down in opportunism and economism, they wage militant struggles which only lead them further astray and can never solve their real problems. The level of consciousness and initiative of the masses cannot be developed in this way. They continue to rely only on the 'leaders' and

never on themselves. Thus this type of movement fails to develop political organisers and propagandists from among the ranks the masses. .

### **THE DEMOCRATIC METHOD OF PROPAGANDA**

If we are help the masses to free themselves from exploitation and to stand on their own feet we must educate them in the politics of Marxism - Leninism, i.e, we must adopt democratic method in our propaganda work.

Democratic methods are based on building close ties with the masses, being integrated with them , and doing all propaganda work on the basis of the real needs of the people and not for the selfish interests of any individual or group.

Propaganda methods include:

- i) Individual ties with the people and small group discussions and meetings.
- ii) Large group discussions, mass meetings, gate meetings, street corner speeches, mass demonstrations etc.
- iii) Cultural activities (dramas , songs etc)
- iv) Newspapers , pamphlets , leaflets, posters etc.

#### **i) INDIVIDUAL TIES WITH THE PEOPLE AND SMALL GROUP DISCUSSIONS AND MEETINGS :**

We should talk to the people and make them talk to us freely about their problems. They should be helped to analyse these problems. If they make mistakes, we should patiently point these out to them through discussion and analysis. Their understanding of the real conditions of society may be weak and confused. We must patiently show them how to correctly analyse the present situation and, if their analysis is one sided and partial, we must show them the other facts of the issues under discussion.

Briefly, they have to be urged to think, to talk, and to analyse themselves and society. They have to be made to realise that only solution to their problems lies in changing this society.

Why do we stress the need for individual contact and ties with the people ? Firstly, the politics of New Democracy are new unless we clearly understand these things, our propaganda will become superficial, hackneyed and mechanical as if we are repeating lines learned by heart parrot-like. This sort of propaganda will never spark off any enthusiasm or inspiration in the people.

Secondly having discussions with small groups has the benefit of collective wisdom, and at the same time, we can extend our contacts and work among the people. Because of their connection with the productive forces, the toiling people have developed a materialist and practical approach to many of their problems. We revolutionaries have much to learn from them. Those elements who come forward in these meetings should propagate the new ideas in the ranks of the people.

#### **ii) LARGE GROUP DISCUSSIONS, MASS MEETINGS, GATE MEETINGS, STREET CORNER SPEECHES, MASS DEMONSTRATIONS ETC.**

These come at the stage when the mass organisation has been formed or is in the process of being consolidated. It is very important that the masses participate

actively in these meetings and discussions. The more active and advanced elements should be given the initiative in such meetings so that they can develop themselves, through practice as capable organisers. These elements should address such mass gatherings. It is this group of people which form the concrete foundations of the movement.

When a movement develops over particular issues, such as rising prices, black marketing shortages, unemployment etc., or over corrupt and unfair practices on the part of the managements in factories, offices, educational institutions etc. an effective propaganda method is to hold street corner speeches, mass demonstrations, protest marches etc. These are logical developments of the stage of mass meetings, gate meetings etc. Where the task of the propagandists is to agitate and arouse the peoples consciousness regarding the issues and problems which affect them most deeply.

### **iii ) CULTURAL ACTIVITIES :**

The formation and development of cultural groups is an indispensable propaganda media. Through songs, dramas and other types of entertainment, we can easily reach the people, awaken their consciousness and educate them in revolutionary politics. However, it must be remembered that the content and language of all these cultural performances should be based on the needs, demands and conditions of the masses.

### **iv ) NEWSPAPERS, LEAFLETS, PAMPHLETS, POSTERS ETC.**

For purposes of exposure, agitation and organisation, the publication and distribution of newspapers, leaflets, pamphlets etc., are indispensable. The content of these should be simple and in the language of the masses. The matter should pertain to the immediate needs of the movement and should educate and guide the masses correctly. The style and content should be lively and capable of moving and inspiring the people. The people should be able to identify themselves and recognise the solution to their problems through these media. We can achieve this only if we go to the people, become integrated with them and understand them properly.

We must distribute these papers, leaflets, pamphlets etc. in all possible places in every household, all localities, villages, factories, tea shops, offices, markets, clubs, libraries, railway stations, train compartments, bus stands etc. So that the movement the people get hold of them there will be a surge of discussion and debate about them.

Postering should be done in all possible places, especially in the areas where the movement is developing. These posters should highlight issues and give slogans to masses.

During this process of awakening the toiling people, the communist revolutionaries, on the one hand, learn valuable lessons from the masses, and their capacities for leadership are developed ; on the other hand, the people are drawn in increasing numbers into the struggle only in this way can the leadership of communist revolutionaries become concrete.

That is, by the correct understanding and implementation of the theory and practice of Marxism-Leninism-Mao's Thought. In other words, just like fish which can only live in the water, the communist cannot survive and grow without the masses. This dialectical relationship is developed by democratic method of propaganda.

**III. Gradually to build up and develop various mass organisations and to lead them, forming secret cores with the advanced sections of the masses in the struggle, and to politicise them. To develop and expand these secret cores as the basis of the underground political organisation in the area.**

We have been discussing the mass line and open mass work. In order to initiate mass work and guide the mass organisation to the level of political organisation, it is absolutely necessary to correctly understand the relation between open and secret work, open and underground organisation. We should never that the organisation of the revolutionaries and the organisation of the masses are at the same time distinct and interconnected, both in form and in content. If we confuse the inter-relation of these two entities, we will become bogged down either in revisionism or in sectarianism. So it is of fundamental importance to grasp this relation between the mass line and underground organisation and their respective methods of work.

The political struggles of the revolutionaries is more complicated than the economic struggle of the masses against the factory owners and landlords. In this lies the difference between these two forms of struggle. In the face of the developing situation in our country to day it is necessary for communist revolutionaries to analyse this question thoroughly.

The broad masses will be mobilised in open mass organisations (as long as the situation permits) such as trade unions for the workers, peasant associations for the peasantry, student and youth associations for the students and youth etc. On the other hand in order to lead these mass organisations to the political goal, it is essential to have a stable, secret organisation of the revolutionaries which should consist, in the main, of professional revolutionaries. Without this it will be impossible to sustain and develop the revolutionary struggle of the workers and peasants and to lead the people to victory. Therefore, it is of the utmost importance to build secret cells with the advanced elements from the masses, which will integrate with the mass movement and lead them in the struggle.

How to build these secret cells, how these cells will establish their leadership, and what will be the process and method of work are the fundamental questions now under discussion.

The formation of the secret cells and its connection with the mass organisation, is not a simple matter. The primary question is, where to begin ?

It is already clear that the revolutionaries must integrate themselves with and participate in every struggle of the revolutionary masses. We have already discussed the first steps necessary for revolutionary work, that is, the selection of an area and the placing of cadres; and integration with the life and struggle of the

revolutionary masses. Now we must try to understand how to initiate work in the selected areas, i.e., how the cadre will go to the area, how he will integrate himself with the local people and how he will begin work. The method of will depend on the area selected and it will differ from area to area according to the conditions obtaining therein. Let us examine these points one by one ;

### **RURAL AREA**

1. Before going to the countryside, comrades from the towns and cities should be carefully prepared both mentally and physically. This means that the comrades must be thoroughly tried and tested ideologically and in the practice of mass struggle. Through this process and over a period of time, they will become sufficiently declassified and mature to be able to adjust to the conditions in the villages.

2. Before a comrade goes to the village, a proper investigation should be made about the area and he should be well informed about the conditions of that place.

3. When a comrade goes to a village, he should go under some cover. He cannot go a new place especially, directly as a political worker. This is dangerous from every angle. The comrades should investigate the requirements of that area and, according to these cover should be taken as a doctor, teacher, vendor, hawker, social worker etc.

4. The purpose of using a cover is to keep our real identification secret: This is necessary because the level of consciousness in the masses in most areas is too undeveloped for us to expose ourselves right from the start. The masses will not accept us, we will be exposed to the enemy, easily isolated from the people and unable to work.

5. Taking cover as a doctor, teacher, shopkeeper etc., the comrade should gradually integrate himself with the people and become accepted as a 'local' member of the community. He must be very active at all times and involve himself in every issue connected with individual, domestic collective (social) problems of the community. Having establish himself as a local and as a good and sincere friend of the people, he can begin to discuss the various problems affecting them and gradually give them the correct political line. In this way, he must initiate struggles to solve the problems on all their fronts, by the collective effort of the people. The comrade will have to exercise great patience, and discipline in this initial process of 'localisation'. He must resist all temptation to become 'political' before he becomes 'local'. When, through his exemplary behaviour and activities he becomes firmly established as a friend of the people, he will be able to initiate political work on a firm basis and will be in no danger of being dislodged and isolated by the enemy.

6. Comrades should note that in every case and as soon as possible, all living and eating arrangements should be made with the poor and landless peasants. Dependence on middle and rich peasants should be avoided as soon and as far as possible.

7. Comrades going to the village must form a secret core. Where this is only one comrade he will form a singleman core. This secret core must regularly review, analyse and discuss the problems facing the people and the developing struggle.

They must study regularly in order to develop themselves ideologically and they must keep regular, secret contact with the higher committees, and send written reports on their work.

8. Having established themselves in this way among the people, the comrades will initiate the discussion of local problems and show how these are connected with the general crisis in the country. When the people are ready to solve their problems collectively, the first steps towards building up an organised movement must be taken. This is the primary, the initial stage of mass organisation.

9. From the very first stage, i.e., of integration with the masses, and the discussion of their problems, the comrades must begin the process of constant observation and selection of advanced elements. At this stage these will be those people who take most interest and initiative in the discussions. These reasons will form the first group of workers through whom the primary stage of mass movement and organisation will, in the main, be launched.

10. This group of workers will conduct propaganda among the people about the necessity of unity and organisation in order to solve their problems. The comrades should move with these workers learn how to handle the people from them, on the other.

11. In the face of any problem confronting the people, this group must seize the initiative. They should hold small group meetings with the people and show them how the individual problem is linked to the collective problem and how this can be tackled only through unity, organisation and struggle.

This is the first task of the communist cadres at this stage- i.e., to make the people conscious of the fact that only through their own collective effort and action will they be able to solve their problem.

12. Gradually, through the process of propaganda and agitation of this kind among the masses, the organised movement will grow and expand. In order to control and guide this expanding movement, several small peasant committees should be organised, selected from the more active and bold members. These peasant committees will be responsible for guiding and developing the movement and will form the basis of the future political organisation of the area. It is essential that each of these committees have a political element as a member to guide and develop them correctly.

13. During the entire period of organised and planned activity, the comrades may, at any time be faced with an unexpected and accidental situation which brings on a spontaneous reaction from the people. In such situations it is essential that the comrades participate actively in the movements and try to give it an organised form. While participating in mass meetings and demonstrations, they should also try to hold smaller meetings with the people so that the situation can be analysed and explained properly and the next step planned in a co-ordinated and organised way.

14. The mass organisation is formed not merely for the sake of mass organisation but for struggle- the two are interconnected. The mass organisation

develops within the mass movement and the mass movement cannot advance without taking an organised form.

15. At every stage of the organised struggle we have seen that it is necessary to form committees from among the local people, consisting of those individuals who have been most active and hold in that stage of the struggle. The peasant committees, as we have noted above, will form the basis of the future political organisation. It is therefore necessary to constantly be alert regarding the most promising members of the peasantry at every stage and to gradually begin the process of political training with the most advanced elements who will, at a later stage, form the secret political core of the mass organisation, that is, when they have been sufficiently politicised through organised secret study circles by the comrades.

16. Side by side with the people's struggles the question of ideological preparation must be kept in mind. The secret study circles organised thus, will deal with the history of the revolutionary peoples of India, the culture and history of the revolutionary people; the society of our country; the philosophical and historical aspects of Marxism-Leninism; and the politics, economy and culture of people's democracy and socialism. For this, simple books and pamphlets should be distributed among the literate members.

17. When the members of the study circle have matured and proved themselves capable of taking the initiative and leading the struggle on all fronts and in its various aspects, they can be formed into secret cores which, as they develop still further in the struggle, will emerge as the local political leadership of the area.

18. The secret cells which have been organised in one area, should be co-ordinated by a centralised core which will lead the entire movement and will hold regular meetings with the cadres to develop them ideologically to check up on their work and to develop them further by the method of criticism and self-criticism. This centralised core must at all times be active in the people's struggles and in the ideological struggles.

19. In this way the local leadership will be prepared to enter the higher bodies of the organisation.

20. We must never forget the connection between the mass line and the secret organisation. Just as fish live in the water and the water must be preserved in order that the fish may survive, so the mass (which is the water) must be preserved in order that the secret cells of the revolutionaries (that is the fish) can survive and grow.

21. With the developing mass movement, the political organisation should propagate among the people the need to carry traditional weapons such as bows, arrows, spears, lathis, kirpans etc., in order to defend themselves against attack from zamindars and their goondas. This will also have the effect of making them more bold and in installing fear in the enemy. When the struggle reaches the stage of the seizure of land and its distribution, and the establishment of the people's organs of power, such as people's courts etc, the people will be ready and should be directed to take to arms to defend these institutions and their gains in the lands. The initial practice of carrying traditional weapons will pave the way for the later

stage when, volunteer resistance forces and a people's militia will be formed. While propagating this the political organisation will also be careful that no kind of adventurist tendencies develop among the masses.

22. Along with this, it is essential for the secret organisation to build up armed unit consisting of the most conscious and militant elements (men and women) which will remain secret and be trained intensively in both military and political science. It will be the task of these secret armed squads to defend people's struggle, to recruit new members and to expand the secret squads all over the area. These armed squads are the nucleus of the guerilla units. All these recruits will be advanced members of the people's militia.

23. Each armed unit will have a commander who must be a member of a political core. The units will have no direct links with one another : the links will be maintained by the commanders who will be under the direction of the central political core.

24. The communist revolutionaries must never underestimate the enemy. They must observe the enemy closely, gather all information about him and find out the contradictions within the enemy ranks so that these can be utilised successfully. The communist revolutionaries must always be on their guard against infiltrators to their ranks. This danger can be minimised only when they observe the rules of secrecy and maintain strict discipline at every step.

25. It must never be forgotten that the entire agrarian revolution is under the leadership of the working class. The comrades in the countryside should be steered in proletarian ideology and must never become isolated. They should constantly guard against tendencies of localism, guerilla-ism and other petty bourgeois tendencies.

26. If we follow this process and method of work in the countryside, we firmly believe that the broad peasant masses will be drawn into the revolutionary struggle; that the revolutionary organisation will expand and grow; that the revolutionary consciousness of the peasantry will intensify and be developed and that the revolutionary path will become bright and clear.

#### **URBAN AREA :**

In the New Democratic Revolution, we regard the countryside as the nerve centre of the struggle, but on no account should we neglect work in the cities and in the towns, because the leader of the revolution, the most organised and advanced class lives here. It is impossible to conceive of revolution without the working class.

To make the working class conscious, to establish their leadership in the revolutionary organisation and to launch various struggles in the various sections of the revolutionary people, is the vital and indispensable task to the communist revolutionaries. To achieve this it is necessary to organise the working class movement in the cities.

How to work in these areas, how to form secret cells among the workers, how to develop these and build up the secret organisation will now be the subject under discussion.



The factory area is most important in the cities because it is here that the workers are engaged in production in its organised and most concentrated form. It is here also that the working class is in direct confrontation with the factory owners. The task of the communist revolutionaries is to build up such organisation in the ranks of the working class that each factory becomes an invincible fortress of New Democracy and Socialism. This is the foundation of the entire revolution.

Regarding the building up of a secret, revolutionary organisation among the workers, Lenin's "A letter to a Comrade on our Organisational Task" is an important document. In this letter Lenin says that it is essential to work in every industry and to train the most militant workers so that they can lead the working class in every struggle and are capable of being taken into the revolutionary organisation. Lenin has discussed in detail the method of work of the secret organisation amongst the workers and the relation between the working class and trade union movements and the secret organisation.

"We must make every factory a fortress. For this, we must build a strong and secret organisation inside each factory and also expand its branches all over the industrial area." ----- Lenin, Vol VII, Page 243.

The question before us is how to start work in the factory area in order to organise the workers, how to build up secret cells in the factories and expand these through out the factory area and how to relate open with secret work.

It has already been mentioned that the working class movement is in the grip of the reactionaries and revisionists. This means, that the workers have been prevented successfully from organising themselves as a class for itself and have been used instead, to further the interests of the ruling classes. In a word, the reactionaries have succeeded in splitting the working class into factions at war and divided among themselves, unable in the face of the growing crisis and increasing fascist repression to organise and mobilise their real strength and fight for democracy and social change. The revisionists, working hand in glove with the reactionaries, have further succeeded in diverting the workers from the real issues and have confused and corrupted them. The result is that the workers themselves have lost hope and have become extremely cynical and opportunistic.

To change this condition is the greatest and most urgent task of the revolutionaries. If we can win the faith of the workers and awaken them to the real issues and to their historic task, the rest will be easy. Because the country is in the grip of a total crisis, there is no scope for economic relief-only revolution can change the situation and only deception and lies can win time for the ruling class. The revolutionaries must penetrate the ranks of the working class, unite the workers on broad democratic demands and expose the real face of the reactionaries and revisionists. They must do this most cautiously, taking care not to expose themselves to the enemy who will crush them at once. For this, the comrades must understand that the fundamental task is to build a secret organisation, capable of guiding the mass movement from amongst the ranks of the workers themselves. This means that we must grasp the relation between the open mass line and the secret underground organisation of the working class.

This process has been described in the chapter above which deals with the peasantry. In the main, the same method of penetrating the area under cover, integrating oneself with the people, becoming 'local' and then taking up the real problems and giving the correct line of action, is to be followed. Here also, initiative should be developed in the more advanced elements from among the workers who will gradually emerge from the struggle and through the secret study circles, these workers will be organised into the secret cells which will be the basis of the political organisation.

However, we must remember that the movement in the cities will follow a different course from that in the countryside, that is the tactics will be different in the two areas. We must clearly understand that the movement in the countryside is at the same time distinct and interconnected.

The cities are the strongest link in the imperialist chain; these are the stronghold of reaction so the struggle at this stage cannot be decisive here. The working class is the leader of the revolution but its main task in the stage of agrarian revolution is to lead the struggle in the countryside on the one hand, by sending its most class conscious and militant elements to the rural areas to organise the peasantry, and on the other, to support the struggle there by developing the democratic and anti-imperialist movement in the cities and uniting all the revolutionary sections such as the student, youth and petty bourgeois strata under its banner.

1. The main task of the communist revolutionaries in the cities is to spread class consciousness to unify the working class, to expose the government and the revisionists, to fight for democracy to resist fascism and imperialism and ultimately, to prepare for the inner revolt.

The first step is to overcome the cynicism and distrust of the workers and to win their friendship and trust. The communist cadres must go either into the worker's basti under cover as a social worker, teacher, doctor, vendor etc., and gradually penetrate the factories from there; or they can go directly to the factories as trade unionists, either independently or under cover of existing trade unions in the area, or as workers in the factories and begin work there.

How will the worker's trust be won? We must prove in practice that we are with the workers at every step, not only in the factories but also in their homes. This means that the trade union worker must gradually penetrate into the bastis just as the basti worker must gradually penetrate into the bastis just as the basti worker must gradually penetrate into the factories.

This penetration will be on the basis of a programme based on the real needs and conditions of the workers. In the factories, the revolutionary cadres must be in forefront of the struggle for economic and democratic demands. In the bastis the personal, domestic and social problems of the workers and their families should be taken up. The basti dwellers must be made to see how, just as in the factories, their individual, domestic and social problems too, can best be solved through collective effort, organisation and struggle.

It is only by participating in the day lives of the workers over a period of time, sharing their joys and their sorrows that we can begin to understand them, help them to solve their problems and guide them correctly to one political goal.

Solutions should never be imposed from above or in a hurry. Comrades must not condemn the cynicism and opportunism of the workers. They must realise its cause and struggle to overcome it patiently and resolutely, never losing faith or becoming arrogant. Patience, tolerance and conviction will definitely bear fruit and the workers will learn to trust us, if we conduct ourselves in this way.

2. During this period, we must observe and carefully select the advanced workers from the factories as well as the bastis in the yourse of the struggle. These workers must be politicised in secret study circles and will be organised into secret cells within the factories and the bastis. From here, they (the workers) will conduct propaganda and agitation among the fellow workers, distribute secret literature, observe and record the reactions and development in the workers and select the most promising elements for further politicisation and training.

In this way the secret cells will be expanded throughout the factory and basti area and these secret cells, co-ordinated by a secret, central core, will form the nucleus of the political organisation amongst the workers.

The most advanced elements, steeled in the class struggle, will be taken into the higher party bodies and from among them, cadres will be sent to the rural areas to organise the peasant struggle.

3. If this process is followed in the towns and cities, then the entire working class will be politically prepared to seize the initiative at the decisive moment when the liberation army encircles the cities from the villages and the workers will take to arms to ensure the victory of the revolution.

### **THE PETTY BOURGEOIS :**

As pointed out earlier the New Democratic Revolution is led by the working class in firm alliance with the peasantry. Through our main work lies in the rural areas, work in the cities is not to be neglected under any circumstances. In this connection, the work among students, youth office workers etc., is extremely important. We have to make this section conscious, so that it can play its due role in the revolution.

### **STUDENTS :**

An important section of the petty bourgeoisie is the student and youth. Therefore, the problem before us is how to make this section conscious of its role, how to politicise it and lastly how to recruit cadres from among them who would ultimately go to the working class belts and to the villages to work among the basic masses.

To begin with, we should understand the character of the student community. Students are not a class, they come from all classes. The mistake of considering them a class should never be made. This mistake if committed, would lead to a grave deviation and we would not be able to achieve anything. A major section of the students come from the middle class, a small section from the working class and richer sections of the society. From the rural areas there is a large section from

the rich peasantry and form the middle peasantry. There is also a small section from the poor peasantry. The influx of students from the rural areas mainly depends on the harvest. In a year of good harvest we would find plenty of students from the poor peasantry but in a year of bad harvest their numbers would dwindle considerably. Besides, there is a growing section from the scheduled castes and tribes. Though they come from the poorest section of society, a section which is oppressed economically as well as socially, they are able to acquire education through government scholarship and they get job reservations too. Therefore, they become admirers of the present government. They are not able to see its class character. We have to be very patient with them.

The basis of our work among students are those who come from the working class, lower middle and middle class and the poor and middle peasantry.

Since most of the students come from the middle class their revolutionary potential, therefore, is dependent on the fortunes of the middle class. The growth of our economy has come to a stop. It cannot grow further in this semi-feudal system. The crisis of the middle class is increasing and deepening. There is growing unemployment, steep rise in prices and a constant and continuous decline in the standard of living. The middle class in our country is in a state of permanent crisis.

Objectively, therefore, the student's potential for a revolutionary role is increasing. But subjectively, they are way behind and are under the spell of reactionary forces. They can be used by the reactionary forces for their own ends. They can either play their revolutionary role or, if not properly understood and handled, will be used by counter-revolutionaries.

The educational system is controlled by the ruling class to serve its own ends. It, therefore, inculcates the values of the ruling class and makes the students first-rate-careerists, status-seekers and it turns out mediocres who lack creativity. It inculcates a spirit in which the students start looking down upon the masses. It results in the increasing gulf between those who come from the rural areas and those from the cities. Thus it divides the student community and exerts all its efforts to involve them in the superficialities of life. It renders them directionless.

Our experiences show that after Naxalbari, many students came forward and went to villages but once they were faced with the hardships, the protracted nature of the struggle, most of them returned to the cities and either became a political, careerists or went over to the camp of the counter-revolutionaries. This was due to the fact that they were not mentally prepared for the hard work involved. They had not learnt Marxism-Leninism through practice and therefore, they came back as quickly as they had gone.

Thus, the way students are recruited, the process of declassification which they go through, would largely determine the role that they will play. The Method of work assumes overriding importance. Our success or failure hinges on it.

Therefore, we have to approach the general mass of students, to give our programme, to develop struggles and to recruit cadres. For this it is necessary to have student mass organisations. Whether we should work in the existing student

organisations or to form a new one entirely depends on the situation existing in a particular place. But we should always strive to build our own student organisation in order to give our own programme, to develop struggles, to expose other organisations, to coordinate student struggles with other struggles, to recruit cadre etc. Where we cannot achieve this, we can start working in the existing organisations and gradually capture the initiative and expose the entire leadership and make it a revolutionary student's organisation. Student organisations should have a formal structure like membership forms, monthly fees etc.

We should start work from the level that we find the student masses. Since the student is largely a political for under the spell of reactionary thinking, we should take up the general demands of the students i.e. the difficulties which they face e.g., the question of hostel facilities, fees, cheap lunches, ration cards etc. We should start with struggles of such small trivial economic, democratic issues.

There should be no attempt to give revolutionary politics (i.e. Marxism-Mao's Thought) directly or openly. No advantage would be gained by it. Most of the students will not understand and it will lead to exposure which would be a great hindrance to our work. Therefore, care should be taken that under no circumstances should our cadres be exposed. This is very very important because, if a cadre is exposed among the students than it would be difficult not to get exposed in other sections too.

We should hold formal open meetings, discussions, symposiums and the subjects should be chosen to create general awareness among the students, eg., India's Agrarian Structure, Foreign Capital in India, the present educational system, the Green Revolution etc. During discussions, note should be taken of those who are taking active part in it.

During the struggle care should be taken to adopt such forms of struggle in which the students are able to overcome their fear of authority. Such forms of struggle can take the form of gherao, in which the masses face the authority directly and if it is for a longer period than they will realise the weakness of the authority, that the posture and reality are entirely different. Going through this process is very necessary and until the students are able to overcome their fear of authority they would not be able to accomplish anything.

During the struggle care must be taken to propagate it as much as possible. Among student the value of struggle is lessened if the general mass does not become aware of it.

From general demands of the students we can gradually go over to political issues like anti-imperialism pro-Vietnam anti-social imperialism etc.

In the next stage the attempt should be made for a joining of the movements e.g., if there is a strike in a factory, students should go in a procession and demonstrate their support.

During the struggles we would be able to spot out potential cadres. These cadres thus spotted out should be assigned definite tasks. The tasks can be from selling a paper, collecting a few students and going in a deputation to the authority

or collecting money for the organisation. This is to see if they actually want to work or if they want to just assume leadership to satisfy their egos. We should also see whether these cadres come to meetings regularly etc.

We can adopt other methods too. Students in group of two or three should go to the working class quarters, slums, villages etc., either to take night classes or for survey work. The direct contact between the masses and the students would go a long way in contributing to breaking barriers between students and the masses. The gulf between the students who come from the cities can be bridged if they work and struggle together. Moreover the student community has to be taught about the present educational system and the way it distorts their personality, their thinking and ultimately, renders them impotent, uncreative and mediocre. Keeping this in view we have to take up the relevant issues like change in the syllabus etc. As far as the representation of the students in running the university administration is concerned i.e., their participation in the senate, syndicate and academic council, admission committees etc., we can raise the demand tactically. But we should be very clear the nothing would be gained by student participation, it will just give a chance to some students to emerge as some kind of professional student leaders to satisfy their own selfish ends. Therefore if we take up the demand for student participation we should unveil its reality before the students at the time.

We have to fight very consciously against colonial culture. There is a calculated attempt on the part of the ruling class and the imperialists powers to, so to say, but off our student community and to render it impotent for any revolutionary and creative work. This we have to fight very consciously because this is one of the most effective weapons to lead the student community astray. Through it, their thinking has become western orientated and they suffer from mental slavery.

We should take special care about cultural activity as far as students are concerned. We should form student cultural groups who can gradually go to other sections of society.

Through this process we would be able to separate our potential cadres from the general mass. Those who are able to come out through is process should be given political training.

During this stage care should be taken that these are running the mass organisations should never act as political commissar. Those should perform the duty of political commissar who are not known as such. The relevant committee among the students should decide who are to be given politics. Their names should be given to the political commissar. For the initial stage, a student act as the political commissar. He should contact those students who are to be given politics individually and given them preliminary books on Marxism and hold discussions. Later he should bring those students together whose response he has found correct. Then he should take regular study circles. In these initial study circles the political commissar should give them an understanding of Marxian philosophy, economics and of revolution, and should gauge their response and should give them books to read. The initial study circle should last around one month, after this a certain time should elapse in which they should be retested.

In the later stage, party cadres should act as the political commissar. His identity should be kept totally secret. Those recommended by the political commissar, who took the initial study circles, on the basis of their work, study and understanding, should be taken for the higher study circles. Those who are found satisfactory in the higher study circles, would form the secret core. This core would be the party core. In the higher stage the strategy and tactics of revolution New Democracy, Mao's Thought etc, should be taken in. The secret core thus formed would have the task of running the mass organisation from behind, to start and develop struggle and in general, to guide it in all its activities.

From among the members of the secret core, one cadre should be chosen who is found the best and most satisfactory. He should be made the convenor. The convenor will keep the link with the other convenors of other students cores. The principle convenor, or the co-ordinating convenor, would maintain the link with the party.

The secret core should be totally secret and even its existence should not be known to the general members. If there is more than one secret core among the students then the existence of the other cores should not be known to any of the members no matter which core they belong to. It goes without saying that the ordinary members of the mass organisation should not know of the existence of the secret core.

From among the members of the secret core, cadres should be recruited and taken to the working class or peasant belts. In the initial period, they should devote some hours of the day working among the basic masses. Gradually they should stop working among the students and devote all their time to work among the basic masses. They should go and live among the masses, that is, their area of work, even if they are continuing their studies.

If we follow the Method of work outlined above, we are sure to avoid the mistakes and deviations which we made earlier, and, the student mass would be able to play its due role in the revolution.

The work among the other strata of the petty bourgeois, like office workers, teachers, youth etc., should follow the Method of work which has been outlined above.



## **VIII**

# **REVIEWS AND REPORTS OF REVOLUTIONARY MOVEMENTS**



## REPORT ON THE PEASANT MOVEMENT IN THE TERAI REGION

-KANU SANYAL

After about 18 months, we, the Communist revolutionaries of the Siliguri sub-division, met at a Convention on September 15, 1968, under quite unfavourable conditions.

Why am I speaking of unfavourable conditions? This is because during these 18 months attempts have been made to crush the revolutionary peasant movement of the Siliguri sub-division and to annihilate the Communist revolutionaries there through 'encirclement and suppression' campaigns. Who started the campaigns of 'encirclement and suppression?' On May 22, 1967, the leaders of the 14-party United Front Government led by Ajoy-Jyoti-Harekrishna-Biswanath threw hundreds of peasants and workers into jail and inflicted physical tortures on them, had their homes looted by the police and shot, bayoneted and killed 18 peasants including men, women and children with a view to crushing the revolutionary peasant movement.

The leaders of the 14-party United Front were unable to prevent their fall even though they had submitted slavishly to Indira Gandhi, the political boss of the comprador-bureaucrat bourgeoisie and the feudal landlords and jotedars. This is because the Congress Party, the political organisation of the comprador-bureaucrat bourgeoisie and landlords, toppled the 14-party UF government after having made that government do what it ( the Congress Party ) needed. It dismissed the U.F. Government in order that it might use the UF again whenever necessary to serve its purpose. The 'encirclement and suppression' campaign that the reactionary UF leaders had started on May 25, 1967 against the revolutionary peasant struggle is being followed up by the regime of Dharam Vira, the governor, as clearly shown by the murder of Comrade Babulal Biswakarmakar, who was shot dead on September 7 this year.

We met at a Convention under unfavourable conditions like these with a view to assessing the experience of the revolutionary peasant struggle of the last 18 months and carrying this struggle forward firmly along the path illumined by the thought of our beloved leader and great teacher, Chairman Mao.

Naturally, we shall place our views before the comrades on the basis of the lessons that we have drawn from the heroic struggle of the Terai peasants.

We have not yet been able to learn well the thought of Chairman Mao. So there will be shortcomings in our views. We shall learn anew from the discussions of the comrades.

## THE IMPORTANCE OF THE PEASANT QUESTION

The great Marxist- Leninist of our present era, Chairman Mao, has taught us: *"The present upsurge of the peasant movement is a colossal event. In a very short time, in China's central, southern and northern provinces, several hundred million peasants will rise like a mighty storm, like a hurricane, a force so swift and violent that no power, however great, will be able to hold it back."*

Chairman Mao further teaches: *"Every revolutionary Party, every revolutionary comrade, will be put to the test, to be accepted or rejected as they decide. There are three alternatives. To march at their head and lead them? To trail behind them, gesticulating and criticizing? Or to stand in their way and oppose them? Every Chinese is free to choose, but events will force you to make the choice quickly."*

The truth of these words of Chairman Mao, of every single word of it, has been fully borne out once more in the struggle carried on in our area. Why has the peasant movement in the Terai region proved to be an event having more far-reaching consequences than even an earthquake?

Ours is a semi-colonial and semi-feudal country, 80 per cent of whose population live in the villages. The contradiction between the people of our country and feudalism is the principal contradiction. The comprador-bureaucrat bourgeoisie, the landlords and the jotedars have been carrying on their rule and exploitation through their political organisation, the Congress Party, by protecting fully and developing imperialist interests and by covering up the basis of feudalism with legal coatings. So the peasants are the basis and main force of the anti-imperialist and anti-feudal struggle. Unless the peasants are liberated it is impossible to achieve the liberation of all other oppressed classes. The Terai peasants are a part of the peasantry of our country. 70 per cent of the Terai peasants are poor and landless, 20 per cent are middle peasants and 10 per cent are rich peasants. These heroic peasants dealt merciless blows to the obsolete and rotten feudal elements—the jotedars, landlords and unsurers. The State apparatus of the comprador-bureaucrat bourgeoisie, landlords and jotedars is preserving the feudal system by force and carrying on an armed rule. Inspired by Chairman Mao's teaching, "Political power grows out of the barrel of a gun," the heroic peasants opposed this armed rule with armed revolt.

The peasants of Terai not only dealt a fierce blow at feudalism, they also expressed their intense hatred for the imperialist exploitation of India, specially the exploitation by U.S. imperialism, swept into the dust the political, economic and social authority, dignity and prestige built up in the villages by the landlords and jotedars, who represent feudalism, and established the rule of the peasant committee in the villages through their armed revolt. That is why the Naxalbari struggle has shown the path for the liberation of India's oppressed classes.

We have seen how the criterion for judging political events changed as soon as the struggle of the heroic peasants started and thus proved how true are the teachings of Chairman Mao. The struggle made it clear as daylight who in a semi-colonial and semi-feudal country like ours is a revolutionary and who is a counter-

revolutionary, who is progressive and who is reactionary, who is a Marxist and who is a revisionist, and which political party wants to advance the cause of democratic revolution, that is, the agrarian revolution, and which party wants to cover up the semi colonial and semi feudal system in order to preserve it.

Starting from foreign radio broadcasts and newspapers which uphold the interests of the bourgeoisie and the imperialists, the man-in-the street in the cities and the villages—everyone chose sides on the peasant struggle in Terai. Not even one of the political parties, which never tire of talking about workers, peasants, and Marxism could maintain its previous position. The struggle of the Terai peasants tore open their masks and forced them to take sides. The struggle of the heroic peasants showed that all the leaders of the 14 'Left' parties including the so-called Marxist party, who had managed to secure ministerial guddis for themselves, were serving the state of the comprador-bureaucrat bourgeoisie and landlords, like the congress party. The struggle made it clear that, like the Congress Party, the leaders of the 14 'Left' parties including the Dangeite clique and Sundarayya & Co., are enemies of India's democratic revolution, that is, agrarian revolution. The struggle of the Terai peasants proved that the agrarian revolution can be led to success only by waging a relentless and uncompromising struggle against them.

The struggle of the Terai peasants acted as a midwife in the revolutionary situation prevailing in India. That is why a single spark of the Naxalbari struggle is kindling widespread forest-fire everywhere. In a word, the struggle of the heroic peasants has brought to the forefront quite forcefully the role of the peasants in India's democratic revolution overcoming the fierce and active opposition put up by all the reactionaries and revisionists.

#### ESTABLISH THE PEASANT COMMITTEES AND GET ORGANISED:

The Siliguri sub-division Peasant Convention gave out the call to - (i) establish the authority of the peasant committees in all matters of the village, (ii) get organised and be armed in order to crush the resistance of jotedars and rural reactionaries and (iii) smash the jotedars monopoly of ownership of the land and redistribute the land anew through the peasant committees.

The Convention further declared that the peasants' struggle against feudalism would have to face the repression of all reactionaries, be it Indira Gandhi's Government in New Delhi or the UF Government in West Bengal. So, all their repression must be resisted by force of arms and by carrying on a protracted struggle.

The call of the sub-divisional Peasant Conference instantly created a stir among the revolutionary peasant masses.

How did the revolutionary peasants of Terai translate this call into action? To put this call of the Conference into effect the revolutionary peasants first of all laid stress upon the task of creating armed groups of peasants in the villages. In every village we heard the words: "Political power grows out of the barrel of a gun". This is because every single struggle, however small, whether for stopping usury or on any other issue has been invariably met with lathis and guns. That is why this call worked like magic in organising the peasants.

Almost all the villages got organised during the period from the end of March to the end of April, 1967. Whereas, previously, the membership strength of the Kisan Sabha could not be increased beyond 5 thousand, the membership now jumped to nearly 40 thousand. About 15 to 20 thousand peasants began to do wholtime work and built up peasant committees in villages. The young men of the villages who had never before been seen in the front ranks of the Kisan Sabha now occupied the place of veteren peasant cadres. With the speed of a storm the revolutionary peasants, in the course of about one and half months formed peasant committees through hundreds of group meetings and turned these committees into armed village defence groups. In a word, they organised about 90 per cent of the village population. This action of the peasants completely changed all our old ideas about organisation. Chairman Mao teaches us: *"The masses, have boundless creative power. They can organise themselves and concentrate on places and branches of work where they can give full play to their energy"*.

We came to realise more profoundly the significance of this teaching of our great teacher Chairman Mao from this action of the Terai peasants.

The great Lenin said: "Revolution is a festival of the masses". What it means in reality was witnessed by us during the struggle of the Terai peasants. While the so-called Marxist pundits, Indira Gandhi and all and sundry were rending the skies with loud talks of national integration, we found how the revolutionary activities of the peasants united all the peasants irrespective of their nationality, religion, language and caste.

The revolutionary peasants, through their actions, made their decess the law in the villages:

1. A blow was dealt at the political, economic and social structure in the villages based on monopoly landownership, which dragged the peasants more and more into the depths of pauperisation. 'No, not the deeds and documents - what is required is the order of the peasant committees,' declared the peasants. They marked out all the land in Terai with their ploughwhares and made it their own. They declared that all land which was not owned and tilled by the peasants themselves was to be re-distributed by the peasant committees. By carrying this out in practice they struck a blow at the main political and economic basis of the jotedars. The old feudal structure that had existed for centuries was thus smashed through this action of the peasants.

2. All the legal deeds and documents relating to the land had been used to cheat them. They held meetings and burnt all the receipts, acknowledgements, plans, deeds and documents.

3. The jotedars and money-lenders, taking advantage of the poverty of the rural folk, got them committed to unequal agreements relating to the mortgage of land and bullocks. The peasants declared all such agreements as well as huge burden of interest imposed on them, null and void.

4. The hoarded rice which is used as capital for carrying on usurious and feudal exploitation was confiscated by the peasants and distributed among themselves. Apart from this hoarded rice, other things like oil, atta ( course flour),

bullocks, cows, a huge number of domesticated animals owned by the jotedars, agricultural implements, even articles meant for their personal use were confiscated and distributed.

5. All jotedars in the villages who were known for a long time as oppressors and those who tried to oppose the peasant struggle were all subjected to open trial and sentenced to death.

6. The wicked, ruffian elements and flunkies who are used to preserve the political, economic and social authority of the jotedars in the villages and those who co-operated with the police were all brought to open trial. In some cases, death sentence was given; in others, the fellows were paraded through the village streets with shoes strung around their necks and with fools' caps on their heads, so that they would not dare commit crimes in future.

7. Realising that their struggle against the jotedars, the landlords and the money-lenders would be subjected to armed repression, by the state apparatus they armed themselves with their traditional weapons like bows and arrows and spears as well as with guns forcibly taken away from the jotedars, and organised their own armed groups.

8. Lest the general administration of the villages should suffer they arranged for night watch and shouldered the responsibility of running the schools in a smooth way. The peasant committees announced that severe punishments would be awarded in cases of theft and dacoity, and took measures to inflict such punishments in some cases.

9. In every area they created regional and central revolutionary committees and established the peasants' political power.

10. They declared the existing bourgeois law and law-courts null and void in the villages. The decisions of the regional and central revolutionary committees were declared to be the law.

In addition to these ten great tasks the peasants also did many other things which wiped out of the villages the old feudal system that had existed for centuries. How intense was the class hatred of the peasants can be seen from the fact that during a raid on the houses of two jotedars, which lasted for two days, they not only ate up the cooked food of the jotedars but also helped themselves to the meals prepared with all other foodstuff left there. In this struggle we witnessed the festival of the revolutionary peasants overthrowing feudalism.

Whenever the peasants became conscious of any shortcomings during these revolutionary actions, they at once came to the peasant committee for their rectification. This means, the peasant committees were not something imposed on them. On the contrary, these committees were wholly their own. Terai was able to hit the jotedars and the vested interests.

The leadership of this struggle was, naturally, in the hands of the landless peasants, who are the most militant section of the peasantry. The reason why these revolutionary actions could become so far-reaching and so vast in their sweep is that the leadership of the struggle was in the hands of the poor landless peasants, who constitute 70 per cent of the peasantry. After the conference, it was the poor

landless peasants who realised before all others that the resolutions of the conference were beneficial to their own interests more than to anyone else. It is only because of this that the work of organising the movement assumed such a broad and militant form. From the experience of their own life the poor peasants realised that any compromise with feudalism would make their future even more miserable than before. That is why, in their fight against the jotedars, the money-lenders, the ruffians and the police it is the poor peasants who have not shrunk from making sacrifices ever since May 24 and 25, 1967. The truth of this is being proved even today through struggles.

Just after the Conference, the middle peasants who constitute 20 per cent of the peasantry, looked with suspicion at the call given by the Conference. So, they were not active in the first phase of the struggle. It was only when they came to realise that their interests would be served by the struggle and the main target and enemy of the struggle was the jotedars, landlords and money-lenders, that they came forward. With the joining of the middle peasants the sweep of the struggle increased manifold and it grew even more intense.

The rich peasants, who constitute only 10 per cent of the village population, at no time thought the declaration of the conference and this struggle to be beneficial to their own interests. Rather, they, particularly those rich peasants who carry on feudal exploitation in considerable portions of their land, apprehended that it meant danger for them. So, after the conference they took the role of critics and opposed the struggle in the first phase and sometimes even acted as spies for the jotedars. But as soon as the middle peasants joined the poor peasants, their movements underwent a change. After the jotedars and the wicked people had been punished and they had fled to the towns and business centres, the rich peasants gave up the path of opposition and criticism and began to demand justice from the peasant committees. And the peasant committees considered every case on its merit and did justice to them. As a result, the rich peasants generally became neutral and even took an active part in the struggle in quite a few instances.

The small jotedars split into two sections in the course of the struggle. One section comprising those jotedars who were able neither to develop themselves as they desired owing to the oppression by the Government of the comprador-bureaucrat bourgeoisie and the landlords nor to maintain their existing standard of living, took part in the struggle. Another section, comprising those who realised that it was not possible for them to resist, turned inactive hoping to take revenge in future.

The struggle of the heroic peasants of Terai demonstrated through practice how to build peasant unity though, it must be admitted, the task was often found to be not at all easy. Real peasant unity can be built only by not making any compromise with feudalism, only by intensifying class struggle against it and by directing the spearhead of attack against it. The peasants proved this in practice. A look at the past and the present revisionist Kisan Sabha convinces one that intense class struggle against feudalism can never be developed by convening such conferences as the 'jute cultivators' conference or by avoiding class struggle for

the sake of unity. A vigorous class struggle against feudalism not only helps to build peasant unity but also guarantees the establishment of the peasants' political power through such peasant unity. This we have learnt from the peasants of Terai.

All the so-called Left parties joined the Congress Party in their mad crusade to vilify the struggle of the heroic peasants of Terai. But all their vilification can never hide the fact that the peasants of Terai have overthrown feudalism root and branch, a feat which could not be done through any legislation or any other thing during all these hundreds of years.

Our great teacher Chairman Mao teaches us:

*"I hold that it is bad as far as we are concerned if a person, a political party, an army or a school is not attacked by the enemy, for in that case it would definitely mean that we have sunk to the level of the enemy. It is good if we are attacked by the enemy, since it proves that we have drawn a clear line of demarcation between the enemy and ourselves. It is still better if the enemy attacks us wildly and paints us as utterly black and without a single virtue; it demonstrates that we have not only drawn a clear line of demarcation between the enemy and ourselves but achieved a great deal in our work".*

The truth of these words of Chairman Mao has been vindicated through practice during the struggle of the heroic peasants of Terai.

#### **ARMED STRUGGLE - NOT FOR LAND, BUT FOR STATE POWER**

The struggle of the Terai peasants is an armed struggle - not for land, but for state power. This is a fundamental question, and the revisionist thinking which has been prevailing in the peasant movement for the last few decades, can only be combated by solving this question.

From the bourgeois parties and newspapers to the leaders of the so-called Marxist party, all have been saying the same thing, that it is quite just for the peasants of Terai to struggle for land but that the acts like arming the peasants and the forcible taking away of guns are dragging the struggle into a wrong path. By making this one statement all the bourgeois and petty bourgeois parties, including the Congress and the so-called Marxist Party, have ranged themselves on the same side and made themselves agents of India's ruling classes.

We all know that every class struggle is a political struggle and that the aim of political struggles is to seize state power. Chairman Mao teaches us: "The seizure of power by armed force, the settlement of the issue by war, is the central task and the highest form of revolution. This Marxist-Leninist principle of revolution holds good universally, for China and for all other countries".

In our country also, we can succeed in overthrowing the regime of the comprador-bureaucrat bourgeoisie and landlords only by arming the peasants and by building up guerrilla groups and a regular armed force.

The peasants of Terai have taken up exactly this work, and this is the reason why all the bourgeois and petty bourgeois parties including the Congress and the so-called Marxist Party have become so furious.

The so-called communists dressed up as Marxists have unmasked themselves by hitting away at this. They want to keep the anti-feudal struggle pegged to the question of mere distribution of land. Like all other bourgeois and petty bourgeois parties the so-called Marxist Party also looks at the question of land distribution from the stand point of social injustice towards the peasants. This is what they have been doing in reality, whatever may be their subjective motivation. That is why they become panicky whenever they see armed peasants or hear the slogan 'Vietnam's path is our path'. And they stage like a true bourgeois the farce of getting up committees with pro-jotedar bureaucrats in order to distribute land.

It would be relevant to mention here what our respected leader, Comrade Charu Mazumdar, had told us. He said, *'Whatever little concessions the UF Government may be able to give to other classes, it is not possible for them to give any concession whatsoever to the peasants'*. We set down this statement in our local election review but were not able to realise its significance at that time. But later the peasant movement in Terai has cleared up our thinking.

As in the other states of India, the peasants of Terai are also being oppressed by the regime of the comprador-bureaucrat bourgeoisie and feudal jotedars. And this oppression is carried on in the villages by preserving the political, economic, social and cultural structure that serves the jotedars and through feudal exploitation. The heroic peasants are every day realising this in their lives. That is why they accurately hit at the proper place.

The first thing the peasants of Terai did was to arm themselves and then carried out the ten great tasks and thus wiped out at a stroke the old feudal system that has continued for centuries. Furthermore, relying on the armed revolutionary strength they established a new political power, that is, the rule of the revolutionary peasant committees in their area.

By carrying out these ten great tasks the heroic peasants have taught us that the struggle of the peasants is not merely a struggle for land. On the contrary, in order to end the monopoly of land ownership and feudal exploitation of the landlords in the villages, which are being preserved by the Congress Party, the political party of the comprador-bureaucrat bourgeoisie and the landlords, with the help of the political, economic, social and cultural structure that serves the landlords a new political, economic, social and cultural structure must be created by establishing a new political power. This political power can be established by arousing and arming the peasants by organising guerrilla groups, by creating liberated areas, by building a regular armed force, and by protecting and expanding this force. Such a political power, no matter in how small an area it is established is the embryo of the future people's democratic state power in India.

It is never possible to overthrow the rule of the comprador-bureaucrat bourgeoisie and the landlords, who have come to terms with imperialism, without arming the peasants in the anti-feudal struggle, without leading their struggle courageously, without building their guerrilla and regular armed forces. This is so because in our country, the feudal landlord class is the main social base of the imperialist and comprador-bureaucrat bourgeois exploitation, and the peasants are



the main force and the basis of this struggle. Herein lies the distinctive feature of the Naxalbari path, that is the Naxalbari struggle. It is precisely because the Naxalbari struggle is not merely a struggle for land that it could not be stamped out.

Without this consciousness, any struggle for land, no matter how militant it may be, is militant economism. Such militant struggle for land generates opportunism in the peasant movement and demoralises the majority of the fighting section as happened during the struggle for seizing the benami lands. Such militant economic movement leads one into the blind alley of revisionism. This means in other words, becoming, consciously or unconsciously a bourgeois reformist. The bourgeoisie tries to gain this object of theirs, sometimes through their laws and sometimes through a Vinoba Bhave. When they fail in this, they depend on the present-day social-democrats who disguise themselves as Marxists. Marxism has nothing in common with this: In short, the question of making the agrarian revolution victorious in our country is not the same as the question of ensuring social justice to the peasants.

### **UNITED FRONT AND ITS LEADERSHIP IN THE ANTI-FEUDAL STRUGGLE**

An important aspect of the struggle of the heroic peasants of Terai is its success in gaining the support of the tea garden workers and other toiling people and, thus, intensifying the struggle still further by building a united front in the anti-feudal struggle. This is the most important task. The struggle of the heroic peasants of Terai has solved this problem.

The Terai peasants began their struggle against the comprador -bureaucrat bourgeoisie and the landlords, who have come to terms with imperialism, have prettified feudalism and are carrying on their rule and exploitation through the Congress Party, which is their political organisation. The fact that the reactionary leaders of the so-called United Front were able to instal themselves on the ministerial guddis did not change the class character of the state.

While the heroic peasants of Terai were smashing the foundations of feudalism in the villages by performing the ten great tasks, the tea garden workers realised from their innate class consciousness that this class struggle was a struggle to overthrow the rule of the Congress Party, which represents the comprador-bureaucrat bourgeoisie and the landlords. That is why the tea garden workers could not be kept away from the struggle of the peasants in spite of the fact that the unions of tea-garden workers were mainly controlled by the so-called communists.

From their own experience of class struggle the tea garden workers of Terai realised that the peasants were their most faithful friend and ally. That is why they not only participated in the struggle of the peasants but were in the forefront of that struggle. They went on strike and arming themselves they have taken part in every struggle since May 24, 1967. The struggle of the Terai peasants helped the tea-garden workers to come out of the mire of trade unionism and economism. This happened inspite of the fact that the so-called communist trade union leaders

were opposing the struggle. And from this anti-feudal struggle there grew up a genuine worker-peasant alliance under the leadership of the tea garden workers.

At the present time every anti-feudal armed struggle is certain to be opposed by imperialism. There are many instances today to bear this out. In the propaganda being carried on by the bourgeois papers representing different imperialist interests, by the Voice of America and by the BBC, we are witnessing this opposition in an embryonic form. The object of their propaganda is to crush the struggle without delay, and the reactionary UF leaders are diligently working to this end under the leadership of the Congress. As soon as the anti-feudal struggle of the workers and peasants of Terai grows more intense, it will have to face direct opposition from imperialism. All the anti-imperialist strata and classes will then naturally join the alliance of workers and peasants.

The struggle of the heroic peasants of Terai has taught us the lesson that a united front of all anti-imperialist anti-feudal elements that can be united can be built only in the basis of the worker-peasant alliance carrying on armed struggle. This united front of workers and peasants can never be built through any so-called 'turn to the villages' or by taking a few demonstrations towards the villages.

Any other front that can be built is the United Front of Ajoy-Jyoti-Harekrishna-Jatin', which can function as ministers or bureaucrats within the existing bourgeois structure but which is unable to give leadership to the People's Democratic Revolution.

The question of leadership of this front has also been solved. No so-called Marxist can lead this struggle or this front. This front will be led by the political party of the proletariat- a party which is armed with the theory of Marxism-Leninism, Mao Tse-tung's thought, the highest development of Marxism-Leninism in the present era- a party having its own army and able to build a united front of workers, peasants and petty bourgeoisie and of all those who can be united. Only such a party can successfully lead the anti-imperialist anti-feudal struggle.

### **OUR DEVIATIONS AND THE LESSONS WE LEARNT**

Taken as a whole, internationally and nationally, the revolutionary situation in our country is excellent. The armed struggle of the peasants of the Siliguri subdivision has been after the fourth general elections at a time when Anglo-U.S. imperialism specially U.S.imperialism, finds itself in an acute crisis and the quarrel between the imperialists has become bitter, when the U.S. imperialist capital is unable to rely fully on the influence of the Congress Party in matters of investment, when all the hoax of economic planning of the Congress Party, the organisation of the comprador-bureaucrat bourgeoisie and landlords, is falling into pieces, when the people are suffering from the effects of an acute economic crisis and when people's lack of confidence in the Congress has become even more pronounced, as reflected in the ending of the monopoly rule of Congress ministers in eight states.

We know that we must adopt an offensive tactic in our struggle when the enemy is beset with crisis and internal quarrels, and must adopt the tactic of advancing our struggle gradually when the enemy has gained some stability. Judged from this standpoint, the struggle of the peasants of Terai is just timely and beyond reproach.

Why have we failed, though temporarily, to advance the struggle of the heroic peasants of Terai? The reasons are: lack of a strong party organisation, failure to rely whole-heartedly on the masses and to build a powerful mass base, ignorance of military affairs, thinking on old lines and a formal attitude towards the establishment of political power and the work of revolutionary land reform. We must always bear in mind Chairman Mao's teachings in discussing these matters.

He teaches us:

*"New things always have to experience difficulties and set-backs as they grow. It is sheer fantasy to imagine that the cause of socialism is all plain sailing and easy success, without difficulties and set-backs or the exertion of tremendous efforts".*

By the lack of a strong party organisation we mean absence of a party which is armed with the theory of Marxism-Leninism and its highest development in the present era Mao Tse-tung's thought which is closely linked with the masses, which does not fear self-criticism and which has mastered the Marxist-Leninist style of work. It is true that the revolutionary comrades of the siliguri sub-division led by our respected leader, Comrade Charu Mazumdar, were the first to rise in revolt against the revisionists. But this does not mean that we fully assimilated the teachings of our great teacher Chairman Mao. That is, while we accepted the teachings of Chairman Mao in words, we persisted in revisionist methods in practice. Though it is true that the worker and peasant party members of Terai were in a majority inside the party and that there was party organisation in almost every area, yet in reality the worker and peasant comrades were led by the petty bourgeois comrades and the party organisation in every area actually remained inactive. The party members were all active at the beginning of the struggle but they were swept away by the vast movement of the people. We did not also realise that the Party had a tremendously significant role to play in advancing firmly the struggle of the heroic peasants. As a result, whatever might be the role the party members played spontaneously at the beginning of the struggle, it was afterwards reduced to nothing in the face of white terror. To belittle the role of the Party in the struggle is nothing but an expression of the old revisionist way of thinking. The Party played no role in matters like deciding what are the needs of the struggle at a given moment, giving political propaganda priority above everything else, advising the people about what they should do when the enemy attacks, preparing the people politically to meet the moves of the enemy, and developing the struggle step by step to a higher stage.

We did not even politically assess, not did we propagate among the people, the significance of the ten great tasks performed by the heroic peasants. As a result, there developed among us opportunism and escapism; and even the fighting comrades began to show signs of a lack of firmness.

So, we are of the opinion that we must carry on a sharp struggle against the revisionist way of thinking and fulfil certain definite tasks. These tasks are: to form a party unit in a given locality and elect its leader; to train these party units, which must be armed ones, to observe secrecy. The tasks of the party unit will be

to propagate the thought of Chairman Mao in a given locality and to develop and intensify class struggle in that locality; to act as a guerrilla unit and attack and eliminate class enemies by relying wholly on the people; and, whenever possible, to take part along with the people in the work of production. We have now started implementing the above programme.

We were unable to raise the struggle firmly to a higher stage because we failed to rely wholly on the people and to build a powerful mass base. We now admit frankly that we had no faith in the heroic peasant masses who, swift as a storm, organised themselves formed revolutionary peasant committees, completed the ten great tasks and advanced the class struggle at a swift pace during the period from April to September 1967. We did not realise that it is the people who make history, that they are the real heroes, that the people can organise themselves and can amaze all by their own completely new style of work. We failed to realise that comrades like Tribeni Kanu, Sobhan Ali, Barka Majhi, Babulal Biswakarmakar and the ten peasant women of Naxalbari are the real heroes and organisers, and so we failed to move forward.

Though we repeatedly recognised this in words during the period from April to September, 1967, in reality, however, we, the petty bourgeois leadership, imposed ourselves on the people. Whenever the heroic peasant masses took the initiative and wanted to do something, we of the petty bourgeois origin opposed them. The reason is, we did not understand, nor did we even try to understand, nor did we even try to understand, the actions of the masses. On the contrary, under the influence of old revisionist habits we arbitrarily set limits as to how far they should go. This resulted in thwarting the initiative of the masses and blunting the edge of the class struggle. Having worked in a revisionist party, we used to bourgeois laws and conventions and so, tried to convince the masses about what was right and what was wrong. So, when the people wanted to attack the police, we prevented them on the ground that our losses would be heavy. We looked at the people's attitude towards the jotedars and the police from the angle of bourgeois humanism. As a result, we failed to organise the large masses, who numbered more than 40 thousand, and were thus unable to build a powerful mass base during April and May, 1967.

Therefore, during the second stage of our struggle we have resolved, we must link ourselves with the needs and wishes of the people, go to the people with boundless love and respect in our heart and integrate ourselves with the people. We must learn from them and take the lesson back to them again through practice. In other words, we must not impose anything from above. Mistakes may be made owing to this, but it is possible to correct such mistakes. The most important thing is- never to allow the initiative of the masses to be suppressed. Our duty is to develop their initiative.

### **IGNORANCE OF MILITARY AFFAIRS AND OLD WAY OF THINKING**

The struggle of the heroic peasants of the Siliguri sub-division was not a movement to realise certain demands in the old sense. This was a struggle to

establish a new political power, the peasants's power in the villages after abolishing feudalism there, so we shall discuss the reasons for our failure in this struggle both from the political and the military view-point. Chairman Mao teaches us: "All reactionaries are paper tigers. In appearance, the reactionaries are terrifying, but in reality they are not so powerful. From a long term point of view, it is not the reactionaries but the people who are really powerful". If, in any struggle, we happen to over-estimate the enemy's strength politically, it will never be possible to gain victory in that struggle. In other words, if we do not have, from the strategic viewpoint, the courage and firmness required to defeat the enemy, we shall inevitably face defeat. If we fail to realise that in the final analysis it is the people who are powerful, we shall not be able to achieve victory in any struggle. It is this consciousness that lends firmness to the struggle, urges one to make supreme sacrifice without fear and teaches one to undergo all kinds of hardship in order to win victory. We believed that we had assimilated this teaching of Chairman Mao. But the course of the struggle made us realise how superficial was our understanding. Today, our continued participation in the struggle makes us feel with every passing day that this teaching of Chairman Mao has to be realised anew every day, every moment and this realisation has to be tested through our own practice. The day when this realisation is translated into reality, we shall be able to shatter the much boasted strength of the armed forces of India's reactionary Government and march forward undeterred.

The encounter with the police on May 24 and 25, 1967 and the action of the people in coming forward undauntedly both during and after the shooting down of unarmed peasant women by the police, and the boundless heroism and self-sacrifice of Comrades Tribeni Kanu, Sobhan Ali and Barka Majhi- how can we explain all these things if not by the fact that they are the expressions of that realisation? And we of the petty bourgeois origin failed to recognise this very thing and so, at times, either under-estimated or over-estimated the enemy's strength.

In the first stage of the struggle we under-estimated the enemy's strength and thought of everything in the old way, and being in a revisionist party we indulged in idle day-dreaming. Sometimes we imagined that the UF cannot go so far or that it will be difficult for it to go so far. On the one hand, we viewed the revisionists from a purely petty bourgeois stand-point while, on the other, we under-estimated the enemy's strength and kept the people unprepared in the face of the enemy, that is, we did not prepare the people regarding the measures that the enemy was likely to take. This is, nothing but revisionist attitude.

Again, when the people were ready to launch attacks on the enemy, we over-estimated the enemy's strength and subjectively magnified the likely effects of such attacks. The people fought with determination and created model heroes whose heroism we belittled. As a result, the people found themselves in disarray in the face of widespread terror, the intensity of the struggle diminished and escapism increased. Comrade Babulal Biswakarmakar, by sacrificing his life on September, 7 this year, has enjoined us to advance along the path pointed out by Chairman Mao.

This is a struggle to seize state power and, as such, it demands of us to prepare the party and the people militarily to the fullest extent. Chairman Mao teaches us: "Without a people's army the people have nothing". We have come to realise the truth of this teaching of Chairman Mao deeply through the struggle in Terai. Though we had known that as soon as this struggle started it would be met with suppression by the Central Government and the reactionary leaders of the West Bengal UF Government, yet we failed to take the programme of action which should have been taken eventually. We had a wrong understanding of Chairman Mao's teaching in that we turned strategic defence into passive defence.

When all the population armed themselves, the jotedars, the vested interests and wicked persons fled from the villages, and so we concluded that we had already created the base area. We mistook the armed people for the armed force and adopted the tactic of resisting and attacking by means of broad mass mobilisation as the main tactic of our struggle. The one or two small armed groups which were formed to take away forcibly guns from the jotedars were not recognised by us as the main instrument of struggle. On the contrary, we assumed that guerrilla groups would eventually grow out on the basis of the spontaneous actions of the broad masses. In many cases, fooled by the display of revolutionary ardour in vegabonds, we made them leaders for organising armed groups. Again, when we found armed rich peasants and a section of small jotedars by the side of armed poor peasants and middle peasants we concluded that together they constituted the united armed force of the entire peasantry. We totally forgot that the rich peasants and that section of the small jotedars could desert to the enemy at the first opportunity. We learnt in the course of the struggle that a few rich peasants and small landowners might take an active part in a big struggle that was raging. But as counter-revolutionary terror started, these people would desert to the enemy camp spreading fear among the poor and middle peasants. In short, our total ignorance of military affairs is the real cause of the temporary set-back in our struggle.

What we have learnt from the struggle of the Terai peasants is that we must deeply study the political and military theories of Chairman Mao, apply them in practice and then study them again. Our greatest responsibility is to make arrangements for our worker and peasant comrades to study the thought of Chairman Mao.

Furthermore, we have learnt from the experience of our struggle that the armed groups formed after arousing the people in the villages and arming them will become the village defence groups.

We must acquire knowledge of guerrilla warfare by arming the peasants with conventional weapons (bows and arrows spears etc. ), and by organising assaults on the class enemies.

We are to build up liberated zones gradually by forming peasant guerrilla groups and by carrying on their activities. It would not be possible either to form guerrilla groups or to carry on their activities for long, if we do not, at the same time, preserve in building liberated zones also. We must keep in mind the fact that

only the liberated zones or those areas which can be transformed into liberated zones from the rear of the guerrillas. We must lay utmost stress on building a people's armed force. To build a people's armed force we must form centrally organised groups of armed guerrillas. These, we think, will be the embryo of the people's armed force.

In some other areas, again, we may try to organise peasant revolts and build the people's armed force comprising those armed peasants who have risen in revolt.

In forming the guerrilla groups or the central guerrilla group we must lay utmost stress on the class standpoint. We have come to realise that only the poor and middle peasants must be the basis for forming the guerrilla groups.

Our failure in establishing the revolutionary political power and in carrying out revolutionary land reforms blunted the edge of the class struggle both during and after the struggle. The revolutionary peasants accomplished two tasks through mass mobilisation. They are: formation of central and zonal revolutionary peasant committees and distribution of land. And we turned exactly these two things into a most formal affair. Our petty bourgeois day-dreaming was at the root of it. We never seriously considered how deeply significant were these tasks.

Had we treated these two tasks seriously and carried on political explanation campaign among the masses about their significance, had we been able to develop the initiative of the people to participate in carrying out these two tasks by educating them, they would have remembered for a long time the gains which they themselves had won through struggle, and would have fought unflinchingly in order to retain those gains.

As regards distribution of land, our policy was to confiscate the land fully and distribute the same entirely.

We did not give any importance to this work also. As a result, in many cases the rich peasants prevented this task being carried out under various pleas. In many other cases, the top section of the middle peasants, being in the leadership in some cases, managed to divert the emphasis from the confiscation of land to making raids on jotedars' houses, and thus deprived this work of its importance. In some other cases again, there developed acute contradictions between the poor peasants and the middle peasants in matters of the distribution of land.

In spite of all these mistakes, the people have been defending heroically the fruits they won through their struggle.

Therefore, we have taken the decision that, of the ten great tasks of the peasants, we must attach the greatest importance to these two tasks and turn them into a weapon for our propaganda.

*[Translated from the Bengali original, which first appeared in the weekly DESHABRATI, October 24, 1968.]*



## **BUILD-UP BROAD UNITED FRONT IN RURAL AREA**

*[Following is the report of an investigation conducted by the Cadres working under the banner of "Krishak Sangram Samiti" (Revolutionary Peasant Organisation) in Birbhum District. On the basis of the class analysis the 'Samiti' has also suggested its programme of action.]*

India is a Country inhabited by 55 crores of People. Nearly 80 pc of this population live in villages and 70 pc of this rural population consists of landless, poor and middle peasantry. The prolonged feudal exploitation followed by 200 years of British rule in the past along with exploitation by feudal landlords and jotedars in the villages and the oppression of the big industrialists, in cities for the last 23 years since 1947 have brought the Indian people on the verge of ruination. The working class, peasantry, youth and student community along with all other working masses in general have been ceaselessly fighting against this oppression and exploitation and to-day it has assumed a serious character. People all over India are no longer able to withstand this oppression, exploitation and have started a struggle of resistance against them. But most of these struggles are being organised without any political leadership and definite political aim. The basic task therefore remains to organise the masses by taking advantage of this revolutionary situation and prepare them for a revolutionary armed struggle.

The Indian people are being exploited by four enemies, which are feudalism, imperialism headed by soviet social imperialism and American imperialism and comprador bourgeoisie-these are the four enemies giving rise to all problems in India. Therefore the only path open for the liberation of the Indian people is a struggle against these four enemies is called the people's democratic revolution. This revolution on the one hand is directed against imperialism and against feudalism on the other. Hence the leadership of this revolutionary battle should be in the hands of the working class, the landless and the poor peasants forming the main core of this revolutionary struggle in alliance with the students and youths, petty bourgeoisie govt and non-govt employees and small traders. In other words, those who are being oppressed and victimised under the present system, and want radical change should join together in support of this revolution. In short we have to build up a united front of the revolutionary classes against these four enemies.

The struggle of the Indian people against the four enemies of India's progress will constitute people's democratic revolution which is the main political task of



the Indian revolution. The agrarian revolution shall form the main content of this democratic revolution. It is only through agrarian revolution, the entire social structure based on exploitation can be overthrown. We are aware of the fact that the Indian social structure is based on exploitation. Marxism and Leninism teach us that a society based on exploitation is protected by the state to preserve class exploitation. The machineries of the state are the police, military, and the law-courts. As soon as we set our hands to change this social order these machineries of the government would be used against us on the plea of our disobeying law and order. The exploiters preach that the state belongs to the whole people. But we have seen the state preserves exploitation ; in other words preserves the existing class exploitation with instruments like the police, military and law-courts. Therefore our liberation and for the completion of our political task we have to destroy the state machineries. We also know that the state is an organisation of violence and army is the chief component of a state. In order to seize and retain the power of the state we must have an army as well, in other words we have to build up an army. We have to start with an armed revolution to resist armed counter revolution. Therefore armed revolution is our basic war tactics. As our aim is a struggle against the four enemies of the Indian people it is also our duty to organise the masses for liberating the villages by armed revolution, to build up liberated zones and thus step by step encircle and liberate the cities.

As our chief aim is to liberate the villages by uprooting feudalism and as the villages happen to be the field of our activity, we have to organise a united front in the villages through armed struggle. To build up a united front, a class-wise analysis of the villages in respect of economic, social and political aspects is necessary, we have to know our friends and foes from this analysis.

The classification of village folk, as at present, run as follows:-

**1. Landless peasants:** Landless peasants form the majority in a village - they are about 45% of the total village population. They are the most exploited and oppressed class in the village- they have no social rights. The rich in the village have deprived them of all their social and political rights. If they ever protested against any injustice perpetrated by the rich, the so-called gentry, they would have been punished. In some cases they suffered physical torture, fines, ejection as well as loss of social privileges. Besides their women folk had to suffer indignities in the hand of those landed gentry. For their livelihood they usually work as (a) hired peasant, (b) mahinder, (c) murish.

**(a) Hired peasant:** They enter into a contract with the employer to work and stay with him for the whole year. For agricultural work they get 1/3 rd of the crops grown, from the employer. Moreover during the cultivating period they get a fixed quantity of paddy for consumption which has to be paid back. But the 1/3 rd share of crops and some quantity of paddy as advance cannot support them for the whole year with the result that they have to borrow from the employer. This loan again has to be paid back with 1/2 or 2 times of interest. In the next year after meeting that loan they are left with nothing for the year. They borrow again

which they can never pay back- with the result that he has to pay for the loan with his labour without being paid for the same. He only gets some quantity of paddy for his consumption. In certain cases the females of their families have to render free services in the house of the employer. These peasants get their ration for 3 months of active agricultural season and at other times they have to render free service in the employer's house supported by their own means. The employer can at any time dispense with their services. The jotedars by making up false accounts of loan also deprive them of their legitimate dues.

**(b) Mahindar :** They serve their employer in all respect, such as tilling, cattle rearing, house cleaning etc. They get a remuneration of Rs. 75-100 for the whole year along with 3 meals daily in the employer's house. Children aged 8-10 years are also employed as Mahindar on contract of meals only. There is no difference between the serfs of the older days and these labour. They can also be discharged by the employer at any time.

**(c) Munish :** They are actually agricultural labour. They do various jobs round the year- they have no specific duty. They do all sorts of work from earth removing to thatching the huts either on contract basis or on daily wage. At the time of agriculture and harvesting they work in the fields as wage earners. Against one day of active service they get one meal a day, some times two. On most occasions they are without employment and so get nothing to eat.

**2. Poor Peasants :** They form 20% of the total village population. Their holdings vary from 1-10 bighas of land. They till their own, an many of them till adjoining plots on soare basis. They are called mini-jotedars in the village. According to rule 60% is the tiller's share and 40% that of the owner, but in most cases this is reversed and in some cases it becomes 50-50 for both. But if the owner provides with an ox for the plough and half quantity of fertiliser then he has the entire share of the hay. For some reason or other if the yield is not satisfactory in a particular year they have to borrow from big-jotedars or money-lenders by mortgagizing their land or houses. This loan is never paid back, the land is never recovered. This land is taken over by the jotedars and in this way the poor peasants are made into landless peasants. They have no social or political rights either. They cannot produce enough for the whole year.

**Lower middle-class peasant :-** They are 15% of the total villagers. They possess 10-25 bighas of land and most of them cultivate their own plots. In case of failure of crops due to illness or some other reason they have to borrow by mortgagizing their land because they can grow just enough for the year from their land and cannot keep any surplus. In this way, they too, turn bankrupt. Now a days some of them are joining Schools and Colleges with a view to get job. They too, as others, are deprived of social and political rights. They too are extremely exploited and are poor. They also become close ally of the revolution. Some of them have their plots cultivated on share basis.

**Middle peasants :** They are 10% of the total village population. They possess 25-50 bighas of land, Besides cultivating their lands on their own they also have it

done on share-basis, Many of them are employed in the towns. Some also run business on small scale. They employ others to cultivate their lands and thereby become small exploiters themselves to some extent. But they too are also exploited from other directions. Normally they have a vacillating character. During a movement they do not put up direct opposition and thereby indirectly helps it. As a class they are ally of the revolution.

**Rich peasants :-** They are 5% to 7% of the total villagers and they possess 50-100 bighas of land. Usually they do not cultivate by themselves. From the yield of the land they are able to save after meeting their annual need. Children of such families are now getting school and college educations and many are service-holders in the towns. With a view to increase their wealth they take to money lending or other forms of business. From their class point of view, they help the liberation struggle at certain times, but at the present phase they will directly oppose the struggle, and in the final phase of struggle they may restrain themselves from offering opposition, but will condemn the whole movement from behind.

**Jotedars-Money lenders :** They constitute 3/5% of the rural population. They are the real instrument of exploitation and oppression in the villages. They perpetuate extreme economic, social and political exploitation on the peasants in general. They hold over 100 bighas of land each. But in any district there are not more than 20/25 families holding land over a 1000 bighas. Our principal task is to annihilate them.

The torture perpetuated by the jotedar-Money lenders in the village over the common peasants is beyond all descriptions. The landless peasants toil the most but gets the least as wages, Moreover they also carry on with the practice of advancing money. A certain person is given a loan of Rs. 10 on the undertaking of giving his services for 15-20 days. In the cultivating season when the rate of labour is comparatively high, the jotedars utilise their services in terms of previous undertaking. The result is that when he should be getting a daily wage of Rs.2 he only gets 50 paise; in other words one has to give in such an undertaking, 4/5 times of extra labour than what he is supposed to do for the amount he is earning. Therefore a section of jotedar-Money lenders and rich peasant are the principal enemies of the struggle for agrarian revolution. The leader of the struggles are landless and poor peasants and their allies will be the middle-class, lower middle-class peasants and a section of the well-to-do peasants as well. The united front in the villages will have to be set up with these classes. What should be the fundamental task in the fight for agrarian revolution? It is just to bring about a complete change in the social structure. In other word, it is to destroy the monopoly of a handful of people over the social wealth and to distribute the resources amongst the common peasants. Another aim is to improve the existing system of irrigation. To sum up, our aims are :-

1. To up-root the Jotedar Money lending system from the villages, in other words, distribute the lands amongst common peasants by breaking down their monopoly.

2. To do-away with the existing courts of law and to set-up people's court, conducted by people-made laws. All judicial powers should be vested in the hands of the people.
3. To set up peasant Government or village panchayat in every village.
4. To organise volunteer forces for maintaining law and order in every village.
5. To compel the Jotedars to take active part in the food production for their own consumption.
6. To entrust the peasant association with all powers with regard to distribution of lands.
7. To abolish totally the system of money lending, mortgagazing and loan advancing system from the villages.  
In short to establish the authority of the peasant association in every matter.  
In addition to the above.
8. To make better arrangements for irrigation.
9. To replace the existing method of cultivation by superior method.
10. To provide for better dwelling houses.
11. To provide for better medical treatment, education etc.

**October, 1970**

**(Taken from Liberation War edited by Late Com.Asit Sen.)**



## **STATEMENT OF UPRSYF**

*[From Liberation War, March 71 issue edited by Com Asit Sen ]*

The UPRSYF was organised in 1969-70. Our task is to arouse, unite and organise the students and youth of U.P. on the basis of Marxism-Leninism-Mao Tsetung Thought, in the practice of the Indian Revolution. This means, that with the thorough exposure of the revisionists after Naxalbari, the revolutionary student-youth realised that they must organise themselves once again under the banner of Marx-Lenin-Stalin-Mao Tsetung, with the task of arousing the masses, arming them with Mao's Thought (Which is the Marxism-Leninism of the present era) and organising them in the struggle to complete the first stage of the Indian Revolution i.e., the New Democratic Revolution.

This means the completion of the bourgeois democratic revolution under the leadership of the proletariat. This means an alliance of all the exploited people of this country- the workers, the peasantry, the urban petty bourgeoisie and the national

bourgeoisie, under the leadership of the working class—who must wage an armed struggle against the main enemies of semi-feudal, semi-colonial India, that is, U.S. Imperialism, Soviet Social Imperialism and their agents, comprador bureaucrat capitalism and feudalism. Thus, our main internal enemies are the big capitalists and the big landlords, and our main task is to unite all the other classes under the leadership of the proletariat, to seize political power through the path of people's war, and to establish the New Democratic State.

Since India is a semi-feudal, semi-colonial country, our path is similar to that of China's path and our revolution is basically at the present stage, an anti-imperialist and anti-feudal revolution. As the vast countryside with about 80% of total population is under feudal oppression, feudalism is the weakest link in the chain of imperialist domination over our country; so, agrarian revolution is the main content of our revolution at the present stage.

However, at no stage must the working class movement be neglected. For, without working class leadership the Indian Revolution will fail yet again; and without fighting revisionism and imperialism and comprador bureaucrats in the cities, we cannot win the workers over to the cause of revolution.

It is also essential that the students and youth of our country, who constitute huge and dynamic force, be mobilised. For their main task is to integrate themselves with the peasants' and workers' movement, arming the workers and peasants with the Thought of Mao and the politics of the liberation war.

But it is well known that the politically conscious revolutionary students are only a tiny minority, and that they cannot succeed in their task alone; they must be supported by the masses of the students and youth, the majority of whom are politically backward.

Thus, the duty of a revolutionary student or youth is not only to go to the basic masses (which is primary), but also to mobilise, unite and organise student and youth movements in the schools, colleges and universities under the banner of Mao's Thought.

This means that the task of the advanced sections of student-youth is to raise middle and backward sections of their community to their own level of consciousness.

This means that the revolutionary students and youth must grasp basic-problems like unemployment, economic problems of students, administrative tyranny over staff and students, imperialist control of educational institutions, bourgeois content of education, inadequate facilities of books, medicine, food etc., unfair practices in examinations, and any other problems which vitally affect the interest of the majority of the students. It is by launching mass struggles against problems of this nature, that we can win the enthusiastic support of the majority of students, so that, step by step, we can raise them to the level of revolutionary politics.

This is the political resolution and the tactical line of the U.P.R.S.Y.F., as published in our organ *yuva-chhatra* in December '69, and March '70 respectively.

We have based ourselves firmly on Marxism-Leninism and the Thought of Chairman Mao, and have resolutely carried forward this revolutionary line in all our work.

However, we have to contend not only with the vicious forces of imperialism and revisionism in the student movement, but also with the unfortunate and dangerous development of 'Left' sectarianism in our own ranks. This 'Left' sectarianism holds that all mass organisation is wrong - and that only armed "actions" by guerrilla squads against individual "class enemies" is correct revolutionary practice.

This line is absolutely incompatible with Marxism-Leninism-Mao Thought. It is a petty-bourgeois line of individual terrorism. It is unscientific, subjective and damaging to the cause of the Indian Revolution.

Already, the revolutionary upsurge after Naxalbari has received a setback because of this erroneous tactical line, which, because it offers instant action, has appealed to the romantic interests of many sincere revolutionary student comrades, whose idealism badly needs guidance on an organised, scientific basis. Their ideals, conviction and undoubted courage are being misused and misled by a leadership which has gone astray by a leadership which has left the revolutionary path, which is the path of hard, patient, protracted struggle to win over the masses of the people in the armed struggle against their deadly class enemies. Instead, they are trying short-cuts on an ad-hoc basis, which can never succeed.

It is high time for all revolutionary students and youth to reconsider their course in the light of Mao's Thought and the practice of the Indian revolution. Let us overcome our subjective inclinations for "instant" revolution. Let us study seriously and carefully the practice of the Great October Revolution and the Great Chinese People's Revolution. Let us grasp seriously, carefully and resolutely, the necessity of basing ourselves on objective conditions in a scientific and concrete way.

The petty bourgeois romanticism of individual as against mass action has caused enough damage to our ranks and to our cause. The R.S.Y.F. (U.P.) appeals to all revolutionary comrades to come forward and unite under the banner of Marxism-Leninism-Mao Thought. We call all comrades to unite with us in the struggle to win over the masses of students, youth, workers and peasants to our great and unrelenting struggle for liberation from exploitation and oppression.

**Revolutionary Students & Youth UNITE !**

**Revolutionary Workers & Peasants UNITE !**

**Long Live the Indian Revolution !**

**Long Live Chairman Mao and People's Republic of China !**



## BIRBHUM REPORT

*[This is a report prepared at the end of 1971 by the West Bengal- Bihar Border Regional Committee of the CPI (ML), and submitted to the Central Committee of the CPI (ML) in 1972. Following this, the committee was dissolved and the authors of the report were expelled from the CPI (ML).]*

Birbhum and its surrounding area was one of the most active and militant centres of the movement. Revolutionary work among the students and peasants started here in 1965 in the CPI (M) and within two years the movement gathered momentum. After Naxalbari, most of the cadres broke away from the CPI (M) and joined the co-ordination committee. During 1967-68, the movement took a new dimension. But in 1969 the cadres and the movement divided into two on the question of building of the party and the political organisational programme. One section started working through the Krishak Sangram Samiti and the R.Y.S.F under the banner of the Co-ordination Committee and the other formed the CPI (ML) Organising Committee under the leadership and politics of Charu Mazumdar.

*This report emerged from the attempts of the CPI (ML) cadres to make a detailed analysis their activities in the region. -E.C. ]*

### SELF-CRITICAL REVIEW OF THE WEST BENGAL-BIHAR BORDER REGIONAL COMMITTEE OF THE CPI (ML), PLACED BEFORE C.M. IN MARCH 1972

Comrades,

We consider it of primary importance to present to the whole party the situation as it exists now in Birbhum and its surrounding areas. The regional Committee also feels it necessary to concurrently review the questions that have arisen amongst us in the light of our past struggles. The Regional Committee also considers that it is impossible to accept the Inner Party Document and its directions recently issued by the West Bengal State Committee.

According to the State Committee, if the cadres do not take independent initiative relying on Mao's Thought, they will oppose tomorrow the reports which they produce today, and go over to the camp of counter-revolution.

How can one say that opposing yesterday's report today is the proof of counter-revolutionary activity and lack of independent initiative? The contrary may be true: it may be that we oppose yesterday's report because of a development in our understanding today. How can it be said that opposing a line today which we supported on the basis of our understanding of the concrete situation yesterday is a sign of a Marxist-Leninist deviation which helps the counter-revolution?

Yesterday (in the Party Congress) Com. Charu Mazumdar said that our problems could be solved only through annihilation of the class enemy. But today we say that the programme of annihilation is militant economism. Is this then not a sign of his own lack of understanding and independence?

We believe that the formulation above is abstract. We firmly believe that the cadres will not tolerate any indications of deviation from the correct line of the international line of Chairman Mao and the C.P.C.

Comrades, we are against any programme which prevents the cadres from criticising or expressing their differences with the Party line by accusing them of being counter-revolutionaries. This denies the existence of inner-Party struggle.

In the interest of the great Indian revolution, naturally there will be hundreds of different ideas competing with one another. Two lines means two sets of consequence, i.e., positive and negative. These consequences will show which is right and which is wrong. There is no reason to fear the consequences.

#### **A Brief Resume of Past and Present Conditions in Birbhum**

Comrades,

Following our party leader Com. Charu Mazumdar's slogan without question, that we would solve problems by annihilating class enemies, we have annihilated in the past few months about 200 class enemies in approximately 22 thanas of Birbhum and surrounding areas. (The earlier report is upto July) We collected about 200 guns and a few rifles. In most of the thanas we depended for this work on the poor and landless peasant guerillas and, through the teaching of the great Mao Tsetung, we organised about 30 poor and landless peasant organisers. In some areas they actively supported, especially in areas where the *Chakriella* groups united and confiscated the property of the class enemies. When the armed police and military became active in those areas, the masses spontaneously took the initiative against them. Since there was no well-planned programme to reduce the power of the police and military and to uproot feudalism through destroying the political, social and economic power of the *jotedars*, we continued to further the policy of annihilation of the class enemies according to the Party Congress line, instead of uniting the peasant masses for war.

The result was that the peasant masses were becoming fully active. In this chaotic state, the attack of the reactionary armed forces was all the more successful. If the rural areas more than 50 comrades were martyred, and most of our guns fell into the hands of the police. The *jotedars* who had run away in the class struggle



returned with police help. And, being separated from the masses , a large number of comrades were captured . Those few party workers who were left were forced to leave their areas. In other words, we were completely routed by the reactionary forces.

### **A Few Urgent Questions**

Comrades,

Naturally, after observing Birbhum and other incidents all over India, certain questions regarding the party line have arisen in the mind of every party workers:-

1. Why is it that , after launching the project of annihilating the class enemy, we have not been able to solve the problems of the people ?

2. What is the role of the Party in mass struggles of the peasants ?

3. Why does the peasantry have to struggle on its own, totally separated from the Indian proletariat.

4. Is there a People's Army in reality ?

5. What is the character of our revolutionary struggle, and is there any necessity to build base areas?

6. What is the role of the party leadership and the Central Committee in conducting armed struggle in our country ?

7. The question of Comrade Charu Mazumdar's assessment of international questions.

Comrades,

-Present conditions have forced us to seek solutions to these questions . Therefore , we too want to submit to the Party leadership the views of our Regional Committee on these matters in the course of discussing them in detail.

### **On the Question of the policy of Annihilating the Class Enemy :**

The main subjects that Comrade C.M mentioned in the report and speech he gave to the Party Congress regarding the question of annihilation of class enemies (we request the comrades to go through these two again) are as follows :

(i) Class struggle means annihilation of class enemies. " That is, annihilation of class enemies is the only means of class struggle.

(ii) Only through this method will we be able to solve all problems. In other words , (a) new consciousness , new belief , will in this way take birth in the landless peasant masses. They will become new people ;

(b) by annihilation of class enemies rural areas will be liberated, red cells will be created every where, the enemy will be divided and as a result, all over India there will be the possibility of mass uprising ;

(c) through this process , the political struggle of the peasant masses will be established and with the birth of new consciousness and new faith able to infiltrate into the poor and landless peasants will be able to infiltrate into the ranks of the enemy , wrest their guns, and these armed peasants will guarantee the existence of red power among the peasant masses. Annihilation of class enemies is, in other words, at the same time the start of guerilla war and highest form of class struggle. In brief, this is our political view, political work and the central core of our politics.

For this, the cadres have to study the “three writings” and be ready to give themselves up and sacrifice their lives.

This was accepted unanimously in the Party congress. We also accepted this line, as did others, as the correct line, since we had no experience and are politically so weak. The areas in which most class enemies were annihilated were set up as shining examples by ‘Doeshabrati’ and ‘Liberation’. This became the yard stick of armed struggle in Midnapur, 24 Paraganas, Birbhum, and in the whole country.

In advancing the cause of annihilating the class enemy in Birbhum and elsewhere, no distinction was made in most areas between big, middle and small jotedars ; they were hunted through village after village. If amongst us anyone differed with this policy, we hounded him as a revisionist. In interpreting class struggle as annihilation of class enemies, we neglected all the other work necessary for an agrarian revolution.

**Comrades,**

We should mention briefly what our connections were with the peasant masses, how far the peasantry was actively with us, and in what light they observed the process in those regions where we applied whole-heartedly Comrade C.M.’s policy of annihilation of class enemies.

We found that from among the poor and landless peasants a few young men, about 5-10% of the whole male population in the field, had undergone constant teaching of the Thought of Mao Tse-tung. That is why they actively contributed to party work.

Through these 5-10% of men the party workers, under the direction of Com. C.M., had spread among the peasantry the politics of seizure of political power. We noticed three responses in the course of our propaganda, struggles and the attack of the enemy. In the first, a part/of the poor and landless peasantry said, “Let the thing begin and gradually, when everybody joins in, we will too.” During this time the jotedars were being annihilated, one section felt that we had done the right thing and this was the right punishment for the victims. Another section felt that there was no advantage in annihilation : one would not, after all, finish all of them off completely. We tried to explain the Party line, that annihilating jotedars meant destroying, in fact, their social and political supremacy. But the peasant masses did not accept this line. Even those who agreed to it felt this was a Party struggle, they did not recognise it as a fight in which they must participate, which they must identify as their own.

Because of the active help of the 5-10% young peasants, a number of village made arrangements for our food and shelter. But, directly the attack by the enemy started, they told the comrades that they considered the party a burden. “Babu, you please go and fight somewhere else, not in our village.” They felt it was dangerous to let the guerillas even stay in the villages. The guerillas never became an integral part of the masses. Many of the cadres felt isolated from the common people. They, the cadres, never realised that it was the line which they followed that was responsible for this isolation.

This will become clearer by taking examples of other areas. Party workers for a long time spread the teaching of Mao Tse-tung. Unhesitatingly disobeying the line of the Party Congress and going against C.M.'s orders, they did not solely carry out the line of annihilating jotedars. In these areas the guerilla groups, after annihilating some oppressor class enemies, also confiscated their land and fixed wage rates of contract labourers. In these areas, it was seen that the peasant masses became active. In a way they felt that this was their fight, even to the extent of taking the initiative against the armed enemy force.

In the previously published Birbhum report, we had raised the question of these areas. In the absence of a mass movement and a proper policy of the party on how to tackle an armed attack, the struggle in these areas never progressed further.

However, the lessons of these two lines of approach were learned through their consequences: the positive and the negative consequences. We received a line on how to become one with the peasant masses - that is, by a wide and deep circulation of Mao Tsetung's teachings, by advancing the programme of agrarian revolution and by working in the interests of the people. On the other hand, according to Com. C.M.'s policy, no emphasis is given to the politicisation but only to the annihilation of class enemies through which, completely isolated from the vast agrarian masses, one carries on a terrorist fight.

Since this does not involve the peasant masses, the ordinary peasant says: "You do your work - we will follow later." Since this policy does not entail the annihilation of the jotedars as a class, the peasant says: "Just killing a few does not mean destroying them completely." If a thorough investigation is made in the areas where this policy has been operative, these facts will become clear to every Party worker.

**Comrades,**

From the consequences of these two policies we have learned that just annihilating the class enemies is in fact terrorism. It is not a struggle for an agrarian revolution. The political report that Comrade C.M. submitted to the Congress, that annihilating class enemies is the main task of the whole Party, is really a terroristic policy to reject the agrarian revolution.

**Comrades,**

What is the work of the Party in the rural areas? In the rural areas the party should conduct the agrarian revolution. Therefore, the first duty of the cadres is to discuss thoroughly and constantly with the poor peasant masses, and then to create party units with the most conscious and advanced of the poor and landless peasants, and to arm them with the Thought of Mao. There should be no formation of guerilla units at first, as directed by Com.C.M. Whether the task is to lead an agrarian revolution or a mass agitational movement or guerilla war, the leadership will come form the Party units.

These party units will spread the Thought of Mao Tsetung among the peasantry and will emphasise the necessity and significance of the agrarian revolution. This is how, slowly, the peasantry should be connected to the idea of revolution.

Revolutionary committees of peasants should be set up and, as far as possible, the peasant masses should be brought into these committees

In brief, whatever be the work done in the rural areas whether it is spreading the teachings of Mao, the formation of party units, peasant committees or armed units or guerilla warfare-the central task is that of making the agrarian revolution. That is, to deprive the zamindar class of its political, social and economic power, to annihilate it as a class (not just to kill them as individuals) and, above all, to establish the authority of the peasant masses in the rural areas. Unless we do this instead of just annihilating individual class enemies, we will be totally isolated from the peasant masses and Midnapur and now of Birbhum as well.

Comrades,

Now we will discuss whether areas can be liberated through the annihilation of class enemies. This question has been discussed by Comrade C.M. in his article "GUERRILLA WAR" and in the report which he submitted to the Party Congress. In this he said that the policy of annihilation will lead to liberation.

In the Birbhum struggle, in the face of the enemies, armed attack, our isolation from the peasant masses was clearly apparent. In many places the peasant masses had resisted the police and military forces but, except in one or two isolated cases, we had no proper military policy, and our guns and rifles were useless due to the lack of proper organisation and policy at the time. Our aim was, under the direction of Comrade C.M., to break the police and military strategy of 'encirclement and suppression' to spread the policy of annihilation of class enemies in new and different areas. This was the Party policy for Srikakulam, Midnapur and Birbhum. In the Party Congress itself Com.C.M. said, "Though this policy one can carry on guerilla war in every village in India." Therefore, the task was to form as many cells as possible for armed struggle. We were not to stay in one place, but to scatter all over. This was the policy to advance the cause of annihilation of class enemies. Therefore, we introduced this policy everywhere. The main target was not to attack the forces of the establishment : there was no need for and organised attack on the enemy armed forces or an organised policy on arms.

In the Party Congress we saw that, after the formation of Red areas in the first stage in Srikakulam, Comrade C.M did not ask the attack to be concentrated on the armed strength of the oppressive forces of the state. Nor did he give direction to the comrades on a military policy. He said : "There are still class enemies left. Till we wipe them off the earth, no new consciousness, no new belief can arise."

The idea that liberated areas can be formed in the rural belt and that the political power of the peasantry can be established without taking seriously the armed struggle of the state (in his article "GUERRILLA WAR", Com. C.M. has given no direction at all on what the state forces can do to us and what we should do to them), by avoiding the necessity of a military line is, in our opinion, Comrades, basically one-sided and subjective.

In Birbhum we saw that the reactionary armed forces, instead of being divided and crushed in one area after another, were able to take advantage (because of

Com. C.M.'s policy) of our isolation from the masses and even build up resistance forces themselves.

**Comrades,**

Com. C.M.'s basic analysis is that the guarantee of the lasting political power of the peasantry is the armed peasant. It is through guns that their power will be born. Only through annihilation of class enemies comes new consciousness, new belief and the new man. If one accepts this analysis, one must also then accept that anyone who has not annihilated the class enemy in the past or in present is not a new man, nor has he become a Communist. (In his article "GUERRILLA WAR", Com. C.M. has said that one who had not dipped his hand in the blood of the class enemy is not fit to bear the name of Communist.) This also is a narrow, one-sided, subjective theory. In reality, it is through the practice of Marxism-Leninism-Mao's Thought, tested in the fire of class struggle, that a new man is made; not through the policy of annihilating the class enemy.

**On the Question of Mass Movement and the Party's Role :**

**Comrades,**

In order to conduct People's War and to unite the poor, landless and middle peasants for the seizure of political power, we must combine guerilla war with mass struggle. In the statement of the comrades from Midnapur Jail published in an inner-Party document, it is claimed that Com. C.M.'s article, "Advances after summing up the experience of the revolutionary struggle of the Indian peasants", had been repeatedly broadcast over Radio Peking. Following this thread of argument, they claim that Com. C.M.'s statement on mass agitation and mass organisation is supported and approved by the international leadership.

In fact Com. C.M.'s article had never once been relayed from Radio Peking. We consider it most improper that without proper information such ignorant claims should have been made. In the above-mentioned article Com.C.M. has written: "Mass struggle and mass organisation is an obstruction to the development and expansion of organised guerilla warfare."

**Comrades,**

We feel that neither the movement to snatch land, nor to seize crops by thousands of peasants, nor the mass movement against white terror, are obstacles in the way of proper development and expansion of guerilla war. In fact, it is only by the active participation of the people in these struggles that guerilla warfare can be strengthened, especially where the leadership is in the hands of the Party, and there has been a wide dissemination of Mao Tsetung Thought. What is important, therefore, is the politics of armed revolution. In Com. C.M.'s article in 1967 (known as Document no.8) we saw mention of the necessity of mass movement among the peasants in a large country like India. But in 1968-70, then the politics and application of armed revolution had been spreading over all corners of the country and our revolutionary party had been formed, then how did mass movements of this kind become obstacles in the way of guerilla war, we cannot understand. If one looks at these mass movements as a whole, one sees them as

centres of the struggle. Since Com.C.M. made the mistake of assuming that a mass movement, in spite of being centralised in the armed struggle, is an obstacle to the development of guerilla war, in an area like Midapur where guerilla war had spread, when the guerillas participated in the crop-cutting movement Com.C.M. criticised them and declared that the Party would not participate in or lead the mass movement.

Because of this line taken by the party leadership, if an ordinary peasant talked of land or crop seizure, we denounced him as an exponent of militant economism. It cannot be denied that, in trying to avoid at all costs the above mentioned 'militant economism', we clearly fell into the working methods of terrorism.

Secondly, the mass movement in the rural areas is naturally not like a legal bourgeois movement. Seizure of crops and occupation of jotedars' landed property are supplementary struggles which help to overthrow feudal authority which oppresses, controls and tortures the peasant masses economically, politically and socially.

This is the peasant's fight to establish the rights of his own class with whatever means are available. Therefore, this kind of mass movement is class struggle.

Thirdly, what is the Party's role in organising such mass movements? In the crop-cutting and land-occupation movement the Party's role is only to give a call, but not to organise any of the struggle - quoting Com. C.M.'s opinion according to an inner-Party document of the W. Bengal State Committee. We do not think this is a correct opinion. We feel that without taking the responsibility of organisation, giving a call or otherwise is equally irrelevant.

#### **On the Question of the Working Class and Urban Struggle : Comrades,**

Our Party is a proletarian party. The working class in India is the leader of the New Democratic Revolution. In our party programme and in Com. C.M.'s article "China's Chairman is our Chairman", it is mentioned that "apart from giving leadership through the Party this way, the (i.e. the proletariat will help the democratic revolution by fighting in different national and international fields, by agitating through the support of the mobilised strength of the revolutionary class almost three years ago, how is it that till today we have not been able to involve our working class in any national or international issue ? Why is it that we have not been able to build up any united movement in support of the agrarian revolution?

In spite of the inhuman torture perpetrated on the peasantry and revolutionary masses by the ruling class, in spite of the mass murders in jails, why have we not been able to create any consciousness among the workers ? There has been neither discussion nor analysis of this phenomenon by the Party leadership. In reality, what has been neglected most in the Party's work has been this question of the role of the working class. With the result that in the whole of India, the peasantry is fighting in total isolation from the vast working class.

## **Comrades,**

The Regional Committee thinks that the following are the causes of the Left deviation in the working class struggle and the movement in the classes :

1. The wrong assessment that only annihilation of class enemies is class struggle.
2. The idea that the fight against revisionism means finishing off revisionists.
3. Not exploiting the contradictions existing among the leftist parties, and ignoring the contradictions which exists between the ruling Congress Party and the Left parties ; evaluating, instead, every one of these as simply reactionary.
4. Not drawing a distinction between the leaders and ordinary cadres if these parties, and not adopting a more flexible policy where the rank and file are concerned. In short, avoiding the difficult work of class struggle by not giving importance and serious consideration to ideological struggle, not being involved in the mass movement of the proletariat, and only following the line of annihilation of class enemies, we have become isolated from the proletariat. We must bridge this gap.

This is what we feel :- (1) That we must give serious thought to building party units exclusively among the working class. (2) Through these party units, revolutionary politics should be disseminated and agitation should be organised, centering around different aspects, against the ruling class. (3) The party unit should take the responsibility of organising armed opposition to any kind of oppression against the working class by the state machinery. The example is there of the movement of workers of N.Eastern Railways under the leadership of our Party. (4) We have to support any kind of mass movement among the working class. In fact the Party should strive to raise these mass economic movements to the level of political struggle, and in special cases we have to be ready to provide leadership to the mass movement. If necessary, separate trade unions must be built by us.

Comrade, we feel that through the above methods we can bridge the gap between us and the working class. Only then can we in India, during the stage of the agrarian revolution, push the working class forward as the motive force of the New Democratic Revolution. We can then send advanced detachments of the working class to the rural areas and thus finally establish the leadership of the proletariat. Comrades, with our lack of experience of the working class struggle, now can we work successfully among them ? We request those comrades who are working with the consciousness of the backward workers and link it up with the armed struggle. We want to learn from them.

### **On the Question of Base Areas and Protracted War :**

There had never before been any extensive discussion, nor any decision taken, regarding the character of development of Indian society. Suddenly we noticed that in the recently issued inner-Party document the W.Bengal State Committee had made the statement that, according to the party, the character of development of the economic, political, social factors in our country is in the main uniform, and the differences are minor. In their argument they have shown that everywhere in India the masses are oppressed by the same four social strata and the principal

contradiction of the Indian masses is with feudalism. When chairman Mao analysed the economic and political development of China, the masses everywhere in China were oppressed by the three social strata and the principal contradiction of the Chinese masses was with feudalism. But even then Chairman Mao showed that the economic and political development of China was uneven.

Rejecting Trotsky's revisionist assesment that Communism cannot exist, the great Lenin and Stalin proved in the praxtice of the Russian revolution that it is possible to break the weakest link in the chain of inperialism and for the socialist revolution to triumph in one country, because of the uneven development of capitalism in the imperialist era. Chairman Mao further developed these theories of the great Lenin and Stalin in his analysis of the development of society in semi-feudal, semi-colonial countires. He showed that, because there is uneven social development in such countries, it is possible to stike first at the weakest link in the chain of the reactionary state power. From this analysis the first question is of formation of base areas in such countires and the question of bringing about the revolution through protracted war. Therefore the question of whom the West Bengal State Committee is attacking should be properly considered when they condemn as revisionist those who support the theory of uneven development of economic and political factors in semi-feudal, semi-colonial India. If the theory of uneven developmet is rejected, then in India the question of base areas or advancing through protracted war does nor arise. What arises is the question of armed insurrec tion throughout the country. This theory avoids facing the painstaking work of establishing stable base areas and turns instead to the new line of guerilla-ism which, Chaiman Mao has said, is the idea of achieving quick victory through roving guerilla actions. A part of Com. C.M's speech at the Party Congress should be quoted here: "If we consciously make an effort, there is a possibility of a vast mass insurrection in India. In India, through the launching of the policy of annihilation, it is possible to carry on a guerilla war. Therefore, create as many centres of armed struggle as possible, do not remain in one place, scatter all over."

This is not the line of accepting the uneven development of India and her masses, this is not the line of doing painstaking work to establish base areas where the stength of the enemy is weakest, nor of the importance of work in the rural areas; this is the line of armed insurrection through guerilla warfare. This line is opposed to Mao's Thought. And the assumption that from this line a quick victory will result is a sign of petty bourgeois impatience. That is why Com. C.M. says that by 1975 the masses of India will have created their epic of freedom, that is. "Revolution cannot wait any longer-it is already twenty years too late." (In the speech to the Congress.) We applied this line to Birbhum and were unsuccessful. The real condition of armed struggle in India points to the uselessness of such a line.

**Comrades,**

The great Mao Tsetung's Thought teaches us that in a semi-feudal and semi-colonial country like India, the three strong weapons are agrarian revlution, people's army and base areas, through proper establishments of which we can accomplish



the democratic revolution. For this, according to Chairman Mao's guideline, the military strategy and tactics of Protracted War must be mastered. These must then be applied to practical conditions.  
comrades:

We think that our main aim should be the formation of base areas and, keeping in minds the pre-conditions for establishment base areas, we must give stress to work in the remote rural areas. We should take advantage of the terrain. As a result does the question of abandoning the vast peasant and working classes of West Bengal arise or the question of putting out the flames of armed struggles? of course not. Advantage can be taken of the remote rural areas and the terrain all over West Bengal, without breaking away from the vast peasant masses.

#### **On the Question of Building up the People's Army :**

There is no doubt that the people's army will consist mainly of the peasant forces. And it is through class struggle that it becomes powerful. The responsibility of the PLA is to achieve victory in the agrarian revolution. Com. C.M.'s opinion in this is correct. But we do not agree with his view that the command of the poor and landless peasants must be established in every guerilla unit. We do not think that of the poor and landless peasants become commanders, the leadership of the poor and landless is established in the agrarian revolutionary struggle. In the rural areas, leadership will be provided by the revolutionary peasant committees under the direction of local Party units. That is why it is necessary to create party units comprised of poor and landless peasants in the peasant committees. Therefore, to raise the question of appointing the poor and landless peasants as commanders of the army is useless.

Secondary, with the party units made up of poor and landless peasants and the leadership in the peasants and the leadership in the peasant committees provided by them, the question of the poor and landless peasant leadership in the PLA is also solved. In other words, where the basic question is to keep the politics of class struggle in command over the people's army appointing petty bourgeois cadres as party representatives (according to Com. C.M.'s line of thought petty bourgeois cadres should act among the forces as the party representatives or political commissars), even if the poor and landless peasants are given command. In our opinion petty bourgeois class interests will prevail. Therefore, in the question of command when building up the PLA we do not think it is correct to impose any pre-conditions. If peasant commanders are appointed, the leadership of the class is established - from this mechanical idea the party leadership has come to the above conclusions, we feel.

Thirdly, our forces will be made up mainly of peasants. As the revolutionary war develops, the number of poor peasants will keep increasing. At this stage (we emphasize the word 'stage'), we know from experience that a vast number of young workers and urban petty bourgeois desire to join the forces along with the poor and landless peasants. We have seen that it is these young men who are able to fight. We can build up the army with all these people. Along with increasing the numbers, it is necessary to emphasize the need for the politicisation of the army.

In the Birbhum struggle, if we had used the youth properly and had organised them into a proper military force, we would have been able to build up quite a powerful army. In assuming that only the poor and landless peasants should form the army, we have wasted and misused this force. We ask the leadership to consider the question of using this youth. Since we know that it is basically through military methods of war that our political aims will be realised, the party leadership will have to concentrate on studying the various aspects and problems of building up an army - how to collect and use arms, expenses of the army, supporting the families of soldiers (especially if the member of the army is a peasant with family responsibility) and many other like problems.

### **On Party Leadership & the Role of the C.C & other Questions :**

**Comrades,**

No one can deny the immense importance of the Central Committee which is the core of leadership of our great Party. But we have noticed that after one meeting of the C.C. after the Party Congress in 1970 these have been no other meetings. We cannot accept the reason given by Com. C.M. and the West Bengal State Committee to the Bihar State Committee, which is that due to security reasons that C.C. cannot meet. Until the revolution is completely victorious, there will always exist the question of safety and security. But does that mean that in the face of even more serious problems the C.C. will not meet ? In which country's Communist movement has the question of security not been raised ? Does that mean that the C.C.s in these parties became inactive ? To decide on the correct Party line, the C.C. of the CPC held six Party Congresses within seven years. On April 12th 1927 Chiang Kai-shek commenced his white terror with mass killings through China. Nevertheless, on the 27th April the Fifth Congress of the CPC was held. Therefore, the statement that the problem of security, even in the face of grave and serious matters, is the reason why the C.C. cannot meet, is really an excuse to hide the real truth. And the real truth is that the C.C. has been rendered practically obsolete. Com. C.M. is the leader of the C.C. No leader can rise above the Party, but certain signs indicate that there is an attempt to put up Com. C.M. as a counter to the Party's C.C. We were astounded to notice this in the report circulated by the Naxalbari comrades.

Even after the establishment of the Party, Com. C.M.'s deviationist statements of the past are still being circulated- "I am the alternative party of India." We have noticed with horror one of our comrades and respected leader (Saroj Dutta) circulating through 'Deshabrati' a statement from which we quote a few extracts:- "From the dawn of civilization it is the exploiters' class that realised the role of the individual and created itself its 'gurus'. But when the revolutionaries opposed to choose their Guru, the bourgeois and revisionist opposed them, knowing that if the revolutionaries choose their guru then the revolution will advance towards success... That is why, in the present context in India, C.M. is the Central Committee of the CPI(M-L), and centering around him the new CPI(M-L) will be built. "We are not going to comment on this in detail. All that we will say is that in the entire

history of the Communist movement, there is not another instance of such political mistake as elevating a person and making him the personification of the C.C. chosen by the Party Congress, and by making use of the name of a martyr. Comrades, these are the reasons why we are against the C.C. being rejected.

#### **Comrades,**

Our questions are with regard to the intolerant attitude and methods practised in every field. We feel that the reason for our Party's terrible isolation is because of our unending attitude in political, military and organisational matter. For example, considering all other leftist parties as reactionary, not utilising the contradictions existing among the exploiting classes, not recognising the contradictions between the officers and lower ranks in the forces (on the other hand condemning the whole police force as foreign), not recognising the existence of the national bourgeoisie in a semi-feudal, semi-colonial country like India, i.e., no friendship with anyone but war on everybody, this kind of extreme left point of view reveals the intolerant attitudes mentioned above. On the other hand, not trying to build united fronts with the nationalist struggles of Nagas, Mizos etc. and other groups which are working towards an agrarian revolution indicates the same tendency. Because of this attitude, the methods of total annihilation are used when there is any difference of opinion within the party itself. In the conditions prevailing in the military field, the necessity of organised retreat, the necessity of self-defence as a preparation for attack is not realised; instead, through 'Deshabrati' foolhardy slogans are given out, of 'not self-defence, but attack.' In every field, instead of the intolerant, extreme left sectarian points of view that prevail, we must adopt a more tolerant point of view and uproot the former kind.

#### **Comrades,**

In this document, through discussion on different subjects, we have shown that the greatest danger to the party is its left opportunism. Firstly, incorrect ideas about revolutionary struggle and total disgust against the revisionism of the so-called Communist leadership was why Com. C.M.'s left deviationist tactical line was accepted at the Congress. Chairman Mao has written, "This history of our party proves that at the time of formation of a United Front between our party and the Kuomintang there is a possibility of the rise of right opportunism. Left opportunism can be evident at the time when our party breaks from the Kuomintang." But the fact that we have to be extremely careful of left opportunism in our struggle against right opportunism is not laid down anywhere in our Party line.

Secondly, the source of the left deviation is that, from the party leadership to the rank and file cadres, the comrades have come from the petty bourgeois class. Therefore intolerance, subjective and one-sided attitudes, self-centredness, all these petty bourgeois ideas have easily extended their grip over the party.

Thirdly, the total lack of study and knowledge is the greatest weakness of the whole Party-i.e. analysing the past and present history of our country in the light of Marxist-Leninist philosophy, not paying attention to the masses, little knowledge

of the international Communist movement, especially of the works of Chairman Mao and the history of the Chinese revolution, and the blind following of the leadership's point of view - such are the other reasons for the left deviation.

Fourthly, the isolation of Com. C.M. and other leading exponents from the practical struggle; with this result, that the lower ranks determine their line on one-sided reports which are either wholly positive or wholly negative. Fifthly - being over-whelmed by temporary successes, belittling the enemies' strength and inflating one's own.

**Comrades,**

We have felt that these are the reasons for the left deviation in the party and that is why we feel that greater stress must be laid on study and ideology within the party. The formation of the party must be based on the working class. And the leadership must of course live in the rural revolutionary area.

Comrades, throughout the struggle we have not been in our right mind. In our report we have presented only our successes. We looked only at the positive, never at the negative side, because we thought that if we place the positive side, the negative side can be removed. Thus we did not question the line that annihilation is higher form of class struggle. But the question on how to solve the contradiction, base areas and protracted war were raised by us. By surrendering totally to the leadership, we have proved our great irresponsibility to the cause of the Indian revolution and to our cadres. We feel our mistakes intensely. For this we urge that we be strongly criticised by all revolutionaries.

**Comrades,**

In most cases we are ignorant and young. Therefore, we must be ready to learn from everybody. In the discussion regarding leadership in this document, in many places it is possible that we have not followed the correct procedure. We hope the leadership and comrades at all levels will point out our mistakes. We will learn from them.

Comrades, after being defeated through disaster, we have become aware of our faults and we have presented these in the documents, so that in future we can avoid them. That is why, Comrade Mao has said, "setbacks are necessary". Recalling the success we have earned in the short-lived struggle, and strongly relying on the future of the revolution, we must wipe out any trace of feeling of defeat and hopelessness.

Crores of workers and peasants must transform into reality the idea of bringing about the bright days of democratic and socialist India. We strongly believe, that triumphing over all obstacles in the path of revolution, running bad into good, we will definitely advance towards a great victory.

Long live the Indian Communist Party (Marxist-Leninist)!

Long live Chairman Mao, leader of the world's downtrodden!



## EXPERIENCES AND LESSONS OF OUR MOVEMENT IN SOUTH ORISSA

GANANATH PATRA

[ *This review was written by Gananath Patra, Secretary, South Orissa Regional Committee in 1975. It was adopted by the same committee. It was circulated in Orissa in Oriya.*

*After the Telangana Peasant Armed Struggle in 1946-51, the girijan movements of Naxalbari and Srikakulam have once again brought the question of armed struggle on to the agenda. The revolutionaries adopted peoples war path as their path. The problems relating to application and practice of peoples war path arose at that time. This review will be helpful to understand the problems that arose at that time and their nature.*

*This review gave an account of the results and lessons of the attempts and efforts of those Comrades who worked in that area, to again move the people by overcoming the negative effects of negating the role of people in the movement and to overcome the mistakes of left adventurism. The review also worked out directions to the movement and the tasks to be performed.*

*The method of work and tasks were worked out according to the severe repressive conditions that were prevailing at the time of writing this review ( 1974-75 ). Comrades should study this review keeping in view the change in the situation later. Comrades should take this review as the first concrete review of Srikakulam - Orissa border region. Eventhough some of the points in this review had appeared in the documents written in the context of ideological and political differences, this was one of the reviews that had examined the practice and activities of a particular area. The responsibility of making available the review of activities and experiences of Srikakulam girijan movement from the second half of 1968 in Parvathipuram, Palakonda and Patapatnam taluqs and experiences in the plain areas ( Vuddanam ) from 1963-64, rests with the comrades directly participated in the movement.*

*Hundreds of comrades, dedicated to the cause of revolution have laid their lives. We will always remember their supreme sacrifices. Their aim of establishing the New Democratic state in India is yet to be fulfilled. Exactly for this reason, we should analyse the wrong trends and policies that got expressed in the course of movement and their results. We feel that this review is a first step in that direction. -CC,UCCRI(ML). ]*

## INTRODUCTION

In the world when two super powers- U.S. Imperialism and Soviet Social Imperialism are fiercely contending and collaborating to redivide the world, the people of the whole world, especially oppressed peoples and nations of Africa, Asia and Latin America, are persevering in their struggle for liberation and are achieving victory. Occupation of rightful place by People's Republic of China in U.N., establishment of revolutionary unity of three great peoples of Vietnam, Laos and Cambodia, defeat of U.S. Imperialism and anti-national betrayers' cliques and final victory of Angola, Mozambique and Guinea Bissau of Africa from Portuguese colonialism - these are only a few instances of victories of the people of the world.

The people of the second most populous country of the world i.e., people of India, fought many a gallant battles against British Imperialism and native reactionaries in the past. Telengana Peasants' Armed Struggle was the highest manifestation of it. But because of the betrayal of the then leadership that great struggle could not end in victory. Afterwards the Indian Revolution was being arrested by international conspiracy. But history of Indian Communist movement was the history of struggles between correct and incorrect lines. This struggle had been continuing prior to Telangana Peasants' armed struggle and afterwards too. This struggle had been continuing and will continue too between proletarian correct thought ( i.e. Marxism - Leninism ) on the one hand and bourgeois revisionist as well as petty bourgeois adventurist incorrect thought on the other. But in the past mostly the incorrect thought dominated over the correct one. As a result of which many gallant struggles of Indian people became fruitless due to lack of leadership of correct thought. Within undivided C.P.I. prior to 1961 and within C.P.M. between 1964-67 there had been struggle continually between correct thought and right revisionist incorrect thought. The great peasant struggle of a Naxalbari was its highest and most concrete manifestation, which could break the fetters of revisionism and take Indian revolution ahead, uphold Marxism- Leninism - Mao Tse tung Thought instead of Khrushchev's revisionism, proletarian internationalism instead of bourgeois nationalism and path of People War instead of parliamentary one. As a result of which the struggle of the people of the whole of India took a broader form and in the organisational sphere, broad masses of cadres deserted the revisionist leadership of C.P.M. and formed All India Co-ordination committee of communist revolutionaries. Firstly, because lack of deep understanding in dialectical materialism among the leadership and cadres, practice became victim of metaphysics, instead of being guided by laws of dialectics; secondly, because of right deviation through out the long period of the past, there developed a blind hatred towards it instead of a conscious one; and thirdly, because of quantitative preponderance of petty bourgeoisie class in a semi- feudal semi- colonial country like India that gave a fertile ground for the development of these two causes and we fell into the pit of left deviation mainly, both in the political as well as organisational sphere.

Due to this reason the spark of Naxalbari, though spread to some extent through Srikakulam, Mushahari and Gopiballavapur, could not become a preiarie fire and all India Co-ordination Committee of Communist Revolutionaries could not transform in to a Marxist - Leninist Communist party taking all genuine communist revolutionaries.

The revolutionary situation in India is excellent even today. But in the above historical background we are organisationally scattered and weak. We are to fight out this weakness. For that we are to meticulously study our past, we are to draw a clear line of demarcation between correct and incorrect and take correct lessons. And to take correct lessons means to take steps to reflect them in our future practice. This work has been started in different levels. Some are partly, some are mainly successful in this direction. This attempt should continue so that we shall be successful completely in this direction.

Our Orissa State review of our past activities could not have been done in a full phased way. Especially as regard the review of our activities in South Orissa this is the only beginning.

### **REVIEW OF THE ACTIVITIES OF STATE CO-ORDINATION COMMITTEE**

When the great Naxalbari peasant struggle reached its apex, it was widely propagated outside India, especially by Peking Radio. It enkindled sparks of new hope among the cadres dissatisfied with the revisionist attitude of the leadership of C.P.I.(M). To support or oppose Naxalbari movement - on this basic question there was a split in C.P.I.(M). This split took still broader shape and at last gave birth to All India Co-ordination Committee of Communist Revolutionaries. In our Orissa a state Co-ordination was formed in the State level. To recognise the leading role of the Chinese Communist party and Mao- Tsetung thought in the world revolution, to identify U.S. Imperialism, Soviet Social Imperialism, Compradore Bureaucratic Capitalism and Feudalism as the four principal enemies of Indian people, to reject Parliamentary path and to establish rural bases and accept the path of Guerilla warfare - these were the basis of the unity in All India Co-ordination Committee of Communist Revolutionaries. To build organisation on this basis and to develop Naxalbari type of movement in different areas and to keep Co-ordination among them-this was a task of All India Co-ordination Committee and such committees of other levels. But in Orissa during undivided Communist Party or even after formation of C.P.I.(M), the movements in different fronts were weaker than other states. And because of that the party organisation as well as other mass organisations were weak too. In such a historical background Orissa State Co-ordination Committee was weak both from qualitative and quantitative aspects. There was almost no party organisation below state level. Only one meeting of the State Co-ordination Committee was held in between the period of its formation and dissolution, and what to speak of building organisation in other levels and movements. So there was the necessity of re-organisation of the State Co-ordination Committee selecting active members on the basis of political unity from within and some active elements from lower level. And this was the duty of the Central

leadership. The Central leadership did not perform it, and moreover, as it had already become victim of left deviation by then, it dissolved the State Co-ordination Committee impatiently and unilaterally and kept northern part of Orissa under the guidance of Bengal, Bihar-Orissa Border Regional Committee (BBORC), North-east part under South Bihar Committee and Southern part under Srikakulam District Committee.

Consequently, first we could not ventilate comrades and peoples of vast areas of Orissa as regard our political differences with C.P.I.(M) leadership. Secondly, publication of party literature in Orissa could not be done. Thirdly, building of party organisation on political unity and revolutionary movement could not be completed. Fourthly, these comrades of State Co-ordination Committee who were remaining inactive are going astray, neither could they be activated nor corrected by such step, neither it helped them to form a group and go further astray, by in the days of co-ordination, though other co-ordination committees marked definite contribution, that of Orissa failed mainly in this direction.

### **BUILDING OF PARTY ORGANISATION IN SOUTH ORISSA AND STARTING OF MOVEMENT**

After few days of the dissolution of Orissa State Co-ordination Committee on the first May, 1969, declaration was made about party formation. And prior to it on the April 22, Central Organising Committee, the Central Leadership had been formed. Direction had been given to form necessary and appropriate committees in the places where revolutionary movement already had began or was about to begin.

So far our then political understanding as regards state character of India, stage of revolution, principal enemy, role of Agrarian revolution, path of peoples war etc., was concerned we were mainly doubtless. But understanding of Central Leadership as well as that of ours as regards necessity of building up mass movement on economic and political problems of the masses, necessity of building mass organisation- secret or open - to that effect, concrete forms of Armed struggle in the course of development of mass movement and inter relation of activities in the towns with different levels of activities in the villages was hazy, untenable and increasingly 'left' oriented. During that period open and legal activities, especially in the peasant front were beyond our imagination. When 'left' political thinking was gaining ground more and more among ourselves, we also became victim of deviations while building party organisation. The trend to build Party organisation taking persons prepared to remain in underground instead of giving due importance to theoretical understanding as well as experience, the trend to stamp persons as 'opportunist' and sever connection with them who are not prepared for the same and intolerance towards difference of opinion as regards politics- these were the concrete manifestations of 'left' thinking in the sphere of organisation.

### **REVIEW OF OUR ACTIVITIES IN VIZAG - MALKANGIRI DISTRICT**

A district committee was imagined taking vizagpatnam district of Andhra Pradesh and Malkangiri sub-division of Koraput district of Orissa. A district



committee was formed for the same. There were ten members, five from Andhra and five from Orissa. So far their class is concerned two were from working class, four from petty bourgeois intellectuals and three from peasantry. ( The author does not know as regard the class origin of the other comrades ). Out of this ten, one was among urban students and youth, three in the working class front and rest in the peasant front.

The Eastern part of this imagined Vizag-Malkangiri district is plain and the Western part of it is full of hilly and plain forests. Most part of the eastern plain is of paddy fields. The mode of production, standard of living, political consciousness, education and culture of the people there are comparatively better. Most of the paddy fields are in the hands of landlord-money-lenders. Majority of the people are landless and poor peasants. So contradiction between Landlord - Sahukar and peasant masses is acute in this area. But struggle of the peasant masses against this system of landlord-sahukar exploitation was in a very initial stage. So the integration of the party with the masses was feeble and local and it was going to develop. There was almost no mass organisation to launch the struggle of the people. On the other hand the inhabitants of western hilly and plain forest area were of Adivasi "koya" tribe. There was very little cultivable fertile land in this area. The mode of production is underdeveloped. Standard of living, political consciousness and education & culture was too low. Landlord- Sahukar class was almost absent there . Majority of the people are poor and middle peasants, at some places rich peasants are also formed, as almost all have reclaimed some of the plain forest lands. Landless peasants are absent. Therefore the peasant masses have to confront officials of forest and revenue ( guard and forester/ R.I.) departments of the government in place of Land-lord and Shahukars.

Besides this, exploitation and oppression of excise, judicial and police departments on the people ( Chaukidars and Constables ) also continue. So the contradiction between the people and state turns to be the principal one in this area. Apart from workers' union centre our contact with the people of this area was very feeble before we went underground. Because in the peasant front there was no mass movement in this area. And our contact with the masses developed freshly only through our political propaganda. The workers' union was of course in our hand and previously workers have valiantly fought on many economic demands and became a successful too. But we had not attempted before hand to educate the advanced section of the workers in Marxism-L eninism -Mao Tse tung Thought to break the fetters of economism and take its leading role in New Democratic Revolution and not built any party organisation to that effect. Our revisionist party of the past is responsible for this. After we went underground we touched this work. We became successful to some extent in this regard. But we could not get time to form a leading group taking this advanced action ( enhancing the political level of the middle section through mass movements on popular demands as well as through political propaganda ) and to unite the middle section firmly around it. Few cases cropping out of the workers movements were also tried in the courts. The peasants were advanced to bring the workers on bail.

Politically conscious workers and comrades had been going to the villages for political propaganda and some other party work. The peasant comrades had been going to the workers centre for party work and to get facilities like medical treatment. In this way it was possible to take up primary steps towards the building of workers-peasants alliance.

Karsak Sangharsha Samithi, a mass organisation of peasants was started. But because of inexperience of cadres working there neither this mass organisation could follow the class line, nor the people participated in it cent percent VOLUNTARILY. Often cadres were subjectively preparing the list of members of mass organisation. Besides that we had no idea of combining open activities with secret and legal with illegal. Especially there was no programme of Agrarian revolution and mass movement of the peasantry. Therefore the above mentioned organisations were rendered inactive and meaningless due to absence of a programme, and very often such organisations were coming into existence in course of settling some dispute of the local people ( not in course of struggle against the enemy class ) still then due to our presence and propaganda the people have sporadically started opposing the direct exploitation of the police and chowkidars.

During this period ( towards the end of April, 1969 the line advocated by all India leadership continued to become more and more left oriented. Annihilation - the politics of individual terrorism- began to infiltrate into our ranks.

Some of us hesitated to accept this line. But it was beyond our capacity to prove its theoretical and practical futility and to oppose it. Still then we did not make any decision in our committee to implement it in the district. But only a few days prior to the next district committee meeting few members of the committee took a very subjective decision to annihilate a landlord of the eastern plain. Because according to these on the one hand the landlord was great exploiter and tyrant and on the other if he was not annihilated it would be impossible on the part of our cadres to work among the masses remaining safe from the police raid.

But as it has been mentioned earlier, the relation of the party with the people was in the primary stage in that area and no mass organisation of the people had been build up till then. Ability to oppose the landlord money- lenders and to protect our cadres ( that which develops in course of organising mass movements on popular issues under the leadership of the party ) had not developed yet.

Generally under such circumstances people can never stand the post-annihilation white terror; and realising that annihilation is not necessary, they rather may isolate and at times turn against us, the concerned leadership did not know it. In the western part it was planned to blow up the road bridge ( by explosive) to save the cadres from police raids. But the comrade incharge of implementing it felt it unnecessary at that stage and refrained from it. On the eastern side, the annihilation programme of the above-mentioned landlord was implemented. This was done after little investigation of the concrete conditions, alienated away from the masses and without considering the safety question of the comrades coming to the D.C. meeting. Just after this seven comrades including five D.C. members fell into the hands of the police innocently. Most of the secrets of our programme in

the district were leaked to the enemy. After a few days of the incidents two another D.C. members including the secretary were arrested.

With this our activities in the district almost stopped. D.C. members and some other comrades in jail began to find out the source of this mistake. Because throughout India there blew the storm of adventurism and our theoretical knowledge was limited, we could not detect that the source of error to be the deviation from mass line. We opened instead that lack of proper plan of annihilation campaign, covering errors and lack of firmness of some comrades ( being unable to withstand the torture of police some leaked information to the enemy after arrest ) are mainly responsible for our losses.

After the tactful escape of some comrades from the vizagpatnam central jail our activities in this district resumed to some extent. But still then our rural programme was mainly annihilation oriented and therefore the broad masses of the people were not accepting it. Our link with the masses became more feeble. In such immature condition the preparedness of the enemy increased too much, and we had to face more losses. Three more comrades including three D.C. members got arrested. It has been mentioned earlier that although there was some economic and political movements in the workers' centre, propagation of the revolutionary politics among broad masses of workers was lacking. Therefore it was not possible to continue the movement in the labour front to fight for the release of labour comrades after the arrest of the important labour leaders of this area, due to lack of secret party organisation and failure in building up a firm mass base after concentrating politically less conscious elements around the core of leadership. Besides that there was no strong labour organisation in the provincial as well as all India level under our leadership.

Moreover, taking advantage of this weakness of ours, a handful of Government agents tried to capture the leadership of the labour union by presenting false witnesses against the detained comrades and thus trying to prolong their detention. But this notorious attempt could not become successful completely because broad masses of workers had firm faith on the party. The plan of the enemy was rendered fruitless when the detained comrades were released towards the end of 1974.

### **REVIEW OF OUR ACTIVITIES IN SOMPETA AREA**

B. In this area that was named finally as Sompeta during the period we formed Co-ordination Committee as well as CPI(ML) after deserting from CPM. It included Sompeta, Tekkali and part of Patapatnam taluk of Srikakulam district of Andhra and Tumbagarh, Labaraketa, Ramgiri, R.Udayagiri and Parlakhimidi P.S. of Ganjam district of Orissa. Geographically Sompeta and Tekkali taluks are mainly plain, but the rest is full of hills and forests. The hilly and forest areas are mainly inhabited by scheduled caste and scheduled tribe people, whereas the plains are mainly populated by descendents of the Aryans and Dravidans.

So far as their mode of production, standard of living, culture, education and political consciousness is concerned the people of the plain are comparatively better than the people of hills and forests. And in this plain the contradiction of the people with the system of landlord- Sahukar exploitation is too acute and that is

principal one. But because of the scarcity of the cultivable land in the hills and forest, the landlord class is weak from empherical point of view. Besides this, exploitation of the department of excise, revenue, forest and police of the Government along with that of money-lenders is rampat in this area. Therefore the contradiction of the people directly with the State assumes the principal role here (State of capitalists and landlords ). Land problem in the plain is the main one. Besides, there are problems of debt, low wage and cheating of Government Officials. The coastal strip of Bay of Bengal is known as Uddanam. This Uddanam consists of almost land for paddy crop. Cashewnut and coconut covers most of it. Raby crop is cultivated in the rest. Large gardens of cashewnut and coconut belongs to rich landlords who possess more culture, ( gradually becoming insufficient due to increase of population). People used to go to Bhilai and other places to work as labourers. Therefore Uddanam area is comparatively advanced so far as culture, education and political conciousness is concerned.

The history of the struggle of eastern and southern parts of this Sompeta area ( included in Srikakulam district of Andhra ) is comparatively older than other parts. In the days of undivided Communist Party of India and the period between the formation of CPM and All India Co-ordination Committee of Communist Revolutionaries, the struggle had been continued both in the sphere of ideology as well as practice through building up of mass revolutionary movement under the leadership of Srikakulam district committee in this area. The peasants armed struggle and revolutionary mass movement of Parvathipuram agency area which has earned international reputation is a notable example of activities of this district committee.

Mass organisations like 'coolie sangham', Mahila Sangham', 'Vidyarthi sangham' and Samskrutika dalam' have been built prior to 1968 in the eastern and southern part of sompeta area. Mass movements were organised both on economic and political demands. Samskrutika dalam worked hard to raise voice against the reactionary bourgeois culture and literature as well as armed struggle among the masses.

Starting from struggle on ordinary economic demands such as increase in wage rate, cancellation of debts etc., the mass movements of Uddanam area efficiently took the higher forms like seizure of crop from landlord's land and tax evasion. The seizure of crop from a landlord's( Maddi Kamesu ) land was really a mass festival. Just after this incident, landlords started goonda attack on the revolutionary masses and cadres. Resistance from the people was also in the process of gaining strength. This movement was confined to Uddanam area only. By then struggle has been waged in the southern part, i.e., eastern part of Pathapatnam taluk, on demands like forceful ploughing of forest land, evasion of tax fixed up by forest department etc. On the other hand, mass movement was obstructed mainly due to dominance of parliamentary politics in the areas around Parlakhemundi of Orissa, and in the agencies of R.Udayagiri, Ramgiri, Tumbagarhete the very term Communist Party has been unknown- what to speak of movements.

When such situation of mass movements prevailed in Sompeta area, peasant armed struggle had already been started in Parvathipuram agency near it, after completion of the highest form of mass movement i.e., land occupation movement, towards the end of 1967. Comrade Koranna and Manganna had become martyrs as the first sacrifice of the struggle. After a short span, the struggle resumed and advanced again towards the second half of 1968. By that time the storm of armed struggle was blowing through out India. But as regards importance of land problem in agrarian revolution, the importance of mass movement, relation of secret work with open, illegal with legal, relation of total situation with partial one, and establishment of rural bases in hills and forests, correct thinking was lacking with all India leadership and broad section of the revolutionaries. Though a minor section of Srikakulam D.C. and major section of Andhra Pradesh State Co-ordination committee presented a basically correct line on all these questions, taking lessons from the experience of Telanganas armed struggle, (1946-51). But the All India leadership did not accept it.

Moreover, by then the All India leadership had already fallen into left deviation ( July, 1968) ("The armed struggle of Terai peasants is not for land but for State Power" -9/1968). Consequently the path for all sorts of open legal activities was closed after the main bulk of revolutionaries went underground towards the second half of 1968.

( Comrades of Parla and Gunupur went underground in January, 1969 )

Taking the broad section of comrades tested through mass movements of the past and then working underground along with some peasants coming forward out of the inspiring atmosphere of struggles some guerrilla squads were formed. The concerned party committee faced the problems of protecting these squads from the enemy raids and extending the struggle to other areas where struggle had not commenced. An appreciable number of Guerilla squads, a comparatively big area, sound mass base, necessary knowledge of activities military and regular supply of arms and ammunitions, and favourable topographical conditions are required to protect the guerillas adoption tactics of active self defence. Our number, when we came underground, was about sixty, including boys, youths, women and oldmen. Though we have a big area, we did not have wide mass base. There was almost no mass base except in a part of Uddanam area.

Again the area having sound mass base was not favourable for military activities from topographical point of view. And in the topographically favourable areas there was almost no mass base because there was no mass movement prior to it. Though there was military supplies just sufficient for the movement, we were only beginners in military operation. Considering all these points the problem of self protection was organically related with the problem of extending the struggle to wider areas. Clear idea of such extension combining secret with open, illegal with legal, armed struggle with mass movement on economic political demands was absent before hand. And in such movement left opportunistic 'Baudpur action' appeared before us as the path of extending the struggle to wider areas.

Baudpur of plain lies in between Uddanam and agency area of Orissa. The landlord Nityananda owned more than 100 acres of land and huge amount of money and gold. But he was tactful and because of that his dealing with masses was comparatively better than other landlords. Yet he was quite apt in exploitation. There was plan in the party committee to confiscate his movable property, ( money, gold, paddy stock, rice, clothing and other things ), to destroy promissory notes of the people and to distribute the confiscated paddy and rice among the masses. It was decided that if this plan would be materialised and could rouse the masses, this would be accepted as the correct path to be followed subsequently. In this action a large section of the guerillas took part.

Action took place according to the plan. For self defence hand made bombs were used. Due to lack of deep intimacy with the masses of the locality, how to distribute the confiscated property? Because previously there was no mass movement, though at the time of action people of the very village were encouraged to take rice and paddy but the local masses did not show any interest to take away rice and paddy; the local masses did not show any interest to take anything; Together we had to keep rice and paddy in their houses against their will. Rupees four lakhs could not be recovered from the iron chest. The promissory notes were burnt away. It was decided to return the recovered 60 tolas of mortgaged gold ( which belonged to the people ) on behalf of the party and was done accordingly.

After the action, especially after giving back people's gold to them, the people made wide propaganda in favour of us. Specifically the middle and poor peasants who got back their gold, doubly praised our activities ( The landless peasants have no gold almost). We were also encouraged by this event. But we could not understand the inability of such action to make the masses conscious, organised and prepared for struggle (especially for armed struggle). In these circumstances the central leadership congratulated such action and called it 'Guerrilla Action'.

To establish the correctness of such action in reference to Chinese experience, it used the shield of a quotation from Lin Piao, i.e., To mobilise the whole strength of the people against the enemy, guerrilla warfare is the only path. And in such actions, the main task is to annihilate the class enemy, such suggestion was also given. Consequently the annihilation campaign continued in Sompeta area and other parts of the country. "*One, who has not drenched his hand in enemy's blood, is not a communist*" - such interpretation was also given. White terror by the state was also doubled. Hundreds of people were put behind bars, many were physically tortured, women were raped and some innocent peasants became martyrs too.

Because the white terror started when preparedness of the masses was in premature stage, their resistance did not increase and was thwarted instead. Because there was no mass movement previously broad areas under the leadership of the party, we were in isolation from the very beginning and this increased more and more as a result of white terror, consequently we had to take shelter in forests and hills and continue annihilation. Previously we had no contact with the inhabitants of hills. Marking that we are passing our time in forests with weapons, they called us Jungle people (Bana Loka ) our work was to pass the whole day

hiding in the forest, and to propagate politics in squads at night in the villages where class enemy is absent. A Government by the people cannot be installed by ballot and that can only be through armed struggle. The people are required to come out for armed struggle, they are required to join guerrilla squads (to become Bana Loka). The Government of the people will be formed only after the Government of the rich is smashed. The poor will lead better life when their government is in power, it means that they will get good food to live on, good dress to put on, and good house to live in. All will read and medical facilities will be there for all. This is our political propaganda. Leaving aside these to advanced sections of the masses how did the rest of the people accept us? The expression of their inner feeling towards us was as follows: "Guards, Constables, 'Revenues', CRP were of one government are exploiting us, putting us in the jail and torture us when we complain. But these 'jungle people' are not like that, they see us well if they win as they say that we shall have good life etc. Our designation was "Jungle people" instead of Communists and we are of another government-- this indicated our lack of integration with masses and this indicated the necessity of revolutionary mass movement on the economic and political demands of the masses. The mass consciousness, mass organisation, mass base and preparedness of the masses for armed struggle develop in course of mass movement on the economic and political demands of the masses and armed organisation like guerrilla squads and village protection corps are developed in course of that too. This was the experience of Great Peasant Armed struggle of Telangana (1946-51) and Peasants' struggle of Naxalbari. But we could not realise that. We have recruited a few from the local masses into our guerrilla squads only through political propaganda and annihilation. Those who joined are either advanced elements of local masses or lumpen proletariat devoid of physical labour. As not in course of movement they generally joined with us in an isolated way from the masses. Subsequently white terror was started in our hill and forest sanctuary keeping military and CRP camps. When our relation with the masses was weak as mentioned earlier there was abundance of enemy agents. It is quite natural that persons from enemy classes and individuals near to the enemy classes (Rich Peasants) become enemy agents. Besides that some more from the masses become enemy agents failing to understand our objectives (for which wrong line is responsible) and being unable to withstand the police tortures; the lumpen section among the masses as well as those lumpens joined in the guerrilla squads (after arrest) became enemy agents for money too. Consequently we incurred heavy losses. We lost leading comrades like Panchadi Krishna murthy, Tamada Ganapati, Dr. Bhaskar, Dr. Mallik, mass poet Subba Rao Panigrahi and Mallesh; we lost valuable comrades like com. Ramesh, P. Appalaswami, P. Apparao, Dushyant etc; we lost women leaders like Ankamma, Saraswati and Nirmala; we also lost representatives of advanced section of local masses like Rama and Buranna. Besides that some leading comrades Chowdari Tejeswararao, Nagabhushanam Patnaik and M. Appala Suri got arrested in other areas where they had been for party work. We annihilated altogether 15 including landlords, sahuikars, forest guards and enemy agents. But our loss was Thrice

more. Of course there is struggle, there is sacrifice and death is a common occurrence. But sacrifice must be done when it is necessary only to keep the struggle continued, to take it forward. We were mainly getting defeated instead of winning victory. We were making unnecessary sacrifices instead of necessary ones. We were sure about this by the end of 1970. But as regard its reason i.e., reason of our defeat we had two opinions. A part of the Sompeta leadership was in doubt as regard the correctness of annihilation line of the central leadership. But their idea as regard alternative correct line was too hazy. Consequently this part of the Sompeta leadership was hesitatingly following the central leadership. On the other hand not to give stress on class analysis, not to rely completely on landless and poor peasants, not to see class difference among the peasants, not to form "Guerrilla squads" adopting completely conspiratorial method, not to conduct annihilation by small "Guerrilla squads", and in action not to take only annihilation programme but to take confiscation of movable properties besides annihilation i.e., not to implement comrade Charu Mazumdar's "a few words about guerrilla actions" cent percent was the reason of our defeat, according to some comrades. Of course, in Sompeta area there were some right trend errors like hazy idea of the leadership and the cadres as regard class analysis, lack of reliance on landless and poor peasants and lack of mobility of guerrilla squads. Yet these were not the main reasons for defeats. The deviation from the mass line, i.e. the deviation from the line of building revolutionary mass movement taking land problem as the main one, combining open with secret, legal with illegal activities and to develop armed struggle along with it was the main reason of our defeat, and this was a left deviation. Even in the first part of 1971 we failed to understand this so in the first part of the 1971, plan was taken for cent per cent implementation of 'few words about guerrilla action', sending some Oriya cadres to work with Sompeta Comrades under the direction of the central leadership. Rest of the cadres and guerrillas were divided into small squads. Village to village propaganda and extension of contacts was done in the vast hilly and forest areas (Ramgiri, Udaigiri, Labanagada, etc. Oriya speaking areas). Before going to new village information regarding its class composition was collected from a near by dependable village and taking their help attempt was made to implement the method of secret meeting with 2/4 advanced elements of favourable classes of the new village. The class enemies are the eyes and ears of the state; the political power is to be captured by destroying these eyes and ears through annihilation campaign and increasing the number of guerrilla squads of landless and poor peasants and defeating the armed strength of the state through guerrilla war. For that we are to take lessons from "three articles" -this was the sum and substance of the political propaganda in secret meetings. The cadre and the rest of the guerrillas set their shoulder to implement this line with much sincerity. For that they crossed many mountains, thick forests and hill streams and rivulets. And did not care tigers, bears and elephants, even like foxes, dogs and bulls, they have drenched themselves in the showers of July, shivered in the cold of January and walked in the pitch dark, the water-like gravel of ragi supplied by masses was the only food to keep body and soul together. Even then we could not adopt the



above-said conspiratorial Methods completely inspite of our repeated trails. Because it was an attempt to capture Power quickly by a few without taking the level of consciousness and preparedness of the masses into consideration and not relying on broad masses and in isolation from them. Apart from this hilly and forest area was different from plain. Here the life of demarcation between poor and middle class peasants was blurred and among Adivasis there was strong clear relationship-- these were additional hurdles for the implementation of above said conspiratorial method. So all our sincerity and sacrifice for revolution was spent to implement a 'left' wrong line cent per cent. There was no line to bring broad masses to the struggle. So they could not understand that we are their vanguard to take their struggle ahead. Apart from it some were doubting us as a result of enemy's scandals too. The blood sticken dead bodies of three sacred comrades of sacrifice on the stone floor gives us this lesson. Why we were following this line inspite of these losses yet? Secondly we were not enlightened well as regard international experiences: thirdly our comrades in West Bengal could still persever in the annihilation line taking advantage of division in the ruling classes and that helped to keep our faith lively in this line. By the end of 1971 U.P. and Bihar state branches of the party and broad section of West Bengal comrades opposed this line of left deviation. Of course comrade Nagi reddy and his followers remaining out side the party pointed out as regard the futility of this line and were working following mass line. This opposition took concrete shape especially after fraternal Communist Party of China had given comradesly counsels and after comrade Charu Mazumdar had taken Bengali Chauvinistic wrong line when India attacked Pakistan: and the Central Committee was revived too. Under such circumstances it was the time to verify the correctness or incorrectness of the line. But the part of Sompeta leadership was in hesitation and conducted two more annihilations by economic pressure and invited more losses.

We were following a left organisational line too to implement the aforesaid left political line. There was no trace of party organisation among the broad masses. All the members of the party were guerrillas (i.e. jungle people). Apart from them there were also some guerrillas who were not party members. The party committee was being elected from the party members. After we went underground there was no mass organisation- open or secret- in the area ( ofcourse for this line no mass organisation was necessary). After Magurjan incident comrade Charu Mazumdar gave direction to form village to village revolutionary committees ( lowest stratum of revolutionary government). In this area call was given to this effect too. But because of lack of mass base, our isolation from the masses and white terror it was not possible to instal the revolutionary committee too.

#### IN SHORT

1. By 1968 in a small pocket of Sompeta area ( In Uddanam area) there was mass movement and that just reached the stage of political movement. Towards the last phase of the movement there was clash between landlords and revolutionaries and raids on behalf the state were also commenced. In Patapatnam and Parlakhemundi area the movement was either weak or intended for

electioneering propaganda. But in the last parts of Sompeta area there was almost no mass movement. Therefore party had almost no contact with broad mass of people.

2. In between 1969 i.e. Bandpur action and beginning of 1972 the history of movement of Sompeta area was the history of left deviation considering politics, organisation and method of work our activities there were mainly analogous to the activities of 'the Guevera's Guerrilla squads. But main target of Guevera's squads was armed forces of the state of enemy class and that of ours was individuals of enemy class.

Magurjan incident:-[Magurjan is a village situated in the border of West Bengal and Bihar.] In the month of November 1970 the peasants of this place with their own initiative snatched rifles from the oppressing police keeping the advice of fraternal Chinese Communist Party, Comrade Charu Mazumdar used this Magurjan incident as a plea for army building and write an article. He gave direction to build army as well as to instal revolutionary committees thereby.

### **REVIEW OF OUR ACTIVITIES IN GUNPUR**

Gunpur is a sub division in Koraput, the biggest district in Orissa. This touches the border of Ganjam and Phulbani. The southern part of this sub-division is of plain as well as hill forests. In southern plain plenty of paddy is grown. Apart from it crops like Magi, Ganga, 'swan' and etc; requiring little water, and oil seeds like ragi and mustard and pulses like Kandulu, maker kanda, and other vegetables are grown abundantly. Ofcourse these crops depend to a great extent on rain. Along with it, water is also canalised from natural dams and rivulets. Valuable forests grown materials like Markda Bahade, Mahua, Kochila and honey are collected. The fruit of Mehua is also a good oil seed. Sabara and Kandhas are the local inhabitants and they constitute the majority of the population. Savara people mainly dwell in the southern plain and hilly parts. Considering their standard of living, political consciousness as well as education and culture they are comparatively better than northern Kandhas. Kandhas are comparatively simple and innocent. Migratives from other areas some Brahmin Karans, Komutis, sundhis, paiks and Harijana have come to dwell in this area in course of time. The majority of the people are peasants and a small part of Brahmins, Karans, Kumutis, and sundhis are landlords and Sahukars have settled in the plain big villages or in small towns like Gunupur, Padmapur and Muniguda.

Once upon a time all the fertile lands of this area belonged to local Saura and Kandha adivasi people. Coming from other areas Brahmins, Karans, Kumutis, Sundhis and other notorious persons lent money in 'laghu', 'phaida' and 'chidni' and compounded the interest, committed forgery and occupied all fertile land. Starting with small capital these notorious persons became landlord saukars. On the other hand the innocent Adivasis became Gotior labourers bonded labour in the house of landlords and saukars for meagre wages or just to fill the belly. Some depended on fallow lands and hills and forests. They are also not left free in these hills and forests. On them untold exploitation and oppression of small officers

and employees of revenue, forest and excise departments of 'welfare government' continued. Whatever the landless Adivasis had grown or collected in the forests was looted on the sahukars through chindi and Phaida. The police department, saviours of the law and order became only an extra burden on the people. The belly and back of the Adivasis became one. In want of clothing both men and women remained half-naked, not to speak of educational progress and hygiene.

In southern part the contradiction between landlord- sahukars and peasants is the principal one. The Contradiction in the state directly i.e. contradictions of peasants with forest, revenue, excise and police departments is secondary one. On the other hand the state of affair in North is just the opposite. Exploitation of forest, revenue and excise and police department is main there. Therefore the contradiction of the peasants with the state directly is the principal one there. In southern part there are problems like land, low wage rate and exploitation and oppression of government machinery. In northern part loan problem (Chhindhi and Phaide), low wage rate and exploitation and oppression of government machinery is there; apart from it there is slight land problem too.

In southern part there had been mass movements under the leadership of the party since 1951 to solve the problems of loan, low wage rate and land. The attention of the then government was drawn to solve the land problem partially by implementing Orissa Tenancy Acts, and simultaneously steps were taken to occupy such land to some extent. In a portion of this southern part there was reformist movement on behalf of Sarvodaya Mandal to solve the loan problem partially during the very period. Because of this and because of the then party leadership was captured by the revisionists and party's activities were mainly limited to electioneering propaganda the above said movement could not take revolutionary character. Yet party could integrate with the masses, a few local peasant cadres were developed and a mass base could be developed too. In northern part at least such recognition among the masses and there was no mass base too.

In the vast area there developed only open and only legal aspects in the most of Gunupur area i.e. the movement fell victim of a right ( reformist ) deviation. Consequently the cadres developed thereby were qualitatively inferior for revolutionary activities. When such a situation prevailed here in the near by Parvathipuram Agency area where the revolutionary mass movement developed into armed struggle, as a result of which there was necessity in Gunupur area of building revolutionary mass movement in the legal with illegal and to develop it into armed struggle. Such revolutionary movement requires qualitatively better cadres and better leadership. But in the above said background we had only inferior cadres and slightly experienced leadership. Apart from it by 1969 January left deviation had already started. Therefore we were developing the wrong notion of only secret, and only armed struggle instead of combining open with the secret, legal with the illegal, and revolutionary mass movement with armed struggle. In such a situation on 23 rd January, 1965 a few cadres of similar standard were brought from Parka and were directed to go underground in the local cadres of Gunupur. The situation was demanding qualitatively one level of cadres, but the

level of existing cadres was different. In order to bridge the gap between these two levels the leadership was inexperienced. Under such circumstances the cadres continued the illegal activities in open way without discriminating enemy and friends, the local enemy class and the local organ of the state power were already aware of the developments in Parvathipuram agency area of Andhra Pradesh. Because of our above said mistake almost all cadres were arrested within 2/4 weeks. Only one local adivasi cadre ( because of his participation in the movement previously and his integration in the local peasant masses) could not be arrested to the last. The left deviation caused heavy damage to the party organisation outside. Consequently though that comrade remained underground for about 5 years, from the beginning of 1969 to 1973, contact could not be established with the party leadership outside. Prior to it his political understanding was limited and during this period he could not be enlightened properly as regard the political development of the outside world and there was no scope for political education. Therefore there could not be developed any movement of either left or right deviation in the southern part of Gunupur where he stayed. Yet because of his stay the mass base developed previously could be protected to greater extent.

### **IN SHORT**

1. From 1951 to the last of 1968 there developed a mass movement in southern part of Gunupur area on peasant problems. During that period the activities of the party were election propaganda oriented and there was also a bourgeois reformist movement of class collaboration organised by Sarvodaya Mandali in that very position of that part. Consequently the above said movement became victim of right deviation. (2) There came a situation when the cadres developed through long revisionist practice ( only open and legal activities ) had to suddenly put their hand into revolutionary practice. Consequently in their activities there was reflection of that very old open methods. The leadership also failed to develop them qualitatively. Because the leadership had slight experience. For this reason, our activities were exposed to the enemy and it became successful to suppress us temporarily.

### **REVIEW OF OUR ACTIVITIES IN URBAN AREAS**

When revisionist and neo-revisionist leadership gained ground ( prior to 1964 and between 1964 and '67 respectively) though there was mass movement of proletariat and other urban revolutionary classes in other provinces in case of Orissa it was weak so far its depth and extension are concerned. The qualitative and quantitative inferiority of urban population due to lack of educational progress as well as of revolutionary intellectuals due to lack of industrial progress is the reason of above said weakness. In such a situation came left deviation. Not to understand the interrelation of activities in urban and rural areas in the course of new democratic revolution and to think them to be only mutually hostile: not to think the mass movement of workers and other sections of the urban people on their demands to be preparatory stage for the political movement and to call it as economism and thinking it unnecessary and harmful to reject it; and because of

that thinking mass organisations like trade unions to be unnecessary not to attempt for their development, or not to attempt to organise necessary new organisations—these were the concrete manifestations of left deviation. So during this period our main work in the urban area was to develop some sympathisers and cadres through secret political propaganda, to collect money, clothing and medicines from the sympathisers and to send a part of it to rural area, to get the leaflets and pamphlet printed and arms and ammunitions collected for the activities in rural area. But it was impossible to create a powerful mass base without mass movement as well as to bring a change in the quality of cadres and sympathisers. Consequently the above mentioned work also got obstructed.

By the end of 1969 came the line of hoisting the red flag on different institutes, breaking of statues, burning of library and laboratory and of taking the programme of annihilation. To support this line it was said that the Indian revolution was a part of world socialist revolution, a part of great proletarian cultural revolution as well; and also in a new situation the strategy of encircling the cities by rural areas and capturing them was not applicable. Because in the urban area of the world i.e. in United States there were big mass movements. So to carry on the above said activities in Indian towns was correct, it was said. And then the movement of annihilation. It was not possible in our part to oppose these wrong arguments because of our limited theoretical knowledge. Therefore, though we had opposed at the beginning, we got down to implement this line with hesitation. The students and youths were organised too mechanically in “Red Guard” squads after summary politicalisation. Attempt was made for annihilation programme too. But that could not become successful.

Activities were conducted where two statues were smashed and a laboratory was burnt. Subsequently such activities went out of party’s control and actions occurred where bombs were thrown into the jail and court and into the meetings of reactionaries. It is mentioned earlier that mass base was weak in the urban areas. Number of experienced cadres was also less. Without mass movement those who came through secret political propaganda—were mostly inspired young men and students. Some lumpen elements also joined with them. Neither they were seasoned in course of victory and set backs of the mass movement to stand with the masses, nor they were tested in that way. In such a situation most of our secret things were leaked to the enemy through the lumpen elements. Consequently within a few months almost all “Redguards” and cadres were arrested. Most of the shelters were exposed to the enemy too. Thus it was not possible to continue these activities of the left thought any more. Though all the urban Redguards and cadres were released from the jail by the end of 1972, all were unfit to continue party’s activities except the experienced hands who participated in the movements of Telengana days. This is another proof that for the above line is wrong for protracted struggle.

Then there was no party organisation in the urban areas. Opportunism or revisionism will develop if party membership is given to the persons other than whole timers—this left thought was working in the sphere of organisation. Therefore in the urban area the contact was almost with a few individuals but not party

committees. Direction was given to the comrades working in mass organisations like trade unions and students organisations to withdraw or to remain inactive. Some disregarded the direction and continued to work in them and some other got dumb founded and remained inactive in both party's work as well as that of trade union, some went back to the CPI(M).

### IN SHORT

- 1) It was a left deviation on our part in the urban areas not to follow a programme of combining open with secret, legal with illegal, mass work with party's work and mass movement in urban areas with the agrarian revolution in villages.
- 2) As a result of this left deviation not only we were isolated permanently from the working class but from other urban revolutionary classes also, consequently there was damage to the revolution as a whole.

### BACK TO THE MASS LINKS

Up to the end of 1971, the Communist Party of India (Revolutionaries ) under the leadership of T. Nagi Reddy, committees such as Bihar State Committee and Bengal-Bihar - Orissa Boarder Region committee of our party respectively under the leadership of comrades S.N.Sinha and Ashim Chatterjee and certain individual comrades waged struggle more or less against the left deviation that developed within the party and made efforts to keep the more correct line before the party.

Although out of these, the line worked out by the APCCR under the leadership of T.Nagi Reddy has been more correct in comparison with others both in national and international problems, and their's had been the first struggle of such type, we did not pay any heed to it under the then prevailing situation at the time.

This group is known as Nagi Reddy group or T.N. Group in brief.

When still the annihilation programme was being carried out. More over, we were responsible, in some way or other, in scandalising them before the cadres and members and even before the masses, by greatly distorting their statements. Such scandals continued in full in Sompeta area up to the end of 1972. Even today at some places such scandals are continuing further.

In such circumstances, it was very natural to accept the line indicated in the document "struggle between two lines" published by the revived Central Committee under the leadership of Com. Satyanarayana Sinha towards the end of 1971, as comparatively more correct than others in the struggle against wrong line until then. Orissa State Organising Committee was formed in December, 1971 by the direction of revived Central Committee. The main Oriya cadre working in Sompeta area was also a member of this committee. Afterwards he was given the responsibility of extending the inner party struggle to Andhra.

On the basis of " Struggle Between Two Lines" of the revived Central Committee and " Present party line and summing up of our experiences" of Bengal Behar Orissa Border Regional Committee, advices of the fraternal C.P.C. and our own practical experiences, inner party struggle was waged against the wrong line of the past. First in the party committees of Sompeta and Parvathipuram agency areas were reorganised and new Srikakulam Regional Committee was formed after completing Srikakulam Regional Plenum. Srikakulam and Vizagpatnam of

Andhra, and Ganjam and Koraput district of Orissa were included in the working area of this regional committee.

### **Our experiences in Sompeta Area.**

Towards June 1972 we began our activities in Sompeta area after getting back to the mass line we began propaganda work through small meetings ( open to the people but secret from the enemy), from village to village. Thorough investigation was made regarding problems of the masses. The masses were called to occupy banjar land and landlords land, not to give any bribe to forest guards and other Government officials and to settle internal disputes of the masses in their own villages without going to the enemies' courts. They were persuaded to use medicines and depend on modern medical science for cure from diseases without entertaining prejudices by rites and sacrifices.

Isolation from the masses in the past, abundance of agents, white terror from the enemy, especially frequent movement of the CRP etc. and numerically our limited strength- each of these put forth a barrier wall in implementing mass line. Still, we went ahead having faith on the masses.

Initially, desperation spread among primary cadres ( so far political level was concerned) at the absence of any immediate result as it was in case of the line of annihilation. The degree of such desperation increased due to the activities of a small group in this area still keeping faith on the left line. Call was given to the people before the harvest season of 1972 in the hill-border -zone to seize the crop of the landlords. To the south of this zone, in between two mountain ridges, there lies a village in the plain. Let us call it "X" for our present purpose. The villagers are majhis of the tribal community. Formerly, all the villagers were well to do middle peasants, because they possessed all the- semi irrigated fertile lands of the mountain plain. They were having small amount of loans from the landlord- money lenders of the outside plain at the time of need, and mortgaging plots of their land. And the landlord money lenders got hold of these land by claiming over interest and adopting many other dishonest means.

Thus, 90 acres of land belonging to this villages was snatched away by non-tribal landlord- money-lender, rich peasants and even some middle peasants of the plain. By 1972, 60 acres out of these 90 acres were registered as sold to landlords- money lenders and others. The remaining 30 acres of land was being illegally ( illegally according to the laws of the enemies' state) enjoyed by landlord -money-lenders as it was mortgaged to them. But virtually tribal people (majhis or savars) were bringing out crops in these were enjoyed by land lord- money-lenders.

It was not possible only on the part of inhabitants of "X" village to seize the crop of all these lands. Because as we had no access to the villages where landlord-money-lenders live. They were using the peasant classes of their village for their own interest unifying them against the tribals.

On the other hand, the majhi community did not have good relation with the Savar community of the villages annexed to the "X". Usually the people of Savar community depend more on the podu cultivation and are simpler than the Majhis. Savars of another village in the vicinity of "X" were share cropping a portion of

the land taken away from the majhis by the landlords. Apart from it, majhis are complicated and prodigal according to the savaras.

In 1972, people came forward to seize the crop of these 30 acres of mortgaged land. Therefore the immediate task of the party was to unify the peasant masses of the village "X" in a proper formula.

The Savar share-croppers were guaranteed to get all the crops they have grown. Advice was given to distribute all the seized crop from remaining land among all the participants equally. It was also declared that a portion of these 30 acres of land would be distributed among the nearby villagers in the next year. People were told not to seize the crop from the land taken away by middle peasants only to isolate the landlord - money-lenders from other masses of their respective villages.

The poor peasants of village "X" took the field leadership of this crop seizing action. They were told to organise some young men for defence under their leadership. As remnants of left opportunistic practices were still with us. We advised them to start the action that night. But the masses differed from us. In their opinion, "It is theft if we reap at night, we will reap in the day time".

Really the peasants who want to recover their land, they want to keep it in their possession for ever. To reap the crop hastily at night is a type of economism for them. After this movement started, we did not have to think much about the secrecy of our moves. We were open to the people. They have begun to realise the necessity of a revolutionary party for revolution, for liberation of the people.

The crop seizing action started. Really it was a "mass festival". All including children, women and oldmen participated in it. We realised at that moment the correctness of com.Mao's saying "masses are the real heroes, and while we ourselves are often childish, ignorant". The masses told us "we will do every thing you just watch sitting behind the obstacles near the hill". Practically they were doing every thing. They were organising themselves reaping the crop, carrying them, chasing the land-lords and their goondas with sticks whenever they came nearer. This continued for three days.

Though we had explained to the masses that police and military are components of the State, and the State is a creation of the landlord- money-lenders and the bourgeoisie and means for keeping their exploitation and establishment in- tact, they did not realise its truth. Although we had told them that at the time of crop seizing the police would come to the rescue of land-lord - money-lender, the masses did not expect so.

So after the victory of three consecutive days they belittled the enemy without immediately distributing the seized crop they piled it, and increased drinking. On the fourth day, participants in the crop seizing were minimum. That day land-lord money-lenders with the help of some goondas started attacking the people. They also made all arrangements of police intervention. The masses defended themselves against the goondas attack, but seeing police they dispersed.

Then we were known as "Guerrillas". We were two women and one man in that squad with nominal arms like two breach loader guns and one axe. From the



top of the hillock first we found the people were not able to retaliate the goondas attack. So we got down to defend the people as Guerillas.

Just before facing a dozen or so armed police on the paddy field, some of dispersed people warned us against our intervention and asked us to run away to the forest on the hill. That day, only the people saved us. The land-lord, money-lenders took both the seized crops and other movable properties of the people of "X" village with the help of the police. The police arrested some old and incapables. But the advanced peasants as well as the leadership of the action of the village "X" went underground .

The next day the police encamped in the village "X". The people told us to go away to some distant and secure village. In the later stage, we questioned ourselves, "Are we really guerrillas"? Whether the Guerilla force in the Agrarian Revolution is organised recruiting advanced local peasants in accordance with their preparedness and need of the movement under the leadership of the party or recruiting cadres are drawn from a distant corner or intellectuals from town imbued with self sacrifice. When according to the level of local mass movement people are preparing to defend themselves from goondas at the time of crop seizing, how far it is correct on the part of a few party cadres to pose as guerrillas subjectively.

The next two months it was not possible on the part of the main cadre to go to village "X" as his health did not permit so. In the mean time inner party struggle was continued on the above mentioned issue, and on the question of the level of the struggle in the whole area, and on whether to build up "Revolutionary committees" or mass organisation like "Peasant association" or among the masses according to the need of the struggle.

At last from the totality point of view, it was settled that it was essential to build up mass movements through out the whole area. Therefore it was decided that to build up peasant association or "Raitu Sangham" instead of "revolutionary committees" was the main organisational task. At this stage, the task of party cadres like us would be carrying on political propaganda, organising the masses and building up mass movements instead of guerrilla activities such as attacking the armed forces of the enemy, carrying on political propaganda and participating in production. At the same time it was decided that the arms of the squads would be used for self defence i.e., protection of cadres, the enemy was vigilant because our left deviation in past. Therefore it was also decided that of hence forth we would be known as "cadres or organisers" instead of "Guerrillas", and the squad would be known as "Organisers squads" instead of "guerrilla squads".

Regarding this, the appropriate international term is "Propaganda team". But it was not accepted by a left oriented majority opinion. Virtually there was no difference between our work and that of the propaganda team. There were no two opinions regarding this.

Again, a method was also forged to build up new cadres through politicalisation in course of mass movements, instead of recruiting guerrillas. Because the problem of cadres was too acute to spread mass movement.

It was marked that when ruthless fight was being waged against the remnants of left opportunistic ideas. The regional leadership was unsuccessful in its role of a guide. Still there was no trend with the regional leadership nurture this left deviation, of course a minority of us (only our cadre) was distressed at our not being called as guerillas. According to them, the position of guerilla is higher than that of cadre. It is the expression of only military view point.

In the meantime, the peasant leadership of the village "X" remained underground for two months. An unprecedented integration of them was built up with the people of the near by Savara villages. The difference of Savara and Majhi was almost dispelled. The Savar masses were helping the people of the village "X" by collecting contributions from village to village. Through this movement an open peasant leadership was being built up with the help of honest peasant leaders in the nearby areas.

This open leadership was engaged in bringing the peasants of village "X" on bail, and creating popular opinion against the landlord, money-lenders openly.

The land-lord, money-lenders filed cases against the peasants of the village "X" as forcefully looting their crop. The peasants also fought these cases by paying to the lawyers.

On the whole mainly at the stage of mass movement, the party should have not been tailing behind the people in combining open with secret activities and legal with illegal and rather should have done it lively and actively. But as the ideological and political development of the regional leadership was not sufficient and it had no direct contact with the masses (or was not involved in mass work), it failed to have any lesson from above mentioned experience consequently it did not attach any importance to build up any Civil Right Protection Committee or legal Aid Committees.

It is why the peasants of the village "X" as victims of lawyers exploiters, when got back the 30 acres of land after the cases were settled lost most of it towards expenses in the trail. It was not even possible to distribute a portion of the grabbed land to the landless Savara and Majhis. Hence gap in mutual confidence has increased between the Savar and Majhis. Thus it became, relatively more difficult to build up movements again on the total land. Still the consequences were hopeful, after working among the masses with summing up of the past mistakes.

Though the mass movement started in "X" village was obstructed temporarily due to the remnants of left opportunistic ideas in us, and especially the inability of the regional leadership to take lessons from the reality, experiences of this struggle was invaluable and its effect was far reaching. After this struggle in "X" village, our isolation from the masses of the nearby villages was turned away to a great extent. Even masses coming across us on the way were inviting us to their villages mentioning their respective land problems.

The fear of white terror was dispelled from the people's mind to great extent. Agents of the enemy were alienated. Realising that the agents are against the people's interest the masses were revealing their names. Later on those persons

were being tried in the people's courts, and thus the problems of agents were being tackled. Some of the agents have changed themselves. The despondence found with those of cadres among us due to lack of immediate result by following mass line was removed after the movement in "X" villages. After 1972, that is after movements in "X" villages, it was easy to build up movements like land grabbing and crop seizing in other zones of Sompeta area.

On the other hand, as the mass line could not be implemented in Parvathipuram Agency area, it gave forth completely different result before the Regional Plenum of 1972. It has been described above how the highest form of struggle i.e., armed struggle took place there and in the later period (1969-71) it was rendered mainly in defeats due to left deviation. Even after extensive losses towards July, 1972 there remained almost 45 whole timer Guerrillas, a party committee and effective mass base ( which is still there ). In the then existing condition what would be the shape of mass line in the practical field? On this question the regional leadership had no clearcut ideas. And because of that although there had been struggle against left deviation to some extent in words, in the practical field a form could not be given to it.

As a result, in November-December of 1972, when peasant masses were engaged in seizing crops from the land of land-lords, money-lenders, regional leadership of the party was busy in conducting a meeting for 15 days, assembling all the whole timers and guerillas of the party. Therefore our isolation from the masses was not done away nor did we have any lesson from the masses.

In the later period a comrade escaped from the jail, was co-opted to the regional committee in an opportunistic manner. Why opportunistic? Because till then that comrade was a supporter of left line ( to this date even ) i.e. the line of individual terrorism. There was no certainty that he would execute the majority opinion, atleast he did not work any where in that direction through out his long stay. His only work was to preach in support of annihilation line before the cadres at the opportune movement.

Prior to this, the local comrades of Parvathipuram agency area did not have no such faith on outside comrades. Added to it, various opinions of the individual comrades of regional committee created a great havoc among the local comrades. Therefore they had more faith on its local leadership. After the main local comrade became martyr and because there was no movement for a long time, almost all the comrades surrendered themselves to the enemy due to lack of leadership. This was the last consequence of left deviation in Parvathipuram agency area.

It has been described previously how the regional leadership did not take the role of guiding us in removing the ramnants of left deviation after the movement of "X" village in Sompeta area. The regional leadership again got back to the old incorrect ideas in the absence of the main comrade who participated in "X" villages, and with the influence of the comrade from jail hiding left opportunistic views.

Without solving the problem of combining secret with open, and legal with illegal, mainly at the stage of mass movement there, the leadership gained self satisfaction by conferring the title to guerrilla on the cadres again.

Consequently the task of having lessons from the struggle of "X" villages and reflecting it in practice could not be performed as it was expected. As a result of recruiting cadres and guerrillas directly by an incorrect method instead of developing and testing them through and in course of mass movement, a number of weak elements and agents of the enemy infiltrated in our work.

In such circumstances, difference between the main comrades participating in the movement of "X" villages with the regional leadership deepened. Then the regional leadership continued to actively rear the remnants of left opportunistic ideas. As a result mass movements there could not have expected progress even to this date.

### **IN BRIEF**

1. We realised the implication of struggle between two lines only after starting mass movement on land issue in Sompeta area, although much before this, we conducted the same theoretically. Because only through practice, struggle between two lines takes concrete shape. It was possible to correct the remaining wrong ideas as regard organisational line (so far party organisation, mass organisation and armed organisations were concerned ) only when we get down to practice.
2. Our isolation from the masses began to disappear only after implementation of mass line in "X" villages. Fear of enemy agents was lessened, encouragement recorded to the cadres. Later on it was possible to build up movement easily on land issues in the nearby zones.
3. In course of struggle, difference of opinion between the official regional leadership and the leadership in practice, regarding the political and ideological weaknesses, lack of practice and lack of integration with the cadres in practice made the official regional leadership unable to correct its mistakes, and hold the role of leadership in the struggle. In consequence, the official regional leadership itself became a hurdle on the path of progress of the struggle.

### **OUR EXPERIENCE IN KORAPUT - GANJAM - SRIKAKULAM BORDER AREAS-(GUNUPUR)**

After Srikakulam Regional Plenum of 1972 the activities in Ganjam and Koraput were included under the supervision of Srikakulam Regional Committee. It has been clarified in the above said plenum that such naming of region, either from the view point of terrain or of interest of party activities in urban areas of Orissa of of international example is not appropriate. But this specification was laid aside by majority opinion. The numerical ratio of Telugu speaking to Oriya speaking comrades was responsible for it.

After regular contact being established with Gunupur area in 1973, Koraput, Ganjam, Srikakulam border area was imagined to maintain contiguity of it with remaining part of Srikakulam as well as co-ordinate activities of this area with that of the totality. Gunupur sub-division and part of Ganjam and Srikakulam was included under its work zone.

By 1972, one cadre inspired by Marxism-Leninism-Mao Tsetung thought and failing to get proper party contact, started working in northern part of Gunupur, under the cover of a philanthropic organisation. The geographical, social and political conditions as well as level of movement of that area has been described elsewhere.

To build up movement there in its concrete conditions by following mass line implies the formation of an open mass organisation and building up of open area movement through it. Within the year 1972-73 the primary resistance movement of the masses against the exploitation, oppression of police and chowkidars, officials of excise and revenue departments and money-lenders (against legua "Chhidni" and "Phaida") was built up satisfactory. There the main line of action was "gherao" where as small propaganda meetings, public meetings and procession were conducted as the open tactics of propaganda in the movement.

As the consequence of this movement, officers of various Government departments atleast accepted the local tribals as human beings, the local exploiters, money-lenders reduced the degree of their exploitation being partially terror-stricken and the masses have been aroused partially. Apart from it the barrier of isolation of Adivasis from non-advasis was dispelled to some extent.

As, at that time, different branches of the party and various revolutionary groups were following different lines, and the comrades concerned had no contact with the party, there had been certain mistakes in his practice there.

First, though under the then existing conditions it was necessary to use cover for protection from the enemy, the comrade used cover both for the enemy and the people. As a result, it was not possible to propagate Marxism-Leninism-Mao Tsetung Thought and politics of New Democracy and Agrarian Revolution directly among the broad masses of the people.

The idea of combining open with secret, and legal with illegal could not be imparted to the people. Therefore the building up of secret party organisation could not gain momentum side by side with mass organisation, nor was it possible to build up local leadership, capable of guiding the movement.

By October, 1973, after regular contact of the party being established with both the northern and southern parts of Gunupur areas, a party organisation was formed for the whole area, and a provisional programme of the movement was accepted. This programme consisted of land grabbing crop seizing, cancellation of illegal debts, claim of proper wage and resistance to the oppression and exploitation of the forest and revenue officials and constables.

To implement this programme we started forming secret peasant association in every village of the southern part, and open resistance committee as well as coolie sangam in the northern part as organisational weapons. Towards November, December, 1973 demand was placed for 5 manas of paddy as the rate of daily wage in the southern part. Call was also given to seize the crop from landlords land. At the same time people were advised to stop work on contract basis. In southern part masses had achieved their two issues to certain extent. All of the crop was seized.

Landless and poor peasant masses could get two 'manas' and at a few places-2 1/2 manas of paddy as their daily wage. But crop seizing took a quite different turn with the knowledge of all friendly peasants, some of the advanced elements of the peasant masses, seized crop and distributed among the participants. This type of crop seizing took the form of economism, as it did not demand for the ownership of the land.

When mass movement was at its initial stage, it was not possible on our part to congregate the broad masses of the people, as whole of our work became secret, and hence, there remained no open form of any mass organisation to lead open activities. As a result, in this movement, only advanced elements of friendly classes participated and therefore, it was not possible to seize crop openly.

Towards January, 1974 struggle was waged resisting exploitation of officials of forest revenue and police and turning down illegal debts in the northern side.

In some villages, turning down of debts was quite successful. For this purpose, united front tactics was followed. (The debts of big money-lenders were turned down totally where as those of small money-lenders were effected partially. And debts of rich and middle peasants were paid back with nominal or no interest). Programme has been accepted to form co-operative funds in some villages with the turned down amounts and measures were taken to utilise and increase them.

The officials of forest, revenue and police department were afraid of the struggle waged against their exploitation. Later on, as the money-lenders did lend their money no more, people were put in difficulties temporarily. In such conditions the Government of the land-lord, money-lenders also stopped giving loan. The masses, therefore, gheraoed the Collector, demanding loan and achieved the same. In the later period people occupied banjar land and demanded for its legal ownership documents(pattas) and got it.

In the northern part, side by side with the advancement of the movement, progress was also made in building up of secret party organisation. Still, need for more efficient intellectual cadres was felt. In the south, towards the first half of 1969, after the surrender of the underground peasant comrade the movement suffered impediment. The basis of his such deviation was his ideological and political weakness, especially, lack of clear idea regarding Soviet Social Imperialism and armed struggle. Added to it, the temporary set backs in the struggle through out country after left deviation- the confusing propaganda various groups regarding correctness of line, the temptation of neo-revisionists as well as doubt temptation of the Government and lack of lively contact with party provided favourable external condition for the deviation.

In the past, as struggle had been waged in that part of the area under the leadership of the party, his surrender did not affect the mass base or the remaining orders that much, though there had been a temporary recede in later period. In later period after establishing contacts with that part activities have been going on by building up open forums of mass organisation, along with secret party and mass organisation, by raising the ideological and political level of the cadres by

learning from the mistakes of the past and by combining open with secret, legal with illegal and mass movement with armed struggle.

In course of these activities there is need for a detailed programme of mass movement for a broad region including other parts of Koraput in the vicinity of this area as well as some parts of Ganjam and the building up of broader open forum of mass organisation to this, has been felt.

#### **IN BRIEF:**

1) From the beginning of 1972, mass movement of the peasantry has been continuing more or less in Koraput, Ganjam, Srikakulam border area (Gunupur Area).

2) In the northern part as the cadre used cover even among the masses, our activities were limited only to open in the beginning. As a result, it was not possible to build up secret party organisation as well as the local leadership, due to lack of direct propaganda of revolutionary politics among the masses. In the later period, it is possible to make some progress of the movement, since the mistakes were corrected.

3) In the southern part as our activities were limited to complete secrecy and illegality, it was not possible to mobilise broad masses of the people in the beginning. In the later period, as a result of combining secret with open and legal with illegal, by forming open forum mass organisation in sub divisional sphere along with secret party and mass organisation the bright future of the mass movement and the possibility of its transition into armed struggle was foreseen.

#### **OUR EXPERIENCES IN URBAN AREAS**

The need of mass organisations for proletarian and semi-proletarian classes is as important as the same of teachers, students, writers, artists, clerks and other labouring intellectual masses to build mass movement in the urban areas as complementary to Agrarian Revolution.

The proletarian and semi-proletarian classes get employed both by private enterprisers as well as central or state government. From the view point of their employment and problems. It is necessary to organise them in local and provincial level and in some fields in all India level.

Of course, first they have to be organised in factory or local level and secondly, in provincial and all India level through co-ordination committee which makes the process easier. But as the problems of teachers, students, writers, artists, clerks as well as labouring intellectuals are mainly of the provincial government, it is better to organise them mainly at the provincial level and often to organise them mainly in provincial level.

In the period of left deviation, as there was no specific plan of building up mass movements in urban areas, there was almost no such mass organisation in Orissa under our leadership. The mass organisations of Orissa were under the control of CPI, CPM, PSP, Congress and such other opportunistic and reactionary parties at that time. After formation of Srikakulam Regional Committee, though the districts of Koraput and Ganjam of Orissa were included inside its periphery the Regional Committee it did not take up any specific plan to build up mass movements and continue party activities in the town of these districts. Because it

did not have any clear idea about the population, problems, movements and organisational conditions of urban areas of Orissa as no member from Orissa had been taken into the Committee.

Under such circumstances, some activities were going on in the towns under personal initiative of some individual oriya cadres. Such activities could not bear fruits, because no specific plan was forwarded by the committee and there was no question of acting cadres to be responsible to any committee.

After examining all these weaknesses, proposal was given in the committee to change the name of "Srikakulam Regional Committee" to "Andhra Orissa Border regional committee". Apart from it, proposal was also given to lead activities in towns or orissa part and this region in coordination with Orissa State Committee as the problems concerned were identical.

But forgetting the real interest of the struggle the above mentioned proposal was cancelled by the regional committee being guided by the petty Bourgeois sentiment that if the name "Srikakulam" were not put before "Regional Committee" the lustre of the "Great Srikakulam Armed peasants struggle" would remain no more. And it advised the State Committee to conduct activities and organisations in rest parts of Orissa leaving a few villages where it was active in peasant front.

Later on, after the formation of South Orissa Regional Committee regular activities in these towns were started.

To build up revolutionary mass movements in the urban areas, mass organisations are essential. Such organisations in urban areas are of two types. With regard to their aim and class composition. First, each of the organisation such as trade union, teachers association, clerks association and students organisation consists either of a particular class, or part of a class. And they carry their respective class interest and at the same time maintained coordination with other revolutionary classes.

Secondly, organisation like "India-China friendship society" carry interests of whole of the masses ( it does not include the enemies). And these are formed accepting members from all classes. Therefore it will not be incorrect to say that the mass organisation of this second type is the primary form of "Revolutionary United Front" of the people.

From the view point of totality, though there are a number of mass organisations in Orissa, they do not have local branches at many places. But due to the massive influence of revisionism in the communist movement of India, especially added to it due to relatively greater influence of feudalism in Orissa, many of the above mentioned mass organisations are still under the grip of the above mentioned parties and the remaining ones are under the control of revisionist parties.

In consequence, it has been completely or almost impossible to build up any revolutionary mass movement through mass organisations formed by reactionary parties. It depends on their mercy. And very often the reactionary parties build up counter revolutionary movements serving their interests. By these movements, people are misled and kept away from revolutionary consciousness dreadfully. The question of development of revolutionary consciousness does not arise here.



On the other hand, in mass organisations where leadership of various types of revisionism prevail the state of affairs is little different. Some of those mass organisations due to the work of some cadres of revisionist parties intending revolution, still maintain their popularity and still it is possible to build up movements there on economic and political demands to certain extent. But the concerned revisionist leadership put mountain like hurdles on the path of leading the movement towards the ultimate goal or integrating it with the revolutionary movements of other struggling masses, especially of the peasant masses. Because Revisionism is the last ideological weapon of the reactionary bourgeoisie class and revisionists are their faithful and tested agents.

The state of affairs of the mass organisations in Orissa urban areas has been such and leading the open movement from secret has been our work. Keeping these two things in view, we have to take up steps of building up new organisations under the party's leadership in places where unpopular organisations still operate under reactionary leadership. And these organisations will have cover keeping their link with the party secret.

And the cadres of the party will work secretly from within so to say in the popular and active organisations and try to establish real revolutionary leadership by overthrowing the revisionist leadership from within. We are working according to this line in this field. In the mean time, in the urban areas of Orissa mass organisations like "Civil Right Protection Committee" "Indo-China Friendship Society" and "Nava Yuva Sahity Sansad" have been formed and they are progressing in their fields.

There is also the need of forming an organisation for the students. Work has been started in a number of trade unions, teacher association, non-gazetted officers association as well as in organisations of other labouring intellectuals. As a result, in the movements of concerned classes, there has been signs of a qualitative change. Through the secret body 'fraction' of the party- it has been possible to render political guidance to the open movements, in the organisations formed in local level. And through sub-committee, the secret body of the party organisational link, the function of these 'fraction', and Sub-Committees have been limited to the mass organisations concerned. The 'fraction' is responsible to its next higher committee, and operates as local committees and the sub-committees fraction as a party committee and is responsible to the state committee of the party. We have realised from the present experiences that this organisational line in the field of inter relations of party and mass organisations holds correct.

#### **OUR LINE AT PRESENT**

We are communists, we see each and every problem with scientific outlook. That is why we take lessons from both right and wrong things of the past in order to avoid mistakes in the future. As our activities are intended for the benefit of the masses that is why it is indispensable to take lessons from the past experience to protect their interests. To take correct lessons from the past experiences it is necessary for us to examine all negative and positive experiences in the light of dialectical materialism. (Because all social phenomena too are dialectical in nature.)

In course of revolution, in course of revolutionary movements there were problems for which we could not find dialectical solutions and by following metaphysical one-sidedness committed mistakes. For those problems we are to find out dialectical solutions and to find out such solutions means taking lessons. More over such lessons are to be materialised in practice. Otherwise that will be fruitless. In the past we faced the problems of inter relations between urban and rural work, legal and illegal, open and secret, mass movement and armed struggle, work in the plain area and that in forest and hilly area, situation in totality that in a part and mass organisation and armed organisation. During right deviation period we have given stress on the first of each above said pairs. And that was a metaphysical one-sided solution. And in the recent past, during left deviation period we have given stress on only the second of the each pair ( that is work in the rural area, illegal, secret, armed struggle, etc. ) And that was too another type of one-sidedness. Both of these types of one-sidedness are incorrect. Because, above said each pair are two aspects of a contradiction. There is both unity and struggle between the two. Existence of one without the other is impossible. Again in the given situation out of the two aspects of a pair, one is principal and another is non-principal. (In the definite phase of a particular phenomenon) at the beginning of a phenomenon the aspect which is principal, turns to be non-principal in course of time; and non-principal one too into principal one. As a result of which the development of a phenomenon takes place. The above said all the contradictions are, of course, non-antagonistic contradictions. That is why their methods of solution are different from that of antagonistic contradictions. For an example, work in the urban area and that in rural area- these two are two aspects of a non-antagonistic contradictions. There is a unity between the two. That means without the work in urban area there cannot be work in rural area. ( rural area has to depend upon urban as regard cadre, money, medicine, clothings, literature and other things). And without the work in rural area the work in the urban areas cannot go in the path of final victory. Again there is struggle between the two also. The work in rural area gets hampered when the cadre do not come forward living comparatively comfortable lives in the towns. As a result there appears the struggle between the two. As it is non-antagonistic contradiction its method of resolution is of course different type. When the party leadership raises their ideological and political level they understand the importance of rural work and get imbued with the spirit of sacrifice and come forward for the same. As a result of which, it becomes possible to transfer them to the rural area- and in this case, this is the method of resolution. Initially the urban work is the principal aspect of this contradiction and in course of time more and more cadre go to the rural area and develop movement there. The rural area become the main centre of our activities. As a result rural work gets converted to the principal aspect and on the other hand the urban work to non-principal one. Without taking both the aspects of a contradiction into consideration if only one aspect is considered then it becomes a mistake of one-sidedness. Likewise if always equal stress is given on both the aspects whether at the beginning or at the end of it becomes a mistake of mechanical understanding. Again if we fail to determine the

principal and non-principal aspect at a definite period or at definite place, or if we try to transfer prematurely non-principal one to principal one then we commit a sort of mistake which amounts to the failure of concrete analysis of concrete conditions. In the past (during right and left deviation period ) we committed mistakes of one-sidedness. But now that is after returning to the mass line there are errors of mechanical understanding and of failure of concrete analysis of concrete conditions at some places.

In Indian situation, during the period of new democratic revolution if we see in the strategic view point ( in the point of view of totality and finality) the work in rural area, illegal, secret, armed struggle and activities in the forest and hill areas etc. are principal aspects. But from tactical view point that is in the beginning of the revolution ( or because of unequal development in the beginning or in the initial stage of the movement), it is natural that the work in the urban area, legal, open mass movement and activities etc. in the plain areas are to be principal one. While considering the inter-relationship between total situation and partial one we are to, ofcourse, take into consideration the inter-relationship between the continuously eroding condition of enemy classes and our developing strength ( speaking very definitely proportional armed strength of ours and that of the enemy). If we do not do that as the revolutionary situation in India is developing unequally, (subjective conditions) the total situation has not become matured, if we go on sacrificing the matured conditions of each place i.e. if we go on sacrificing the partial situation, then we will delay the revolution for a long time. Therefore, taking both the things into consideration the plan of base area is the correct solution, that means in whole of India to work with the plan of building a few places of base area is the correct solution of this problem.

#### **THE CONCRETE CONDITION IN OUR REGION:-**

The objective condition in Orissa ( Geographical condition, mode of production, state character etc. which decides the stage of revolution) is more or less analogous to that of other provinces in India. But the subjective conditions here are different from other provinces considerably. The party, the strength of the mass organisations under the leadership of the party, mass base, the consciousness and preparedness of the masses are of comparatively low level than many other provinces of India. Therefore, while going to fix the concrete line for this region, we are to take the subjective conditions into consideration. Now in the prevailing subjective conditions in Orissa, especially in South Orissa, the work in the urban, legal, open, mass movement activities in the plain rural areas etc. are to be inevitably principal aspects. Therefore, keeping the need of above said principal aspects and plan of building of base area in view, we are to fix the working plan of the party and distribution of the cadre. But we cannot leave the transformation of principal aspects into non-principal one and their opposites to principal one to the phenomenon of the spontaneity. If we do we will commit another type of mistake. Because to cognise the reality is not only our task but to change it also is the work of more importance. To do that the work that is already going on, the work in the rural area, illegal and secret work, armed preparation ( the self protection of the

U.G.Cadre) etc. are to be continued and in the course of time consciously we have to bring their continuous development and improvement. And only by doing that we can transform the embryonic form of armed struggle i.e. the use of arms for the protection of cadre through 'village protection' to the regular "guerilla warfare".

#### **CONCRETE LINE:**

(i) **In the Urban area** : We are to build up mass movement on the basis of proposed seven point programme ( proposed by C.C. under the leadership of Comrade S.N.S.) on the economic, political, social, cultural and educational demands of proletariat, semi-proletariat, petty bourgeoisie and other patriotic elements. But to meet the organisational necessity, we are to work secretly (a) in the existing mass organisations under the leadership of revisionists which are active and popular from within and we have to take the tactics of building and establishing revolutionary leadership, (b) where there are mass organisations under the leadership of reactionaries and where there are no mass organisations we are to build up new mass organisations under cover name as an alternate, (c) the organisations like that of students and Indo-China friendship organisation, literary organisation and organisation for the protection of civil liberties which are organisations of more than one friendly class are to be newly and openly organised. We have to adopt these tactics. In each front the party organisation ( sub-committee and fraction ) and the identity of the openly active cadre is to be kept secret from both the enemy and general members of the mass organisation as a whole. As regard the propaganda of mass movement and to give guidance there and to enlighten the broad masses on national and international politics we are to take initiative to publish open magazines on behalf of some mass organisations at least. ( In those organisations where our party leadership is established). Added to that we have to take the help of open and secret leaflets, posters and wall writings too ( to keep our open propaganda -legal as far as possible we are to restrain ourselves while using jargon). Besides that to build up a clear idea about the purpose of a movement and action and to consolidate the broad masses, we are to adopt the tactics of rally, public procession etc. In the situation existing to-day any leaflet or magazine in the name of the party are to be published and distributed secretly, posters and wall writings etc., in the name of the party are to be done secretly with caution.

As regard the line of action in urban area we are to adopt Dharna, strike, gherao etc. As there is unequal development we have to use these weapons in various ways considering the place, time and persons concerned. But in each field in order to avoid the un-necessary sacrifices ( both of party and that of people ) we are to work with far sightedness (i.e. possible with the help of capable leadership) and to adopt the tactics of active self protection.

#### **2. In rural area**

In view of all objective and prevailing subjective conditions and the usefulness to the future military activity we are to divide the rural area into two categories. First, militarily important contiguous hill and forest region and secondly militarily unimportant vast rural plain.

(a) Militarily important contiguous hill and forest region:-

To develop this region of military importance as base area i.e. militarily, politically, economically independent from enemy we have to start from the existing conditions. In the existing conditions there, the definite problems of the masses are land problem, problem of shift cultivation, forest problem, meagre wage problem, loan problem, exploitation and oppression of Government officials. To solve these problems there is necessity to make a programme of mass movement. In the higher stage of mass movement in order to distribute the land of landlords and shahukars and the Government fallow land as well on the basis of "land to the tiller" we are to finalise the "land policy".

To start mass movement we are to conduct secret, political propaganda and secret mass organisational activities among the masses with the help of "Propaganda team" with capable individual party cadre. For secret political propaganda we are to organise small meetings of landless, poor and middle peasants and these meetings are to be secret from the enemy and open to the masses. These propaganda meetings are of two types. In the first type of meetings we are to discuss general politics i.e. A to Z politics; and in the second type of meetings we are to discuss problem or problems in the interests of mass movement. Through our propaganda when people come to realise the necessity of movement and organisation, we are to organise them in mass organisations. In the rural areas "Peasant Association or Organisation to injustices" in the mass organisation of peasants. We are to organise landless, poor and middle peasants in such organisations voluntarily and with the help of the party and they are to be kept secret from the enemy. Organisations are to be built up on village to village basis and leadership of each organisation i.e. 'Village peasant committee'.

Generally in the initial stage of the mass movement problems like wage increase and cancellation of loans are taken and hence rich peasants oppose it. Therefore as our strength is less it becomes necessary to keep all our activities secret from the rich peasants or 'analogous committees' are to be elected. We are to give guidance to the masses to establish proportional majority of landless and poor peasants in these committees. (If we educate the masses as regard class analysis especially that of rural area it becomes easier to establish such proportional majority.) Each village committee has to be given a programme. On the whole that will be

- (i) to achieve local solution to the contradictions among the masses and to build up unity
- (ii) making the masses conscious and unified to make them prepared for anti-landlord, anti-shahukar movement on the area-wise basis.
- (iii) We have to bring the masses to fight against natural odds (cyclone, drought, diseases etc.). The implementation of this programme depends upon the effective work of propaganda team or that of cadre and their lively relationship with the masses. These are all secret works.

To mobilise the broad masses in the movement ( it becomes possible when we combine open with secret, legal with illegal). We have to organise open

propaganda as regard the movement, in the public meetings. We are to elect open organisation (in the sub-divisional or district level.) Besides that in order to achieve our demands or at least to give pressure we have to take open activities. To do this our open cadre, non-party cadre as well should take the leadership. In the open propaganda we must restrain ourselves while using words. While taking actions we are to use prudence. Besides that open and secret, legal and illegal, these two types of work are to be conducted in a very complimentary way. To establish the leadership of revolutionary politics in the mass movement it is necessary to build up upper level party committees like local and area committees besides the lowest party organisation that is 'cell' among the masses. To do that we have to educate the advance elements of the masses in the "political classes" who took part in movement in the past or are taking part in the present movement. A "regular syllabus" has to be fixed for the political classes and that is to be materialised with the responsible guidance.

Added to that it is necessary to provide party literature and magazines in a planned way to the above said literate persons for their self education. In the course of this party education and their participation in the movement, we are to give full party membership or provisional party membership to the tested persons and organise them in secret party cells. To develop the ideological and political level of the cell and its effectiveness in work, the higher party committee should maintain lively contact with the each cell through the propaganda team or the cadre.

"Propaganda teams" are organised taking cadres who are transferred from the urban areas and the whole timer cadres who are locally recruited. The cadre may be full party member or candidate member. While organising each team we have to consider the inter-relationship between politically veteran and beginners, practically experienced and inexperienced and local and displaced, in order to maintain the effectiveness of work and mobility. In each team there should be two to three persons.

To conduct political propaganda, to build up secret mass organisation and to develop mass movement, to give leadership in the armed preparations of the masses-these are the works of propaganda team. Besides that to organise political classes and the lowest party organisation i.e. cell is another important task.

The propaganda teams are to move in both hill and forest area and intermediate small plains in a very mobile way while discharging their responsibilities. And as an adverse after- effect of previous left deviation the enemies' preparedness is comparatively more. So it is necessary that they should be armed. But use of arms is intended for only self protection or protection of cadre. Another point has to be noted while using arms, that is the masses mainly protect us when the local cadre conduct their political work mixing with the people or when the intellectual cadre work in the plain. In that case use of big arms like gun means we ourselves are exposing to the enemy. So in that case the under-ground cadre or important cadre those who have attracted the attention of the enemy, should use arms like pistol, revolver and pipe-gun which can be carried secretly. Those teams who move in

thick forest and plains should have both small and big weapons. As is a common thing that Adivasi people carry some conventional weapons, so it is also useful that Adivasi should carry them.

In course of the development of the movement while taking mass actions like gherao, seizure of crop the resistance of the masses takes the form of mass resistance. We should not leave the development of such resistance to spontaneity. To give such resistance a pre-planned and conscious form it is necessary to organise volunteer squads temporarily when such mass actions are conducted. To do that it is necessary to organise such squads selecting brave, strong, active and conscious persons ( mainly from landless and poor peasants ). It is necessary to elect a commander for each squad and arm the squads in conventional weapons.

In course of the forward march of the movement especially when the land seizure commences there comes the attack of the goondas of enemy classes on the villages of the people, and also raid by state force. So it becomes indispensable to protect the village and the people from such attacks and raids. Then the people also realise the necessity of self-defence and come forward to counter attack voluntarily under the leadership of the party. In that situation it is necessary to organise village protection squads taking mainly landless and poor peasants for the protection of the village. Subsequently it is necessary to organise guerilla squads in zone level and to conduct sudden attacks on the enemy to protect the people. Members of the village protection squads stay in the villages, take part in the production and fight when it is necessary to protect the village. Therefore village protection squads are led by respective village peasant committees. But during the military action they are completely led by the commander or Asst. Commander. On the other hand the members of the guerilla squads are whole time fighter. Guerilla squads are organised in Zone level taking participants of the volunteer squads, some of the members of village protection squads some directly from the landless and poor peasantry and some physically able cadre. The number of members in such squads should be between 5 to 7. And each squad should have elected commanders, Asst. Commanders squads should be too mobile and should work under the guidance of higher party committee. At the beginning stage of guerilla warfare to smash the armed strength of the enemy, to attack the enemy and to conduct political propaganda are two main tasks of guerilla squads. After liberated area is formed, beginning of positional warfare while working at the rear of the enemy to fight with the enemy the political propaganda and taking part in the protection - all these three are the tasks of the guerilla squads.

b) Militarily unimportant vast rural plain

In the vast rural plain there are economic and political problems like that of land, wage, loans etc. Added to that there are problems like government levy collection and irrigation which are of partial nature. Taking all these problems it is necessary to make a programme of mass movement. In each and every village "peasant associations" and "Cooli Sangh" are to be organised. These associations or sanghs may remain open or secret considering the situation there. To give the leadership in open and legal activities it is necessary to elect the open organ in the

sub-divisional level from the open conferences. For the necessary propaganda to build movement public meetings, processions, leafleting etc. open tactics on behalf of peasant associations are to be adopted.

To establish the leadership of revolutionary politics over the movement the capable party cadre should conduct secret political propaganda, secret political classes and build up party cells. In course of development of the movement in this area too volunteer squads and village protection squads are to be organised. But as there is unfavourable topography the embryonic form of the armed struggle of the village protection squads cannot to be taken to the higher stage, because it is harmful to do so. Therefore, instead of doing that the cadre are to be transferred to broader areas to organise movement. Knowing that the greater interest of the movement can be protected, some cadre may be sent to hill and forest areas to help the forward march of armed struggle there too.

As the objective conditions here are different from that of hill and forest area, we are to take more flexible tactics. That means while pressing demands, while conducting open propaganda and while taking actions, more or less we have to adopt the tactics of "measure one foot and walk half of it."

#### **A WORD ABOUT BUILDING OF ARMY :**

In course of the development of Chinese revolution in their concrete conditions and also because of capable leadership, Chinese communist party had an army of 40,000 strength when the first koumintong- communist United Front broke. But the Indian situation to-day is different. Neither it is possible to have an united front with the ruling classes nor there is any army in the hands of the party. So in the concrete conditions here the task of building army and that of establishing base area are organically connected. For that, taking a plan of establishing base area in the hill and forest region, we are to build up revolutionary mass movement and to develop continuously the embryonic armed struggle of cadre protection to the regular guerilla war-fare in the whole region. Thus developing a conscious upsurge in the whole region we are to build up army collecting fighters from guerilla squads, village protection squads and directly from the masses. To develop such a situation in the proposed base area complementary conditions in the urban as well as vast rural plan are necessary under that circumstances the proletariat, semi-proletariat, petty bourgeoisie revolutionary intellectuals and those who lose their jobs may be recruited to army units. Same will be the case with the peasants of the vast rural plain.

#### **CONCLUSION**

Comrades,

We have checked up our both positive and negative experiences of the past on the basis of international experiences and we have analysed them in the light of dialectical materialism and keeping a line for the future. It is our strong belief that our line is basically correct. Besides that this is not only our proposed line, but we have already started our work in persuit of this line and are getting expected results. We are brave enough to sum up all our future experiences and to develop this line.



The revisionist conspiracy arrested the Indian revolution for 20 years and the left deviation of the recent past has delayed it another 10 more years. To avoid to be victim of both ideology and politics and we are to persevere in the revolutionary practice. To differentiate wrong from the right we are to grasp scientific methods.

Because of lack of clear understanding as regard line there was left deviation in the past. Consequently revolutionaries believing in Marxism-Leninism-Mao Tsetung thought are scattered in groups, sub-groups and as individuals. Many of them have deep feeling towards revolution and spirit of endless service to the people and that of supreme self sacrifice. Yet because of lack of clarity on the line and intolerance to each other and petty bourgeoisie carrieristic vices, it is not possible to unite all genuine Marxist Leninist revolutionaries in a single Marxist Leninist party.

To unite in an monolithic Marxist-Leninist party, it is necessary to achieve unity on the basis of similarity of party programme, tactical line, and organisational line. To do that all genuine Marxist-Leninist revolutionary groups and individuals should come forward to work together taking a minimum unanimous programme of mass movement in the areas and regions ( urban,rural plains and hill and forest regions). Then it will be possible to remove the differences concerning party programme, tactical line and organisational line by responsible, constructive and comradely criticisms and it will be possible to cross the first step of achieving party unity.

To achieve the unity of the party we have started our activities as mentioned above. We hope all genuine Marxist-Leninist revolutionaries will agree with us on this question and hasten the process of party organisational unity.

Long live revolution

Long live Indian revolution

Let the last hope of our martyrs be fulfilled

Marxism -Leninism -Mao Tsetung Thought Zindabad

All genuine Marxist-Leninist revolutionaries unite

Proletarian internationalism Zindabad :

**-GANANATH PATRA**

**11-4-1975**

**SOUTH ORISSA REGIONAL COMMITTEE  
COMMUNIST PARTY OF INDIA (ML)**



# AN ANALYSIS OF THE DEBRA PEASANT MOVEMENT

GUNADHAR MURMU, BHABADEB MANDAL

*[This is a brief comment written by Gunadhar Murmu, Bhabadeb Mandal, who directly participated in the Debra peasant movement (West Bengal). - E C.]*

In the year 1969, within a month of its restarting the Debra Peasant Movement, the Debra Party Committee evaluated the struggle in the area. This evaluation was criticised and rejected in the Border Regional Organising Committee. Surprisingly, many people are still avoiding to admit its mistakes of ultra- 'leftist' nature. Even afterwards the Border Regional Committee has not assessed what were the real mistakes in the evaluation, what were the plus points, what were the forms of political and ideological weaknesses. The question was presented in such a way that it seemed that the two line struggle never existed in Midnapore, that the history of the armed struggle in Midnapore is not a history of the two line struggle.

The intense political struggle in the Bengal- Bihar- Orissa Border Regional Organising Committee and later on in the party committee, the Midnapore peasant struggle, particularly the peasant movement in Debra, teaches Marxist - Leninists how the movement suffered set back because of Left deviation. We are mainly on the party organisation because the party congress(1970) instead of bringing fresh impetus to the Debra struggle was connected with the destruction of the movement and organisation. The death of comrade Sudeb Sashi Gurudas just one month after the Congress in Keshpur near Debra clearly manifested this. Our analysis will point out the weakness of the past Debra report in the light of the history of the development of the struggle. Our analysis is limited by the fact that the past reports are not all at hand. Therefore, we hope to receive criticism and suggestions.

Standing on the verge of the victory of the Chinese Revolution, Mao-Tsetung said, 'Imperialists and reactionaries will create trouble and continue counter-revolutionary attacks till their death. They will never abandon their reactionary's policies.' Along with this, he also said, "People will fight for decades, hundreds of failures would never be able to check their victorious move, this is another Marxist law. Revolution of the people of Russia have also done this." (Leave illusions, prepare for struggle).

Has not the peasant movement of Debra affirmed this statement of Mao? The Debra report has also upheld this statement, and said that the previous intense mass struggles of Debra gave rise to the armed struggle of 1969. The approach of the party to the lessons of Debra past struggles should not be one of the arrogance or carelessness but one of gratitude. It is said that the party could not adopt this approach. Chairman Mao's teaching has not been practised by the Border Regional Organising Committee.

Debra is a plains area. Land is very fertile here. Hence feudal and various exploitation and repression of the peasants is extreme. Besides this it is a stronghold of big traders. It has many rice mills. The landlords have also organised their forces here (the reactionaries have 10-12 guns in every single village.) Memories of the Zamindars' armed forces also remain in the mind of the peasants. As a result, it seemed that the Debra area was ripe for intense class struggle. In addition, there was social exploitation of thousand of tribals in that area. On three sides of Debra lie Keshpur, Daspur and Ghatal. Both areas were influenced by the Tebhaga Movement. At that time Debra also felt some of the impact of the movement. In these circumstances the peasants of Debra responded easily to the call of the Communists and enthusiastically built up villages, area and station peasant samitis. By the end of the 1950s, through organising the peasant samitis the leadership of the communists started the peasant movement in Debra. Seeing the initiatives in the organisation of the samitis, the Jamindars and Jotedars struck back against them in 1956. They started evicting share-croppers. Naturally, the peasants did not want to lose their lands. The peasant movement started with the mobilisation of the peasants in villages, organisation of demonstration and eruption of struggles in pockets.

Though in some places the jamindars and jotedars accepted their demands, the struggle was not completely victorious. But the peasants gained in the movement against eviction of share-croppers. The small jotedars were neutralised. In many respects, the rich peasantry remained neutral. Through this movement unity was established between the peasants and labourers and the share-croppers. After that came the 1956 survey settlement. Before that the peasant samitis demanded the abolition of the jamindari system without compensation. The survey aggravated the contradiction between the jotedars and the peasantry. Due to the lack of perspective, the party leadership did not pay enough attention to Debra. As a result, far from becoming self reliant the peasants of Debra found that there remained no course open to them. While the movement was in its first stage, the Indian attack on China was gradually building up. The political cadres of Debra did not make any mistake in recognising revisionism. The experiences of the peasant movement itself pointed out the revisionists. They enthusiastically built the organisation of the Communist Party of India (Marxist).

A large number of complaints started coming to the Peasant Samitis against the reactionaries. The peasants wanted to initiate the confiscation of land on a large scale. They wanted to know what measures could be taken to fight against the eviction of share-croppers and against other grievances.

The enthusiastic activity of the peasants workers and the party cadres in those days evoked the unlimited creative powers of the masses. Ignoring the black rule of the Congress Party, by 1966-67 they had organised the whole of Debra. The surging peasant movement of 1967 was the result of this activity. It is true that the establishment of the United Front Government temporarily inspired the peasants with hope. The peasants took 1967 as the ideal time to start their class struggle. This movement was in every degree as powerful and as militant as was the armed struggle of 1969. To this day peasants of Debra tell their organisers about the movement of 1967, compare 1967 with 1969 and if the same degree of mass character is lacking they become uninspired. It would not be wrong to say that the peasant movement of 1967 is a glorious chapter of the class struggle in Debra.

### **What happened in 1967?**

1. Under the leadership of the communist cadres and the Peasant Samiti re-occupation of land started on a broad scale. Large scale confiscation of benami land, khas land and land possessed by absentee zamindars, and seizure of paddy started. It is true that the Peasant Samiti could not advance the programme of confiscation of all the lands belonging to the zamindars and jotedars. That is why the mass mobilisation of the peasants could not become a permanent feature, the programme was not based on the slogan, "Land to the tillers". Still the limited programme taken up by the peasants of Debra erupted into a bloody and fierce class struggle. Debra splitting into two groups. On the one side were the jotedars, BDO, JLR and Police, and on the other side were the peasants.
2. It had been said before that Debra is a den of big profiteers and black marketeers of rice. They are a strong agency of semi-feudal exploitation. The peasant samiti issued the slogan, "stop black-marketing of rice". All the bazars of the station were crowded with demonstrations by excited armed peasantry. The big black-marketeers started taking to their heels whenever confronted with such demonstrations. They set up check-posts along the banks of the streams. The enemy started becoming more and more panicky. Eight to ten thousand peasants started mobilising in a single demonstration. The news of such demonstrations started spreading from mouth to mouth, from one part of the station to another.
3. With this, the movement for higher wages started. The bourgeois newspapers started asking, "Is Debra going to be another Naxalbari?" Debra has many agricultural labourers. They raised a demand for a fair wage. The plot of the jotedars to have their work done cheaply by bringing labour from outside became ineffectual. Top police officer were rushed to Debra as the movement there started spreading. The jotedars tried to stop the peasant movement with guns. On one side were the peasants armed with arrows and spears, and on the other side with the concerned jotedars with their guns, these open struggle strengthened the peasants.
4. Through this movement the Party and the Peasant Samiti acquired another gain-class unity. The Tribal Bengalis, the poor peasant labourers started uniting, trained cadres started emerging from amongst the middle peasants, and the rich peasants thought it better not to be open enemies. The organisers of the Samitis acquired the knowledge that the movement itself brings unity. The black-smiths, the boatmen

of Kheyapar, petty shopkeepers, all started mobilising under the banner of Peasant Samiti.

5. The authorities proclaimed Section 144 throughout the station. Arrest warrants were issued against many cadres. Still, the peasants were not demoralized. The open struggle the initiative of the women among the peasantry - all these happenings led the people towards the path of revolution.

6. The leadership had adopted a broad outlook in leading the struggle. So, the struggle expanded. An example will be sufficient. Once the peasants snatched 20 guns in a struggle. The leaders returned the guns to the jotedars. Later on many criticised the decision as a cowardly one. But why was the decision correct? The peasants of Debra had not reached the stage of creating armed squads, it was not part of their programme. In that situation even if the peasants had kept the guns, they would have been easily lost, and on the contrary since they were not ready to counter the repression all the struggles would have collapsed. If the leadership adopts the policy of firmness in struggle and a broad outlook then it will bring success to the struggle. Is it possible that this struggle was launched without any political orientation? The neo-revisionist leadership hurriedly came from the city to pacify the peasants. The communist cadres did not compromise with the revisionists on the question of struggle. "It is becoming too much" -- they rejected all these cautionary words, they realised well that the peoples' interests can not be served by compromising with revisionists.

Why then the struggle of 1967-68 did not become stable? Why did such a broad mass mobilization went astray and reach a stage of temporary disintegration? Great Stalin has said, "without a revolutionary theory and a correct line of action practice gropes in the dark". Debra could not develop without a concrete programme for the democratic revolution, intensive struggle for land reform, and correct strategy. At that time it was necessary that the struggle for higher wages should be co-ordinated with the agrarian revolutionary programmes, it was necessary to further broaden and concretize the land policy in order to avoid frustration among the peasants in the face of ruthless oppression. Peasant Samitis are the genuine authority in the village-this should have been proclaimed clearly. Initiative should have been taken to organise village guards and guerilla units to forestall attacks from the reactionaries. But was it possible to do this without a correct leadership from a Marxist-Leninist party? What was the situation at that time? Could anybody envisage such a broad and widespread worker-peasant movement in 1967 when in 1966 mass movements of West Bengal had become ineffectual? The movement of '66 was basically confined to cities and suburbs, and youth and students were the main participants in that movement. The workers and peasants came forward in 1967. The toiling masses started rising up with the lay-offs in the factories, the food crisis in the villages and temporary hope in the united front government. In many places their intense struggle overtook the leadership and the Debra struggle emerged out of this background. From that time onwards how could the peasants be able to forge ahead without a correct policy perspective and direction from a revolutionary party? After 1967 this was

the practical demand of the Debra movement and on that basis we will analyse how far the CPI(M) was able to develop Debra. After overcoming many doubts and hesitations and struggling against them the comrades of Debra voluntarily joined the All-India Co-ordination Committee and the Party.. But what political line did they receive from the leadership? They wanted to get a line from Naxalbari but instead the distortion of its lessons brought them disaster.

1. The cadres of Debra could not have learnt that the seizure of power and land policy are vitally interconnected. The lesson of Naxalbari was presented as capture of power through armed struggle. The importance of peasant problem, the close interconnection between land distribution and capture of power-- these points were undermined by this distortion. From here on the struggle in Debra practically became isolated. The root of the failure of the next struggle was inherent in this isolation. The peasant masses quickly grasped that armed struggle is the only path of liberation for the people because none of the class struggles of the past in Debra were without bloodshed and strikes. Hence the communist cadres and peasants of Debra assimilated the truth that "Political power grows out of the barrel of a gun". But the wrong line of the leadership of the coordination committee and the party and the ideological weakness of the cadres of Debra created the basis for isolation of the struggle.

2. The Border regional leadership took the responsibility of formulating the programme for the next struggle. But the leadership overlooked the main point. What about the mass movement and a mass organisation? It cannot be denied that at that time the communist cadres of Debra in various discussions upheld the necessity of mass struggle and objected to acting hastily. But as in this respect they did not have a clear political views understanding of mass struggle and mass organisation were negated in the new programme. In this way the base of Debra slipped away. We will see how the line of action of the cadres also gradually started becoming obscure.

3. What was the conception of the armed struggle that had been put before the cadres of Debra and the leaders of the border region by the party leadership in the middle of 1969? They put forward the line that individual annihilation is the only path of struggle. Clearly, the cadres of Debra hesitated to accept this line. Their hesitation started creating doubts in the Border Regional Organising Committee about their willingness to struggle. Then the party comrades of Debra pledged to wage struggle on this path if other areas of the Border Region also started working on the same path. But after this they continued on their previous course, the path of mass movements, in the season of scarcity in August and September. They started the movement of bamboo-cutting on the jotedars' lands. After a few days armed struggle in Gopiballavpur was initiated. The task of starting struggle came up before the comrades of Debra. Why did the cadres of Debra fall into this dangerous course of annihilation? The reason behind this was that they were lacking in a correct understanding of armed struggle. Due to their experience in mass struggle they were not willing to start the struggle without mobilizing the masses. But due to the lack of solid ideological understanding regarding annihilation there

was weakness in their opposition to the line. In this way the line started fading away.

4. The red guard propaganda movement of 1968-69 also brought harm to the area. Charu Mazumdar said that groups of students and youths should leave the cities and go to the villages and openly propagate politics, and they should return only after propagating politics. It was assumed that this would help build up solid peasant movements like Naxalbari. Later on this was circulated as advice to students and youth. From the city groups of young red guards came to Debra and their open activities helped the enemy. The losses were many times more than the gains.

5. At that time there used to be no discussion in the party regarding the building of base areas. But the cadres of Debra began to raise this question in discussions right from the beginning. But they did not have a clear understanding regarding where to have these bases. Initially they thought of building them in the plains. This mistake crept into their Report of Debra. Firstly, the establishment of bases is impossible without the expansion of the area. In Debra the area was not expanding, it was continuously shrinking because of the programme of annihilation. Second, it is the height of stupidity not to take into consideration geographical and natural advantages -- this the cadres of Debra did not understand. Guerilla zones and base areas are not one and the same thing. The plan to develop the armed struggle in the area were not conceived to take into account the totality and the historical background of the struggle of Debra.

6. The distortion of the lessons of Naxalbari and the 'the organisational line practised there gave rise to three trends viz. an atmosphere of conspiracy in the Border Committee, a contradiction between the intellectuals and peasants and sectarianism. The struggles of different areas should develop with a comradely relationship with one another under the leadership of a single party. But instead of this, the politics of creating antagonistic contradictions between the various areas in the Border Committee became primary. It was as if the old cadres, with their long experience were the guilty ones, and the new cadres understood everything. It was as if the old areas were rotten and having a democratic heritage was wrong. It was as if it was glorious to be a blank sheet of paper. This way the dialectical nature of the contradiction between the old and the new experiences became confused. It is natural that with such an organisational policy the Border Party Committee failed to give leadership to the struggle of Debra. The cadres of Debra started protesting in many ways against this, but owing to general ideological weakness and being part of the same process ( the annihilation campaign and other activities) they could not rid themselves of these mistakes. They had also become the victims.

#### **What is our most important work?**

We now propose to give concrete shape to our above analysis with the above analysis we wanted to make it clear that we have to march forward not spontaneously or partially but with overall and well-organised application. But we had our weakness precisely on this point. We failed to have an overall programme because we ourselves remained isolated and divided. Could an armed

force win victory in a major battle if it is divided? No. So our duty is to build up a party as the centre of all Marxist - Leninists. The revolution demands the presence of innumerable revolutionary cadres. Without this how can the revolution succeed in our country? The two-line struggle was going on in the CPI for a very long time, and with the intensification of the polemics within the international communist movement this struggle also sharpened, and on the issue of Indian aggression on China, many communists came out ignoring the revisionist leadership. But could their struggle against revisionism be consolidated as a concrete ideological victory? Everyone knows that a handful of revisionists prevented this from happening, by suppressing the ideological struggle within the party. What did we observe in 1967? Major sections of the cadres waged a struggle against revisionism and hailed Naxalbari, but again a handful of sectarian elements hurriedly put an end to the ideological struggle and destroyed the prospect of unity by proclaiming the building of a party. They pushed the struggle for unity into the quick sands of dis-unity and did not even try to consolidate broad sections of communist cadres on the correct path.

So, Indian communists should analyse ideological firmness and unity not subjectively but dialectically, if we adopt correct organisational measures will the ruling class have the power to forestall the revolution? If anyone goes through the history of the Indian Communist Movement he can easily understand what severe losses the party received in the ideological struggle against the 'right' and 'left' organisational line. In the days of Joshi, Ajay Ghosh and Dange in partnership with intellectuals turned the Party leadership into a haven of oblivion, they did not have anything to do except erect obstacles in the path of the important struggles with their learned pretensions and in handling the important issues and without considering seriously they used to suppress the ideological struggle. The party leaders used to tolerate staunch congressites. The organisational principles of the party leadership often used to be a hotchpotch collection from various groups. The same customs can still be observed in the National Council of the Revisionists.

On the other hand, what are the 'leftists' doing? Whoever used to oppose the 'left' deviations within the Telangana struggle was branded as a traitor to the party. In place of proletarian principles, fascist organisational principles were introduced. Recently, what did the co-ordination committee and the CPI(ML) under the leadership of Charu Mazumdar do? One by one many comrades were expelled who had embraced revolutionary politics rejecting the revisionists. Without going through any ideological struggle relations with them were severed. Has not history proved that their line was correct? Today the CPI(ML) itself has split up due to 'left' deviationist politics and organisational principles. Charu Mazumdar used to say, "we are not afraid of being alienated." Do the present Marxist- Leninists wish to continue worshipping the same alienation? Then why are some of them obstructing unity on the pretext of ideological struggle?

#### **How to organise**

No doubt these experiences are valuable. If we genuinely want to build a communist party which will dedicate itself to the emancipation of our toiling masses,



what barriers remain in the way of rooting out these mistakes completely? What will a doctor do if he sees a gangrenous wound? Does he treat it superficially or does he drain out all the pus and eradicate the infection? So the conscious representatives of the proletariat should think about this and should establish a strong party on the basis of ideological struggle. Two things should be mentioned in this respect. This ideological struggle is being carried on with the intention of establishing unity among the revolutionaries. Second, it is initiated from a definite basis of unity. This means that we are for active ideological struggle and in order to reach a definite goal we are for guiding the ideological struggle within a definite frame work. On this we are clearly against 'ultra-democracy' and anarchy. This means that:

a) To guarantee unity there should be a clear line of demarcation between unity and dissent.

b) we have to start from minimum unity amongst the various revolutionary organisations. This unity is nothing but the preparation for building of a united party. On this basis minimum and broad unity can be achieved.

All the Marxist- Leninist organisations unite on equal footing on the basis of acceptance of Marxism-Leninism-Mao Tsetung thought with the aim of establishing the People's Democracy and Socialism and of People's War as the path. There is no need to think that the process of party-building will be an easy one. Firstly, there will be struggle against two trends, i.e., for centralism and against centralism. Second, it is time consuming and complicated to unite the major sections of the revolutionaries on strict principles, that is why we should start from minimum and broad unity.

On this broad basis, the revolutionary organisations should sit together with the aim of building a central organising committee. This unity and the unity in the Party Congress is not one and the same thing. That means that the Party Congress should be genuinely a Congress of unity and a new force standing forth. As the unity in the Party Congress is much more solid than the unity among these various groups, the Central Organising Committee should direct its entire activities towards these goals:

1. To prepare a Draft Self-Critical Report, Draft Programme, Draft Constitution and Draft Organisational Report along with the analysis of the Communist Party of India.
2. To form Organisational Party Units from state to local level.
3. To organise preparatory conferences from the highest to the lowest levels for the election of representatives to the congress to take concrete resolutions about the agenda and the participants to circulate the draft for discussion through the Organising Committee and accordingly to organise the conference.
4. On this basis to convene the Congress, which will be the highest body of the party, which will be responsible for resolving any difference that remains in the Central Organising Committee.

Let us consider the different oppositions regarding this point.

### **What are the points of opposition?**

a) A broad understanding is favourable for unity, but some comrades have raised questions such as, should we dissolve the existing organisations? Do these comrades think that it will be better for the organisations to remain independent even after the formation of the Central Organising Committee or that everyone will dissolve their organisations without having any organised centralized guidance.

This can be understood easily. Instead of the independent existence of various groups, the formation of a Central Organising Committee will be a process for Party building. The independent organisations are there till the formation of a Central Organising Committee. After the formation of the Central Organising Committee, it will organise the State Organising Committees. In this way, the independent existence of the groups will wither away but the revolutionaries will not be in a position where there will be any lack of organisation.

b) Some are for inviting these groups to the Congress. According to them one of the groups of CPI(ML) should convene the Congress and other groups should join. But then there will arise the question of how a Congress can be convened without the preparatory Conference. Would any Marxist-Leninist organisation join such a conference? How would the documents be prepared? How would the representation for the Congress be finalised? Instead of being a Congress it will turn into an ideological battle field and the documents will be partisan.

c) Some had spoken about the monolithic character of the politics and organisation of the Party. They have said that without being unanimous on the basic political questions, without resolving those real problems, which we have faced in the last eight years regarding our revolution, how can the Central Organizing Committee be formed.

It had been explained before that we should not confuse between minimum unity and (Party) higher unity. Any Marxist-Leninist Party develops after resolving some of the problems on principles, and resolves the rest through democratic centralism. Central Organising Committee will place those drafts, and everyone will accept the resolution of the Congress as final. If anyone rejects this formulation will it not be termed as the idea of having a 'purified' party? In this regard, it should be clarified that the COC will be formed on the principle of democratic centralism and it will firmly establish this principle in the COC and Party.

Some have said that this formulation is against the principle of building the party from above. Let us analyse this understanding. What is meant by building the party from above? It means to build the party through the congress from the highest to the lowest level. Before organising the Congress there exist various groups but afterwards the Congress is the highest body of the Party. One of the groups will exercise political and organisational initiative and leadership. In his article, 'One Step Forward, Two Steps Back', Lenin has briefly said that whichever organisation has maximum political and organisational influence in the local conference and in the organisational body will have more importance in building the party. Apart from this,

has anyone demanded a declaration of the importance of any one group through a proclamation? This demand is illogical and shows a lack of self-confidence.

d) Let us analyse the last possible argument. It has been said that in this organisational set-up there is the point of equal status which is confusing. In this point there is no proper recognition of the struggle between two lines.

Those who have raised these questions ever thought that to give proper recognition to the struggle between the two lines we will have to accept the above point? The two line struggle was there in the CPI(M). It was renewed just after Naxalbari. Throughout this period the revolutionaries were struggling against various wrong lines. Is not the consequence of the political struggles, when left deviation was dominating the revolutionary movement, became clear today? All the two line struggles, which came after Naxalbari, are significant. Often it was seen that at the time of its emergence the theoretical basis of the correct line is weak and is without a firm footing. As time passes it becomes strong, solid and penetrating. There should not be any surprise that the demand for equal status is emerging. Because in the two-line struggle it will be wrong to emphasise political weakness and undermine the important aspects of the correct line.

What did these comrades understand by equal status? By equal status they understand equality to establish their authority. Frankly speaking this understanding is wrong. Central Organising Committee is the highest body. The question does not arise about equal status for all the groups and equal sharing for all to the lowest levels. They cannot think of the Party as anything but a collection of groups. Between the two alternatives, i.e., condemning everybody as incorrect and giving everybody an equal status, as the basis of the initial conference, we are for the latter.

Then will it have to be understood that by equal status they mean accepting principles unanimously? This is also impossible. In practice in any revolutionary party it is better to adopt all the principles unanimously, and if it is not possible then decision of the majority is accepted. They are not viewing the point of equality dialectically. We hope that these comrades will view it as the coordination of unity and progress and not explain it individually.

Comrades, in conclusion we want to say that if we do not take the correct lessons from our past mistakes, do not have an uncompromising attitude in our overall self-criticism and a desire for unity, it will be impossible in this situation to build up a United Party. Streams of heroes' blood/Stream of mothers' tears/ will they ever again/ vanish into the dust?

**DEBRA COMMITTEE**



## **COMMUNIST REVOLUTIONARY MOVEMENT IN KERALA DURING 1968 - 1971**

**- JOSE ABRAHAM**

The Naxalbari rebellion is not an unexpected advent in a single morning. It did not ascend like a red star in the eastern horizon of India. It was a continuation of several ideological struggles that took place in the Communist Party of India. But it came out in the form of a practical revolt against the established systems. It had two sides a -revolutionary line and a mass line. It should be described as a revolt by Indian peasants, organised in a correct path, after the Great Telangana Rebellion - which covered the span of 1946 -51. It is not a comparison. We must not, however, forget the life of Naxalbari and its limit. Both the rebellions brought in the limelight the union of revolutionary - mass lines alongwith the slogan of political power.

The Naxalbari revolt took place in the midst of growing ideological confrontations in the party. An all India convention of rebels in CPI(M), who supported the Naxalbari politically, took place in Calcutta.

The Naxalbari revolt inspired the Communist Revolutionaries all over India. As a result, an All India Co-ordination and State Co-ordination Committees came into being. The All India Co-ordination was named as the "All India Co-ordination Committee of Communist Revolutionaries (AICCCR) in CPI(M)."

There was a dispute over its name in Kerala. One section under the leadership of Kunnikal Narayanan and Philip M Prasad demanded that the name should be 'The Co-ordination Committee of Revolutionaries in CPI Kerala'. The other section insisted that the name should be according to All India Committee. The first session was in Trivandrum. It ended without taking a solid decision. Then the Committee was formed in the second session at Ernakulam. The decision was to follow the name according to All India Committee.

The dispute over the name is mentioned here to show that there were differences among the Communist Revolutionaries in Kerala at the time of formation.

There were ideological confrontations between the revolutionaries of AICCCR and Kerala Co-ordination focussing on one section supporting the slogan, "kill the zamindars, kill the capitalists" and another section rejecting this slogan.

For example: The police took Com. Vargheese into custody, hand cuffed and took him to the forest of Thirunelli, tortured cruelly and finally shot him dead. When Com K.P.R.Gopalan raised this issue of inhuman murder in the Kerala

Assembly, the then Home Minister answered showing a report printed in *Liberation* - Malayalam weekly by the "Annihilation" group. The headline read: "Accepted martyrdom confronting police."

Many ideological differences manifested not only on the question of individual killings but also on the fundamental policies in politics.

Many ideologies and slogans influenced the revolutionaries like - 'need no party'; 'need only revolutionary groups'; 'no mass organisation and no trade unions'; 'boycott elections permanently'; 'boycott of elections is a symbol of revolutionaries', etc.,

'Party is a must'; 'need trade unions and mass organisations'; 'permanent boycott of elections is a deviation towards left'; 'election boycott is not a symbol of revolutionaries'. If it is so, the 'Panthicosts' and 'Yahovas' also can be included in the label of revolutionaries because they are also boycotting elections.

We all know how the '*Calcutta Thesis*' (1948) did harm the Telangana Movement. Similarly, the harmful line of Charu Mazumdar, which practiced the murder of landlords and capitalists and the action centered against individuals virtually crippled and endangered the Naxalbari Movement. As a result, the proud and popular movement of Naxalbari was dubbed as anti-social, murderous and crime-oriented. In such circumstances the Communist Revolutionaries could not move forward with the former plans.

A section argued that the revolutionary activities should be carried out by small, isolated and individual groups in secret. But the other section formed the trade unions and other organisations, formed various popular organisations, organised and led the workers strikes. Such activities were evident in Kerala Co-ordination.

The group opposed to the line of annihilation organised thousands of CLR and TLR workers in the Kerala Electricity Board. They conducted several strikes against dismissals and for permanency in employment. As a result they gained all the facilities similar to other workers in the Board. Keeping this victory as a model, similar strikes were started in agricultural farms and other government institutions for permanency and stability in employment.

In the Idukki Project of Kerala State Electricity Board, the Communist Revolutionaries formed a union called "Idukki Project Construction Workers Union." Infact, no union work was allowed in this field till then. No facilities were given to the workers. The bureaucracy and contractors were free to dismiss any employee at their will. They virtually tried to suppress the functions of the union ruthlessly. The main contractors were big capitalists like Vin Chadha group. They had big influence among the ruling and opposition parties and the bureaucracy. The MNC Lavin had invested in the project. So the Idukki Project had the influence of international capitalism. Therefore, the struggle of Idukki Project Workers was simultaneously directed against the contractors, bureaucracy, the state and central governments, international capitalism and imperialism.

Many strikes were conducted for rights. At the culmination the police fired. Two workers - Bhaskaran and Padmanabhan - were shot dead by the police. They became martyrs for ever. Other 22 workers were mortally wounded by the police bullets. It was pioneer case in the history of criminal cases in India against a large number of workers.

The Chinese Communist Party strongly denounced the police firing. But the 'Annihilation' ideologists, who always denied the trade unions and its strikes, only insulted the workers.

A letter written by Kunnikal Narayanan to the Chinese Embassy became more dangerous. He had communicated a made up information to the Embassy that tens of thousands of armed workers were ready to liberate Idukki. This letter was later brought to the court by the police as a solid evidence in the firing case to justify police action.

The workers unions were very active at the time, in various fields, like construction, plantation, felling trees, loading and unloading, motor and beedi workers. But where ever there were popular uprisings and strikes and where ever the people were active with their popular agitations, the 'Annihilation' ideologists accused the Communist Revolutionaries who were leading them as neo revisionists and propagated against them.

There were peoples uprisings, marches and rallies of workers in Perambavoor, Trichur, Thodupuzha and Kannur. But the 'Annihilation' ideologists despised all of them. They argued that those agitations only exposed the revolutionary workers before the police force. They had shown their protest against the workers uprisings by dismantling and ceasing the activities of thousands of workers in the agricultural workers union in Wayanad and the Socialist Youth Federation in Kannur district.

There were strong pressures on the prominent union leaders like Jose Abraham and Vazhoor Viswam to resort to an 'action' making use of the tens of thousands of workers in the Idukki Project. There arose an important question. The idea put forth was: To liberate the Idukki region for 24 hours. It gave rise to the question: How it would be further protected? "Let anything happen after 24 hours" - was the reply. One thing was clear from this reply. Those who proposed the action needed only a fake reputation in resorting to any 'action'. They had no plan whatsoever for future as real revolutionaries.

There were two strong sections in the Kerala Co-ordination Committee. One section was in favour of 'Annihilation' line. It included leaders like Kunnikal Narayanan, Philip M Prasad, Konthalot Karunan and K P Narayanan. Other section which opposed 'Annihilation' line included leaders like KPR Gopalan, Arayakkandy Achutan, Jose Abraham, Vazhoor Viswam, M.T.Thomas, P K Gopalakrishnan and Subash Chandra Bose. There were serious differences between the two groups in the state co-ordination.

The group opposed to annihilation line organised a state convention at Thodupuzha. On the eve of this convention, the Annihilation group resorted to an 'Action' - the attack on Thalassery police station. Then the attack on the camp at

Pulpally. There a doubt arose whether their ultimate aim was to create an atmosphere which would disturb the Thodupuzha Convention. The police took into custody Com. Arayakkandy Achuthan who had no connection whatsoever with the Thalassery police station attack. But the strength of trade union at Thodupuzha and the undeniable support of the people helped to conduct the convention of Communist Revolutionaries at Thodupuzha.

The reason for the disintegration among the Communist Revolutionaries lies mainly in the 'Narodnik' line sought to be perpetuated by Charu Mazumdar and his followers after the Naxalbari struggle and the indulgence in barbaric assassination against individuals. Other reason was the personal grudges of the leaders.

The pioneers who took steps for the total destruction of Co-ordination in Kerala, it can be said, were the faction who stood for the 'Annihilation' and 'Action' line. They were led by the primary thought that any form of organisation is revisionism.

The Communist Revolutionaries who adopted mass line functioned in Kerala and tried to organise trade unions, mass organisations and a Communist Party. They organised Proletarian Communist Workers Party - Communist Unity Centre.

They published magazines such as:

1. EDATHUPAKSHAM ( Leftism ) -Editor :**Jose Abraham**-1968 -  
THODUPUZZHA
2. JANOKODI ( People ) Editor : **KPR Gopalan** - 1969- TRIVANDRUM
3. VIPLAVA BHARATAM ( Revolutionary India ) Editor: - **Vazhoor**  
**Viswam** -1970 - KOTTAYAM
4. RAN (War) - Editor : **T K Janardhanan** - 1971 - THALASSERY

---

*JOSE ABRAHAM : A Leading comrade in the Communist Revolutionary Movement and a prominent leader of working class movement in Kerala. He played an important role in organising the struggles in Idukki region.*



# A REPORT OF KONDAMODALU TRIBAL PEASANT MOVEMENT

## Foreword <sup>1</sup>

Comrades,

The Report<sup>2</sup> we are sending here on the Agency Movement of East Godavari district (AP) is only the Report of Kondamodalu Area. The movement in Kondamodalu area reached the level of land seizure. Here, defying the landlords and Govt. machinery the people rose in waves and seized the lands. The experiences gained and the people's role in this movement provided us most valuable lessons. We are sending this Report in view of the significance of these experiences in advancing the New Democratic Revolution with Agrarian Revolution as its axis.

But, in its document, "Reject the Document, 'Left Deviation inside the Party,' sent by the Jail Leaders" the Rival Committee<sup>3</sup> outside made some wrong formulations. It is not possible here to reply all the questions raised in it. As mentioned in the Report, there were some hurdles as well as weaknesses in the Agency movement as a whole. But the Rival Committee is evading the main lessons to be taken from the advance of movement in Kondamodalu area. They agreed in their document itself that "*it is true, the people in East Godavari district had come into more militant struggles than in this area.*" Does it mean to say that it is a special feature of people in Kondamodalu area than those in other areas? If it is not so, should we not think about the difference in approach and methods adopted in this area to move people into "*more militant struggles*"? One cannot draw correct lessons if one attempts to write a review of entire movement to answer the questions raised by one Committee Member who refused to self critically realise his weaknesses in implementing the decision of Agency Committee and think to concretely apply the same and twist it to suit the formulations already made.

For instance, here are two examples from their review:

*"In some areas, we faced the problem of cadre maintainance because from thebegining we did not develop the habit of shouldering this responsibility financially among the people."*

This was not the attitude adopted by our comrades in Kondamodalu area. Any one with an experience of people's movement can easily understand that it would not have been possible to build up the kind of movement in that area had we carried on work there with this understanding.

*"Committee Members did not change their old methods which they adopted in the past. They did not adopt secret organisational methods and take*



*precautions needed for the same. They lacked a correct political understanding about the movement. All this has caused harm to the advance of movement."*

This too does not apply to Kondamodalu area. We started our work in Kondamodalu area in Jan 1969. It was in March 1969, the local police camp was set up in Kondamodalu. Reserve police camp came in April. Our movement was within half a mile to 4 miles distance to these camps. Kondamodalu was included in this. Here, the shifting cultivation, loan evasion, farm servants' strike and land occupation had taken place. Tilling of lands has begun in June 1969. The people seized back crops grabbed by the landlords earlier. Lands which were not yet tilled were tilled and sown. The people moved into action in a big way. The movement has reached higher level. It suffered a setback with the arrest of the comrade who was performing local responsibilities and there was no one to take the responsibility. How could the movement here reach such a level in the thick of police repression if the comrades here have not changed their old methods and have not taken necessary precautions and if they had no political understanding about the movement? However, taking the entire Agency area into view, it is true that the centres like Kondamodalu would have come up in rest of other areas too had those weaknesses not manifested there. Entire situation would have been different had it been the case. We must take note of the speciality of proper methods which led to the advance of movement in Kondamodalu area together with being able to clearly see the weaknesses which affected the development of movement in rest of the Agency area.

Likewise, when it comes to the building of guerrilla squad, here the village squads were formed. Efforts were made to form the Central squad. The hurdles encountered in this course were mentioned in the Report. It is true, the presence of a trained squad would have been helpful to the movement. But the rival committee presented this question from its own subjective angle of asserting its own formulation, i.e., *"the people get prepare for land distribution only when they gain confidence in the fighting strength of our squads which can resist Govt's armed forces."*

Here is one more formulation made by them: *"Had there been armed guerrilla squad ready and provided the leadership to the people by remaining themselves with the people when the landlords and police had come upon the people, the people would have stood up and courageously resisted. The movement would have gone to higher level. Because of the main weakness of guerrilla squad not being ready the doubts among the people whether we can win or not and vacillations among some have cropped up."*

As far as people's resistance is concerned, right in April 1969 itself, i.e., when Poulas was arrested, the people rushed to the camp with arms where Poulas was kept. When the armed police came to stop people who have begun tilling the land, hundreds of people stood in defence of those tilling the lands. The armed people encircled the Sub Inspector when he caught hold of our comrade's hand

who was tilling the land. Police had to go back. When the roustabouts spread in the villages that the police would come at the time of transplantation, the people asked for bombs to use the same for self defence and took the same from our cadre. In Oct, 1969, the girijans stood organised to put up resistance against the landlords when they sought to destroy the crops raised by the girijans. When the landlords retreated to the background and the police came to the fore, the entire people disappeared into the bushes immediately responding to the suggestion to retreat into hidings. Panicked police had to beg the people at this turn of situation. When police proposed to talk, only 4,5 elders came out and talked to them. Then the police left from the scene. But, at this time only some expressed the doubt whether we can win the battle since the police are armed with better weapons than us. It does not seem surprising for those with a realistic understanding about people to hear some expressing the view like this in the conditions where the villages as a whole moved into action together with the village elders. If this is characterised as the general feature of the people, then how all other acts are to be defined? Similarly, when the development is seen this way even after people moving into action on land question, how the formulation, "*people get prepared only when they gain confidence in the fighting strength of our armed squads*", is correct?

Therefore, the developments as well as experiences of Kondamodalu movement are to be seen as a reality before us to understand the forces of agrarian revolution inherent in rural areas. In the same way, these experiences prove that we can build up the agrarian revolution and a real mass revolutionary movement necessary for an armed struggle if we carry on work in accordance with the understanding provided in the circular, "*Lay Foundations For a Struggle - oriented Mass Movement*" and the "*Immediate Programme.*"

With Revolutionary Greetings,  
Dec, 1970  
**ANDHRA PRADESH REVOLUTIONARY  
COMMUNIST COMMITTEE**

*1. This Foreword was drafted by Com. V. Ramalinga Chary on behalf of the State Committee, APRCC. It discussed and rejected some wrong lessons drawn by Com. C. Pulla Reddy in a document basing on a report of East Godavari district sent to the outside State Committee in Nov. 1969.*

*2. In Sept 1968, the APCCCR has taken certain decisions in the light of the orientation of protracted armed struggle and the understanding of establishing the liberated areas. As part of this, it took some steps to build up the people's revolutionary movement in the vast areas of Eastern Ghats which are a part of Dandakaranya-spread over the vast areas of Visakha, East and West Godavari, Karimnagar, Warangal, Khammam districts, the then Bastar and Gadchiroli areas which are also known as the Godavari Vally. With this revolutionary orientation, the APCCCR has directed some state and district leaders and cadre who could carry on work with enough responsibility to work in various pockets of this area. It allotted Khammam area to Com. Pulla Reddy, Warangal area to*

*Com. Ramanarsaiah, Visakha and East Godavari districts to Com.V.Ramalinga Chari, Nallamala forest areas to some other comrades. As part of this, it allotted the Vishakha and East Godavari districts to Com.V.Ramalinga Chari, Com.Mogoluri Soma Chari, Com. Simhadri Subba Reddy and Com. Kambam Padmakara Shanti Raju. Some cadre of Student Movement from Kakinada and some others (Com. Ankamma Choudhury, Com. Sivaramakrishna, Com. Sundaraiah, Com. Bose and others were important among them) became a part in the efforts to build up the movement in the East Godavari Agency.*

*The efforts to build up the girijan movement in the East Godavari district had commenced after the elections in 1967. The building of East Godavari Girijana Sangham has begun at a time when the class struggle in the girijan movement of Parvathipuram Agency area of Srikakulam district was advancing in the thick of serious class battles. The activities of Sangham had taken a militant form in the forest areas of Y.Ramavaram and Maredumilli. These were the areas where the comrades had taken up the programmes against the atrocities of forest officials, the plunder and domination of Muthadars. The activities in Kondamodalu area were started in Jan' 1969 only after the State Committee has taken the steps with a comprehensive view and as part of building the revolutionary movement. By this time, the District Committee has concretely decided then Com. Simhadri Subba Reddy who was sent to this district as the Organiser for this pocket of Kondamodalu. The report we are publishing here was written by him when he was in Secunderabad Jail in Nov-Dec 1970. This report was circulated at the time together with the present Foreword by the APRCC.*

*3. After the arrest of majority of the state leadership in Dec 69 the comrades outside formed a state committee. In the course of time it came out with its own politics and worked as a 'Rival Committee'.*

## A REPORT OF KONDAMODALU TRIBAL PEASANT MOVEMENT

We have gone to this area in Jan' '1969. It was the time for the preparation of shifting cultivation<sup>1</sup>. Harassment by the forest officials, the exploitation by the landlords and money lenders were the main problems in the area. We brought out a leaflet generally dealing with all these problems and have taken up the programme of entering into so called reserve forest and cutting for shifting cultivation, in the main. An extensive propaganda was carried on this programme. We have introduced the method of each village collectively preparing the soil for shifting cultivation. The people have moved into action accordingly. Girijans<sup>2</sup>, who were hitherto getting frightened even at the sight of forest officials and praying them offering hens or money not to foist cases against them, have shown the courage with the consciousness gained from the Girijana Sangham and warned the forest officials, '*be careful -this is not your father's property*'. The forest officials found no other way but to flee away.

Karanam and Munsab<sup>3</sup> together were collecting the revenue tax from the girijans for bringing the lands under the shifting cultivation. On one side, the forest officials were harassing the girijans calling the shifting cultivation as illegal. On the other side, the revenue officials were harassing the people by demanding the payment of tax as per law. Both these departments under the same exploiting law sought to plunder the people. This time too, as usual, the karanam began asking the people to pay the tax. He saw to it that the notices are issued to this effect by the Tahsildar. But the people did not comply to this. At last, Tahsildar himself had come to the area and asked the peasants to see him. The people explained the entire situation to him. They explained the problem of land too. It is not that he does not know what the peasants have explained to him. The revenue officials joined hands with karanam and munsab only with a corrupt mind to fatten their own pockets by deceiving the innocent people. They found themselves helpless and with no answer when the peasants countered them with fitting replies. They disappeared from the scene with such pacifying words like, '*submit the petitions to the collector about your lands*'. Besides this, some middle peasants, the president and some members of Panchayat Board took upon themselves a programme. They declared '*we the elders together with some others would sign a petition, submit the same to the collector and talk with him about the lands*' and

---

1. Shifting cultivation : It is also called as 'podu' or zoom cultivation. It is a cultivation carried by the tribals on the hill slopes. Tribals would cut and burn the forest and sow the seeds at the commencement of rainy season.

2. Girijans: In A.P. the Tribals or Adivasis are popularly known as Girijans.

3. Karanam & Munsab: Village officers of revenue department.

asked the peasants to collect the money needed for the expenses. Here the officials, encouraged by the liberal landlords, thus sought to divert the unity of Sangham towards toutery by making use of this programme. Some peasants expressed in favour of this programme. We too did not oppose this programme. In this context, we were conscious of the warning contained in the document, "*Lay Foundations for a Struggle-oriented Mass Movement*" which said that submitting the memorandums and petitions to the authorities and going around the offices had become main in communist party's activity in place of people's movement. At the same time, in the concrete conditions obtaining at the time there, mobilisation of signatures on the memorandum has become necessary to make the people conscious of the need of organisation. We practiced it only as an exception. A petition was prepared with details about how much land under which landlord's occupation was there and also how horrible was the condition of farm servants<sup>4</sup> and coolies. We gave the programme that the signatures of all the peasants in every village must be obtained on the petition. We advised the peasants that there is no need for 10-15 people to go to Kakinada (District Head quarters) and waste two or three hundred rupees for the purpose and, instead, the petition can be sent by post and answer to this too can be had by spending just four rupees. With this, those who, in fact, brought this programme on to the agenda have silently disappeared from the scene. The ordinary youth have taken upon themselves the task of collecting the signatures from the people. Later the people scolded those who proposed the programme but disappeared. The people began to shed whatever the little blind faith they used to have in such people. They came to realise that such methods will not solve their problems as they were aware that several petitions were submitted earlier in the name of District Girijana Sangham and they were deceived in the same way. Together with these problems, the injustices caused by the paper mill managers to the coolies while calculating the wage for the bamboo cutting also have come to our notice. These injustices included taking 35 bamboos more for a load of each bullock cart on the plea of not being upto the standard. We have solved all these problems by remaining with the people. In this context, the girijan coolies warned the head-strong mill supervisors and clerks to '*be careful and behave properly, lest, they would be pushed into river Godavari*'. From that day onwards, the deductions, small or thin bamboo controversies have come to an end.

## PROBLEM OF MONEY LENDERS

We held meetings in every village. We collected the details regarding indebtedness; how and how much land was lost as a consequence by the girijans. In consultation with the people, we have decided what type of loans should not be paid and if at all any loan deserves to be paid back, how much amount can be paid. When a decision that a particular loan need not be paid back was conveyed to the people, they posed questions like '*whether it was justified not to pay back the loans taken by them? Then who will come to the fore to again give the loans?*'

4. farm servants : Agricultural workers appointed on yearly basis are called farm servants or 'palerlu'

We have explained the whole story of lending loans in detail and made it clear how the injustice was meted to them in the entire course of lending and prepayment of the loans. We tried to impress upon them that it is better to save some grain for food instead of putting themselves in a position of standing with a begging bowl at the door of money lender by allowing him to take the entire grain in the name of Nagu<sup>5</sup>. By that time, the tamarind crop has already come. Money lenders flocked to the area to collect the loan amounts. Some girijans told them that they would pay nothing to them.

Some girijans told that they would clear the debts either after the harvest of jowar crop or next year. With this, even those who never told us about their debts came to us and gave the details. The people requested us to be present to give a proper reply when the money lenders come for collection. We told the people that it is not possible for us to do so. At the same time, we asked them to explain the accounts to the money lenders. Or, if need be, we would give them the accounts in a written form so that the same can be used to explain to money lenders. Then, we selected some active youth in different villages, equipped them with the details and method of accounting and asked them to get themselves prepared and united to chase away the money lenders if they resort to the coercive methods to collect the loans. We entrusted the responsibility of dealing with and resolving the problem of indebtedness to two or three youth in every village. We also told the people that every one must join the Girijan Sangham, form the committees so that the problem such as this can be looked after by those responsible to these committees. We have decided a measure of tamarind or jowar as the membership fee. Those who were entrusted with the main responsibility have performed the task well. They have decided that no one should clear off the debts without informing them.

### **PROBLEM OF FARM SERVANTS**

As on March(1969), while carrying on concrete work on the problem of debts, we have also carried on propaganda on the problems. Through this we have taken these problems into wider propaganda. The farm servants were getting ready to solve their problems by the beginning of New Telugu Year(April). The landlords were frightened by this growing consciousness among the people. In this context, as part of our political propaganda, we explained to the people about our movement in Srikakulam, Warangal and Khammam districts and liberation movements in the world. In every village, the children, women and youth began singing our songs. It has become a feature to listen to their songs in every meeting. Every where, be it on the toddy trees or in the work of shifting cultivation, the songs were heard. In this whole atmosphere, the landlords conspired to nip our movement in the bud. They sent memorandums and telegrams to authorities alleging that the '*people are coming enmasse with bows and arrows aimed at us to kill all the landlords of Kondamodalu, loot and set on fire all our properties*'. With this, by March 15, 1969, a local police camp was set up in Kondamodalu.

---

5. NAGU: Method of giving loans in food grains with agreement to pay back certain quantity of grain, default of which doubles or triples the amount.

This has taken away what ever the freedom we had till the date. We had to work by remaining in total secrecy.

In continuation of their attempts to spread the false reports, the landlords also carried on a campaign of terror among the girijans. They said '*You would die. Police will shoot you down; your huts would be burnt down?*' Police too joined in this kind of propaganda. They also carried on a new type of propaganda like, '*the communists would be asking you to do this and that hiding themselves in some unknown places. It is you people who die. Do not revolt like this. Write to the authorities; they would solve your problems.*' Some people fell prey to this. The implied message of this propaganda was nothing but warn the girijans that their properties would be looted if again a rebellion erupts in the area. In reply to this, we explained to the girijans what is meant by 'rebellion'. Why the people had to rise in revolt in the past. We explained that this revolt is not of the kind of Perantapalli Sadhu rebellion<sup>6</sup>. It is a people's war carried on by the entire people against the Govt. Ours is a peoples war to establish the people's raj. Some others began to tell the people that it is only a clash of communists for power, but not a struggle for land and life for the people. We have clarified all these questions and convinced the people. We explained about the revolutions in Russia and China and the changes they brought in the conditions of people there. We explained to them about the Telangana Peasant struggle and the sacrifices made in the course of this struggle, victories won and the methods of struggle. Some people who had migrated from Khammam district and settled down in this area have confirmed that what we explained to the people had really happened in Telangana. However, we cannot say that people understood fully what we explained. But their confidence has grown in us. The police, who were going around the hamlets in search of us propagated against the UG life being led by us. They raised questions like, '*what good these communists can do to you who are fleeing themselves away?*' At a time when the people were just getting themselves organised, the anti-people's forces made every attempts to push the people into a state of confusion by distorting and countering our political and organisational steps. Indeed, we had to struggle hard to cross this stage. We could realise the key role of this kind of efforts in making the people own our politics only in the course of tasting the fruits of our efforts. It also helped us to go over to the activities in the conditions of total secrecy from the semi-open conditions. We explained to the people by going to them in the night why we had to remain in UG, why it was needed and what the people had to do in such a situation etc., The people's affection and respect had grown towards us. They have taken collective responsibility and care towards arranging food for our comrades.

We already wrote the details about the problem of debts and peoples alienation from lands in the villages. Yet, for the sake of classification, we wrote the accounts of entire population. It helped us to directly and fully know about the individuals

---

<sup>6</sup>Sadhu rebellion: In 1940s, a saint called 'Perantapalli Sadhu' organised decoits the Nizam province adjacent to Kondamodalu area.

and their economic conditions in the villages. At the time of enrolling the membership to the Girijana Sangham, they were keeping away the women and youth from it. In some villages, the youth were supposed to remain in the shade of elders. The meetings were being called only by the village elders. Later, i.e., in the context of membership drive, we had to encourage the women and youth to join the Sangham by explaining their role. We were educating them when they were accompanying us in the course of travel from one place to another. We were encouraging them to get educated. We also directly imparted education to some of them. Gradually, the role of youth has grown in our activities. They were carrying out the programmes with initiative. The farm servant youth stopped on their own to work under the landlords. Then a farm servant was getting Rs 200/- as salary. Wage was being cut if he fails to go for work even for the reason of ill-health. We have carried on an extensive propaganda that a farm servant must be paid a salary of Rs 400/- together with three meals every day and a pair of new cloths per year if he is to join the job again for the new year.

We also demanded that the debt amount which was being increased every year be cancelled and the salary must be paid promptly each time. Some farm servants who were working like slaves for years together only because they could not clear off the debts have stopped working as farm servants. In earlier days, farm servants, who chose to run away were being searched and caught hold of. They were being beaten and forced to work again as farm servants. All such people now have breathed a sigh of relief and a total emancipation. Now they have gained the courage to declare that any one who dares to repeat the old practice will be beaten to death. All the farm servants went on strike under the leadership of Sangham. Landlords had to carry water from Godavari. Even their watch-dogs-the police were compelled to carry water they needed from Godavari. During this period we brought out a leaflet raising the problems like, the need to occupy the lands; wage rise; rise in the rate of rents for ploughing with bullocks and yoke; bamboo rates and wages of farm servants etc. This was distributed widely among the people.

### **VOLUNTEER SQUADS**

Youth were organised into squads in some villages. Arrangements were made to train them in drill. We began to tell that the entire youth must organise themselves into squads and be prepared to put up the resistance against the landlords and police when need arises. But this task of organising youth into squads was not completed in all the villages. It has not taken a concrete shape in the villages where the work has begun. Yet, when our activist Com. Poulas was arrested (April 20) the youth of all villages have rushed with bows, arrows and daggers to get him released. They demanded the SI for the release of this Comrade. They have come back believing in SI's deceptive promise to release him the next day. Again in the next morning, more people-300 youth-started to go to the SI. But they came to know that our comrade was taken to Devipatnam in the previous night itself. The girijans were very furious at the SI for his act of deception. With this act, their hatred towards landlords too has grown. This



incident has become a turning point in the movement of this area. The people's affection towards the cadre of Sangham has become clear from the anxiety shown by them through this act to protect him. Towards the end of May 1969, we have convened the meeting of squads of all the villages, trained them in the parade with Red Flag, etc. and also in the method of using the hand bombs. Com T.N. has sent a person for this purpose from Anantapur who was an expert in this job.

We have organised Sangham in the villages. We organised the people through the method of electing the Committee and the leader of Sangham. We put this method into practice where the women elected their committee and its leader. We organised the youth into youth volunteer squads instead of forming youth organisations. When it come to arming the people, we carried out this task as part of the effort to impart preliminary military training to the youth volunteer squads. We could train the people to use the traditional weapons and fire arms in a small way.

### PROGRAMME ON LAND QUESTION

After April 20, 1969, the local police was replaced by the reserved police. The authorities tried every attempt to remove the deep affection among the people for girijans, the girijans' affection towards our cadre and to isolate us from people by diverting the programme. Collector himself has visited all the villages in the area. He enquired about the problems of girijans. He told, *'True, all these problems need resolution; These are worth asking, but this is not the method to solve them.'* *'Don't listen to these Naxalites. They are well educated and well fed people. You have seen that Poulas. See how fatty he is. Are they as thin as you are?'* *'You submit the petitions. I will see that your lands are given back to you.'* In reply, the girijans told that *'we have already submitted several petitions, but nothing was done'*. Then the collector asked the Thahsildar and VLWs to take the petitions from the peasants. Accordingly, they took the signatures of girijans then and there and left the area. This has created some hope among some girijans that they may be given the lands. By this time, in the context of farm servants strike, the collector has intervened and made the landlords to accept our demands. The struggle for lands under shifting cultivation, the lands under the occupation of landlords has also intensified by this time. The peoples attention has turned from farm serventship to lands. The meeting of farm servants has decided that the farm servants must not join the work unless and until the salary is enhanced to Rs. 600 from Rs. 400 accepted by the landlords. We saw to it that a decision was adopted and implemented to the effect that the land belongs to the tiller but not to the landlords. Therefore, the girijans must seize the lands under the leadership of Girijana Sangham. Continuing as farm servants means the farm servants quarrelling among themselves for the sake of landlords. So they must henceforth abandon the work of farm servants. Thus the farm servants freed themselves from the ever increasing burden of debts and slavery which were weighing on their backs for several years. Such people got their old debts, which were to the tune of 2000-3000, cancelled. With this, the landlords, backed by the reserve police, began threatening the farm servants that they would see their end if they refuse to work as farm servants.

Again, the Collector came to the area in May 1969. He tried to bring a compromise between the landlords and the farm servants. He made the landlords to agree to raise the farm servants' salary even up to Rs 600/- But he could not convince the farm servants to work as farm servants. Same day, he examined and enquired into the petitions of girijans. He asked the landlords to show their land records and the receipts of land revenue paid by them. Some bluffed that the same were lost in Godavari floods. Collector went back saying that he will see them when he visits the area next week. Next week, he came. But without even getting down from the boat, he asked the peasants to come to Devipatnam. The peasants were angry. However, some peasants who were under some illusions expressed the view, 'let us see what happens.' Those under such illusions have gone to Devipatnam some times to meet the Collector. He met only once but did not talk with the people. With this even those who were harbouring illusions too stopped going to Devipatnam. During this period we propagated in a big way that the problems can not be solved by petitions under the present law. We formed the village Girijan committees as well as Mahila committees. We have given a clear organizational shape to the volunteer corps. We propagated that the people must get prepared to occupy the lands under the occupation of land lords. In June 1969, we convened a meeting of the people of all the villages who had to seize back the lands of Kondamodalu landlords. In this meeting we explained to them with the help of their own experience that the problem of land must be solved on the land itself but not in courts or offices. With this, the peasants have arrived at a decision in this meeting that they would no more go to the Collector but occupy the lands. It was also decided that even at the time of entering into the lands all the peasants must start by assembling themselves at a place. Instead of each village moving separately, they must collectively till the land in one village after other. It was also decided that not only the people of those villages who are entering the lands but also the people of other villages must be mobilized in the context of this programme. It was decided that what-ever the bullocks and ploughs the girijans have must be mobilized from all the villages. It was also decided that together with those who come with the bullocks and ploughs the women and men must also carry with them the pots of chili powder and what ever the weapon available.

On one side, the police was telling to the people that they would be given lands and their demands were justified. On the other side, they were asking the people to tell about the whereabouts of their leaders and beating them up in the course of their search for leaders. They have seized bows, arrows and agricultural implements from some people. We have taken up the land question and strengthened the organisation connected to this programme right in the midst of police searches.

In the third week of June (1969), the red flags were hoisted in every village. The peasants marched in procession raising the slogans together with their bullocks and ploughs to reoccupy 40 acres of land usurped by Sivaiah Patrudu in Kathanapalli village. 30 ploughs, 500 to 600 women and men with their traditional weapons were mobilised to the spot. Some people also carried the hand bombs

with them. Some people, with Red flags fluttering on their ploughs, were tilling and singing. Volunteer squads were guarding from behind the bushes. Women were engaged in clearing the weeds in the land with sickles. As expected, the police from the Kondamodalu camp did not come to the spot along the bushes. They walked across the fields along the open area while halting on the way. They caught hold of comrades in the plain area who were tilling the land together with the peasants. The girijans turned furious and roared that the police must leave our comrade's hand. The police officer found no way but to go back together with his team. No landlord has accompanied them. The people saw this as the inauguration for their programme of land seizure. They planted the red flags in the land the moment tilling was over. The people from 10 miles distant places too had come and taken part in the programme. In fact, they had nothing to do with these lands. They have participated in the programme with the understanding that their problems can be solved only by abiding to the programme of Sangham and with an organised strength and mutual co-operation. By the time this land tilling programme was taken up the rainy season has begun. The landlords have already sown the dry paddy, gingily seeds and paddy sprouts for wet cultivation. They could not pluck tobacco leaves as the farm servants stopped the work and no coolie was prepared to take their place. One or two big land-lords brought some farm servants from plain area. This year, the girijans started freely occupying the forest land and started shifting cultivation. Therefore, they had enough land to cultivate. They gave a part of it to the farm servants. Land tilling programme was temporarily stopped for 10 days to make necessary preparations for cultivation. People thought that they may not be able to reap the crop which they raise in the lands occupied by them. So they thought that the yield they get from shifting cultivation may be of some help for them. They decided to carry on the struggle for land while, at the same time, continuing the shift cultivation. They have decided to carry on even this programme collectively. We made use of this 10 days' time. We have selected some active youth from among the village volunteer squads and took them to new villages to carry on the propaganda. There too, the people have taken up the land seizure programme. Farm servants demanded the enhancement in their salaries. They told us that it would have been good had we gone to their area before they joined work at the beginning of new year. We had to allot one cadre to the area where the people were directly facing the landlords' exploitation and were on the move against it (Mantur, Tallur, Kachhalur, Gondur, Madipalli and Penkula padu villages). The people of these villages told us that they too would move into action next year on the question of forest lands. They promised to stand by the struggle of Kondamodalu people. Later on, the people of all these villages have joined the programme of harvesting.

#### **FORMATION OF GUERRILLA SQUAD**

While this dry land cultivation<sup>7</sup> was going on, the important cadre of the Agency held their meeting in the third week of July 1969. Here an armed guerrilla squad was formed

*7. Dry land cultivation: It is a short term cultivation in Kondamodalu. It begins with pre-monsoon time, i.e. in the month of April/May and the crop will be harvested in August/September*

Three local youth and four youth from outside were recruited as the members of this squad. We have decided to keep this squad in the Pullangi area and strengthen the organisation in the villages in the course of training programme. The squad leader, together with one squad member, have gone to the plain area. The comrade who was entrusted with the task of politicalisation went to his home just within a week's time. With this, the squad was left with no programme. They were given lathi training for one week. In fact, this squad has come back to Kondamodalu in a disappointed mood as it encountered the problem of food and lack of programme there. Another member has gone to the plain area for treatment. No one has come back. Earlier, it was decided that the squad must complete the training within a month and carry on actions against the informants. This squad wanted to complete the training at the earliest with an understanding that our movement gets further intensified in Kondamodalu area and, therefore, the members of this squad must be ready to provide the leadership to the squads there. But, in our view, we could not give significance to the recruitment of squad members and determining the responsible comrade who can organise the squad in a capable way as much as we gave to the formation of squad and to plan about the requirements of a squad. It would have been good had one of the comrade present taken this responsibility. We could not do so. Mobilisation of arms remained nominal as the money collected for this purpose was spent for the needs of organisation. Later, towards the end of Aug 1969, a squad was formed in Kondamodalu area with militant youth. A comrade was entrusted with the task of training it. This comrade was arrested along with Achari in the first week of Sept 1969. With this, once again, the steps towards the formation of squad faced a setback<sup>8</sup>.

---

*8. On the question of formation of guerrilla squad, the leadership of East-Godavari was of the view that the people must put up the resistance when the people's movement was in an upswing and to defend themselves from the conspiratorial physical attacks and atrocities of the landlord forces. After the arrest of Com. Ramalinga Chari and 4 other comrades in Sept/Oct, 1969, there emerged a trend in a responsible comrade in East Godavari who was lacking the orientation of building the revolutionary people's movement. According to this, the theory of individual annihilation has emerged from the experience of Sompeta in Srikakulam district and it will be a means to hasten the advance of revolutionary movement. The state leaders of ML party under the leadership of Charu Mazumdar began attempts to encourage such people.*

*They made futile attempts even to influence the leaders and cadre of Kondamodalu movement. The leadership and cadre of Kondamodalu had smoothly rejected this trend. They made it clear that neither the experience of Telangana nor the experience of Naxalbari approve this.*

*It was towards the end of May and the beginning of June 1969, the cadre from other districts and plain areas started coming to Kondamodalu area where the entire people were being organised. Two comrades who came from Krishna District in Jan 1969 went back just within 4 days. They expressed that they had come here with an idea that an armed struggle was going on here and to take part in it and there was no need for them to come to this area to work on problems because such problems were there even in their own villages. On April 7-8, 1969, com. Poulas along with two comrades of a good political level came to the area. They went back within a week. Com. Poulas was arrested on April 20, 1969, i.e., four days after they left the area. This was exactly the day when Com. Subba Reddy had returned to the area after attending the State Plenum.....*

## TRANSPLANTATION PROGRAMME: EXTENSION OF MOVEMENT TO NEW AREAS.

We have begun the transplantation in August 1969 in the land sown by the land lords. Even those who were vacillating earlier too participated in this programme. It took 15-20 days. Hundreds of people have taken part in this programme. Some were tilling; some were collecting the plants; women were engaged in the work of transplantation. Volunteer squads were keeping a watch against police. The people were in greater number but the work was less. We held meetings of the women and youth who had come there a-new. We formed committees. People seized the gingily and cereal crops before this transplantation programme. One youth has exploded a bomb when gingily crop cutting was going on. On hearing this sound, the people in other fields and villages immediately rushed to the spot with their bows and arrows thinking that police is firing upon our people. In the course of transplantation as well as weeding in the fields of dry crops under the leadership of women's organisation we declared that the crop belongs to the people. Village girijan committees and women's committees acted with total responsibility in this programme and mobilised the people.

When all these works were going on, the people even from 10 kms distance came to this area to help and participated in them. Some people came there with an interest to know what was happening there. They invited us to their area. Importantly, its impact was seen in Polavaram taluka of West Godavari district, in Rampachodavaram and Nelakota area on the borders of plain area. Later, our volunteer squads went to those areas and gave a programme on their problems.

---

*In March 1969, ie. at a time when the activities in the area had reached a level and were advancing, com.Achari have had a report from Com.Subba Reddy and Com.Shanti Raju. Basing on it, he had greatly enthused the comrades. He told the comrades that the people in this area are moving exactly in the way the people in Srikakulam had moved in the early period. He pointed out that the steps must be taken to move the people into the lands. He assured that the situation will be reported to the State Committee, the efforts will be made to bring more organisers. He made several other suggestions and asked the comrades to mobilise economic resources locally. Com.Achari worked in this kind of co-ordination with com.Subba Reddy who was a lone organiser there.*

*By the time Com. D.V attended the cadre meeting in the Agency area in May 1969, some more comrades had come to the area. Some more cadre came after this meeting. The direction to take up the programme of land seizure in June, i.e., at the begining of mansoon was worked out in this meeting attended by Com. DV and Com. Achari. After this, Com.Achari came to Kondamodatu area. Here he witnessed the then ongoing movement; the organisation of Sangham; higher level of people's consciousness and the command the party organisation was wielding on the people. He went back with an overflowing joy at the state of affairs. Again, he came back to the area in the third week of July 1969 to attend the meeting of the cadre of entire Agency area. The guerrilla squad and the tasks for it were set. Then, he was in a thick of struggle within him between the understanding of forming the guerrilla squad and that of armed struggle at an higher level of people's movement. Perhaps, it remained unresolved for him till he reached the jail.*

They enrolled members in some villages. With the help of Sangham, the people seized back their cattle taken by the money lenders. One money lender was tried in a meeting. One point must be noted here. Girijan youth themselves made speeches here explaining the problems. Girijan youth participated in this meeting overcoming the superstitions and age-old traditions and customs. For instance, earlier, reddy youth were not eating in the houses of koyas. They were not eating when we happen to go to a koya village. They were not eating a new fruit, touching a new flower and a new crop without holding a festival of new crop in their village. We could put an end to all these gradually through education. Initiative has greatly grown among the youth. People did not allow the cattle of landlords to enter the forest in Kondamodalu area. They did not allow the cutting of fire wood in the forest area. They caught hold of the cattle of land lords and used them for their agricultural work.

### FOOD PROBLEM

In this context, some people were suffering for want of food grains. They had to face this problem because, though the lands belonged to them, the crops have not yet come into their hands. Landlords were not in a position to get the works done by the coolies. Every thing was done as a collective programme. People as a whole have participated in the programme. Those with nothing to eat too participated in the programme while starving. This problem had to be solved by none but the Sangham. Every village committee has collected the details of the families suffering from this problem in the village. A suggestion has come to us that we can get the foodgrains as one landlord in a village has not yet taken his surplus grain to the market. But most of the people did not agree to this proposal. More over, this village is far away from this area. It requires more labour but it brings only a little result. So we proposed a way out: Let us pull on one month's time. By that time, the crop of shift cultivation will come into our hands. This will help us. People should refuse to clear off the debts. Thereby, they can save 200 bags of jowar. The jowar thus saved as well as the entire produce of the villages can be brought to a center. We decided to give back the jowar taken from every one from the grain collectively produced by the Sangham.<sup>9</sup>

Godavari floods have destroyed some of our crops. In the context of these floods, our party sympathisers formed some units. We explained to them about the Communist Party; the great Marxist teachers and the Socialist Governments in these countries. We admitted some as sympathisers. We explained to women

---

9. When there was a food problem, an idea was aired that the granneries of propertied people of plain area must be looted. This problem was discussed in a wider meeting of people. There were no grain reserves with the landlords in the area as they were growing tobacco in the main. The rich people having the granneries of surplus grain were there-only at a distance of 15 to 20 kms. More over, it was felt that the attempts to loot the grain may hamper the then ongoing programme of transplantation. Therefore, the meeting has decided that the families which are having a surplus Jowar must give it to Sangham as a loan. Thus the people themselves had shown a correct solution to the problem. They have sincerely implemented the same. What the leadership has done here was simple. It just placed the problem before the wider meeting of people and sought the people's advice.

and men about the struggle of Vietnamese people (with the help of Photos from Vietnamese Magazines. Photos of gun wielding women tilling the lands; women shooting down the airplanes and the gun wielding women reading the News, etc;). People were greatly enthused by it. We felt that this method of education gave the result of hundred speeches. Two units have taken a concrete shape. They are yet to take a clear shape in rest of the villages.

#### **PROBLEM THAT AROSE AT THE TIME OF TRANSPLANTATION**

We also faced the problem of seeds for dry land cultivation as well as other problems connected to land where the transplantation was in progress. The problem such as land mortgaged by the girijans; the lands grabbed from girijans in the name of lease; the lands taken by the small peasants of plain areas from the girijans; the lands that changed hands from one girijan to another girijan, etc. had come to the fore. Every family was anxious to get back the entire land it once lost. The then ongoing land tilling programme has given them such a confidence. Thus there were families which had lands at one time but lost them. There were also families which had no land what so ever or those who were having only a small piece of land. In these conditions, we convened the meetings of village girijana committees. It was decided that the girijans must collect the seeds needed or for the lands yet to be brought under tilling from their relatives and also from the sympathisers of Girijana Sangham. Following decisions were adopted regarding the question of lands:

1. It is not possible to thoroughly examine and resolve the question, which land belongs to whom in a short time. Likewise it, is also not possible to resolve the problems concerning the land among the girijans. For this season, the girijan must collectively cultivate the lands except those which are presently owned and cultivated by the girijans. Our party must be guided, not by the idea which land must be cultivated by whom, but by the idea that it is not the landlords but the girijans who must cultivate the land and enjoy the crop. Once these tasks are completed, the Village Girijana Sangham will thoroughly discuss and resolve the problems of land among the girijans which are brought to its notice. At the same time, the principle that no family in the village must be left without land must be implemented at the time of land distribution. Land presently owned by the girijans must not be distributed. Once the transplantation work is complete, the concerned village committee should shoulder the responsibilities such as the protection of crop, provision of irrigation for the crop within the boundaries of the village.

2. Attitude towards the girijans lands under the occupation of land lords and the lands on lease under the liberal landlords: we must occupy them.

3. Girijans' lands under mortgage: we must occupy them.

4. Lands taken on lease from girijans: we must seize them back irrespective of the fact whether the period of lease was complete or not. Some of those who took on lease have left the land on their own. Some clinged to the lands. They were pushed out of the lands.

5. Problem of those who lost their lands in the past and migrated to other areas: They have given petitions to us with details about which of the land is under the occupation of which landlord and with a request to get their lands back. We have decided to do so only if the girijans come back to this area and join the struggle.

6. Attitude towards small farmers from plain areas who had taken a piece of land on lease from girijans: We have told them that they would be given a share in the crop if they join the struggle led by the Sangham. At the same time we did not exclude these lands from the present occupation.

#### **ATTEMPTS TO IMPLEMENT THE PRINCIPLE OF 'ALL POWERS TO PEOPLE'S COMMITTEES'**

All the villages in this area were carrying on an united struggle on the question of shifting cultivation, resistance against debts and lands seizure, etc. However, the girijan committees were formed and functioning on the basis of village. As and when needed, these village girijan committees were taking their own decisions. Many problems have come to the fore with the programme of land seizure. An Area Committee was elected with a view to deal with these problems. Shifting cultivation was carried on defying the forest department. Lands were seized and tilled defying the landlords who grabbed the lands and also the collector who was claiming the authority to resolve this problem. It was decided that we must have armed squads because we have seized our own rights as well as their authorities. It was decided that besides the volunteer squads we must have a squad for the entire area which devotes its entire time and concentrates itself only on the work of squad and the village committees must select and send the capable people for this. The landlords were camping in Rajahmundry (Revenue Divisional Head Quarter)) when the transplantation work was going on in the area. From there, they were having consultations with Kakinada town (District Head Quarter) and Hyderabad (State Capital). One or two landlords, left the area abandoning the land and even cattle consoling themselves, 'let us be satisfied with whatever we have already earned in the area'. Once the Agency Area Girijan Committee came to be accepted as sole authority, the sangham received the levy from the liquor shop keeper which was till then being paid to the elders of two temples and the Panchayat President in the village. Suggestions were made that the taxes (tax) collected from sellers in the huts must not go to the Panchayat but to the Girijan Sangham. But nothing was concretely thought on how to manage this. Some landlords were very furious at this development. They began threatening that they would bring goondas from outside and a better gorkha police force. We came to know that they were conspiring to attack and kill the main girijan cadre. The people from each village moved on their own initiative, asked us for bombs and had them to use the same for self defence.

Second time, important Comrades were arrested exactly at a time when we were about to give a shape to the squad. We incurred a serious loss because of this. We faced financial problems at a time when the movement has reached a



higher level. Though the people were taking care of food and tobacco, we found ourselves without a pie in our hand when we were in a dire need of money to train up the squad members and deploy cadre in new areas. It would have helped a lot had some money come to us from the State Committee. It would have been good had we been provided one comrade who was experienced in training. It would have been good had the training been given in advance, at least, to one or two cadre who were organising in the area.

### **HARVESTING-PEOPLE'S PREPAREDNESS FOR RESISTANCE:**

By the time wet crop transplantation programme was complete the dry crop was ready for harvesting. The Area Girijan Committee has taken the responsibility for this entire programme. Women had taken part in greater number in the programme of transplantation. Poor people from plain area too joined this programme. After crop harvesting and thrashing was over, the grain was distributed among all who have taken part in this programme without any differentiation between girijans and non-girijans. They have kept aside to bags of grain for Sangham. The girijans offered a measure of extra grain to the members of Area Committee in line with a customary habit of giving grain to the elders who were dealing with caste panchayats. They refrained from it when we told it was no proper. For instance, a middle peasant lost his cow. He alleged that it was killed and eaten away by the villagers. But the sangham has given the verdict that it was a false allegation. Later, he found his cow. Then the people charged him a fine of Rs 15 for making a false allegation. Earlier, the village elders were using such money for drinking purposes. But now the Sangham kept the said money in the account of Sangham's funds. It was the time when Com. Ramalinga Chary was arrested. Already youth had taken a pledge to take the place of the leaders if their leaders are arrested. They had shown the determination to continue the work.

At one time, in addition to the police force camping there a DSP, together with an additional force has entered the field where the women were busy in cutting the crop. This was the time when the people in the surrounding area too were busy in harvesting and thrashing the crop. The moment the people saw the police all of them have rushed to the spot and encircled the police force with their own weapons. The police were terrified to find themselves caught in the midst of a large number of people. The DSP together with his force had simply left the scene telling the people that, 'we came here only to see the people and not to do anything against them'. The landlords were jubilant when they saw police officer entering the fields and hoped that the police would handle the people sternly. But they were nonplussed with the turn in the situation.

At one time earlier, the people of one village were seen running behind a stag in an attempt to hunt it down. The stag was caught by the people. 400 people have divided its meat among themselves.

All this was only a pointer to the people's preparedness for an organised resistance.

The people from hill top region too have joined the programme when the crop harvesting was going on here. The president of that village advised the people against going to the struggle area and warned about possible arrest of leaders if they happen to come to their village. Earlier also, he reported to the police that the people have given food to us and brought the police repression against the people. This kind of propaganda by him has infuriated the people. In Kondamodalu, it was decided that our propaganda squad should go there and punish him. A squad of 15 youth reached the village in the night. Some militants from Vemulakonda area also have accompanied the youth squad. All together, 100 girijans were mobilised from the surrounding villages. They advised him to stop his exploitation. He had to arrange food for all in the night. With this, this president who asked the people earlier to beat the Sangham people with bows and arrows mended himself and stopped from coming in the way of Sangham. We have carried on an extensive propaganda in Vemulakonda, Tannurupalem, Gangavaram, Musurupalli and Geddada Mutha area. There we declared that the people must get prepared for the seizure of forest lands. The people have shed their fear about the president and Mutadars<sup>10</sup> and started holding meetings freely. They demanded us to allot an organiser. But we could not do so. They advised us to punish the person who was responsible for the arrest of Com. Choudhary and one women Comrade in Chokulagudem village. We held a meeting of all the people in another village. In this course, the propaganda squad established contacts with 40 villages and held meetings in 20 villages.

#### **PEASANTS ON THE MOVE IN MANTURU AND NELAKOTA**

In Manturu, the landlords created contradictions among the tribal people belonging to Kammari and reddi castes. Our comrades have united them when they went to this village for the first time. In drought time, they seized the dry paddy crop. Later in sept. 1969, they entered the land and started ploughing. They tilled the land defying Thahsildar's advise. With this, the people in Madipalli and penkulapalli villages too have shed their vacillations and began tilling the land. Women of this village have most enthusiastically participated in this programme. They have forced the landlords to enhance the wage rates. Once the seedling job was over, the Govt. sought to auction these lands for lease. We opposed this auction. We decided to resist this auction. But the Thahsildar told the people that the land will be leased out only at a nominal rate and Sangham can take the

---

*10. Muttadari System: This system was re-introduced by the British colonial rulers in certain tribal areas after the suppression of Rampa Tribal rebellion in 1880. The tribal villages in Rampachodavaram (East Godavari district) were divided under 26 Muttas. Each Mutta had one Head man called as Muttadar who was obviously a person loyal to colonial regime. He was entrusted with the job of assisting the circar in maintaining peace in the villages; providing information about 'rebels', 'robbers' and 'bad' elements; collecting levies and taxes. These Muttadars used these 'powers' to recklessly loot the tribal people and subject them to worst forms of oppression. This oppressive and anti-people system was abolished only in 1970 in the wake of tribal movements in Srikakulam, East Godavari and other districts.*

land in auction. Finally, heeding to the advice of our sympathisers, the Sangham has taken the land on lease at the rate of Rs 10 per acre. People thought this too was in their own interest because the said land was a good fertile land. The people in this area have moved into action to occupy the land as a result of our efforts in 15 days. We organized them in every respect. Later, Devipatnam president submitted a petition proposing to auction the land. He chose to do so at a time when the crop was about to come. So, the people of the entire village prepared themselves not to allow the auction. The male persons were ready with new bows and arrows. Women were ready with the pots of chilli powder. Again, our sympathizer intervened in the situation. He arranged a compromise between the landlords and our people. The sympathizer told the people that those who are ready to pay Rs 5 more than what the landlord is prepared to pay in the auction will get the land in lease. So, he advised that the people should not create any trouble. Girijans were very much disappointed by this. But they agreed to this because they could not reject his advice. We made it clear to the people that his advice was wrong and harmful to the people. We elaborated our point to them. Then the sympathiser indicated that in future the village may not be useful even to the extent it is useful now if the clashes occur in the village. With this, we too have softened our attitude. Perhaps, we were wrong in doing so.

In Nelakota, the landlords have set fire to the houses of peasants. People were furious at this. They declared that the landlords cannot enter the village. They informed us that they will see the end of landlords if we send 200-300 people from Kondamodalu to help them. We told them that it is not possible to do so. We advised them to mobilise support from the surrounding villages, bring them too under the leadership of Sangham and carry out our programme. But it seemed that they would not leave our place without taking us with them. So, a 15-member squad has gone with them. By the time the squad has reached the village in the morning, the people were already tilling the lands. We did not stop them. The squad stayed there for 10 days. It trained the youth and women in singing and drill. A leaflet was brought out on the problems of this area and widely distributed. This leaflet also reached the harijan and other poor people in the plain area. They expressed their solidarity. The farm servants and wage labourers expressed the desire for an increase in their wages. As a result of this propaganda, the people have welcomed the squad to the villages. The squad went there without a pie in their hands. But they could manage to meet their needs as there was good help from the people. The squad members too were very much enthused by this.

### **SURVEY PROBLEM**

In kondamodalu, as soon as the crop seizure was over the people had sown whatever the jowar, bengal and horse gram seeds were with them. They bought the seeds with the money they got from selling gingily crop and levy amount received by the Sangham from the local liquor breavers. Yet, there remained 500-600 acres of land that needed to be sown. The problem of seeds continued. We planned to solve the problem by cutting and selling bamboos and timber. We

thought of selling the teak timber which was cut some time back but was lying in the forest because the forest department has seized it and foisted cases against the people. We wanted to use this money to buy the seeds. But we found none who could buy it. Earlier, either the landlords or timber smugglers were buying it. But our time was lost only in the search for such people. People borrowed some seeds and started the sowing. People brought the problem of survey when our squads were campaigning in Vemulakonda and Nelakota areas. The Govt. has embarked on this programme to save the landlords at a time when the peoples' movement in Agency areas has taken the form of armed struggle and sought to bury the feudal system. The survey programme will cause an immense harm to the girijans.

1. Land was surveyed and pattas were given in the name of those who were enjoying it at the time.

2. Once the survey was complete, every one should confine to the piece of said land and must not go in for shifting cultivation.

3. After the survey, every one should pay the land revenue directly to the Govt.

4. The tamarind and acacia concinna not belonging to the individuals but belonging to the village would henceforth become govts' property. No one should touch them.

The Govt. officials told the people that they would benefit from the survey as, according to them, it will prevent the occupation of girijans' lands by the people from the plain areas. But they did not tell that they would survey the lands grabbed by the landlords earlier and restore the same to girijans. They were only telling that the lands would be surveyed and given to those who are presently owning those lands. It has become clear that all this was only aimed at nothing but providing the legal guarantee to the lands under the occupation of landlords. It was also proved that even the reforms this Govt. is bringing are in favour of the ruling classes but not meant for the poor. Much protest has flared up against the attempts made by the Govt. in the name of survey to throw the dust in people's mouth and hand over their lands to the landlords. Even the small muthadars had expressed that this injustice must be opposed. In 1968, Yellavaram landlords had submitted petitions to the Govt. demanding for a survey. They were very much happy when the survey has begun. As usual, they found that the survey can be managed in their own favour by paying more money to the survey officials. We brought out a leaflet opposing the survey. We called upon the people not to allow the survey. The people in vemulakonda area are totally opposed to the survey. Here not only they did not co-operate with the survey work, but also told them not to carry it. Likewise, in kondamodal, some people received orders for land in response to the petitions taken by the Tahsildar from them in June. This was all together 34 acres land. Here too, they gave the land belonging to one girijan to another girijan. One or two only came in favour of girijans whose lands were once grabbed by the landlords. The way lands were given made it clear that all this was a farce. They were asking the people to *'stop your programme; the authorities as earlier would*

*give you the land'*. In reply to this, the peasants questioned '*what is there for you to give our own lands to us which are already being tilled by us?*' The people who got 34 acres of lands considered that these lands do not belong to them individually but to the sangham. They expressed the view, '*who are they to distribute the lands. We distribute the land ourselves once our battle is won.*' Later, the Tahsildar took back the land orders from some which he gave earlier. It has become clear that all this was a farce.

## **INTENSIFICATION OF POLICE REPRESSION**

The landlords of Nelakota could bring the police repression to suppress the people's movement by using money and their own influence in the Government circles. The Govt. clamped sec 144 all along 25 Miles area from Papikondalu to Nelakota and prohibited people from carrying any weapons. They planned to start repression in Nelakota and extend it up to Papikondalu. They adopted the method of provoking the people by keeping the landlords in the forefront. One landlord came to remove the weeds in the land which was occupied and sown by us. The armed people have chased him out. They resisted the police when intervened in the scene. Police have beaten up the people in the presence of higher authorities. They looted the village; insulted the women. They have taken 9 important persons into custody. Because of this, the people had to take shelter in the hills. Sharabhavaram villagers helped by giving them shelter. They assured to join the struggle if the police come to their village and attack the people.

After a reckless repression was unleashed against the Nelakota village the same officers camped in Kondamodalu with a decision to unleash the kind of repression they carried on in Nelakota against Kondamodalu villages too. They have set up a camp in Koyyalagudem inside the Kondamodalu area.

Learning from the experience of Nelakota, the Kondamodalu people were ready to teach a proper lesson to the police. They stopped all their work and got themselves united in a big number and kept an eye on police movement. They made up their mind to put up the resistance at the village which may become the first target of attack. It was also suggested that this resistance must not be put up in the plain area but we must hit by drawing them into hills and bushes. Finally, some new shelters were arranged. The people, women and children, began searching for new places for their protection.

As per the police strategy, the landlords sought to destroy the peoples' crops. They sought to provoke the people by leaving the cattle into the crops. The village volunteer squads who were guarding the crops warned the landlords. One day, in the afternoon, our squad members have chased away the landlord youth who were grazing the crops by their cattle. With this, all the landlords moved to attack our people. No sooner the people have seen it they moved into action enmasse informing each other and carrying daggers. It has become a war scene between us and them. There was only a gap of 50 yards between them and us. They went on retreating as our people advanced. Some youth aimed their arrows and were ready to strike. But the elders stopped them. Landlords were almost shivering with the

fear of death. They stepped back. Then the police entered the scene. All this was an open area. As per the advise given to the people earlier, they retreated to the hills with a view to strike from behind. They hid themselves behind the bushes and trees. The police officers were very much frightened when 500-600 people suddenly disappeared from the scene and no one was in the sight. They were apprehending attack from any corner. They requested some one to come out and talk to them. They also assured not to cause any harm to them. After half an hour, four or five elders have softened their attitude and came out of their hiding. Police officers preached them saying that they must not violate the Sec 144. Govt. itself will give them the lands and all the lands brought under plough by the people in fact belong to the Govt. Then, they left the scene.

Once the police left the scene, all the people who were hiding in the bushes and hills came out and reached our center. Then it was getting dark. Before we asked them why it happened so, the people began asking, *'how can we fight when they are coming with such big guns? It is not the way. We must find some other way.'* We told them ' we can acquire weapons only by resisting them with bows and arrows and seizing their weapons. For this, we must carry on guerrilla war against them. We could have had some weapons to resist them. So we must preserve our produce and other properties safely and get ourselves ready to strike. Squad must get prepared well. When the squad is striking at the landlords, all of us would accompany it . We felt- that the people would have suitably punished the police had we stayed with the people on that day and provided them the leadership and this would have brought a turn in the movement. But the two comrades could only witness all this just sitting at a nearest spot in their shelter. Later on, the people who realised from their own experience the importance of squad have decided that they would take the responsibility of the families of those youth who were recruited into the squads. Later , the squad was sent to the kanivada area with a decision that it should revive contacts in Yellavaram taluka, carry on propaganda in that area and take action against the informants. Here an informant who was responsible for the arrest of our people has fallen in the hands of our squad. We kept him in custody for two days. Entire squad was of the view that he must be given one or other punishment. But the main comrade who was present there argued that he must not be punished. He brought Mao's name in defence of his argument and thus the informant was allowed to go safely.

This comrade was using extremist phraseology and talking much about the need to do this and that. He was criticising the state leadership that it was doing nothing but confining itself to economic struggles. But he did nothing to help the implementation of the programme given to the squad which was sent to Kanivada. Besides this, he tried to divert the squad members. Squad was disappointed by this. After their return to Kondamodal the squad members began to carry on their own works separately. The two important comrades brought the family problems to the fore which were never brought by any one. Much trouble had to be taken to bring all of them together. In this context alone the crops were ready

for harvesting. People were ready on their own for crop cutting. While the cutting was on, the police came on the scene. They arrested 8 people. They could not catch rest of the people. Police officers left the spot warning the people not to continue crop cutting. But the people began the crop seizure which was their right. At the same time, the people carried their bows with them. In this context, they expressed firm opinion that the landlords and police should be killed. But it did not happen so. Some brought the thantriks with an idea to kill them through thantra or black magic. On knowing these things, we made the people to abandon such ideas and attempts. In these conditions, we thought that we can raise the strength of people's resistance struggle only through guerilla actions. But Mao taught us that a guerilla action requires an extensive area. Are we having it or not? How it should be? All these questions were in our mind. Yet we have decided to go in for guerilla actions keeping in view the movement in Kodamodal till that time; the movement which spread in new areas under its influence and our relations in Yellavaram taluka even though the people are on the move here at present.

We contacted the State Committee. SC expressed its inability to help financially and asked us to stand on our own legs. It told that, if possible, it will send some money and some comrades who can be useful for the squad. We have formed the Agency Committee of East Godavari and West Godavari Districts. We held the meetings of Agency's important cadre and squad on 15,16,17 Dec 1969. The Comrade who was promised to be sent by the SC could not take part in this meeting."

We have worked out a programme to overcome the financial problem by an action in an area with which we have no relation. We have also taken up the programme of acquiring the weapons thorough actions on informants. We held classes on the girijan peasants struggles in India. All the comrades were very much enthused by this. This meeting was attended only by comrades from Kondamodal and Mantur areas. Two important comrades have taken the responsibility each for one to prepare the plan for money action and action on informants. In the meantime, we planned to give possible training to the squad in using the gun. The arrests of our comrades in Madras have taken place right at a time when the squad was ready for action. The comrade here was perturbed by this. He asked the squad to abandon the idea of action and leave this area. We made efforts to call back some of the squad members, send some to restore contacts in Yellavaram taluka and plan for action. After Madras arrests, the comrade who was to prepare a plan for money action has abandoned this task and came back to the plain area. With this, there remained none who can perform the responsibilities and carry on activities connected to the movement. As a consequence, the movement of this area suffered a set back.

---

*11. Com. Madala Narayana Swamy said that com. Nekkalapudi Ramarao will come from the State Committee and guide. But he did not turn up.*

From the beginning we have carried on our work in this entire area with the understanding provided in the "*Lay Foundation for a struggle-oriented Mass Movement*" and the "*Immediate Programme*" (the documents adopted by the APCCCR's State convention held in April 1969). As pointed out in the document, "*Lay Foundations for a struggle-oriented Movement*", We have adopted all the forms of struggle and taken the movement to higher level. The movement of this area has proved that we can achieve good result if we implement the mass programme. But the movement in the district as a whole could not reach the level it must have reached because of the vacillations, 'Left' deviationist trend; weakness of not being consistent In mobilizing the people and irresponsible behaviour in carrying out the programme manifested in some in the leadership. Kondamodalu movement is a concrete experience gained from the practice of revolutionary mass line in a specific area.

**SIMHADRI SUBBA REDDY**  
**( VISWAM )**

**DEC, 1970.**



## SELF - CRITICAL REPORT OF THE CENTRAL COMMITTEE OF CPI(ML)

*[CC, re-organised under the leadership of Satyanarayan Sinha- EC]*

1. The armed peasant uprising in Naxalbari region in May 1967 heralded a new stage in the history of the national liberation struggle of the Indian people. The peasant masses who were organized and led by the Communist revolutionaries under the red banner of Mao Tsetung Thought launched a massive assault against oppression. The peasants seized landlords' lands, burnt the legal deeds concerning the land ownership, cancelled debts on the peasants seized food grains, cattles and agricultural implements and distributed the same among the landless and poor peasants and established the authority of the peasant committees.

The Naxalbari struggle took place at a time when a great peoples' upsurge (1964-70) had overtaken India. The Indian people were launching militant mass struggles to resist the onslaught of the reactionary ruling classes in every part of the country. The mounting wave of strikes and gheraos launched by the working class and the urban petty bourgeois employees for higher wages and better living conditions, the rising tide of peasant struggles for land, the vigorous struggles of the student masses had seriously isolated the ruling classes and their principal political party, the Indian National Congress, thus further aggravating the inner crisis of the ruling classes. The people wanted solution of their basic problems and were not prepared to tolerate oppression any longer. Fascist repression could not cow them down, it only led to further intensification of the struggles of the people. The revolutionary upsurge found its highest expression in West Bengal. The C.P.I. (M), the party to which the communists and the revolutionary people looked for leadership, exposed its true nature by sharing power with the ruling classes with a view to sabotage and liquidate the revolutionary upsurge. Despite opposition from revolutionary ranks of the party, the leadership led the party to join a coalition with the reactionary state. The C. P. I. (M) leadership now had entered into a bloc with reaction and confronted the people as enemy in practice. The people in West Bengal faced a joint offensive from the ruling classes and the revisionists, the hirelings. Revisionism now stood naked before the people.

The Naxalbari struggle took place at a time when the Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution in China had triumphed. Marxism-Leninism-Mao Tsetung Thought emerged victorious over revisionism and the attempt to restore capitalism in China was smashed. Socialist China emerged as a bulwark of world revolution, inspiring oppressed people and nations of the world in the struggle against imperialism,

social-imperialism and reaction. The national liberation struggle had launched offensive in many countries of Asia, Africa and Latin America. The class struggles of the working class and other toilers challenged the might of the monopoly capital in the heart-lands of capitalism. Modern revisionism faced increasing isolation throughout the world.

2. It was therefore natural that the Naxalbari peasant struggle was widely acclaimed by the revolutionary people in India and abroad. Revolutionary people in India saw in this struggle a new hope for their emancipation. It showed for the second time in the history of our struggle the correctness of the path of the peoples war, (the first being the Telangana peasant struggle), the path which had brought victory for the great Chinese people. The international communist movement lost no time in hailing the uprising of the peasants in Naxalbari with great joy and the C. P. C. called it the "Spring Thunder over India".

The Naxalbari struggle had in practice, drawn a sharp line of demarcation between Marxism—Leninism and revisionism, between proletarian internationalism and bourgeois nationalism and between revolution and counter-revolution.

Now the Naxalbari struggle had once again proved that India was a semi-colonial and semi-feudal country, that the character of Indian revolution was new democratic. It also proved that the targets of Indian revolution were Imperialism, Social-imperialism, Feudalism and Comprador-bureaucrat capitalism, that a revolutionary united front of all anti-imperialist and anti-feudal classes would have to be forged under the leadership the working class with worker-peasant alliance as its core. It proved that the path of the Indian revolution was the peoples' war, the revolutionary role of the peasantry as the main force of Indian revolution and agrarian revolution as the axis of new democratic revolution were highlighted. Revolutionaries all over India began to rally around the Red banner of Marxism, Leninism-Mao Tse-tung Thought, the banner, which was unfurled by the communist revolutionaries of Naxalbari. The inner party struggle against revisionism in the C.P.I. (M) now reached a decisive phase. The revolutionary rank rose in struggle. The phase of conducting peaceful inner party debate over the ideological, political and tactical line of the party was over. Now the leadership of C.P.I. (M) was openly siding with reaction in launching repression and disruption against the revolutionary ranks of the party openly siding with the revolutionary struggle of the Naxalbari peasantry. There had already occurred a virtual split in the C.P.I. (M). The inner party debate had now changed into a public confrontation between the revisionist leadership and the revolutionary rank. Revisionism proved itself the loyal lackey of reaction and counter-revolution.

3. The new orientation in the liberation struggle of our people that was provided by the Naxalbari peasant struggle stirred the entire country. The revolutionary people who for many years were tired of reformism and the parliamentarianism of the leadership of the party had found a new Telangana in the Naxalbari struggle. The sparks of revolutionary struggle ignited in Naxalbari spread to many parts of the country. Revolutionary struggles burst forth in all parts from Assam to the east

to the Punjab in the west, from U.P. in the north to Kerala in the south. Srikakulam, Mushahari, Lakhimpur Kheri and Midnapur emerged as outposts of revolution. The impact of revolutionary peasant struggles inspired the militant students and youths in many important cities to come out against the government with a vigour hardly noticed before.

Nevertheless the sparks could not develop into a prairie fire. On the contrary, one by one, the areas of revolutionary struggles got more and more isolated and the reactionary state suppressed our movement with comparative ease. The movement lost some of its worthiest leaders, thousands were locked up in jails, thousands became disheartened and inactive and the movement which had created high expectations and hopes among the broad masses of the Indian people failed for the time being. The ideological, political, tactical, military and organizational errors committed by the party that led to this disaster has to be discovered and lessons drawn so that party and people are enabled to lead Indian revolution to final victory.

Com. Lenin has taught: -

*"The attitude of political party towards its own mistakes is one of the most important and.....surest ways of judging how earnest the party is and how it in practice fulfils the obligations towards its class and the toiling masses. Frankly admitting a mistake, ascertaining the reasons for it, analyzing the circumstances which gave rise to it and thoroughly discussing the means of correcting it-that is the earmark of a serious party, that is the way it should perform its duties, that is the way it should educate and train the class and then the masses".*

(Lenin "Left wing Communism" collected works, Vol xxv p.200)

It is only when the entire party self-critically reviews its decisions and their implementation with the aim of 'learning from the past to avoid mistakes in future' and go forward to cure the disease to save the patient, can it serve the cause of the people.

In order to attempt a serious analysis of mistakes committed and the circumstances that led to them and in order to thoroughly discuss the means of correcting mistakes, the whole movement has to be reviewed from April and May 1967 to the present period.

The revolutionary movement that began since Naxalbari peasant uprising in May 1967 can be divided into three distinct phases. The first phase is the period from May 1967 to November 1967 i.e., from the beginning of the Naxalbari peasant uprising to the formation of All India Coordination Committee of Communist Revolutionaries (A.I.C.C.C.R.), the second phase is from December 1967 to March 1969 i.e., the period till the formation of the party and the third phase is from April 1969 to November 1971.

The C.C. proposes to review the movement phase wise so that a detailed analysis can be presented as far as possible.

#### **First Phase - May 1967 to November 1967 :**

4. Beginning from W. Bengal, the revolt of the revolutionary ranks against the party leadership soon spread to all corners of the country. In almost all states,

committee for solidarity with Naxalbari peasant struggle began to be set up by the communist revolutionaries in utter defiance of the prerogative of the party leadership. These committees became the centre for the communist revolutionaries in the struggle against the revisionist leadership. These committees conducted propaganda campaign in support of the Naxalbari struggle and exposed the misdeeds of the United Front government in West Bengal. They also carried forward an exposure campaign against the revisionist leadership of the party which had now openly joined the counter revolution. The leaflet issued by Com Jangal Santhal on behalf of Kisan Sabha was widely circulated throughout the length and breadth of the country. The leaflet highlighted the total failure of the so-called land reforms of the Congress and United Front governments and also the demands of the peasantry. This leaflet enabled the party ranks to understand the real nature of revisionism in practice, it enabled them to clearly grasp the fact that the party leadership had joined the coalition to sabotage and liquidate the revolutionary struggle of the people.

It must be stated that though the committees for solidarity with Naxalbari peasant struggle proved to be very helpful in struggle against revisionist leadership, though they had for a short while become the rallying point for the communist revolutionaries in several states, there was no clarity in several of them on ideological, political and tactical issues concerning Indian revolution. In many committees, Mao Tse -Tung Thought was not accepted as the ideological guide and therefore the struggle against revisionism in those areas was somewhat vague and abstract. It was therefore quite natural that these committees could function only for a short while.

The Polit Bureau, the hard core of revisionists in the party, sensed the intensity of the anger and fury of the rank and the cadre against revisionist policies of the party leadership. In order to counter the ideological offensive launched by the communist revolutionaries in Naxalbari and other parts of the country, in September – October, the P.B organized a number of party schools in various parts of the country. The party cadres who had already accepted Mao Tse-tung Thought as Marxism -Leninism of the present time and had launched a bitter ideological political struggle against revisionism took advantage of these party schools and turned them into an arena of political debate. They met and discussed amongst themselves the need of coordinating their efforts for struggle against revisionism, about the necessity of unleashing armed struggle on the pattern of Naxalbari peasant struggle and about the necessity of building a revolutionary party.

The ideological debate that overtook the entire party following the Naxalbari peasant struggle brought about a sharp polarization in the party. Those who stood for armed struggle were now ranged against those who stood for parliamentary struggle.

In U.P and Andhra, the majority of the State Committees revolted against the revisionist leadership whereas the entire J &K state had revolted and decided to function as an independent unit with Mao Tse-tung Thought as its ideological

guide. In other states, the majority of state committees remained with the revisionists.

5. Now, the time had come to forge some sort of an all India coordinating body which could function as an ideological political centre. Communist revolutionaries of West Bengal took the initiative in convening a meeting of communist revolutionaries in the whole country in November 1967. The meeting was held in Calcutta and all those who had openly supported the Naxalbari peasant struggle and had denounced the revisionist leadership participated in the meeting. In this meeting, communist revolutionaries from West Bengal, U.P, Bihar, Tamilnadu and Kerala participated. There was no participation from J&K and Andhra states as the communist revolutionaries of these states had not yet decided for evolving a coordination. The communist revolutionaries of Andhra were against an open revolt against the leadership of the party. They had decided to conduct inner party struggle in order to win over the majority of the party before coming out in open revolt. The J&K unit had reservations about the West Bengal leadership and had decided to function independently till they were convinced.

The positive aspect of this meeting was that it adopted a resolution hailing the Naxalbari peasant uprising. The meeting unanimously came to the conclusion that India was a semi- colonial and semi- feudal country, that India was in the stage of a New Democratic Revolution, the essence of which was agrarian revolution, that the enemies of Indian Revolution were imperialism, feudalism and comprador – bureaucrat capitalism, that the path of Indian Revolution was the Chinese path and that a revolutionary united front of all anti- imperialist and anti-feudal classes with worker- peasant unity as its core would have to be forged under the leadership of the working class. Thus, there was complete unanimity in the meeting on some fundamental issues of party programme.

The meeting pledged

- (a) to propagate Mao Tsetung Thought.
- (b) to conduct struggle against revisionism.
- (c) to launch "Naxalbari type" of struggle and
- (d) to develop conditions for building a real communist party in India.

Besides, it also issued the call to all the communist revolutionaries of India whether outside or inside the party to coordinate their efforts to fight revisionism and launch armed struggle in the country on the pattern of Naxalbari peasant struggle.

It also elected by consensus All India Coordination Committee of Communist Revolutionaries (AICCCR) to act as the coordinating centre. Com Sushital Roy Chowdhary was elected the Convener of the AICCCR. The negative aspects of the meeting were:-

(a) No tactical line could be presented by any one in the meeting. This was not possible as the Naxalbari peasant struggle was not reviewed. The Telangana struggle, the first application of the Chinese path on Indian soil, too was neither reviewed nor mentioned. In absence of summing up of these revolutionary struggles any tactical line could not be prepared. Charu Mazumdar stated in the meeting

that Naxalbari comrades were drafting the report and it would take sometime in finalising it. The inevitable consequence of the absence of the review was that comrades carried with them different conceptions about what was meant by 'Naxalbari type of armed struggle'.

(b) Another aspect of the formulation '*Naxalbari type of struggle*' was that it generated a stereotyped and mechanical approach about armed struggle. An understanding grew that conditions throughout India were uniform and similar and everywhere 'Naxalbari type of armed struggle' could be launched at once. This mechanical approach led to dangerous and erroneous understanding at a later phase that armed guerrilla struggle could be launched even in a single village, that political mobilisation of the people in an extensive area was not necessary at all. The uneven development and varying conditions of different regions were not taken into account nor any importance was given to the question of terrain. This naturally led to the erroneous conception later on that forms of struggle other than armed struggle had become obsolete.

(c) In this meeting questions were raised about our approach to trade unions, Kisan Sabhas, Student Federations and such other mass organisations. However, the meeting left all this to be decided later. It was stated by Charu Mazumdar that the most important task was to launch Naxalbari type of armed struggle as that was the dividing line between revisionism and Marxism – Leninism.

(d) It was also decided that all important cadres were to go underground. The question of combining legal with illegal, open with, secret was not considered at all.

## **2<sup>nd</sup> Phase – December 1967 to March 1969:**

6. With the formation of the AICCCR struggle against revisionism entered a new phase, a phase of revolutionaries breaking out openly from the CPI (M) and forming the AICCCR. In many states, State Coordination Committees of Communist Revolutionaries were organised by the revolutionary cadres and the 4 tasks decided by the AICCCR were accepted and efforts were made to implement them. The revolutionary mass peasant struggles broke out in every part of India. In Srikakulam district of Andhra Pradesh the peasants had been conducting a revolutionary mass struggle from August – September 1967 itself. This struggle had reached a new stage by the time the AICCCR was formed. The girijan peasants had begun reoccupying the landlords' land which previously belonged to them. They reoccupied about 800 acres of such lands. They also brought under their cultivation forest waste land of about 2500 acres. In order to solve the food shortage, they prevented the landlords and Sahukars from carrying grain from the agency areas to the plains. The peasant movement forced the merchants to sell rice at 2 seers per rupee. They forcibly harvested the landlords' crops and seized the ploughs and cattle of the landlords. They annulled the debt burden of about Rs.3 lacs payable to the landlords and Sahukars by burning pronotes. The mass organization of the girijan peasants called the Girijan Sangham developed tremendously not only quantitatively but qualitatively. Its decisions were now being implemented by the broad masses of the peasantry i.e it now enjoyed considerable authority

and led by the communist revolutionaries it gained immense prestige among the masses. The masses now moved breaking all barriers. The peasants carried their bows and arrows, their axes and country made guns during the demonstrations organised by the Girijan Sangham and the party. Some notorious landlords who had earned the wrath of the peasant masses were annihilated in revolutionary mass actions. These annihilations enthused the masses as the landlords began to leave the area for plains and cities.

Likewise, revolutionary peasant struggles broke out in Mushahri in Bihar. The peasants led by communist revolutionaries and Kisan Sangram Samitees (the mass organization of the peasants) seized the crops of the landlords. They began seizing landlords' land and fought against the gangster bands of the landlords. In mass actions which took the forms of armed demonstrations, mass revolutionary violence and mass resistance to the police raiding parties by men and women, by old and young, the peasant masses exhibited tremendous fighting capacity. The Kisan Sangram Samitees developed from an insignificant force into a formidable force in the district of Muzaffarpur. In revolutionary mass actions, peasants armed themselves with Ballams and other traditional weapons and led armed squads, attacked the landlords, burnt the pro notes and other land deeds, seized mortgaged articles and ornaments from the landlords and returned them to the peasants and seized other properties of the landlords.

The police repression began. The attitude of the government and the people's mood to offer mass resistance brought the struggle to a new phase, the phase of armed guerrilla struggle. In the plateau region of Bihar, particularly in Ranchi district, revolutionary mass struggle of the Adivasi peasantry burst forth with an unprecedented force. The peasant masses seized landlords' land, harvested forcibly the crops belonging to the landlords and Sahukars, occupied forest land, captured Haats and markets and drove out the thekedars, who were authorised to collect tolls from these Haats and prevented the wholesale purchase of food grains by outsiders i.e., the city merchants. They decided Hamari Dharti, Hamara Anaaj, Hamara Jangal, Hamara Raaj. They attacked notorious and tyrant landlords and usurers and seized their properties and annihilated some of them. The police stations that were situated in the countryside were deserted by the police personnel who had become mortally afraid of the peasants' mass revolutionary violence.

In Debra- Gopiballabhpur (West Bengal) and in Lakhimpur Kheri of U.P. similar mass peasant upsurge was witnessed. Peasant masses led by communist revolutionaries enacted similar deeds. (The West Bengal and U.P State Committees have not yet reviewed these struggles).

In Punjab, the revolutionary peasants struggle began from December, 1968. The landless and poor peasants of Bhikhi Samaon forcibly seized the land of money lenders in December 1968 under the leadership of communist revolutionaries and this had a tremendous impact on the people. The workers of Birla farm of Ropar were inspired and they launched a massive struggle on demands of higher wages and better living conditions. Soon, the strike struggle of agricultural workers developed into a mass revolutionary movement of the broad masses of the peasantry.

Later on the landless and poor peasants at Kila Hakima seized about 1500 bighas of farm land owned by General Balwant Singh. Thus, in the Punjab too, the armed struggle had a mass character in the beginning.

Thus it can be seen that just like the Naxalbari peasant struggle the subsequent mass struggles of peasantry in several parts of India that broke out or were organized by the communist revolutionaries had strikingly common features. They were struggles of the broad masses of the peasantry for land, for crops, against usury, for higher wages and better living conditions for the agricultural workers, against feudal oppression and government's repression. In all these places, the peasant masses had been carrying on struggles for a long period against the feudal oppression led by their Kisan Sabhas and the communist party. They were in all places led by mass peasant organisations, like Kisan Sabha, Girijan Sangham, Kisan Sangram Samittee or Agricultural Workers Union. They began on economic and partial issues and soon developed into struggle against the State. i.e., for seizure of political power by armed struggle.

In most of these struggles, the communist revolutionaries with Marxism-Leninism-Mao Tsetung Thought in command were in the vanguard.

The '*Terai report*' which was a review drafted by Com. Kanu Sanyal also bears out the above features:-

The Terai Report states:-

"On March 18, 1967, the Siliguri sub divisional peasant conference declared:-

(i) Implement the decisions of the peasant committees in all affairs of the village.

(ii) Organize and arm yourselves to smash the resistance of Jotedars and village reactionaries;

(iii) Break the Jotedars' monopoly of land ownership and start redistribution of land through the peasant committee.

..... to implement these slogans in actual practice, the revolutionary peasants first laid stress on organizing armed groups of peasants in every village. In each village we could hear these words "Political power grows out of the barrel of a gun", for every minor struggle beginning with the movement against usurious interest had to face lathis and guns. That is why these slogans worked like magic in organizing all the peasants. Between the end of March and the end of April 1967 all most all the villages may be said to have been organized. The membership of the peasant association, which never before exceeded 5,000, now rose to about 40,000, About 15,000 to 20,000 peasants became actual wholetime workers. In village after village, the peasant committees were set up..... within one and a half months at the speed of a storm, the revolutionary peasants set up peasant committees after holding hundreds of small meetings and converted them into armed village defence groups. In a word about 90 % of the people of the villages got organized. The 10 % deeds that the revolutionary peasants of Naxalbari accomplished, included confiscation of landlords and Jotedars' lands setting fire to all legal deeds concerning land ownership, annulment of peasants' debts, confiscation and distribution among peasants of the food grains, domestic



animals agricultural implements etc.. of the landlords and Jotedars and organisation of regional and central revolutionary committee.

Except some minor organisational exaggerations, the Terai report stressed the mass character of the struggle, the role of the mass peasant struggles and development of the struggle of land into the struggle for seizure of political power. The report did not at all minimize the struggle of the peasantry for land, and against usurious capital or the need of developing mass revolutionary resistance to the repression of the government and the gangsters organized by the landlords. On the contrary, the report made out that struggle for land distribution and other economic demands were necessary link for launching revolutionary struggles against the State i.e., for seizure of political power. The peasants' struggle for land ultimately brought the struggle to armed resistance against the State and thus to the seizure of the State power.

Even the shortcomings mentioned in the Terai report laid emphasis on the necessity of the mass character of the revolutionary peasant struggle. Pointing out the reverses suffered by the movement, the report enumerated the following failures:

- (a) Lack of strong party organization.
- (b) Failure to absolutely rely on the masses to build a powerful mass base.
- (c) Ignorance in military affairs.
- (d) Thinking on old lines and a formal attitude towards establishing political power and the task of revolutionary land reform.

(e) Failure to propagate the significance of the 10 great deeds performed by the peasant masses.

The Terai report once again laid stress on the relationship of mass struggle for land and the struggle for seizure of political power in the following words:-

“Our failure in establishing the revolutionary political power and in carrying out land reforms blunted the edge of class struggle both during and after the struggle.”

The Terai report, by and large was a correct interpretation of the Naxalbari peasant uprising and it correctly (in the main) summed up the experience of the struggle and drew correct lessons.

7. The AICCCR met in May 1968. The mid term polls were approaching and the AICCCR had to decide the approach. The West Bengal State Committee had adopted a resolution calling upon the people to boycott the mid term poll. On the other hand the Bihar state committee had advocated “boycott of elections” in general. The AICCCR after some discussion unanimously adopted a resolution calling upon the people to boycott the elections and take to the path of armed struggle, the path of Naxalbari.

Our understanding was and remains that there is a fundamental difference between the conditions prevailing in Czarist Russia and those prevailing in present day India. Hence the tactics adopted or formulated by Com. Lenin in relation to elections cannot be mechanically applied nor it can be adopted in toto by communist revolutionaries in India.

The conditions were basically different in the following ways:-

a) The world capitalism had not entered the stage of permanent crisis during days when Lenin formulated his tactics on the question of elections.

b) The parliaments, whether based on adult suffrage or on restricted franchise, though historically out-moded, were young compared to the present day world; very few countries had parliamentary form of government;

c) In conditions of Czarist absolutions, the Russian people considered even a Duma based on restricted franchise as an advance;

d) The Russian revolution had entered the period of a lull;

e) The question of participation in parliament was considered a question of tactics for bringing out a nationwide insurrection first in the cities, then spreading to the countryside;

These were the conditions that the Russian Revolution and Com. Lenin had to reckon with.

Whereas the conditions facing the Indian revolution are basically different because:-

(a) The Indian revolution is taking place at a time when world capitalism has entered the stage of permanent crisis.

(b) The parliamentary democracy has become very old, outmoded and obsolete, not only historically but particularly too as far as India is concerned.

(c) The parliamentary democracy in India is based on adult suffrage and the Indian people have sufficient experience of the sham character of the democracy for the last quarter of a century. They know that it is based on bogus votes and not on real votes.

(d) The Indian revolution is not in the period of a full.

(e) The question of participation in parliament is a question of principle as ours is a protracted people's war first beginning from countryside, capturing power there and then proceeding towards encircling the cities and capturing them. It means that the party takes the road of armed struggle from the very start.

The AICCCR, therefore, came to the valid conclusion that the question of participation in the election was not a question of tactics but that of path i.e., whether to take to the parliamentary path or the revolutionary path. Thus the decision to boycott elections was based on a concrete assessment of the world and Indian situation and it was not based on 'romanticism' and 'subjectivism' as some persons are alleging.

Our experience since the mid-term poll has further exposed the deception practiced by the reactionary ruling classes in the form of parliamentary democracy. Besides boycott of elections, the AICCCR in its May meeting also discussed the question of our policy towards the trade unions and economic struggles. A draft jointly framed by S. N. Singh and Parimal Das Gupta was unanimously adopted. The AICCCR took into its consideration the existing division in the trade union movement (there being half a dozen central. T.U.s.) on the basis of political affiliations and correctly rejected the idea of launching its own central trade union.

It decided that communist revolutionaries should work in such trade unions that enjoyed prestige in the eyes of broad masses of workers at a given place irrespective of its political colour; they should work in such a manner as to unify the ranks of the working class in class struggles on economic and political issues, they must lead the workers to realize through class battles the deception practiced by revisionists, reformists and reactionaries to drag the working class from the revolutionary path, they should work in a manner and with an understanding to enable the working class to discharge its leading role in the people's democratic revolution, they should concentrate their activities in industries and concerns of strategic importance and they should build a network of secret and underground party organization among the working class and see that its advanced section is sent to organize revolutionary peasant struggles in the rural areas. This was a correct approach based on Marxism-Leninism. It sought to link the partial with the whole, it sought to link the economic struggle with political struggle, it sought to fight alien ideologies without disrupting class unity of the working class, it sought to combine the legal with illegal, open with secret and the party with the mass.

The May meeting also reviewed the implementation of the four tasks enumerated by the AICCCR in its first meeting and expressed satisfaction at the result of the work done by the state units.

The various state units had seriously undertaken the task of propagating Marxism-Leninism-Mao Tsetung Thought. Revolutionary students were in the forefront of this propaganda campaign. Gone were the days when reactionaries could go scot free after burning the effigies of Mao- Tse tung and Chou Enlai. Now Streets, college walls, roads, bridges, buildings proclaimed- "Long Live Mao Tsetung". Revisionism faced isolation and with each day passing, it grew more and more discredited. The communist revolutionaries had also seriously undertaken the task of propagating the politics of agrarian revolution. Not only that, in several states revolutionary mass struggles of the peasantry had already, begun developing under the leadership of the communist revolutionaries, the details of which are given in earlier paras.

The question of consolidation of all revolutionary groups was also considered. Prior to the May meeting of the AICCCR, the C.P.I (M) held its Burdwan plenum in April 1968. There it had adopted an ideological document, which refuted Maxism- Leninism and upheld revisionism openly. It rejected the alternative draft placed by Nagi Reddy, Pulla Reddy and the majority of the Andhra delegates as 'left' opportunism.

The CPI (M) leadership claimed later in its political organizational report:

*"This left sectarian understanding had already corroded the consciousness of a number of party members, as it was seen in the pre-Burdwan discussions, in the Burdwan discussions and the post-Burdwan splits and desertions. Had the party not been vigilant against this distortion, had it continued to accept blindly*

*all that came from the CPC, it would have found itself by now in the ranks of those who condemned the Soviet intervention in Czechoslovakia and indirectly supported American conspiracies. The Madurai document and the Burdwan decision, while they totally repudiated revisionism (sic?) in every form, asserted the independent position of the party".*

The Burdwan plenum was as a matter of fact an open and shameless rejection of revolutionary policies by the CPI (M) leadership.

Therefore, the AICCCR considered it its duty to contact the revolutionaries who still remained in that party and persuade them to join the AICCCR. In pursuance of this understanding two representatives of the AICCCR went to Burdwan and met Nagi Reddy and others. However, Nagi Reddy's group did not consider it proper to join AICCCR at that time. This group was the single group of revolutionaries which still wanted to remain in the CPI (M) for conducting inner party debate and for winning over the majority of the party members to revolutionary politics. The sum total of this approach of theirs meant that they disapproved the call of revolt issued by communist revolutionaries of Naxalbari, they disapproved the open revolt of the rank and file against the neo revisionist CPI (M) and they in the final analysis disapproved the formation of the AICCCR under the leadership of the communist revolutionaries of Naxalbari.

If all of us would have followed their reasonings, we would have found ourselves in the company of those who had adopted a revisionist ideological document, a document that slandered Chinese communist party. Not only that we would have found ourselves in the company of those who rejoiced at the rape of Czechoslovakia by the Soviet Social imperialists but finally we would have suppressed Naxalbari peasant struggle in practice and in league with reaction.

The Nagi Reddy group did not take initiative in contacting either the Naxalbari leadership or the AICCCR even for talks and, when the AICCCR took the initiative it did not agree to join the AICCCR. Thus owing to the erroneous attitude of the Nagi Reddy group, there arose a doubt, some sort of a distrust in the revolutionary ranks. And subsequent history was to prove that that doubt was at least partially confirmed, notwithstanding the deviations of the AICCCR.

Anyway, the rank and file in Andhra Pradesh were growing justifiably restive at the way Nagi Reddy and his colleagues were treating the question of consolidation of revolutionary forces, the question of struggle against revisionism and the question of launching Naxalbari type of armed struggle.

The May meeting of the AICCCR considered the situation arising out of the refusal of the Nagi Reddy group to join the AICCCR and decided to maintain contact with that group. At the same time, the AICCCR decided to contact those revolutionaries in Andhra Pradesh who were prepared to join the AICCCR. This decision was absolutely correct as it alone could unite and consolidate the revolutionary forces at that time. Not to do this would have led us to weaken the revolutionary will of the ranks, to isolation of the revolutionary forces, to their fragmentation and ultimate disintegration.

The May meeting issued a call to all the communist revolutionaries still inside the CPI (M) to repudiate revisionism and join the AICCCR. The call disapproved the existence of various groups and declared that further continuance of groups would jeopardize the interest of people and the cause of revolution.

Subsequent to this appeal the Srikakulam District Committee which was in forefront of revolutionary peasant struggle adopted a resolution supporting the call of the AICCCR and agreeing to join it in September 1968.

The resolution reads: -

**On joining the All India Co-ordination Committee: -**

"In the country, Naxalbari comrades stood in the forefront and carried on the inner party ideological struggle. They exposed the betrayal of the neo-revisionists before the people. They first raised the flag of revolt, applied Mao's Thought and blazed the way for all revolutionaries. Addressing the comrades still with the neo-revisionists, they stated in December (1967 - C.C) 'We call upon the revolutionary comrades still within the Communist Party of India (Marxist) to repudiate openly the neo-revisionist leading clique and politics and openly join hands with us who are striving to build a genuine communist party in our country.'"

Again in May 1968 revolutionaries from different states who had formed themselves into All India co-ordination Committee of Communist Revolutionaries requested the comrades still with the neo-revisionist clique and comrades in separate groups to join the AICCCR. They made it clear that old revolutionaries should realize the harm done to the Indian revolutionary movement by the existence of separate groups. As a result of these two public calls, many State Coordinating Committees of Communist revolutionaries joined the AICCCR. But our Andhra Coordination committee did not join them. The D.C. feels that this is a very regrettable position.

The D.C. approves the calls given by the AICCCR during December - May and agrees to join the AICCCR.

We hope the State Committee will approve the calls given by the AICCCR and join it".

This determined stand adopted by the Srikakulam D.C was bound to exercise tremendous influence among the revolutionary rank and file throughout the country in general and Andhra Pradesh in particular. The Andhra leadership came under mounting pressure of the ranks and it hurried for talks to Calcutta in October 1968, just on the eve of the AICCCR meeting. During the discussion, Nagi Reddy and his colleagues expressed their difference on two questions of principle i.e., whether Soviet Union had become a social imperialism and whether elections were to be boycotted, during the entire period of revolution. They, despite our repeated clarifications maintained their reservations on these two points of principle and assured us that they will study the question more deeply. Despite these differences of principle and as they assured us that they would deeply study the literature on these subjects, and also because Nagi Reddy accepted the decision of the AICCCR that he would resign his seat in the Assembly within two months, the AICCCR in its October 1968 meeting decided to affiliate the Andhra Pradesh

State Coordination Committee in the AICCCR, and asked the Srikakulam D.C which had already joined it to work under the AICCCR. It is not true as is being alleged by some comrades that Nagi Reddy and his colleagues had no basic difference with the AICCCR.

9. It is after the 1968 October meeting that a convention of revolutionary students and youths was held in Calcutta. Delegates from all parts of West Bengal participated in it. Inspired by the emergence of revolutionary peasant struggles in various parts of the country, inspired by the struggles against revisionists which had reached a new height and inspired by world shaking victories of the Chinese people in Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution, the student masses had begun to move in a massive manner to revolutionary politics. Mao Tse-tung Thought became a craze for the students and they clamoured for contributing their share in the revolutionary movement. In this background, the convention was called upon to formulate correct tasks for organization of the students and youth in revolutionary struggle. The convention adopted a programme for the youth and students. The programme sought to link economics with politics, immediate with the basic, partial with total. It was a programme of unleashing mass revolutionary struggle under mass organization of the students, a programme for struggle against revisionist ideology, a programme for solidarity struggles in support of working class, peasantry and other toiling people and a programme of integration with working class and peasantry for organizing them in revolutionary struggle. The programme was in the main a correct application of Marxism-Leninism-Mao Tsetung Thought on the student and youth fronts in India.

10. The May meeting of the AICCCR carried forward the struggle against revisionism still to a higher phase. While it reiterated the line of continuing and further unleashing mass revolutionary peasant struggle of Naxalbari type, it also formulated a correct line (in the main) for work in urban areas, particularly a correct line on the trade union front. The meeting dealt a heavy blow at revisionism and its much-trumpeted "parliamentary path" by summing up the experiences of the Indian people in the light of Marxism-Leninism-Mao Tsetung Thought and adopting the line of boycott of elections. The meeting also carried forward the line of unifying and consolidating the revolutionary ranks in order to lay a solid foundation for building genuine communist party in India.

11. In this phase i.e., in 1968 the Soviet Social Imperialism, in total defiance of world public opinion, marched its army into Czechoslovakia and occupied that country. It shot down people who demanded freedom from Soviet Social Imperialism in Czechoslovakia. The Soviet leaders who were themselves liquidating socialism in Soviet Union, who were now grossly engaged in restoration of capitalism in their own country and who were collaborating and contending with US imperialism for world hegemony could not reconcile themselves to the irresistible trend of modern history "countries want independence, nations want liberation and people want revolution" They trampled under their foot the sovereignty of Czechoslovakian people with a view to act as a puppet regime there, a regime that could obey their orders without murmur. The unbridled

exploitation carried out by the new Czars in Czechoslovakia had pushed the broad masses of the people of that country to mass revolt. The facade of 'Socialism' could no longer hide the ugly imperialist features of social imperialism. The rape of Czechoslovakia by the Soviet Union aroused the indignation of the world people. The Maxist - Lennist parties all the world over condemned the Russian aggression and supported the freedom movement of the Czechoslovak people, and the revisionist parties, on the contrary, danced to the batons of Soviet leaders and rushed to support the Russian aggression in the name of "Saving the Socialist system there." The AICCCR adopted a correct Marxist - Leninist and proletarian internationalist standpoint and condemned the Russian invasion. The CPI and the CPI (M) supported the Russian aggression in the name of defending the 'socialist system'. In the ranks of the AICCCR too the struggle between Marxism - Leninism and revisionism was bound to appear. Parimal Das Gupta came out publicly in support of Soviet aggression. So long as he conducted inner party struggle on the issue, the AICCCR patiently argued with him but after he publicly expressed himself against the AICCCR line, he was expelled. The decision to expel him was taken by W.B.SCCCR and was subsequently approved by the AICCCR. Charu Mazumdar wrote an article 'Parimal Babu's Rajniti' (politics of Parimal Babu) in Bengali to refute the revisionist thesis of Parimal Das Gupta. This article, while it correctly defended the Marxist- Leninist and proletarian international line of the AICCCR on the issue of Soviet aggression on Czechoslovakia, made dangerous 'left' opportunist formulations on the question of mass organization and economic struggle. The article advocated a wrong understanding of the revolutionary situation in India and denied the role of mass organizations like trade unions. These formulations of Charu were against the May decision of AICCCR.

12. However, it must be noted that though the decisions taken by the AICCCR in the first phase i.e., between Dec. 67 to March 69 were in the main correct, proper attention was not given to certain important questions. For example, some comrades had raised questions whether boycott of elections meant armed attacks on candidates and polling booths etc. Although the majority of the members of the AICCCR expressed their disagreement with the tactics of attacking booths and candidates in general, it left the question of tactics and forms to be decided locally. The experience later proved that subtlety and vagueness about this question led to both reformist and adventurist tactics in many places. In certain areas, the line of boycott of elections was interpreted not as a line exposing the parliamentary path preached by the revisionists, as a line of adopting the means and mobilizing them for revolutionary mass struggle, but a line for adventurist armed attacks on polling booths and candidates. In such areas, comrades, without the participation of the masses and sometimes in opposition to them, conducted armed attacks on candidates and booths and subsequently got themselves isolated from the people. In such areas, the slogan of boycott of elections failed to succeed.

Similarly, there were areas where comrades confined themselves to propaganda work only. They merely issued leaflets and posters, wrote slogans on walls in general but did not link it with organizing and mobilizing the people for

revolutionary mass struggle. In such areas, the slogan was bound to be understood as a negative slogan and masses therefore did not respond to it.

However, there were areas where cadres and units linked the slogans of boycott of elections with their immediate and basic issues and mobilized the masses for boycott of elections. In such areas (though very insignificant in size from an all India point of view) the masses boycotted the elections. The summing up of our experiences during the mid-term poll confirms the correctness of the view of those who were against armed attacks on booths and candidates and wanted to link the boycott slogan with the immediate and basic issues facing the people in various areas and wanted to educate, organize and mobilize the masses for taking to the revolutionary path of armed struggle. Unfortunately, there are still persons in our ranks who do not link the slogan of boycott of elections with revolutionary struggles and thus fall a victim to adventurism or reformism. They do not take this slogan dialectically but metaphysically.

Adventurists considered that the line of boycott of elections was a negative and passive line and a revolutionary alternative had to be evolved and thus, in the name of linking it up with political struggle against the State, adopted the dangerous line of attacking the booths and the candidates and thus drove the masses away from the revolutionary path. Reformism on the other hand turned the line of boycott of election into a lifeless, negative and passive slogan by not linking it up with organizing and mobilizing the masses for revolutionary mass struggle on immediate and basic issues facing the people. The result of both the varieties of opportunism was the same. Thus, the AICCCR failed to pay proper attention to the questions raised in May meeting on the issue of boycott of elections and link this slogan with the revolutionary mass struggles of the people.

13. Similarly, while the AICCCR correctly decided that revolutionaries should participate in economic and partial struggles in order to educate and organize the working class, the petty bourgeoisie and the students for political struggle, it did not extend the same line to the rural areas i.e., with regard to the peasants. Naxalbari comrades led by Charu Mazumdar had now begun stressing that the peasant struggle in Naxalbari was **not a struggle for land but for seizing political power**. Charu Mazumdar reported that Naxalbari struggle was no longer in the stage of Human peasant movement but that it had reached the stage of armed **guerrilla warfare**. As a matter of fact, the set back suffered by the Naxalbari struggle (it was admitted in a clear cut manner in the Terai report) owing to mounting repression launched by the government and other measures adopted by the reactionary and revisionist political parties and the mistakes committed by our comrades, had placed on the agenda altogether different task for the communist revolutionaries i.e., the task of integrating the party with the masses and overcoming the shortcomings mentioned in the Terai Report. The link between the party and masses had weakened, the mass organization of the peasants which had initiated and conducted the struggle was now ignored. Instead of consolidating these mass organizations and extending the areas of our struggle, Naxalbari comrades led by Charu Mazumdar drew wrong conclusion that mass organizations of the peasants i.e. Kisan Sabhas, were no



longer necessary and that they had become fetters in the development of armed struggle in the rural areas. Instead of rectifying the mistake-political, tactical, organizational and military that was leading to shrinkage in mass participation and disintegration of the Kisan Sabha, an erroneous thesis was advocated by Charu Mazumdar, that the Hunan stage (the stage of mass revolutionary struggle of the peasants against feudalism) was over and struggle for seizure of power had begun.

To Charu Mazumdar, economic and partial struggles did not appear necessary any more in Naxalbari area and therefore, the need of mass organization of the peasants (secret or open) was no longer felt. The Kisan Sabha units now could not function openly owing to severe repression and were becoming defunct. Instead of taking steps to revive the Kisan Sabha under changed conditions and functioning them secretly, the Naxalbari leadership altogether decided to dispense with them. The concept of Kisan committees as organ of peasants' rule came to be the substitute for the mass organization of the peasantry. It did not occur to them and later on (after April 1969) to all of us that peasant committees will develop into organs of peoples' rule only through a process, i.e., a process of class struggle on the agrarian questions, particularly the seizure of landlords' land and the process of armed guerrilla struggle against the State and not by a decree of the AICCCR.

The Naxalbari leadership now began to propagate against participation in economic and partial struggle in rural areas in general. To them it appeared that armed struggle for seizure of power would get diverted if economic or partial struggles were launched in the country side, and if there was no need of economic or partial struggle, then mass organizations like Kisan Sabhas were absolutely unnecessary.

Charu Mazumdar had found economic struggles useful in April 1967, when he made the following observations *"Naturally, the problem arises whether there is any further need for mass movements based on partial demands. There is certainly such a need now and it will remain in the future. India is a vast land and the peasantry is divided into many classes. Thus in every area and among all classes the level of political consciousness cannot be the same. Thus an opportunity will always exist for the peasant movements based on partial demands and communists must make good use of this opportunity."*

(Reproduced in *Liberation* November 1969 p. 83.)

However Charu Mazumdar and the leadership of Naxalbari now began to propound an entirely new thesis. Charu wrote in *Liberation* 8, 1968:

*"If the Naxalbari peasant struggle has any lesson for us it is this militant struggles must be carried on not for land, crops etc., but for seizure of state power".*

Com. Kanu Sanyal went back from the correct conception of the Terai report and began to echo Charu. He observed, *"The struggle of the Terai peasants is an armed struggle not for land, but for state power."* (*Liberation* 9, 1968. Emphasis ours).

The struggle for land, a struggle which is aimed at changing the property relations, a struggle that is directed to solve the basic issue of agrarian revolution was considered as an ordinary economic struggle by the leadership of the AICCCR.

The AICCCR, which had adopted a correct policy towards trade unions and partial and economic struggles of the working class and the urban bourgeoisie, succumbed to the line of abandoning economic and partial struggle in the rural areas and decided to do away with Kisan Sabha under the erroneous-understanding that while economic and partial struggles could be fought in towns as the struggle there was not for seizure of political power, they were a hindrance to the development of armed struggle in the country side, where struggle was directed towards seizure of political power.

Com. S.N. thought that economic and partial struggles were useful in mobilizing the peasant masses in new areas, but he too agreed that so far as areas where armed struggle were taking place, they would divert the movement for struggle for seizure of power into reformist channel.

In an article he observed: *"This, of course, does not mean that we do not take up economic issues in a new area where we begin work"* (Liberation- September 1969).

Naxalbari peasant struggle was itself a living example of how armed struggle could develop from struggles that were mostly of partial and economic nature.

It must be stated here that all the AICCCR members did not understand the real significance of peasant struggle for land. They did not understand the revolutionary significance of peasants seizing land for distribution among the landless and poor peasantry was the basic issue of the agrarian revolution and that it was not simple economic struggle. No one in the AICCCR ever raised the question that struggle for land alone could give meaning to armed struggle in a period when the principal consideration in the country was contradiction between feudalism and the broad masses of the people. No one raised the question that armed struggle could sustain in this period only when it was waged in defence of peasants' struggle for land and crops-the struggle for smashing feudal oppression and authority.

Many comrades including S.N. held the view that the role of mass peasant struggle like that in Hunan was not yet, over and that such mass struggles could be launched in new areas i.e., the areas where armed struggle had not begun. But the Naxalbari leadership, particularly Charu Mazumdar, considered that the stage of economic struggles were now over for the entire rural areas of the country.

Charu Mazumdar further developed his stand against forming mass organizations, against the tactics of combining the legal with illegal, open with secret and the other forms of struggle with armed struggle. As we have said earlier, in his article 'Parimal Babu's Rajniti' he took a major turn towards '*left opportunism*'. He stated: *"Open mass organization of the peasants will strengthen the tendency towards open movement and, as a result, we shall become leaders of another revisionist mass organization. The leadership of the poor and landless peasants can be established in the peasant movement only by building secret party organization among the peasants - so this struggle (guerrilla war) can be started only by propagating widely among the peasants the politics of seizure of political*

*power and this work can be done among the peasants by a party unit composed of poor and landless peasants— It is guerrilla war that is the only tactics of waging revolutionary war of the peasants. No mass organization can perform this task by open work."*

Thus Charu did not at all take into account unevenness of the movements in different parts of the country and sought to formulate a uniform tactic for the whole of the country irrespective of the level of development. He distorted the Marxist -Leninist concept of combining the legal with illegal, open with secret, other forms of struggle with armed struggle and party organization with mass organization and began to advocate wrong concept of "only illegal" "only secret" "only tactic of guerrilla war" and "only party units". He dropped even the idea of a secret mass organization. The principal was changed into only what appeared most strange was that he advocated a party unit comprising only of members from the landless and poor peasantry, a conception that has nothing to do with Marxism – Leninism. From refusal to recognize the revolutionary significance of mass organization in areas of armed struggle, Charu Mazumdar had begun to reject this significance even for other areas. He did not recognize any other form of struggle except the guerrilla war and completely ruled out any kind of open work. He counterposed legal against illegal, open against secret, mass organization against party organization and other forms of struggle against armed struggle.

Charu Mazumdar had now disowned the lessons of the Terai Report, the decisions of the AICCCR, his own earlier writings and the clearest understanding of the Spring Thunder over India. Charu Mazumdar himself had written in October, 1968.

*"There are both advanced and backward sections even within the revolutionary classes. The advanced section accepts revolutionary politics quickly and backward section naturally takes time to accept it. That is why there is the need for conducting economic struggle against the feudal class and this need will remain in future too. That is why the movement for seizing the harvest is necessary".*

(Build up the peasant class struggle through class analysis, investigation and practice)

Charu Mazumdar also over rode the decision of the AICCCR on task on the trade union front adopted at the May-1968 meeting. He wrote in 'Parmal Babu's Rajniti'.

*"In the period when the revolutionary situation prevails and when every struggle quickly turns into a clash, the trade union is not enough for tackling this revolutionary situation and in this revolutionary period, the class organization of the working class is the party organization that is why one must admit that today the task in India is to build up the secret party organization not mass organization, if one agrees that a revolutionary situation prevails in India".*

Charu Mazumdar had exaggerated the revolutionary situation and drew wrong conclusions. Every clash is not and cannot be construed as a political struggle. While it was correct to say that trade unions are not enough to tackle a revolutionary

situation (why a revolutionary situation alone, we should say any situation) and secret party organization is absolutely necessary if the proletariat intends to seize political power, it was totally a 'left' opportunist line to rule out mass organization altogether when every clash was not a political struggle.

Thus, by the end of the second phase, Charu Mazumdar and along with him the entire Naxalbari leadership abandoned the mass line, abandoned struggle for land and crops, rejected economic and partial struggle, rejected mass organization in rural and urban areas both and rejected all other forms of struggle except armed guerrilla struggle.

15. Although Charu Mazumdar and the Naxalbari leadership had begun to advocate the above mentioned 'left' opportunist concepts and thesis, they were not immediately accepted by the AICCCR. In Bihar, in areas of Monghyr, Ranchi, Darbhanga, the peasants were organized to seize the landlords' crops under the leadership of the communist revolutionaries as late as December – January 1969. The Bihar State Coordination Committee had instructed its members to participate in trade unions and economic struggles following the decisions of the AICCCR on T.U front in May 1968. Our members were in the forefront of mass struggle in Chandarpura Thermal Plant, Sindri Fertilizers and the Railway strike in Dhanbad. The Hatia Mazdoor union (S.N was still its General Secretary) was the decisive factor in the H.M.T.P strike which continued from the last week of April 1969 to first week of May 1969. The Bihar State Coordination Committee had not agreed to reject mass struggles of the workers on economic and partial demands till December 1969. It had not agreed to rule out mass struggles of the peasants on economic and partial demands for organizing new areas in the countryside till December 1969. However S.N and the Bihar State Coordination Committee advocated and practiced the wrong and 'left' opportunist understanding that partial and economic struggles would divert the peasants from the path of armed struggle **in area where armed struggle had begun.** That is why, after April 1969, when the first armed guerrilla attack on tyrant landlords began in Deoria area of Muzaffarpur district, no mass peasant struggles were initiated or launched there. However, mass organization of the peasants, the Kisan Sangram Samitees were continuing (not thana or district level) in villages. The concept that these committees had become organs of people's rule and were not mass organizations was still not there in Bihar.

16. It was the 'left' opportunist understanding of Charu Mazumdar and the leadership of Naxalbari which was primarily responsible for formulating the dangerous thesis of "no economic struggle, no mass organization, no open work" This understanding found its reflection not only in our work among the peasants, working class, petty bourgeois intelligentsia but also among students. The mass revolutionary peasants' struggles and the armed struggle in various parts of the country had tremendous impact on the broad masses of the students. The students took out massive demonstrations, clashed with police, propagated revolutionary politics and popularized in a demonstrative manner Mao – Tsetung Thought. There

were powerful students' organizations in west Bengal, Andhra Pradesh, Bihar, U.P, Punjab, Kerala, etc. under the leadership of communist revolutionaries. The line of "no mass organization, no economic struggles" created a peculiar situation for our students. In order to get over that Charu Mazumdar gave the directive to organize Red Guard movement on the pattern of the Great proletarian Cultural Revolution in China. Hundreds of students went to the villages propagated the politics of armed struggle and then came back. Though this directive was a mechanical application of China's cultural revolution, it initially led to popularization of our political line in a number of areas. However, the Red Guard movement was intended to win away the mass of students from economic and partial struggles and also from mass organizations. Hence it could not be sustained indefinitely as it was no answer to the daily problems that the student masses were called upon to face.

17. The revolutionary mass struggles of the peasants in Naxalbari, Debra-Gopiballabhapur, Mushahri, Srikakulam and Punjab and the militant struggles of the students in many parts of the country under the leadership of the AICCCR had a great effect on various groups of communist revolutionaries who were still maintaining independent entity. Many revolutionary cadres had broken away from their parent groups and joined the Coordination Committee. The AICCCR was now regarded as the political organizational leadership and the centre of Indian revolution.

However owing to 'left' opportunist politics that had emerged in the leadership of the AICCCR, there was bound to appear 'left' sectarianism and authoritarianism in the organization. In Andhra Pradesh CCCR political and organizational differences had appeared even before it had joined the AICCCR. There were differences on the question of giving training to guerrillas, on the question of launching the armed struggle in Srikakulam and in other regions and on some other questions. The extreme hesitation exhibited by Nagi Reddy and his colleagues in responding to the call of revolt given by the Naxalbari comrades, the hesitation in joining the AICCCR, their reservations about the slogan of boycott of elections and Soviet state becoming Social – Imperialist had further created a fund of distrust. In this situation it was natural for Srikakulam District committee, which was in the forefront of struggle, not to agree to the principle of democratic centralism in its relation with the Pradesh CCCR. They were completely justified in maintaining that they will abide by agreed decisions. As a matter of fact throughout India, many coordination committees followed this pattern. Any way, it was not a peculiar feature of Andhra Pradesh alone. Insistence of the Pradesh leadership for strict adherence to democratic centralism only further strengthened the distrust of Srikakulam comrades.

Besides, Nagi Reddy had agreed that within two months he would resign his seat in the assembly, but he did not do so in the stipulated period. All these created a situation in which criticism and counter criticism began in the ranks and then among the masses following the party. The Srikakulam D.C. was maintaining contact with the AICCCR centre which consisted of Bengal comrades led by Charu.

The AICCCR met in Feb 1969. Charu Mazumdar reported to the meeting that Nagi Reddy and his group were putting obstacles in the development of armed struggle in Srikakulam, they were carrying on factional activities and were interested in disrupting the unity of the revolutionaries. He reported that their further continuance with the AICCCR would jeopardize the cause of armed struggle in Andhra Pradesh. The previous hesitations and reservations of Nagi Reddy and his group had already made the AICCCR suspicious. Now it was a question to choose between his group and the Srikakulam D.C., which was in the forefront of armed struggle. The AICCCR decided to disaffiliate the APCCCR and recognize the Srikakulam D.C. as the organizer of the Pradesh coordination committee. The AICCCR however decided that its relation with Nagi Reddy group would be non antagonistic.

Nevertheless the AICCCR exhibited a blatant bureaucratic attitude, when it refused to listen to the representative of the APCCCR Kolla Venkayya.

The AICCCR should have patiently heard Kolla Venkayya, should have intervened and appointed a commission to investigate the charges and counter charges and tried to resolve the differences in a party manner. Summary disaffiliation was essentially a bureaucratic step.

Later on i.e., Oct 1970, it was learned that the S.K.L leadership did not want a split but it was persuaded to agree by Charu Mazumdar. We also came to know that Charu Mazumdar had, in his anxiety to isolate Nagi Reddy group, joined hands with Venkataratnam group, a group that ultimately turned out to be rotten eggs. The facts that S.K.L comrades were actually opposed to a split and Charu was maintaining contact with Venkataratnam group were not known to any member of the AICCCR outside West Bengal actually. Charu had now begun to act in a factional manner in the AICCCR. He would first talk with the West Bengal and Srikakulam comrades and make them agree to the decision he wanted the AICCCR to adopt and then go unitedly in the AICCCR meeting. In this condition, it was impossible for other AICCCR members to know the real opinion of Bengal and Andhra comrades. There was virtually another AICCCR in the AICCCR and that consisted of those who had already started calling Charu Mazumdar "respected and beloved leader" i.e., of those who regarded him as infallible authority and did not tolerate anybody having difference of opinion with the "Respected leader:

The AICCCR was thus ill informed about many vital aspects of the contradictions that had arisen between the S.K.L.D.C. and the Pradesh leadership. It must however be admitted that the AICCCR acted in haste, adopted a subjective and bureaucratic attitude and departed from the principles of democratic centralism in handling the contradictions in Andhra provincial Coordination committees.

Nevertheless, the primary political responsibility for the birth and growth of contradiction and the ultimate disaffiliation of the AICCCR rests with the leadership of the AICCCR. It is regrettable that some of them are still refusing to own up their share of mistake on this score

18. In this phase the struggle between two lines became very sharp on the question of forming the party. Charu Mazumdar and along with him the whole of W. Bengal

leadership were refusing to form the party on the plea that it was to be formed "from below" that the first and foremost thing was to unleash armed guerrilla struggle and in course of such a struggle, cadres and leaders would be tested and then a revolutionary party would arise, a party that would be pure and without errors. They wrongly interpreted the party history to justify their stand point. They said that so far every revolt of the rank and file was utilized by the revisionists of one brand or another to seize control of the party in order to divert it from the revolutionary path.

There was already another group which had not joined the AICCCR and was opposing it politically and organisationally all the time, which was advocating the theory of "historical inevitability of groups" and opposed the Marxist – Leninist theory of historical necessity of building the party. This group advocated the view that in the present stage it was wrong to form the party and even the AICCCR. The group preached that groups should maintain their separate entity and conduct class struggles for teseted-revolutionaries for a long time( how long , it did not mention). Then, only after tested revolutionaries emerged at a certain stage of development, a genuine party, a party which would have no deviation, would emerge and till such a stage arrived the "groups were historically inevitable." The protagonist of this theory of 'historical inevitability of groups' were called the "Dakshin Desh Group". They derived this name from their organ that they published from Bengal.

There was thus a striking resemblance between the concepts of Charu Mazumdar and the West Bengal leadership and the Dakshin Desh. They advocated the concept of a 'pure' party , a party 'with out errors' a party 'without contradictions' and a party that shall never suffer the troubles from revisionism. Their theory negated the leading role of ideology of politics and relied on 'actions' and 'struggles' which would automatically give birth to a revolutionary party. Little did they realize that "actions" and struggles "would automatically give birth to a squad or mass organisation and not a party. Little did they realise that their theory was at best a worship of spontaneity. Little did they realise that their theory meant concept of bringing about a revolution without the party, without politics. Little did they realise that they were substituting Dialectical Materialism with subjective idealism on the question of party building . S.N wrote an article criticising the theory of historical inevitability of 'groups' advocated by Dakshin Desh. This article was published by the Hindi organ of the AICCCR (Lok Yudh). However the AICCCR leadership refused to publish it in "*Liberation*" or "*Deshbrat*" when they came to know its contents.

In AICCCR, Shiv Kumar Mishra and S.N. waged a continuous struggle against erroneous concepts about party building advanced by Charu Mazumdar. But the entire West Bengal leadership stubbornly supported Charu. Only in Feb 1969 meeting of the AICCCR, after the exit of Nagi Reddy group and Parimal Das Gupta and after the S.K.L leadership was entrusted with the task of organising the Andhra pradesh Coordination i.e., after Charu thought that he had majority of the AICCCR who already regarded him as the authority, did he himself suggest that the party should be formed. When comrades, prominent among them S.N and

Shiv kumar Mishra, pressed for knowing the reasons of a change in his position on the issue of party formation he grudgingly offered a self criticism that his conception was wrong and idealist.

Now, the majority had agreed to form the party. A resolution drafted by S.N entitled 'it is time to form the party' containing self-criticism of the AICCCR on its erroneous conception of party building was adopted by the AICCCR. The resolution called upon all the Marxist – Leninists to disband their groups and join the efforts to build a genuine communist party in India. This resolution was necessary as revolutionaries, by and large, had fallen victim to the wrong conception of '*building the party from below*' and the concept of a '*pure party through struggles*'.

Apart from the above mentioned erroneous concept, Charu Mazumdar had some other erroneous concepts too. He had a wrong conception regarding the contradiction between old and new. He tried to put the young against the old cadres in the AICCCR. His opinion was that all the old cadres in the AICCCR, who were in the CPI and CPI (M) and were now in the coordination, had long association with revisionism and were hardly of any use. He sought to distort the history of the party, the history of struggle between two lines and thus sought to negate the entire past. He mentioned only the association of those old cadres with revisionists and not their struggle against them. He mentioned only their old age and not their experience. Although he himself was one of many such cadres but he placed himself above everybody else.

Similarly he highly and correctly commended the revolutionary ardour of the young cadres, but never mentioned their lack of experience or lack of theoretical maturity. His conception of contradiction between old and new was a perversion of Marxism – Leninism. It led to the concept of a soldiers' party, a party of arms-bearing youth without ideology and politics, a party in which no other old cadre was needed except Charu. This erroneous conception led to a State Committee member in U.P demanding for a soldier secretary for the State Committee. It led to some good for nothings in Bihar to demand that Com. Nripen Banerjee who fought and suffered till his last days to serve the cause of the people, be removed from the leadership of the state as he was too old. They called him a Jhoal Maal (tattered rag).

The Marxist conception of combining the old with new, combining experience with vigour in building the leadership at all levels was being abandoned. But this concept was being propagated in a clandestine manner and not openly in the AICCCR meetings. Hence it was difficult to detect it and fight it in time. Undoubtedly this conception led to dangerous consequences for the party at a later stage.

The areas of armed struggle most enthusiastically welcomed the resolution of the AICCCR for party formation. They had realised from their practical experience and every day life that a loose coordination was not at all effective to organise, lead and develop revolutionary struggles. It was only a revolutionary party, a monolithic party, a party which took Marxism – Leninism-Mao Tsetung Thought as its guide, which pursued a revolutionary style, practiced criticism, self-criticism



and functioned on the principle of Democratic Centralism that could mobilise and lead the Indian revolutionaries and the Indian people to victory over their enemies. As a matter of fact many state coordination committees were already functioning on this basis.

On the other hand, there were in each state a few people who were functioning in groups. Some of them vehemently opposed the resolution and decided to keep their identity. There were some who sensed the wind and decided to support the resolution, though they were opposing the formation of the party so long.

The resolution had created tremendous enthusiasm among the communist revolutionaries and the masses following them.

The AICCCR adopted a political resolution and an organisational resolution. While the political resolution laid down in explicit terms the basic points of the party programme the organisational resolution laid down the line for building the party. After debate and amendments they were unanimously adopted by the AICCCR. As these documents are not available, it is difficult to remember their errors. However, the basic points on which the Party Programme and Party Constitution were formulated were laid down in these documents.

20. The last session of the AICCCR was held on April 22, 1969, the birth anniversary of Lenin. The AICCCR considered the reactions of the State Coordination Committees and also that of the general rank and file of the AICCCR with regard to the party formation. Almost all the State Coordination Committees had decided unanimously in favour of forming the party immediately. The AICCCR therefore decided to form the party by electing a central organisation committee out of its midst.

In this meeting representative of Jammu and Kashmir unit of the Coordination Committee was also present for the first time.

In the meeting there was difference among them on the question of the name of the party. However, unanimously, the suggestion advanced by S.N that the name of the party should be CPI (ML) was accepted.

The AICCCR was a very large body and so it was decided to form a smaller C.O.C out of its midst. On the basis of evaluation of the members of the AICCCR, unanimously the following were elected in the C.O.C.

1. Charu Mazumdar 2. Kanu Sanyal 3. Sushital Roy Chowdhary 4. Saroj Dutta 5. Souren Bose- all from west Bengal 6. Satyanarian Singh-Bihar 7. Shiv Kumar Mishra 8. R.P Sharaf -J&K 9. P.Krishnamurty- Andhra 10. Tejeshwar Rao - Andhra 11. Appu-Tamilnadu

After electing the C.O.C the AICCCR dissolved itself. Charu Mazumdar was unanimously elected the General secretary of the C.O.C.

21. The AICCCR, though it committed some political and organisational mistakes of 'left' opportunism and authoritarianism in its last days, though it had started drifting away from the lessons of the Chinese revolution, Telangana peasant revolt and the Naxalbari peasant uprising because of the collective departure of the Naxalbari leaders from mass line, it must be stated that taken in totality, it played a great historical role in advancing the cause of the Indian people and Indian

revolution. It was successful in propagating Marxism – Leninism – Mao Tsetung Thought in India on a massive scale. It was successful in launching and leading revolutionary mass struggles of the peasantry on agrarian issues and it initiated and developed armed struggle in the several parts of the country. It launched powerful assaults on reformism and parliamentarianism, carried the struggle against revisionism to a higher phase. It unified and consolidated in the main the ranks of the communist revolutionaries and rallied them under its banner smashing the alien and anti –Marxist theories of “historical inevitability of groups” and building a “pure” party from “below”. It was successful in initiating the building up of a genuine communist party by first forming it and thus it laid the foundation of building the CPI (ML) as the political, organisational leader of the Indian revolution.

The formation of the party on 22<sup>nd</sup> April 1969, on Lenin’s birth anniversary, was a great victory for Marxism-Leninism-Mao Tsetung Thought in India, a great victory for the Indian proletariat and the Indian people in their long march towards freedom and socialism and a great victory of the world proletariat and world people fighting against imperialism, social – imperialism and reaction. The blood shed by the best sons and daughters of the Indian people in struggle for India’s liberation had blossomed in the form of CPI (ML).

### **The third Phase –April 1969 to Nov 1971:**

22. The period following the formation of the party in April 1969 till Nov 1971 was a period in which we came across the highest manifestation of ‘left’ opportunism in politics and ‘authoritarianism’ in organisation. This was at the same time a period in which sharp struggle developed between Marxism – Leninism and ‘left’ opportunism, a struggle that is still continuing. After the C.O.C. meeting, Charu Mazumdar and the West Bengal leadership began their campaign for ‘establishing’ Charu Mazumdar’s ‘authority in the party’. Souren Bose, Saroj Dutta, Kanu Sanyal, were the chief campaigners in favour of establishing Charu Mazumdar’s authority in the party. They chose Naxalbari first and then the entire party organisation in W. Bengal for the experiment. The historical significance of Naxalbari struggle in national and international sphere, the recognition of the party and its leader Charu Mazumdar by the fraternal parties, particularly the C.P.C, the growth of revolutionary peasant struggle and armed struggle in various parts of the country, the emergence of Srikakulam, Mushahari, Surajgarh, Midnapur, Unnao, Nainital and some areas in the Punjab as areas of peasants’ armed struggles and consolidation of major revolutionary forces in the party had tremendously enhanced the prestige and image of the W. Bengal leadership particularly Charu Mazumdar. A delegation had been sent twice to meet fraternal parties and they had returned declaring that the “*leadership of Charu Mazumdar was the surest guarantee for victory in Indian revolution*”, Charu was ‘*the greatest Marxist – Leninist outside China*’ and that his authority must be established in the party if revisionism was to be finally smashed and its re- emergence prevented.

This campaign of establishing Charu’s authority in the party was launched by the W. Bengal leadership as differences had already begun to appear in the party on several questions concerning the party line. These differences first appeared in

W. Bengal State Organising Committee as their 'left' opportunist line began to be implemented there from the very moment they were pronounced. The line of no economic or partial mass struggles, no mass organisation, no open activity was being practiced there much before the C.O.C was formed. Now Charu was already propagating the line of 'annihilating' the class enemies as this was the only 'action' possible for cadres in absence of mass struggles and mass organisation. And therefore, its consequences were already being felt by a number of leading comrades who naturally began to ask questions. Differences appeared in the West Bengal P.O.C over the interpretation of a formulation (in truncated form) from Linpiao's article 'Long Live the victory of the people's war'. That formulation is "*Guerrilla warfare is the only way to mobilise and apply the whole strength of the people against the enemy*". Differences arose whether mass struggles on economic and partial demands were no longer necessary, whether 'actions' were the only thing to be organised, whether armed struggle was the only form of class struggle and whether legal work was no longer necessary and whether working class had any role to play in the revolution. Similarly there were differences on the question of establishing the authority of Charu Mazumdar in the party. The West Bengal P.O.C by a majority decision not only upheld the political line now being advocated by Charu Mazumdar but also upheld the authority of Charu Mazumdar. The P.O.C now had decided that differences with Charu Mazumdar's views would be departure from Marxism – Leninism – Mao Tsetung Thought. This step was indeed a blow to inner party democracy, a blow to Democratic Centralism and a step towards establishing a bureaucratic personal regime in the party. However, the comrades outside West Bengal did not know these things then. The authors of the "authority doctrine" wanted to carry their battle in installments i.e., first the authority be established one area, then it should be carried forward to another and so on till it was established over the entire party by the mandate of the Party Congress. Thus, instead of deciding the issues of differences by collective decision in the light of Marxism – Leninism -Mao Tsetung Thought, in the light of our own experiences and in a party manner by the method of Democratic Centralism, a device was being installed to silence criticism and to muffle the differing voices. Asit Sen and some of his associates who had expressed differences with the line were sought to be silenced by bringing in the question of Charu Mazumdar's authority. However, Asit Sen and his associates stuck to their views and they were sought to be isolated from the party. Asit Sen too acted in an un-Marxist manner by bringing about a pamphlet entitled "Aar ek ti Bipetjanak line" (Another dangerous line) and distributing it in public. He did not send either his document to the C.O.C. nor approached the C.O.C to intervene and stop the high handedness of the W.B.P.O Committee, though, one cannot say today whether anything effective could have been done by the C.O.C. at 'that time'. The West Bengal P.O.C expelled Asit Sen.

23. S.N met Asit Sen on his own initiative and had a long discussion with him. S.N advised Asit Sen to withdraw his document from public circulation after his self- criticism for having done so and take the matter to the C.O.C. for discussion

and decisions. But Asit Sen did not agree. In the C.O.C. meeting Charu and some others of the West Bengal leadership criticised S.N for going to an expelled member for discussion without prior permission of the C.O.C. S.N maintained that in the larger interest of the party he had gone to discuss things with Asis Sen and that his views at least must be discussed. But that was not accepted. The pamphlet of Asit Sen had two aspects – positive and negative. While he had correctly defended Marxism- Leninism from 'left' opportunist distortions on the question of participation in mass struggles on economic and partial demands. While he had correctly stressed the need of organising the working class for revolution by participation in trade unions etc. and while he correctly ridiculed the idea of organizing 'action' 'by hook or crook, he had advanced a peculiar theory of a 'proletarian party'. The substance of his thesis was that first the working class be organised in trade unions and then politically educated in course of economic and partial struggles. And only when we are able to build a party composed of working class cadres mainly, steeled and tempered through class struggles, the party can be called a proletarian party. And only such working class cadres should be sent to organise the peasantry in the countryside. According to him sending the petty bourgeois cadres to rural areas would automatically lead to adventurism. Therefore, his line on party building meant that till a real proletarian party was built, concentration should be in towns and industrial areas where party cadres from working class could be recruited, educated, steeled and tempered. Thus, he was opposing the Marxist – Leninist concept that the building of the party is primarily its ideological – political building and was reducing the entire question of building a proletarian party to physical predominance of members and leaders with working class origin. It would lead to the conclusion that British Labour Party was the model proletarian party as it consisted mainly of members with working class origin. It would lead to mean that C.P.C. and other Marxist- Leninist parties where party members and leaders with working class origin were a smaller party of the whole, are petty bourgeoisie parties. This was a ridiculous theory and a hundred percent vulgarization of the concept of proletarian party in order to appease the backward workers and cadres. The immediate practical implication of Asit's line in party building was, if implemented, it would divert the party from giving priority to organising the rural areas, it would mean weakening the revolutionary peasant struggle and armed struggle. Asit's line would make the party town – based instead of rural based. However, it was strange that for sometime no criticism of this line was written by the party leadership. After some time S.N wrote an article refuting Asit's thesis on the question of building a proletarian party. Though S.N correctly defended the correct Marxist- Leninist concept of party building from Asit's vulgarisation and correctly exposed the practical implication of his thesis, he defended 'annihilation of class enemies' as a necessary step to smash feudal authority in the countryside. Actually the meaning of 'Annihilation of the class enemies' which it came to bear little later, was not yet understood.

### **Mushahari and its lessons:**

24. An article written by S.N was published in Liberation some time before the party was formed. In this article the role of economic and partial struggle and Kisan Sangram Samitee in mobilising the peasants for higher form of struggles were brought out. The mass resistance of the peasantry was upheld. The article correctly brought out the necessity of relying on the landless and poor peasants in agrarian struggles. It correctly laid down the tactics of small units, constant mobility and constant expansion of the areas to be followed by armed guerrilla squads in the plain area. However the 'left' opportunist understanding on the relation between struggle for land and armed struggle for seizure of political power was reflected in as much as it was not mentioned and stressed. Secondly, the importance of favourable terrain for building rural base areas was completely negated and the differences between mountainous river valleys and plain areas for building small or extensive but durable base areas was absolutely obliterated by a slogan that 'people are the mountains and people are the jungles'. Politically and strategically this slogan was correct but militarily and tactically this slogan was 'left opportunist'. It led to a wrong concept in the party as a whole and particularly in Bihar that with Mushahari as its centre, a durable base area could be developed in the northern plain areas. This concept is mainly responsible for the set back suffered by the party in Bihar.

Thirdly, while correctly stressing reliability on traditional weapons for developing armed struggle, the article negated the role of fire arms and such other modern weapons that could be procured with ease i.e., with little effort.

Fourthly, no distinction was made whether our armed guerrilla struggle was in the stage of strategic defence or of strategic offence .i.e., whether our squads were to act in self defence mainly or in offensive actions mainly. The failure to point out that our armed squads were to act principally in self-defence and non-principally in offensive was a result of 'left' opportunist understanding on that question.

*'Mushahari and its lessons'* had contained the above mistakes in matters of principles and tactics.

25. In first C.O.C meeting, at the instance of the Charu Mazumdar, some extract called summary of the talks held between the Naxalbari comrades and the leadership of a fraternal party, was read out by Souren Bose. The "summary" only stressed the correct leadership of Charu Mazumdar. When the C.O.C. members demanded that the entire minutes of the talks be placed in the C.O.C. Charu Mazumdar rejected it saying that the minutes will be produced at an opportune moment and comrades should have patience and have confidence in me. Actually Charu and those of his thinking in West Bengal had now initiated the inner party struggle to install Charu as the infallible authority in the party. In Deshabrati and Liberation he was already being referred to as the most respected and beloved leader of the party and people. Now with Charu becoming the General Secretary of the party the C.O.C. was being rallied to give it a formal recognition. However the doctored 'summary' of

the talks and its particular contents could not win any adherents in the C.O.C. except the members belonging to West Bengal. Com. P. Krishnamurty of Andhra too was a man of independent judgement and he did not fall a victim despite repeated attempts by Charu and his associates.

Another important thing that happened was a letter from Ceylonese party. In this letter our open declaration of Sriakulam as Yenan of India and our approach to the trade unions were criticised in a fraternal manner. But the certificate of correct line being pursued by Charu Mazumdar by another fraternal party, a fraternal party enjoying the confidence of the world proletariat, was too fresh in the minds of comrades and thus the criticism of Ceylonese party was rejected in a summary fashion. We still do not know if any reply was sent to the Ceylonese party by our leadership or it was simply ignored.

Finding that the Bihar State Committee had, as late as May 1969 participated in the HMTP workers strike at Hatia, the Liberation carried an article in No. 10, vol 2 of August 1969 from the Australian Communist No. 32, the theoretical journal of that party, under the caption "Trade unions: Capitalist or worker Organization." In this article summing up the experiences of the trade union movement in a capitalist country like Australia, it was pointed out that the trade unions had turned into their opposites i.e. from the weapon of the working class into the weapon of the capitalist class. This line of boycotting trade union movements or T.U organisations was sought to be mechanically applied in India, a semi colonial and semi feudal country. As far as Bihar was concerned this line was not accepted and we still worked in the trade unions and these trade unions were not recognised by the managements. They enjoyed the massive support of the workers and they had not become the weapon of the capitalist class. On the contrary they were and are still, fighting weapons of the workers and suffered extreme form of repression. The Australian article had not been able to convince us. The line of boycott of trade unions involved also the boycott of economic and partial struggle of the working class and urban petty bourgeoisie. It meant a snapping of the ties of the party from the daily struggles of the toiling masses and ultimately with the people. The trade unions might have turned into their opposite in the developed capitalist country like Australia owing to the existence and a growth of a strong labour aristocracy, but in India, the trade unions still retained their validity.

This article succeeded in breaking the resistance of many among us against the line of boycott of trade unions and economic struggle in the urban area.

26. During this phase the 'left' opportunism that had arisen by the end of the second phase, developed in full form. It found its expression in the theoretical and practical work of the party programme (both draft and the one adopted by the 8<sup>th</sup> Congress), in evaluating the political situation in the world and the country, in tactical line of the party, in its military line and its organisational line.

The C.O.C. met in August 1969 or the first week of September to discuss the draft party programme and the draft party Constitution.

The draft party programme written by Com. Sushital Roy Chowdhary was rejected and S.N. was entrusted with the task of preparing another draft in the

meeting itself. The draft committed the following errors of principles. The main errors were:

1. It described the country as a country of peasants and thus negated the other sections of people including the proletariat.

2. It treated the entire bourgeoisie as comprador in nature and denied the existence of the national bourgeoisie i.e., altogether.

3. It considered synonymous the contradiction between landlords and peasants and the contradiction between feudalism and broad masses of the people.

4. It deviated from the correct Marxist Leninist thesis of forging the revolutionary united front from the very beginning as a process in course of revolutionary struggles of the anti imperialist and anti feudal classes and advocated an erroneous theory of building revolutionary united front after one or more than one area was liberated through armed struggle.

5. It denied the concept of a protracted people's war and the importance of establishing consolidated extensive and durable base areas in the countryside and advocated "innumerable small bases of armed struggle." Besides it advocated guerilla struggle as the only form of struggle and denied other forms of struggle.

6. It denied the concept that sovereignty belonged to the people, and also denied the fundamental rights i.e., freedom of speech and press, of assembly and association etc. of the people.

7. It denied that peoples political power at all levels be exercised through elected bodies and advocated constituting revolutionary committees, thus mechanically copying an organizational form in the period of the Cultural Revolution in China.

8. It vulgarized the concept of proletarian internationalism and in the sphere of foreign policy advocated subordination to a fraternal Party and country. It failed to evolve an independent and correct approach of the People's Democratic State in India in the sphere of foreign policy.

There were sharp differences on some of the concepts advanced in the draft. Long discussion took place on the question of the comprador character of the entire Indian bourgeoisie. Those who advocated that the entire bourgeoisie in India was comprador in nature argued that India was for long period a colonial country under the direct rule of a single imperialist power, Britain, and therefore the bourgeoisie in India was nurtured by British imperialism and it could not develop a national bourgeoisie strata. Whereas China was a semi colonial country where many imperialists contended and this made the emergence and growth of a national bourgeoisie strata possible in China. They referred to the participation of the national bourgeoisie led by Sun Yat Sen in armed struggle against imperialism and their alliance with C.P.C. and the policy of friendship with Soviet Union and showed that there were no such evidences in India.

On the other hand, those who advocated the existence of national bourgeoisie in India maintained that there were national bourgeoisie leaders in India who really opposed imperialism. Some of them mentioned Tilak etc. They pointed out that the party of the proletariat in India the CPI, itself did not take to the path of armed

struggle against imperialism. On the contrary they trailed behind the Indian National Congress, the party of the comprador big bourgeoisie and big feudal landlords. And therefore the flabby national bourgeoisie could only trail behind the leadership of Indian National Congress. Therefore launching or non-launching of armed struggle does not determine the existence or otherwise of the national bourgeoisie. Charu and S.N along with the whole leadership of Bengal had taken the position that the entire bourgeoisie was comprador in character while some others had taken the position that there existed a national bourgeoisie in India.

In order to bridge the difference that seemed unsurmountable at that time S.N. suggested that deeper study was needed to arrive at a unified understanding on this question, therefore let the entire bourgeoisie be considered as comprador in nature and then small and middle bourgeoisie be included in the revolutionary united front as they are bound to develop contradiction with the comprador bourgeoisie when armed struggle led by the proletariat reached a particular point. Hence self-contradictory formulations were introduced in the Draft Programme. It was an opportunistic compromise in matter of principle but superficial knowledge of Indian history and lack of maturity in Marxism led to this self-contradictory formulation. Though an apparent unity was achieved the problem remained where it was. After further study S.N. came to the conclusion in January 1971 that his stand was wrong and subjective and that only big bourgeoisie was comprador and he offered his self-criticism in the Bihar State Committee of the party.

On the second point too, differences expressed themselves sharply in the C.O.C. Charu and the West Bengal leadership insisted that the principal contradiction at this phase of our revolution be formulated as one between the landlords and the peasants, whereas S.N. insisted that it be formulated as one between feudalism and the broad masses of the people. The argument of Charu was that he was only concretizing the contradictions in distinct class terms and making it precise, whereas S.N maintained that feudalism was not only the enemy of the peasants but it is also the enemy of the working class, urban petty bourgeoisie and small and middle bourgeoisie too, that it was the social base of imperialism and is acting as the principal fetter in development of productive forces and that agrarian revolution was the task for the entire people. Therefore the principal contradiction be formulated as one between feudalism and the broad masses of people.

Again as in the case of the national bourgeoisie a compromise on matters of principle was arrived at to maintain unity. It was mentioned *"the principal contradiction at this phase of revolution was between landlord and peasant i.e., between feudalism and the broad masses of people."* This formulation was unanimously accepted. Regarding the fifth point also differences arose. But Souren Bose said that Charu Mazumdar would not compromise at all on the question of *"Guerrilla war as the only way"* and not change his interpretation of the same and moreover, that whole para has to be included in the draft programme without any change whatsoever. A hitch of first magnitude had arisen. They were not even prepared for any change to remove clumsiness of the para. And the entire C.O.C. agreed to it. The entire para concerning the path of Indian revolution had



been written by Charu and inserted in the programme even without changing any punctuation mark.

It must be admitted that on all other errors of principle contained in the Draft programme there was no difference at all and the entire C.O.C. is responsible for it.

So far as the Constitution was concerned there was not much discussion on it. Both these drafts were then released for discussion in the ranks.

27. Charu Mazumdar wrote an article on the basis of Draft programme under the caption "*China's Chairman is our Chairman, Chinese path is our path*" and it appeared in 'Liberation' Vol 3, November 1969. This slogan completely distorted the relations among the Marxist-Leninist parties. It upheld the conception of a teacher party and a pupil party. Besides antagonizing the national sentiments of the Indian people, it also embarrassed the C.P.C. Every one knows that CPC upholds and practices the principles of equality, fraternity and mutual support in its relations with other genuine Marxist – Leninist parties and opposes resolutely the concept of a leader and follower parties in the international Communist movement. This slogan damaged our cause a great deal. It was indeed, a vulgarisation of the Marxist-Leninist concept of proletarian internationalism. While it was correct and natural to show love and respect to Com. Mao Tse tung, it was absolutely wrong and ridiculous to call him the Charman of the Party of another country and that too when it was not a fact.

28. As we have said earlier, a negative attitude towards mass economic struggles and mass organisations had emerged and developed in the Naxalbari leadership owing to Charu Mazumdar's insistence.

In such a condition the only course for initiating and developing armed struggle could be "Guerrilla actions" against the landlords individually (individually because of the small number of squads & guerrillas). And the only form of organisation could be "Guerilla squads". The role of the people, party and politics in struggle for seizure of political power was thus completely negated. Now the main thing was "Guerrilla actions" by guerilla "squads" and the logical result of such a line in the sphere of style of work would be conspiratorial. In substance a line of assassinating individual landlords by a squad or individual in a conspiratorial manner, without people, without politics and without party and without any struggle against the state apparatus, was given. The understanding given in the "*Three documents of the AICCCR*" which proposed conspiratorial method and upheld peoples war was now completely being abandoned.

Charu now wrote his much-publicized work "*A few words about Guerrilla action*". This work of his was the clearest manifestation of the 'left' opportunist line and that too in crudest form. It was published in Liberation in January 1970 but the line enumerated there was being practised for some time quite earlier in West Bengal.

Charu Mazumdar wrote that an intellectual comrade (i.e., an organiser) should go to the village and whisper into the ears of a poor peasant with potentialities "Is it not good to annihilate such and such a Jotedar?" Thus the guerrillas should be

selected one by one secretly and organised in a group. This group is to be formed **conspiratorially** and secretly from the local people **even from those party units** that have not yet fully acquired the style and discipline necessary for working underground.

That was how Charu answered the question of how to start guerilla warfare in the country.

Further in January 1970 itself he wrote another much-publicised article "Make the 70's the decade of Liberation." In this article he observed "Comrades now it is not our task to conduct wide propaganda. Select one particular area and one particular unit. Select one particular squad, carry on the battle of annihilation there successfully, then take up another squad and another unit.... political propaganda should not be purposeless, it should be conducted with the aim of making the battle of annihilation successful".

After Feb. 1969 itself, Liberation and the central leadership had begun propagating the line of annihilation of class enemies as a novel discovery. Seizing upon an incident in Bhathapuram of Sompeta area, where a squad of 10 persons had attempted to kill a landlord but failed, the "*Liberation*" wrote "The all important incidents that happened in Srikakulam in Feb. was Guerrilla attack on the house of the landlord of Bhathapuram. The result was nothing remarkable, only ten people took part in the action and the class enemy could not be annihilated. But with uncommon foresight Com. Charu Mazumdar pointed out, "This should be only method to arouse the peasant masses. Summing up the experience of Naxalbari and raising it to a higher stage and analyzing the form in which the famous thesis of Com. Lin Piao namely "*Guerrilla warfare is the only way to mobilise and apply the whole strength of the people against the enemy*" could be applied in concrete condition of India, Com Charu Mazumdar pointed out: "*To start an annihilation campaign by applying the guerrilla method against the landlord and their agents*" Lib Vol.3, Nov. 1969 p.44.

This generalisation on the basis of single incident at Bhathapuram where 10 persons attempted to kill a landlord was compared in significance with Paris Commune, the "Bloody Sunday" incident of Father Gapon and the Hunan peasant movement.

Castigating those in the party who maintained that it would be a fatal mistake to generalise on the basis of a single incident, Liberation asserted, "*The history of the national communist movement shows how every one of the Marxist teachers from Marx to Chairman Mao has generalised the experience of a single contemporary event in his life into a universal truth. The Paris Commune in Marx's life, the "Bloody Sunday" incident of father Gapon (Jan 5, 1905) in Lenin's life and the Hunan peasant movement in Mao's life are such instances*". (Ibid p 145).

The Bathapuram was sought to be bracketed with Paris Commune, "Bloody Sunday" and Hunan peasant movement and Charu was now being promoted as a Marxist teacher equal in rank to Marx, Lenin and Mao. The annihilation of class enemy was now considered as the concrete application of the line of guerrilla warfare propounded by Lin Piao and what not. Though this article was published

in Nov.69 its contents were propagated orally since March 1969 itself. Those in the C.O.C who had raised doubts about 'generalising from a single incident' gradually had begun succumbing to the line of annihilation of class enemy, after Naxalbari and Srikakulam comrades had agreed to it. This line was seen as a line which could enable the movement that was experiencing stagnation after the first round of police repression, in areas where mass revolutionary peasants struggle had earlier broken out.

The same article of 'Liberation' stated: "*How could such a situation be brought about? The method of guerrilla warfare did it. This is where the Naxalbari struggle got struck as mentioned in Com. Kanu Sanyal's report on peasant movement in Terai region.....By concrete application of Mao Tsetung Thought and concretely singling out the principal aspect at the given time and solving it the communist revolutionaries in India have been able to get over the weakness of Naxalbari struggle.*"

So the understanding that the annihilation of the class enemy by guerrilla method was the panacea for overcoming the stagnation and taking the revolutionary struggle forward to a higher stage in the rural areas began to be hammered in the minds of the ranks after March 1969, and after Aug 69, it had become the general line of the party. This line was the inevitable logical outcome of rejecting mass revolutionary struggles and mass organisations. The role of politics, the people and the party had now been totally negated.

While it accepted the line of annihilation of class enemies it rejected the concept of the style and method of conducting the same in a conspiratorial manner i.e., without people, without party and without politics. Although the main activity of the party in Bihar too was conducting annihilation of class enemies in Mushahari region, it was firstly done only in relation to the tyrant landlords and exposed police agents who had become security risks. Secondly it was with the consent of the masses. Not only that, the P.O.C. had made it a condition that as masses did not participate, actions should not be carried out. In almost all the annihilations that were conducted in Mushahari region, hundreds of people participated in it. In strict sense of the terms, these were not squads' actions.

The review of Srikakulam struggle adopted by the regional party plenum in August 1972 also proves that by and large Srikakulam Regional Committee too conducted annihilation of the most hated and tyrant class enemies by mobilizing the masses and with their participation in hundreds. These actions were mass revolutionary actions led by the guerrilla squads and the party. However, it was wrong and utterly ridiculous on our part to call them 'Guerrilla Struggle', 'Guerrilla action' or 'Guerrilla warfare'. But the 'left opportunists', love for exaggerating things, for substituting the desire for the reality, led us and the entire party to give them a much higher meaning.

Nevertheless in several areas of West Bengal and those areas of Bihar where the groups that were opposing the AICCCR and had now joined the party at the instance of Charu Mazumdar and were maintaining independent contact with him and were working under his direct instructions, started squads and group actions

to annihilate landlords, who could be annihilated with ease and that too without people, without party and without politics. They maintained that "actions" alone would arouse the masses and negated the leading role of politics. Dangerous consequences appeared for the party. They grew isolated from the people and turned into roving rebels wandering for shelter and food and "*whispering in the ears of landless peasants*" of their choice – whether there was any one to be annihilated.

The Bihar State Committee in its report which was adopted by the 8<sup>th</sup>. State Conference categorically criticised this as "Putschism."

Anyway, despite the mass character of the "annihilations" conducted in Mushahari and Srikakulam, the fact remained that the agrarian programme and anti feudal mass struggles on the demands of the peasantry was abandoned altogether in these areas too. The mass participation in killing the landlords could only make isolation more gradual but it could not prevent it altogether.

29. The period following the July, August meeting of the C.O.C. was one in which Srikakulam struggle faced severe repression at the hands of govt. armed forces and the police. By November 1969 or so, the entire area in which the party was conducting annihilation was being encircled and combed. The govt. had already forced the peasants to come down from the mountain and forests and settle in hamlets specially built in the adjoining plain area guarded by armed forces of the government. The revolutionary struggle was facing a severe Hitlerite repression mounted by govt. forces from all directions. The need of the hour was to break loose from the encirclement and go back again where the people were.

In Mushahari, Surajgarh, Darbhanga etc., the situation was still on incline. The area under our influence constantly expanded and not a single guerrilla was killed. In different regions different situations existed. But Srikakulam, where the revolutionary struggle had reached its highest summit, had been singled out by Govt. for most brutal repression. The leadership of the party had declared that it was Yenana and the Govt. considered it a prestige issue.

Under these conditions the C.O.C. met in December 1969. Charu Mazumdar concealed the real situation obtaining in Srikakulam from the C.O.C. and persuaded the Andhra representatives too, not to disclose the reality as it might effect the morale of the party. However from newspaper reports, to some among us things were becoming clearer. Therefore when he proposed to issue a new year call to the party to immediately form a peoples' army, when he exhorted the C.O.C. to ask the guerrilla squads to go nearer to the enemy and attack him, and when he said that "offence was the best defence" and asked the party and the guerrillas to pursue the line of "actions" only, sharp differences arose.

S.N maintained that it was premature to give the call of forming the army now and wrong to pursue the line of attacks only. On the contrary he requested the C.O.C. to give a call for building extensive areas in mountainous and forest regions and give top priority to certain regions in concentrating our work there. He maintained that Srikakulam might face encirclement and therefore the vast plain area around Srikakulam and mountainous area extending to Orissa be organised

by giving special attention on behalf of the C.O.C. and a member from party centre should be specially deputed for this purpose. On the question of establishing base areas and the policy of concentration, Charu Mazumdar sharply differed. He observed at that very time that the old conception of base areas did not hold good now and the line of giving top priority for concentration in some areas was outdated. He was still hesitant to sell out his theory of a nation wide upsurge in India and the ruling classes being surrounded by volcanoes from all sides, thus making issue of establishing rural base areas as an irrelevant one. However he counterposed the question of formation of the army with that of concentration in certain areas and said that guerilla squads operating in various regions be transformed into the army.

Prolonged discussion started in the C.O.C. The Andhra Pradesh and West Bengal comrades insisted on what they called "the futility" of concentration and supported suggestions of Charu that the call for the formation of the army be issued as a new year call. Shiv Kumar Mishra thought that a new year call for formation of the army was not necessary as it would lead to mechanical practice. He however did not give his opinion about concentration. Ultimately it was agreed at the insistence of Charu that the call be given in respect of Srikakulam at best and for other areas the call should be given to take the guerrilla struggle to a higher stage.

**Any way for the first time it was openly stated that concentration and extension in particular regions for the purpose of building rural base areas was an old conception and that this conception missed the very essence of the new era.**

Thus when the counter revolutionary armed forces were able to encircle us in Srikakulam, when the enemy was able to force the peasant masses out of Parvathipuram and settle them in special built hamlet type enclosures in the plain area and when they mounted savage attacks from all directions to crush us, Charu Mazumdar (not the C.O.C.), instead of asking the revolutionaries to break loose and escape from the enemy encirclement, instructed them to "forget all ideas of self defence, attack and destroy the enemy" and "do not worry about unnecessary losses". The result was quite disastrous for the party. The small but courageous squads built by hard work and self sacrifice of the martyrs along with many worthy leaders perished in the main, owing to "left" adventurist tactics.

In this phase, particularly between the December 1969 meeting of C.O.C. and the Party Congress in May 1970 a number of articles were written by Charu Mazumdar in Liberation without consulting the C.O.C. and were published by him in Liberation.

These articles laid down tasks in ideological sphere and tasks for the working class, youth and the students.

Having become the General Secretary of the party, having won over the West Bengal and the Andhra State Organising Committees to accept him as authority on Marxism – Leninism and utilising the prestige of Naxalbari struggle in the International movement. Charu Mazumdar now began to impose his own thought on the party by various methods. He and the West Bengal leadership had realised

the hesitations, reservations and opposition of several C.O.C. members and state organisation committees to the “left” opportunist line and felt that unless an independent ideology was formulated and unless party was severed from the general treasury of Marxism – Leninism – Mao Tsetung Thought they could not possibly carry out their line for a long period. Therefore they prescribed what to read and what not to read for the party members it was difficult for them to convince the old cadres in the party (cadres who were in the party before 1967) for rejecting Marx, Engels, Lenin, Stalin, and Mao Tsetung outright and accept Charu’s ideas as Marxism Leninism. They chose the youth who had now overwhelmed the party for carrying out this task. Therefore Charu addressed the youth and students and asked them that the only things for revolutionaries to read are “quotations” from Chairman Mao, “Three rules of discipline and eight points of attentions” ..... Charu also asked them to “learn by heart and propagate in to and in identical language, the oral and written statements of the central leadership” and claimed that “no one except the central leadership of the party knew or possibly could know even the ABC of Marxism-Leninism – Mao Tsetung Thought”. Thus the party was now being prepared for accepting Charu’s thought in place of Marxism-Leninism – Mao Tsetung Thought and youth and students who possessed revolutionary ardour but lacked in maturity in Marxism Leninism were being inspired to mould the whole party and the movement on the basis of Charu’s ideas. Organisationally, they were inspired to throw out the old who refused to accept Charu as authority.

In relation to our work among the workers Charu wrote:

‘It is ordinary workers who will conduct trade union struggles. Our cadres will do the work of building the under ground party by propagating politics. But the party cadres will in **no circumstances** get themselves in these struggles. (Our party work within the working class)

This line could not but isolate out cadres and party from its own class, the proletariat and thus turn it into a petty bourgeois party.

30. As we have said earlier thousands of students had left their colleges to join the revolutionary struggle led by the party. Instead of getting them integrated with working class and the peasantry in the vast urban and rural areas of the country in a planned manner, instead of educating them in Marxism- Leninism and instead of tempering and steeling them to become good cadres by participating and leading the class struggle of the workers and the peasants. Charu instructed them to go to the villages at “your own initiative and integrate yourself with poor and landless peasants, with only task of annihilation of the class enemies”. Naturally it became difficult for most of these students to stay for any length of time in the villages. Some of them stayed and indulged in putschist “actions” and were either arrested or killed but most of them came back to the town to do something purposeful.

It is these students who were asked to carry out a programme of (a)destroying schools and colleges, libraries and laboratories (b) breaking up of idols of all sorts (c) attacking clubs and recreation halls (d) annihilating small and middle traders, businessmen, merchants and capitalists. (e) annihilating general cadres of

revisionist parties. This could not but disrupt the unity of the toiling people, strengthen the hands of the enemy and isolate the party from the broad masses of the people and cause immense damage to the cause of revolution.

Between the C.O.C. meeting in December 1969 and the holding of the party Congress, the "left" opportunist line on the student and youth fronts gripped the whole party in West Bengal. This vulgarized version of a cultural revolution was called a "massive revolt of the new against the old" and what was worst the party organ "Liberation" carried an article by "observer" (S.Bose) advocating that if there was to be a revolution, there has to be a revolutionary party and if there has to be a revolutionary party there has to be an authority. And he advocated that the authority of Charu Mazumdar (not of the C.O.C.) be established in the party. So what was being done in a clandestine manner was now being advocated by the party organ. Liberation and other party organs exaggerated beyond proportion the so called revolutionary significance of all these activities that it began to effect even the remote provinces. What to speak of neighbouring provinces.

This trend about a "cultural revolution" or to be more exact, the vulgarised version of a cultural revolution, had just started appearing in other provinces when the Party Congress was convened.

31. The rapidity with which Liberation went on publishing Charu's articles containing "left" opportunist line, policies, direction, instructions and talks overwhelmed the entire party. The youth and students who possessed revolutionary ardour but lacked experience in Marxism – Leninism were now the major section in the party. In several states the petty bourgeois groups who had opposed the coordination were now admitted in the party by Charu Mazumdar and demanded that the party should follow the same. The situation was peculiar. They learnt by heart and propagated in toto and in identical language quotations from Charu Mazumdar and demanded that the party should follow the same. The situation was particularly serious in Bihar, where several such groups were sent to work by Charu and the West Bengal leadership. They accused that Mushahari struggle was not being conducted according to Charu Mazumdar's line. They opposed its mass character they demanded that since the old leadership and cadres were revisionists, they should quit. They demanded that Charu's authority be established in the party. They were encouraged by Charu to maintain independent contact with him over the head of Bihar State Organizing Committee. In U.P. too the Benaras unit of the party was maintaining independent contact with Charu Mazumdar over the head of the State Committee. After establishing authority of Charu Mazumdar in West Bengal and Andhra, the West Bengal leadership had started carrying factional activities in Bihar and also in U.P. They resorted to various tactics by organising contacts through such petty bourgeoisie and employees who have gone to work in Calcutta and other cities of West Bengal from other provinces, by winning over opportunist groups and admitting them in the party etc.

At the time of Provincial Conference of party in Bihar, Charu Mazumdar and Saroj Dutta held separate talks with cadres of erstwhile Revolutionary Communist

Centre (MNGG group) who were earlier admitted in the party and were delegates and asked them to remain loyal to Charu Mazumdar and the MAIN CURRENT of the movement i.e., to Naxalbari leadership particularly Charu.

In U.P. they tried to conduct factional activities at the time of holding the Provincial Conference against the P.O.C. leadership.

In Punjab, for his factional interest, he recognised that section as the P.O.C. which had a very insignificant following in the party instead of resolving the differences in a party manner. It should be noted here that Shiv Kumar Mishra too, who had been dealing with Punjab earlier and knew the whole situation, did not report to the C.O.C. the truth about the Punjab party.

In Kashmir, Charu brushed aside the majority of the P.O.C. members and recognised the tiny minority as the P.O.C. thus disrupting the party there.

In Kerala, Charu refused to admit in the party the Verghese group which was carrying on revolutionary struggles simply because they did not agree to accept Charu as the authority on Marxism-Leninism and instead brought one Mr. Ambadi who joined the ruling Congress two months after the Congress.

Thus we find that in order to have a Party Congress of his choice, Charu Mazumdar and associates who worked in the party centre admitted just on the eve of the Party Congress spurious groups who were opposed to the party so long, conducted factional activities and drove out majority members and cadres in some provinces from the party and refused admission to many genuine revolutionaries, besides establishing Charu's authority in West Bengal and Andhra.

This was the organisational method pursued by Charu and his associates before the Party Congress.

32. The Party Congress was held on 14 – 15 May 1970. Prior to it i.e., a day earlier the C.O.C. met to finalise amendments to the draft Party programme, draft Party Constitution, the Political Organisational Report and also the panel of the proposed C.C.

Several amendments had come from different provinces. The U.P. State conference wanted to reject the concept of the 'entire bourgeoisie was comprador in nature' and replace it with the concept that the "big bourgeoisie was comprador in nature", thus accepting the existence of national bourgeoisie in India. As we have said earlier, this amendment was rejected by the C.O.C. The second important amendment was concerning other forms of struggle. The U.P. State conference wanted that it should be explicitly mentioned that armed struggle will be complimented by other forms of struggle. This amendment too was rejected by the C.O.C. Another amendment sought to delete the words "under the leadership of the C.P.C." from the foreign policy para of the peoples democratic state. This amendment too was rejected by the C.O.C.

Andhra comrades wanted to amend the concept advanced in the draft party programme about the rich peasants and substitute it with the concept of annihilating the rich peasants and treating them as enemies of agrarian revolution. This amendment too was rejected by the C.O.C. However there was no amendment from any state conference opposing the concept of annihilation of class enemies.



In draft Party Constitution there were a few amendments and some of them were accepted. However there was one vital amendment from Andhra comrades and that amendment demanded that *"party members be required to place their entire property at the disposal of the party and those who refused to do so, must not be admitted in the party."* The C.O.C. rejected this amendment.

The political Organisational Report drafted by Charu Mazumdar was thoroughly discussed by C.O.C. members. They wanted a review of the struggle led by the party since August 1967 wanted summing up of the experiences. In absence of such a review it was difficult to draw correct lessons and take the revolution forward. Some members also wanted clear cut self criticism from the leadership on certain issues. However Charu maintained that self criticism "would damage the fighting morale of the fighters and guerrillas" who were the main section in the Party Congress. Though S.N. and some other comrades objected to this strange meaning given to self criticism, but inspite of this objection, the C.O.C. agreed to Charu's suggestion.

Despite this, several amendments were moved and adopted with regard to the Political Organisation Report and Charu promised to include them before submitting the report to the congress.

It was decided that the Party Programme be moved by S.N., the Party Constitution be moved by Shiv Kumar Mishra and the Political Organisational Report be moved by Charu Mazumdar, before the Party Congress.

**In the Party Congress one of the U.P. delegates moved the amendments adopted by the U.P. State Conference. However they were rejected by the Congress after C.O.C. reply to the debate.** The Andhra delegates too brought forward their amendment regarding treating the rich peasants as enemies and this amendment too was rejected.

Of course some minor amendments were accepted by the Congress which strengthened its basic stand.

The programme and constitution were adopted unanimously by the Party Congress and there was no abstention or opposition even by those delegates who had moved the amendments. Subsequently, after the Party Congress the U.P. State committee disowned its amendments in a self criticism circulated among the ranks. It characterised the amendments adopted by the provincial conference as a "right deviation."

Then the political organisational report was moved for adoption. Since it did not contain the amendments accepted by the C.O.C. several delegates demanded summing up of the experiences since last 3 years, many demanded self criticism from the leadership. However, while this discussion was going on, Souren Bose, a member of the C.O.C. while participating in the debate over Political and Organisational Report asked the Party Congress to accept that loyalty to Charu Mazumdar be declared a necessary condition for conferring party membership.

Anyway, the whole proposal meant that Charu be placed above the C.C and above the party, that difference with his views be considered as opposition to

Marxism-Leninism-Mao Tsetung Thought. Ambadi, the unknown delegate from Kerala who was later on to join the ruling Congress party of Mrs. Indira Gandhi, said that Charu Mazumdar be considered next only to Com. Mao Tsetung and Lin Piao and those who did not accept it, should quit the party.

Naturally, the C.O.C. members and other delegates who differed with this un-Marxist concept regarding the authority had to speak out S.N. (Bihar), Shiv Kumar Mishra and R.N. Upadhyaya-U.P, Appu-Tamilnadu, some one from Assam-all of them opposed this concept of authority. S.N. came out most sharply against the concept advanced by West Bengal and Andhra leadership. He observed that authority is not demanded or imposed but it grows in the course of following and practicing correct line for a long period. He maintained that "a leader or leadership gains the authority by giving correct leadership to the party and people over a number of years, particularly in hard and complex situations, and this is possible only when a leader or leadership is absolutely loyal to Marxism-Leninism and Proletarian internationalism, integrates the universal truth of Marxism-Leninism with the concrete conditions of his country, integrates with the broad masses of the people, follows the style of learning from the people and giving back to the people, practices democratic centralism, perseveres in criticism, self criticism and is not afraid of making the greatest sacrifice for the cause of the proletariat".

S.N. told the party congress that *"Marx, Engels, Lenin, Stalin and Mao Tse tung, the great teachers and leaders of the world proletariat had become authorities in their time because they made historical contribution to the development of proletarian ideology and revolutionary class struggle i.e., by taking history forward. They had not demanded the authority nor sought to impose it, the way certain C.O.C. members wanted"*. He asked the Congress to uphold the principle of collective leadership, the principle of the committee system, as the kind of authority that some people were advocating would lead to the establishment of a "personal regime" in the party, that it would lead to polycentralism in the international communist movement, that it would lead to stifling democracy inside the party and establish bureaucratic centralism and that it would lead to bureaucracy in the leadership and ultra-democracy in the ranks and ultimately destroy the unity and cohesion of the party and damage the cause of Indian revolution. He further said that our struggle and organisation was only three years old and hence, it was not correct to adopt such a decision now as many problems concerning the Indian revolution were still to be solved. S.N. also told the Party Congress that he would not remain a member of a C.C which did not uphold the principle that individual was subordinate to the units, minority was subordinate to the majority, lower bodies were subordinate to the higher bodies and all party members were subordinate to the Central Committee.

R.P. Sharaf of Kashmir did not speak at all but he privately told S.N. and Shiv Kumar Mishra that he is with S.N. Later on i.e. after the sharpening of differences between Charu on the one hand and the Bihar and U.P. Provincial Committees on the other, he said, that he had appreciated only the 'oratory' of S.N. and not it's content. The situation was that on the one hand there was a majority in the Party

Congress who upheld Charu's authority as two states, Andhra and West Bengal delegates, were solidly in favour of it, on the other, though in numerical minority, the majority of states, i.e., Bihar, U.P. Tamilnadu, Assam, were stoutly opposed to the concept of authority as advocated by the former.

Charu, therefore, intervened and in his speech, he said that the question of authority was a political question. He said that 9th Congress of the C.P.C. was held only to establish the authority of Lin Piao and not for anything else. If authority was not established it would lead to polycentralism in the Party and to revisionism. However, there was still a hangover of revisionism in the Party. Many persons were still prejudiced about authority on account of the impact of 20th Congress of CPSU. Hence the issue should not be forced for a decision by vote. On the contrary, those who upheld the concept of 'authority' should carry on inner Party struggle till revisionism on this score was defeated.

Ultimately, the resolution or the suggestion with regard to the establishment of the authority of Charu Majumdar in the party was withdrawn. Charu thus virtually had called on the Party to launch a mighty inner party struggle to defeat those who did not agree to his authority. The Political Organisational Report was adopted with amendments before being published. However they did not carry out this assurance at all. Charu and his West Bengal and Andhra followers considered the question of establishing Charu's authority in the party as the central question for the Party Congress to decide. And therefore, the struggle on this question became very sharp and intense, overshadowing all other questions. The Party Congress elected a C.C. consisting of Charu Mazumdar, Kanu Sanyal, Sushital Roy Chowdhary, Saroj Dutta, Souren Bose, Suniti Gosh, Asim Chatterjee (from West Bengal), S.N.Singh, Gurbax Singh, Raj Kishore Singh(from Bihar), Shiv Kumar Mishra, Mohindra Singh(from U.P.), Nag Bhushan Patnaik, Appalusuri, V. Satyanarian and Kailasham (from Andhra Pradesh) Appu Kodandaraman(from Tamilnadu), R.P.Sharaf (from Kashmir) and Ambasdi(from Kerala). One place for Punjab was kept vacant as no struggle delegate could reach the Congress from there.

33. In the C.C. meeting which was held the same day after the Party Congress was over, once again the question of authority came. S.N., Shiv Kumar and Appu clearly told the C.C. that C.C. was the highest organ between two Congresses and hence it was the authority for the subordinate party units and members. They also criticised in strong terms that Charu Mazumdar was acting arbitrarily as he went on giving his own line on students, youth, trade unions, and all sorts of political questions without consulting the C.C. and against the earlier decisions of the C.C. They also criticised that a party member was sent to a fraternal country by Charu without the C.C. decision. Sushital Roy Chowdhary, who was till then silent, also spoke on how the party committee system was being negated by Charu mazumdar in W.Bengal and he stressed that all major political and organisational decisions be taken by C.C. or by P.B. and not by anyone else. Charu agreed that thereafter he would see to it that all major political and organisational decisions were taken by

the C.C. or P.B. He was elected General Secretary of the Party by the C.C. unanimously. A polit-bureau of 10 members was also elected by the C.C. unanimously, consisting of Charu, S.N., Kanu Sanyal, Saroj Dutta, S.K. Mishra, Souren Bose, Sushital Roy Chowdhary, Appu, R.P. Sharaf, and Nag Bhushan Patnaik.

Firstly the Party Congress had ended by and large by placing its seal of approval on a 'left' opportunist understanding, which had its manifestation in Party Programme and Political and Organisational Report.

This 'left' opportunist understanding ran right through the strategic and tactical tasks of the party. Its assessment of the world and the national situation, its line of strategy and tactics of people's war was also a victory of the 'left' opportunist line in the Party.

Secondly, the Party Congress also created a new awareness among the party leaders and cadres to study the Indian conditions more deeply, awareness that they have to independently study and practice in order to come to valid conclusions. Actually, many delegates returned from the Party Congress with very critical views of the leadership. Despite the fact that the Programme and the Political Organisation Report were unanimously adopted, many delegates felt that the whole line had to be re-examined.

The greatest positive aspect of the Congress was that it gave birth to this critical attitude. It had shaken the entire party out of deep slumber born of absolute loyalty to Charu Mazumdar owing to international recognition.

34. After the Party Congress was over, Com. Mao Tsetung issued his solemn statement on 20th May, 1970. This statement was discussed in the Bihar State Committee which met in July 1970. The Bihar State Committee hailed this statement as a programme for the world people fighting against U.S. imperialism and its lackeys. The Committee felt that this statement armed the world people with the most scientific and correct assessment of the world situation and the bright perspective of victory in struggle against U.S. imperialism and its lackeys and that it inspired the world people with irrepressible and unprecedented self confidence in their struggle.

However, the Bihar State Committee felt that the formulation in the Pol. Org. report adopted by the Congress contained an erroneous understanding with regard to the question of world war and it should therefore be corrected in accordance with Com. Mao's statement. The Pol. Org. Report had stated that third world war had already begun and basing itself on that understanding had underestimated the strength of the world people and had not treated revolution as the main trend of the world today.

Apart from this, the 'left' adventurist line had reached its climax after the Party Congress. In Calcutta, Burdwan, and other cities of West Bengal, the 'cultural revolution' of breaking idols, burning schools, colleges, libraries and laboratories, annihilating small and middle businessman, traders and merchants, traders and merchants, annihilating revisionist cadres etc, by the squads had become the

principle feature of the party's activity. In rural areas, the instruction was given for annihilating the rich peasants. Despite severe setbacks suffered in Srikakulam and Midnapur, the leadership went on whipping up 'left' opportunist slogans one by one. *"One who did not dip his finger in the blood of the enemy was not a Communist", "India's revolution had become a part of the great proletarian cultural revolution", India had become a Volcano," "It were not we but the enemy who needed a base area for self preservation" and "It was not the era of self defence but the era of self sacrifice, pursue the line of attacks only, and do not worry about unnecessary sacrifices"*. This was bound to have its impact on several units in Bihar, particularly in the southern plateau region, because several groups from West Bengal who were admitted in the party, were sent to work in this region of Bihar. These groups demanded that authority of Charu Mazumdar be accepted by the State Committee, that the line that was being implemented in the rural and urban areas of West Bengal be implemented in Bihar too and the annihilation of the class enemies be done in the manner mentioned in a few words of guerrilla action. They accused the leadership that they were being prevented from carrying out *"rebellion in the towns"* of Jamshedpur, Ranchi, Dhanbad, Patna and Muzaffarpur.

Under these circumstances, the Bihar State Committee decided to approach Charu Mazumdar for convening an emergent meeting of the C.C. to review these struggles and lay down a line.

It also wrote to him to correct the formulation regarding the world situation and the world war in the light of Com. Mao Tsetung's statement of 20<sup>th</sup> May (as the Pol. Org. Report was still not printed). However Charu Mazumdar did not reply to this letter. Since then till Sept.'70 the Bihar State Committee and its Secretary, S.N., wrote several letters, but Charu neither agreed to convene a meeting nor sent any reply. Thereafter, the Bihar State Committee held its meeting in Sept. 1970 and adopted a resolution, *"New upsurge and struggle against 'left' opportunism"*.

This resolution was within the framework of the decisions the party Congress and did not transcend this limit. It did not oppose the line of annihilation of the class enemies nor understanding of the Party Congress with regard to the comprador nature of the entire bourgeoisie. It also did not criticise the line of abandoning struggle for land, or crops, or other types of economic and partial mass struggles in rural or urban areas.

However, the resolution correctly assessed the world situation and stressed *"revolution was the main trend in the world today"*. It also correctly assessed the national situation as a situation of a new upsurge.

The resolution then drew attention to the emergence of 'left' opportunist trends reminiscent of Lilian and Wang Ming lines on a number of questions vitally affecting revolution.

It noted that there were comrades who advocated a concept of drawing no line of demarcation between the landlords and the rich peasants and advanced the slogans of annihilating the rich peasants too. The resolution emphasised the anti-

imperialist and anti-feudal character of India's revolution. It stressed the need of winning over the majority of the rich peasants and neutralizing the rest, drawing attention to the dangerous consequences of B.T Ranadive's line on this issue during 1948-50. The resolution emphatically declared that it may be that in the initial phase of our struggle rich peasants oppose revolution, but this is no reason why we must not distinguish them from the landlords. In course of development of our revolutionary struggle, a good section of rich peasants would side with the revolution and a good section would remain neutral. Only a tiny section that has feudal tails would merge with the enemy. The resolution, therefore, warned against confusing two distinct stages of revolution, the democratic and the socialist revolution.

Secondly, the resolution stressed the importance of different nature of party's work in rural and urban areas. It opposed the 'left' adventurist line and practices in the cities and stressed that in the initial phase of our revolution and that also 'for a long period, party must work under cover in the towns, build up adequate strength, win over the masses in towns for revolution, bide its time and engage in armed actions of a defensive nature'. The resolution criticized those who talked of a general upsurge evenly developing in rural and urban areas and their tendency to blur the difference between the nature of our work in rural and urban area".

Significantly, the resolution again stressed the necessity of building rural base areas and linked it up with the nature of work in cities and rural areas and opposed the concept of a "quick victory." It observed:-

*"Every communist must bear in mind that despite the new upsurge, the law of uneven development of revolution, the law of building rural base areas by protracted armed guerilla struggle and law of working under cover patiently, winning over the masses, building up adequate strength through various forms in the cities, are still valid".*

Though the resolution did not mention the need of economic struggles in the towns (perhaps for fear of being branded) it did talk of mass struggles on political issues in national and international sphere.

It stated:

*"We must resolutely guide them (youth and students) to work in a manner that may unleash the initiative of the mass of workers and other sections of town poor to come out in active mass struggle on political issues, both national and international. The working class must intervene in a massive way to support the struggle of all toiling sections chiefly the peasantry. We must resolutely guide them to develop such forms as would mobilise broad sections of workers and intelligentsia on political issues and organise resistance to the enemy but must not engage in offensive actions. We must resolutely guide them to organise a net work of underground party units in the working class so that large number of its advanced cadres are sent to the rural areas. No communist worth his salt would bow to spontaneity and abandon firm leadership on the question of nature of work in towns."*

Thirdly, the resolution criticized the military line 'No self defence' and attacks only, by extensively quoting from Com. Mao Tsetung and stressed the necessity of active self defence.

The resolution stated:

*"Today, when the armed guerrilla struggle is facing and fighting encirclement and suppression campaign of the enemy in several guerrilla zones, the problem of strategic defence acquires an importance of first magnitude. The party leadership at all levels must study and find resolutions to the concrete problems of self preservation and destructions of the enemy."*

Fourthly, the resolution observed:

*" 'Left' opportunism in politics finds its expression also in the functioning of leading party committees at all levels. On the plea of severe repression launched by the enemy against the party, some leading comrades, particularly some secretaries, have been functioning in a most authoritarian manner. Regular meeting of party committees at many places are not held nor collective decisions taken. In matters of taking decisions and implementing them, majority of committee members are not consulted. In some leading committees secretaries have established personal regime and introduced servility.....inner party democracy and healthy party life comes to an end in such a situation. It destroys the initiative of the Party rank and breaks the ties between the leadership and the ranks and ultimately destroys the party unity and thereby paves the way for the defeat of revolution."*

In the end, the resolution declared:

The State Committee is of the opinion that the fountain source of left opportunism in politics and authoritarianism in organisation is in the central leadership of the party and therefore much serious efforts will be required on the part of the entire party to combat and liquidate it.

The State Committee calls upon all party members to put Mao Tsetung Thought in command as it is the Marxism – Leninism of this era and not their own thought or any body else's thought in command on all political, organisational and military issues.

Despite its negative features, the resolution served as the first shot fired by Marxist – Leninists against left opportunism in the party. The quest had now begun to bring the party on correct rails.

As every one who has studied the above resolution adopted by the Bihar State Committee can see that Bihar State Committee had not named anybody while criticising the left opportunist line on some of the questions concerning Indian revolution and had tried its best to make as mild a criticism as possible. It was done with a view to enable the CC or P.B to discuss the points raised without generating any heat and come to a decision. The State Committee tried its utmost to faithfully follow the directive of Com. Mao Tse Tung "to learn from past mistakes to avoid future ones", and "to cure the disease to save the patient". After the State Committee adopted the resolution, Charu Mazumdar agreed to convene the P.B meeting. But strangely he did not inform R.P Sharaf, Appu and Sushital Roy Chowdhary. Besides, Souren Bose was outside the country and Nag Bhushan

Patnaik was arrested at the time he and some other comrades were staying in Calcutta for talks with Charu. In this condition, only four members were present, namely, Charu, Saroj, S.N and Shiv Kumar. After the discussion, P.B. was evenly divided Charu and Saroj were against the resolution and Shiv Kumar and S.N were in favour of the resolution. Thus, the P.B. could not clinch the discussion. Thereafter, the P.B decided the following:-

1. Resolution of the Bihar State Committee along with comments made by Charu Mazumdar be sent up to area party committee level for discussion and opinion.

2. The meeting of the C.C. be convened within two months i.e., till December 1970 and decision be taken there on issues raised by the resolution and the comments.

3. Since Bengal State Committee expresses its inability to arrange for the venue of the C.C. meeting the Bihar and the U.P. State Committees shall take the responsibility to fix the venue of the meeting and inform the Centre by 15<sup>th</sup> November 1970.

It must be stated here that Bihar and U.P. State Committees fulfilled their responsibilities, they arranged the venue of the C.C. meeting and informed the General Secretary well before 15<sup>th</sup> November of the same. But the General Secretary of the party adopted such attitude after the P.B. meeting that has no parallel in the entire history of our party.

They did not circulate the Bihar resolution even to the State Committees till Jan 1971, what to speak of the area party committees.

The Gen. Secy. and his associates refused to convene the C.C. meeting.

They unleashed a filthy slander campaign against the Bihar and U.P State Committees accusing them of revisionism.

They propagated that Bihar and U.P. State Committees have been dissolved and Sushital Roy, S.N. Singh, Shiv Kumar, Mohindra Singh, Gurbux Singh and Raj Kishore Singh, all members of C.C., have been expelled from the party. What was worse, this was given in the columns of the reactionary press.

They claimed that since the majority of the C.C. members had turned revisionists and renegades, its meeting would not be convened.

In the name of centralizing politics, they declared that the party centre (meaning Charu Mazumdar) would decide the line and not C.C. or P.B.

They went about organizing meetings of their followers throughout India, over the head of the Bihar State Committee and conducted a slander campaign against the majority of the C.C.

They set up rival state committees in Bihar and U.P. They declared that every one who did not regard the most "*respected leader*", Charu as the authority on Marxism-Leninism-Mao Tse tung thought or any one who dares to differ with Charu on any issue is not a party member and can never be one.

They declared finally against those who refused to obey the directives of Charu and counterposed revolutionaries and enemies and it was a revolutionary duty to annihilate them.



Thus instead of removing the differences in the party manner, Charu and his associates embarked upon the path of splitting party and destroying it. There is no doubt that owing to the above destructive activities of Charu and his associates, the cause of Indian people and Indian revolution was greatly damaged. The attack against the unity and cohesion of the party was launched at a time when imperialism and social imperialism had intensified their activities for establishing world hegemony. The U.S. imperialism had accelerated the war in Indo-China and Soviet Imperialism was feverishly engaged in weaving intrigues to swallow the Indian subcontinent. This attack against the unity and cohesion of the party was launched at a time when revolutionary struggles in Andhra, Bengal, Bihar, U.P. and Punjab were facing severe setbacks and when it had become imperative to sum up the experiences and draw correct lessons.

Later on Charu wrote his 'Comments' and the Bihar State Committee was able to get hold of a copy somehow. The comments by Charu made arbitrary accusations. However, he openly disowned the party programme by stating, *"I have always held that the rich peasants in our country are indulging in mainly feudal exploitation. Therefore, our relations with rich peasants will be the relation of struggle."*

With regard to Bihar State Committee resolution on differences between the nature of work in rural and urban areas in the initial stage of revolution he said, *"I think that this arbitrary division between offensive and defensive is nothing but a hangover of our revisionist past."*

*"With regard to our policy of active defence in the period of strategic defence, the suddenness of attack, the chain of shelters and the underground apparatus provides for the preservation of our fighting force .... Apart from this particular angle and method of functioning, any emphasis on self preservation will inevitably encourage revisionism within us and weaken the spirit of dare to fight and dare to win and seize the destiny of our people in our own hands."*

Regarding Bihar State Committee's proposal about party committee system, he wrote that regular meeting of the C.C. or the P.B. are not possible and the risk is too much to take. And lastly he branded the resolution of the Bihar State Committee as 'Monstrous'.

35. After Charu rejected openly the understanding of the Party programme on the question of the rich peasants, the compromises made by others on other aspects of the Programme came to an end. The Bihar State Committee, which had been reviewing and reconsidering all the aspects of the party line and had come to valid conclusions, decided to make a comprehensive analysis of the party line.

In the meantime, the U.P. State Committee too adopted a resolution by May 1971. Its draft was available to the Bihar Committee in December 1970 itself. The resolution congratulated the Bihar State Committee for taking the lead in launching a struggle against left opportunism. It also raised the question of the national bourgeoisie, the question of uneven development of various regions and different tactics and slogans in relation to different regions, the question of mass struggle on economic and partial issues for rural and urban areas both, etc.

Thus while lending full support to the resolution of the Bihar State, the U.P. resolution further contributed to the resolution of a correct programmatical and organizational understanding of the party in the light of Marxism-Leninism-Mao Tse tung Thought and thus greatly helped in our struggle against left opportunism.

The Bihar State Committee held its plenum in Jan – Feb. 1971 and adopted a Report entitled “Problems of Indian Revolution and Neo-Trotskyite Diversions”. The Report has been circulated far and wide among the party ranks, hence we do not want to deal with it in detail. The main feature of the Report is that it laid bare the Neo-Trotskyite nature of Charuism and defended the purity of Marxism-Leninism-Mao Tsetung Thought on certain programmatic, tactical, military and organisational issues facing the party.

While exposing the external features of the Charuities, the report irrefutably proved that Charu and his associates were confusing democratic and socialist (and proletarian cultural) revolutions and were thereby destroying the prospects of any and all revolutions. It showed that Charu and his associates did not accept the evaluation of the world situation made by Com. Mao Tse tung on 20<sup>th</sup> May, that they regarded imperialism as the decisive force and not the people and they regarded aggressive war and not revolution as the main trend in the world today. It also showed that they were preaching panic and flightism among the people.

The Report further showed that Charu and his associates did not accept the strategy and tactics of a protracted people’s war, that they peddled the concepts of general upsurge, open and frontal clashes everywhere, that they treated the work in rural areas and urban areas at par with each other, that they were advocating a quick victory and purposeless action everywhere. It showed that their assessment of the present situation in India was based on subjectivism and highly exaggerated and their understanding that India will be emancipated before 1975 was utterly wrong and subjective.

It showed that they were denying the importance of establishing rural base areas giving priority to the policy of concentration in mountainous and forest areas, that they were preaching a line of armed struggle by roving rebel method and that they had made cities their centre of gravity and not the countryside. The report showed that by boycotting and opposing mass struggle on economic and partial issues, they were departing from the mass line and liquidating the mass character of revolution.

The Report showed that they were distorting Lin Piao’s formulation which compared the guerrilla warfare with other forms of warfare and correctly advanced that guerrilla warfare is the only way to mobilise and apply the whole strength of the people against the enemy. The Report showed that Lin Piao did not discuss here the various forms of class struggle or coordination of other forms of class struggle with armed struggle. On the contrary the report quoted from Mao Tsetung and Lin Piao to show that armed struggle could not succeed if it was not coordinated with other forms of struggle. Of course the armed struggle was the principal form. The Report showed that by advancing a slogan to annihilate the party leaders and cadres who differed with their line. Charu and his associates had turned into counter

revolutionary gangsters. The Report showed that Charu and his associates were trying to replace Marxism-Leninism-Mao Tsetung Thought with Charu's thought as the guiding ideology of the party, that they had departed and made complete rupture with Marxism-Leninism and had turned Neo-Trotskyite. This Report played a great historical role in educating and mobilising the party members throughout the country in struggle against left opportunism and in defence of Marxism-Leninism. It became a handbook, in fact a weapon, to combat 'left' opportunism and in defence of Marxism-Leninism. However, this Report too did not oppose annihilation of the class enemies though it maintained that all the problems could not be solved at all by annihilation. The report also did not sufficiently stress the necessity of peasants' struggle for land and did not understand the difference between the struggle for land and other ordinary economic and partial struggles. It treated them alike.

Despite these negative features, the Report was able to arouse the interest of the party cards to study deeply the works of Marx, Engels, Lenin, Stalin and Mao Tsetung. It aroused their interest to assimilate the lessons of their struggles for the Indian people fought in the past and present. Undoubtedly, it had delivered a decisive blow at '*Left opportunism and its advocates the Neo Trotskyites.*' The Bihar and U.P. State Committees were making strenuous efforts to contact other states and were now able to contact the Punjab comrades. The Punjab-Himachal State Committee also had adopted a resolution and supported their stand. This State Committee was in fact advocating the need of establishing base areas in the mountainous and forest regions from 1969 itself. That is why Charu sought to admit the other minority group in the party. Therefore, now the coordination was broadened to include Punjab-Himachal State Committee also.

In December '70, differences in West Bengal State Committee began. Com. Sushital Roy Chowdhary, who had pleaded for a "committee" system in the C.C. meeting immediately following the Party Congress to elect the P.B. and the General Secretary, had incurred the wrath of Charu Mazumdar and his associates. They could not digest the fact that the Secretary of the West Bengal State Committee should have let them down on the question of authority. Hence feverish efforts began to isolate him from the party ranks. Sushital Roy Chowdhary had also been opposing the "Cultural Revolution" initiated by young cadres at the instance of Charu in Calcutta and other cities of West Bengal. Saroj Dutta had written an article "In defence of idol breaking" which was being given widest publicity by the party leadership. Therefore it was natural that differences would arise in the State Committee. Sushital Roy Chowdhary placed a document in the West Bengal State Committee criticizing some aspects of the "left" opportunist line. However, that document was rejected by the W.B. State Committee. Except S.R., no one, not even Ashim Chatterjee, supported the resolution. Subsequently S.R. was removed from the leadership of Deshbrati and Secretaryship of the State Committee. He fell terribly ill and Charu and his associates succeeded in thoroughly isolating him. He ultimately died and left behind a document that

was published by C.C. This document had supported the stand of the Bihar and U.P. State Committees in the main.

Souren Bose had returned to India from abroad and brought with him the criticism and suggestions from the fraternal party. The minutes of the talks were handed over to the party leadership but they suppressed it. Ashim had come to know about it orally from Souren Bose, as he was at that time in Calcutta. It is, however, reported by him that Charu pulled up Souren Bose for having divulged the substance of the suggestions to Ashim and subsequently when Ashim demanded the minutes, Souren Bose tried to give the impression that the criticism was only over minor matters and the party line was all right.

However, Ashim grew suspicious and demanded the document but it was refused.

After this incident, the Bihar Resolution was discussed in the West Bengal State Committee and they rejected it unanimously branding it as revisionist. It should also be stated here that none of the C.C.M.s including Souren Bose or Ashim opposed Charu Mazumdar when he illegally, arbitrarily and without any authority and without convening a C.C. meeting "expelled" S.N., Shiv Kumar, Gurbax, Mahendra and Raj Kishore from the party. None of them, even those who later on joined the battle, opposed the illegal and arbitrary "dissolution" of the Bihar and U.P. state committees, and some of them even took initiative in organizing rival committees. But, it must be stated that suggestions and criticism by fraternal party had its impact and some of them began to reconsider their stand.

In the meantime, a serious situation was created by consistent and regular interference by the Indian Govt. in the internal affairs of Pakistan. The Indian Govt. took advantage of the happenings in East Pakistan. The Indian Govt. politically and financially backed Mujeeb in his "movement" for independent "Bangla Desh" with a view to tear away the eastern wing of Pakistan. It was a "movement" which struck against the very unity, integrity and sovereignty of Pakistan and Mujeeb had launched this movement in league with imperialism, social imperialism and Indian expansionism. The Indian Govt. unleashed a powerful cyclone of national chauvinism in India with a view to mobilising the people in support of the aggressive war that it was feverishly planning to launch against Pakistan with massive political, financial and military backing of the Soviet Social Imperialism. U.S. and British imperialism too had supported Mujeeb in gaining an absolute majority during the election. Besides the traditional forces of reaction, the C.P.I, the C.P.I.(M), the Socialists and Sarvodayites too joined the bandwagon of Indira Govt. and vied with each other in agitating the masses for "crushing Pakistan once for ever". The growing unity of the working class, peasantry and other democratic classes now faced a set back as Hindu communalism raised its ugly head. Minorities, particularly Muslims, were thrown into utter panic. Having succeeded in blowing the cyclone of national and religious chauvinism, having secured the backing of all the so called opposition parties and having made all preparations for launching its war of aggression, the Indian Govt. began to beat the war drums.

In such a situation, proletarian internationalism demanded from the C.P.I.(ML) that it took a firm and determined stand to oppose the aggressive war that Indian Govt. was trying to launch and to support the just struggle of the Pakistani people in defence of the unity, integrity and sovereignty of their country. The Bihar State Committee adopted a resolution on 29<sup>th</sup> March, opposing Indian war drive and supporting the just cause of the Pakistani people. This resolution was published in the form of an Editorial in the State Committee organ "Jan Yudh".

But Charu and his associates began to issue all sorts of self contradictory statements and finally gave the slogan of a united "Golden Bengal" (Sonar Bangla). Their line did not support the just struggle of the Pakistani people. It equated aggressor and aggressed and it did not accept that "East Bengal" was an inalienable part of Pakistan. In substance, it tailed behind the Indira Govt. for all practical purposes. "Left" opportunism was after all a variety of opportunism. The failure of the cultural revolution in Bengal and high pitch of national chauvinism there had driven large number of youth who backed Marxism-Leninism and were frustrated in the "cultural revolution" to join Youth Congress (The youth organisation of the ruling Congress). Charu and his associates sought to rally back at least some sections of Bengali youth by advancing the chauvinist slogan of Sonar Bangla. This was an open treachery in practice by the charu clique with Marxism-Leninism and proletarian-internationalism. It was natural that those who so long hoped that Charu would pay heed to the suggestions of the fraternal party on questions concerning Indian revolution now came to the conclusion that Charu's adherence to Mao Tsetung Thought and to proletarian internationalism was a fraud. The BOBRC (Bengal, Orissa, Bihar Regional Committee) led by Ashim adopted a resolution criticising Charu Mazumdar's line with regard to "Bangla Desh". Later on they also adopted another resolution summing up their experiences. The resolution on the question of "Bangla Desh", while it correctly opposed the national chauvinist line of Charu Mazumdar and remained firm on proletarian internationalism, advanced certain erroneous conceptions about the role of socialist aid and the class character of the yahya regime. B.O.B.R.C. thought that socialist aid from China had enabled the national bourgeoisie to control the state in Pakistan and that Yahya regime was a national bourgeoisie regime.

The other document of the B.O.B.R.C. published in July 1971, correctly upheld the Ching-Kiang path, the path of protracted guerrilla warfare and the establishment of rural base areas. It correctly raised the question of an agrarian programme and land policy and it correctly opposed "*annihilation of the class enemies*" in rural areas. But it still suffered from 'left' opportunism on certain questions. It advocated armed struggle in towns and annihilation of class enemies there by guerilla method. It opposed what it called the controlling offensive actions in towns at present.

It is indeed interesting. Those who had become disappointed with the result of the line of annihilation of class enemies in the country side had found the line useful in towns. Certainly, the B.O.B.R.C. understanding was in this respect 'left' opportunist or may be they just wrote it to appease the adventurist section in their following without meaning it. Be as it may, this was a hangover of the 'left'

opportunist line. The B.O.B.R.C. and its Secretary, Ashim Chatterjee, met the same fate that the Bihar and U.P. State committees met. They were 'expelled' by Charu without convening a C.C. meeting. Correspondence began and ultimately a meeting was arranged between S.N. and the leadership of B.O.B.R.C. i.e., Ashim, Santosh and Kailash. During two days of discussions, all of them reached a common understanding. Ashim and his colleagues stated that they had only one reservation and that was over the class character of Yahya Regime but they would not stress it. Ashim also suggested that the C.C. should be revived and the party centre should be reorganised. It is at this meeting that S.N. first came to know of the existence of a document containing criticism of the party line by the fraternal party. However Ashim could not be certain of it as Souren Bose had told him afterwards that it was over minor matters. The revival of the C.C. had now become a political necessity because Charu was advocating a national chauvinist line on question of India's aggression against Pakistan on behalf of the party. The C.P.I (ML), Marxism-Leninism and proletarian internationalism had to be defended; the blot on the fair name of the party had to be removed.

39. It is in this condition that C.C. meeting was convened. The revival of the C.C. was unanimously decided. The C.C. met on Nov. 7<sup>th</sup> 1971 (October revolution day). It paid homage to martyrs, adopted the resolution on struggle between two lines, a resolution on India's war against Pakistan titled "*Oppose war, support revolution and on restoration of all legitimate rights of people's Republic of China in the United Nations*"

The resolution on struggle between two lines "*upheld Marxism Leninism Mao Tsetung Thought and internationalism and exposed its vulgarization and distortions by Charu Mazumdar. It exposed the hegemonistic attempt of Charu in relation to other fraternal parties. It correctly formulated the four class alliance (working class, peasantry, urban petty bourgeoisie and national bourgeoisie) for the people's democratic revolution, it correctly pointed out the process of forging the united front from the very beginning of the activities of the party, it correctly stressed the leading role of the working class in such a front and worker peasant alliance as the core of such a front. In this connection it delivered a crushing blow at the line of close doorism preached and practiced by Charu and his associates. The resolution strongly defended Com Mao Tsetung's Statement of 20<sup>th</sup> May and upheld the thesis that "Revolution is the main trend in the world to-day". In this connection it smashed Charu's plighted and pessimism, combated Charu's line of quick victory by 1975, it correctly assessed the political situation in the country and upheld the path of protracted people's war. It pointed out that the central task of the party was "establishment of rural base areas". It laid down the task of giving priority for concentration in mountains and forest regions in a planned manner. With a view to build up rural base areas it laid down correctly 7 point directives for work in rural and urban areas. It correctly pointed out the relation between mass struggles on the question of land and other immediate economic issues facing the peasants, workers and other toiling sections of the people and armed struggle for seizure of political power. It pointed out that our participation in mass*

organizations was necessary for winning over different sections of people on the side of revolution. It correctly sought to combine the illegal with legal, secret with open, economic with political, partial with total, armed struggle with other forms of struggle and party organisation with mass organisations.

It combatted the anti-Marxist theory about authority of Charu Mazumdar and exposed its harmful consequences. It correctly upheld the party committee system and "method of leadership" laid down by Com. Mao Tse tung as model for functioning. It correctly pointed out the base ingredients of democratic centralism on the basis of which the party must function and stressed the strict adherence to the four disciplines pointed out by Com. Mao Tse tung.

The C.C co-opted Santosh Rana, R.N Upadhyaya and Baldev Singh as members of C.C.

The C.C expelled Charu Mazumdar and Suniti Ghosh who was his chief lieutenant from the party and elected S.N. as the General Secretary of the party.

The revival of C.C enthused the overwhelming majority of cadres and brought the struggle between two lines to a new stage. It laid the political and organizational foundation for bringing back the party on mass line. The revival of the C.C was a great victory for Marxism – Leninism Mao Tse tung Thought in India. It was actually a revival of the spirit of Naxalbari struggle, a revival of 'spring Thunder over India', a revival of proletarian internationalism in the Party and a revival of "party committee system" and democratic centralism.

There is however a criticism in some quarters that the C.C. should have adopted a self critical report on Nov 7<sup>th</sup> 1971 itself. i.e., in the revival meeting itself.

In our opinion it was not possible. And even if such a self criticism was made, it would have been very formal and superficial, something like a Christian making a confession. A real and educative self critical evaluation was not possible because:

1. It was the first time that C.C. had met after the Party congress as Charu had refused to convene its meeting.

2. While the majority of the C.C. had come around to correct party line in the main, Charu still clung to his line. Therefore drawing a line of demarcation had become imperative.

3. None of the members of the present C.C. including S.N., were ever associated in running the party centre and they had very scanty knowledge of areas or regions beyond their sphere of activities.

4. Hence, before a full, exhaustive and educative self critical report could be prepared, the C.C had to sum up the experiences of at least major centres of armed struggle.

Why was such a dangerous line adopted and why did the whole C.C fall a victim to such a line?. Let us understand in the first instance that the AICCCR or C.O.C or C.C there has always been a struggle between two lines. The history of the party since Naxalbari struggle has been a history of inner party struggle. In the first phase and the greater part of the second phase the AICCCR, had adopted a

correct line on most of the issues in the main. And even after that phase, various comrades differed on several questions and only at a particular stage they succumbed to the whole line. It should also be stated that no one in the AICCCR or COC or CC proved correct on all the issues and all the time.

40. But Charu Mazumdar had 'left' opportunist understanding even before the historic Naxalbari struggle broke out. He remained on correct line only during the period of November 1968. And he reverted back to his old line i.e., the 'left' opportunist line he advocated before the Naxalbari struggle.

Charu, as early as 1966, stressed the importance of organising secret small armed units and for secret annihilation of police men, army men, bureaucrats and class enemies.

He wrote an article entitled "*What does the year 1965 point to*". He observed, "If these armed units are politically educated, **they themselves will be able to build stable base areas** in the country side for carrying on struggle. It is only by this method that we can take part in the task of making the people's democratic revolution successful (emphasis ours, translated by Suniti Ghose from Bengali original).

Again in an article "*The main task today is to build a truly revolutionary party through un-compromising struggle against revisionism*" (written on 30-8-1966) Charu stated:-

"Today the party's activist group means a combat unit. The main tasks of these units are to propagate politics and to hit at the counter revolutionary forces. We attack not only for attacking but for annihilating (i.e., assassinating the enemy). Always remember this lesson taught by Mao Tse tung. The targets of attack will chiefly be (1) the representative of state power i.e., police or military officer. (2) hated bureaucrats and (3) class enemies. Collection of weapons will also be one of the object of such attacks. In the present age **this attack can be launched both in urban and rural areas**" (emphasis ours, translated by Suniti Ghosh from Bengali original).

THE ABOVE QUOTATIONS FROM HIS WRITING IN THE PERIOD BEFORE THE NAXALBARI STRUGGLE SHOWS WHAT HIS UNDERSTANDING WAS OWING TO PUBLICATION OF "SPRING THUNDER OVER INDIA". THE TERAJ REPORT AND THE CORRECT CONCEPTION OF MAJORITY COMRADES HE WAS HESITANT FOR SOME TIME AND AS SOON AS HIS LEADERSHIP WAS ESTABLISHED HE REVERTED BACK TO HIS OLD UNDERSTANDING WITH THE SPEED OF A HURRICANE AND NEVER RECOVERED AGAIN.

SO FAR AS THE MAJORITY OF C.C.Ms. WERE CONCERNED, THEY FOUGHT (THOUGH UNSYSTEMATICALLY) AGAINST 'LEFT' OPPORTUNISM, SOME TIME ON THIS ISSUE AND SOME TIME ON THAT ISSUE, TILL THEY FINALLY SUCCUMBED TO CHARU'S LINE ULTIMATELY MANY OF THEM WERE ABLE TO REDISCOVER THEIR LOST MOORINGS AND QUICKLY REACHED A STAGE WHEN THEY WERE



ABLE TO EVOLVE A MARXIST – LENINIST LINE, A CORRECT LINE IN THE MAIN. THIS DIFFERENCE MUST BE UNDERSTOOD.

41. Why did they deviate (the majority of the COC) from a mainly correct into a mainly incorrect line? We maintain that they did so because of the following factors:-

1. Lack of maturity in Marxism – Leninism – Mao Tse tung Thought.
2. Lack of dialectical materialist approach in concretely analyzing role of classes in Indian Society, in summing up the experiences of the international communist movement particularly the Great October and the Great Chinese revolution, in summing up the struggle of Indian people, particularly the Telangana peasants struggle and other revolutionary struggles and in assessing the political situation in India.

3. The lessons of right and 'left' deviation in the party were not correctly assimilated and hang over of these alien trends had remained alive.

4. 15 years of uninterrupted reformism had brought about an impetuous attitude in the leadership which was still to get rid of its petty bourgeois nature and prejudices.

5. A mechanical and perverted conception about the leadership of International Communist Movement. The recognition of the party and its leadership was taken as recognition of political organizational line of the party automatically. Failure to use one's own brain in all activities.

6. Lack of reliance on the masses, failure to learn from them, and failure to regard masses as the motive force of history.

7. preponderance of the petty bourgeois elements in the leadership and general membership of the party.

These were the historical, ideological and social sources of the deviations of the C.C. and subsequently of the entire party which led to serious reverses in our movement. These were the causes that led to the failure of the sparks burning into a prairie fire.

42. There is a controversy over whether it was correct for the C.C. to expel Charu Mazumdar from the party. Some people think that since Charu was the political leader of the Naxalbari struggle and had played a leading role in struggle against revisionism at a certain phase, and since he died in police custody, he should be reinstated in the party.

In our opinion, the role of an individual should be evaluated in totality and not by erasing away some period of his activities from the total period of his life, particularly the end period of his life. The evaluation must be made of his positive and negative contributions in the party. One should be judged in totality, one should not be victim to a Hindu practice that all dead are good.

As we have shown earlier, Charu's understanding in the period between 1965-67 i.e., before the Naxalbari peasant uprising, was thoroughly 'left' adventurist and that it resembled the theory of Narodniks of Russia and terrorists of India in the mid thirties.

His understanding during the period of Nov.1967 to May 1968 was, by and large, correct, though he opposed the formation of the party by advancing the concept of building the party from below. His political understanding during in the period July 1968 to the last days of his life was completely wrong and 'left' opportunist.

However the C.C did not punish and expel him because his understanding was wrong but because:-

1. He stubbornly clung to the line and tried to impose it on the party, with all the vehemence at his command.

2. He violated all the norms and forms of the party, though he was its General Secretary. He refused to function the C.C and paralysed it. He arbitrarily and unconstitutionally went on "dissolving", all the committees including several state committees without any authority.

3. He established a personal regime in the party and started a cult after his name. Those who dared to differ with him could not remain in the party.

4. He refused to correct himself even after witnessing the collapse of one area after another, after witnessing the dangerous consequences of his line in practice, even after people, cadres and important leaders advised him.

5. He did not correct himself even after he received the correct advice from the International Communist Movement. He placed himself not only above the C.C., not only above the CPI (ML), but even above the International Communist Movement.

6. He unleashed a terror campaign in the party and ordered that C.C. leaders who differed with him be assassinated. Two attempts were made to kill S.N and one of our dedicated comrades, Nag, was called for discussion at Digwadih (Dhanbad) and assassinated. Such assassination of party cadres have also taken place in Calcutta and other parts of West Bengal.

7. Though for some time he did play the leading role in struggle against revisionism, a major part of his life (1967 to 1972) was wasted in fighting Marxism – Leninism – Mao Tse tung Thought.

8. He ultimately succeeded in splitting the whole party and liquidating its major part. Considering his contribution in totality, he proved himself a liquidator, and renegade. Therefore it was correct to expel him from the party.

43. The subsequent theories and practice of his (Charu Group) group proves without a shadow of doubt that the expulsion was a hundred percent correct decision. After revival of the C.C. and during Charu's life time his group still further degenerated into an adventurist and narrow sect opposing Marxism-Leninism – Mao Tsetung Thought, opposing the allies of the Democratic Revolution continuing the philosophy and practice of individual terrorism and continuing their splitting activities.

Let us quote from their Liberation (July 1971 to January 1972 Vol 5 No.1) to find out if they have learnt anything from the repudiation of 'left' opportunism by overwhelming majority of C.C Ms., overwhelming majority of the party members

and the International Communist Movement; "Comrade Charu Mazumdar is the great helmsman of Indian Revolution. It is by depending on him that we shall know how to sail across the ocean of revolution" (p-82) "Any thought of making a front with middle peasants or other forces of revolution (the working class, the urban petty bourgeoisie and national bourgeoisie- C.C) at this stage will only adversely effect the fundamental work of guarding party's class line" (P 83,84)

*"We have realised through our experience that it is as much urgent to start quickly the campaign for annihilation of class enemies as to grasp the party's class line. This is because the party's class line became more firm through the campaign for annihilations of class enemies. The hatred of ages is preserved in every particle of blood of the poor and landless peasants. Therefore no other class is capable of jumping upon the class enemies so successfully and with such intense class hatred".*

*"In general the lesson we have learnt is that armed peasant struggle can be developed only by firmly establishing the authority of Com. Charu Mazumdar at all levels of party work" (P.116).*

*"The concrete lessons that we have learnt are:- (i) Grasping the party's class line, the class line of the poor and landless peasants, (the working class is not their class nor its line is their class line- C.C.) i.e., the main guarantee of the development of struggle not merely in the initial stage but throughout the entire period of the revolution" (P.116) (here they deny the leading role of working class in People's Democratic Revolution).*

*"That is why we think that any doubt regarding Com. Charu Mazumdar's bold conclusion that in the present era of revolutionary upsurge revolutionary mass movement can be built without mass organisation is a concrete manifestation of revisionism," (P.118)*

*"Our respected leader comrade Charu Mazumdar has shown that this is not era of Ching Kang of 1928. This is the decade of the '70s, the era of down fall of the imperialist and reactionaries in one country after another" (P.122) Again, they say,*

*"Does not championing, at this stage, of the mountain jungle theory amount to advocating a theory for abandoning these tasks, a theory for denying peasant struggle in West Bengal and Punjab?" (P.122).*

*"We welcomed the attack on the colonial educational system and culture launched by youths and students, because this education and culture cripple the revolutionary consciousness of students and youths and make them hate and neglect workers, peasants and other toiling people. That is to say, we reject totally Satyanarain's hated document regarding urban struggle....." (P.90).*

*"The leadership at different levels advocated the limited aim of annihilating only wicked enemies instead of carrying the battle of annihilation to terrorise landlord class in a big way" (they are not satisfied with killing only wicked landlords, they must finish all and sundry -C.C) (P.187).*

*"The battle of annihilation of class enemies, the political line formulated by comrade Charu Mazumdar is the successful practical method of fulfilling the*

*revolutionary task of building the Red Army. This method is creatively developed from Indian revolutionary practice to solve the problem of building the Red Army" (P.179).*

Not only this they go on eulogizing "Vice Chairman" Lin Piao in all their literature even after knowing the explicit views of the C.P.C. regarding him. We do not know their intentions but certainly their intentions are not pious. They have now started dubbing Kanu Sanyal, Souren Bose, Suniti Ghosh, Kola Venkaiyya, Nag Bhushan Patnaik and even Khokan Mazumdar as revisionists and as last reserve of imperialism.

This is how their are reviewing struggles and this is how their leadership is rectifying errors and, all these take place when one by one the areas of armed struggle suffered major reverses. Such reverses take place after thousands of our cadres have been killed, many thousands arrested, and after the party in the main faced isolation among the people.

All these show that Charu had deserted the camp of Marxism-Leninism Mao Tse tung Thought ideologically, politically and organisationally and he ultimately had turned into a renegade and liquidator. Contrary to this though the entire C.C. was guilty of 'left' opportunism. Its majority realised the harmful consequences of the same and began to rectify its erroneous understanding practices.

Hence any approach of equity and any approach that sought to bracket the C.C. with Charu is wrong and dangerous. It is once again a subjective approach and can lead only to anarchy, disruption and liquidation of the party.

44. What are the lessons that emerge from this history of five years of CPI (ML) for the party, the working class and the people?

The C.C. considers the following as the main (not exhaustive) lessons that are to be drawn from our five years' history:

(1) The party must uphold firmly Marxism-Leninism-Mao Tse tung Thought as the ideology guiding its thinking and practice.

(2) The party must adhere finally to the principle of integrating the universal truth of Marxism-Leninism-Mao Tse tung Thought with the concrete conditions of Indian revolution:

In order to make such integration effective, it is necessary to have a profound understanding of the basic stand point of Marxism-Leninism-Mao Tse tung Thought (i.e. Dialectical and Historical Materialism). Profound investigation and study of the history of Indian society and its present stage of development from this basic stand point is required. It is necessary to transform such general and specific lines, policies and work styles (method and style) resulting from such investigation, study and analysis into social practice. It is possible to confirm whether a line is correct or incorrect or how far it is correct or incorrect only through practice.

Therefore, the C.C. calls upon the entire party ranks to deeply study the works of Marx, Engels, Lenin, Stalin, and Mao Tsetung, the history of C.P.S.U. (B), the history of C.P.C. and the history of the revolutionary struggles of the Indian people, attentively. The C.C. calls upon the entire party ranks to practice the party line among the people and to constantly sum up the experiences thus gained, and thus creatively enrich the line.

The C.C. is of the firm view that only by such an approach which links the universal with the concrete and theory with practice can the party be able to eradicate dogmatism and empiricism prevalent in the method of our study and investigation. *"Idealism and mechanical Materialism, reformism and adventurism are all characterised by the breach between the subjective and objective, by the separation of knowledge from practice"*.

3. The party must firmly adhere to mass line. Whether one does not follow the mass line is a question of distinction between the stand point of historical materialism of the proletariat and the stand point of historical idealism of all the exploiting classes.

Historical materialism teaches us that "the people and the people alone are the motive force in the making of world history." Historical idealism, on the contrary, maintains that it is the few "wise" great and super human "Heroes" who make history. The party must declare a ceaseless ideological struggle to weed out the remnants of the theory and practice of individual terrorism i.e. the theory and practice of annihilation of individual class enemies by individuals or squads divorced from the people.

Historical idealism, subjectivism and all sorts of alien bourgeois and petty bourgeois thinking trends, habits etc. enter the body politics of the party as petty bourgeois elements predominate in the leadership and general membership of the party. It is only when the party pursues mass line, proceeds in all its activities from the desire to serve the masses and participates and leads the masses in their class battles, it gets steeled and tempered. The party gets Bolshevised in the course of the revolutionary class struggles of working class, peasantry and other toiling sections of the people. It is mainly the cadres, who have gone through the process of class struggle, pursuing a mass line in all their activities, that are able to overcome the petty-bourgeois prejudices, habits and trends. To link oneself with the masses, one must act in accordance with the needs and wishes of the masses. All work done for the masses must start from their needs not from the desire of any individual, however well intentioned. It often happens that objectively the masses need a certain change, subjectively they are not conscious of the need, not yet willing or determined to make the change. In such cases we should not make the change until, through our work, most of the masses have become conscious of the need and are willing and determined to carry it out, otherwise we would isolate ourselves.

The party must learn to integrate itself with the masses, to remain boundlessly loyal to the masses and constantly pursue the mass line in all its activities.

4. The party must learn to make concrete study of concrete situations and adopt the line, policies, directives, methods and style of work decided by the highest organ to the concrete conditions obtained in zones, areas and spheres of activities i.e. it must learn to combine the general with the particular. India is a vast country and its various regions have their own peculiarities in socio-economic conditions, class compositions, traditions of struggle, level of organisation and consciousness i.e., the law of uneven development operates and conditions vary from one region to another. This means that appropriate tactics, forms of struggles, forms of

organisation, method and style of work must be evolved for integrating with the broad masses of the people and organising them for revolution. Any attempt to apply the general in a mechanical manner to all the regions in utter disregard of the concrete conditions obtained there, would be dangerous.

5. The party must get rid of subjective and one sided approach while mobilising and organising the people for revolutionary struggle. It must learn to combine the illegal with legal, secret with open, economic struggle with political struggle, armed struggle with other forms of class struggle and mass organisations with party organisation. The armed struggle will remain the principal form of struggle and the people's army remain the principal organisation.

The party, while remaining underground and pursuing the secret method of functioning, must utilise the legal opportunities however limited they are for mobilising and organising the people's struggles against the economic, political and cultural policies of the reactionary ruling class. Wherever possible it should set up open, broad based mass organisations of workers, peasants, urban petty bourgeoisie and other democratic sections of society in order to mobilise the people for revolution. And wherever it is not possible to set up open mass organisations, it should set up secret ones. Whether the party pursues mainly the open mass work (while remaining underground) or whether it mainly pursues the secret mass work, it must organise three organisations in a village or area - party unit, mass organisations and mass armed guerrilla squad of self defence corps at the present phase. The party must champion the demands of all democratic classes whose objective interests are in overthrowing imperialism, social imperialism, comprador bureaucrat capitalism and feudalism and thus emerge as the unifier and leader of the people of the country. It must utilise the contradictions in the enemy camp for developing revolutionary struggles. It must forge worker peasant alliance as the base of the broad united front of all anti - imperialist, anti- feudal classes in India. It must abandon close doorism as such.

6. The party must take up the task of building extensive and consolidated rural base areas as its central political task as our victory in people's war will ultimately depend on how strong, extensive and consolidated base areas do the revolutionary forces possess.

In order to achieve this the party must give top priority to organised work in the mountainous and forest regions and this must be planned by the C.C.

The party must begin building the people's army in course of developing **the present small areas of armed struggle of such regions into extensive guerrilla zones, i.e. in course of consolidating and expanding the present small areas.** The party must understand that the task of building a people's army in the actual conditions of our struggle today is inseparably linked with organising and leading the class struggles of the peasantry on issues of seizure of landlord's land crops and against usury and social oppression and class struggles of the people etc. Only in course of these struggles, it is possible to arouse the peasant masses to the necessity of building a people's army and only in course of these struggles the

party can attract large number of militant peasant cadres willing to join our army. And only such an army can remain as fish remain in water.

The party must start building up the army units recruiting regular fighters out of the present guerrilla squads under a regional military command to be set up by regional party committee at the present phase and it must take up the task of developing these army units quantitatively and qualitatively in course of armed struggle against the armed forces of the reactionary Govt. in defence of peasants' struggle for land etc.

The party must educate its armed guerrilla squads or army units not to engage in adventurist actions and not to transcend the level of the consciousness and the degree of organisation of the masses of that area in launching armed actions for seizure of property of the landlords or while attacking the armed units of the state. We must remember that we are in the stage of strategic defence and that we do not yet possess a base area. Our armed actions at present are carried out mainly in self defence and defence of struggle of the peasants.

7. The party must arouse the masses to arm themselves with traditional and locally available weapons. It must arm the guerrilla squads with locally available fire arms initially and with modern weapons subsequently. The question of supply of arms and ammunition must be solved by disarming the landlords and the enemy armed forces, as enemies are the chief sources of our supplies in this sphere. Training of squads in the use of arms, tactics, and style of fighting must be undertaken locally in the initial phase.

The cadres and the party must rely on the people and organise them for their daily maintenance in the main.

8. The party must tirelessly work to unite those Marxist Leninist groups that are still having separate existence by a process of ending antagonistic relations and establishing fraternal relations, by exchange of experience and views and through discussions in a comradely manner by participating with such groups in launching and leading revolutionary struggles on the basis of mutually agreed decisions. By this process mainly the present disarray in the ranks of Marxist-Leninists can be ended. The party at the same time must ceaselessly continue its ideological struggle against the theory of "*historical inevitability of groups*" preached by some people while firmly adhering to the thesis of historical necessity of a single party of Marxism-Leninism in India.

9. The party must build up teams of leadership at all levels consisting of party members who practice Marxism-Leninism and not revisionism, who unite the party and do not split it and who are open and above board and do not indulge in conspiracies or intrigues. In building such teams of leadership, care should be taken to combine the old, middle aged and the young. Those coming from school and colleges or from the petty bourgeoisie intelligentsia should be first asked to integrate with the basic masses and after they are steeled and tempered in class struggle for some time, they should be admitted in the party.

10. The party must strictly adhere to the principle of democratic centralism in its functioning. Democratic centralism guarantees unfettered democratic rights

to the members and units for forwarding their suggestions, criticism and proposals, on all the political and organisational issues facing the party, to the higher committees, on the one hand, and on the other hand, it upholds that once decisions are taken they must be implemented on the basis of individuals subordinating to the unit, lower bodies subordinating to the higher bodies, minority subordinating to the majority and all members subordinating to the C.C. The party must function on the basis of collective leadership and the committee system and resolutely oppose personal regime and authoritarianism, bureaucratic centralism and ultra democracy. It must declare a war against factionalism as factions are incompatible with the party.

11. The party must practice criticism and self criticism with the aim of learning from the past to avoid mistakes in the future and "to cure the disease to save the patient". The higher committees should encourage the practice of criticism and self criticism in the ranks by initiating it from above.

12. The party must launch a rectification programme for eradicating dogmatism, empiricism, commandism and tailism and all such alien trends prevailing in the methods of thinking and style of work of the party units at all levels in the light of Marxism-Leninism-Mao Tsetung Thought and our own experiences.

13. The party must guard itself from 'left' and right deviations and must ceaselessly fight against any or both whenever they emerge. The history of the international communist movement as well as the history of our own party teaches us that when right deviation is corrected, the 'left' deviation may appear and when the 'left' deviation is corrected, the right deviation may appear. It also happens that 'left' deviation is followed by another 'left' deviation and similarly a right deviation is followed by another right deviation. The party is already engaged in combating right opportunism on the question of "Bangla Desh", armed struggle, participation in elections and approach to the C.P.C. It is also engaged in combating the 'left' opportunist deviation on the question of army building and the question of mass struggle and mass organisation. The party must remain firm on Marxism-Leninism-Mao Tse tung Thought and defend its purity from all distortions and vulgarisations.

Comrades,

The history of our party has been a history of inner party struggle, a history of struggle between two lines (the correct and incorrect)

Com. Mao teaches us:-

"Opposition and struggle between ideas of different kinds constantly occur within the party: this is reflection within the party of contradictions between classes and between the new and the old in society. If there were no contradictions in the party and no ideological struggles to resolve them, the party's life would come to an end."

Apart from this, Com, Mao while condemning liberalism in matters of principles, has clearly pointed out:-



*"We stand for active ideological struggle because it is the weapon for ensuring unity within the party and revolutionary organisations in the interest of our fight. Every Communist and revolutionary should take up their weapon".*

*"But liberalism rejected ideological struggle and stands for unprincipled peace, thus giving rise to a decadent philistine attitude and bringing about political degeneration in certain units and individuals in the party and the revolutionary organisations."*

We therefore, reject centrism, liberalism or neutralism in the struggle between two lines in the party. We reject the above passive and negative attitude, as we think that such an attitude would threaten the very life of the party and that then the party will degenerate from a proletarian party into a bourgeois party. We must remember the truth that so long as class struggle exists, the party exists, class struggle will certainly have its reflection inside the party. So struggle between different lines are bound to appear and party will have to resolve these contradictions if it wishes to move forward.

Many Joshis and Ranadives, many Charus and Upadhyas will continue to appear in the party in future also. However the party committees are advised to narrow the target of exposure and concentrate their attack on renegades, double dealers, conspirators and opportunists who are a handful in number and to work in manner as to unify overwhelming majority of cadres. The C.C.'s correct line is already politically unifying the revolutionaries. Several sections following Charu have already admitted some of the major errors and have moved towards unity and consolidation. The correct will ultimately win whatever the ordeals. Revolution will ultimately triumph-whatever the difficulties.

Comrades,

During last five years many beloved sons of our people and worthy leaders and cadres of the party have sacrificed their precious lives for the cause of revolution, for the cause of the proletariat and the people. In the forefront of these martyrs have been several members of the C.C. and various state committees and other units of the party. Many workers, peasants and other cadres and sympathisers have heroically fought and laid down their lives while fighting and resisting the enemy. And many are waiting to kiss the gallows so that our people and country may win their emancipation. Thousands are languishing in prisons bravely enduring tortures and brutalities. And every day dozens of ordinary workers, peasants, intellectuals, teachers, students and govt. employees are facing bullets and joining the ranks of our martyrs to further their cause. The C.C. pays its homage to these Martyrs and pledges that it will fear no sacrifice and surmount every difficulty to serve the cause which they held so dear.

The world situation is becoming extremely favourable for revolutionary forces. And an excellent revolutionary situation exists in our country. The party has by now evolved a mainly correct programmatic, tactical and organisational line and is in the process of evolving a correct military line. It has been able to unify the overwhelming majority of party members in Bihar, Andhra, Punjab,

Jammu & Kashmir, Haryana, Rajasthan around the correct line of the party and is striving hard to defend the correct line of the party and its organisational cohesion from attacks in U.P. and Orissa. It is participating in mass struggles of the workers, peasants and urban petty bourgeoisie and increasingly winning their confidence in several regions. The isolation is rapidly ending and the party today stands at the threshold of emerging as a confident leader and organiser of the masses, while remaining firm on the path of armed struggle. The party is at the same time consolidating its ranks by waging a sharp struggle against factionalism, cliquism and other divisive trends and is fully vigilant against the attempts of the Indian reactionary govt. which is trying to disrupt and destroy the party by encouraging small factions and indulging in savage repression.

The C.C. is confident that with firm unity in its ranks, deep integration with masses and our unshakable loyalty to Marxism-Leninism and proletarian internationalism, the party will be able to unite all the forces that can be united in the struggle against Soviet Social imperialism, imperialism, feudalism and comprador and bureaucrat capitalism and march to complete victory in not a too distant future.



## ABOUT THE TALK HELD IN 1970 BETWEEN COMRADE CHOU EN LAI AND COMRADE SOUREN BOSE

From India, we have learnt several versions about the minutes of this talk. First of all, we are certain that on October 29, 1970, there had been a talk between Comrade Chou En lai and Comrade Souren Bose. We have gone through some of the versions of this talk prevailing in India: the content of them are almost the same Comrades, if you are interested in this question, I am ready to inform you the main points of this talk, i.e., about your party, Indian revolution and basic experience of the Chinese revolution.

First of all Comrade Chou said to him, "I am very sorry, because I have not been able to meet you for so long."

Comrade Bose answered, "It does not matter, because you are so busy in your work".

Comrade Chou: On the one hand this is because I was busy in my work, on the other hand, it takes much time to go through all of your materials. I have not yet gone through all of your materials. Comrade Chou went on to say.

"We have had too little talks with each other. In accordance with Chairman Mao's instruction we have done very insufficient job in the international communist movement".

Comrade Chou also asked something about specific conditions of Comrade Bose's journey. He went on to say-

'You have undergone a long journey to pay a visit to China and to have talks with us. We welcome you and congratulate you on the foundation of your party and also on the success of your First National Party Congress and also for the victory of your causes. This is a victory for the Indian people and also for the international communist movement as a whole. Your party was born in the struggle against imperialism, feudalism, comprador capitalism and modern revisionism. You have four enemies, i.e., you have four mountains on the back of the Indian people; you have one more than that of the Chinese. We had three, in the process of development of the international communist movement and also on the question of ideologies there is a dark side also. On the formation of social imperialism by Soviet' this is something beyond our experiences. For us, it was a new thing. At that time we were struggling against them for 10 years. It has some difference with old line revisionists because of political power, armed forces, etc., under

their rule. We congratulate the initial victory of your party. This is a new victory in India after the second world war. We congratulate on the stand of the fraternal party. I think, Comrade Bose gone through Chairman Mao's articles "On the people's Democratic Dictatorship". This was written after the victory of 1949 i.e., when we entered the cities. In that articles, Chairman Mao mentioned about the Chinese revolution. Today I am going to mention them for the reference of our Indian Comrades. Comrade Mao Said, 'We relied upon these three weapons for the victory of the Chinese revolution viz. party, army, and united front'. On the question of the party, Chairman Mao said, "A well disciplined party which is armed by theory of Marxism-Leninism, adopts the method of self-criticism and keeps in close touch with the masses of the people.

"Now, let me say something about how we used the theory of Marxism-Leninism to arm our party. On this question, Chairman Mao often said that we should integrate the universal truth of Marxism - Leninism with the concrete conditions of our revolution. During the early days, when we mentioned Mao's thought we took this as the main content of Mao thought i.e. we took the integration of universal truth of Marxism - Leninism with the concrete situations of the Chinese revolution. This is because in integrating the universal truth of Marxism - Leninism with the concrete condition of the Chinese revolution, Chairman Mao has done the best and the greatest development. So Chairman Mao is considered to be the greatest Marxist - Leninist. So, at each historical, crucial moment and at each important turning of Chinese revolution, it is Chairman Mao who excelled or rescued or remedied the general orientation of the Chinese revolution. Whenever we failed to do thing in accordance with Chairman Mao's instruction the revolution met with failures or set backs. I am not going to the details of how Chairman Mao developed Marxism- Leninism.

Comrade Chou continued to say, "Chairman Mao has always taught us, even if it is universal truth, it should be bound with the actual condition of a certain country and it should be through the revolutionary practices of the revolutionary comrades in that certain country. That means, it should be bound with that concrete practice, and on that basis they should form their own revolutionary line. If it is universal truth, it cannot be transplanted".

Comrade Chou took the example of great proletarian cultural revolution to show him. He said,

"The great proletarian cultural revolution is a continuation of Chinese revolution under the dictatorship of the proletariat, and it cannot be carried out in absence of the dictatorship of the proletariat. The revolution of each country has its own characteristic. Therefore, I tell you, Comrade Bose, that a fraternal party is after all a fraternal party. This is not the same party; because in each country it has different historical background, environment and different historical development. So to win revolution, in that particular country, we must integrate marxism-leninism with the concrete condition of that country, and on that basis formulate a correct Marxist - Leninist line. So, on this point CPC and Chairman Mao are in no way

too modest. In accordance with chairman Mao's explanation, to be modest is to seek truth from facts, so, in this case, if we are modest, this being modest is correct. So this is by no means hypocrisy of the bourgeoisie."

Comrade Chou said, "By seeking truth from facts, we mean, the Indian revolution should rely upon the Indian leftist comrades through their revolution to work out their own correct political line and also through their revolutionary practice, train and steel their own leadership and in this regard no other party can do instead of them."

Comrade Bose said, "In the present international Communist Movement, Chairman Mao has his authority."

Comrade Chou said, "We do not deny this, After Marx, Engles, Lenin and Stalin in the present day, Chairman Mao had persisted in truth of Marxism Leninism and persisted in the principle to the highest degree and persisted in fighting against imperialism, revisionism and world reaction and in a big country like China. Consisting of 1/4 of total population of the world, pursued the revolution of the proletariat. This has made world people happy and also look forward to China. But Chairman Mao always said that if we overestimate him, that will not be correct. For instance, if we copy many of the instructions made by Chairman Mao to the Chinese party and to the Chinese revolution, transplant all this to the Indian revolution, that will not be correct. As comrade - in arms and students of Chairman Mao, if we offer some information to the Indian communists (M-L). Can this be more proper than what we uttered? Not necessarily so. This is completely impossible. That means, it is not possible for us to offer you any information which is better than what you decide. So, this is unnecessary and also impossible. Therefore, between us, there can be relationship between comrades. What we can do is to just base on your presentation and to offer you some information for your reference only and when we do this, we proceed from the attitude of learning. If we do beyond this, that will not be in correspondence with Mao - Tse - Tung thought and that will be a violation of Chairman Mao's teaching. That means we will commit mistakes. Therefore, we ask the CPI (M-L) to consider. If you say CPC is a party of leadership and Chairman Mao leader of your party this is not proper. To be frank, this is not in correspondence with Mao's thought and this is what Chairman Mao has constantly opposed. In 1957, at Moscow Mao said that we opposed the patriarchal party. So saying this not only referred to Khrushchev but also to Stalin. In his life time Stalin in some of this information given by him to Chinese revolution, was wrong. Of course, Stalin was a great international Communist and his merits outnumbered his demerits. On the question of opposing patriarchal parties some of the fraternal parties agree with us, but some disagree. But those persons like Khrushchev disagreed. Now a days the Soviet revisionist renegade clique still uses this tactic to direct those parties under the dictatorship. But their baton is less and less effective now. Especially when the Soviet Union sent troops to occupy Czechoslovakia, those directing baton has been less and less effective. You had a debate with Dasgupta on the question of occupation of

Czechoslovakia by Soviet Union. What you have done is alright. So far as the relationship between fraternal parties is concerned, Chairman Mao has touched upon another question, that is of communist international. The first communist international was founded after the publication of Communist Manifesto, and it gave the impetus to the communist movement in the initial days, but the working class movement of each country produced their own leadership. The Paris commune was the first communist revolution in the world. But it was not led by the First Communist International. It was waged by the French Working class itself. The Socialist October revolution of Russia won its national became revisionist and lost its role, and the October revolution won its victory under the leadership of Lenin and by the Russian Proletariat itself. After the victory of October revolution, there was a new Communist International to prepare the communist movement in the world as a whole and also the communist movement of all countries to free themselves from the influence of revisionists as well as social democracy, but we do nothing beyond this and if there is some superior party to direct the movement in different countries this is wrong. This is because the world is so vast that it is not possible for any party to know the conditions in different countries and each party has its own historical conditions. Each country's revolution is in different stages and also it is different in nature. It is only possible for the revolutionary party of a certain country to integrate the universal truth of Marxism - Leninism with the concrete condition of that country. If a superior party or an international party has to issue orders, or directives for another party even inferior in organizational matters, this is bound to commit mistakes. China is a case in point. Therefore Chairman Mao said when the Third Communist international was dissolved, the Chinese revolution won its victory. In view of the historical lessons in the present struggle against modern revisionism it is duty of our party and your party as well as other fraternal parties fighting against modern revisionism to exchange information and help each other. But if we want to set up with reluctance an international organization, there will be mistakes. Now the situation is quite different from those during the days of the October Revolution. Now the situation has become more and more complicated.

"Some of the political parties after seizing political power have gone revisionist. Some of the parties thought have won state power. Yet they are still fighting against worst enemy and some of the parties have split up into several splinter groups. It is only through revolutionary struggle at home, we can see that the parties which can train their own leaders and can formulate a correct line on the basis of integrating Marxism - Leninism with the concrete situation of their own country are alright. It cannot be done through groping in the dark. Therefore, Chairman Mao said, when the leftist parties come to contact with us we should receive them and exchange views with them. But it is improper for some party to try to set up an international organization and treat our party as a part of leadership just as some parties did to the CPSU. This is not proper. There are too many historical lessons in this field. By doing so we cannot help the fraternal parties their ability of being independent and having initiative in their hand. On the contrary,

to rely upon opinions of a big party is very dangerous and it is bound for us to commit mistakes. It is so dangerous that when we do not know the conditions well, but we try to give opinions to direct certain parties. Therefore our fraternal parties should keep in touch with each other on equal footing and all the fraternal parties should have independence and initiative in deciding things; and this is a question on which the success and failure of the revolution depend. This is because it is upto ourselves to sum up and accumulate experiences and raise it to the level of theory and raise it to the level of theory and also get it integrated with Marxism - Leninism. So on this question we had talked with Comrade Bose and we emphasized it again and again. Now the world is divided into different nations and different countries. Though the Pro-nationalism is the common thing for all of our parties but in making revolution, we should start from the specific conditions of our own country. So in making revolution we must take into full account our national characteristic. If we regard the leader who is directing the revolution in another country as our own leader this is not good because this will hurt the national feelings of that country and the working class of that certain country does not think it well. So, we say this is not proper in the fields of theory as well as practice to respect the great Marxist Leninist leader of the world is one thing and to take him as the leader of another party is quite another. So this is a big problem, by no means a small matter in the development of your party as also on the question of leading the Indian revolution to victory. This is matter of principle, So, I cannot but mention it again because it is a matter of principles so far for how to use Marxism - Leninism for arming the party”.

Comrade Chou continued to say, “Mao said that this party is a party which maintains close link with the masses of the people. This has two meanings. One, the party is the vanguard of the proletariat; it is not a mass organization. Second this vanguard of the proletariat; if it does not maintain close touch with the masses, it does not follow the mass line, it will be divorced from the masses of the people. After we seized the state power in the country as a whole there is still the problem of keeping close touch with the masses of the people. This is a question of following mass line prior to the victory of the revolution, we had many experiences and lessons in this respect and we committed errors on the matters of political line on many occasions. I think Comrade Bose knows them well. Due to the error of right opportunism pursued by Chen Tuhsu, our revolution met with failure. Chen Tu Hsu betrayed the revolution surrendered and captured with the bourgeois, betrayed the interest of the first Chinese revolution. In the period of agrarian revolution we committed mistake of left opportunism on three occasions, So, we were divorced from the masses of the people. In those days, we failed to fully mobilize the masses of the people and make revolution together with masses of the people but we just organized a few vanguard elements to do the things”.

Comrade Chou Said, “I can give you two instances to show one of city and another of country side. In the cities, parties should be kept as secret organizations. But due to the left deviationist line, we refused to go among the workers in factories and students in schools, etc., to do painstaking and meticulous work. In Shanghai

we organized so called flying meeting. In the big cities on the occasion of some festivals viz. May day, we organized some students to organize rally with big banners and also distributed leaflets from high building. This was wrong. In the beginning many people join in such meeting and gradually less and less, and finally they were exposed and arrested by Kuomintang. This is one of the instances in the cities. Another situation was as follows. When the reactionary ruling class suppresses the revolutionaries in the cities, we just organized a few secret armed forces to kill those who unleashed white terror in the cities and we killed some of them. By doing so, we may inspire the masses of the people for the time being but if we use this method to mobilize the masses of the people this won't do. This is so because in those days the armed forces of the reactionaries were far stronger than those of us, and any how revolutionaries would be arrested by them and this will not be helpful for mobilizing the masses again.

“ In the country side, after the defeat of the first great revolution, there were such situations. There are two phenomena on is successful armed struggle. In those years we mobilized masses of the people to go deep among the masses of the people in the country side, among the farm labourers and poor peasants and rise them in struggle for food grains, for higher wages etc., and for guerrilla warfare. In accordance with Chairman Mao's instructions, we did this but one principle we ought to give attention is that we must mobilize the broadest masses of the people. When it is necessary, we may kill very few local bullies and tyrants who incurred bitter hatred of the masses of the people; but when we kill them, this should be done on the basis of the demand of the masses of the people and we should try them before killing them. They should be tried before the people when the masses of the people are fully mobilized and we also use the armed forces to defend the fruits of the struggle and distribute the land, food grains. Under such circumstance the peasant masses dare to distribute land and food grains among themselves. Hence, the extension of armed forces and guerrilla units: and the guerrilla units then grow from small to big and weak to strong. In this situation, the peasant movement was developed in a wave like. That means it is developed from a few villages to more villages and the armed forces of ours were expanded from small to big. So, in this way, we gradually established a small base area. Such base areas are the fruits of armed struggle. That means, we used armed forces to defend political power. In these base areas, we relied upon armed forces to seize political power so as to defend the fruits of agrarian revolution. So in the first volume of selected works of Chairman Mao, Such questions were mentioned. In fighting battles it is common that we suffered from defeats and lost some areas, and we had to shift from one place to the other. But any how, the armed struggle must be integrated with masses of the people. In mobilizing masses of the people openly, we must have some agrarian policy and through practice make them into agrarian programmes. And we should recruit party members among the advanced elements of the peasantry. It is in this way that we established revolutionary base area in Ching Kangsang and in other places, and in the same way, we expanded some



base areas into bigger ones. Armed struggle led by Comrade Mao and other comrades are experiences of successes. The revolutionary base areas led by other comrades were victorious when they acted in accordance with Chairman Mao's line, principles and methods.

"After the defeat of first revolution, another phenomenon appeared that was leftist deviationist line and putchism. We relied upon few persons to go to the country side with arms and kill a few landlords. In doing this we may mobilize the masses of the people for the time being in the locality and distribute food grain. But we did not mobilize before and, instead we just relied upon killing of some landlords and then the reactionary armed forces in the country side and the cities rushed to the spot very quickly and the handful of advanced people with weapons were forced to run, arrested or killed, so we suffered in those areas where the leftist puchist line was carried out. Therefore, in leading the armed struggle in the country side, the crucial point is party's political line principles, and policies, and it also depends upon whether we have mobilised the masses of the people, relied upon them or not. Otherwise, we cannot get a strong foothold. If we fail to carry out a correct line, policies and principles and without relying upon and mobilizing the masses of the people, we cannot get a foothold. Here, another question mentioned by Chairman Mao is that this party should have the spirit of self-criticism. When we committed the mistake of putchism, if we have the spirit of making self-criticism, correcting our mistakes and carrying out correct lines and policies formulated by Chairman Mao that would be good; and we have many such experiences. If we refuse to make self criticism and sum up our experiences it is bound to commit mistake, even more serious mistakes of putchism. That was the outcome of three leftist lines, especially the last one represented by Wang Ming. At that time though we had vast base areas. We lost it. Then we were compelled to a Long March. This was summed up at the Seventh National Party Congress. In the KMT occupied areas the strength of the party was lost 100% and in the base areas 90%. Previously we had 3 lakhs of armed forces but after the Long March, when we arrived at North Shensi province, we had only 30,000. So, 90% was lost. Therefore, Chairman Mao said, "Only when this party combines theoretical basis of Marxism - Leninism with the concret condition of the country, can we work out a correct political line whether the policy we adopted is right or wrong is to be tested through the mass movement". Just as Chairman Mao said, we should adhere to the policies of the masses of the people and then raise it high level among the masses and then test among the masses. We adhere to those policies which are correct and rectify those that are wrong. If we refuse to correct those wrong lines and wrong policies and we just stick to them, there will be even more serious mistakes, When we pursue a wrong line, the discipline of the party will be dissolved and nobody will listen to the words of the party. In his "Left Wing Communism: An Infantile Disorder", Lenin said on the question of discipline - in observing discipline we should rely upon the consciousness of the masses and on the correctness of the party leadership and this discipline should also be testified

among the masses. The previous few words were said by Chairman Mao in his article on People's Democratic Dictatorship. This was formulated by Chairman Mao on the basis of summing up our experiences and successes and failures of our revolutionary struggles after our nationwide victory".

Comrade Chou Said, "The second magic weapon for defeating the enemy by our party was an army under its leadership. It is only the armed forces under party which carried out correct policies, that can win the victory, Just as Comrade Bose knows that during the Long March, it was in 1935 at Tusni meeting that the leading position of Chairman Mao in the Central Committee was established and since then, our forces continued to expand day by day. Until 1945, that is after the victory of anti - Japanese war our armed forces expanded from 20,000 to more than one million.

During the anti-Japanese war, in Yenan, among the high ranking cadres of the party, a rectification campaign was carried out, and during the campaign, we criticized the wrong line and thinking among the cadres, and after that we held a Congress, and the Chinese revolution achieved victory throughout the country. Therefore in order to win the victory in the revolution, we should have an army under the leadership of the party.

"The third weapon is the revolutionary united front of various revolutionary classes and groups under the leadership of party, On this aspect we do not know much about the Indian situation: So we will just say some thing about our experiences. If we say that India is like China and both have the task of fighting imperialism, feudalism, bureaucratic capitalism, that means that we have the same revolutionary stage, i.e., the stage of democratic revolution. Chairman Mao has always given great importance to the united front work . After the defeat of the first great revolution in 1928, it was in Moscow where the Sixth National Party Congress was held. In the Congress, we rectified the mistake of left putchism and defined the nature of Chinese revolution to be Bourgeois Democratic Revolution. This revolution was to be under the leadership of the proletariat and was to be on the basis of the worker peasant alliance, but the question of the bourgeoisie was not solved yet. It was said in the resolution adopted at the Sixth National Party Congress that the bourgeoisie followed the KMT in opposing the Chinese revolution. The Chinese bourgeoisie is flappy. Just as Comrade Bose said, many bourgeoisie are comprador and they gradually established their factories. Since this is bourgeois democratic revolutionary stage not the stage of socialist revolution, so at this stage, the bourgeoisie are not to be abolished, and the exploitation system and private properties are not to be abolished. Therefore, the question, of the bourgeoisie is to be studied well. Among the bourgeoisie there are some national betrayers and also patriots. So, the bourgeoisie is divided into two groups. Those patriots among the bourgeois though they came from compradors, but when they started the reown factories, they began to have contradiction with imperialism, and they have patriotic ideas. Hence, we say that they are national bourgeoisie in nature; so they are patriots. Small and middle sized enterprise have contradictions with the monopoly big enterprises because the latter attempt to swallow them up.

But at the Sixth National Party Congress, this question was not solved well. So, we dumped all bourgeoisie together as reactionaries. Hence, bourgeoisie became the target of attack without discrimination. So, on this question, we did not apply "one divided into two". In those days, in the country side most of the enterprises were small and medium sized. But we confiscated them without discrimination. Therefore in country side we pursued the ultra left line and attacked the intermediate classes and sections. Because of our wrong line even the peasantry became dissatisfied with us because they could not buy things. We became isolated from the masses. Chairman Mao disagreed. He stood for winning over small and medium sized enterprises in the country side, at least neutralizing them. So, the antagonism between red and white areas would be covered up and small and medium businessmen will come to the red areas. The small and medium sized enterprises as well as national bourgeois have their own political representatives and those political representatives are always dissatisfied with the KMT reactionaries. Therefore under such circumstances, it was possible for us, at least, to neutralize them and not to push all of them away to the side of KMT reactionaries. This was during the time of agrarian revolution.

During the anti-Japanese war, because of Japanese aggression against China. Chinese revolution remained unchanged. In order to fight against foreign aggression this united front was further expanded and we had further alliances. Basically speaking it was the united front led by the proletariat based on worker - peasant alliance and alliances with different democratic parties, classes and sections. Of course this development covered different stages. The whole Democratic Revolutionarily Period can be divided in to several stages.

During the Democratic Revolutionary Period, apart from having united front with exploiting classes, among the laboring people there was also united front. There was a united front of workers and peasantry united front between proletariat and other laboring people. Of course, the worker peasant alliance is the most reliable basis of the united front. The working class itself is divided into left, middle and right. So there is also a question of united front. For instance, in the Chinese revolution, when the armed struggle led by the CPC was not yet greatly expended in cities, we had to go among yellow trade unions so as to win the masses there. During the ten years agrarian revolution we achieved very little in this respect, and suffered great losses because of three ultra leftist lines. Hence we failed to win over the support of the masses. We did not go among the masses of the people to retain as well as expand our forces; so, ultimately we became isolated from the people and got exposed to the enemy. Some of our comrades were sacrificed, some were arrested, some were forced to shift to the guerrilla zone, some became passived, and some turned betrayers. Now 21 years have passed since the nation - wide seizure of power. Chairman Mao always reminds us no to forget the past. We should recall our past experiences and lessons".

Comrade Chou said, "Since the founding of our party 50 years have passed. At this time when we recall the past half century of march traversed by the CPC

we have come to an understanding that under the leadership of Chairman Mao, whenever we followed Chairman Mao's words, we advanced forward, and whenever we refused to do so, we suffered failure. This is what I have learnt, and on this basis, I have said to you something today. These experiences given to you are of the past 28 years of Chinese revolution. So, this is for your reference only".

After this, Comrade Chou asked some specific questions about India, about Srikakulam such as how far it is from sea, how many persons were there, the height of the hills, food taken by the people there, etc.

Comrade Kang said, "After Comrade Chou's presentation of the experiences of the Chinese revolution, I have not much to say, I fully agree with him. Because our party does not know much about the Indian condition, we just say something about our own experiences, and this is just for the reference of our comrades from the Indian Marxist - Leninist party.

"The first question I want to say is about the relationship between our two parties, just as Comrade Chou mentioned previously. So, in terms of the relationship between our two parties, you, our India Comrades understand us. You said that your party regarded our party as a party of leadership, and regarded Chairman as your chairman. We have repeatedly said that we do not agree with this view. This is by no means a question of being modest. Chairman Mao has always taught us that on the matter of principle we should never be too polite. Our party has always acted upon Chairman Mao's teachings. This is a question of Marxist-Leninist Principle Comrade Chou has already talked minutely on this question. Only when we regard our two parties as equal parties, it is possible for us to exchange views on the basis of learning from each other.

In May this year, Comrade Bose gathered our opinions about the two articles. In one of these articles, it is said the chairman of the Chinese party is the chairman of your party. At that time the CC of our party told Comrade Bose through one of our comrades that we did not agree with this point of view. This is because our relationship is that of fraternal parties, and not of a party being led -not the relationship of a patriarchal father party and the son party. The relationship of our parties is one of mutual support, learning from each other and cooperation with each other, Why do we persist on this matter? This is because this is the teaching of Chairman Mao. Chairman Mao consistently opposed such practice. i.e., to regard relationship between two parties as one of party of leadership and a party being led.

"Comrade Bose also asked our opinion about another article. Because our party does not know much about the Indian conditions and also some of the question cannot be made clear through other channel. So we suggest your party to send a delegation to China in order to exchange views. If possible since the rise of the Naxalbari movement and since the founding of CPI (ML) our party has done its utmost to support it. I think Comrade Bose will remember on the night of the last national day when Comrade Bose met with Chairman Mao, he said to him; "Your party represents the hope of the Indian People". Our party as always' approached your party in this way. Soon after the Naxalbari movement, you have established a formal Marxist - Leninist party, and this Marxist-Leninist party has expanded its

organizations in many of the Indian states. Your party is a revolutionary party and a very brilliant party. You have clearly defined the nature of your revolution and you have defined the task of the revolution as fighting against imperialism, feudalism, modern revisionism and bureaucratic capitalism. Your party has persisted in mobilizing the masses of the peasantry for armed struggle. We are very thankful to you for your party having warmly supported our cultural revolution and having the highest respect for Chairman Mao and Mao Tse-Tung Thought. What Chairman Mao has said at a rostrum is the general representation of our party in regard to your party. Of course, because your party has been established not long back and it is a young party, the party is in its infancy, so in the process of struggle, on the matters of policies it is unavoidable for it to commit some mistakes. This is something easy to understand. We support your party. But why did we not broadcast those two articles? This is because some of the questions mentioned in those articles, we do not know about. So, whether it is beneficial for CPI (ML) if we publish these two articles - this question we want to consult with you, Comrade Bose. Therefore, after Comrade Chou's talk. I would like to exchange views with you on some of the questions mentioned in those two articles.

"In May this year Comrade Bose approached us with one of these two articles which is entitled "Chinese Chairman is our chairman, Chinese path is our path". Comrade Bose, please excuse us: it is, just from the title of the article, very hard to publish this article. So if we publish it, first of all Chairman Mao would criticize us, saying why we have published such an article with such a title? Of course, many things in this article are good. For instance, it has said that the main content of your revolution is agrarian, and nature is democratic, Those things are alright it is said.

"The landless and poor peasants are allies of the revolution, and we should closely unite with middle peasants and win over a part of rich peasants and neutralize the majority of the rich peasants. "All those are alright, But there are still some questions on which we want to exchange views with you. For instance on the question of petty bourgeoisie and bourgeois intellectuals it is said that it is only through armed struggle when the worker peasant alliance is established and when the red political power is established throughout the whole country, it is possible to form a democratic front of all these classes under the leadership of the working class. ( Note : Exactly What is said in CPI (ML)'s program is, "Such an united front can only be built after establishing workers peasant unity and the red political power in at least a few parts of the country) This point deserves our study. In the light of our experiences, this problem should be analyzed with the view point of "one divides into two". A part of the upper strata of the petty bourgeoisie is reactionary. But, it is said in your article that they are linked together with counter revolutionaries, economically and ideologically. But another part of them can be with the revolution especially in the cities, and in your movement against the imperialists, this force cannot be neglected. According to our experiences there are a large number of patriotic intellectuals. From the reports of western news agencies, we have seen that there are such intellectuals in India also who are

against US imperialism and Soviet Socialist Imperialism. So, I am afraid, it is not proper to have the democratic front formed with them (petty bourgeoisie) only after the seizure of power throughout the country. It is because of these questions that we did not publish those articles. So, we asked to send a delegation of your party to consult.

"There is another article " March Forward through Summing up Experiences of the Peasants Revolutionary struggle of India". This is another article on which Comrade Bose asked our opinion. Again, we did not publish this article, because we wanted to exchange our views with Comrade Bose first. In this article, there is a passage saying we have gained the following experiences from the Naxalbari struggle peasants are struggling not for land but for political power". We do not know whether such a formulation is proper or not in India. As you said, the main content of the Indian revolution is agrarian, and you mobilize the peasantry to establish political power through agrarian revolution. In that case we think, agrarian revolution is linked with the struggle for the establishment of political power. These two things are inter-connected and cannot be separated from each other. So, if you say that the peasants are not struggling for land but for political power". We think, this formulation is not so accurate.

"Another question is also mentioned in the article. It says " Without mass movement and mass organizations, can we start guerrilla warfare? The mass movement and mass organizations intensify the tendencies towards open and economist movement. Therefore, open mass movement and mass organizations are a hindrance or an obstacle to the development and expansion of guerilla warfare". But, in accordance with our experiences, mass movements and mass organization are just the basis of guerrilla warfare, and not the obstacle of guerrilla warfare. If there is no mass movement and mass organization, that will be an obstacle for guerrilla warfare. We do not know whether your formulation is in conformity with the actual condition or not. This is a question of principle because, we think that armed struggle and guerrilla warfare and mass movement are the war of the masses.

"Another question mentioned in the article is about the question of annihilation of the class enemies. Previously, we did not know much about this formulation. So, we just approached this in accordance with our experiences. Only after going through an article published in the July issue of "Liberation", we have come to know the real meaning of this annihilation of class enemies by your party, the form of guerrilla warfare and about the formation of secret squads to engage in secret assassinations preferred by the Marxist - Leninist party of India. So this is completely different from what we mean by guerrilla warfare. That article gave many examples. So we went to study together with our Indian comrades whether you have just organized such squads to wipe out the landlords physically and take that as the main from of guerrilla warfare. After reading the July issue of "Liberation" and also after going through the article entitled "A few Words about Guerrilla Action", we have come to understand that your way is the same as we did during the defeat of the Chinese revolution, i.e., by small squads assassinating

the landlords secretly. When the article deals with how to organize guerrilla units, it is said that in the process of organizing guerrilla units. We must keep absolute secrecy. This is a completely different form of organization different from relying upon the broadest masses of the people. Not only the form, the nature is also quite different from the guerrilla units in its real things. It is also said that the guerrilla units should be kept secret from the local people who have not yet mastered the method of doing illegal work. We think that this question is related to the principle of guerrilla warfare. We think that it is dangerous for the guerrilla warfare to divorce itself from the masses as well as from the party organization”.

Comrade Chou cut in, “That means, the guerrilla squad is divorced from the local people and the local party organization”.

Comrade Kang said, “Again in the article, there is a formulation saying, “these people whose hands are not stained with blood of the class enemy, are not worthy to be called a communist. This formulation is not proper. If we think so then the party organization will change its nature. Because of the above reasons, we did not publish many of the articles by your party, and many of the articles are not by Comrade Charu Muzumdar. As we thought, it is not proper for us to talk about such questions through other channels, we thought it proper to have a face to face talk with Comrade Bose.

Comrade Kang went on to say, “If we want to wage real guerrilla warfare we should apply the method adopted by Chairman Mao. It seems to us that your general Orientation is correct, but only some of the policies are not proper and are not in conformity with Marxism - Leninism - Mao Thought. In 1968 when I met with Comrade Bose, talked about this question with him emphatically. I said during the talk, “if we engage in armed struggle in an isolated way, i.e., without the broadest masses of the people this kind of struggle would not be successful. Disregarding the vital interests of the peasants and disregarding agrarian struggle of the peasantry, the armed struggle would have no base, hence it will not be successful. I have said that the level of consciousness of the masses has always been raised from lower stage to higher, and only when we proceed from the vital interests the economic interest of the masses of the people and raise their level of consciousness, can we mobilize the masses of the people for armed struggle in a way of isolating ourselves from the masses.

“So far as your work in the cities is concerned, you have not said anything about the experience of your struggle against imperialists in your articles. You said in the article that in accordance with the experience of the Chinese Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution all of the mass organizations should be changed. But you should not copy our experience. From your articles, we can see that your party does not have any active attitude towards the trade union work”.

At this time, comrade chou cut, in “You said that the work of the trade union is defensive and economist. Only the party organization is offensive and militant. It is not good for you to set these two things against each other. You regard a small number of secret squads engaged in secret assassination

as offensive, but the economic struggle of the broadest masses of the people as defensive. This question deserves our study and this is question of principle.

Comrade Kang said, "There is also a problem about the attitude towards the middle peasants. It is said that the middle peasants should not join the secret guerrilla activities. You have also criticized Nagi Reddy saying "Nagi and his like attempted to confiscate land, cattles and farm 100 s of big landlords and distribute among poor peasants. Do they not think that big landlords should call their police? When the police comes, the big landlords and other reactionaries would try their utmost to help the policemen to arrest the peasants. So when the landlords as well as other counter revolutionaries can move freely and commit evils according to their will how can we confiscate the land and distribute among the peasants" We do not know much about the advocacy of Nagi Reddy, but from your formulation, we feel that Indian Marxist - Leninist party has not yet solved the question of relationship between agrarian struggle and guerrilla warfare. In the light of the experiences of the Chinese revolution, we think that it is just on the circumstances that we should organize armed forces to defend our land and guerrilla organization to defend our activities. Previously when we started armed struggle we achieved success in this armed struggle only when we could mobilize the masses of the peasantry to start agrarian struggles. The peasants were engaged in struggle for the purpose of defending the fruits of their struggle. When our Comrades asked comrade Bose, How did you get distributed among peasants? Do you have any specific land policy? He answered, "We have not yet started this work, because until now we have no political power and army of our own". How can we do so in this way? First of all, let us work out some land policy with which the peasantry can be mobilized, establish armed forces so as to seize political power, this is a just reverse process. This is another question which merits our study.

"Just as I have said previously, your party has established and it lacks experiences, but I believe that so long as your party persists in its general orientation, such specific policies can be solved gradually. So it is inevitable for us to commit mistakes of this kind or that in the revolutionary struggle. Just as Chairman Mao Said to Kanu Sanyal, it is very hard to avoid mistakes among the revolutionary ranks. Revolution has its ups and downs, and revolution always advances in a wave like way.

So it is bound to suffer setbacks. Now I raised before Comrade Bose, the questions. Please consider these questions after going back home tell Comrade Muzumdar how to rectify the policies.

"Recently, we have seen from the reports in the October issue of "Hindustan Standard." It is said that the Chairman of the Marxist - Leninist party said, "If we commit mistakes, we should try to rectify them because erroneous political thinking and working methods are the enemies of our revolutionary work. So we should not let such wrong thing to develop". So Comrade Charu Muzumdar is all right when he said this. But rectification of mistakes should be done step by step and this should not hurt the enthusiasm for revolution of the masses and the party



members. We should not allow the enemies to have any scope to attack and disintegrate our party so, in rectifying our mistakes, we should not be impetuous and this term should not be swift. We should be careful.

“The second point is that in rectifying our policies, we should use constructive things to replace those wrong things. For instance, we should have a clear cut agrarian policy, and this agrarian policy should be formulated by consulting the masses of the people. That means, we concentrate the opinion of the masses of the people and then get it formed into policies and persist in implementing it among the masses. On the other hand, we should establish our own armed forces in an active and systematic way, and place them in secret armed squads. We should rectify those improper policies in the process of positive reconstruction. Especially we should integrate Marxism - Leninism- Mao's thought with the actual condition of our own country.

“These are the questions we put forward for reference to Comrade Bose, and these things are based on what is said in your document and articles. So, it is highly possible that what is said is not in conformity with actual conditions of your country. Even what I said may be wrong. Previously, we understood your view point just in the light of our experiences. Today also, there may be such tendencies. So you should by no means take this opinion as an opinion of the party of the leadership. You can just put it aside without paying any attention to it. This is for your references only. I just said this fragmently not systematically”.

Comrade chou : I fully agree with Comrade Kang in his views. You have 2000 men in Srikakulam. Many of your comrades got sacrificed in that struggle. Would you please give us a brief account of your experience, and successes and failures in Srikakulam? I have already gone through all your reports of the minutes, but I have not been able to understand this. You are there encircled by the enemies and suppressed by them or you are isolated there, because you are divorced from the masses of the people. What is true? What is about your agrarian policies there? In accordance with Chairman Mao's teaching, if we want to learn from experience, we should dissect a sparrow, that means, we take a typical case, and we try to view a problem from different angles, Comrade Bose, have you been there?

Comrade Bose : I have been there twice. So, about the question of Srikakulam, it was not because the enemies have outnumbered us. Uptill now, it has not been possible for the reactionaries to enter into the very heart of this mountainous area.

Comrade Chou : Is it mountainous region?

Comrade Bose : that is a small hilly area.

Comrade Chou : Is it a forest area?

Comrade Bose: Not a dense forest, because it is situated in the north of Andhra.

Comrae Chou : What is the distance from Srikakulam to Hyderabad?

Comrade Bose: It is far away.

Comrade Chou: Then, is it far from sea?

Comrade Bose: 40-50 miles from the sea.

Comrade Chou: Is there any sea port near by?

Comrade Bose: No

Comrade Chou: Are there any fishing boats?

Comrade Bose: Yes, small fishing boats.

Comrade Chou: What is the height of the hills?

Comrade Bose: In some places 300-500 ft.

Comrade Chou: Highway?

Comrade Bose: No

Comrade Chou: Animals?

Comrade Bose: Very few

Comrade Chou: Is there only foot path?

Comrade Bose: Yes

Comrade Chou: Easy to hide?

Comrade Bose: Yes.

Comrade Chou: Then, how did you suffer setback there?

Comrade Chou: Our party congress reviewed the struggle in the area, and we thought that it was because of the bureaucratic attitude of the local party organization towards local people. Because we failed to arouse the class feeling of the masses of the people towards the enemy, and we failed to arouse bitter hatred of the masses of the people against the enemy. Though we killed 120 policeman, we should have seized guns from them, but we failed. Because of the wrong attitude of the *leadership we failed to mobilize the masses fully and seize the guns.*

Comrade Chou : So, these guns were taken away by other policemen?

Comrade Bose : Yes

Comrade Chou : Were these 120 policemen killed enmass or scattered?

Comrade Bose : They were killed within 8 months successively.

Comrade Chou : Were they killed by the guerrilla squads?

Comrade Bose : Yes

Comrade Chou : Did you put any placard about your land policies?

Comrade Bose : No.

Comrade Chou : Is the party organization kept secret?

Comrade Bose : The party organization is known to the local people

Comrade Chou : Is the party organization known to all of the local people or some of the local people?

Comrade Bose : All of the local people. In early 69 land distribution was done and each household got 6 bighas of land. But afterwards they gave up this work, because in mid 1969, policemen came and burnt some houses of the people and then ran away

Comrade Chou : How many policemen came at different times?

Comrade Bose : Their number ranges from 1500-2000.

Comrade Chou : Were they local troops?

Comrade Bose : No, they were the CRP

Comrade Chou : How many days did the CRP station in that areas?

Comrade Bose : They did not station in that area at all. They burnt the houses and ran away.

Comrade Chou : How many people were arrested by the CRP there?

Comrade Bose : Over 100 people were arrested there by them and they are still in jail.

Comrade Chou : Are they imprisoned in the local area or sent away? Are there leading members of the party organization among them?

Comrade Bose : The leading comrades of the local party organization were not arrested but a few members of the local party organizations were killed.

Comrade Chou : Have you any leading comrade staying in that area?

Comrade Bose : Yes.

Comrade Chou : When the CRP came to Srikakulam was it because we had no guns or because of any other reasons that we failed?

Comrade Bose : Not only because we had no firearms. Although we did not have enough firearms but we had local made weapons; the critical point is that we have not yet made any policy towards the police.

Comrade Chou : Have you cut down the communication line? Shifted masses to another place?

Comrade Bose : Yes.

Comrade Chou : So, you evacuated the masses of the people after many were arrested after many were killed or arrested?

Comrade Bose : Generally speaking as soon as we got any information, we got the masses of the people evacuated; still several hundred people were not evacuated at one time.

Comrade Chou : So, have you any policy about dealing with the government troops?

Comrade Bose : No, not yet.

Comrade Chou : Among the masses, do you have some progressive mass organizations, say, militia, guerrilla unit, etc.?

Comrade Bose : We have some mass organizations among the masses, but these are not mass organization on the basis of armed, i.e., not armed forces. Myself and KanuSanyal went there to train the guerrilla units. Contents of this military training includes how to seize guns from enemies. Such things, I learned in China. At a meeting of the local party committee everyone agreed that is it not proper time to engage with the enemy troops.

Comrade Chou: Did those 1500 policemen come at the same time or they just came there on many occasions?  
on many occasions?

Comrade Bose: They came in groups and by stages.

Comrade Chou : Guerrilla units are to be trained through struggle against the enemy : otherwise it is not possible to get them trained without fighting guerrilla warfare. So the 16 Chinese Characters of guerrilla warfare were developed during

the process of armed struggle in Ching kang. That was done by Chairman Mao, and in this way, we could preserve our forces as well as wipe out the enemy.

Comrade Bose : We taught the local masses with the 16 Character secret of the guerrilla warfare, and the local masses can now recite them.

Comrade Chou : But they do not practice. Comrade Kang said; they are lacking experience.

Comrade Bose : When I went to Srikakulam for the second time, I called a meeting of the coastal region. It was decided that at that time, it was not proper to launch attack on policemen.

Comrade Chou : We may not use the word "attack" but use the word "Fighting". We may not attack the enemy each time.

Comrade Bose : There is a sharp differences of opinion between the leading members and the ordinary people. So, I will convey your opinion to the Central Committee of our party.

Comrade Chou : Which kind of opinion is in majority?

Comrade Bose : That opinion is in majority, i.e., now it is proper for us to engage with the police.

Comrade Chou : Are the leading comrades still among the masses in the mountainous region? Is it possible for them to carry our work among the masses still? Is it area of national minorities? Have they common thing with the other areas of Andhra? Are the leading Comrades semi-open among the hilly people? Are they natives of that area? Do you have homemade guns? You have just said that 120 policemen were killed and you failed to seize their guns, what were the reasons? Is it because you do not want to use the guns or took it away? Have you any regulations of not using firearms? Now, what about the feeling of the local masses? Are they disheartened or intigent because several hundreds were arrested? Land has already been taken back by the landlords or it is still in the hands of peasants? Is there any mass organization?

Comrade Bose : Federation of militant peasants organization.

Comrade Chou : Is it open? What is the percentage of this organization of the local population?... You may continue your struggle in this area and the form of the struggle can be raised one step. Does the party organization of that locality have a unified idea? Have they come to know the past mistakes? Are they now rectifying their mistakes? Are the leading comrades of the locality always shifting to different places and they hide themselves among the masses? Do you have some masses to stand on guard in the hilly regions? What about the area of that locality? Do the reactionary landlords exist? Are these only rich peasants? How about communications with outside? Is there any business dealing?

On hearing reply to these questions, Comrade Chou said: That means, you are completely isolated. I have just said, during period of our agrarian revolution, in some of our areas where putchism were practices, there were no contacts between these two. Do you have any such problem?

Comrade Chou : That means you are not completely cut off from outside. Is it possible for you to get in the area through small footpath without passing by the tents of the police? Can we say, apart from Naxalbari area, this is the biggest area? So, the day after tomorrow you will leave for home, but this question deserves our study. Will you please examine it? In the srikakulam area, is there any leader of national minority? Your experience in this area deserves our study. Are you self sufficient in economic affairs there? Is it very high? Is malaria prevalent? Do many of them live in straw sheds? How many years have you been working there? Are there any revisionist? What about members of the revisionist party? Have they come over to you? To which group do they belong? All of them joined? Now are they working hard with you? You should lead them correctly and at the same time you should sum up your experience.

Comrade Kang : You should sum up the experience of your failure?

Comrade Chou : What is the population of Srikakulam district?

Comrade Bose : Two and a half million.

Comrade Chou : Are there many places in India where people do not know how to grow rice. But the topography is suitable? Can you select for a guerrilla zone from these areas? Your orientations is correct, that is, to go to the villages, to start guerrilla struggles, create guerrilla zones and expand in and create base area. But you should have programmes and policies.

Comrade Chou : In Assam, the population is not so large and the area is vast..... in your article, you oppose to go into jungles what is the reason? Is it for the reason that it is not very easy to get in contact with the masses?..... So long as we rely upon the masses, we can start guerrilla warfare. This is right, Sometimes, armed forces can shift to other places under the cover of the masses. Just as Mao said, "We fight when we can win.... This is to preserve our forces and hiding our guerrillas among the masses. Consolidate our forces now in Andhra, Assam and West Bengal. Is it easy for you to solve the problem of feeding yourself ? In the very beginning we started guerrilla warfare in the border areas, because the border belongs to several provinces; one part belongs to this and another to that. So, usually we started our guerrilla warfare in the border areas. Same in the case with India. It is better to start in the border area, because in such cases, it is easy for you to deal with the enemy because of their administration.

'Dialectical approach towards hardship, death, sacrifice. "We fear neither nor death" we fear no death, but there should be worthy death. Chairman Mao said in his article, "One is mightier than mountain another is like feather." It is not good for us to die adventurous and unworthy death. We communist party members do not agree with such anarchist practice, that is to assassinate a landlord or policemen without mobilizing the masses. Without the masses, we just kill one bad element by a handful of people. Of course, by doing so, we can make those masses who hate such bad elements happy, for the time being, but because this is not to be done by mobilizing the masses of the people, so as a result when this need passes, nothing is left there. So, these are question which merit our study and

examination. In accordance with your objective conditions you may start your guerrilla base areas. Now a days the Indian people especially peasants, are leading a very hard life and they are oppressed. So they want to make revolution, So long as we mobilize the masses we can find out many places where we can start guerrilla warfare.

Comrade Kang : Chairman Mao said, “policy is soul if there is just a slogan but no policy, it will not do”.

Comrade Chou : As you know our August first Nanchang uprising we attacked the Kuomintang. We fired the first shot against Kuomintang. This orientation was correct. But we were wrong in our policy. In Nanchang during the agrarian revolution we should have gone to the villages but at that time, we went to cities.

Comrade Kang : Some comrades opposed to go up to the mountains saying that Chairman Mao's is Marxism is the mountains. Our Party committed such kind of mistakes in those days.

Comrade Chou : It was in the mountains that Chairman Mao practised Marxism. The second point is after the Nanchang uprising we planned to rely upon foreign assistance i.e., to rely upon Soviet assistance. So, we led nearly 20,000 troops - to Swatoo, hoping to have Soviet assistance from there. As a result, we suffered defeat in fighting big battles against the enemy. You advocate not to rely upon foreign assistance this is right. At that time Comrade Kang said to Comrade Chou, “Materially, not to rely upon foreign assistance, but spiritually, they copy Chairman Mao's words: Even they copy about that hinges of the redguards.

Comrade Chou : So, you are organizing red guards in schools. But on this, Chairman Mao does not agree, and he said to the Japanese friends, “It is not proper for you to organize red guards”. I heard that your first party congress was held in the city.

Comrade Bose : Yes

Comrade Chou : That was very dangerous..... In the big cities we can hold only short meetings..... Because in the past you were in touch with revisionists, you know many of the old revisionists, so it is very easy to get you recognized by them. For instance, many know Comrade Charu Majumdar. So he should move constantly. In 31 years, Comrade Mao went to Tungshing city once, and that too, as Comrade Stalin asked

him to go. As yours is a vast country, it is completely possible for you to find out suitable places. You are to find out “Ching kang “where you will select. It is for you to select.... if you still have some question which require our answer, we will contact again.

Chairman Mao said, “Your party represents the hope of the Indian people. Your general orientation is correct. So long as you correct the policies your party will be more hopeful



## MORE ABOUT NAXALBARI

KANU SANYAL

(April 1973)

[This document came as a continuation of the "Report on the Peasant Movement in the Terai Region" written by Kanu Sanyal in Oct, 1968. It has thrown light on how the Naxalbari Peasant uprising has developed as well on the problems it encountered. It has thrown light on how the two lines - one represented by CM and his followers and other by Kanu Sanyal and other leading cadre and committee in Naxalbari had manifested and clashed all along. On the strength of facts, it asserted that the Naxalbari rejected the left sectarian line and developed along a revolutionary mass line. It also made a critical evaluation of Terai Report of 1968 and corrected certain left sectarian conclusions (like 'Naxalbari is not a struggle for land but state power) drawn in the Terai Report which had nothing to do with the actual course of development of Naxalbari Peasant Movement - EC.]

The Naxalbari peasant uprising is going to complete its sixth year. During these six years, a storm of many events has swept over the whole country. The formation of the "Naxalbari Aid Committee" in 1967 and thereafter the creation of the "All India Co-ordination Committee of the Communist Revolutionaries," centering around the peasant uprising of Naxalbari, was a big step forward in the history of the Indian Communist movement. The slogan of building up of Naxalbari type of struggles under the leadership of AICCCR brought about an enormous new wave of struggle all over the country. This enormous new tide was so extensive and deep that it created stir amongst the majority of the oppressed people and youth of West Bengal, Bihar, Andhra, Uttar Pradesh, Kerala, Punjab, Assam, Orissa and Jammu and Kashmir. It can only be compared with the post-war events of 1946-47. This stir, on the one hand, created panic within the ruling classes and on the other, enhanced the process of disintegration amongst the reactionary, revisionist and neo-revisionist parties. Why this new indication of vast possibilities brought about by the Naxalbari peasant uprising suddenly failed, from the beginning of 1969, needs thorough re-examination.

The peasant uprising of Naxalbari acted as a decisive factor in uniting the Communist Revolutionaries all over India. After the formation of the AICCCR,

some of its correct steps also opened up new possibilities. As the AICCCR did not make a proper and correct evaluation of the Naxalbari peasant uprising, Naxalbari was reduced simply to an image. Over and above, the Co-ordination Committee, not being able to discuss and reach a clear decision on the '*Terai Report*' (even with its shortcomings), hampered the cause of developing itself into a leading team. On the other hand, for unknown reasons, no discussion took place on the '*Terai Report*' in the Darjeeling district; as a result, the Communist Revolutionaries of Darjeeling district failed to give a correct and complete history of Naxalbari peasant uprising before the Communist Revolutionaries, of the country. This helped a clique of political careerists who were trying to utilise Naxalbari for their narrow group ends from the outset to come in the limelight of leadership. The All India Co-ordination Committee failed to realise the mischief of this political careerist group even after the publication of the article "Spring Thunder Breaks Over India" by the Chinese Communist Party. The net result of this was that this clique of political careerists utilised the glorious role of Naxalbari within the Co-ordination Committee. Taking the opportunity of confinement in jails, their living underground and the exclusion from the Co-ordination Committee for unknown reasons of the Naxalbari Communist Revolutionaries, this clique of political careerists established Charu Majumdar as the leader-creator of Naxalbari with the plea of "*Lessons of Naxalbari*" and "*Evaluation of Naxalbari*." The subjective outlook of the AICCCR towards the Naxalbari peasant uprising and its lack of political vigilance led to the split in the unity of the Communist Revolutionaries. Availing of this chance, this careerist clique were successful in their conspiracy to make this split permanent by hurriedly forming the CPI(ML), basing on the slogans: "*guerilla warfare is the only way*" and "*individual annihilation is the only strategy and tactic*." After twenty years of the Telengana peasant rebellion, the peasant uprising of Naxalbari in 1967 brought anew the basic question before the Communist Revolutionaries: What should be the role of the peasantry in the stage of the New Democratic revolution in a semi-feudal and semi-colonial country like India? On the solution of this question depends the success or failure of the democratic revolution of India. To state more explicitly, is it the bourgeoisie who will lead the peasant, or is it the proletariat who will establish hegemony over its dependable and numerically bigger ally, the peasantry, in the stage of democratic revolution? The revisionists and the neo-revisionists pose the peasant problem in an agrarian country like India as a mere economic problem; in the question of seizure of political power they tag the peasants to the coil of the ruling classes and leave the peasants at the mercy of the economic reasons of social development by putting forward the theory that "force" or "political power" creates and regulates the economic relations, deny the very programme of agrarian revolution in the stage of democratic revolution and push the peasantry towards the bourgeoisie.

Almost a hundred years ago, Engels, while fighting against the conspirators within the social democratic movement, said in his work, *Anti-Duhring*: "*In short, always and everywhere it is the economic conditions and instruments of power*



*which help "force" to victory and without which force ceases to be force, and anyone who tried to reform methods of warfare from the opposite standpoint..... would certainly earn nothing but a beating."*

The Naxalbari peasant uprising forcefully presented this peasant problem and its importance before the democratic revolution of India. In order to confuse this question, an effort was made to show in a subtle and cunning way, since 1967, as if Naxalbari was suddenly created in 1967, Naxalbari was the creation of the documents written by Charu Majumdar known as *Eight Documents* and Naxalbari could not preserve its existence because of not following the instructions of Charu Majumdar. To make a scientific analysis of the real history of the Naxalbari peasant uprising, a new post-mortem is necessary. Mao Tsetung in his article, 'Reform Our Study', has said : "*Marxism-Leninism is a science and science is knowledge come by honesty, absolutely no trickery will do.*" In the same article he again said: "*Instead of relying on sheer enthusiasm one must, as Stalin says, combine revolutionary sweep with practical spirit. With this attitude one will not chop up history..... such an attitude is one of seeking the truth from facts and not one of impressing people by claptrap.*"

The Naxalbari peasant uprising was not suddenly created in 1967. It did not fall from the heaven by the grace of God nor was it a spontaneous movement. Lenin has taught us : "*Socialism is not the invention of any dreamer. on the other hand, it is the necessary result of the development of the productive forces in modern societies. The past history of human society is the history of class struggle. This class struggle will continue until private property and anarchy in social system of production, which are the foundations of class contradiction and class domination, are liquidated.*" The idealists refuse to accept this interpretation of history. The conspirators within the socialist movement want to chop up the past history. They want to show that history was not created by the slaves. According to them, heroes, intelligent and wise persons create history. To them the past history is full of ignorance and full of mistakes. They say. one or two wise heroes will enlighten the world. Unfortunately, such one or two wise heroes did not illumine the path of Naxalbari.

The past history of the workers and peasants of the Naxalbari area is history of glorious class struggle. The beginning of this class struggle dates back to 1946. Then there was an interruption in the struggle from 1948-51 owing to the ultra-leftist, adventurist line of the Communist Party of India. Thereafter, commencing from 1951 at a stretch upto the year 1967, the history of the Naxalbari area is a history of longdrawn class struggle. This class struggle surged ahead through zig-zag course, both peaceful and violent means, legal and illegal clashes and through consistent painstaking work of the communist cadres. The aim of this article is not to go into details about the class struggle of the workers and peasants of the Naxalbari area. It can be described in short through a few stages.

The Darjeeling district was a non-regulated area under the British rule. After 1947, though not considered as non-regulated area, the ill-effects were still felt.

While the workers throughout the country were enjoying trade union rights, it was impossible for an outsider to approach the workers in the Naxalbari area, and to approach the peasant huts, a person from a political party had to depend on the mercy and the permission of the landlords (*jotedars*). Amidst this condition, 1951-54 was the period of the organisation stage in the Naxalbari area. During this stage, the peasantry of Naxalbari advanced through clashes to get themselves organised. This stage was a period to organise and to put a stop to illegal small extortion of the *jotedars*. Even at this primary stage the peasants' class struggle could not advance through the so-called peaceful means ; on the contrary, it was a path of bloody clashes with the *jotedars*. Tea gardens and villages being adjacent to each other, the peasants learnt through their class struggle that without the presence of the tea workers by their side, their class struggle would not surge forward. From this angle, the peasant cadres of Naxalbari area, by skilfully organising the tea workers, proved their class consciousness.

The second stage from 1955 to 1957 was the period of development of united class struggle of the workers and peasants of the Naxalbari area and it was a higher stage. It was a higher stage for two reasons :

(1) The worker-peasant unity was not merely a slogan-mongering one ; the working class understood that in order to realise its class demands the active support of the peasantry was indispensable and sought active support of the peasantry in each of their struggles and supported the peasantry in the same way. In short, a firm alliance of the working class and the peasantry developed and it remained as it was till 1967.

(2) The class struggle itself shook their illusions on legalism and they in turn armed themselves with conventional weapons, not depending upon customary, legal and peaceful means. The years 1955-56 were memorable in the class struggle of the workers and peasantry of Naxalbari. During 1955, in the Bonus struggle of the tea workers, thousands of tea workers and peasants not only forced the tea planters but also the police to retreat. On one occasion, about ten thousand armed tea workers and peasants disarmed the police force. Armed workers and peasants transformed the Bonus movement into a political struggle.

In 1958-62-in the third stage-the West Bengal Kisan Sabha gave a call to regain possession of 'benami' land. The sub-divisional Kisan Samiti in Naxalbari declared from its conference that the partial struggle for the recovery of the 'benami' land within the four walls of land would not serve the purpose of real land reforms and would not help build peasant unity. So the conference gave a call to confiscate the entire produce of *jotedar's* land. The call of the conference was : (1) Reap and store the harvest at your own place and raise the Red Flag ; (2) *jotedars* must furnish proof of their ownership before the peasant committee without which no share to them ; (3) arm yourself to protect the crop; and (4) save your crop from the police. The intensity of the struggle of 1958-59 could be felt from the following facts :

About two thousand peasants were arrested in that year; seven hundred criminal cases were instituted ; police could not arrest any leading cadre; clashes with the

jotedars, clashes with the police and snatching of arms etc., took place. Naxalbari, in that year, turned into a Red flag area. The peasantry could keep 80% of the crop in their possession and saved 70% of the crop from the hands of the police in that struggle. In one occasion, a big Congressite jotedar planned to loot the paddy of the peasants in a weak area by mobilising Congress volunteers. Hearing this news, five thousand armed peasants resisted the Congress goondas and police and helped the peasants to get back their entire produce. 1958-59 was the year of terror of the jotedars and planters-landowners. The fighting mood and class consciousness of the peasants of Naxalbari was no lesser than that of 1967. The role of Charu Babu in this movement was peculiar. Though he was not directly connected with this struggle, he arbitrarily declared withdrawal of the struggle at the instruction of the State Kisan Sabha leaders without prior consultation with the participants of the struggle. The intensity of the struggle can be understood from the fact that the struggle was branded as 'left adventurist' in the Political-Organisational report of the West Bengal conference of the Communist Party held in the year 1960. In spite of this, the peasantry of Naxalbari carried on their struggle to preserve the fruits of the struggle till 1962.

During the fourth stage-1962-64-in the years of the India-China border clash, the workers and peasants of Naxalbari stood, in support of China, fearlessly. Even in these years of chauvinism and bitter anti-communism, the workers and peasants of Naxalbari boldly stood firm and did not allow even any meeting to be held by the chauvinists in the rural areas. As a result, besides many middle class cadres arrested throughout West Bengal more than a hundred workers and peasants were arrested only in Naxalbari. Even then the workers and peasants preserved their organisational strength by resisting onslaught of the jotedars and tea planters. In 1964, the workers, peasants and middle class party cadres in Darjeeling district fought vehemently against revisionism, isolated the Dangeites from town and rural areas and formed CPI(M) and registered their unequivocal support to the stand of the Chinese Communist party in the international communist movement. These events prove the higher level of political consciousness of the worker, peasant and middle class cadres of the Party of the Siliguri Sub-division.

The struggle, as described from 1951 to 1964, did not develop spontaneously. These struggles could be organised because there was a leading team of self-sacrificing cadres of the Communist Party dedicated to the service of the people. It should be mentioned that there was no wage-earning whole-time of Party. A few episodes have only been mentioned here of the important struggles during the period 1951-64. Therefore, the Naxalbari peasant uprising did not take place suddenly in 1967. It is for the existence of this glowing history of the past glorious class struggles that Naxalbari became a reality. Those who do not want to perceive the past history, whatever they may be, are no Marxists.

Now let us come to the 'Eight Documents' written by Charu Majumdar. To many, these eight documents may seem mysterious; because many do not know their source and their existence. Particularly, 90% of those connected with the

AICCCR and the CPI(ML) do not know about them. There was constant propaganda since 1967 that the '*Eight Documents*' written by Charu Majumdar were the creators of Naxalbari. How far is the claim justified can be seen from the events of the communist movement in the Darjeeling district from 1965 to 1967.

After the formation of the CPI (M) and just before the holding of its (Party) Congress in 1964, the reactionary Congress Government arrested the communist cadres all over West Bengal. At that time, beginning from October 1964 upto the first part of 1965, workers, peasants and middle class Party cadres of Siliguri subdivision (Naxalbari) were arrested en masse but Charu Majumdar was not arrested because of his illness, and eventually he too was arrested at the end of 1965. During the period, 1964- June 1966, the Party cadres of Darjeeling district had to wage ideological struggle with the CPI (M) leadership while in jail. And during this very period, they prepared themselves politically and arrived at the firm conclusion that the liberation struggle of India must follow the Chinese path. Just at the same period, Charu Majumdar wrote six documents and distributed them among the party cadres expressing his opinion about the democratic revolution of India and about the CPI(M) leadership. Many cadres of Darjeeling district could know about these documents while they were in jail through the press report of UNI of Kalimpong in the bourgeois papers. The threats of the CPI(M) leadership regarding these documents on the one hand and the ignorance of the real contents of the documents on the part of the cadres of Darjeeling district created an uneasy chaotic situation. Charu Majumdar sent 5/6 of his selected cadres to the rural areas with these documents. These new young cadres went to the villages and made a futile effort from 1965 to June 1966 to propagate according to these documents. Meanwhile, cadres of Darjeeling district came to know about the contents of the documents after their release from jail in June 1966. Then the discussions on the basis of these documents started between them and Charu Majumdar.

In short, the major points of the documents were: CPI (M) is a revisionist party and should be unmasked; the Chinese path is the path of liberation of India; armed struggle is the immediate task; to form secret combat groups is immediate task; setting fire to jotedar's house, attacking the individual jotedar and collection of guns through these combat groups not political campaign but 'action' will mobilise the people and there is no necessity of mass organisation and mass movement. The leading cadres of Siliguri Local Committee after discussion with him agreed on some points and disagreed on some others. The points on which agreement was arrived at were: Chinese path is the path of liberation of India; agrarian revolution can be completed through armed struggle; propagate the politics of agrarian revolution among the workers and peasants and organise them to build up a secret Party organisation. The points on which the leading cadres of the Local Committee put stress were: the indispensability of workers' and peasants' mass organisations and mass movement; necessity of inner party ideological struggle inside CPI (M); political work and 'actions' are not opposed to each other; on the contrary, 'action' will be meaningless if politics is not in command

and so political work is the necessary condition for preparation ; necessity of mass struggles through which organs of struggles are to be built up and necessity of mass organisation in urban area. Charu Babu declined to agree on these points. In short, from the very start there were two distinct opinions which may be called confrontation between two lines. At this stage a compromise was reached . It was decided that the cadres of the Local Committee would put into practice in Naxalbari area those agreed points in accordance with their own experience , and the new cadres would act according to Charu Babu's opinion in an area adjacent to Naxalbari, Chater Hat-Islampur area in West Dinajpur district. As Charu Majumdar was connected with the workers' and peasants' struggles in Jalpaiguri district till 1952, the cadres of the Darjeeling district were respectful to him and so this compromise was possible.

The work in Chater Hat-Islampur area was started exactly on the basis of the six documents . Secret groups were formed , a little political propaganda was made and actions were started. That is, efforts were made to set fire to jotedars' houses , some paddy were harvested at night and plans for snatching guns failed. As politics was not given importance, as the necessity of building up mass organisations and mass movements was ignored , actions based on combat groups became the assembly place for some lumpen elements. During the Naxalbari uprising in 1967, the jotedars of this area mobilised the entire peasantry behind a certain political party and attacked the houses of the known combat group cadres. The combat group cadres were bewildered in the face of this attack of the jotedars accompanied by the peasants. Why the peasants went under the leadership of the jotedars, they could not account for. As a result, combat groups became ineffective and disorganised. Some leaders of the combat groups and party cadres, having no shelter in the face of jotedar's attack, were forced to leave the area. It should be remembered that this happened when Naxalbari was at its peak. After this nothing was left in that area excepting a handful of peasant families. The party cadres of that area isolated themselves from the masses by trying to apply the '*Eight Documents*'. It is enough to quote Mao Tsetung here : "*Thus any practice that isolates us from the masses has no sanction at all, and it is simply the mischief done by the sectarian ideas of some comrades' own invention*".

In Naxalbari area, or more precisely in Darjeeling district, the party cadres decided to gain majority in the District Committee by carrying on ideological struggle inside the CPI(M). Out of a total of 26 members of the District Committee, all but six accepted the politics of the Local Committee and a separate secret committee was formed inside the District Committee. The party members of the tea gardens in Darjeeling district both in the hills and in the plains started supporting the politics of the secret District Committee. At that time the struggle inside the CPI(M) reached to such an extent that the West Bengal State Committee was forced to withdraw its decision of expulsion of Charu Majumdar from the party membership. Although Charu Majumdar apparently accepted the necessity of ideological struggle in the CPI(M), in practice he disregarded it and so in an ungaurded moment the West Bengal State Committee got the opportunity to dissolve

the Darjeeling District Committee. In spite of this, the ideological struggle inside the CPI(M) spread to the adjacent districts.

During the Naxalbari uprising in 1967 it was possible to hold 105 meetings of the Party members and sympathisers in 21 days only in Calcutta. From 1966 to the month of May 1967, working as one disciplined team, the cadres of the Local Committee and District Committee organized the Party members on the one hand, led mass struggles on the other, and were able to resist the attacks of the CPI(M) leadership. It was possible because the cadres could practise firmness in principle and flexibility in policy as far as practicable. But after May 67 this style of work could not be maintained because Charu Majumdar could take advantage of some factors present at that time : (1) Party cadres' extreme hatred against revisionists of all types ; (2) The state leadership's ill treatment towards the cadres of the Darjeeling district for their criticism of the CPI(M) revisionist leadership since 1966. This, together with the discontent amongst the cadres led to blind antagonism among cadres who lost the sense of flexibility ; (3) Treating the rank and file members and the leadership of the CPI(M) at par by the cadres of the Darjeeling district, i.e., forgetting the glorious anti-revisionist role of the rank and file members of the CPI(M) ; (4) The absence of secret and skilful party centre to resist the attack of the CPI(M) leadership, to preserve the mass struggle in face of the police onslaught of the United Front Government and above all, to lead properly the Naxalbari uprising ; (5) Unbearable conditions of underground life of Naxalbari cadres in the face of brutal attacks of the U.F. Govt. police (with order to shoot at sight ). (6) Lack of self-reliance and self-confidence of the Naxalbari cadres and their unconditional faith in Charu Majumdar. At this period Charu Babu was staying at home due to illness ; it was not possible for him to move about. So he had no direct connection with the struggle. But these aforesaid reasons opened up scope for him to distract the Party cadres.

The period June -December '66 may be termed as a springboard of Naxalbari uprising. The District and Local Party cadres propagated the politics of agrarian revolution among the tea workers. As a result, tea-worker Party members and the general tea workers mobilised around the revolutionary party cadres . Worker's discontent against the revisionist Union leaders on the one hand and economic clashes on the other, pushed the workers towards struggle. In that sense, nine days' general strike in tea industry in September '66 played the preparatory role of the Naxalbari peasant uprising and the tea workers played the role of the vanguard. When the tea workers' strike in the adjacent Jalpaiguri district was fizzling out, the militant mood of the tea workers of Darjeeling district scared the revisionist leadership who hastily took to the path of settlement of the strike. In Darjeeling district, the strike was more extensive than that of 1955. Besides the workers of the Red flag union, workers of other unions and even the workers of unorganised gardens had to join the strike. At the death of a worker in police firing during clash with police in the hills, the workers' mood of revenge rose so high that the revisionists got panicky. In the plains, that is, in Naxalbari, the peasants stood firm by the side of the workers leaving aside their intensive agricultural

work. Armed workers and peasants continued the strike scaring the blacklegs away and forced the police to retreat. The struggle was not confined within the bounds of the tea worker's economic demands but turned into a political struggle of the working class and the peasantry. By withdrawing the strike without realising any basic demand, the revisionists got all the more isolated from the workers. The District and Local cadres took full advantage of this situation and passed resolution on the programme of agrarian revolution from the branch conferences of the plantation unions. In the annual conference of the hill tea workers, the revisionist leaders were severely criticised and ousted from the trade unions. The annual conference of the plantation workers in Naxalbari advanced one step farther and called upon the peasants to start struggle for land. The correct method of work of the party cadres in respect of mass organisation and mass struggles helped to mobilise the workers and peasants of the district as well as Naxalbari area, build up anew more trade unions which led to drawing them in the struggle. It was found that during Naxalbari uprising the tea workers observed general strike three times in support of the peasant struggle. The Party cadres of Darjeeling district defeated through practice Charu Majumdar's line of ignoring the necessity of trade unions for the time being.

From the experience of these struggles, Charu Babu changed his opinion and was compelled to accept the utility of economic struggles and wrote document Nos. 7 and 8 on these experiences. But wrong ideas cannot be got rid of by winning only once in the struggle against erroneous ideas; so consistent struggle must be waged against incorrect ideas. It is always urgent and indispensable task to make the party cadres, general party members and the people vigilant against the mistaken ideas. But unfortunately because of the continuation of struggle inside the CPI(M) and the mass struggles simultaneously, events advanced with such a speed that this could not be possible. So though some formulations of document Nos. 7 and 8 were correct, Charu Majumdar was able to drag the cadres to his own old line easily. The tea workers' struggle of September 1966 influenced the peasantry so immensely that in November/December of the same year the peasant's movement quickly spread all over Naxalbari area. Utilising the experience of the struggle of 1958-59 and enthused with the politics of agrarian revolution, armed workers and peasants created terror among jotedars and planter land-owners. Thousands of organised armed peasants harvested paddy and also snatched guns and this took place without the help of any such combat groups. When the armed police force came to seize crops, hundreds of armed tea workers prevented them. At this time warrants of arrest were issued against the workers and peasants. As a result, the Party cadres had to go underground. In 1967 the question of election came just at the time when warrants of arrest were hanging on the Party cadres, ordinary workers and peasants. The district and Local Party cadres utilised the election to propagate the politics of agrarian revolution. During this period, the Party cadres gathered some experience of combining legal with illegal works in an illegal condition (because of warrants). A difference occurred between the District cadres and some new cadres on utilising this election. The cadres of Darjeeling district pointed out

that at this moment utilising this present election to serve the politics of agrarian revolution and the advocacy of the parliamentary path -these two are not the same. In practice, the emergence of Naxalbari uprising immediately after the election proved the correctness of the District cadres. From this it should not be concluded that it is a tactic for all the time. The unity of the workers and peasants of Naxalbari was further strengthened through the election and a basis of unity between the poor peasants and middle peasants, on the one hand, and a part of the rich peasants along with a few small landlords, on the other, was created. During the post election period the work of Party cadres multiplied. The division of share produce remained postponed owing to the election. As a result, immediately after the election, the share -croppers started taking away the entire produce depriving the jotedars, which sparked off clashes with them. The jotedars were forced to retreat in face of combined resistance of workers and peasants. In these circumstances, the peasantry compelled the Party cadres to declare the practical task of the agrarian revolution. Consequently the proposal for seizure of land started pouring from numerous area conferences. This was reflected in the sub-divisional joint conference of the workers and peasants held on May 7, 1967.

This historic conference of May 7, 1967 brought forth Naxalbari before the whole country. The creator of the Naxalbari peasant uprising was the mass organisation and mass struggles of workers and peasants. The implementation of the task of seizure of land gave birth to this uprising. The programme of seizure of land taught the peasantry that only by smashing the political domination and power of the jotedars and planter land owners in the rural areas and in their place by establishing the political domination and power of the workers and peasants in the rural areas, the task of the agrarian revolution can be completed. The lesson of Naxalbari is that the main content of agrarian revolution is to distribute land to the peasants; it is for the preservation of that land in his possession that resistance struggles will develop in rural areas which, in its turn, will transform into a struggle for political power. So in the stage of democratic revolution or agrarian revolution, struggle for land and struggle for political power are intertwined. The writer of the *Terai Report* has correctly described how the Naxalbari peasants' struggle for land surged forward and how the peasants' revolutionary Committee established political power in the rural areas. In spite of that he failed to understand the scientific conclusion that in the stage of agrarian revolution, struggle for land and struggle for state power in the rural areas are intertwined. For this reason he diverted himself to a mechanical and incorrect formulation by trying to explain the real lessons of Naxalbari uprising in terms of erroneous anti-Marxist-Leninist line of the *Eight documents*. Practically Naxalbari uprising is a living protest to the *Eight Documents*. Lenin said : *"Both economic and political agitations are equally necessary to develop class consciousness of the proletariat ; both economic and political agitations are equally necessary for guiding the class struggle of the Russian workers because every class struggle is a political struggle. These two kinds of agitation are inseparably connected in the activities of the social democrats as the two sides of the same medal"*.



Here one more side of the *Eight Documents* is to be mentioned. If the cadres of Darjeeling district could scrutinise the *Eight Documents* they would have understood that Charu Babu remained in Siliguri from 1952 till 1965 which was the time of writing these documents ; but surprisingly enough, in the first six documents no mention was ever made of the worker-peasants' class struggle of Naxalbari. Even in document Nos. 7 and 8 there was no mention of the implementation of politics of agrarian revolution in the Naxalbari area from June to December, 1966. From these omissions some fair questions arise, such as : Did Charu Majumdar omit this unintentionally ? Was there nothing worth learning from the long-drawn 17 years' of glorious struggles of tea workers and peasants in Siliguri sub-division of Darjeeling district ? Was the glorious struggle of the tea workers and peasants of June-December '66 so insignificant that it could not be mentioned in Charu Babu's document Nos. 7 and 8 ? Some more scrutiny of the document No. 8 will reveal that besides mentioning a partial experience of killing of a scab in the Tebhaga struggle of 1946, he mentioned only the 1965 food movement in South Bengal. It was in no way unintentional on his part. Leaving aside other conclusions it can be said that Charu Babu was suffering from the disease of subjective over-enthusiasm which led to personal egoism. That is why he consciously chopped up the past history and did not take any lesson from it. He did not want to analyse the objective realities and so with his subjective over-enthusiasm and egotism placed personal feeling above principles. Marxism-Leninism and Mao Tsetung Thought teach that subjectivism will inevitably push towards opportunism or adventurism. In fact, that only took place. Charu Majumdar wanted to establish anarchism in a new form. The history following the formulation of the CPI(ML) has proved this. In 1878, while repudiating Duhring in the social democratic movement in his work *Anti-Duhring*, Engels said : *".....the principles are not the starting point of the investigation, but its final result ; they are not applied to nature and the human history, but abstracted from them, it is not nature and the realm of humanity which conform to these principles, but the principles are only valid in so far as they are in conformity with nature and history. That is the only materialist conception of the question."* Lenin said : *" In this respect Marxism learns, if we may so express, from mass practice and makes no claim whatever to teach the masses forms of struggle invented by systematisers in the seclusion of their studies".* Mao Tsetung said : *" We are Marxists and Marxism teaches that in our approach to a problem, we should start from objective facts, not from abstract definitions, and that we should derive our guiding principles, politics and measures from an analysis of the facts."* In connection with *"Lessons of Naxalbari"* and its *"Evaluation"* an idea was circulated that Naxalbari could not keep its existence as Charu Majumdar's instructions were not followed. Social revolutions take place due to the maturity of the internal contradictions of the society, not by any individual's dictates. Mao Tsetung said: *" Changes in society are due chiefly to the development of the internal contradictions in society, that is, the contradiction between the productive forces and the relations of production, the contradiction between the classes and the contradiction between the old and*

*the new; it is the development of these contradictions that pushes society forward and gives the impetus for the suppression of old society by the new."*

The problem of the existence of Naxalbari becomes clear when it is judged in the light of Mao Tsetung Thought. Mao Tsetung has said that if a red area is to exist, it must fulfil certain conditions. Besides the condition of the contradiction among the ruling classes and their spilt, he has pointed out of some more, such as: 1) A strong mass base, 2) A correct and well organised Communist Party, 3) Adequately strong people's armed force, 4) Favourable terrain, 5) Favourable economic conditions for self-reliance. A part from these, he mentioned two more important conditions, such as : 1) Whether the nation-wide revolutionary upsurge is in the high tide or low ebb; 2) the places where red political power first emerges and can last long are not those unaffected by the democratic revolution. On the other hand it will be there, where in course of the bourgeois democratic revolution the masses of workers and peasants rose in great numbers. Defying all these it is not possible for any red area to last long. Judging it from this angle it is true that there was the down-fall of Congress party in eight of the states due to its internal contradictions and its spilt, countrywide mass discontent against the government and there was a strong mass base at Naxalbari. But save these, all other conditions were absent. It should be mentioned first that there was no well organised and skilled communist party organisation in Darjeeling district to cope with the situation, there was no clear-cut plan to lead the struggle, there was no direction to build up a people's and armed force in spite of the presence of armed people and apart from this, on the question of the terrain, there was no plan to shift themselves to the hill areas.

In 1967, the situation of West Bengal was of a complex nature. On the one hand, the Congress party was defeated and there was a strong aspiration among the people for radical change. On the other hand, victory of the so-called leftists in the election created illusions. So the mood of overthrowing a government of the so-called leftists, formed after a series of propaganda for the parliamentary path throughout some decades, was absent among the people. It should be borne in mind that the CPI(M) was formed through struggle against revisionism and this party had an image at that time as leader of different mass movements within the parliamentary frame-work. It is true that the revolt of the communist cadres of Darjeeling district, of some leading cadres of Calcutta and some other districts against the CPI(M) leadership was correct and they proved themselves to be real communists by firmly standing at the side of Naxalbari uprising. But the rank and the members of CPI(M), though having confusion against the revisionist leadership, were not ready for a revolt.

In these complex circumstances it was possible to preserve the Naxalbari peasant uprising without incurring heavy loss and also it was possible to advance in a disciplined way from anarchic planlessness. At that period the Naxalbari cadres proposed a dialogue with the United Front Government. But Charu Majumdar did not agree and said that any dialogue with the U.F Government was revisionism. In this complex situation, subjective tactical mistakes, absence of subjective

preparations and absence of flexibility in policy by keeping firm on principle led to setback of Naxalbari uprising.

Then, was the Naxalbari peasant uprising untimely ? Certainly not. The question of timeliness of Naxalbari does not depend on whether Naxalbari could keep its existence as a red area or not. In the context of the countrywide revolutionary upsurge of 1965-67, and judged by the yardstick of the inevitability of fighting against all types of revisionism for the general orientation of India's democratic revolution and the advancement of India's revolution, Naxalbari was a correct, timely and extremely important historic event. It is to be remembered that all the conditions to establish a red area never remain present ; some conditions will be present and some other will have to be created. To create the conditions it is essential to preserve the uprising. The Naxalbari peasant uprising presented this general orientation : Revolt of the Indian peasants and revolution of the Indian people are inevitable. So the uprisings have to be organised ; but in order to preserve it in a planned way, flexibility in policy while keeping firm on principle is necessary.

The immaturity of grasping Marxism-Leninism and Mao Tsetung Thought in the concrete condition of India is the sole reason as to why such a long time was required to understand the importance of the Naxalbari peasant uprising. So, extreme price had to be paid through heavy losses.

India is a vast and ancient land of many nations. Failure to keep in view the specific features of Indian society and inability to solve the problems of Indian revolution from the traditions of struggles of the Indian people led to subjective super-imposing of the experiences of other countries mechanically ; it brought about right and left deviation in the Indian Communist movement. Expressed in the language of Mao Tsetung, it is "*cutting the feet to fit the shoes.*" Denying the materialist truth that it is the Indian people who are the real creators of Indian history since time immemorial, the communist leadership painted some persons of the ruling classes of different era as creators of history and father of the nation. As a result the Indian communist movement sunk to the level of metaphysics—some of the communist leaders revised Marxism-Leninism and diverted the communist movement to right and left deviations ; on the other hand, another section, acting mechanically, landed into devastation. One of the main reasons of the sorry plight of the Indian communist movement is that almost all of its leaders in different levels have come from the impetuous petty-bourgeois class, the class of conservative petty peasant producers with narrow outlook, and from the anarchic, decadent feudal class. The presence of permanent deep economic crisis in the Indian society led to occasional political crises which, in its turn, gave birth to sporadic revolutionary upsurges both big and small. But due to the betrayal of the Indian communist leadership, these have failed time and again. At that time, an honest section within the communist movement tried to find out the correct path. But their impetuous class character and anarchic outlook had pushed them towards subjectivism ; they had fallen prey to adventurism by trying to apply mechanically the much valuable experience of other countries in toto, which was utilised in full

by the political careerists. The latest example of that in the Indian communist movement is the emergence of the CPI(ML) and its aftermath.

In order to advance with a correct policy by fighting and defeating revisionism of all shades and subjectivism, the unity of all the honest communist revolutionaries is the prime necessity today in the Indian communist movement. But this unity must develop on the basis of mutual respect, attitude of mutual learning and on the basis of how much unity can be maintained. It is not all easy to develop this unity. The situation which developed just after Naxalbari is absent now. On the contrary, an atmosphere of mutual disrespect and expression of arrogance in many groups exist ; they pose great hurdles towards achieving this unity. The CPI(ML) which was formed by a section of Communist Revolutionaries of India has been reduced to groups and sub-groups. The open letter issued by the six leading persons of the CPI(ML) had been a very correct and timely step. In the present context the overall political situation of India demands that the most important task today before the Communist Revolutionaries, along with the CPI(ML) groups, is to build up the unity of all these honest communist revolutionaries of India.

*[Reproduced from Proletarian Path Vol II, Nos. 4 & 5,  
May-Aug, 1974]*



## OPEN LETTER BY SIX LEADING COMRADES

*[This letter was released from Vishakhapatnam (AP) Central Jail. Several News Papers as well as FRONTIER, an English Weekly from Calcutta have published on November 4, 1972. -EC.]*

**Comrades,**

We convey *our* revolutionary greeting to all. We feel that we are not competent to send you these suggestions, but owing to abnormal situation inside the Party now, we are compelled to take this course.

By this time, we hope, you all know that the great glorious and correct Chinese Communist Party had sent us most valuable fraternal suggestions in respect of our liberation struggle in India in the month of November, 1970.

We are citing certain excerpts of the valuable suggestions for our convenience. The suggestions are :

(1) The Chinese Party-grew and developed by fighting alein trends-both left adventurism and right deviation.

(2) The Chinese Revolution became successful with three magic weapons : (a) the Party (b) the people's Army (c) the United Front.

(3) To call a Chairman of one Party as the Chairman of another party is wrong, and it will wound the national sentiment of the working class of this country.

(4) Your idea of United Front is wrong. You have said that the United Front will come into being only after the formation of some base areas. This is a mechanical understanding. The United Front is a process. The United Front comes into being at every stage of struggle, and again it breaks down. This is not a permanent organisation. There is no doubt that the worker-peasant unity is its main basis. But the main understanding behind the United Front is the unity between the exploiter and the exploited (those exploiters who are not the main target of the revolution). The characterisation of the bourgeoisie as a whole as comprador is wrong.

(5) Regarding the formulation that the open trade union, open mass organisations and mass movements are out of date, and taking to secret assassination as the only way : This idea needs rethinking. Formerly we misunderstood your word '*annihilation*'. We used to think that the idea is taken from our Chiarmen's war of annihilation. But from July 1970 issue of *Liberation* (the organ of CPI-ML) we came to understand that this annihilation means secret assassination.

(6) You have applied Lin Piao's People's War Theory in a mechanical way. Lin's Guerilla War theory is a military affair. During the anti-japanese resistance war when we had an army of 10 lakhs, at that time some comrades in the army raised a slogan that positional warfare and mobile warfare are the way to mobilise the people. In reply to this wrong theory, Comrade Lin said that guerilla war is the only way to mobilise the people. This military theory has no relation with political and organisational question.

(7) Regarding the formulation that if a revolutionary does not make his hand red with the blood of class enemies, then he is not a Communist : If this be the yardstick of a Communist then that Communist Party cannot remain a Communist Party.

(8) No stress has been given on agrarian revolution and the slogan for the seizure of State power is counterposed to the land problem. There is no agrarian programme.

(9) Without mass struggle and mass organisation, the peasant's armed struggle cannot be sustained. The Communist Party of China supported Naxalbari struggle not merely as a struggle for the seizure of State power. The article 'Spring Thunder' published in China in support of Naxalbari and later published in *Liberation* will clarify it.

(10). The authority and prestige of a leader cannot be created but grow and develop.

(11). The general orientation of (CPI-ML) is correct but its policy is wrong.

We firmly accept these valuable suggestions and criticism from the fraternal Party. We deeply feel that the Central Committee of our Party led by Comrade Charu Majumdar should have accepted the above suggestions and criticism at once and made self-criticism and rectify the mistakes, as suggested, in the interest of the agrarian revolution of our country.

But to our great disappointment, regret and disgust, we found that Comrade Charu Majumdar and the Central Committee led by him, has refused to take lessons from the above valuable suggestions. In our opinion, if he had any reservations in respect of the suggestions from the fraternal Party, then he could have readily circulated the fraternal Party's suggestions to all the Party units for discussion. But he failed to take this course, as a result of which discussion and discord cropped up inside the Party. This is the bad old method and practice followed inside the Indian Communist movement.

We firmly believe that the Central Committee and the Central Party line have deviated from the path of the glorious Naxalbari peasant uprising. That is, the path shown in their Report on Peasant Movement in the main has completely departed from the path enunciated in the famous article "Spring Thunder" in respect of our armed agrarian revolution. We deeply feel that our policy suffered Left adventurist deviations as a result of which a wrong left adventurist method was adopted for which at present the party in fact has split into groups and factions

and Com. Sushital Roy Chowdhury was the victim of this method and for this the cause of the armed agrarian revolution of our country is hindered and jeopardised.

We firmly declare that we do not owe any allegiance to any group or faction. Our relation with the groups which believed in the Thoughts of Mao, both inside and outside the CPI(ML) is not antagonistic. We firmly believe that as General Secretary of the Party, Comrade Charu Majumdar is mainly responsible for the Left adventurist deviations and at the same time, we firmly believe that all the members of the former first Central Committee elected by the first Congress of the Party and all the members co-opted in the present Central Committee cannot also shirk their responsibilities, because they are also more or less directly or indirectly responsible for the Left adventurist deviations.

We, the undersigned, with utmost devotion and frankness accept our guilt and we emphatically declare that we will boldly accept the criticisms of our comrades in this connection, and we are also doing our self-criticisms with full honesty. We call upon all the members of the former and the present Central Committee to accept their guilt and make self-criticism in the interest of our armed agrarian revolution.

We earnestly request all the members of our Party and the sympathisers to be bold enough and come forward unhesitatingly to repudiate the Left adventurist deviationist line advocated by Comrade Charu Majumdar and ask him to make honest self-criticism and to accept his guilt in respect of our armed agrarian revolution. We also appeal to our comrades and sympathisers to criticise the Central Committee members and ask him to accept their guilt and make self-criticism honestly. We must be very careful against revisionism, while fighting against Left deviations, which have become the main danger inside the Party for the present.

We appeal earnestly to all the members of our Party to prepare a review of the struggle in their respective areas; start discussions throughout the Party; and try to rectify the mistakes in the light of the Naxalbari path as laid down in the article 'Spring Thunder', and by accepting the suggestion from the great, glorious and correct Chinese Communist Party as the basis, without any reservations and create a new unity to carry forward the armed agrarian struggle.

*Kanu Sanyal*  
*Chowdhary Tejeswara Rao*  
*Souren Bose*  
*Kolla Venkaiah*  
*D. Nagabhushan Patnaik*  
*D. Bhuvanamohan Patnaik*

## TARIMELA NAGI REDDY MEMORIAL TRUST PUBLICATIONS

		Rs Ps
1. India Mortgaged	T.N.Reddy	100.00
2. Socialism : Utopian and Scientific	Engels	10.00
3. Manifesto of the Communist Party	Marx and Engels	10.00
4. Critique of The Gotha Programme	Karl Marx	15.00
5. What is to be Done?	Lenin	30.00
6. "Left Wing" Communism An Infantile Disorder	Lenin	20.00
7. The State and Revolution	Lenin	20.00
8. On the Correct Handling of Contradictions Among the People	Mao Tse Tung	10.00
9. Karl Marx and His Teachings	Lenin	10.00
10. The State	Lenin	10.00
11. Best Son of Indian Revolutionary Movement-Com.T.N.Reddy	-	20.00
12. Communist Manifesto -Its relevancy in the present age	Parimal Dasgupta	5.00
13. Reichstag fire trial - Dimitrov blasts the fascist conspiracy	-	5.00
14. Petty - Bourgeois and Proletarian Socialism	Lenin	5.00
15. How and why Indian Bourgeoisie betrayed Indian People? How 'Indian' is the Indian Bourgeoisie?	T.N.Reddy	4.00
16. The Tasks of the China League for Civil Rights	Soong Ching Ling	1.00
17. The Struggle in the Chinkang Mountains	Mao Tse Tung	7.00
18. Talk between Chou En Lai and Souren Bose	-	10.00
19. On Contradiction	Mao Tse Tung	12.00
20. On Practice	Mao Tse Tung	5.00
21. On Correcting Mistaken Ideas in the Party	Mao Tse Tung	5.00
22. The Role of the Chinese Communist Party in the National War	Mao Tse Tung	7.00
23. Historical and Polemical Documents of the Communist Movement in India	-	300.00
24. My Arrest (Bengali)	T.N.Reddy	5.00
25. Feudalism and Land Reforms (Bengali)	T.N.Reddy	6.00



26.	Mahan Telangana Khethihar Sasatra Kranthi :KuchMahatvapurna Anubhav (Hindi) (translator -Nirmalananda)	Meghanath	Rs Ps 15.00
27.	Marx Se Mao Tse Tung(Hindi) (translator-Ranjit Singh)	George Thomson	50.00

#### PUBLICATIONS IN TELUGU

1.	కమ్యూనిస్టు పార్టీ నిర్మాణ సూత్రాలు	-	2.00
2.	కా.తరిమెల నాగిరెడ్డికి కలాల నివాళులు	-	5.00
3.	విప్లవోద్యమంలో ఉద్యమించిన ఉత్తమోత్తమ సారథి.కా.తరిమెల నాగిరెడ్డి	-	20.00
4.	చౌ.ఎన్.లై. రచనలు	-	4.00
5.	ప్రజల మధ్య వైరుధ్యాలు-వాటి పట్ల సక్రమంగా వ్యవహరించే పద్ధతి	మావో జెదాంగ్	1.50
6.	ఫాసిస్టు కోర్టులో డిమిట్రావ్ సింహగర్జన	-	3.00
7.	పోలీసు మంత్రి జలగం వెంగళరావును శిక్షించాలి.	మండ్ర సుబ్బారెడ్డి కోర్టు స్టేట్మెంట్	5.00
8.	కేంద్రీకృత ప్రజాస్వామ్యం	మావో జెదాంగ్	1-25
9.	ప్రపంచ కమ్యూనిస్టు ఉద్యమం - గుణపాఠాలు	చంద్ర ఫుల్లారెడ్డి	4.00
10.	సోషలిజం ప్రథమ పాఠాలు (అనువాదం-వి.వి.లు)	లియో హ్యూబర్మన్ సిబిల్ హెచ్ మే	5.00
11.	రాజకీయ ఆర్థిక సంక్షోభం నాదూ,నేదూ	ఎ.బి.కె.ప్రసాద్	5.00
12.	భారత ఆర్థిక రాజకీయ సంక్షోభం -నాదూ,నేదూ పరిష్కారమార్గాలు	జూలై,2004 సదస్సు వ్యాసాలు	50.00
13.	సోరెన్ బోస్తో చౌ ఎన్ లై సంభాషణ	-	10.00
14.	సామ్రాజ్యవాద ప్రపంచీకరణ-నేటి దేశ పరిస్థితి	ఆగస్టు, 2006 సెమినార్ పత్రాలు	10.00
15.	చైనా విప్లవం,చైనా కమ్యూనిస్టు పార్టీ	మావో	10.00
16.	శ్రీకాకుళ గిరిజన రైతాంగ ఉద్యమం "	వెంకట " (మేలు ప్రతి)	150.00 200.00

#### For Details :

**P.JASWANTHA RAO,**  
Secretary,  
T.N.Memorial Trust,  
32-13-26/1, B.M.RAO ROAD,  
Mogalrajpuram,  
VIJAYAWADA-10, AP

#### For Copies:

**Mythry Book House**  
Jaleel Street, Arundalpet  
VIJAYAWADA - 520 002  
E.mail:mythrybs@yahoo.co.in



**T.N.Memorial Trust** was formed in 1978 with the aim of propagating T.Nagi Reddy's ideals and Marxism Leninism Mao's Thought -the ideology adopted by him. The **Trust** adopted the aim of propagation democratic, patriotic, progressive and socialist ideas among the people through Literary, Cultural, Educational and Scientific activities. It is striving to the best of its ability to translate these aims into practice. The **Trust** has published Marxist and other Progressive literature. It is organising Seminars and other Programmes. We are confident of continuing and enlarging these activities in the days to come.

**T.N.MEMORIAL TRUST**

