

A publication to mark the centenary of  
Mao's birth on December 26, 1993

**Marxism-Leninism-  
Mao Zedong Thought  
is our world outlook**

By  
**D.V. Rao**  
(A compilation of articles)

**Proletarian Line Publications  
Hyderabad**

**Long Live Marxism-Leninism-  
Mao Zedong Thought**



**26-12-1893**

**9-9-1976**

*Long live the memory of the late Com.Mao Zedong,  
the immortal leader of the Chinese revolution and the  
great Marxist-Leninist teacher of the world proletariat.*

**A publication to mark the centenary of  
Mao's birth on December 26,1993**

**Marxism-Leninism-  
Mao Zedong Thought  
is our world outlook**

**By  
D.V. Rao  
(A compilation of articles)**

**Proletarian Line Publications  
Hyderabad**

Date of publication :  
December 1993

**CORRECTIONS**

\* Please read Page 51 as Page 54, and as Page 54 as Page 51

Page	Para	Line	Printed as	Read as
60	4	7	inside the revisionism	inside the revolutionary ranks, not to speak of revisionism.
145	3	12	not	her

Price: Rs.20/-

For details :

**Proletarian Line Publications**  
16-2-146/6, Malakpet,  
Hyderabad-500 036.

**CONTENTS**

FOREWORD... .. vii

**PART - I**

- On Mao Zedong Thought** ... .. 1
1. Marxism-Leninism and Mao Zedong Thought is Our World Outlook (1971)... .. 1
  2. Comrade Mao Tse-tung (1976) ... .. 13
  3. Theoretical Problems (May 8, 1981) ... .. 24

**PART - II**

- Some Questions relating to the application of Mao's Thought to Indian Revolution** ... .. 33
1. Extracts from *Left Trend Among Indian Revolutionaries* (1970) ... .. 33
  2. An Extract from Note to the English Translation of *Right Opportunist Trend Inside the Party* (1971) ... .. 51
  3. An Extract from *Fundamental Line and Question of Unity* (March, 1973) ... .. 54
  4. Preface to the First English Edition, 1974 of *Telangana Armed Struggle and The Path of Indian Revolution* ... .. 58
  5. An Extract from *Telangana Armed Struggle and The Path of Indian Revolution*.  
Chapter IX ... .. 66
  6. Preface to *Refutation of Wrong Trends Advocating Withdrawal of Telangana Armed Struggle* ... .. 77

**PART - III**

- On some problems of Indian Revolution** ... .. 95
1. Karl Marx's Death Centenary.  
To Make the Indian Revolution a Success is Our Best Tribute to Marx (March 12, 1983)... .. 95

2. The Indian Revolution Will Succeed Only When the Revolutionary Proletariat Makes Marxism Its Own (May 7, 1983)....	100
3. CPI (M) Does not Cease to be Revisionist Simply Because It Could Establish Relations With CPC (May 23, 1983)....	105
4. CPI Leaders Continue Their Slanders Against CPC (June 14, 1983)....	114
5. Renouncing the Revolution at Home and Demanding Unity of International Communist Movement Cannot Go Together (June 21, 1983)....	121
6. Indian Revolution and Proletarian Internationalism (September 20, 1983)....	129

#### PART - IV

#### Mao's Thought and Some Problems Relating to Socialist Revolution in China.... 140

1. India and China's Continuing Revolution (October, 1978)....	140
2. October and Chinese Revolutions Show the Path of Revolutions to the People of the World (October 15, 1979)....	153
3. On Developments Inside China (July 18, 1980)....	157
4. Hold High The Banner of Mao Tse-tung Thought! (September 14, 1980)....	160
5. October and November Revolutions: Some Problems Facing the International Communist Movement (October 26, 1980)....	163
6. Some Problems Relating to Socialist Revolution in China (October 17, 1981)....	173
7. Twelfth Congress of Communist Party of China (September 20, 1982)....	190

#### APPENDIX

Lenin On Concessions....	194
--------------------------	-----

## Foreword

The 26th of December 1993 marks the birth centenary of the late Com.Mao Zedong, great leader of the Chinese revolution and Marxist-Leninist teacher of the world proletariat. We are publishing a collection of writings of the late Com.D.V. Rao, in which he has summed up the essence of Mao's Thought along with applying the same to the problems facing Indian revolution.

Part I includes three articles dealing with the essence of Mao's Thought and explaining how it is necessary for communist revolutionaries to take Marxism-Leninism-Mao's Thought as their world-outlook in order to lead the Indian revolution to a success. In the third article (an extract 'theoretical problems') of this part the author makes it clear that communist revolutionaries never regarded Marxism-Leninism-Mao's Thought as a dogma and had always treated it as a living ideology undergoing continuous development. In the same article the author explains the communist revolutionaries' views regarding certain controversial questions like the cultural revolution, three world theory etc. He critically reviews the experience of the relations between the international communist movement and the Indian communist movement and explains how the communist revolutionaries are advancing by drawing proper lessons from them. In the same article he also explains why it is necessary for Indian revolutionaries to have a correct attitude towards China. He also makes it clear that the Chinese Communist Party (CPC) is upholding Mao Zedong Thought and the policy being followed by the leadership is basically correct. Hence he rejects the contention of those who say that it has turned revisionist and points out that the activities of such people are contrary to proletarian internationalism.

We have included in Part II extracts from some documents dealing with the application of Mao's Thought to Indian revolution. In the first extract, the author refutes the false assertions of the CPI(ML) led by Charu Mazumdar which were opposed to Marxism-Leninism-Mao's Thought. He reasserts the historical truth that the Telangana armed struggle (1946-51) was the first application of Mao's Thought to Indian revolution. He also explains how the leadership of the CPI(ML) accepted Mao's Thought in words and reduced it to mere chanting of Mao's name while actually practising revisionism by renouncing the task of building up revolutionary mass movement. The other extracts deal with the various arguments brought forward at various times to reject or subvert the applicability of the path of peoples' war to India. The leadership of the CPI(M) brought forward such arguments as part of its neo-revisionism. A section of CPI(ML) leadership represented by Chandra Pulla Reddy tried to do the same while accepting Mao's Thought in words. The various extracts are a refutation of such arguments while upholding the peoples' war path. This is in essence the struggle to uphold and defend the applicability of Mao's Thought to Indian revolution.

Part III is a compilation of articles dealing with the problem of Indian interpretation of Marxism, relations with fraternal parties, unity of international communist movement and its relation to Indian revolution and the problem of proletarian internationalism and its relation to Indian revolution. The author has not confined himself to merely accepting Marxism-Leninism-Mao's Thought. It should be noted that he has applied it to the practice of Indian revolution and has elaborated it by basing himself on the experiences gained through revolutionary practice. In these articles the author exposes the opportunism practised by the leaders of the CPI and the CPM along with refuting their slanders. As such the articles form a part and parcel of the task of defending and elaborating Marxism-Leninism-Mao's Thought in India.

Part IV deals with the problems relating to Socialist Revolution in China. The author makes it clear that the CPC leadership after Com.Mao's death is upholding Mao's Thought and is following basically correct internal and external policies. He also held that it was of special importance for communist revolutionaries in India to have a correct attitude towards China (see P.27, 'Tasks being fulfilled by the leadership of the CPC-Our attitude'). The articles included in this part are in defence of correct policies of the CPC which are in accordance with Marxism-Leninism-Mao's Thought.

The author was the leader of the Telangana armed struggle (1946-51) right from its inception in 1940 till it was withdrawn by the then CPI leadership. Subsequently he summed up its revolutionary experiences as well as the experiences of other revolutionary movements in the country and developed and elaborated the programme and path of Indian revolution as the fundamental line and theory of Indian Revolution. He, along with the late Tarimela Nagi Reddy, founded the Unity Centre of Communist Revolutionaries of India (Marxist-Leninist), to lead the Indian revolution to success. The articles included in this compilation are only a part of the author's extensive writings which are an elaboration and defence of Marxism-Leninism-Mao's Thought as applied to Indian revolution. We are confident that the readers will find this compilation useful.

To work for the success of Indian Revolution is the greatest tribute we can pay to the memory of the late Mao Zedong. Let us re-dedicate ourselves to this task on the occasion of the Centenary of his birth.

Long live the memory of Mao Zedong, the immortal leader of the Chinese Revolution and the great teacher of the world proletariat!

Long live Marxism-Leninism-Mao Zedong Thought!!

Date : 23-12-1993

-- Editor.

## PART - I

### Marxism-Leninism and Mao Zedong Thought is Our World Outlook

The Prosecution charges us in the following way:

*"They proclaimed that Mao Zedong Thought was the Marxism-Leninism of the present epoch, rejected the parliamentary path as futile, and adopted a revolutionary, violent path as the only way of achieving political power."*

There is nothing wrong in this. Every revolutionary has to do this. Communist revolutionaries have also done the same. This is not a crime. On the other hand, every communist revolutionary thinks it his bounden duty, as well as his birth-right to have the world outlook of Marxism-Leninism and Mao Zedong Thought, and to lead the Indian revolution in accordance with it. We know that the revolutionaries have to sacrifice much, in order to carry out this sacred task and to defend this right. We are prepared for this. We have already sacrificed much. We will do so in future.

Marxism-Leninism and Mao Zedong Thought is not just a collection of theories contained in books. If that were so, the ruling classes would never have been afraid of it. More than 100 crores of people of Russia, China and the East European countries have, in accordance with the world outlook of Marxism-Leninism and Mao Zedong Thought, liberated themselves from the thousands of years of slavery, exploitation and oppression. People of other countries also are fighting for their liberation, travelling in the same path. The Indian people, as a part of the world people are fighting for their liberation from the system of imperialism, landlordism, and finally from the system of exploitation. Every people's revolution guided by Marxism-Leninism and Mao Zedong Thought has to succeed in the end. History has proved this universal truth. For the same reason, the Indian ruling classes are very much afraid of Marxism-Leninism and Mao Zedong Thought and of the activities carried out by the revolutionaries in accordance with it.

Before we explain why it is necessary for our people to have the guidance of Marxism-Leninism and Mao Zedong Thought for

the success of people's revolution of our country we think it necessary to mention the main points of Marxism-Leninism and Mao Zedong Thought. They are as following:

The great Lenin, who applied Marxism to the conditions of Russia and led Russian revolution to success, said:

*"Marxism is the system of Marx's views and teachings. Marx was the genius who continued and consummated the three main ideological currents of the nineteenth century, as represented by the three most advanced countries of mankind: classical German philosophy, classical English political economy and French socialism combined with French revolutionary doctrines in general. Acknowledged even by his opponents, the remarkable consistency and integrity of Marx's views, whose totality constitutes modern materialism and modern scientific socialism, as the theory and programme of the working class movement in all the civilised countries of the world....."*

(Lenin on KARL MARX)

Philosophical materialism, dialectics, materialistic conception of history, class struggle, value, surplus value, socialism and the tactics of proletarian class struggle are the principal aspects of Marxist theory. We, who have taken Marxism as our world outlook, are applying these aspects to the concrete conditions obtaining in India. Besides this, we carry out our activities in accordance with Marx's teaching, *"The philosophers have only interpreted the world in various ways. The point however is to change it,"* and also realising the importance of *"revolutionary practical activity."*

Karl Marx with the help and co-operation of Engels, his comrade-in-arms, analysed scientifically the contemporary capitalistic system, the problems it has created and pointed out the scientific solutions for them. He lived the life of a revolutionary. And he worked as a revolutionary. By summing up the experiences of the people's revolutions in the world, he has handed down the theory of proletarian revolution to the revolutionary peoples of the world.

We, communist revolutionaries, are making efforts to solve the problems facing the Indian people's revolution by applying all the Marxist theories to the specific conditions in India. Marxism is the guide for us in this effort.

The great Lenin, who is the greatest disciple of Marx and Engels,

applied Marxism to the specific conditions of the contemporary world, especially the Russian conditions, and led the Russian proletarian revolution to a successful conclusion. The totality of his theories, the world outlook he has given to world people is called Leninism.

Stalin, the great Marxist-Leninist, defined Leninism in the following way:

*"Leninism is Marxism of the era of imperialism and the proletarian revolution. To be more exact, Leninism is the theory and tactics of the proletarian revolution in general, the theory and tactics of the dictatorship of the proletariat in particular....."*

Stalin has explained this in the following lines:

*"Marx and Engels pursued their activities in the pre-revolutionary period (we have the proletarian revolution in mind), when developed imperialism did not yet exist, in the period of the proletariat's preparation for revolution in the period when the proletarian revolution was not yet an immediate practical inevitability. But Lenin, the disciple of Marx and Engels, pursued his activities in the period of developed imperialism, in the period of the unfolding proletarian revolution, when the proletarian revolution had already triumphed in one country, had smashed bourgeois democracy and had ushered in the era of proletarian democracy, the era of the Soviets"*

**(Foundations of Leninism)**

Lenin has headed the Russian Revolution to the victorious end. The main subjects of Leninism are:

Permanent revolution, proletarian revolution, dictatorship of the proletariat, role of the proletariat and the party in the system of dictatorship of the proletariat, the struggle for the victory of socialism and socialist construction in one country. All the philosophical, economic and political works of Lenin are a guide to all revolutionaries. Lenin played the leading role, not only in the Russian revolution, but in the international communist movement also. He formulated the guiding principles for the revolutions in the colonies and semi-colonies. Lenin was the founder of the Third International.

Stalin developed and enriched Marxism-Leninism after Lenin's death. He played a leading role successfully for a period of 30 years in consolidating the dictatorship of the proletariat, in defeating fascism, and in achieving victory for socialism and democracy. As

the leader of the international communist movement, he worked for strengthening and developing the movement. The Soviet Union had been the centre of world revolution during the periods of Lenin and Stalin and had been helping all the revolutions of the world, including the Chinese revolution.

China is the most populous country of the world. It is an oriental country with an ancient civilization. Comrade Mao led, for two decades, the people's revolution of the country to a successful conclusion by applying Marxism-Leninism to the concrete conditions and revolutionary practice of a semi-colonial and semi-feudal country like China, and by over-throwing, with the help of people's war and a protracted armed struggle, imperialism, feudalism and the Chiang Kai-shek clique, which protected them. And he proved, once for all, that it is possible for the people of colonial and semi-colonial countries to overthrow the strongest of imperialisms with the help of People's War. After the victorious revolution, it was consolidated, and socialist construction has started, and thus China became a strong country under the leadership of comrade Mao. The sum total of the works of Mao, summing up the experience of China's revolution and of world revolution in the prolonged revolutionary epoch, is the Mao Zedong Thought. The main features of this are the following:

1. If at all revolutions in colonial or semi-colonial countries ruled by imperialists, feudal classes and their henchmen are to be successful, they should go on in the form of protracted people's armed struggle. The revolution should take path of first setting up liberated bases in the rural areas and then finally liberating the cities. The working class has to lead this armed struggle. We call this the People's War. Guerilla warfare plays the main role in the People's War.

For the armed struggle to succeed, it is necessary to have a united front of the revolutionary classes. The united front will be against imperialism, feudalism and their lackeys in the country. It will support the armed struggle. The United Front consists of the working class, the peasantry, the middle classes and the national bourgeoisie which is for revolution and against imperialism. It will be led by the working class.

It is necessary to have a strong and revolutionary Communist Party organisation to conduct the armed struggle and lead the united front. A party which can apply Marxism to the concrete conditions and revolutionary practice of its country can alone lead the revolution

to a successful end.

The path which contains these three principal points is the path of People's War.

2. Revolutions in the colonial and semi-colonial countries can succeed only as People's Democratic Revolutions, under the leadership of the proletariat. People's Democracy is the product of the People's Democratic Revolution. The leadership of the proletariat guarantees not only the completion of the People's Democratic Revolution, but provides the opportunity for the uninterrupted transition to socialism and the leadership over the socialist revolution also. On the contrary these revolutions cannot complete the tasks of National Democratic Revolution if led by the bourgeoisie. In such cases, these revolutions stop mid-way without completing any of the tasks, and a situation arises wherein the countries may again become neo-colonies of imperialists.

3. The influence of the bourgeoisie does not vanish by itself even after the proletariat comes into power. The proletariat has to conduct a struggle consciously against the bourgeois influences. This struggle is called the Proletarian Cultural Revolution. The Communist Party of the Soviet Union has become a revisionist party, as there was no cultural revolution in the Soviet Union and as the influence of the bourgeoisie on the proletariat was not fought. Basing on these experiences, Mao felt the need of a cultural revolution in China, where the proletariat is in power, and led it successfully. These experiences would be a guidance to all those countries where the proletariat is in power.

These are the main points of Mao Zedong Thought. It is a guide to the revolutionaries of all countries. Thus Mao Zedong Thought is a continuation of Marxism-Leninism, and is a theory of international significance, that can emancipate the proletarian masses.

After the death of Stalin, the leadership of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union has betrayed Marxism-Leninism, has given up the objective of world revolution, has revived capitalism in their country, changed the dictatorship of the proletariat into the dictatorship of the bourgeoisie and turned into an imperialist power in practice, while, in words, it was socialist. For this reason, we call it social imperialism. It is colluding with world imperialism, especially US imperialism to suppress world revolution and is creating and increasing

its spheres of influence in contention with world imperialism, and is trying to turn the under developed and East European countries, into its neo-colonies. It is getting ready for an aggressive war against China by encircling it. It has revised Marxist-Leninist principles to meet the requirements of its social-imperialist policies, and introduced the theories of peaceful co-existence, peaceful transition and peaceful economic competition with imperialism. We characterise this as revisionism. For the same reason, the leadership of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union is a revisionist clique. The leaderships of the communist parties of a good number of countries have betrayed the revolutions of their respective countries by adopting this revisionist path. Thus all these parties have become revisionist.

The Communist Party of China, under the leadership of Mao, has uncompromisingly fought against this revisionism introduced by the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, and defended Marxism-Leninism. The ideological struggle thus conducted, has become part and parcel of Mao Zedong Thought. Mao's People's War path got strengthened, and became up-to-date, by assimilating in itself the revolutionary experiences of various countries. For the same reason the communist revolutionaries of various countries accept Mao Zedong Thought as the Marxism-Leninism of the present epoch, and are working for social revolutions in their respective countries. We are working for making the Indian People's Revolution a success in accordance with Mao Zedong Thought, by fighting against all those forces who are against the Indian people's revolution and against revolutionary Marxism-Leninism.

The Proletarian Cultural Revolution\* has succeeded in China. This revolution took place against revisionism, bourgeois and petty bourgeois ideas. 70 crores of the people of China have participated in it. This is the first of its kind in history wherein a cultural revolution took place under the guidance of the Communist Party in a country where the Communist Party has come to power. These are the weapons added by Mao Zedong Thought to the armoury of Marxism-Leninism. Because of Cultural Revolution the Chinese people consolidated themselves as never before and participated in the socialist construction more than ever. They are able to help the world revolution more than ever. China's Cultural Revolution is a guide to those countries which are advancing towards socialist

\*See p.26-27 and Section 5 (starting on p. 184) of the article *Some Problems Relating to Socialist Revolution in China*.

construction.

Marxism-Leninism and Mao Zedong Thought is not at all new to the people of India. About 40 years ago, the Indian revolutionaries have begun to lead the Indian revolution under the guidance of Marxism-Leninism. They have led a number of working class and peasant revolutionary struggles with this outlook. They carried on the struggle against British imperialism. For the same reason, they had to face intense repression. It is clear that all the conspiracy cases foisted before 1942 by British imperialism against Communists were meant to suppress the Communist Party and the revolutionary movement it was leading.

Revolutionaries in Telangana, inspired by Marxism-Leninism and Mao Zedong Thought, have built a revolutionary movement and led the armed struggle (1946-51) in accordance with Mao Zedong Thought. Though this could not continue as a protracted armed struggle due to the weakness of the revolutionary forces and the revisionist line of the leadership, the armed struggle in Telangana has provided numerous new experiences to the Indian revolution and shown a path for its development. Communist revolutionaries, after analysing in the light of Marxis-Leninism and Mao Zedong Thought, the experiences of and taking lessons from Telangana armed struggle and the revolutionary struggles which took place hitherto in our country, are building and leading the revolutionary movement.

It is but natural that the imperialists are terribly afraid of revolutionary Marxism-Leninism and Mao Zedong Thought. The main reason for this is that people in a number of countries have liberated themselves from the rule of imperialists and their reactionary henchmen. The present Indian ruling classes, who are the lackeys of imperialists and social imperialists, and who are following in their foot-steps are also afraid of Marxism-Leninism and Mao Zedong Thought. Some among the Indian ruling classes pose themselves as if they are not opposing Marxism-Leninism, but opposing only Mao Zedong Thought. They say that their object is to achieve socialism peacefully. To be true, there is nothing like achieving socialism peacefully. Nowhere and at no time in the history of mankind the exploiting class have abolished their exploitation by themselves nor was it ever possible to abolish it by the peaceful actions of the people. Revolutionary Marxism-Leninism teaches us that socialism can be achieved in a revolutionary way, through a violent revolution. Therefore they are opposing Mao Zedong

Thought as well as Marxism-Leninism.

There are some who argue that the fundamental principles of Marxism-Leninism do not apply to our country, where religion is a strong force, and which is multi-national with age-old traditions. The countries of Russia, East Europe, China, North Vietnam and North Korea, where revolutions have succeeded under the guidance of Marxism-Leninism, are the countries where religious systems had been strong. Russia and China are also multi-national countries. China is a country with age-old traditions. All this shows that their argument is wrong. We in our country have the caste system in addition. This is a feature of feudal society. This will be destroyed along with feudalism. This is possible only through a revolution.

There are fundamental differences between the social systems of our country, which is semi-feudal, semi-colonial, and the Western countries, where capitalism has developed to its highest level. That is no reason why one should say that the fundamentals of Marxism-Leninism do not apply to the social system in our country. The fundamentals of Marxism-Leninism are scientific and universal. What is needed is that they should be applied to the concrete conditions and revolutionary practice of our country.

Mao led the revolution to a victorious end by applying Marxism-Leninism to the concrete conditions and revolutionary practice in China, which was a semi-feudal, semi-colonial country before the liberation. The essence of the experience of the Chinese revolution, which was a protracted armed struggle, is the Mao Zedong Thought.

China is our neighbouring country. Even though there are some differences between our country's present-day social system and the Chinese social system of pre-liberation days, there are many similarities in fundamental aspects. Most important among them is that ours is a semi feudal, semi-colonial country like China of pre-liberation days. For the same reason we are firmly of the opinion that all the principal aspects of Chinese revolutionary experiences do apply to our country's revolution also. The Indian ruling classes are terribly afraid of Mao Zedong Thought for this reason.

There is no contradiction between Marxism-Leninism and Mao Zedong Thought which is the Marxism-Leninism of today.

Those who are afraid of Mao Zedong Thought are also afraid of revolutionary Marxism-Leninism. For the same reason, the

Prosecution has mentioned that we have declared Mao Zedong Thought as present-day Marxism-Leninism. There is nothing wrong in such a declaration. Once we accept Marxism-Leninism as our world outlook, it automatically follows that Mao Zedong Thought is also our world outlook. Marxism-Leninism and Mao Zedong Thought are inseparable.

Some people emasculate the revolutionary essence from Marxism-Leninism. Some others distort the fundamental principles of Marxism-Leninism. Such is the Marxism-Leninism they advocate. They say that Mao Zedong Thought is no Marxism-Leninism. They are all revisionists. They are not for a social revolution in India. Even if they want it, it is only in words, not in deeds. The ruling classes are not at all opposed to such people. In fact they appreciate most of them and call them "good communists". They became "good communists" because they have simply emasculated the revolutionary essence from Marxism-Leninism. We have become enemies of the ruling classes simply because we are striving for a people's revolution. We are not sorry for it. On the other hand, we are proud of it.

Why should the Indian people accept Marxism-Leninism and Mao Zedong Thought?

Before we answer this question, it is necessary that we say a few words about the counter-revolutionary and reactionary ideologies that have been followed and are still followed in India.

Gandhism is the first one. Gandhism has been the ideological foundation for the national movement under the leadership of the Congress. Non-violence is the fundamental principle of Gandhism, which means that people should adopt non-violence towards their enemies. This ideology is opposed to root out British imperialism and feudal autocracy through National Democratic Revolution. As a result of this, British Imperialists have ruled as long as they could, and left our country in the unfavourable national and international situation obtaining after the Second World War; they left after handing over the administration to the Gandhian leadership. Their capital is still in the country. Their exploitation is still continuing. Thus Gandhism has prolonged the period of our slavery, instead of reducing it. Even though Gandhism demanded power, it preferred slavery to revolution. It obstructed the growth of even revolutionary bourgeois democratic consciousness among the people. Thus Gandhism has been an instrument for compromise with imperialism.

Economically, Gandhism encouraged village self-sufficiency in opposition to industrialisation. It is a reactionary feudal economic system. This was useful for compromising with feudalism.

For this reason, Gandhism is clearly a reactionary ideology of comprador bourgeoisie and landlord classes, which served as the basis for compromising with British imperialists and feudalism, and for protecting their interests.

We have been rejecting the counter-revolutionary Gandhian ideology from the beginning. Even today, we reject it.

The ruling class "socialism" is another counter-revolutionary ideology, which is current now-a-days. This has been put forward as Avadi Socialism and a Welfare State in the last 25 years. This is the ideology of big bourgeoisie and landlord classes. According to this, the steps taken, i.e., nationalisation of banks, abolition of the privy purses of the princes, and other constitutional amendments etc. to prolong the life of Indian neocolonial economic system, are shown as socialist measures; and being compradors to the Soviet social imperialism is shown as favouring socialism. This ideology with its leftist slogans is attempting to mobilise the working class, the middle classes and the people in general behind the ruling classes.

In our country, monopoly capital, landlordism, and imperialism strengthened themselves with the help of the ruling class "socialism". This is opposed to revolution. Therefore we have been rejecting this, and even to-day, we are rejecting this "socialism" as a counter-revolutionary big-bourgeois-landlord ideology.

Besides these, there are communal ideologies prevalent in our country. They are serving the ruling classes by working against social revolution, and against the unity of the proletarian masses. We are opposed to all of them.

During the last two decades, revisionism appeared in India with emasculating the revolutionary essence from Marxism-Leninism and thus interpreted the fundamentals of Marxism-Leninism to serve the interests of the ruling classes. The Communist Party of India (CPI) and the Communist Party of India (Marxist) [(CPI (M))] represent old and new revisionism respectively. While the former supports the ruling classes openly, the latter supports their parliamentary system. Both are striving to prolong the life of the ruling classes, who are on their death bed. Thus, both of them are opposed to

people's revolution. For the same reason, we are opposed to both of them. We are carrying on a struggle against them.

To put it in a nut-shell, we are opposed to, and we carry on an uncompromising struggle against, any ideology which is against the people's revolution that is going on in India.

The people of India need not accept an ideology simply because it happens to be Indian. People must resolutely oppose the ideologies which are useful to defend the existence of ruling classes and exploitation and domination of imperialists. The people of India should accept the ideology which can be a guide to Indian people's revolution. Marxism-Leninism and Mao Zedong Thought is such a revolutionary ideology.

Marxism-Leninism-Mao Zedong Thought has liberated one third of the world's population from the capitalist and feudal exploitation. The people in these parts have begun to enjoy complete freedom in economic, political and cultural fields, for the first time in the history of mankind after the liberation. Thus this ideology, which is revolutionary as well as practical, is a guide to liberate mankind in the entire world. Mao Zedong Thought, which is the present day Marxism-Leninism, has liberated 70 crores people from imperialism and feudalism. China is our neighbouring country. Our economy consists of all those fundamental aspects of pre-liberation Chinese economy. Our people have to liberate themselves through a revolution, from the exploitation of foreign imperialism, landlordism, big bourgeoisie. Mao Zedong Thought will be a guide to our revolution, just like it has been to the Chinese revolution.

Marxism-Leninism-Mao Zedong Thought alone can unite the world proletariat against world capitalism by overcoming national barriers, and by fighting national chauvinism. For this, the Indian proletariat has to accept this revolutionary ideology as a guide.

There is national, communal, caste chauvinism in India. There are divisions among the proletariat and peasantry. They are influenced by counter-revolutionary ideologies. Revisionism is one of them. Marxism-Leninism-Mao Zedong Thought alone can unite revolutionary people on the basis of the alliance of the proletariat and the peasantry under the leadership of the proletariat. Historical experience has proved that no other ideology can fulfil this task.

If we, as revolutionaries, have to fulfil our task, we have to

advance Indian people's revolution by applying Marxism-Leninism-Mao Zedong Thought to the specific conditions and revolutionary practice in India. People in India also have to follow this ideology. Let the world imperialism, and its lackeys tremble at the sight of this ideology. People in India have nothing to lose except the chains which they have had from thousands of years. They have to create for themselves a new India, a people's India, a socialist India. We the communist revolutionaries are devotedly striving for this.

We have no doubt as to the applicability of fundamental principles of Marxism-Leninism and Mao Zedong Thought for India. The revolutionary experiences of the Indian people will themselves prove that this is true.

(Extract from *The People's Democratic Revolution in India - An Explanation of the Programme*, 1971.)

## Comrade Mao Tse-tung

Com. Mao is no more. With his death, the greatest Brain in the world ceased to think. But he remains for ever in the hearts of the oppressed peoples of the world in general, and Chinese people in particular for his singular contribution to the success of Chinese revolution, establishment and consolidation of dictatorship of the proletariat through the proletarian cultural revolution and his relentless fight against modern revisionism. His system of views cover all fields, i.e., philosophical, political, military, economic as well as cultural. They are known as Mao Tse-tung Thought. It is the Marxism-Leninism of the present era, because he has continued, elaborated and developed Marxism-Leninism to new heights till his death. As such it has become the guiding force for communist revolutionaries all over the world in their fundamental task of leading the revolutions in their respective countries.

Com. Mao is the finest product of Chinese revolution in particular and world revolution in general ranking among Marx, Engels, Lenin and Stalin. Com. Mao has lived a full life as a revolutionary putting what he taught into practice.

### 1. Com. Mao as the leader of the Chinese Revolution.

Like all revolutions, Chinese revolution had to traverse a zig-zag course before it consummated in success. It was com. Mao who had a clear vision of shape of things to come regarding Chinese Revolution when it entered a critical period in 1927. The beginning of the period was marked by the split in the united front between Communist Party of China and the Kuomintang, failure of armed uprisings in various parts of the country and the consequent temporary set-back to the revolution. Notwithstanding this situation it was he who advocated for the first time that the revolution can be defended in China in the following words:

*"The long-term survival inside a country of one or more small areas under Red Political power completely encircled by a white regime is a phenomenon that has never occurred anywhere else in the world." (Why is it that Red Political*

### *Power can Exist in China? 1928).*

He advanced the reasons for this phenomenon: His theory proved to be correct not only by its survival, but also advancement and ultimate success of the Chinese revolution. In view of the new world situation obtaining after the Second World War, he extended the theory for all colonial and semi-colonial countries. We know that organised revolutionary forces in various countries have applied this theory with success. Vietnam, Laos, and Cambodia in Asia, Algeria and some other countries in Africa can be cited as examples. Liberation movements in other countries have also taken up this path. Thus the theory he advocated in 1928 has acquired an international significance even during anti-fascist war, to be more precise during anti-Japanese war, and subsequently it has become a universal one.

### **2. Theory and Practice of People's War.**

Every country wages a patriotic war when it becomes victim of aggression by a foreign country. This happens inspite of the social set-up the country possesses (feudal etc.). In modern times when the imperialists, and counter-revolutionary ruling classes of every colonial and semi-colonial country controlled and backed by them, are armed to the teeth, it is necessary for the revolutionary forces in general and the proletariat in particular, to adopt the path of people's war either for national revolution or for social revolution (democratic). Com. Mao not only advocated it, but also worked out strategy and tactics for this purpose. It is a strategy meant for a militarily weak force (country, people) fighting a just war against a strong enemy. Some comrades wrongly counterpose the path of people's war with that of insurrection, which the Russian proletariat used as a weapon to seize power. In fact it is an extension of the latter, in view of the present situation especially the situation obtaining ever since the end of the First World War and success of October Revolution.

Summing up the wrong view and correcting it, Com. Mao explains:

*"Their argument is: Since our war is like the war in the Soviet Union and since Soviet Union won victory, how then can there be an alternative but to follow the Soviet example? They fail to see that while we should set special store by the war experience of the Soviet Union, because it is the most recent experience of revolutionary war and was acquired under the guidance of Lenin*

*and Stalin, we should likewise cherish the experience of China's revolutionary war, because there are many factors that are specific to the Chinese revolution and the Chinese Red Army" (Strategy in China's Revolutionary War).*

Here Com. Mao speaks of many specific factors relating to Chinese Revolution, while not in the least underestimating the special significance of Soviet Union's experience. This applies to other countries as well.

Indian communist revolutionaries were in search for such a path in the early years of their activities. They struggled for it between 1946-51 (Telangana and other armed struggles) but could not meet with success due to subjective conditions. They again took up this path in 1967-68. A section of communist revolutionaries took left adventurist and individual terrorist line which led to setbacks to armed struggles in our country. Notwithstanding this, they are applying it keeping the specific situation of our country in mind. Thus Mao's theory and practice of people's war is a contribution to world revolution itself.

### **3. Guerilla Warfare, raised to the strategic level**

Formerly, Marxists-Leninists considered guerilla warfare to be one of the forms of the struggle adopted by the peasants either in support of insurrection or positional and mobile warfares (Of course there are counter-revolutionary guerilla warfares which are conducted by the ruling classes to suppress genuine revolutionary movements). Com. Mao, consistent with his theory of people's war, which is a protracted war, also developed guerilla warfare to a strategic level and worked out the necessary strategic line. He explains the need for such a theory in the following words: *"The question of strategy in guerilla war does arise however in the case of China, which is neither small nor like the Soviet Union, but which is both a large and a weak country. This large and weak country is being attacked by a small and strong country but the large and weak country is in an era of progress; this is the source of the whole problem" (Problems of Strategy in Guerilla War).* Though Mao has advocated this theory "in the case of China", it was applied and is still being applied by the people during and after the second world war period. Now guerilla war has become a common phenomenon among the people fighting for their emancipation against imperialism, feudalism and reaction. This theory has resolved a

number of crucial problems facing the national liberation movements and people's democratic revolutions which are confronted with a stronger enemy. This in essence means creating rural base areas to encircle the cities in various parts of the country so that the whole country may be liberated in a given national and international situation.

Our people, especially the peasantry, adopted guerilla warfare as a form of struggle during British regime, and as a strategy during the Congress regime (at the time of and after the transfer of power). But we as Communist Revolutionaries have failed to continue and develop it further because of subjective reasons, even after 1968, when organised communist revolutionary groups emerged out of the then existing communist revolutionary movement. While adopting guerilla warfare as a strategy is not at all a controversial subject as far as communist revolutionaries are concerned, left adventurists equate it to individual terrorism of one form or other.

#### 4. Agrarian Revolution - An Immediate Task.

That the agrarian revolution is the axis of the bourgeois democratic revolutions is an incontrovertible point. It is all the more a decisive factor in the people's democratic revolution directed against semi-colonialism and semi-feudalism.

But Com. Mao advanced the theory of inseparable link between the agrarian revolution and the guerilla war to establish base areas. In the period of national war, the agrarian programme will be such as to unite all the patriotic forces. A thoroughgoing agrarian revolution which includes the distribution of landlords' land to the poor peasants and agricultural labourers, to develop and consolidate base areas - Com. Mao has implemented such a programme in the period of agrarian revolutionary war (1927-1937). The Red Army led by the CPC has helped in implementing it.

We, in our country, are facing a different situation. We don't have a Red Army or a People's Army to start with. It has to be created from the guerilla forces at the time of establishment of base areas. (We are not discussing here various military aspects connected with this subject). Such guerilla forces can be developed only at an advanced stage of agrarian revolution, when the land distribution comes to the forefront. Here left adventurists take a different point of view. They advocate creation of a People's Army without agrarian revolution, though they pay a lip service to the latter, without

accepting the interconnection between the two, which these comrades refuse to accept in one form or the other.

#### 5. United Front and People's Democratic Dictatorship.

Formerly communists, basing on the experience of Russian revolution, advanced the slogan of Soviets of workers and peasants during the stage of bourgeois democratic revolution. Lenin in his writings on colonial and national question stressed the importance of the national bourgeoisie as an anti-imperialist force, which can be an ally, however vacillating and temporary it may be, during this stage of revolution in colonial and semi-colonial countries. Basing on the experience of Chinese revolution, Com. Mao advocated United Front with national bourgeoisie, inspite of its having a dual role during the stage of people's democratic revolution and people's democratic dictatorship as a state form in which the proletariat shares power with national bourgeoisie.

He has also stated in clearest possible terms, the importance of the United Front, armed struggle and the party building in the following manner:

*"... .. the united front, armed struggle and party building are the three fundamental questions for our party in the Chinese Revolution. Having a correct grasp of these questions and their interrelations is tantamount to giving correct leadership to the whole Chinese Revolution"*  
(Introducing The Communist.)

This theory applies to all colonial and semi-colonial countries. Failure in grasping these questions on the part of the Indian communists has led all these years in the failure to provide a correct leadership to the revolution all these years. Now the Communist revolutionaries, having grasped these questions, are able to work out a fundamental line and are fighting against right and left opportunism basing on it.

#### 6. Theory of Contradiction

Com. Mao enriched and elaborated the Marxist-Leninist theory of Contradiction and applied it to the practice of Chinese revolution as well as world revolution. His works *On Contradiction* and *On the Correct Handling of Contradictions Among the People* are monumental by themselves. He has led the Chinese revolution, consolidated the dictatorship of the proletariat, defended it against

imperialism and social imperialism basing on these theories. These theories in turn were evolved as a result of summing up the experience of Chinese as well as world revolution. They are of special significance to us because it has been an unresolved problem to the Indian Communist movement to locate who is our enemy and who are our allies in the stage of people's democratic revolution. We can safely say that we have resolved this problem in all its fundamental aspects; we are yet to learn to apply it to everchanging situations we are encountering. We are confident that we can correctly apply it under the guidance of Mao Tse-tung Thought.

### 7. Fight Against Modern Revisionism.

After the death of Stalin, Khrushchev-Brezhnev clique usurped the party and state apparatus in Soviet Union, departed from Marxism-Leninism, advocated revisionism, pure and simple, and restored capitalism leading to social imperialism. Com. Mao, as the head of the Chinese Communist Party, carried on relentless struggle against Modern Revisionism and in defence of Marxism-Leninism. This struggle has become a guiding force to Communist revolutionaries all over the world to carry on the same struggle in their respective countries and to form real parties of Marxism-Leninism. (They are either already formed or on the way of formation). Communist revolutionaries in our country have broken away from revisionism and neo-revisionism and took up the path of Marxism-Leninism-Mao Tse-tung Thought. But a good number of them embraced left adventurism equating it with Mao-Tse-tung Thought. There are still some who are misguided by such theories while their leadership is adopting right and left opportunism or a combination of the both. Hence a struggle against them in defence of Mao Tse-tung Thought.

Present-day China is a bulwark of world revolution, which is a source of inspiration and guidance in the form of Mao Tse-tung Thought to the revolutions all over the world. The failure of the encirclement of two super powers is a clear indication of the material and revolutionary strength of the people, the party and the government.

### 8. Cultural Revolution:\* Contribution in Cultural Front.

Com. Mao emphasised the need and indispensability of Cultural

\*See p.26-27 and Section 5 (starting on p. 184) of the article *Some Problems Relating to Socialist Revolution in China*.

Revolution long ago in 1940, in his famous work *On New Democracy*. He said, "A given culture is the ideological reflection of politics and economics of a given society." Hence, "A cultural revolution is the ideological reflection of the political and economic revolution and is in their service." Regarding the culture in the stage of New Democratic Revolution, he characterised in the following words. "It can thus be seen that the content of China's New National Culture at present stage is neither the cultural despotism of the bourgeoisie, nor the socialism of the proletariat, but the anti-imperialist and anti-feudal New Democracy of the masses, under the leadership of proletarian socialist culture and ideology". he further says: "Revolutionary culture is a powerful weapon for the broad masses of the people. It prepares the ground ideologically before the revolution comes and is an important, indeed essential, fighting front in the general revolutionary front during the revolution." These quotations are enough to show how much importance Com. Mao attached to cultural revolution as a part and parcel of new Democratic Revolution. He has worked out the tasks in this front in his various writings. His famous work, *Talks at the Yanan Forum on Literature and Art*, is a guide for all the proletarian revolutionary writers and artists. His theory of New Democratic cultural revolution applies to all countries which are in the stage of national liberation, people's democratic revolution and socialist revolution. Of course, it is a theory which applies Marxism-Leninism to the concrete practice of Chinese revolution (See note on page.22)

### 9. Proletarian Internationalism.

Com. Mao's writings are permeated with proletarian internationalism. He as the head of CPC has implemented it in word and spirit.

His revolutionary work and contribution to the Chinese revolution began when the Communist Party of China was affiliated to Third International (Comintern) guided by Stalin. He contributed his might in shaping Comintern policies themselves (antifascist united front) basing on the experiences the CPC gained in the war against fascist Japan. While being loyal to the Comintern, he judiciously implemented its line, to the advantage of the Chinese revolution. While relying on the Chinese people for success of its revolution, he has never for a moment underestimated the role of the support of international proletariat and the revolutionary people.

He continued his work with redoubled vigour when the Comintern was dissolved during Second World War, and every Communist Party has become sovereign in its respective country. Even during the war, the

CPC headed by Mao has helped the anti-Japanese wars going on in Burma, Malaya, Indo-China, Indonesia etc. He has helped the armed struggles and the revolutions which were going on in these countries as well as African countries. Chinese help to the peoples' war of Vietnam against American aggression is well known throughout the length and breadth of the world. He continued the help till the revolution succeeded in spite of the danger of war of aggression by America against his own country. This is the finest example of his proletarian internationalism. His struggle against modern revisionism, defending Marxism-Leninism, which led to total military encirclement with serious economic consequences, is the result of his rare courage and further development of Marxism-Leninism in the present era. The *Great Debate* he initiated and summed up has established the universal truth of Marxism-Leninism once again. Such a phenomenon took place when the Second International collapsed and the Third Communist International was established under the guidance of Com. Lenin. Com. Mao did the same, in a different form, by breaking away with CPSU and its Modern Revisionism. Though we don't have any international organisation in any form, his unique contribution in the struggle against Modern Revisionism is a guiding star to communist revolutionaries all over the world. It is proletarian internationalism in the real sense of the term.

China, under the leadership of Com. Mao, has been helping militarily, economically and technically all countries which have different social systems and which are fighting for independence, against hegemonism and super power domination. The military help is free and there is no arms sale. Economic help is based on mutual advantage. Finding in China the most reliable friend, nations like Pakistan and Egypt are coming out of the grip of super powers, casting away the fears of aggression by the neighbours armed by super powers.

Imperialists and pseudo-communists accuse China of being nationalist – bourgeois nationalist at that – falsifying the facts. They say that China does not help the Communist parties in the friendly countries but is giving primary importance to its national interests, i.e., it renounced the proletarian internationalism for its nationalism.

One must know that China has state-to-state relations with the governments of other countries. Such relations are guided by its foreign policy, which is based on proletarian internationalism as we have seen in the case of Pakistan etc. In the same way, China has party-to-party relations with Communist parties in other countries. These relations are guided by this factor : whether the concerned parties are Marxist-

Leninist in the real sense of the term, or Modern Revisionist, being satellites of CPSU. CPC does not have any relations with the latter, while it will have fraternal relations with the former, irrespective of its relations with the country to which it belongs. There is no international organisation for Communist parties and everyone of them is sovereign in having its own policies. Whichever party needs the help and advice of the CPC, it extends, and is extending its help, basing on Marxism-Leninism. It is a hope against hope if one chooses to be a revisionist of one hue or the other and expects the same attitude as that of a Marxist-Leninist Party. This policy of China is proletarian internationalism in the real sense of the term.

Com. Mao, while defending Marxism-Leninism against Modern Revisionism, adhered to proletarian internationalism.

It must be known that defending the Chinese revolution is not the responsibility of Chinese proletariat alone. It is the responsibility of entire revolutionary proletariat of the world as well as every country. These Communist parties of Marxism-Leninism should formulate their policies also accordingly.

#### 10. Conclusion.

This in essence is the Thought of Mao Tse-tung. It is the summing up the revolutionary experience of not only of China, but also of entire world, guided by Marxism-Leninism. That is why it is correctly characterised as the Marxism-Leninism of the present era.

Com. Mao has lived a full life of a revolutionary. For beginners, for those who are in the midst of revolution and for those who are consolidating the fruits of the revolution, his life is a model from which all of us can learn and have to learn much. The age of above eighty years is an age of decay for a normal man. But it was not so with Com. Mao, and we needed him for some more time to come. Thus we have lost the greatest thinker from our midst never to return. The objectives which he has set forth before us are eternal. We deserve to call ourselves his best pupils only by carrying out his behests to the end.

Though he left us physically his thought is eternally with us being a guiding force to the revolutionary communists, proletariat and the oppressed people all over the world in their struggle for emancipation and socialism.

We communist revolutionaries in India take a pledge on this occasion that we defend Marxism-Leninism -Mao Tse-tung Thought, fight

against revisionism and left adventurism, form ourselves into a monolithic party, which can lead Indian revolution to a success.

Long Live the Memory of Comrade Mao.

Long Live Mao Tse-tung Thought!

**Note :** Here ( Page No. 19) we have deleted a portion of the text in keeping with the author's subsequent writings. The deleted portion runs as follows :

Com. Mao's theory of the Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution, which started in China in 1966, is the continuation and further development of the same theory to the stage of socialist revolution, when the dictatorship of the proletariat was established and proletarian cultural revolution was necessary.

It was initiated, guided and headed by Com. Mao. It is one of his greatest contributions to the arsenal of Marxism-Leninism. Drawing lessons from the negative experience of Soviet Union, where the party had departed from Marxism-Leninism, embraced Modern Revisionism, and socialism has been transformed into social imperialism. Com. Mao propounded and successfully implemented the theory of continued revolution in the condition of the dictatorship of the proletariat. Thus cultural revolution is playing a decisive role in not allowing the restoration of capitalism in China either in the present period or in future. It is this cultural revolution which has developed into a political revolution against the survivals of the bourgeoisie for establishment and consolidation of the dictatorship of the proletariat.

#### 9. Class Struggle in China

In view of this what is going on in China is the struggle between the survivals of bourgeoisie and the revolutionary proletariat, in the era of dictatorship of the proletariat. This is the class struggle not only in the cultural front but ideological and political struggle between contending forces, wherein it is the revolutionary proletariat and its vanguard, the Communist Party, which is a decisive and winning force, whereas the survivals of the bourgeoisie as formerly represented by Liu Shao-chi, Lin Piao and others, together with their ideologies have become a waning force. The time is not far off when they will be thrown into the dust-bin of history notwithstanding the attempts of the imperialists and social imperialists to embellish their role.

Imperialist ideologues are characterising the class struggle as the struggle for power "between various factions" and "groups" existing inside the leadership of the Communist Party of China. Social imperialists say that there is a chronic "instability" in China, with all its concomitants. Both of them are falsifying history. We know that a civil war was going on for years in Soviet Union after the seizure of power by the proletariat, and an ideological struggle was going on against Trotskyism till about 1937. There is nothing extra-ordinary about what is going on in China in view of the prevalence of capitalist social imperialism, fighting for their survival against the revolutionary forces of the world. They will have their own impact on the class struggle which is going on in China. This is one of the reasons why it has acquired an international character.

The experience of the cultural revolution shows that all countries where the dictatorship of the proletariat will be established, should undergo a constant class struggle, to prevent restoration of capitalism in the respective countries. It is the socialist consciousness of the people and Marxist-Leninist ideological firmness of the party which can prevent such a situation being repeated in any country. This is another reason for its international significance.

China has achieved self-reliance in all fields without so-called foreign aid. The third world countries have the same economy as that of pre-liberation China. Notwithstanding this, at least some of them are working for independence in the real sense of the term, by doing away with foreign aid. They are looking for China as a model to shape their economies on the basis of self-reliance, though their social setup imposes limitations in their attempts to be fruitful.

Thus the class struggle that is going on in China acquired an international significance in more than one sense.

See the sections 3 and 4 of the article "*Some Problems Relating to Socialist Revolution in China*" for the author's subsequent views on class struggle in China. See also pages 158, 159 and 168 where the question of rehabilitation in general and that of Liu Shao-chi in particular have been explained.

The article was published as a resolution of the Central Committee of the UCCRI (ML) after Com. Mao's death in September 1976.

- Editor

## Theoretical Problems

We have already stated that Marxism-Leninism-Mao Zedong Thought is our world outlook. We have also explained this. We still have this view. There is no change in it.

In the last decade, certain developments took place in the international communist movement. Cultural revolution was one such important development, which has become a controversy. Chinese Communist Party leadership has stopped it and broadly reviewed it and concluded it as wrong. (It is understood that they will take a final decision in the 12th Party Congress). We had categorically supported Cultural Revolution. Now the question arises whether there is any change in our attitude now. Though there is no change fundamentally, to some extent there is a change, we should say.

Before explaining this, it is necessary to recollect the relation between international communist movement and Indian communist movement and their traditions.

1. Indian Communist Party had supported all the decisions taken by the Soviet Communist Party headed by Stalin. As far as we know, those decisions were correct. Supporting them was also correct. But the mistakes which were committed due to lack of understanding were serious. For example: characterising the anti-fascist war during World War II as peoples war and formulating a class collaborationist policy in accordance with it. It has caused an irreparable loss to Indian revolutionary movement. It is clear that it is necessary to support or apply with a correct understanding and keeping facts in view.

2. In the course of Chinese revolution, certain important problems and experiences that were useful to colonial and semi-colonial countries came to the fore even by 1930s. For example, People's war path and comprador bourgeois class. The then leadership of the international communist movement (Comintern) confined these experiences to China. It did not apply them to India and other colonial and semi-colonial countries. In the writings of Stalin, there

are a number of points dealing with the armed struggle in China, united front, and the role of comprador bourgeoisie. But it is clear that they were not applied while explaining the problems of India. For example: without raising the question of comprador bourgeoisie, calling it as compromising big bourgeoisie. Keeping that aside, the leadership of the Indian communist movement did not try to understand the class nature of the comprador bourgeoisie and formulate policies by applying these experiences. Nor did it develop prolonged peasant struggles into armed struggles. If this effort was made in our country, international leadership would not have obstructed it. No such effort was made even after the international organisation (Comintern) was dissolved. If this had happened, it would have been easy to develop the peasant struggles, which had erupted between 1945 and 1951 into protracted armed struggles.

3. A considerable section of revolutionaries broke away from revisionism and neorevisionism and accepted Mao Zedong Thought. But the same trend appeared among them also. It was common for them to chant Mao's quotations the whole day, may be a hundred or thousand times. But they have not made any effort to apply Mao Zedong Thought to concrete conditions in India. Even if they have done, it was not along correct lines. We can understand the extent of degeneration in their understanding and practice when we see that there are still some among their ranks who support the annihilation of 'class enemy' and 'actions' for money.

Communist revolutionaries did not follow this path. They applied Marxism-Leninism-Mao Zedong Thought to the concrete conditions in India, atleast to the extent of their understanding. They formulated a path. They set on to implement it while defending it from right and left trends.

4. Our experiences show that there are an abounding number of people who accepted our path in words, but did not practise it in deeds. As a result, it has become necessary to carry on a struggle for implementation of the line with a correct understanding.

When we examine all these things, it can be seen that the same obstacles which were there to translate Marxism-Leninism-Mao Zedong Thought into a motive force to the Indian revolution are still continuing. The only difference is that an organisation of communist revolutionaries fighting for a correct line both in words and deeds is formed and developing. This organisation had never

followed Marxism-Leninism-Mao Zedong Thought as a dogma. We have been following it as a living ideology ever developing. Our understanding and practice are also developing in line with that. Viewed in this angle, there is fundamentally no change in our attitude towards cultural revolution. We are considering it as theoretically correct. This theory applies both to China and India.

The Communist Party of China implemented cultural revolution as a part of the programme of new democratic revolution. And it had positive results. Even during the period of socialist revolution, a struggle against alien theories, ideas and traditions among working class and the people will be necessary. To that extent, it is necessary to implement the programme of cultural revolution. It has to go on ceaselessly. At times it may assume some additional importance. But whether cultural revolution should be started and carried on in an intense form and as a destructive force, even after the establishment of proletarian dictatorship has become a point of discussion in this decade, particularly after Mao's death (1976). There are some who opposed it previously (revisionists and neorevisionists). Their opposition is one thing. And opposing the CPC leadership even while claiming to be following Mao Zedong Thought is another thing. They are two different things. Those belonging to the first category are opposed to Mao Zedong Thought itself. But the leadership of CPC has always been following Mao Zedong Thought. They reviewed the experiences gained in Cultural Revolution and stated that it was wrong to have started it in 1966 and continued for a decade. Not only that; they are also publishing details about it. Such being the case, why should we reject their contention? Those who say that it was correct to have started the Cultural Revolution in China are only repeating the outworn phraseology but are unable to put up necessary arguments to support it. Moreover, they are unable to see the harmful and bad consequences caused by it to the revolution in our country. Or they are unable to answer the questions arising in that context.

We too had to face certain bad consequences because of Cultural Revolution. The activities carried on under its name did not help to advance the revolutionary movement. For example: the struggle to be carried on against imperialist, feudal and reactionary culture, which was and is being spread among people, was in no way strengthened or advanced by merely breaking a few statues. Moreover, it had helped only to create an aversion among intellectuals and

common people about cultural revolution. The same is the case with the "programme of annihilation of class enemy". People's revolution has to be won by the armed forces of the people defeating the armed forces of the government. And if any one says that this can be achieved by their "annihilation" programme, it would be a mockery of people's revolution.

#### **The Tasks Being Fulfilled by the Leadership of the CPC -- Our Attitude**

1. We are of the opinion that the CPC is adhering to Mao Zedong Thought. We are rejecting the theory of those who say that it has turned revisionist. The activities of such people are contrary to proletarian internationalism.

2. We are of the opinion that the policy being followed by the leadership is basically correct. Because of this reason, we are supporting it. It means that there may be differences on secondary issues. But it is not a must. Realising mistakes, short comings and correcting them is the internal matter of a party. If is following a correct line in carrying on socialist construction, by correcting the mistakes committed in the past and also in foreign policy. We are supporting it.

Though we had recognised that certain mistakes were committed by the time of writing this book, we did not propagate them, nor did we support them. They are:

1. In 9th Party Congress (China), Lin was declared as a successor to Mao in the Party Constitution itself. We did not accept it. We did not defend it.

2. Indian revolutionaries faced serious difficulties in uniting on the basis of a correct line and in consolidating into one party as a result of recognition of a 'left' adventurist group as a Marxist-Leninist group. The leadership recognised and corrected the mistake soon (during the life-time of Mao).

We don't know the circumstances in which these mistakes were committed. We do not consider it proper to make open criticism. But still we did not hesitate to follow Mao Zedong Thought and to formulate and implement a revolutionary line in accordance with it. The distinguishing feature was: here we have not formulated a programme in accordance with the Cultural Revolution. We have developed and are developing it as a part of mass movement. And

it is correct.

It is particularly necessary for Indian revolution to have a correct attitude towards China. Because Soviet Union has established itself as the main super power in our country, it is mobilising anti-China forces also along with forces favouring it. In this way, it is trying to strengthen itself in both ways. If the Soviet Union is strengthened, it is detrimental to the Indian revolution to that extent. Thus they are becoming detrimental to both Indian revolution and China.

It is a well-known fact that those of the ruling classes who are in power in India today are not only lackeys of Soviet Union, but are arch enemies of Indian revolution. They are doing their utmost to see that the experiences of Chinese revolution are not within the reach of the Indian people. Though some cosmetic trimming is seen in India-China relations, there is no basic change. This situation will continue to be so as long as India remains a part of Soviet global strategy. This is the main reason for non-improvement of relations between India and China in all fields. Even Chinese literature is not within the reach of the people. Except the information given by the bourgeois press, people have no way of knowing about the changes and developments taking place there. When we keep this in view, calling baselessly the present Chinese leadership as revisionist, and opposing it, would only be strengthening Soviet social imperialism and Indian ruling classes indirectly. Anti-China forces occupy an important place among those who oppose Indian revolution.

We have been thinking that the then Yugoslavian Party led by Tito was revisionist and that capitalism was restored by him in his country. But under his leadership, the party has been opposing Soviet hegemonism. There is no additional information about restoration of capitalism there. We have also come to know that the information basing on which we came to this conclusion was wrong. The additions and changes made in the course of socialist construction are only related to the specific conditions of that country. In this way, every country must have opportunity to carry on socialist construction in accordance with their specific conditions, within the limits of basic principles. None has said as to what extent it has gone beyond that scope.

The leadership of that country (Tito) had followed nonalignment. Though it has a limited anti-imperialist character, it is not one that

benefits a socialist country. In the same way, though they condemned the aggressions of Soviet Union and Vietnam, they have not condemned the Vietnamese attacks against China. Though that party has correctly opposed hegemonism, we have to conclude that is not based on proletarian internationalism. Even then the Yugoslavian party is opposed to the Soviet hegemonism.

Yugoslavia has brought to the fore the question that every country can and should carry on socialist construction according to their specific conditions, within the limits of certain basic principles Marx and Engels mentioned this point in their *Communist Manifesto*. Lenin has reiterated this in his writings. The question of Yugoslavia has to be reexamined in this light. As far as we know, the Chinese Communist Party has taken this attitude. And it is wrong to blame it.

### The Theory of Three Worlds

By the time of writing this work, it had already come into vogue that Asia (except Japan), Africa and Latin America belong to the third world and that India is part of it. In this work, we too have referred to them in the same manner. Further, we have made it clear that Soviet social imperialism, even while contending with U.S. imperialism, was also colluding with it to encircle People's China. The fact of the matter was: by that time itself collusion had come to the minimum and contention was maximum. With the Shanghai Communique released at the time of 1972 (Nixon's China trip), China could break the encirclement around it. The US encirclement was no more and only Soviet encirclement remained. But Soviet Union was not content with the then existing encirclement; it had extended it to Afghanistan and Vietnam.

The developments in China have been a point of discussion since past 25 years. In our country, these discussions have started ever since 1948. Viewed in this way, improvement of relations with U. S. has become yet another point of discussion. Establishment of relations with some of the reactionary and fascist regimes belonging to the third world (Zaire, Chile) has also become a controversy. All these are different aspects of the Three Worlds' Theory. Any measure opposed by Soviet Union becomes a controversy in our country. It is not difficult to find the birth-place of these controversies. (It is a fact that there are doubts about some of the Chinese policies among China's supporters also).

By the time we were completing this work, Soviet Union had already become a social imperialist power (occupation of Czechoslovakia in 1968). Soviet Union played the main role in the 1971 war with Pakistan and in separating Bangladesh. But still there was a lot of confusion prevalent among freedom-lovers and democrats including the revolutionaries. Because of this we have concentrated on establishing how Soviet Union is a social imperialist power. By this, we feel, there is a clarity to a great extent among revolutionaries. But those in confusion still remain. At that time, Three Worlds Theory was not a point of discussion. The basic principles of this theory were explained by Mao in 1974. In 1976, the Albanian party leader, Enver Hoxha, had criticised it in the report to the 7th party congress. Mao died shortly after this criticism appeared; important changes were made in the policies of Chinese Communist Party.

With this, another uproar started all over the world. Small groups supporting the Albanian Party had raised their heads in other countries. Albanian literature flooded our country. It is still pouring in. After all, its influence will also be there to some extent. Certain groups have emerged, which "criticise" Chinese leadership as revisionist and say that China developed into a third super power. MASS LINE group belonging to Charu Mazumdar's and Punjab group of communist revolutionaries are important among them. Still others are opposing it in different degrees. Doubts and suspicions are quite common. The Theory of Three Worlds is also a part of it. Some oppose it. Some others are indirectly rejecting the theory by expressing suspicions and doubts on basic issues. Communist revolutionaries and others are in a considerable number among those who support it.

In the present national and international situation, this theory has a lot of political significance. It is in the light of this theory only that we can correctly understand the struggle waged against the hegemonism of the super powers and the aggressive wars carried on by Soviet Union and its stooges (Vietnam and Cuba). Our support to this theory needs no mention.

In this work, we had characterised Vietnam as a country struggling for liberation from US imperialism. To that extent, it is correct. But gradually it has become a stooge of Soviet Union by providing it all facilities to set up military bases. It has occupied Kampuchea and Laos by sending its troops into those countries. A struggle

for liberation is going on in Kampuchea under the leadership of the communists. Vietnam had openly betrayed its ideological and political degeneration by supporting the 'emergency' (1975 June) declared by Mrs. Gandhi. We need not be surprised at its emerging as an aggressive power by the end of 1977. Vietnam is carrying on aggressive attacks on Chinese borders.

Soviet aggression of Afghanistan is yet another serious development. With this, the Soviet Union lost the good-will it had in international affairs and became isolated by now. Freedom lovers and people all over the world are supporting the heroic struggle being waged by the Afghan rebels to liberate their country from Soviet Union. During the period of writing this book, there were a number of people supporting Soviet Union. The number of those who opposed was very small and we are one among them. Today those who oppose the policies of Soviet Union are in a considerable number. This opposition is taking the form of a mass movement. This is a welcome development.

Many such developments had taken place in the last decade. This is an evidence of the onward direction of the world revolution. During this period, Soviet Union had become a more aggressive power than US from the position of an equal contender with it. This is an important development. And it is a fundamental aspect of the Three Worlds Theory. Understanding this is essential to understand the struggles for independence as against super power hegemonism all over the world.

The decline of the Soviet Union has begun with its aggression on Afghanistan. This weakness was further exposed in Poland. We should note that it could not march its troops into Poland as it did in Czechoslovakia (1968). But it would be wrong to define it as a weakened super power like the US. Though US is attempting to recoup itself, it can not attain its old position. US will be still weaker, than now, so long as such countries as West Germany and France (the recent victory of social democrats) among Western European countries adopt an attitude of appeasement towards Soviet Union.

The Third World War did not break out during the last decade. But the reason for this was not the super powers' love for peace. Socialist China is prepared to fight back any war of aggression and to wage a protracted war if necessary. It is fortifying its defence

capability. Many states the world over are not prepared to get embroiled in war. If Soviet Union is forced into a protracted war even in such a backward country as Afghanistan, which country can it hope to conquer in the Third World War? Opposition to war has built up well during this period. If war could be prevented for some time, the anti-war force would very well gain in strength. If still war breaks out, the world people would be in a position to defeat the aggressor. (8-5-1981)

(This is an extract from Foreword to the (Second) Telugu Edition, 1981, of *People's Democratic Revolution in India -- An Explanation of the Programme* - Ed.)

## PART - II

### Extracts From *Left Trend Among Indian Revolutionaries\**

#### 14. Mao's Thought and the Telangana armed struggle

During the period of 1946-51, 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 could 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 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 (M.L.) 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*

\*This is the title of a critique of the policies of CPI (ML) led by Charu Majumdar, written by D.V.Rao in 1970

*exploited masses of the Indian people, thus ushering in a new era in the political history of India.* (Charu Majumdar, *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 mature 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 peoples 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 (M.L.) 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 People's 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. (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 (M.L.) 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 upon the masses. The position with them is same even today. The experiences of Naxalbari show that no leadership can successfully lead the people's struggles without fully relying upon the masses. In spite of their loud talk about relying upon the masses, they are not in actual fact still prepared to undertake the revolutionary mass mobilisation. Therefore this selfcriticism 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 struggle of the Naxalbari peasants with the distribution of land, establishment of the village Soviets and building of people's 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 with 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 (M.L.) 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. Deviation from Marxism-Leninism and 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 people's political power*", Mao explained one of the characteristics 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 the C.P. (M.L.) wish to build the base areas and to establish people's 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 worker and peasants with struggle experience should be drawn into the revolutionary people's 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", in 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 revolutionism, 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 people's 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 people's 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 merely reject violence and terrorism as a matter of principle. He directed that all Marxists should reject violence in the form of individual terrorism. He pointed out that while not being useful, it is extremely harmful to the revolution. Thus he denounced terrorism as unacceptable.

Like all the other revolutions, our people's war is also undoubtedly a violent revolution. All the people's armed struggles going on in different parts of our country today are also likewise violent struggles. Not only we accept violence in principle but also we actually practise 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 C.P. (M.L.) in the Circar, Rayala-seema 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 C.P. (M.L.) 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 C.P. (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 whatever 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 whatsoever that this deviation of theirs is close to the concept of "Roving Rebel Bands" and the 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 C.P. (M.L.)**

We have so far analysed the incorrect views as well as the incorrect practice of the C.P. (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 C.P. (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 given up the peasant and working class struggles. Thus both the revisionists have given up the building up of revolutionary movement through revolutionary struggles as well as leading of the revolution.

The leadership of the C.P. (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 new revisionists and the leadership of the CP (ML) 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 people's war. They vehemently denounced the Andhra Communist Committee as reformist for having proposed the path of people's war. Similarly the leadership of the C.P. (M.L.) have also given up the peasant revolutionary struggles, but they have done so in the name of the very people's war itself. They are denouncing the Communist Revolutionaries of Andhra, who are organising people's war through people's 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 people's 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 C.P. (M.L.) on the fundamental question, on the question of rejecting the people's 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 C.P. (M.L.)?

For the old and new revisionists who defend the ruling classes, or follow the parliamentary path, the people's 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 C.P. (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 of 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 the revisionism as well as the "LEFT" deviation and march forward taking all the aspects of armed struggle into 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.

.....  
 .....  
 .....  
 .....

### 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 theirs 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 people's 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 incorrect 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 of 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. They are fast realising, through their own revolutionary experiences, as to how utterly wrong are the policies of the leadership of the C.P. (M.L.) and 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 C.P. (M.L.) is now travelling in the same path. They are forcing their wrong policies on their cadres and party members in the name of Com. Mao.

.....  
 .....  
 .....  
 .....  
 .....

#### **4. It is only when correct leadership is provided to the revolution that revolutionary authority is established:**

We have already shown as to how the C.P. (M.L.) has failed in the field of ideology, armed struggle as well as achieving the unity among the revolutionaries. Unmindful of such a serious mistake at the very outset, they are now going to establish their "Revolutionary Authority". They are openly declaring that the recognition of their "revolutionary authority" is the pre-requisite 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 of 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 C.P. (M.L.) are 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 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 of 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 alongside Mao and Lin Piao. The Indian revolution has yet to produce such leaders. The sooner the leadership of C.P. (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 C.P. (M.L.) carry on an uncompromising struggle against the erroneous "Left" policies of this leadership and unite with the revolutionaries outside the C.P. (M.L.) on the basis of Mao's Thought.

We have discussed here the main differences between us and the leadership the C.P. (M.L.), shown where they are making mistakes, and put forward our stand. The following is the sum total of these discussions:

1. The principal contradiction in the present Indian society is the contradiction between feudalism on the one hand and the vast masses of the 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 shunning 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 base 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 people's 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" this trend also gives up the task of building the revolutionary movement through revolutionary mass movements. There is similarity in them in this respect. This wrong trend is contained in the armed struggle outlook of the leadership of the

C.P. (M.L.).

5. The support of the leadership of the C.P. (M.L.) to the separate Telangana movement is incorrect. They tailed 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 "People's Raj" in India, and in Andhra as a part of India, could be established only when the ruling classes are defeated through people's war. But to advance a slogan of "People's-Raj" in Telangana alone would be a fraud on the masses. When the ruling classes are fighting among themselves, we should make use of these contradictions and advance the revolution but should not tail behind one of these groups of the reactionary ruling classes. This is nothing but opportunism.

6. We do not recognise the revolutionary authority of the leadership of the CPI (M.L.). They have failed in fulfilling 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 have 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 C.P. (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 People's China as the centre of the world revolution stands as a powerful safeguard 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 revolutions 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.

Date: 1-10-1970

(Translated from Telugu Original)

## An Extract From *Fundamental Line and Question Of Unity*

### II. Partisan warfare as a form of partial struggle

We are surprised at the way in which a document is introduced into our discussions. C.P.Reddy group has included it in the list of the documents which are supposed to be meant for discussions. They are silent about everything that has to be said about it.

It is a fact that there is one such document. It is about 20 years old as its date-line suggests. It was known as *Kishan Document*. Though it represented the official tactical line of the party for some time, it was never implemented. It was never discussed even by the leading cadres. A major part of the leadership of the period also did not know that such a document existed.

As far as we are concerned, we reject the whole document because it is fundamentally opposed to the path of people's war. Hence we do not deem it necessary either to defend the document in toto or in parts. If we go into the document, the C.P. group's understanding of the partisan warfare does not even coincide with that of the document or the part they quote. It does not touch the fringe of that mass approach the quotation contains.

The document replies to the question when and how to begin partisan warfare in the following lines:-

*".....in a big and topographically suitable area, when the peasant movement has risen to the level of seizure of land, the question as to how to effect that seizure and how to defend the land so seized will become a burning, live question. The party is of the opinion that partisan warfare in such a situation, undertaken on the basis of genuine mass peasant movement, and the firm unity, under the leadership of the party, of the peasant masses, especially the most oppressed and exploited strata, combined with other forms of struggle such as social boycott of landlords, mass peasant struggle, agricultural workers strike, can, if correctly conducted and led, have*

C.P. group is trying to hide the neo-revisionist nature of the document by making use of Stalin's name. Mr.Sundaraiah has referred to Kishan document -- they call it as document of "*Tactical line*" -- in his book, *Heroic Telangana Revolutionary Struggle -- Its Lessons*, he has written like this:

*"Here one thing has to be said. Certain parts of the document were not included in the Policy Statement. The questions as well as answers given to them in connection with the discussions that took place between the delegation of our party and Central Commission of Soviet Party were also among those that were not included. In fact such omitted parts are not part and parcel of Policy Statement. They were meant only to explain certain theoretical issues and principles that formed basic theoretical basis of the Policy Statement. (Retranslated from Telugu version p.493).*

Thus neo-revisionists do not accept *Kishan Document* as it is. They are saying that "*It is meant only to explain certain theoretical issues and principles that formed basic theoretical parts of their Policy Statement (they have announced that it is their Tactical Line).*" Thus it is clear that this document is connected with neo-revisionist line. "*Kishan document*" is another name for the document, *Indian Situation in 1951*. (This is what Mr.Sundariah has referred to as Tactical Document).

Revisionists and neo-revisionists claim that writings of Marx, Engels and Lenin are the basis for their programme and tactics (Neo-revisionists cite Stalin's writings also). We do not accept their contention. We are fighting them by exposing the opportunism practised by them in the form of giving false interpretation to the writings of these great men and their application to Indian situation.

But this is not the nature of *Kishan document*. It says that Chinese path is not applicable to India and formulated that guerilla warfare which is one of the important experiences of Chinese revolution as "one powerful weapon in the arsenal of revolutionary movement" alone. Thus *Kishan document* has rejected the path of people's war by saying that it is not applicable to India. Whether this document has got Stalin's approval or not, or whether it is Stalin's document or not is, not a point for discussion here. The point is whether it accepts the path of people's war or not. When it does not contain a single point that accepts the path of people's war and rejects Chinese

path, is it not a travesty of truth to say that "it is clear from Kishan document that comrade Stalin has suggested mainly this path as the path of Indian revolution"? The leadership of this group is either not in a position to understand the path of people's war and "Kishan document", or is prepared to take up the path of neo-revisionism by hiding itself behind the claim that there is the path of people's war in the document, which in fact does not exist. We have explained in our document how the arguments of Somaiah are closer to the arguments of neo-revisionists. We have pointed out how C.P. Reddy group is accepting "Kishan document" as the basis of people's war path which is claimed by neo-revisionists as their "theoretical basis". It is obvious that except for revolutionary phrasology there is no difference in the programme and practice of "Marxists" and this group.

They themselves are sunk in the quagmire of neo-revisionism. To hide this, they are calling their opponents -- referring to us, without naming -- as brand new revisionists. This may serve their purpose of slandering us. But this word by itself cannot prove us as revisionists. On the other hand, this only exposes their hatred and enmity towards us and the defeat that they have met in the field of ideological struggle.

.....  
.....  
.....

(1971)

**An Extract From**  
**Note To The English Translation of**  
*Right Opportunist Trend Inside The Party*

If someone becomes revolutionary simply because they claim to be revolutionary and their adversaries become revisionists simply because they brand them as such, no ideological struggle will be required to defend Marxism-Leninism-Mao's Thought in India. There will be no need to make serious effort to build up revolutionary party. It is obvious from the attitude of these people that they are using the word revisionism only as an abuse but not as a part of principled ideological struggle.

This is not all. While they themselves have sunk in the quagmire of neo-revisionism, they are resorting to self-deception as well as deceiving others by slandering their opponents as "brand new revisionists".

In their booklet "*Some Problems Relating to the Path of People's War in India*", criticising Charu Majumdar group, C.P. Reddy group has written as under:

*"Past Heroic Telengana Struggle has for the first time brought this question on to the agenda: What is our path of revolution? Is it Chinese path or Russian path? Andhra communist party has argued as in China, Indian revolutionary struggle will also have to traverse the path of protracted armed struggle if it has to achieve complete victory. It has led the struggle in accordance with Mao's writing. It is also clear from the Kishan document that comrade Stalin has also suggested this path as the path of Indian revolution in the main" (Retranslation from Telugu version P.43).*

As far as the present issue is concerned, the last sentence is important. We have discussed some of the issues related to *Kishan document* in our document, *The Fundamental Line and the Question of Unity*. Here we have to explain one more point.

*a rousing and galvanising effect on the peasant masses in all areas and raise their own struggles to a higher level".*

This para stresses the need for a peasant revolutionary movement, leading to seizure of the land for starting a partisan war. Organising the peasantry, raising their consciousness has been given prominent place. It also stresses the need for other forms of struggle while carrying on armed struggle for land. C.P. group shuts its eyes to this important aspect of the document it mentions.

The said document deals with the subject of partisan warfare as a form of partial struggle. The C.P. group is said to have interest over this point only. The point is dealt in the form of a question and an answer which is as follows:

*Question : Have we to take up partisan struggle only when the peasant struggle for partial demands reaches the stage of land distribution and establishing village peasant committees? Or can we take it up when the movement is still in the stage of struggle for partial demands, as for example rent reduction?*

*Answer : The partial struggle has also stages. It starts with small demands. Let us say reduction of rent. It is not yet a partisan struggle. If the enemy refuses to grant the demands and the peasant is eager to win it by force then the partisan struggle can start. True it is not the struggle for seizure of land but only reduction of rent. Still it will be a partisan struggle.*

*Hence it does not depend on us. If the masses are ready and eager, we should assist them.*

We do not find the last sentence in the given quotation of the C.P. group which is of some significance. We will explain this point later.

A cryptic question and a cryptic answer as mentioned in the quotation can never resolve any of the problems arising out of this subject. Can the armed actions of the groups of the militants during partial struggles be equated to the partisan warfare? Are partial struggles for increase in wages and anti-feudal struggles one and the same? Do the partial struggles provide the necessary organisation, level of consciousness and continuity of the mass action to carry on partisan warfare? These are the basic questions though they appear to be secondary. Neither the question nor the answer tries to go into them. Obviously, the questioner does not know anything

about these points.

To come to the last sentence which the C.P. group deliberately omits. After advocating partisan warfare as a form of partial struggle the answer says:

".....it does not depend on us, if the masses are ready and eager we should assist them". Here there is a mass approach to the issue. *The readiness* and *the eagerness* of the masses mentioned here denotes embryonic form of organisation and consciousness which is enough for armed actions but not for partisan warfare.

We are not opposed to armed actions in accordance with readiness and eagerness of the masses during partial struggles. In fact, we have been advocating such militant type of organisation of partial struggles. Our documents\* *Lay Foundations for a Struggle-oriented Mass Movement* and *Immediate Programme*, contain formulations to meet the requirements of the situation. In our subsequent documents we explained our position in unequivocal terms. But the point of controversy is whether such militant and armed actions are to be called partisan warfare? or partisan warfare is to be organised to conduct a partial struggle?

We are unaware of the partial struggles where militant and armed actions are characterised as partisan warfare. Whereas we have ample experience to show that, if properly and correctly conducted, all anti-landlord struggles will reach the level of land seizure in short time. And that is the time to start a partisan warfare.

We are firmly of the opinion that certain armed actions themselves do not constitute partisan warfare. On the other hand, it has an ideology, programme, organisation and mass character. It has strategic and tactical principles militarily. Mao dealt the subject in all its aspects. Instead of taking up the position in accordance with Mao's directives, C.P. group has departed from them and reduced them to armed actions. All this is going on in the name of scissored and trimmed quotation from a document which we reject.

It is also a dishonest and cunning step on the part of the C.P. group to delete the last sentence in the answer which is its basis, though the word *eager* is found in the earlier part. Here the answer clearly says that it is the consciousness and organisation of the masses

\* The documents mentioned here, also by D.V.Rao, are published as part of *Agrarian Revolution and our Tasks*, Proletarian Line Publications, Hyderabad.

expressed in the form of '*ready' ness* and '*eager' ness* that should decide the question but not the pressure of police nor the desire of the party leadership.

Subsequently they changed this formulation into "*armed struggle to resist the police repression*" without reference to the level of consciousness of masses. In practice, it has degenerated into assassination of individuals.

Thus the C.P. group, while claiming that their line is in accordance with *Kishan Document*, departs even from it in all its aspects.

Now we will deal with some aspects of experiences of armed struggle and agrarian revolutionary movement in Telangana upto 1951.

.....  
..... (March, 1973)

**Telangana Armed Struggle  
And  
The Path of Indian Revolution\***

**Preface to the First English Edition, 1974**

Modern Revisionists led by Soviet leaders have revised the fundamentals of Marxism-Leninism, in their application to the concrete practice of world revolution. The *Great Debate* that took place inside the world communist movement has exposed its real face. While Marxism-Leninism was and is being defended by CPC headed by Comrade Mao, Soviet revisionist leaders have degenerated into social imperialists. Their line is one of expansionism. They are facing People's Republic of China (PRC) with one-million-strong modern army concentrated on the length and breadth of its border, with highly sophisticated atomic weapons. This, in itself, is a conclusive proof of their being social imperialists.

Soviet revisionist leaders did not stop at revising the fundamentals of Marxism-Leninism. They are trying to revise and re-write the history of Russian Revolution, Communist International, and the Czarist Russia to suit the revisionist theories and social-imperialist policies. They are providing abundant material for this purpose through their mass media of communications.

So far as Indian revolution is concerned, they have revised and are still revising Marxism-Leninism as applied to the concrete practice of Indian revolution. For this purpose they started revising Marxist-Leninist approach towards Gandhism and the leadership of Indian National Congress. They are extending revisionism to all problems facing Indian revolution.

We cannot expect their counterparts in India, i.e., the leadership of the CPI, to sit with folded hands. They are doing their best to follow in the foot-steps of the Soviet leaders. One of the specific features of the Indian revolutionary movement was that a liberal

---

\*This book by D. V. Rao, published for the first time in English in 1974, is a critique of P. Sundarayya's book *The Telangana People's Struggle and Its Lessons* See p.66..

reformist trend was dominating the CPI leadership all through, taking different forms and different slogans at different periods, mainly right and left opportunism and centrism.

Emboldened by modern revisionism, the CPI leadership has also departed from Marxism-Leninism and revised its attitude towards all problems facing Indian revolution. It was easy for it because it was sailing in the same boat even from earlier period. Thus, it is also busy in re-writing the history of Indian revolutionary movement with a revisionist understanding and interpretation.

The armed agrarian revolutionary struggle in Telangana in 1946-51 was the result of constant revolutionary work done by the Communist revolutionaries during earlier period, i.e., from 1941 to 1946. Telangana had its quota of liberals inside the Party. Apart from what they did to harm the revolutionary movement and armed struggle that was going on, they began to write on 'Heroic Telangana' bringing it into their revisionist line. If we go into the material they have produced, we find that the understanding it contains essentially coincides with that of ruling classes towards Telangana armed struggle. Neither the Soviet nor the CPI leadership is ashamed of this, because they together with the Indian ruling classes have become the birds of the same feather who flocked together.

One can understand this phenomenon, because they are more 'open and permissive'. But the situation with the leadership of the CPM is not the same. It claims a monopoly of Marxism-Leninism in India, by adopting a line of parliamentary opposition, whose content is nothing but bourgeois liberalism, which supports the Government in all its basic policies, while opposing it on issues of a secondary nature.

Everyone knows that organised peasantry has participated in the armed struggle of Naxalbari and of Srikakulam. Therefore, they are people's armed struggles whose content is agrarian revolution. It is a fact that the leadership of these struggles has adopted a left adventurist and individual terrorist line in conducting these struggles. Therefore, they have failed to develop them into protracted armed agrarian struggles. But the leadership of the CPM has denounced these struggles as individual and squad terrorism shutting its eyes towards the organised mass participation of the peasantry. Herein lies the identity of their outlook with that of the revisionist leadership of the CPI.

When the leadership of the CPM stooped to deny the mass participation in the armed struggle of Naxalbari and Srikakulam, it has nothing to learn from their experiences. To the leadership of the CPM everything appeared to be left adventurism, and individual and squad terrorism, as far as these struggles were concerned.

This is the period and the context in which P.Sundarayya attempts to look at armed struggle in Telangana (1946-51). The guerilla warfare, which is the highest form of struggle and which was continued to defend the land and *gram-rajyas*, was a struggle for power. Sundarayya, while reducing this to partisan warfare for partial demands, has removed the question of power from the agenda of Telangana armed struggle. This is the variety of revisionism he has adopted in dealing with armed struggle that went on after "Police Action". Though this appears to be a demarcation from CPI leadership, they are one with the other in removing the question of power from the agenda which is a fundamental one in Indian revolution.

Telangana armed struggle is rich with experiences, political, organisational and military. They are being used and should be used by all revolutionaries in advancing the cause of Indian revolution. There are already controversies, and more of them are bound to develop as the revolution advances. We are aware that the present review does not answer all the questions raised by these controversies. We are dealing with them in our various documents. We will continue to do so in future. We are also conscious that a comprehensive work is the need of the hour to help and guide the young revolutionaries in the present phase of the Indian revolution.

The content of armed struggle in Naxalbari and Srikakulam is agrarian revolution, being similar to that of Telangana armed struggle. Their experiences bear special characteristics because they took place in the context of an advanced stage of world as well as Indian revolution. Genuine revolutionaries are busy in studying them diligently, so as to use them as weapons to fight against right and left opportunism inside the revisionism and Trotskyism outside our ranks.

## 2

National Book Agency (Private) Ltd, Calcutta, which is controlled by the leadership of CPM, had published *Selected Writings of Comrade Mao Tse-Tung* in a single volume, in December, 1967. The publisher's note says that, 'Apart from the selections from the

four-volume edition in English published from Peking (from the Second Chinese edition), this volume also contains three articles', whose titles are given in the note.

But the note keeps silence over the works which are omitted from the four volume edition, nor it gives any reason for such omission. We are more concerned with the omission of two important works of Mao. The first is: *Why the Red Political Power Can Exist in China?* an article written by Mao on October 5, 1928. The second is: *Problems of Strategy in Guerilla War Against Japan*, written in May, 1938.

Mao, while discussing the 'Reasons for the emergence and survival of Red Political Power in China' in the said article, says as follows:

*The long term survival inside a country of one or more small areas under red political power completely encircled by white regime is a phenomenon that has never occurred anywhere else in the world. There are special reasons for this unusual phenomenon. It can exist and develop only under certain conditions.*

*First is can occur in any imperialist country or in any colony under direct imperialist rule.....*

In the notes which are included towards the end of this article, the last sentence was explained at length. After briefly reviewing the advance of liberation struggles during the period of Second World War, and mentioning the changed co-relation of forces after the War, the following sentences are included in the notes:

*Thus much as in China, it has become possible for the peoples of all or at least some of the colonial countries in the east to maintain big and small revolutionary base areas and revolutionary regimes over a long period of time, and to carry on long revolutionary wars in which to surround the cities from the countryside and then gradually to advance to take the cities and win nation-wide victory. The view held by Comrade Mao Tse-Tung in 1928 on the question of establishing independent regimes in colonies under direct imperialist rule has changed as a result of the changes in the situation*

The subject-matter discussed in the article concerns with a period when there was a Kuomintang regime in China. Basing on the experiences of liberation movements during the period of Second World War, Mao advocates the path of People's War to countries

directly ruled by imperialists. It applies to all or at least some as the note suggests. Thus Mao had come to a definite conclusion of applicability of the path of Peoples's War to colonies and semi-colonies, towards the end of Second World War. One need not take shelter under the words *at least some* to exempt India from this category. The very fact that the armed struggle could continue and survive for five long years in Telangana, and that the demand for withdrawal had come from the leadership, and not from the people or ranks, shows that it was possible to develop it into a protracted armed struggle if the leadership had a correct understanding of the path of revolution in colonies and semi colonies. When the CPI delegation visited China, the Chinese leadership knew full well that a section of Indian leadership who once accepted this rejected it through the *Statement of Policy* adopted in October, 1951 and through the document called 'A Note on Indian Situation 1951'.

The omission of the above article with the relevant notes by NBA is not accidental. It has a direct bearing on the leadership's attitude towards the Telangana armed struggle, and the Naxalbari armed struggle which had already started by that time. Since the leadership was opposed to armed struggle itself, it omitted this article to suit the parliamentary path.

The second one which was omitted is Mao's famous work in *Problems of Strategy in Guerilla War Against Japan*. No reason was given for this omission. Mao discusses all the fundamental problems of guerilla warfare in this work and it is a classic by itself. The omission of this work means that the leadership is fundamentally opposed to the guerilla warfare as enunciated by Mao. Their opposition to the peasants' armed struggle of Naxalbari and Srikakulam, taken together with this important omission, is a conclusive proof that they are opposed to armed struggle and are after parliamentary path. It should be understood that Mao has developed his theory basing himself on Lenin's article *On Guerilla Warfare* (1906) and applying it to the concrete practice of Chinese revolution.

Mao stresses time and again that building of united front and the Party is inseparable from armed struggle in Chinese revolution. It is so in all revolutions of colonial and semicolonial countries. When the classical work on guerilla warfare is removed from Mao's writings, the high-sounding words contained in the publishers' note, i.e., ".....these writings which embody the creative and successful

*application of Marxism-Leninism to semi-colonial and semi-feudal conditions of pre-liberation China are of great and immediate interest to the communists and people of all backward countries"*, become empty. By this omission, the leadership is giving expression to its revisionist understanding of Chinese revolution as well as Indian revolution.

Their formal expression that the Telangana armed struggle is a partisan warfare for partial demands is an extension of their revisionism to their understanding and characterisation of the struggle.

## 3

There are some who pose themselves as revolutionaries accepting Mao Tse-Tung's Thought. At the same time, they are one with the document *A note on Indian Situation 1951*, as the basis of their tactical line: because, according to them, it advocates People's War, fundamentally. In fact, the contrary is the truth. The document rejects Chinese path, the path of People's War in its application to Indian revolution. Let us go into the following extracts of the relevant documents:

*Our revolution in many respects differs from the classical Russian Revolution, but to a great extent is similar to that of the Chinese Revolution. The perspective likely is not that of a general strike and armed uprising leading to liberation of the rural side but of dogged resistance and prolonged civil war in the form of agrarian revolution, culminating in the capture of political power by the Democratic Front.*

**(The Thesis of Andhra Secretariat, May, 1948, quoted by Sundarayya - P.393)**

This is the key passage which expresses the basic understanding of the then Andhra Secretariat. This passage does not contain anything which can be interpreted as Indian revolution being an imitation of Chinese revolution. It only says that our revolution is *similar* 'to a great extent' to that of Chinese revolution. Taking similarities as the basis, we are expected to apply the Chinese path to the concrete practice of Indian revolution. Thus, the understanding it provides is fundamentally a correct one.

*Note on Indian Situation 1951 (Kishan Document)*, instead of basing its criticism on this passage, distorts it in the following manner.

Afterwards, on the basis of wrong understanding of the experience of Chinese Revolution, the thesis was put forward that the Indian Revolution would develop **exactly in the same way** as the revolution in China and that partisan war would be the main or almost the only weapon to ensure its victory (emphasis added).

Obviously, the words *exactly in the same way* are distortion of what **Andhra Thesis** said. Basing on this distortion, the *Note* says that the *'Thesis minimised the working class and its actions'* and asks the Party to *'discard'* the above *'erroneous thesis.'*

This is not the place where we can discuss the question of role of the working class in Chinese revolution. Our purpose in quoting the above passage is to explain that the above mentioned note rejects Chinese path as applied to Indian situation and advocates the following course of action:

*Therefore, in order to achieve victory of the popular democratic revolution, it is absolutely essential to combine two basic factors of the revolution, the partisan war of the peasants and workers' uprising in the cities.*

Though the path of People's War does not exclude workers' uprising at the time of their liberation, the path put forward by the *Note* is not the same as People's War. It *'discards'* this path as *'erroneous thesis'* in clearest possible terms. Therefore Communist Revolutionaries must be vigilant against introducing alien conceptions of People's War by the pseudo-revolutionaries. On the one hand they are embracing Trotskyism by insisting on individual terrorism as a substitute for People's War by characterising the *'Note on Indian Situation 1951'*, that it fundamentally advocates a People's War. We have to fight these outlooks as departure from Marxism-Leninism-Mao Tse-tung Thought and eliminate them from the understanding of our ranks.

We are giving an extract from the document of Amarabad Regional Committee, which we have mentioned in our review. There is another extract from a Telugu book written by M. Basavapunnaiiah, in which he has given the full text of the note submitted by C. Rajeswara Rao, in the meeting mentioned by P. Sundarayya on p 416-17. These are in the form of appendices given at the end of the book. This material together with a report of Manukota area (p.524-27) shows that the situations in the fighting areas did not provide any basis for withdrawal of armed struggle. The central,

as well as a section of Andhra P. C. leadership had taken this decision on their own account, without any relation to the guerillas and party ranks, without observing the basic principles of guerilla warfare. Subsequent events have shown that this leadership has taken a parliamentary path in the form of revisionism and neo-revisionism. We hope this review will give a basically correct understanding of Telangana armed struggle (1946-51) as against neorevisionist understanding provided in P. Sundarayya's book *Telangana People's Struggle and its Lessons'*.

**An Extract From  
Telangana Armed Struggle  
And  
The Path Of Indian Revolution**

**CHAPTER IX**

(We are reproducing a chapter from Com. DV's document, *Telangana Armed Struggle and the Path of Indian Revolution* written criticising P. Sundarayya's book, *The Telangana People's Struggle and its Lessons*. This chapter criticises P. Sundarayya's attempt to cite Stalin's advice as well as the Kishan Document [*A Note on Indian Situation (1951)*] to defend the withdrawal of Telangana armed struggle. This chapter also explains to an extent how the *Statement of Policy, 1951*, was preferred by deleting references to revolutionary path etc. in the *Note on Indian Situation 1951*. The author also criticises the duplicity of CPM leaders in relation to the above two documents. Readers should note that Com. DV made it clear time and again that, inspite of having some revolutionary content, *The Note on Indian Situation, 1951*, rejects the path of people's war as not applicable to Indian conditions and hence cannot be accepted by Communist revolutionaries.

P.Sundarayya was always opposed to the path of people's war as the path of Indian revolution. If he was quoting *A Note on Indian Situation 1951* here and there, it was as a part of CPM leadership's method of opposing the peoples war path and by no means an honest approach towards the above document. In view of the illusions being spread by some groups, it is all the more necessary to understand this aspect of neo-revisionist politics. We hope the following part of Com. DV's above-mentioned document helps the purpose. See p.58 -- Ed.)

Sundarayya links the question of withdrawal of armed struggle in Telangana with the Programme and tactical line adopted by the Party with the help of International leadership and the split in the Communist Party. This is a self-contradictory position he takes up. If the withdrawal of the armed struggle is correct according to the new programme and tactical line, his advancing the split as the main reason is then wrong and the position taken by the C.P.I. leadership becomes more or less identical with that taken by Sundarayya himself. If withdrawal of the struggle is wrong according to the new line and the decision of withdrawal was taken due to the split only, it becomes wrong and capitulationist.

Sundarayya, in order to defend his self-contradictory position,

does neither reproduce the relevant paras from the *Note on Indian situation (1951)*, nor provides an objective and truthful report of the discussions held between Indian delegation of CPI and that of CPSU led by Comrade Stalin.

Let me state at the very outset, that there is not a word, sentence or a para which denotes withdrawal of armed struggle as tactics permissible under any circumstances in the above document. On the other hand, some alternative tactics were suggested, which are revolutionary in nature and which help to come out of difficult situation faced by the peasant guerilla forces. In the same way, the talks or discussions held between CPI delegation and Comrade Stalin, as reported orally and not in the form of a document, does not contain any clearcut suggestion to withdraw the armed struggle in Telangana. Yet Sundarayya takes shelter under the cover of the document and conversation with Comrade Stalin, to defend his position that withdrawal of armed struggle in Telangana was correct. It has been the practice of the former leaderships of the CPI to misuse the help and advice given by the international leadership for its group and factional purposes to enforce the wrong line of thinking, which was either right or left opportunist. The leadership of 1951 was no exception to this. Sundarayya also followed in their foot-steps in his book, in connection with the help and advice given by Comrade Stalin.

Sundarayya produced extensive quotations from *The Statement of Policy* which is said to have been adopted by the All India Conference of 1951 (from pp 401 to 408) and then quotes some paras, which, according to him, are "the omitted parts dealt with the elaboration of some theoretical issues and principles, which go more to explain the theoretical-ideological basis" for the said *Statement of Policy*. He does not make it clear why *The Statement of Policy* was adopted by the Conference instead of *A Note on the Indian situation in 1951*, which was the outcome of the discussions between CPI and CPSU delegations.

He simply omits first two paras of *A Note on the Indian Situation in 1951* and states simply that "the replacement of the present bourgeois-landlord state by a people's democratic state is possible only through revolution." And he goes on to explain this point from quotation of *The Statement of Policy*.

The two relevant paras in the document are given under the

caption "Not peaceful but revolutionary path". They are as follows:

(1) "The immediate main objectives set forth in the Draft Programme of the Communist Party of India are the complete liquidation of feudalism, the distribution of all land held by feudal owners among the peasants and agricultural workers, and achievement of full national independence and freedom. These objectives can be realised only through a revolution, through the overthrow of the present Indian state and its replacement by a People's Democratic State. For this the Communist Party shall strive to rouse the entire peasantry and the working class against the feudal exploiters, strengthen the alliance between the working class and the peasantry, and build, under the leadership of the working class broad nationwide United Front of all anti-imperialist classes (including the national bourgeoisie), sections, parties and elements willing to fight for democracy and for freedom and independence of India.

"(2) While resorting to all forms of struggle, including the most elementary forms, and while utilising all legal possibilities for mobilising the masses and taking them forward in the struggle for freedom and democracy, 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. The concrete experience of the last three years in India, after the so-called transfer of power, has only confirmed this thesis."

Compare the two paras either with his first sentence (p.401) or subsequent paras he quotes from *The Statement of Policy*. The omission of these paras obviously means the CPM does not accept the understanding given in these paras as the ideological-theoretical basis for its *Statement of Policy*. It is more correct to say that its *Statement of Policy* rejects it.

He again introduces his own (or rather CPM's) conception of partisan warfare as being *partial partisan struggle* in the heading given to the paras relating to the subject of partisan warfare as **Partisan struggle -- A Marxist-Leninist understanding -- Partial Partisan Struggle** replacing the *Partisan warfare of peasants* which can be

found in the original document. In addition to this he omits an important para which provides an understanding towards the preparation of the peasants for the partisan warfare. The omitted para runs thus:

"In the rural areas the party has to rouse all sections of the peasants, including the rich peasants against feudal exploitation and build their unity basing itself firmly on the agricultural workers and poor peasantry who together form the overwhelming majority of the population. While the liquidation of feudalism and the distribution of land to the peasants must remain the key slogans of the agrarian revolution for the entire period, it is necessary to formulate immediate specific demands for each province and each area, like reduction of rent, fair prices for agricultural products, abolition of feudal levies and forced labour, living wage for agricultural workers etc. and lead actions for the realisation of these demands. The agrarian crisis is maturing rapidly and the peasant masses are seething with discontent against the present Government which rose to power on the basis of their support and afterwards betrayed them. Despite, however, this widespread discontent and despite the numerous peasant actions that have taken place in many parts of the country, the peasant movement in the country as a whole remains weak and large sections of peasants have not yet been drawn in active struggles because of absence of organisation and firm leadership. It is our task to overcome this weakness by intensive popularisation of our agrarian programme, by formulation of such concrete and easily understood demands as can become the basis of the broadest mass action, by patient day-to-day work and correct leadership of struggles to realise these demands, and by building in the course of these struggles a network of peasant and agricultural workers organisation with underground units in villages as their leading and guiding centres. Volunteer squads of the most militant and conscious sections of the peasants have to be formed to defend the peasant movements against the attack of the enemy squads that will form nucleus of the partisan squads as the movement will develop and reaches the stage of seizure of land and partisan warfare".

It is clear that the whole para provides one understanding as to how to prepare the peasants for partisan warfare. The last sentence of the para is relevant and important. It gives an understanding

that the seizure of land and partisan warfare is interlinked. Seizure of land of landlords can never be a partial demand. Once peasantry goes into action on this demand, the very foundation of landlordism is shattered and the armed forces of the state come into full-scale action against the peasantry and the only course left to the peasantry is to resort to guerrilla warfare.

Even the para Sundarayya quoted (p 409) gives the same understanding.

*"For example, in a big and topographically suitable area where the peasant movement has risen to the level of seizure of land and foodgrains, the question as to how to effect that seizure, and the question how to defend the land so seized will become a burning question. The party is of opinion that the partisan warfare in such a situation undertaken on the basis of a genuine mass peasant movement and the firm unity, under the leadership of the party, of the peasant masses, especially the most oppressed and exploited strata, combined with other forms of struggle, such as social boycott of landlords, mass peasant struggle, and agricultural workers strike, can, if correctly organised and led, have a rousing and galvanising effect on the peasant masses in many other areas and raise their own struggle to a higher level".*

Here, the struggle for seizure of land is regarded as a higher level of struggle and linked with armed struggle in the form of Partisan warfare.

That Stalin did not think the seizure of land to be a partial demand is clearly shown in one of the answers he was reported to have given to a question mentioned in the same book (pp. 412-13). Here he differentiates between a partisan struggle at the 'stage of land distribution and establishing of village peasant committees' and the partisan struggle for 'smaller demands-let us say-reduction of rent' under certain conditions, i.e., '*if the masses are ready and eager*'.

In view of this, to say that the *Note on Indian Situation (1951)* advocates the struggle for land seizure and armed struggle for its defence as partial partisan struggle is baseless. It is the distortion and misrepresentation, in which Sundarayya has indulged, to suit his right opportunist line.

In the same way this document never advocated withdrawal of armed struggle as a tactic, permissible in connection with partisan warfare.

Here are the relevant portions of the document, which, even if attempted to interpret to mean so, do not provide such understanding:

*'At the same time the party has to act with the utmost flexibility, when overwhelming forces of the enemy are concentrated against the partisan areas and the partisan forces run into danger of defeat and total annihilations'. (p 410).*

Here, flexibility means a revolutionary flexibility and not a right opportunistic and capitulationist flexibility. When the party acts with revolutionary flexibility, it retreats in face of disadvantageous situation etc. The same idea is clarified in a different context. The answer to one of the questions is given as below:

*Question : Can partisan warfare, even of the most elementary type, be developed in areas where communications are well developed?*

*Answer : Yes, when encirclement occurs, transfer the best forces to another area. Lead out the armed forces so as to join it with the armed forces in another area, so as to create a liberation army of your own.*

This is a very important formulation. The answer does not advocate withdrawal of armed struggle, even when the partisan warfare is in its earlier stages, i.e., on partial demands, not the seizure of land as Sundarayya conceives. Instead, it advocates to '*transfer the best forces to another area*'. This also provides the understanding for the creation of liberation army, in which such partisan forces which are transferred are expected to join and strengthen them numerically as well as qualitatively.

Therefore to say that the document gives the indication of permissibility of withdrawal of armed struggle even by implication is wrong and baseless. There is nothing in the document which confirms the contention of Sundarayya that the withdrawal of armed struggle was done in accordance with the document.

Now, let us deal with the part he dealt with i.e., the discussion that was said to have taken place between the CPI delegation and

Stalin, on the question of Telangana armed struggle itself. If one goes through the *Note on the Indian Situation (1951)*, one can understand that it was the summing up of the experiences of Telangana armed struggle in the form of tactical line as understood by the CPSU delegation and Stalin himself. In spite of this a discussion was reported to have taken place on the specific issue of Telangana armed struggle and Sundarayya gives an account of it. (pp. 414-15).

The gist of the discussions which Sundarayya gives here is from oral reports of the delegation from CPI. No authentic verbatim report was made available to the Central Committee, let alone to lower committees. Therefore, the 'gist' Sundarayya gives is neither authoritative nor reliable.

The points he makes out of the 'gist' are:

1) 'It was sectarian and incorrect to continue it as a liberation struggle, against the regime of the Indian Union for establishing people's democracy.....'

'But it was absolutely correct to defend the gains of the Telangana peasantry through armed partisan struggle when those gains of peasantry, i.e. land and other democratic liberties were under attack by the Union Government *and its armed forces*.....'

Then he harps on the theme of conducting partisan warfare as partial struggle with the aim of arriving at a negotiated settlement.

I have already explained that there is not a single word or sentence in the original document *A Note on Indian Situation (1951)* that the struggle for seizure of land and its defence is a partial struggle. Nor there is any scope for interpreting the concerned para to mean as such; on the other hand one of the questions and the answer given to it makes it amply clear about partisan warfare as a form of struggle for partial demands like reduction of rent etc. The gains which the Telangana people had during 'anti-Nizam' armed struggle were of a basic nature. The land seized from landlords, the *Gram Rajyas* (village soviets) set up by the people, and the armed guerilla forces and the militia the people built up are not partial in character, nor can they be changed into partial under any circumstances. Therefore the armed struggle to defend their basic gains can never be equated to the partisan warfare for partial demands which the above mentioned answer suggests. Therefore the armed

struggle for defence of those revolutionary gains is for basic demands and hence its character is basic even though it is carried out against Nehru Government.

Here Sundarayya confuses the character of the basic nature of armed struggle with the tactical slogan advanced by the Party, i.e., overthrow of the Nehru Government. He seems to take shelter under a para from the document, which runs thus:

*"In spite of the offensive nature of the partisan struggle, it is necessary to emphasise, in our agitation and propaganda, in the initial period the defensive nature of partisan struggle saying that the objective of partisan struggle is above all to defend the peasants from the attack of the government and its punitive organs. In doing so, special attention should be paid to the demands for which the peasants are fighting and the atrocities of the government which force the peasants to take arms. It is necessary, at the same time, to point out that it is the government that is responsible for violence and bloodshed."*

Here the document clearly states that the nature of partisan struggle is offensive, and not defensive. The term *offensive* is used in the military as well as political sense. Therefore, the defence of revolutionary gains through armed struggle in the form of partisan warfare is an offensive struggle but not a defensive struggle.

The revolutionary gains being of a basic character can and must be defended by overthrowing the Nehru Government or whatever Government that exists. Struggle for partial demands and settlement basing on them can take place within the framework of the existing regime. But the nature of the basic demands, which the Telangana armed struggle had thrown up, is such that no negotiated settlement was possible with the then existing regime. [The same is the case with the present regime]. Therefore, even according to the above document, the offensive character of the armed struggle continued even after 'Police Action'. It is wrong and misrepresentation of the document when Sundarayya says that the character of the struggle has changed after the 'Police Action', either according to the document or according to the opinion of Comrade Stalin, who is said to have approved it.

What are the slogans that the party should have advanced? Time and again the party had advanced the slogan of defending the gains

of Telangana armed struggle and explained why the party had to fight for them in the form of armed struggle, while characterising the nature of this struggle to be offensive for the purpose of overthrowing the Government.

The document provides clear understanding of '*coming into existence of liberated territories with their own armed forces in several parts of the country*' (p 410), and says that they can be defended and retained only when the working class comes into action. If Sundarayya's understanding of trimming higher level of armed struggle into partial struggles which can be withdrawn with or without a negotiated settlement is correct, how can then such 'liberated territories' come into existence? Therefore, the point he mentions and elaborates on this subject, as a part of the 'gist' of the discussions with Stalin, is neither in accordance with the original document, nor tallies with the concerned questions and answers.

Sundarayya adds another para, in which he says Stalin suggested withdrawal of Telangana armed struggle. It runs thus:

*'It was also observed that in the then prevailing situation, it was unfortunate that the Telangana armed partisan resistance could not be defended and continued. The time had come to withdraw the armed partisan struggle, and it was for the leadership of the Indian Communist Party, to decide on what terms to withdraw it and negotiate, and how long it had to be continued to secure suitable terms, and when exactly to withdraw the armed resistance etc. Undue prolongation of the Telangana armed partisan struggle in the absence of mass peasant upsurge in support of the partisan struggle, might raise the danger of its deteriorating into squad or individual terrorism.'* (pp. 415-16).

Here Sundarayya puts the suggestion of withdrawal of Telangana armed struggle in the mouth of Comrade Stalin. What we were reported does not tally with the 'gist' he gives in this para. It was reported to us (of course, orally) that after studying various aspects of the armed struggle in detail, Comrade Stalin suggested to the Indian delegation to '*send more arms, more cadres, and whatever the partisans need in fighting areas, to continue the armed struggle*'. This was the first suggestion that he made in one of the earlier meetings which the delegation had with him. Later on, when the delegation pressed him again to advise what to do with the armed struggle, he was reported to have said, '*It is a pity that you cannot*

*defend the struggle*' and nothing more. When we asked the delegates who had reported this matter to us the reason for contradictory nature of the two statements Comrade Stalin had made, it was reported to us that, perhaps, he might have come to the latter conclusion after understanding the depth of the split in the party. This much was the report we had from Andhra delegates, and nothing more.

In view of the report we had from the Andhra delegates, Sundarayya's omission of Comrade Stalin's first suggestion, which was most important, principled and in accordance with the original document, which he was said to have approved is deliberate and not accidental. He does not mention the split in the party and its effects on the armed struggle as understood by Comrade Stalin anywhere in the 'gist' he gives. Nor he mentions any reason which Stalin might have given for this suggestion, if it was really so, excepting that there was "the absence of mass peasant upsurge, in support of the partisan struggle.....". Any person who knows ABC of guerilla warfare, also knows that its tactical principles are meant to meet all situations. The people's upsurge will not be the same, either in quantity or in quality when armed struggle goes on for a fairly long time, when people have to fight a protracted civil war or national war. Assuming that there was a temporary lull in the situation, it does not mean that party should withdraw armed struggle and lay down arms. It could have adopted such tactics which were necessary for survival and become active again when situation permitted for such a step. No international authority, much less Comrade Stalin, visualised a long period of post second world war lull. On the contrary, those parties who have continued armed struggle could carry on for long, some being successful, others still continuing and the rest facing setbacks temporarily.

There was no Comintern existing at the time. Every party was sovereign, with powers to take their own decisions on matters relating to questions of revolutions of their own countries. The advice Comrade Stalin and the CPSU delegation gave to the Indian delegation was a help coming out of their responsibility, because the leadership of the CPSU had based its policies on proletarian internationalism as long as Comrade Stalin was alive and headed that party. It was left to the leadership of the party who represented to accept it, amend it or reject it. Experience has proved that the leadership, instead of using it to advance the cause of revolution, misused it to sabotage and disrupt the revolution. On the contrary, the successful

outcome of Chinese revolution proves the correctness of the attitude of the CPC under the leadership of Comrade Mao, who, while being loyal to Comintern and receptive to the guidance Comrade Stalin provided, has used the fraternal help and guidance to advance the cause of revolution. Thus, they could come out successfully. Indian leadership could do neither, inspite of genuine attempts of the international leadership to help during various phases of Indian revolution.

Everyone knows that the central leadership of the party had no contribution in developing the armed struggle in Telangana since its earlier stages. In fact, it was the victim of the wrong policies adopted by the leadership from the very beginning. The Telangana armed struggle had developed and survived inspite of the right opportunist and left adventurist policies of the central leadership without any concrete guidance and help. This is the positive aspect of the armed struggle which provides us with the necessary experience which can and must be used for the advance of Indian revolution. At the same time, it had its own short-comings born out of the wrong policies that the central leadership had adopted although except for a brief period during 1950.

In view of this, it is strange and monstrous to say that Comrade Stalin asked the leadership of the party to take a decision for withdrawal of an armed struggle which has lasted for about five years with which the central leadership was not positively connected in any way and which has no experience of armed struggle itself.

At the same time we can understand the implications of the words which Comrade Stalin was reported to have used that '*it is a pity that you cannot defend the struggle*' (meaning Telangana armed struggle.) If those words mean anything. it is that, he had come to the conclusion, by that time, that the leadership was unfit to lead the struggle as it did not possess the necessary revolutionary characteristics that are necessary to lead the armed struggle in the most difficult circumstance in which it was going on.

In view of the above, the 'gist' of the discussions that Sundarayya attempted to reproduce in his book (pp. 414-16), cannot be treated as an honest presentation of the subject discussed. Neither it has any documentary evidence in support of this, nor it is based on understanding contained in the document *A Note on Indian Situation (1951)*. Hence it has to be rejected as baseless. (1974)

## Refutation of Wrong Trends Advocating Withdrawal Of Telangana Armed Struggle\*

### PREFACE

The armed struggle, for that matter, the revolutionary movement, in Telangana is important for Indian Revolution, in more than one way. **Firstly** it has provided an occasion to test the general line followed by the then Communist Party of India. It was proved that the line was wrong. **Secondly** it has provided a path for Indian Revolution. I am aware that not all are unanimous about these points. They have been controversial in the past and they continue to be so.

Of late, there has been some discussion going on, on origin, development and end of this struggle. There have been books and articles by authors, some of whom are directly or indirectly connected with the movement and others were not. For the younger generation, it is a thing of past. Therefore, a few of them, who are interested in the subject, are going in for the research work on the subject and its various aspects. All this is a welcome development because it is a subject matter which has become a living subject discussed again and again.

Another positive feature, the most important at that, is that the discussion is related to the line to be adopted as a path of Indian Revolution. So far as we are concerned, our general line is worked out on the basis of the experiences and lessons we have drawn from Telangana Armed Struggle. Others have their own versions of the struggle as well as its lessons. Some others claim that their line is the same as ours but their practice is quite opposite and nothing common with ours. Therefore, we have been joining issues with them. Our opponents, more so in Andhra, are attaching importance to the subject because Telangana Armed struggle has become part and parcel of the consciousness of entire people in

\*This is the title of a document written in Telugu by D.V.Rao and adopted by the Secretariat of the Andhra Provincial Committee of CPI in 1949. The PREFACE was written for the first English version, published in 1982.

Andhra Pradesh, though there is a difference in degrees from region to region. Therefore they are putting up a show that their general line is in accordance with the experiences of this armed struggle, to convince their following. It is a futile attempt in which they are indulging.

## I

There were two trends in the Telangana people's movement from the very beginning i.e., anti-Nizam and pro-Nehru, and anti-Nizam and anti-Nehru. Of course there was another trend which was of a local nature and was presented by the Hyderabad City Committee. It can be characterised as *Azad Hyderabad* trend. Though this was part and parcel of former one although, it has appeared in a specific form and in specific conditions. They have never been academic. They were operating because communists, as practical workers, were working among the people, i.e, workers, peasants, middle classes and other sections of the people who were to be mobilised against Nizam's regime. And the mobilisation was not limited to public meetings and rallies, which were rare because there was no semblance of civil liberties in the State. Therefore, any genuine mobilisation of people would have only taken place, when the struggles, class struggles at that, were taking place. This does not mean that there were no public meetings or rallies. In fact they were held, but only with the permission of the government, which was accorded rarely and sparingly.

One of these trends is associated with right opportunism represented by late PC Joshi, who was the Secretary of the Party till the end of 1947. It can be said that it (anti-Nizam and pro-Nehru trend) was dominant during the same period. This expressed in the movement in the form of lining up with a section of the State Congressmen who were claiming that they were for a mass movement against the Nizam. In fact there was no such movement at any time, and there was no programme activity organising it. They were the state Congressmen who belonged to such section as Swamy Ramananda Thirtha, Govinda Das Sharaff etc. They had their counterparts in Telangana, and Warangal District (which includes present Khammam Dist) was an important centre where they were present. But the course of the movement proved that there were no such elements in Nalgonda district and it left no scope for them to emerge. Of course there were a few individuals here and there who claimed that they were nationalists, but in fact

they were Gandhians just like any others. This was the picture outside the Party.

Telangana people's movement, taken as a whole, covers entire Telangana because there was the working class movement, a student movement, a movement of the middle classes, specially the gumastas, i.e., clerks working in private shops etc. There was a movement of weavers and such artisans. All these movements had more or less Telangana-wide character because the organisations were spread all over it including Hyderabad. But so far as the peasant movement is concerned, it was more or less concentrated in the two districts of Nalgonda and Warangal, though other districts too had their share, Karimnagar being one such important district. Therefore, when dealing with the peasant movement, we were confronted with these trends more often, and we had to decide one way or the other, what attitude we should adopt towards these trends.

Nalgonda district was the centre of the anti-Nizam and anti-Nehru trend, which has taken birth in a part of it (Suryapet) and which has grown strong as the movement also grew. At the same time, even in that district, anti-Nizam pro-Nehru trend was present in strength and there was a constant conflict although, though for a long time there was no confrontation between the two. But the anti-Nizam pro-Nehru trend had its own adverse effects on the movement in the district as a whole but it had its roots in certain parts, where it was strong (Bhongiri etc) Though such trends were there in Warangal district also, the anti-Nizam anti-Nehru trend was feeble and could not assert itself in practice, as the character of the peasant movement which took shape in the district showed. To be more precise, in places where anti-Nizam anti-Nehru trend took roots and asserted itself we could build an agrarian and anti-feudal peasant movement, and where it was weak or non-existent, such a movement could not be built. In such areas there was a general anti-Nizam peasant movement which was loose and less organised, so that it could not be transformed into an anti-feudal revolutionary movement.

## II

Viewed in this background, the mistakes the communists committed and the shortcomings that were existing in the movement were not related to the local leadership alone. In fact the wrong line that was advocated and implemented by the leadership of the

centre as well as the state (Andhra PC-as it was called) was solely responsible for what had happened. There was no line of building an anti-feudal agrarian revolutionary movement under the leadership of the party with a clear-cut programme. It is a fact there was a difference between the situation existing in Telangana and coastal and Rayalaseema districts, which were part of British India at that time. But this was in regard to civil liberties and certain other features existing in deltaic areas. There too were vast areas where feudal exploitation and oppression was rampant and it was possible to develop an anti-feudal agrarian revolutionary movement in those areas. But the right opportunism that existed and dominated at that time prevented the party from taking up this task in right earnest manner. Therefore the anti-Nizam-pro-Nehru right opportunist trend was not of a local nature either inside Nalgonda and Warangal districts, or in Telangana. But it was of an all-Andhra character. In fact it was an all-India feature.

Therefore the anti-feudal agrarian revolutionary movement which developed in parts of Telangana, that is Nalgonda and to an extent Khammam and Warangal, was neither a spontaneous movement nor merely a product of Telangana being a part of feudal Nizam State. It was a revolutionary movement headed by a revolutionary trend inside the party as against the official policy of the then existing party. The anti-Nizam aspect had helped to tone down the struggle between the two trends because both were united against Nizam and the revolutionary movement that was headed by this anti-Nizam movement enormously contributed to the growth of the political prestige of the party not only in Telangana but in coastal and Rayalaseema parts of Andhra also. Perhaps there might be another reason for not having any confrontation between the two trends: it was that the dominant right opportunist trend did not know to what levels this movement would reach in so short a time. In a way, this trend was caught unaware at every turning point, so that, it could not decide what to do and what not to do to suppress the other trend that was revolutionary. But they could contain its growth to a certain extent.

Therefore, the top leadership could not enforce totally its line of class collaboration and Right opportunism when faced with a new situation which was developing against that line. There was a shortcoming with the revolutionary trend also, perhaps indispensable in the given situation, in that the comrades concerned had to work

within the framework of official and wrong line. Therefore, even when the movement and organisation were developing as revolutionary and basically on correct lines, certain weaknesses did remain in them. And they could not be fought out as long as the official line was on force, and as long as the revolutionary trend was not conscious of the wrongness of the official line and its consequences. In a way, the revolutionary trend co-existed with the right opportunism formally, though in practice both were opposite as was manifested by two different types of the movement, one revolutionary, and the other, reformist.

To be more precise, in the earliest phase of the movement we were developing contacts and searching for reliable cadres who can work for the party and among the masses. We distributed literature and organised campaigns by mobilising the masses on issues within the framework of the law. This was the period when the party was banned and intense repression was there on it. This period ended by 1942. And then we went into the masses to organise peasant struggles against landlords in a limited scale until the middle of 1944. Though there was relaxation in overall repression against the party due to our supporting anti-Fascist war, we had to undergo severe repression due to organising these struggles, though they were limited in scope to an extent. There were differences inside the party at the state level in that the right opportunist trend grumbled that they were essential and there was nothing wrong with them. Though the right opportunist leadership could not stop the struggles being organised, it could successfully prevent the development of similar struggles in other parts of the district and Telangana as a whole. Thus the struggles organised and developed by the Comrades belonging to revolutionary trend and its leadership were more or less isolated and were suppressed by the authorities, though temporarily and partially. The same thing happened when a struggle developed to a higher level, i.e., covering an extensive area in Janagaon Though we confined ourselves to legal activities in the main, we had also mobilised peasantry on a big scale against bigger and more oppressive feudal landlords. Though there were no differences in the earlier phase as long as we confined ourselves to legal activities, we again had to fight an isolated battle in 1945 and 1946 when the land distribution and armed resistance began. This time there was no active opposition to this phase of the movement; but not taking up same issues and not extending the movement in the same district and other districts, had not only

weakened the movement (1945-1946) in Nalgonda district, but also prevented developing a similar movement throughout Telangana where similar conditions did exist. This was due to the predominance of the right opportunist trend.

### III

Situation changed when anti-Nizam struggle started some time around August 1947 because the Nizam had refused to join in Indian Union. The struggle was joined by the Congressmen, and in Telangana we were in the forefront. Then again there were differences whether we should take up the programme of land distribution or not. At some stage we took it up, but to some extent it was delayed, in most of the districts it was not implemented. Obviously this had its adverse impact on the development of agrarian revolutionary movement in entire Telangana. Therefore, by the time the Central Government marched its armies into Telangana to suppress the agrarian revolutionary movement, which developed in the two districts in the main (Nalgonda and Warangal), the leadership, the party and the movement had to face a disadvantageous situation not only in facing stronger armed forces of the Union Government but also in having no such movement in other parts of Telangana. Added to this, the right opportunist wing of the party stabbed in the back of the movement by disorganising and abandoning it. This was the situation we had faced immediately after the Union armies entered.

This was also the time when there was a change in the party line from one of right opportunism to left adventurism. The Second Party Congress took place in February, 1948, which provided the party the left adventurist line. Seeing that there was an all-sided recognition to the Telangana armed struggle that was going on in isolation till that time, P. C. leadership, with the limited understanding provided by the struggle dared to put forward a line for future of Indian Revolution in its document, which was prepared and sent to the Polit Bureau of the party. The Polit Bureau, instead of realising the correctness of the line and working out a line for Indian Revolution, denounced it outright and rejected as reformist. This step of the leadership, which was expected to take up the responsibility of helping the struggle in all its aspects, was again a stab in the back of the struggle which was already undergoing critical phases due to suppression by Nizam and Union military forces.

A left adventurist line always sees right opportunism or

reformism in a basically correct revolutionary line. This was so in the past, the same continues even today. At the same time, it was not opposed to continue the armed struggle in Telangana against Nehru Government and its armies. Therefore it was a blessing in disguise for us who were for continuing the armed struggle, and in fact we were continuing the armed struggle by the time the Polit Bureau has rejected our line and the document in which the line was incorporated. This is not to say that there was nothing wrong in the document. In fact, it contained certain shortcomings which could be overcome by a healthy and proper discussion. But this did not happen. As a result, we had to face additional difficulties and obstacles which were of a serious nature than what it would have been if there was a correct line.

An armed struggle of this nature could be conducted only on the basis of a basically correct line, or there must be enough provision inside the party to conduct armed struggle and an internal struggle for a correct line basing on it. But to our disappointment, there was no inner-party democracy to conduct an inner-party struggle and armed struggle simultaneously. Therefore, a situation has arisen where we had to compromise with the wrong line to certain extent and continue the armed struggle. This again could be compared favourably with a situation which was existing during the earlier phase of the movement when a revolutionary trend backed by the revolutionary movement was developing within the framework of the wrong and reformist line and overwhelmingly reformist mass movement. The difference was that the leadership had a basically correct line as mentioned above, while the central leadership (PB) had rejected it outright characterising it as reformist. This is not a small difference which could be ignored. It was difference of basic and important nature which came in the way of defending and extending the movement in a correct direction.

This is not to say that the PC leadership was free from mistakes while leading the armed struggle. It could not correctly assess the growing level of the movement even in the limited area of two districts and its consequences. Therefore, it could not prepare itself and the movement for the impending military intervention of the Union Government and prepare itself and the party to face it. As a result, even a section of the revolutionary trend which wanted to continue the armed struggle was reduced to a state of helplessness. Therefore, barring a section of this trend, the major part of the

leadership of the area of the armed struggle advocated its withdrawal and in fact laid down arms. They had their own reasons advanced for their continuation of withdrawing it. They were discussed in this document comprehensively. An important feature of this document is that it has not gone in for quotations from the classics. Rather it relied on the experiences that we gained during the various stages of the Telangana movement including the armed struggle. We have summed up these experiences to the extent we understood them and drawn basically correct lessons which are valid even today. At the same time, we had to work out this document within the frame work of the wrong line that was forced on us by the Polit Bureau. Some of the quotations and explanations given in this document contain extracts from the Polit Bureau document. 'Tactical Line' as it was called. And we used them to defend our line of continuing armed struggle. Barring this, the rest of the document gives more or less a correct picture of the situation existing then and a correct programme to continue the armed struggle.

#### IV

In fact the Polit Bureau itself was a victim of desperationism. Which is manifested in its attitude towards Telangana Armed Struggle in the following manner: "It is no doubt true that Telangana is in danger and it has to bear the brunt. That it is more or less isolated. Yet we must fight to the last. Because by not resisting you are not only not going to save anything but completely demoralise the people. Whether you resist or not, repression is going to be brutal. Prolonged and protracted resistance, if possible, however, might even retrieve the situation if we keep it prolonged for a time" (*Documents of the History of CPI*, Vol.VII, p.417. PPH).

Here the Polit Bureau, after three months of police action, sees that there is a danger of Telangana armed struggle being crushed because it did not evaporate immediately after it, as was perhaps anticipated by it. Therefore it only could see the danger, having no confidence that a deep-rooted agrarian revolutionary movement, with a programme of land distribution could not only sustain armed struggle against the onslaughts of the Union armies, but could advance it also, because we had taken up guerilla warfare and not a positional warfare as our form of struggle. It should be noted that the Polit Bureau was silent about guerilla warfare as our form of struggle. It should be noted that the Polit Bureau was silent about guerilla warfare as its strategy and tactics as enunciated by Mao (some extracts

from his works were quoted in the documents) because it was opposed to Mao as such. Not only that: it was waiting for insurrection which it thought was round the corner. Polit Bureau realises that the armed struggle was more or less isolated. Which was a fact. But such an isolation was the creation of Polit Bureau itself, because having sufficient time -- of more than nine months ever since it came into existence in February 1948 (The police action took place after six months--Sep 13, 1948 -- and the above formulation was made three and half months after the Police action, i.e., the end of the Dec. 1948) -- it could not prepare the organisation and the mass movement in various states either to take up the issue of Telangana and campaign for its solidarity or to reorganise the mass movement so as to take it to higher levels. It advanced the existence of reformism as the whole reason for it. It did nothing to overcome it.

It wanted that Polit Bureau should fight to the last but not to continue the armed struggle. There is a difference between continuing armed struggle and fighting to the last. The former means a protracted armed struggle reaching higher levels; and fighting to the last means to resist till the last man dies and then the armed struggle automatically stops. This betrayed the lack of confidence in the peasant armed struggle. Therefore, Polit Bureau put up a militant posture by advocating to fight to the last. It was not shy of saying that by not resisting we are not only not going to save anything but completely demoralise the people. Therefore, it wanted resistance so as not to demoralise the people; and not for defending the gains of armed struggle, about which the Polit Bureau might have thought that they were already lost. Further, it thought that by prolonging the resistance, the situation might come wherein struggles might take place in other places leading to insurrection. Subsequent events show that though the situation is ripe for peasants to take up arms in various places (Armed Struggle in Tripura in 1950), such measures were not taken; instead, the struggles were allowed to be fizzled out (Worli in Maharashtra, peasant struggles in Kerala and elsewhere).

Therefore, the desperationism mentioned in the document applied to the Polit Bureau itself. We did not comment on it; instead, we left it at that. As far as I remember, some comrades, either from Telangana or from elsewhere within the jurisdiction of the PC, had also expressed a more or less similar view.

There are certain mistaken views of the Polit Bureau incorporated in the document as I mentioned above. One of them related to strategy. The strategy has been visualised in Andhra Secretariat's document which is popularly known as *Andhra Thesis*. It contained the following: "*Objective: to overthrow imperialist big business-feudal combine and completely wipe out all the features of feudalism, medievalism and colonial impress. Main force of the revolution: workers, both rural and industrial. Immediate reserve: Peasantry in general with the exception of those rich farmers who are unable to shake off their tails of feudalism; and poor and middle peasants, in particular, remain as immediate reserves throughout this stage of new democratic revolution. Direction of the main blow: against the collaborationist bourgeoisie and its henchmen who have been duping the peasantry and are still trying to keep their grip on them to betray the revolution. The proletariat must carry to completion the new democratic revolution by allying itself with the mass of peasants in general and poor and middle peasants in particular in order to crush by force the power of resistance of the imperialist-big business-feudal combine and paralyse instability of the middle bourgeoisie, upper middle class and a section of the rich peasantry*" (p.837.lbid)

I can not say that the strategy as formulated here is correct. It is defective in many respects and was liable for correction and improvement. At the same time, it was a strategy for new democratic revolution in which the object of the revolution was to overthrow the collaborationist big bourgeois-feudal combine. Though the *Thesis* mentioned that it was imperialist - big business - feudal combine, by overthrowing the big business-feudal combine the revolution automatically liquidates imperialism. Therefore to say that it is a partner in the state power was not correct. In other respects, though there is a possibility for improvement, the fact remains that the strategy visualises a united front with national bourgeoisie and rich peasantry. The national bourgeoisie was mentioned there as middle bourgeoisie. It also was clear about the hegemony of the proletariat in the new democratic revolution.

Therefore the strategy that we mentioned in the document is not correct even according to our own understanding at that time. We mentioned it only to be in line with the then Polit Bureau. In the same way, throughout the document, we mentioned it was the bourgeoisie who is in power and not imperialist-big business-

feudal combine, as mentioned in the *Andhra Thesis*. In the same way, there was another extract from the Polit Bureau Document (*Tactical Line*) which was related to the developing struggles in that period. It was: "These struggles bear one special character.....its stage being determined by the form and successful character of the resistance offered" (See P.13 - 14).

This was rather over simplifying the picture of that time though it was the same in 1945 - 1946 and 1947; but later, the mass upsurge was continuing though not of the same level. The very fact that the railway-men strike which was to take place subsequently was a miserable failure, and the struggles that were taking place earlier could not continue, proved that though there was not a period of lull as such, there was no powerful mass upsurge in subsequent months. All the same, people were on the move, and wherever we could organise them into struggle, they were ready to take part in them; even then they continued for a long time. Situation in Telangana was also the same.

## V

The document has a distinct feature in posing the question of path of Indian revolution as shown by Telangana armed struggle, though it was forced to link it with the insurrection in accordance with the then Polit Bureau line. This is how it puts it.

*"The experiences that we had in Telangana armed struggle have shown a new path for New Democratic Revolution in India. Here the class struggle has reached a higher level in the countryside even before the working class was prepared for insurrection. By creating a people's army and overthrowing Nizam's power through armed struggle..... on the basis of the slogans of land to the tiller and Gram Rajyas.....we could commence and advance revolution. Though, after military action, the armed struggle suffered major setbacks because of weaknesses in the movement, the Congress-Nizam set of ruling classes failed to suppress it by their armed forces. On the other hand, it is again spreading in the struggle areas and extending to newer areas. Thus Telangana Armed Struggle was not confined to overthrowing Nizam's rule; instead it is continuing to overthrow the Indian Bourgeoisie also from power. The experience of Telangana proves clearly that, even in India, it is possible to overthrow Bourgeois- Zamindari rule in the countryside by developing guerilla struggles basing on land question, and that such struggles*

*will be of utmost help to the proletariat's struggle to seize power through insurrection....." (See Page 38).*

Earlier, we had dealt with the distinguishing features of successful Russian and Chinese revolutions and applied their experiences to our own revolution. But we never said that it will take the course of either of the two or both. We said clearly that it is Telangana which showed a new path for New Democratic Revolution of India in unmistakable terms. If we had in mind that it is the Chinese path, we would not have said it is a *new* path. A new path is always a new path, which distinguishes itself with others. Therefore, our view that Telangana armed struggle has shown a new path for Indian revolution is not a new one of today, but it took its origin long back when Telangana armed struggle was developing and continuing. The mention of insurrection was superfluous. Because it was meant only to be in tune with Polit Bureau's line as was mentioned earlier; in fact it contradicts the idea of insurrection. Because the armed struggle being a new path cannot subordinate itself to insurrection. Therefore, the insurrection's secondary role will be there and not primary role. This is how the new path took its origin and developed. Therefore, those (Chandra Pulla Reddy etc) who think that I have borrowed this idea from China or Chinese writings in 1967-68 are wrong, and their stand is baseless. I had these views at that time itself. And when I advocated the same after we broke from CPI (M), I was reviving the old idea and not a new fabricated and manipulated one as CP Reddy has developed for his own reasons.

## VI

The document often mentions about the mistakes committed and the shortcomings of the movement. It has pointed out some of them as being the open methods of functioning instead of secret methods; failure to build the political organisation at lower levels (villages) and doing everything through armed guerilla squads; failure to draw masses to actively participate in the armed struggle in majority of the places and thus reducing them as passive spectators etc. This was true. Apart from this there was one important shortcoming, that was a wrong line followed by the central leadership which had its own disastrous effect on the entire course of armed struggle. Unless we realise its important aspect, we cannot understand why the other mistakes were committed in conducting the struggle. Some of the other mistakes were the tendencies of militarism; compromise

with land lords, and sometimes giving them a leading position in the struggle; having illusions in the liberating role of the Congress and the Union Government and creating these illusions among the people instead of fighting them back; failure to prepare the party and guerillas in advance to face the onslaughts of the Union Army etc.-- these were some of the weaknesses manifested. It should be known that we were racing against time with a disinterested central leadership at the top. At the same time, any leadership with a political foresight should take these measures whatever be the attitude of the centre and others.

That we could improve the situation by continuing the struggle was evident by the reports and subsequent experiences from the struggle areas and those areas where we extended. It shows that if we had a correct line from the beginning and acted accordingly from top to bottom, the situation would have been very favourable, but we could not expect it in the given situation. And also we cannot adopt an attitude of '*if it were so*' and such deviations are products of the internal and external situations in a given period.

The document appears to be belated as the date of its finalisation shows (September, 1949, one year after the police action). The background of this situation is as following: We prepared our draft note (*Andhra Thesis*) in the March itself -- roughly after one month of Party Congress -- and sent it to the Polit Bureau either in April or in May.

There was no reaction from the Polit Bureau till the meeting of the Polit Bureau was concluded, which was long after the document was sent, ie., 9 months. Meanwhile the armed struggle continued and advanced till the police action and received severe setbacks immediately after it. We continued armed struggle after the police action on our own responsibility and Polit Bureau had no role to play in it. Though myself and Sundarayya, who were in the struggle areas at the time of police action, instructed the area committees to continue the armed struggle, and to retreat the guerilla squads and important leading cadres to the forest areas, while making arrangements to put up resistance and defend the gains from the local offensive of the landlords and the Govt. forces, they could not materialise because of the weaknesses existing in the organisation and the movement. The main reason for suffering so many losses was this.

A meeting of the Polit Bureau concluded by the end of December, 1948. We had the documents with us either in January or February when we started discussion on them. While discussing them, we worked out a line for continuing the armed struggle in '*Andhra Committee's Letter*', and in political resolution on the Hyderabad state. In which the then existing situation was analysed. It was those comrades who were either opposed to the line of continuing armed struggle or are not satisfied with our approach, sent their criticism together with proposing a political retreat by withdrawing armed struggle and abandoning the revolutionary gains. We dealt their views by criticising on the basis of the experiences we had by then in the armed struggle in Telangana itself. We issued a first set of documents, i.e., the '*Andhra Committee's Letter* and Political Resolution some time in April, and it took six months to issue this document after we circulated them. It was natural that the discussion on our first set of documents in the lower units, i.e., area committees and down below went on for about two months, and we started receiving their criticism from May onwards. We immediately attended the criticism and started working on this document and it took some two months to prepare and finalise it. Since we sent comprehensive document, the '*Andhra Committees's Letter*, in March itself directing the lower units to organise themselves and continue the armed struggle, there was no occasion to complain that we had provided no guidance. The time gap that appears should be understood in this context.

Though most of the comrades at lower levels, mainly area committees and important comrades down below, laid down arms in violation of instructions we issued on our individual responsibility immediately after police action, a good number of them, realising their mistakes, reorganised themselves and guerilla squads with the remaining cadres and continued the armed struggle as disciplined soldiers of the party; though some of the leaders of the area committees.....could not reconcile themselves to continuing the armed struggle they did not stage revolts or break away from the organisation, as it has been the practice of the last one decade and more.

The leadership of Huzurnagar Area Committee could not reorientate itself to the new line for some time; it gradually changed itself and continued armed struggle to some extent. The Palwancha leadership left the struggle area for good and went into the interior

area of the forests, with the remaining squads, where there was no need for resistance because there was no military offensive and people were not in action. The Tiruvuru organiser, not reconciled himself to the new line, organised some raids on individual rich men's houses, looted money, gold and other valuables, betrayed secrets to the police resulting in the death of many a valuable comrade and sympathisers of our party. After this treachery, he left the place once and for all, and took shelter with a top Congress man who had his property in an adjacent state. He lived there for the rest of his life not to be seen again by the people in Andhra who knew him. The only comrade who differed to begin with but was convinced of the need of continuing the armed struggle after we issued this document was Muthaiah of Munagala paragona. He continued the armed struggle with convictions of a communist revolutionary and died a martyr's death after some time.

It was clear from this that there was certain amount of inner-party democracy to enable the comrades expressing their differences with the line the leadership was following without fear, and their differences were taken into consideration and criticised in a way that a healthy discussion could be possible while implementing the line. No action was taken against them for their expressing their differing views. There were some black sheep in the leadership of the area committees who refused to implement the line and did not reconcile with it. They could sabotage the armed struggle to certain extent. Barring this, we could reorganise and continue the armed struggle with the remaining cadres and guerilla forces so that we could consolidate the struggle areas and extend it to the adjacent districts and forest area. This is how inner-party democracy and discussion helped us in overcoming the differences and continue the armed struggle. Unlike this, today there is a tendency from those who are supposed to have differences to assert either not to implement the line till the discussions are over or form themselves into a group by disrupting the organisation and the movement.

This attitude of theirs has nothing in common either with the experience of the party or the principles of revolutionary party organisation. We should fight this disruptive tendency to the finish and unify the organisation and the movement in a proper way.

## VII

There are certain similarities between the wrong views expressed by the present-day leaders of various parties and groups, and those that were expressed and dealt with in this document. The CPI holds that it was wrong to continue the armed struggle after the police action and abandoned the gains. They proved to be wrong because Congress is no friend of the people. We could defend the gains as long as we continued the armed struggle. As and when we laid down the arms the Congress regime liquidated all those gains, i.e., land etc., and restored landlordism. We can see the domination of landlords even today.

The CPI(M) argues that it was correct to continue the armed struggle after the police action and it was also correct to withdraw it in 1951 before the elections. The armed struggle which continued for three long years after police action could also continue subsequently and there was no reason why it should have been withdrawn half way. The very fact that the revolutionary gains, the land and armed guerilla forces, were liquidated after the withdrawal leading to shrinking of our mass base to the minimum shows that their views are wrong.

Those who claim themselves to be revolutionaries, especially Chandra Pulla Reddy (CP), say that armed struggle should be conducted without land distribution, or express views similar to some extent with those who advocated the above-mentioned views. If one says 'no land distribution and no armed struggle', CP says 'no land distribution but armed struggle'. Here both are common in their views so far as abandoning the distribution of land and abolition of landlordism are concerned. The difference will be only about the need for armed struggle. The CPI (M) advocates formally that armed struggle may be conducted as a partial struggle for some partial demand without raising question of seizing power. CP also advocates that armed struggle can and should be conducted without distributing the land of landlords. Thus his raising the question of seizure of power becomes too formal. Now both CPI and CPM took up the parliamentary path. Therefore what the CPM says has no meaning because of its adopting parliamentary path. Renouncing distribution of land of the landlords and seizure of power is common to all, i.e., CPI, CPM and CP group. To say that there can be an armed struggle without land distribution and seizure of power, as CP advocates, has no meaning and is purposeless and it is a

fake armed struggle and not a genuine one. It is nothing but trading with the idea of armed struggle.

The comrades who advocated political retreat and withdrawal of armed struggle after police action wanted that the revolutionary gains should be abandoned and preparations should be made afresh for armed struggle. CP advocates 'armed struggle' for armed struggle without linking it to the basic revolutionary gains, i.e., the distribution of the land of the landlords, setting up of Gram Rajyas. Thus there is a certain amount of commonness in having no revolutionary gains between these two.

The former was honest enough to advocate withdrawal, but the latter (CP), in order to pose himself a revolutionary, does not admit this. Instead he wants an 'armed struggle' for armed struggle sake etc.

This is how the same mistakes, wrong trends, deviations appear under new conditions and in new forms. Now that the people and the revolutionaries are likely to be carried away -- in fact they were carried away with such slogan as armed struggle -- the newcomers in the field needed 'left' slogans to enforce their rightist views and programmes. CP is one who is implementing his rightist programme with left slogans. There are some others who take similar attitude. Of course people have realised the fraud played upon them and are not believing what the new slogan-mongers say. They are discarding them and embracing the revolutionary mass line we are advocating.

## VIII

This document was prepared by me as a draft and was adopted by the Secretariat of the Andhra Provincial Committee\*. There were no important changes made by the Secretariat when it was adopted. I do not remember if any minor changes were made at that time. Even if some were made they are of no consequence. As it stands today, the rest of the Secretariat members left the politics of this document. I do not want to comment here on them.

There was some scope to improve this document. But I preferred to publish it without any such changes so that readers may know my views and the situation existing then as they were at that time.

\*Secretariat consisted of Chandra Rajeswara Rao, Secretary, P. Sundarayya, M. Basavapunniah, B. Narasimha Reddy and myself.

The necessary explanations are given in the footnotes so that the readers may understand the context and my present views on some of the subjects. In English translation, there is a change in using the word *armed struggle* instead of 'guerilla struggle' in the Telugu original text, since the armed struggle sounds better and more comprehensive than the 'guerilla struggle'. (In Telugu it is used as 'Guerilla Poratam'). The rest of the words were retained as they are and translated accordingly. I hope readers will appreciate our attempt to publish this document which has played an important role in continuing the armed struggle for two years after it was issued. The readers will know more about the revolutionary movement and armed struggle in Telangana after going through this book. Many questions are asked on various aspects of the struggle and there are answers in this book. One can see that my writings in the recent past contain the same views which I expressed in this work.

Dated : 20-9-1982

-Author

## PART - III

### **KARL MARX'S DEATH CENTENARY To Make The Indian Revolution A Success Is Our Best Tribute To Marx**

Karl Marx, the founder of Marxism -- the scientific socialism -- was born in the city of Trier, Germany, on May 5, 1818. His was a well-to-do family. During his higher education he was influenced by leftist ideas and became a revolutionary. He was introduced to Engels in 1844, and ever since, they were colleagues till the end of Marx's life. Together they developed scientific and revolutionary theories in the realms of philosophy, economics and socialism. They developed contacts with contemporary revolutions and revolutionary movements and led them. In this connection, Marx wrote many works. The small booklet he wrote, the *Communist Manifesto* is known to us all. *Capital* was his most voluminous writing. In this work, written in three volumes, Marx exhaustively dealt with the capitalist system, criticised all the contemporary theories and developed his own scientific theory. Though his theories are not accepted by representatives of the bourgeoisie, even today they are regarded as authority by communist revolutionaries all over the world. Even others regard them as standard.

He experienced the worst sufferings of poverty. His life is a great ideal for all revolutionaries. He carried on his ideological work and revolutionary practice until he breathed his last on March 14, 1883.

While understanding the teachings of Marx, we should remember what he said in one of his letters to Joseph Weydemeyer, his friend. Marx wrote:

".....As to myself, no credit is due to me for discovering the existence of classes in modern society, nor yet the struggle between them. Long before me, bourgeois historians had described the historical development of this struggle of the classes, and bourgeois economists, the economic anatomy of the

classes. What I did that was new was to prove: 1) that the *existence of classes is only bound up with particular historical phases in the development of production*; 2) that the class struggle necessarily leads to the dictatorship of the proletariat; 3) that this dictatorship itself only constitutes the transition to the abolition of all classes and to a classless society.....".

(Marx and Engels: *Selected Letters*: p. 18 : Peking 1977.)

There are many nowadays who believe that Marxism is but describing the worst exploitation by the exploiting classes and the untold sufferings of the people. But then there are many non-Marxists among those who make such descriptions. Viewed in this angle, it is not enough to understand and speak of exploitation. We will be real Marxists only when we proclaim that, through class struggle and under the leadership of proletariat, people's democratic dictatorship and then proletarian dictatorship, must be established, followed by building socialism. It is necessary to note this difference between real Marxists and others.

He spent his last 33 years of life in London. At that time he wrote many essays on the British imperialist rule in India, on the 1857 War of Independence and on the social system of India of those days. Besides them he made several comments on India in his *Capital* and on other occasions. If we keep in mind the limitations of information available to him at that time, we can appreciate the great objectivity and scientific outlook displayed by Marx.

Lenin applied his theories to the Russian conditions and led the great October Revolution (1917) successfully. And then he laid the foundations for socialism in Russia. He also led the international communist movement, laid the foundations for and developed the Third Communist International. In quite early days of his leadership to the Russian revolution, Lenin spoke of Marxism as following:

*"We do not regard Marx's theory as something complete and inviolable; on the contrary we are convinced that it has only laid the foundation stone of the science which socialists must develop in all directions if they wish to keep pace with life. We think that an independent elaboration of Marx's theory is especially essential for Russian socialists; for, this theory provides*

*only general guiding principles, which in particular, are applied in England differently than in France, in France differently than in Germany, and in Germany differently than in Russia".*

(Lenin, *Collected Works*. Vol.4, P.211)

These views of Lenin about Marxism are greatly valuable as well as necessary. He said Marx's theory was not a complete one and that it needed all-sided development. Lenin, Stalin and Mao are in the forefront of those who thus developed Marxism. They applied Marxism to revolutions in Russia and China and made them successful.

Lenin also said that Marxism was not inviolable. He meant it was not inviolable like religious preachings. By scientific experimentation and by every new experience gained in the course of revolution, some of Marx's views may prove to be inapplicable in subsequent times or in some countries. Therefore to maintain that his views are inviolable may harm the cause of revolutionary movements. And hence the need, Lenin said, for an independent elaboration by the Russian socialists, i.e. the Marxists of those days. Lenin cited reasons for his contention. Thus, not only Marxism, but Leninism as well as Mao Zedong Thought have only developed general guidelines so far as our country is concerned. Just as France, England, Germany and Russia were different from each other, so are India and China with their own common features as well as different conditions. Viewed thus, communist revolutionaries also should elaborate and apply Marxism independently. Same should be our attitude towards Leninism as well as Mao Zedong Thought.

Lenin said these words as long back as 1899. Having evolved a programme for Russian revolution, he said this while explaining how open discussions on it are useful and how they will help an elaboration of the Marxist theories.

The CPI had been a branch of the Third Communist International for quite long. But the party leadership had failed to apply and elaborate Marxism-Leninism in accordance with the concrete conditions of India. As a result, the party was left like an infant that can not use its limbs notwithstanding the limited successes scored in building the revolutionary movement. Instead of understanding and discussing any question faced by the revolutionary movement in the light of the Indian conditions, they quoted chapter and verse

from the writings of Marx, Engels, Lenin and Stalin, but failed in an independent elaboration of the same. This was one of the reasons why the party leadership adopted right and left opportunist policies as also class collaborationist policies.

Though there was some effort in this direction during Telangana armed struggle (1948-50) it did not continue. It tapered off then itself. It was again revived after 1968 and is still continuing. Communist revolutionaries belong to this category.

The communist revolutionaries of today are in more favourable conditions than those in 1920-40 period. Those days it was difficult to get Marxist literature whereas it is available aplenty today. What all is required is to study it from a Marxist perspective and to apply it to Indian conditions and revolutionary practice.

However, revisionists of all hues as well as the 'left' opportunists claim they are doing the same. The trend among them is to give a Marxist coating, in the name of concrete conditions of India, to the reactionary theories in the Indian society and thus support them directly and indirectly. This trend, which has raised its head in recent period and is disrupting the revolutionary movement, can be termed as revivalist. But the Indian conditions as well as the experience of the revolutionary movement -- the parliamentary path and the 'left' opportunist path (politics of murder)-- have irrefutably proved that revivalism is wrong and contrary to Marxism.

There have been anti-Marxist trends at all times and in all countries. They are at times weak and at times strong. And, in all circumstances communist revolutionaries must have to fight against them. This is what we are doing today.

Those who deviated from Marxism are writing hundreds of articles about Marx and Marxism and claiming that they are its adherents. This is what is done by those who sell their spurious goods under respectable labels. There is a great need to keep an eye on them and to isolate them from the revolutionary movement.

Ours is a large and populous country. It is being plundered by all imperialists including super powers. The landlord class in India has been providing it a basis. In the name of foreign and scientific culture, imperialist theories and culture, reactionary theories and cultures are being fostered by the ruling classes. While preserving the best qualities of the Indian people, we must fight against foreign

and native reactionary theories and cultures. Thus we should unite the Indian people. The communist revolutionaries can realise this programme in alliance with other revolutionary forces.

The best tribute that we can pay to Karl Marx is to advance the Indian revolution in the light of his teachings. This is the only way to give practical shape to his ever-lasting theories and to be worthy of his ever-cherished name.

We, communist revolutionaries, while remembering March 14, pledge to dedicate ourselves to the cause of Indian revolution.

(12-3-1983)

## **The Indian Revolution Will Succeed Only When The Revolutionary Proletariat Makes Marxism Its Own**

May Day, the International Working Men's Day, has been celebrated throughout the country. On this day the working class has expressed its determination to continue its struggle for better living conditions and democratic rights.

May 5 is the birth day of Karl Marx, the founder of Marxism and the greatest genius the man-kind has produced. His death centenary fell on March 14 of this year. It has been observed all over the world including our country.

We communist revolutionaries attach more significance to these days than others. For us, they carry revolutionary significance inspiring us to work more for the revolution of our country. We dedicate ourselves to make the revolution a success. For others it is more or less a ritual, which they celebrate usually.

### **I**

That the working class is under the grip of economism is indisputable. This does not mean that it is free from any politics. Various sections have their politics of caste, religion, liberal reform, the class collaboration etc. Its political as well as economic interests are opposed to such politics. But there are some political parties and forces who, in their bid to draw the working class to their fold, have organised their own trade unions and developed a trade union bureaucracy, which is opposed to trade union democracy and which is acting against the interests of the working class. Though the working class has been nursing illusions about this leadership all these years, it is gradually shedding them away. It is in search of a new leadership which genuinely defends its interests, political as well as economic.

Thus, the economism prevailing among the working class is opposed to revolutionary politics but not the type of politics mentioned above, i.e., liberal, reformist etc. It means that the working class

should abandon economism and adopt revolutionary politics, which is possible only when there is a revolutionary party of the working class, i.e., a party of communist revolutionaries. The CPI and CPI(M), though claiming to be parties of working class, have abandoned Marxism-Leninism long ago, embraced revisionism, and have been adopting class-collaborationist politics all these years. The path pursued by communist revolutionaries is a revolutionary path which guarantees the success of the people's democratic revolution in our country.

### **II**

The death centenary of Karl Marx has been observed on March 14, 1983 all over the world including our country. The CPI journals were lavish enough in producing articles which are devoid of revolutionary content. CPI (M) has its own share in this. They write all and sundry but not about Indian revolution which is the crux of the problem so far as the proletariat and the people of our country are concerned.

Interestingly enough, the Parliament was "good" enough to pay tributes to Karl Marx on March 14. The leaders of the ruling party as well as of opposition spoke highly of Marx. During the last one hundred years after his death, it has become so popular among the working men and the people of the world that they are finding their future in revolutionary Marxism and nothing else. It indicates that Marxism is the theory and practice of the exploited and the oppressed who are struggling to build a new socialist society. In such a situation, leaders of various parties, including those of CPI and CPI (M) have joined the chorus.

The present-day parliament, in accordance with the Constitution, continues to adopt and uphold repressive laws to suppress revolutionary Marxism to the extent it is practised by the parties groups and the people. The government is enforcing these laws with all the ruthlessness at its command. As such the Parliament which praised Marx and Marxism in words, suppresses it in practice.

The present regime is allowing the circulation of works of Marx, Engels and Lenin in our country. This freedom, if any, is limited to only reading but not for practising, especially its revolutionary content. The CPI and CPI (M) are being allowed to come into power at State level because they have renounced revolutionary path which is the revolutionary content of Marxism when applied to specific

conditions prevailing in our country.

### III

Ironically enough, it was a *swamiji*, who never claimed to be a Marxist -- nor he can be one -- who spoke a few useful words while addressing a gathering on the occasion. Swami Ranganadhananda is reported to have said the following: "*Marxism must be applied in Indian way as was done by Lenin in Russia.....Marxism can liberate India too provided it was approached in Indian perspective*" (*Indian Express* March 16, 1983). He is reported to have spoken about "*Indian methodology*". Though we do not make it a point of discussion at present, at the same time, we can say that there is no such common methodology for India as a whole. If we take his words as such, what he said is correct. Russians could make their revolution a success because they made Marxism their own. The same is the case with Chinese. This means Indian revolution will succeed only when the proletariat and the people of our country make Marxism our own. It is obvious that Indian revolution could not succeed because we could not make it our own, inspite of the emergence of Communist Party more than half a century ago. In this connection, we should keep in mind what Lenin has said about the need for "*an Independent elaboration of Marx's theory*" about 84 years ago. It is obvious that we also need such an elaboration.

Almost all the religions preach equality, brotherhood etc. But none of them could achieve them. It is because they have been adopting themselves to the slave, feudal and capitalist societies in the respective countries. Ours is one among them. But the socialist societies could establish equality etc., as and when they emerged though they never professed and encouraged any religion. On the contrary they opposed them while accepting the right of the people to have the faith in religion and practise it.

In view of this, religious personalities who have no vested interests began to accept socialist society as the solution to the crisis in which the mankind is embroiled, inspite of their adherence to their respective religions. More often we hear them saying that they have no quarrel with Marxism except that it denies the existence of God. Late Archbishop of Canterbury can be cited as an example.

### IV

How to make Marxism our own is a problem which eluded the Marxists of our country for a long time. The experience of more than half a century shows that mere reading of the Marxist-Leninist classics leads us nowhere. Instead we have to study the experiences of our own class struggles and draw lessons for our revolution, keeping in view Marx's teachings. We communist revolutionaries did the same in a modest way and worked out a revolutionary mass line. As we implement it people are making Marxism as their own. All this presupposes an uncompromising struggle on our part against alien ideologies.

Some of those who claim a hereditary right in Marxism say that to fight US imperialism is a best tribute for Marx in the present year when people are all observing his death centenary. That US imperialism is a super power which should be fought to the finish is indisputable. But what about Russia? Is it not a super power which is dominating our country? Is it not a super power which has been occupying Afghanistan for the last three years and more, and helped Vietnam in occupying Kampuchea? Russia has no right to indulge in aggressions simply because it claims to be a follower of Marxism. Therefore, the genuine followers should fight Russian social imperialism with equal vigour. Its predatory role has already extended to our country.

Fighting this or that super power is one thing and fighting for the success of revolution in our country is another thing. The revisionists are advancing the slogan of fighting US imperialism in order to rally behind ruling classes as represented by Mrs. Indira Gandhi and Russia, another super power.

So far as revisionists and neo-revisionists are concerned, they have no programme of fight on struggle against US imperialism except verbal opposition. By tying themselves to the ruling classes, they can not be otherwise. Their support to Russia is unqualified. As such their attitude towards US depends on the relations between the two super powers.

It is true that the success of Indian revolution is possible only when the two super powers are driven out of Indian soil. Therefore to treat one super power as a friend and ally of our people leads the revolution nowhere.

## V

CPI (M) claims that it is following an independent line suited to Indian conditions. Of late the CPI has also advanced this slogan. The parliamentary path that they are pursuing is not new. Social Democracy in Europe has been practising that for about seven or eight decades. It is opposed to revolutionary path.

The independent line which they are following is a line independent of Marxism-Leninism. Neither Marxism-Leninism has advocated such a path nor the objective conditions in our country permit it. It is a path which serves the interests of the ruling classes.

The Indian Marxist line is a line which serves the immediate and long term interests of the revolution. While the Communist revolutionaries have such a line the others donot have it. They are not only implementing this but also carrying on struggle against anti-Marxist, anti-Leninist lines. May Day together with the birthday of Marx (May 5) will always inspire the working class, the oppressed people and the Communist revolutionaries to dedicate themselves to the cause of revolution of our country.

Let us have our interpretation and application of Marxism, suited to the conditions in our country, while at the same time serving the interests of our revolution.

This is the best way to pay our tributes to Karl Marx on his birthday, and to the workers of Chicago (US) who laid down their lives for the sake of emancipation of the working class and other oppressed peoples. (7-5-1983)

## **CPI(M) Doesnot Cease to be Revisionist Simply Because It Could Establish Relations with CPC**

Of late contacts were developing between CPC (Comunist Party of China) and CPI (M) , culminating in establishing relations between the two. Various interpretations are given to this event. Some are speculating that it may help in normalising the relations between our country and China, on the governments' level. The question is also being discussed in the context of relations between two communist parties belonging to two different countries, more so CPC and others.

## I

To understand the event, we have to explain the origin and development of international communist movement headed by Third Communist International (Comintern), and the developments which took place after its dissolution. We can not go into the details because of the limitations of this article. Suffice it to say that the relations between the Comintern and affiliates were not the same althrough.

It is a fact that formation of Comintern was a historical necessity and world communist movement has advanced considerably under its leadership. Communist parties have been formed in a capitalist as well as colonial and semi-colonial countries with revolutionay programmes. Proletarian revolutionary movements advanced under the leadership of the concerned parties. They had the advantage of guidance of such great leaders as Lenin and Stalin.

So far as India and China are concerned, guidance from Comintern was always available. CPC had utilised it in a different way than the CPI of Comintern period. The CPC headed by Mao relied on its own experience, corrected the mistakes committed by the leadership of the Comintern, and advanced the revolution. This was how it exercised its independence during that period. Different is the case with the leadership of CPI. It has never grasped its own programme nor implemented it. It did not rely on its

independence in correcting the basic shortcomings the then general line contained.

The Comintern was dissolved in 1943. A new situation arose wherein the parties have become independent and were expected to look after their own affairs. It was easier for CPC to adapt itself to such a situation because it was already pursuing its own independent line. The same was not the case with CPI whose dependence on Comintern was total. Though the party was formally independent, it continued to be dependent on "international guidance". In fact there were some comrades at various levels who were opposed to dissolution of Comintern, which meant that they wanted continued dependence.

## II

While the relations between CPI leadership and CPSU (Communist Party of Soviet Union) were always good, cordial and fraternal, CPI's relations with CPC met with ups and downs. The Polit Bureau (1948-50) headed by B. T. Ranadive condemned Mao as reformist simply because he worked out a correct strategy, tactics, course of revolution and led the New Democratic Revolution in China successfully. There were no party-to-party relations between CPI and CPC by that time. Therefore there was no question of their breaking up. But then it was a clear indication that there existed an anti-CPC trend by 1948 itself.

However, party-to-party relations between CPI and CPC were established during fifteen for a brief period. Thanks to anti-CPC activities indulged by late Ajoy Ghosh, the then secretary of CPI, the relations were broken again around 1960. They were again restored after the split and at the time of formation of CPI (M).

It should be noted that the relations between government of India and Chinese government had undergone substantial changes during the period. CPI's relations with CPC were always linked with its attitude towards Indian government as well as Soviet Union. Since both were hostile to China, the question of party-to-party relations between the two did not arise during this period. The same situation continues even today.

## III

Though party-to-party relations between CPI (M) and CPC were broken at the time of Naxalbari revolt and formation of Charu

Majumdar's CPI(ML), they were suspended by CPI(M) for all practical purposes after the formation of CPI(M), i.e., after the Party Congress held in Calcutta in 1964 for this purpose. The reason for this was: there were three lines of thinking among the leading sections who joined together to form CPI (M). One section was severe in its criticism about CPSU leadership while it was supporting CPC in the main in the ideological debate that started in the earlier part of the sixties. Such leaders were from a good number of states, the main contingent being from Andhra and West Bengal. There was another section which was critical both about CPSU and CPC. This was from Kerala. There was yet another section which was more critical about CPC and less about CPSU. This was from West Bengal.

When all these sections joined together to form the leadership of CPI(M), they became anti-CPC in the main. There was a historical background for this as the earlier developments in the CPI show.

Upto this time, the CPC did not intervene in the internal affairs either of CPI or of CPI(M) when the latter was being formed. The leadership of CPI(M) had never taken pains to inform its ranks about the suspension of relations with CPC not to speak of explaining it. Obviously, the leadership did not want to annoy CPSU leaders. Rather it wanted to get "recognised" by it by keeping itself away from CPC. The government of India's hostility towards China had its bearing on this attitude of CPI (M).

Thus there was a CPI linked with CPSU and "recognised" by it, while the CPI(M) was left out so far as CPSU was concerned. The parties of various countries, though formally independent, had their own party-to-party relations, some with CPSU, others with CPC, a few with both. So far as CPI(M) is concerned, it had to content itself with having relations with the parties like that of Romania which has relations with both the parties. So far as CPSU is concerned, it acted as a patriarch over some of the parties, which accepted its leadership, and dictated their policies.

## IV

The situation was anomalous for CPSU as well as CPI and CPI(M). CPI(M) was equally pro-Soviet, sometimes more than CPI. It was stronger, with Left Front governments in two (sometimes three) States. CPI(M) gradually backed out from its mildly critical stand about CPSU, and stopped calling CPI revisionist. They have

come together in a United Front, but could not merge. CPI was for a merger but CPI(M) did not oblige. The differences between the two parties were not so important as to prevent merger.

CPI(M) had tried its best to get a recognition from CPSU, through Romania, but it was of no avail. Obviously, the stumbling block was CPI. Otherwise CPI(M) was second to none in supporting CPSU in all respects.

The change in the leadership of the CPC was a god-send to CPI(M). It expected that it would denounce Mao Zedong Thought and repeat what Khrushchev had done to Stalin so that both may come together without any reservations. But the CPC had taken a different direction. While denouncing Cultural Revolution, it upheld Mao Zedong Thought as firmly as it should be.

It should be noted that CPI(ML) was renounced by CPC in 1970 when Mao was alive. If recognition of CPI(ML) was the real reason behind break in relations between CPC and CPI(M), it should have been possible to start efforts from both sides for establishing relations during earlier part of seventies itself. But there were no such efforts. This again makes it clear that CPI(M) was bent on getting recognition from CPSU by supporting its policies.

## V

There is much talk about CPC's interference in the internal affairs of CPI(M) etc. As we stated elsewhere, the relations between the two were already suspended; as such the question of intervention does not arise. The only difference was that CPC leadership, which was silent all the while, had come out openly against the CPI(M) leadership, with all its consequences. But we do hold that there was such intervention so far as revolutionary communist movement was concerned. It was by way of supporting Charu Majumdar and his formation of CPI(ML), Apparently it was directed against CPI(M) leadership. But it resulted in disintegrating and disrupting the entire revolutionary movement. The CPI (M) was no longer representing it by then because it adopted the 'Path of Bengal and Kerala' as its line, which is the parliamentary path in its naked form, by renouncing the path of revolution. Thus the harm done to Indian revolutionary movement was more than to CPI (M).

We are firmly of opinion that the question of Path of Indian revolution should be settled by the communist revolutionary

movement in India . It can be accomplished only when Marxism-Leninism is integrated with the revolutionary practice. No party outside our country can undertake this task. We, communist revolutionaries, already have undertaken this task with all the self-confidence at our disposal.

## VI

CPC leadership was adhering to the principle of equality with and non-interference in the internal affairs of the parties of other countries. But the earlier half of the decade starting with 1966(Cultural Revolution) saw a different picture in our country, when this principle was given a go-by. But it was restored in full when the present leadership was at the helm of affairs. It should be noted that it had party-to-party relations with Romania and North Korea during the period of Cultural Revolution, in spite of basic and important difference. The only criterion at the time was that they were independent of CPSU to a considerable extent.

The present CPC leadership extended the relations to almost all. It has established its relations with Italian party which was independent of CPSU although. More notable and oft-mentioned are the parties of France. It had established relations, long before, with French Socialist Party, which is now the ruling party. Then came the French Communist Party. It has been loyal to CPSU all along, though there are some differences between the two. Notwithstanding this, CPC had established party-to-party relations with it. The differences they had are not allowed to come in the way of having such relations. CPC has relations with Communist Party (Marxist-Leninist) of France. The *Beijing Review* (10.1.83) has reported about the visit of its delegation as following:

"The Chinese Communist Party is willing to establish and develop relations with the workers' parties and other French political parties", said Hu Yaobang, General Secretary of the CPC Central Committee, on December 31, 1982.

Hu made this remark to a delegation of the Central Committee of the Communist Party (Marxist-Leninist) of France.....

"In our relations with these parties, " Hu Yaobang said, "We follow the principles of independence, equality, mutual respect and non-interference in each other's internal affairs".

It is clear that CPC is establishing party-to-party relations not only with bigger parties like French Communist Party, but also a smaller one like Communist Party (M.L.) of France. Therefore the scope of such relations is wider than what is considered to be. Besides this, CPC is having relations with such parties as Somalia's Revolutionary Socialist Party which is the country's ruling party.

Answering a question connected with establishing party-to-party relations with French Communist Party -- "Does this mean that parties that maintain close relations with the Soviet Communist Party can develop relations with the Chinese Communist Party?" -- Hu Yaobang, General Secretary, CPC, said, "I think they can, because one of our principles is not to interfere in other parties' internal affairs. Any party, whether a workers' party, communist party or nationalist party, if it is willing to be friendly with us, we are willing to establish relations with it". (*Beijing Review* : 25.10.82) .

By this, it becomes clear that CPC is establishing relations with more than one communist party if such parties exist in a country and they desire to have relations with CPC.

It should be noted that in all countries, especially those of the Europe and the Third World, people including working class are realising the pinch of Russian hegemonism as that of USA. As such their genuine nationalism stands in opposition to Russia which is expressed in rising national feelings. The communist parties which once had total allegiance towards CPSU have to reckon with this fact. Though the leaderships of most of the parties do not accept the social-imperialist and hegemonic nature of Russia, they have to relax their allegiance to convince the people that they are national parties. French and Spanish parties can be shown as examples in this respect, though they too have their own differences.

The latest example which we have in our country is that of CPI. Everyone knows about its unquestionable loyalty and allegiance towards CPSU. But the leadership had to come out in the open dissociating itself from a policy article in the Russian press which asks CPI and all pro-Soviet forces to support Mrs. Indra Gandhi. The leadership also declared that CPI is an independent party having its own policy, without any dictates from Moscow. We need not take it on its face-value. But the fact of the matter is that it has to reckon with Indian nationalism, which is growing and is directed against Russian hegemonism in our country.

All this goes to show that some of the parties having allegiance to CPSU, and once rapidly anti-CPC, are coming forward to establish party-to-party relations with it. The policies of the new CPC leadership have facilitated this process more than any other factor.

The statements issued by the leaders of CPI(M), while they were at Beijing and after their return, make certain facts clear which we should take into consideration.

1. The relations established between the two parties are on the basis of four principles and not on the basis of Marxism-Leninism and proletarian internationalism. The four principles are: (1) independence (2) equality (3) mutual respect and (4) non-interference in each other's internal affairs. The parties of Marxism-Leninism and proletarian internationalism must adhere to these principles in their relations. At the same time, we can not call CPI (M) as a party of Marxism-Leninism and proletarian internationalism simply because it accepts these principles. Support to Indian ruling classes in all its basic policies, adherence to parliamentary path as against revolutionary path, support to the Russian and Vietnamese aggressions in Afghanistan and Kampuchea respectively etc. are open departures from it all along.

It also shows that it is a matter for communist revolutionaries in our country to settle accounts with these forces, and not for the CPC.

2. It is correct to say that there is no agreement between the two parties on any of the basic and important issues arising out of national and international situation; yet CPC could establish relations with them. At the same time, CPI(M) is in agreement with CPSU on all such issues. At the same time it is not "recognised" by it. There is no explanation for this from CPI(M).

3. CPI(M)'s opposition to CPC's policies is not of a critical nature. It has joined anti-China bandwagon in all respects excepting in that it has not characterised Chinese government as fascist military dictatorship. It has been saying that China is socialist only to equate it with social-imperialist Russia. It is silent over Russia's stationing one million troops along the entire Chinese border. Instead of condemning Vietnamese acts of aggression on China in 1979, it has condemned CPC for its counter-attack in self-defence. It has arrogated itself the right "to demand that the leaders of the CPC completely break with that disastrous line..."- which is nothing but

interference in the internal affairs of CPC (See CPM's organ *People's Democracy*, March 18 and April issues of 1979). Fact is that it has been loyal to the above four principles all along is untenable and preposterous.

4. In the Indian communist movement we have stated earlier there has been a strong trend of depending on help and guidance from international leadership. This attitude is continuing even to this day. CPI's dependence on CPSU is obvious inspite of its claim for independence. CPI(M)'s dependence can be seen in its support to CPSU in all its basic policies even though it was not "recognised" by it formally. To substitute this "recognition", it was in need of some relation with a party like CPC, in spite of having nothing in common with it.

CPI(M) has no revolutionary movement in our country to rely on. Its parliamentary strength is dwindling. Section after section is coming out from it every passing day. Faced with this disintegration, and no recognition from CPSU, it needs a straw to catch and survive, at least for the time being. It has it in having relations with CPC.

In the conditions prevailing today, this step creates some confusion among revolutionary ranks, which in turn reflects the survival of dependence. Communist revolutionaries as we are, we are seized of the problems facing our revolution and we are able to resolve them with the help of the revolutionary line we are pursuing. It is an internal matter of the movement and we are capable of settling accounts with all parties and groups that renounced Marxism-Leninism while claiming to be Marxist-Leninist.

5. The leader of the delegation is reported to have said that CPI(M)" has actively supported the Indian government's efforts to improve relations with China". In fact Mrs. Gandhi's government has become a stumbling block in improving relations with China. Instead of taking steps to normalise relations straight away, it has brought forth the border problem to be resolved first. It means that normalisation of the relations will be postponed indefinitely. CPI(M) leaders' support to the government in this respect means their support to the present state of affairs which has nothing in common with normalisation. "Improvement" in one degree or two is of no consequence in the context of the need of the hour.

6. The leaders of CPI(M) claim that their present step helps

in the unification of international communist movement. They should know that CPC established such relations with a number of parties belonging to the countries of Europe and the Third World. CPI (M) is one of the so many. Most of the other parties have atleast some common points to agree with CPC. But CPI(M) has none. It is known for its self-righteousness, having nothing to learn from others.

The essential division inside the international communist movement is not between CPC and CPSU, as it is made out by CPI(M) and others. It is divided into revolutionary Marxism-Leninism and that which is opposed to it. It is quite natural that there can be and there are differences in each section. A unity is possible on the basis of revolutionary Marxism-Leninism so far as communist revolutionary movement is concerned.

To conclude: In our country also the division in the communist movement is not between pro-Russian and pro-Chinese sections as it once appeared to be. The real division was and continues to be between the revolutionary communist movement and that which is opposed to it, which we characterised as revisionist. The path which CPI(M) is following has nothing in common with Indian realities. It is a parliamentary path practised by social democracy of Western Europe. Everyone knows that it is serving imperialism in war and peace, and not socialism. If this is the reality, how can a parliamentary path be an Indian path? Certainly not. It is a path of western social democracy now advocated by CPSU.

We Communist revolutionaries have no such paths imported from outside. Our path is Indian path arising out of revolutionary experiences of our own country. We learn from the revolutionary experience of other countries. We rely on those of ours, Herein lies the strength of ours.

We hold that revolutionary communist movement in our country and the world will be unified on granite foundations of Marxism-Leninism and proletarian internationalism. In the changed conditions, unity of communist revolutionary movement will adopt ever new forms, but its content continues to be the same. We can not visualise a situation wherein this content has to be changed. (23.5.83)

## CPI Leaders Continue Their Slanders Against CPC

Of late the leaders of CPI and CPI(M) are presenting themselves as a united force having differences on some issues. Now that the leaders of the CPI(M) have established party-to-party relations with CPC (Communist Party of China), those of the CPI have something to say by way of expressing their differing point of view. Instead of commenting on what the leaders of CPI(M) said in this regard, they are attacking CPC by way of continuing the slander which they indulged in all these years. Since all this is going on in the name of Marxism-Leninism, it is necessary to clarify what is correct and what is wrong and slanderous.

### 1. A baseless attack against CPC

Indradeep Sinha, a top leader of CPI, writes in *New Age* of June 5, 1983:

*".....the omission of Marxism-Leninism and proletarian internationalism from the list of principles governing the restoration of fraternal relationship between the CPC and the CPI(M) must certainly be due to the fact that one of these parties does not accept them as its governing ideology. It is well-known that the CPI(M) does accept Marxism-Leninism and proletarian internationalism as its governing ideology. Hence it must be the CPC which does not do so".*

We do not know what the leaders of CPI(M) have to say on this point. It is a fact that the basis of the relations between CPC and CPI(M) is four principles (independence, equality, mutual respect, and non-interference). There is no mention of Marxism-Leninism and proletarian internationalism as the basis, either in the joint communique or the statement issued by the leaders of CPI(M). But the conclusion he draws about CPC has no basis whatsoever.

We do not know the source from which the author has come to know that CPC does not accept Marxism-Leninism. Time and again the leaders of CPC have asserted, and are asserting, that they

are Marxist-Leninists. Their practice proves that it is so. There is no reason why one should accept the author's contention which is slander, pure and simple.

CPC maintains relations with Communist Party of Romania on the basis of Marxism-Leninism and proletarian internationalism. Hu Yaobang, General Secretary of CPC, has affirmed it by saying, "No force on earth could break or disrupt Sino-Romanian friendship based on Marxism and proletarian internationalism." (*Beijing Review*, May 16)

This is a conclusive evidence that there are parties with whom CPC has relations on the basis of Marxism-Leninism and proletarian internationalism. Of course, they observe the four principles as well in their relations. Therefore the CPI leader has no ground to say that CPC is not guided by Marxism-Leninism.

It is another matter that the CPI leader certifies the leaders of CPI(M) that they are guided by Marxism-Leninism etc.. For a long time, they were at logger-heads. It is only recently that they are united while keeping their separate identities as parties. Before their unification, CPI(M) leaders were branding CPI as revisionist. Now that they are united, it has ceased to be revisionist so far as CPI (M) is concerned. The CPI, in turn, treats it as being guided by Marxism-Leninism etc. The opposition of CPI to Mrs. Gandhi's government is more symbolic than real. This is the only change, if any, in the policy of CPI, which does not warrant a change in its characterisation of being revisionist.

The fact of the matter is that both the CPI and CPI(M) have embraced their respective varieties of revisionism. That is why they could unite while maintaining differences on this or that issue. That they certify each other as being Marxist-Leninist makes no difference because no party of revisionism admits that it is so. Parliamentary path, social chauvinism, class-collaboration etc. are common to both the parties which transformed them as revisionist. Their role is similar to the parties of Second International which were the embodiment of all these departures from Marxism-Leninism.

### 2. Mao Zedong Thought Accords with Marxism-Leninism:

The author says;

*"Needless to add that a communist party that has substituted Marxism-Leninism by "Mao Zedong's Thoughts" as its guiding*

*ideology is bound to relapse into bourgeois nationalism which finds repeated expression in great power chauvinism etc". (The same article).*

It is well known that both the CPI and CPI(M) leaders are opposed to Mao Zedong's Thought. That is no reason why the author should stoop to tell a blatant lie. Chinese communists never renounced Marxism-Leninism and substituted Mao Zedong's Thought for it. They treat it as an application to the practice of Chinese revolution. Such an application is quite in accordance with Marxism-Leninism. This is what it means according to Lenin:

"We do not regard Marx's theory as something completed and inviolable; on the contrary we are convinced that it has only laid the foundation stone of the science which the socialists must develop in all directions if they wish to keep pace with life. We think that an independent elaboration of Marx's theory is especially essential for Russian socialists; for, this theory provides only general guiding principles, which in particular are applied in England differently than in France, in France differently than in Germany and in Germany differently than in Russia.....(Lenin. **Collected Works**. Vol.4. pp.211-212).

We have to mention those lines again and again so that Indian communist revolutionary movement may emancipate itself from dogmatic approach to Marxism-Leninism-Mao Zedong Thought. What Lenin said about Marxism applies to Leninism as well as Mao Zedong Thought. The very fact that the Chinese communists led by Mao could lead Chinese Revolution to success, provides sufficient ground for coming into existence of Mao Zedong's Thought. Mao's application of Marxism-Leninism was independent as was the case with Lenin, who applied Marxism independently as is stated in the above quotation. Thus Mao followed Lenin's teachings in developing the theory and practice of New Democratic Revolution, whose correctness is proved beyond doubt by the successful revolution in that country. It is undoubtedly a new contribution to the arsenal of Marxism-Leninism. Obviously the CPI leadership does not accept this position. If it thinks that the success of the revolution is due to some accident or some deviation (chauvinism), it is due to its ignorance of Marxism-Leninism and nothing else.

Both the leaders of CPI and CPI (M) were expecting, just as the sections of the ruling circles in many countries, including ours,

that Chinese communists (CPC) would renounce Mao Zedong Thought and fall in line with Russian hegemonists. But to their disappointment, they found that the CPC adhered to Mao Zedong Thought as usual, while at the same time it corrected the mistakes committed by Mao, in his later part of the life (Cultural Revolution). What was done by the CPC in this respect was also quite in accordance with Marxism-Leninism.

Mao Zedong Thought was not a product either of nationalism or national chauvinism, as the CPI leaders want our people to believe. Contrary is the fact. The leadership of CPC alone and others need not accept it. It should be known that CPC accepted it as its guiding ideology long back in 1945, in its 7th Congress. Neither CPI of that time nor anyone else raised an objection to it. How then can the leadership be charged as chauvinists? It is slanderous to levy such a charge against it.

It is well-known that the present-day ruling classes are opposed to the influence of Chinese revolution on the people of our country. Counter-revolutionary as they are, their attitude can not be otherwise. But the leaders of CPI and CPI (M) claim to be Marxist-Leninists while at the same time oppose CPC's continued adherence to Mao Zedong Thought. They oppose CPC and Chinese government's policies, and support those of the ruling classes as represented by Mrs.Gandhi. Thus there is a common ground between the two, i.e., Mrs. Gandhi on one side, and the leaders of CPI and CPI(M) on the other, in opposing Chinese government and its policies so far as India is concerned. They extended the opposition into the realm of ideology. This is a characteristic of revisionism and social chauvinism. Had Mao and Chinese communists contented themselves with claiming to be Marxist-Leninists, without further developing it into Mao Zedong Thought, there would have been no successful Chinese revolution and no new China as we see it today. But the leaders of CPI and CPI(M) did quite the opposite. We, communist revolutionaries think that to make Indian Revolution a success, we have to develop Marxism-Leninism-Mao Zedong Thought further so that we can integrate it with our revolutionary practice. What we are doing is the same.

### **3. Unity and Split in the Indian Communist Movement**

It is wrong to say, as the author of the article says, that it is the leaders of CPC who were responsible for splits in the Indian

communist movement. It is not a fact. The split had come into the open during Telangana armed struggle itself. A section of leadership set up a rival centre at Bombay, started a journal *OPEN FORUM*, cyclostyled copies of which were circulated through length and breadth of India. The contents of the major part of the journal were open condemnation of Telangana armed struggle. Besides *OPEN FORUM*, they published pamphlets slandering it. All the anti-armed struggle forces were mobilised behind it. Most of these forces are, or were, in the present-day CPI.

The leaders who came into the top in 1951, and were at the helm of the affairs ever since, never cared to condemn this treachery. Instead, they were allowed to hold important leading positions at all levels. It is this section who acted as storm-troopers for class-collaborationist policies as long as the party was formally united till 1964. Thus there was a *de facto* split in the united CPI ever since 1950, which was formalised in 1964. Everyone who knows something about international communist movement can understand that the CPI leadership had nothing to do with either Telangana armed struggle or the *de facto* split which developed inside the CPI ever since 1950.

Late Ajoy Ghosh, who was the Secretary of CPI from 1951 till his death, had his own role in forcing a break with CPC long before India's war with China in 1962. Dange was hand in glove with him while he was alive and continued his role as a disruptor, after Ajoy Ghosh's death. These leaders, together with some more, were in close contact with the leaders of the Nehru Government at top-most level, briefing them about the developments inside the Central Committee. This is how the split was engineered by the class-collaborationist forces inside the united CPI. They constitute the present-day CPI leadership at almost all levels.

This does not mean that the leaders of the CPI(M) had nothing to do with the split. They had their own role.

While dealing with the phenomenon of splits, the CPI leaders are throwing stones from their glass houses. In spite of their unflinching loyalty to the CPSU, CPI has been a divided-house all through. Recently there was split leading to formation of another communist party led by Mr. Dange. The CPI(M) is in no better position. It has been splitting horizontally at various levels down below.

All this goes to show that it is a slander to say that the leaders

of the CPC engineered a split in the Indian communist movement or the united CPI. It is the class collaborationist policies of CPI leaders and their subservience to CPSU which were responsible for the split so far as united CPI was concerned.

There was some interference from the side of the leaders of CPC so far as CPI(M) was concerned for a brief period between 1967-70, during the period of Cultural Revolution in China, which had a decisive impact on the split that took place in CPI(M). It was the revolutionary movement which suffered heavily due to these splits. The CPI(M) also did suffer in the sense that it could not retain considerable number of the revolutionary ranks behind it to serve its parliamentary path. It had become another variety of CPI.

Communist revolutionaries are getting united inspite of the obstacles they are facing. This unity is on the basis of independent application of Marxism-Leninism to the practice of Indian revolution. Such a unity is developing for the first time in the communist movement, though there were attempts earlier.

#### 4. The Documents of 1956 and 1960 are not Sacrosanct.

The author quotes from the statement of 12 communist parties (1956), and the declaration of 81 communist and workers' parties (1960) and from Togliatti (1935) to prove his contention. There was an attempt to assess the post-Second World War situation in the first two documents, by the concerned parties. They were highly defective and compromised with fundamentals in many respects, inspite of the affirmation of many Marxist-Leninist principles in words. They showed a green signal to parliamentary path to communist parties, more so of the parties of the Third World countries, when the need of the hour was to follow a revolutionary path. They affirmed the "leading" role of CPSU while the need of the hour was the struggle against subservience to it and an independent application of Marxism-Leninism. The very fact that they failed to unite the international communist movement as well as the movement of our country clearly shows that the formulations they contained were far away from the reality obtaining in the movement.

There was no common understanding on these documents among the CPI leaders themselves. Every section had interpreted them in its own way resulting in consolidation of groups and factions inside the party. While a section (present CPI) advocated the path of class collaboration openly, the other [present CPI(M)] deceived

the revolutionary ranks and mobilised them in the name of opposing it and fighting its revisionism. Both advocated two varieties of a single path of class collaboration, the difference being skin-deep.

Therefore the two documents mentioned in the article are neither basic nor authentic. They could not stand the test of revolutionary practice of international communist movement.

The class collaborationist policy pursued by CPI during the anti-fascist war of 1941-45 clearly shows that the leadership of CPI of those days did not understand the revolutionary significance of united front tactics, and failed to apply them independently keeping the specific situation obtaining in our country. Today, for CPI, proletarian internationalism means serving the interests of Russian hegemonism and renouncing the interests of the revolution in our country in toto, and once for all. This understanding and practice has nothing to do with Marxism-Leninism, whose independent application and interpretation should mean that revolution in India is advanced. Anything which goes counter to it is wrong and should be repudiated. Serving the Russian interests means renouncing revolution itself, because Russia is opposed to Indian revolution.

#### **Conclusion**

To conclude: The leaders of both CPI and CPI(M) are united and stopped calling each other revisionists, splitters etc. They are parading this as the unity of Indian communist movement. The differences, if any, are not so serious as their unity-in-action indicates. Given this background, how is it that the CPSU has refrained from establishing relations with equally loyal CPI(M), and created a situation in which it was forced to go to CPC, with whom CPI(M) does not see eye to eye? Everyone knows that CPI(M) was after "recognition" from CPSU, and preferred to be in the waiting-list all these years. Instead of explaining this aspect of the situation, the author of the article tried in vain to prove that CPC is not a party of Marxism-Leninism. This clearly shows that the leaders of CPI are in the fore-front of anti-China band-wagon only to serve Russian hegemonic interests as against those of Indian revolution, which they have discarded long back. (14-6-1983)

### **Renouncing The Revolution At Home And Demanding Unity Of International Communist Movement Can Not Go Together**

Now-a-days there is some talk about international communist movement and its unification, more so from CPI quarters. Unless certain wrong understandings about the international communist movement and its relations with the communist movement of our country are removed, people are likely to be misled and get satisfied with what is going on, instead of concentrating their attention on the revolution, the revolutionary movement and related problems.

Normally, international communist movement includes the movement in a given country. In the present context, our own country. Therefore we can not think of one to the exclusion of other. In the same way, one should not over-state it and underplay the other. A genuine communist movement is a revolutionary movement whose immediate objective is people's democratic revolution in a country like ours, and socialist revolution in a capitalist country like England, France, USA etc. Let us know significance of the two movements when viewed with a correct perspective.

#### **Present state of affairs in the international communist movement.**

It is obvious that the International Communist Movement is not homogeneous not only at present but it was so for the last three decades and more. After the dissolution of Comintern, communist parties in each country have become independent replaced by a new set of relations which were different from those laid down by Comintern. This situation puts new demands on the parties to think and act more independently though it was a must even when they were affiliated to Comintern. The revolution in China could succeed because CPC, headed by Mao, could interpret Marxism-Leninism independently and apply it to the practice of Chinese revolution.

Most of the communist parties could not orient to changed

situation after the dissolution of Comintern. If they were dependent on Comintern for its guidance while it was functioning, they continued the same after its dissolution and substituted CPSU for Comintern. It was easy for them for such a switch-over because CPSU was playing a leading role in Comintern all along. The dependence was so much that it was subservience to CPSU which was understood and practised as proletarian internationalism. After the death of Stalin, the new leadership of CPSU used this subservience to serve its interests. But the need of the hour was that the parties assert independence and more independence so as to advance the revolutions in their respective countries.

In order to carry on this stupendous and fundamental task, it was necessary that the parties have a correct Marxist-Leninist understanding on questions of war, peace and revolution. Obviously there was no such understanding in most of the parties. Differences of a fundamental nature have been existing for the last three decades and more. The leaders of the CPI(M) admit this fact in the following words.

*"..... today the international communist movement is badly divided and this division is not confined only to the CPC and CPSU. Divergent views are being expressed..... Just because of that these parties can not be written off." (People's Democracy-June 12, 1983).*

Previously, CPSU and CPC were singled out for the division or split in the international communist movement. Now, those leaders admit that there are other parties who hold "divergent views" on fundamentals of Marxism-Leninism, and they can not be written off simply because of this. It should be known that most of the problems, fundamental as they are, arose because of the policies of CPSU, which is the centre of controversy, and not CPC and its policies during Cultural Revolution. It should also be known that it is not CPC alone which is opposed to CPSU, on these fundamental questions; there are others who hold similar views to those of CPC for which it can not be blamed of either interference or of pressurising. CPI(M), for that matter CPI, is having relations with most of these parties, while at the same time it has differences with them on the above-mentioned issues. They are connected with the CPSU and are the result of its policies. The leaders of CPI(M) are not explicit on this point.

To say that Russia and Vietnam had sent their armies to

Afghanistan and Kampuchea and stationed them in those countries by way of "aid" is to deny a fact which is known to the people of the world. And the fact is naked aggression. That the leaders of CPI(M) support it does not alter its nature to one of "aid". These powers are forcing puppet governments of their choice not only on the respective peoples but are pressurising and threatening other countries also, to coexist with those governments. This is the type of "aid" they are extending.

#### **Sermonising about proletarian internationalism.**

The CPI(M) leaders, while mentioning some statement of their P.B., have to say the following:

*".....It is equally the duty of the ruling communist parties of socialist countries to follow a policy that would help the struggles of the working class and peoples of non-socialist countries against their own exploiters and oppressors. It is utterly wrong for the big parties of some of the socialist countries to pursue policies which subordinate the class struggle, in the countries with whose governments they have friendly relations, to the narrow immediate needs of the foreign policy of their Governments....." (The same article)*

These leaders are sermonising about proletarian internationalism for the last so many years. The author of the article admits that there are divergent opinions about Marxism-Leninism and proletarian internationalism itself. CPI(M)'s opinion about it is one of the so many. Its opinion is not based on objective reality. The article says some thing about "the big parties of some of the socialist countries". What are those parties? Which are those socialist countries? Do they think that their efforts for unity of international communist movement would end in failure if they came forward with names of those countries?

The "big parties" whom they are not ready to name are CPSU and CPC. We do not know whether they have in mind the Vietnamese party also. So far as CPC is concerned, the leaders admit that it is "correcting" the mistakes it has committed in the past. The fact of the matter is that the CPC has adopted policies for correcting its mistakes. It is taking steps in this direction. At the same time, the mistakes committed by the CPC have no comparison with those committed by CPSU and its leaders. But they are being equated by the interested sections including CPI(M) to the crimes committed

by the leaders of CPSU so that their enormity is minimised. Is this not shielding the CPSU leaders from the crimes they have committed?

That the CPI is pursuing policies "which subordinate the class struggle" to the narrow immediate needs of the foreign policy" of the Soviet government is indisputable. This is because Mrs. Gandhi and her government have "friendly relations" with Soviet Union. But what about CPI(M)? It is also doing the same in the name of proletarian internationalism. It is not only supporting the foreign policy of Soviet Union, but that of Mrs. Gandhi also. CPI(M)'s complaint is that Mrs. Gandhi is not dittoing Soviet Union's foreign policy. She is putting up a posture in words that she is not kowtowing Soviet Union. But in reality she is following its policies in deeds.

The CPI(M) might take pride that it is opposing Mrs. Gandhi in internal policies. If it is so, CPI can as well take credit for doing the same, because it also claims to be opposing Mrs. Gandhi in her internal policies. What then is the difference between the two? This is not the innovation of CPI (M) leaders. Late Ajay Ghosh, after he became the Secretary, had worked out a device which meant a liberal parliamentary opposition to certain aspects of internal policies like suppression of civil liberties, loans from US etc. It was a mere verbal opposition. Present CPI (M) leaders have been indulging in the same. There is no opposition to Mrs. Gandhi on any of the basic issues and there is no mass movement against the regime which alone can be characterised as opposition in deeds.

Therefore, CPI (M) is as much class collaborationist and is subordinating class struggle -- to the interests of Soviet Union as well as Mrs. Gandhi's regime -- as CPI.

What has happened in our country is that Nehru and his successors have utilised the basic weakness in the leaders of both CPI and CPI (M) and dislodged them from the idea of a revolution in our country, not to speak of a practice towards it. Their weaknesses are: loyalty towards Soviet Union to the denial of revolution, and aping western countries in adopting parliamentary path. Both have nothing in common with revolutionary content of Marxism-Leninism. By establishing friendly relations with Soviet Union, the leaders of the ruling classes could pose themselves as progressive anti-imperialists so that the leaders of CPI and CPI (M) ran after them

to support their regimes, which continues even today. By offering a symbolic parliamentary system, they have reduced them into parliamentary parties who have turned their faces away from revolution. Absence of independent interpretation of Marxism-Leninism and its concrete application to the practice of Indian revolution have landed them into this quagmire, from which they can not come out.

It must be known that Soviet Union's changed policies, after Stalin's death, have helped Nehru and his successors because it has ceased as world revolutionary force and became a hegemonic super power.

It must be known that they (Nehru etc) have no such relations with China, which have been hostile all along barring a few years in early fifties. This is because they did not derive any such advantage which they had from Soviet Union. This situation continues even today. Herein lies the fundamental difference between Russia and China.

**Advance and success of revolution in our country  
is in the interest of socialist countries.**

The question posed by CPI (M) leaders itself is wrong in that a socialist country, big as that (Soviet Union), wants the interests of the revolution in a country to be subordinated to the immediate interests of its foreign policy. A genuine socialist country never does it. It is possible only when it ceases to become a socialist country. It is not a deviation but a departure from Marxism-Leninism itself. Even if we presume that it was a deviation in the beginning, it will never last for two decades. It is bound to degenerate into departure. Granting that it is still a deviation, the interests of the country's revolution do not allow the revolutionaries to respect the deviation, by sacrificing the revolution.

The deviation in the CPSU, if it is really a deviation, does not mean that CPI or CPI (M) should inherit it, which they did. The continued immediate interests of CPSU spread over two decades become ultimate interests because, for revolution such a long period is most important so that it decides the success or failure of the revolution itself. Therefore, those who cherish the interests of revolution most, should discard Soviet Union and CPSU because it is opposed to revolution by nourishing a "deviation" which is renouncing Marxism-Leninism.

It is well known that Russia and Vietnam had supported the proclamation of Emergency in 1975 by Mrs. Gandhi. Is it not a counter-revolutionary step directed against democratic and revolutionary movement in our country? The leaders of CPI (M) criticise CPI for supporting emergency but are formal in their criticism about Russia and silent about Vietnam.

Advance and success of revolution in our country is a blow to imperialism in general and US in particular. CPSU need not fear it if it is genuinely Marxist-Leninist and Russia is genuinely socialist. If CPI (M) leaders are really Marxist-Leninist, and realise that CPSU is opposed to revolution in our country, they should discard and write it off. That they are not writing it off means that they are not serious about the revolution in our country. Rather they are opposed to it.

Ulyanovsky's latest article (*The Indian National Congress: Lessons of Revolution*) is a conclusive evidence that CPSU is totally against the revolution in our country. The sum and substance of the article is to support Mrs. Gandhi on matters of foreign affairs, on the part of CPI and CPI (M). It demands a total subservience to Mrs. Gandhi and her regime. CPSU knows that these parties have renounced revolution long back. What it wants them is to renounce their liberal parliamentary opposition, which is not real at all. That they do not accept that aspect of the article which is connected with internal policy of the government leads them nowhere as long as they eschew revolution directed against the ruling classes, though the parties may differ as to who they are.

The CPI (M) leaders have the following to say about the path they are pursuing:

*Each Communist Party should strive to bring about social transformation by peaceful methods. But how this transformation will be brought about does not depend upon the desire and striving to bring it about by peaceful means. It mainly depends on the behaviour of the ruling classes. Historical experience teaches that the exploiting ruling classes constituting the minority of the people do not respect the will of the majority and suppress it by use of terror and bestial violence. When their rule is threatened by the exploited majority, they do not hesitate to do away with the bourgeois parliamentary system and resort to naked dictatorship and rule by terror (from the same article)*

Communist parties are independent. As such they need not wait for sermons from CPI (M) leaders that they should "strive for social transformation by peaceful methods". What is necessary is to know as to what the CPI (M) leaders have to say about the same in our country as well.

If historical experience shows that ruling classes resort to bestial violence against people who constitute the majority, the question of peaceful social transformation does not arise. That is to say, that the desire of any communist party, more so of the dictum of CPI (M), to bring about peaceful social transformation does not fit in with the historical experience of the society.

It is a fact that the bourgeoisie as a ruling class did away with parliamentary system in certain capitalist countries during forties (Germany, Italy, Japan). After Second World War, countries of the third world have also resorted to such methods. Experience in our country is different. Parliamentary system and naked terror are co-existing. This being so, what is the solution?

The PB statement is silent over this as the above extract shows. The experience further shows that CPI(M) wants the present parliamentary system to continue so that it may be an instrument for achieving its slogan of the rule of Left and Democratic Front at the Centre. The experience again shows that such a Front in West Bengal, when in power, is serving the ruling classes and not the majority of the masses of the people. It is helping them to strengthen the illusions in the Constitution, and in the ruling classes it represents. Therefore, people are asked to choose the parliamentary path which the CPI (M) had chosen. As a result, they are kept away from revolutionary path. The silence over the path of revolution can only mean this. CPI (M)'s practice confirms this.

It must be known that when major part of CPI (M) leadership was detained in various jails towards the end of 1964, the Polit Bureau had come out with a memorandum in which it stated that there is no difference between the path chosen by CPI and CPI(M), and hence there was no need that they should be detained.

In fact the concerned paras were the gists taken from the statement of 81 parties in 1960 in a distorted form, though there is a mention of peaceful path for capitalist countries under certain conditions, which have nothing in common with those in our country.

The ruling classes as represented by Nehru and his successors have provided a parliamentary system which is symbolic in its nature to dislodge the communist movement from taking a revolutionary path. They have succeeded in their efforts so far as CPI and CPI (M) are concerned because of their right opportunism and revisionism. All this is going on in the name of Marxism-Leninism.

#### Conclusion:

CPI (M) claims that it is for the unity of international communist movement. There are two types of this movement, one being opportunist, and the other being revolutionary based on Marxism. The party, CPI (M), which is right opportunist and class collaborationist at home and supports social imperialism and hegemonism can not perform this task. That some parties including CPC are having relations with CPI (M) does not make it revolutionary and Marxist-Leninist because they did not take up the responsibility of judging it on that score. Guiding principles of party-to-party relations do not permit them to do so. Revolutionary communist movement will decide what is Marxism-Leninism and what is not, so far as our country is concerned.

Imperialism in general and the two super powers in particular are dominating our country. As a result our revolution is directed against the two super powers. We can not think of a successful revolution if it is directed against US only, because Russia has already stepped in its shoe. A party is judged whether it is Marxist-Leninist, or not, in relation to our revolution and not in relation to the desire in words for unity of international communist movement. A successful revolution in our country will go a long way in such unity efforts. Renouncing revolution at home and demanding unity of international communist movement cannot go together.

CPI (M) can not be Marxist-Leninist simply because it claims to be so. It can not be revolutionary simply because it happens to be in power in two states, with some numerical strength. A party of genuine Marxism-Leninism applies it to the practice of our revolution by interpreting it independently. The organisation of communist revolutionaries is performing this task, which alone is a guarantee to the success of revolution as well as unity of international communist movement. (21-6-1983)

## Indian Revolution And Proletarian Internationalism

The month of October is significant in that two world-shaking events took place which have changed the correlation of forces in favour of world revolution including revolution in our own country. They are : October Revolution (1917) in Russia, which resulted in establishing the first proletarian state in a western country; successful Chinese revolution (1949), which resulted in establishing a New Democratic State in China. They have given a severe blow to imperialism to such an extent, that it has ceased to be a decisive force in international affairs, as it once was.

Indian revolution, when it is completed, will be a more or less final death-blow because India will no longer be a hunting-ground for imperialism of all hues. Therefore a successful revolution is necessary to usher in freedom and prosperity to our people. Added to this, it will have international significance of the order of successful Russian and Chinese revolutions. Therefore communist revolutionaries attach utmost importance to it. By leading the revolution to a success they are carrying on not only national tasks, but international tasks as well. To put it in other words, there is no international task more important for them than leading revolution in our country to a success. This is how proletarian internationalism is cherished and practised by communist revolutionaries. They are aware of other proletarian international tasks as well.

### I

Marxism-Leninism enjoins all communist revolutionaries to be real proletarian internationalists, i.e., to work for peace, to defend socialist countries etc. This does not mean renouncing the task of revolution in one's own country or slowing it down. Working for revolution in one's own country is the real proletarian internationalism because the revolution strikes at the roots of imperialism itself. A

country which drives away imperialism from its soil can play an important role and sometimes a decisive role in preventing a world war, a war of aggression against a socialist country, and in achieving peace. Therefore, it is primary task of communist revolutionaries to work for a successful revolution in one's own country. All other tasks, even if they are related to proletarian internationalism, are linked with this task. Therefore, proletarian internationalism never demands that task of revolution in one's own country should be subordinated to other tasks in a given situation.

## II

CPI, when it was united, adopted a line of class-collaboration, during the period of anti-fascist war, when Russia was attacked by Nazi Germany (June 1941). As a result it has renounced the line of overthrowing the British imperialism through an armed revolution. It was said that India would have liberation automatically and peacefully once fascism was defeated. The war was characterised as 'people's war, simply because it was so for Russia. In the name of defending Russia it had supported British imperialism, which was an ally of Russia during that war. All this was done in the name of proletarian internationalism.

Socialist Russia at the time was waging a people's war in order to defend itself, and all that CPI was expected was to support socialist Russia in that war. For this there was no need to change its programme and tactics of building the mass revolutionary movement to overthrow the British colonial regime. The national and international situation obtaining during anti-fascist war did not warrant to say that it can be liquidated peacefully immediately after war. Therefore the tactics to be adopted at the time should have been one of class struggle and not class-collaborationist. By fighting British imperialism the party would not weaken its role as supporter and defender of anti-fascist war. On the other hand it would have strengthened it.

In Burma, Malaya (presently Malaysia), Indonesia etc., the communist parties carried on armed struggles against fascist Japanese occupation and did not allow the colonial powers to stage a comeback. With the help of this policy, they were leading revolutions in their respective countries, together with their carrying on international tasks of fighting an anti-fascist war.

In China, though the Communist Party had advanced the slogan

of coalition government, it refused to surrender its armies and liberated bases to Chiang Kai-shek, because such a step would amount to liquidation of revolution.

The experiences of Second World War show that a good number of communist parties in colonial and semi-colonial countries had proved themselves to be best proletarian internationalists by carrying on armed struggle against fascist aggressors. They had their best allies in genuine nationalists who were opposed to the respective colonial powers as well as fascism.

Experiences in Telangana, more so in Nalgonda District, had shown that, by adopting revolutionary tactics and building revolutionary peasant movement against feudalism, the party in this district had proved to be revolutionary as well as proletarian international. It had in no way hampered anti-fascist-war. It should be known that the feudalism against which the party had fought was an ally of British imperialism, which again was an ally of Soviet Union in its war against fascism. We can not compare the armed struggle in Telangana with those of Burma, Malaya, Indonesia etc., either in the level or in the extent, yet it was a revolutionary movement and an armed struggle. Though it was directed against Nizam to begin with it was in essence against the British imperialism, until power was transferred to big bourgeoisie and landlords.

## III

For some years, after 1946 onwards, the question before the party was: armed revolution or a peaceful parliamentary path?--against ruling classes, i.e., British imperialism to begin with, collaborationist big bourgeoisie and landlords subsequently. By 1950, the issue of the danger of Third World War and struggle for peace was before the party. Nehru posed himself as opposing war and supporter of peace. He was also in friendly terms with Russia. The dominant trend at the time was to renounce revolution in favour of a struggle for peace and against war danger from USA. It continues till this day in the two communist parties, CPI and CPI (M).

US imperialism is a super power. It was the same for the last four decades and more. There has been a danger of Third World War all these years. In our country, there have been governments which claim that they are opposing such a war, are opposing US imperialism, and want peace. Does this mean that communist revolutionaries renounce revolution or postpone it

indefinitely till the expected World War is over, while limiting their activities to the struggle for peace? Does this mean that we should support the government which claims to be opposing Third World War? No, certainly not. Present government, and the governments in the past, while claiming opposition to war and support to peace, have been supporting wars of aggression which are taking place in one region or the other. For example, the present government supports the Russian war of aggression against Afghanistan. It also supports the Vietnamese war of aggression against Kampuchea and its occupation. Therefore it is not genuine in saying that it is opposed to a war and is for peace. Of course these are not World Wars. Whether they will become part of Third World War is a matter to be decided by the course of events, because they become so only when a Third World War takes place.

There is a danger of war as long as there is imperialism. As a super power, US dominates most of the countries in the world. This means that a struggle for peace to prevent the Third World War should continue. This point is indisputable. But it should not be counterposed to the development of the revolution in a given country, because its aim is to change the society basically and it is directed against the ruling classes. Mrs. Gandhi, being an ally of Soviet Union in its bid for hegemony, is opposing USA in certain respects of its foreign policy, i.e., its policies for world hegemony. But this does not mean that her opposition is to US imperialism as a whole. She is importing US capital on a massive scale. In fact US is the biggest exporter of capital to our country. Indian big business wants to import more US capital and technical knowhow in preference to other industrialised countries. US is exporting its capital with an eye on our country to rob and plunder it. This being so, Mrs. Gandhi and her regime can not be treated as a consistent fighter against US imperialism, more so, as a fighter for peace opposing third world war. Being too weak, they are not in a position to prevent US waging a third world war or initiating a third world war, in case it does.

US warmongers are facing world public opinion against third world war. Whether such an opinion can prevent it or not is a point for future observation. Experience of the last so many years has shown that, such a public opinion could prevent it for the time being, i.e., for the last three decades and more. But we can not say that it can prevent it indefinitely and for all time to come,

because as long as imperialism is there, there is bound to be a third world war. This is the fact of the situation. In view of this, people should not rely on the government which is importing US capital on a massive scale and is dependent on it economically. Therefore, people of our country should take initiative in their hands and fight for peace. This is only the guarantee for defending peace.

A peace movement can not bring about a revolution to change the present society. In our country, it has a limited purpose, and has nothing to do with basic changes in the structure of the society, that is a change from a semi-colonial and semi-feudal society to one of new democratic society. Therefore there should be a continuous struggle against ruling classes to make the revolution a success.

But some of those who claim to be Marxist-Leninist and to be opposing US imperialism say that there should be no revolution because it becomes main obstacle towards their efforts for peace and against the third world war. The fact of the matter is that a successful revolution and a revolutionary movement towards that end guarantees a stable peace than the existence of the present-day government together with reactionary forces supporting it. This being so, there is no point in saying that the main and fundamental task of the present-day is to prevent the third world war and support Mrs. Gandhi's regime, so that a third world war may be prevented, meaning that revolution should be either postponed indefinitely or renounced.

#### IV

The other force is Russia which is also a super power. There are forces in our country who believe that Russia is a genuinely socialist country which is struggling for peace. These forces do not have any explanation to the wars of aggression it has been waging and the wars it has been helping. Afghanistan has been a standing example in that Russia has committed an aggression against a weak country. Russia has helped, and is still helping, Vietnamese aggression against Kampuchea. Still they claim or they believe that Russia is a socialist power.

This being so, their attitude towards Russia is that of blind worshipping, though they may claim that they are critical about it. They think that such aggressions are for the good of the concerned country or to help and complete the revolution in those countries. There is no evidence to show that these Russian forces in Afghanistan

or Vietnamese forces in Kampuchea are helping revolution in any way whatsoever. A revolution forced on the people with the help of a powerful country like Russia, can not be a genuine revolution. It is a fake revolution created by getting the support of a section of natives for aggressors and nothing more.

These pro-Soviet forces, mainly the CPI and CPM, think that Russia, being a socialist country, has the right to commit aggression or to help to commit aggression to export revolutions to other countries. It is these forces who, in the name of opposing US imperialism, extend their support to aggressions and plans for world hegemony. They do not have any explanation that Marxism-Leninism is opposed to wars of aggression, and any country which claims to adhere to Marxism-Leninism can not commit aggression. Once an aggression is committed, it amounts that party and government of such country have renounced Marxism-Leninism. In our country, the government of the comprador (collaborationist) big bourgeoisie and landlords is an ally of Russia. This alliance is not meant for the country's development, as it is claimed. It is aimed at reducing India to become partner in Russian drive for world hegemony to replace US imperialism.

## V

We communist revolutionaries treat Russia as social imperialism because it committed and abetted aggressions by renouncing Marxism-Leninism. Therefore any war between Russia and US, no matter who strikes first, will be treated as imperialist war meant for world hegemonism, and therefore, we have nothing to choose between the two. It will be an imperialist war if and when it takes place, but not a war between imperialism and socialism. Even when government of India supports Russia in its war against US, it cannot be treated as taking the side of progressive forces or anti-imperialist forces. Obviously it will be taking sides with one imperialist power as against the other. This being so, communist revolutionaries in India will fight against both the forces, US and Russia as well.

Therefore the question of support to the government in case of a war does not arise. Proletarian internationalism demands that communist revolutionaries should not take the side of government of India simply because it takes the side of Russia which is opposed to US. For those who treated it as a socialist country, such a war will be an anti-imperialist war headed by a socialist Russia. As

such they want to support both Russia and government of India which takes sides with Russia. Added to this, they (CPI and CPM) have renounced the task of building revolutionary movement directed against the government simply because it happens to be an ally of Russia. The class collaborationist policy which was in vogue during anti-fascist war is again being repeated even when there is no world war. This is being done in the name of fighting the danger of third world war.

## VI

Over a long time there was a discussion, which is still going on, whether proletarian internationalism means merely supporting and defending a socialist country in relation to its policies and activities.

In this connection, the Communist Party of the Soviet Union (CPSU) and Communist Party of China (CPC) have been the points of controversy. CPSU has been the ruling party of Soviet Union ever since the proletarian revolution in that country was a success; subsequently the CPC has been the ruling party of China ever since the revolution in that country had succeeded (i.e. from 1949). At the time, there was the Communist International. Though CPSU was formally its member, it had played a leading role throughout.

The programme and policies of the Communist international were expected to be implemented by its affiliates and Communist Party of India was one of them. Violation of that policy was supposed to be an act opposed to proletarian internationalism. Obviously this understanding was wrong. Implementation of the line needs, besides having programme etc., a correct application and independent interpretation of Marxism-Leninism. In the absence of this, the leadership was a spoon-fed baby throughout.

Subsequently, Comintern was dissolved in 1942. Every party was supposed to be independent and sovereign in its own country. Though there was no such guidance which was binding, because of the influence that CPSU carried in the international communist movement, something said or written by various journals of CPSU or its leaders was supposed to be an authoritative international guidance which was binding on the concerned parties in other countries. Communist Party of India, when it was united, did suffer with such ideas which came in the way of correct application and independent interpretation of Marxism-Leninism. The Communist

Party in India, when it was united, did not draw correct lessons from the revolutionary experience it had in our country, of various struggles, more so of peasant struggles which took higher forms, especially the form of armed struggle. It had to rely on revolutionary experiences of our country and the struggles the party had led together with other struggles.

Proletarian internationalism demands that the party should fight for peace and oppose imperialist wars and support a socialist country when it is attacked; oppose the manoeuvres or designs directed against a socialist country, liberation movements and proletarian revolutionary movements in respective countries. This aspect combined with the basic question of working for revolution in one's own country should be characterised as proletarian internationalism. Those who do not work for revolution in their own country, and who at the same time talk about proletarian internationalism and international duties etc., are not Marxist-Leninists in the real sense of the term. This is because proletarian internationalism is part of Marxism-Leninism which enjoins that communists should work for revolution in their own country. The CPI and the CPM do not work for revolution in our country on the plea that Indian government is an ally of Russia. They are supporting it in such a way that there is no question of overthrowing it by armed revolution. The parliamentary path they have adopted provides a guarantee to retain one pro-Soviet government or other in power, while they are satisfied with sharing it at state level. Therefore we can safely say that they have abandoned their task of working for revolution in our country. Recognition by CPSU and CPC does not make them revolutionary once they abandoned this task.

## VII

More or less the same is the case with those who claim that they are not only Marxist-Leninist but adhere to Mao Zedong Thought as well. They say that the present-day CPC leadership is revisionist and taking a capitalist road. For them defending Mao's Thought means carrying on a virulent campaign against the present Chinese leadership in the name of fighting against its revisionism. They have nothing to contribute so far as Indian revolution is concerned. They concentrate their efforts on slandering Chinese leadership. At home their policies and activities are revisionist and right opportunist, and on international sphere, they indulge in "left" phrase-mongering. As such by not working for Indian revolution, they have abandoned

Marxism-Leninism and Mao Zedong Thought. By resorting to such campaign, they are joining the band-wagon of anti-China forces; they are diverting the attention of revolutionary ranks and the people from the revolution and its tasks. This being so, some of those elements who claim that they are not only adherents of Marxism-Leninism but Mao Zedong Thought also, and who oppose the present Chinese leadership as being revisionist or capitalist roaders, are blind enough not to see that it adheres to Mao Zedong Thought. CPC is practising Mao's Thought in a way they think correct. The leadership also says that it is correcting certain mistakes which are incorporated in Mao's theories, i.e., the theory of cultural revolution. This being so, they should have accepted it if they are genuine towards Mao's Thought.

## VIII

We communist revolutionaries support or appreciate CPC not because it is opposed to CPSU, but because it is for Indian revolution and world revolution. We oppose CPSU not because it is opposed to CPC, but because it is opposed to Indian revolution. Its activities in our country for the last so many years are standing examples to prove this contention. Therefore whether one is pro-Russia (CPSU) or pro-China (CPC) is not the deciding factor to treat a person, a group or a party to be revolutionary. On the contrary, it is their attitude towards Indian revolution which is the criterion to decide this question. Whether one works for our revolution or not is the criterion to treat whether one is revolutionary or not. Talking about revolution and working against it, has become a common feature among a section of those who claim that they adhere to Marxism-Leninism.

Therefore communist revolutionaries work for Indian revolution and they treat it as their primary task which is international as well. A successful revolution in our country will be decisive contribution to world peace. As such Indian revolution will have an international significance. Therefore it is also the international duty of communist revolutionaries to make the revolution a success. We communist revolutionaries think that the best way of observing proletarian internationalism is to work for revolution in our country. Our attitude towards other parties, groups and individuals who claim that they are adhering to Marxism-Leninism and Mao Zedong Thought is decided by whether they are working for Indian revolution or not. This is the criterion that we adopt.

Those parties which support the present Indian regime as against Indian revolution cannot be treated as fraternal parties because, by this act, they are opposing Indian revolution. These parties (Communist) which support it even though their regime may have friendly relations with the Indian Government, will be treated as fraternal parties because State-to-State relations are different from party-to-party relations. This must be the criterion to treat the communist party in a given country, whether it is a fraternal party or not.

There may be differences with others regarding international questions but supporting our revolution will be the basis in deciding our attitude towards other parties. Therefore discussion about proletarian internationalism in relation to supporting Russian or Chinese Parties without any relevance to Indian revolution is diversionist.

There may be differences on this and that aspect of the situation. They can be resolved in course of time. We are firmly of opinion that not working for revolution, at the same time, talking about proletarian internationalism cannot go together. Communist revolutionaries do not accept this type of proletarian internationalism as genuine.

#### IX

Here comes the question of parliamentary path. They [CPI and CPI (M)] talk of revolution endlessly. At the same time, they practise parliamentary path which means renouncing revolution, which again means renouncing proletarian internationalism. What they observe is opportunist internationalism.

There are parties which talk of Marxism-Leninism and Mao Zedong Thought and at the same time they adopt parliamentary path. Some parties may claim that they are opposing this Government. But when they adopt parliamentary path, they can not be treated as accepting and practising Mao Zedong Thought because the parliamentary path itself goes against Mao Zedong Thought.

We donot treat those forces who adopt parliamentary path as proletarian internationalists. They are at best opportunist internationalists. This being so, communist revolutionaries are real proletarian internationalists because they are working for Indian revolution while at the same time they fight for world peace, and against the third world war. Our revolution must advance in conditions of world war and when there is no war.

Communist revolutionaries, while opposing world war, continue to work for revolution and do not support the government which is an ally of this or that super power, more so of Russia. It can not be relaxed or postponed either in the name of struggle against US imperialism or Russian imperialism.

This being so, proletarian internationalism, in the real sense of the term, never comes in the way of organising revolution or revolutionary movement, whatever the national and international situation may be.

In view of the above explanation, we are firmly of opinion that there is no proletarian internationalism than working for the success of the Indian revolution. This is what Marxism-Leninism teaches us.

(20-9-1983)

## PART - IV

### India And China's Continuing Revolution

The success of Chinese Revolution culminating in the formation of People's Republic of China on October 1, 1949, is a world-shaking event next only to the great October Revolution in Russia (1917). Hence its international significance. It had influenced the national movement in our country when there was a British colonial regime. It had further influenced the post-Second World War revolutionary upsurge, which took mainly the form of agrarian revolutionary armed struggles. Telangana being the major one in our country. Today it is Mao Tse-tung Thought which guides world revolution and the revolution in our own country. Communist Revolutionaries are alive to the general features of the experiences of the Chinese Revolution together with the specific features of our country. The General Line they have adopted and are practising is a standing example of their revolutionary effort. Gone are the days, when the struggle against the right opportunism was carried out by left adventurism and vice versa. Present period is one, in which the communist revolutionaries are carrying on these tasks on the basis of a general line which is a basically correct application of Marxism-Leninism-Mao Tsetung Thought to the practice of Indian revolution. Herein lies the unique significance of the present-day ideological struggle.

China's progress as a socialist country is phenomenal. It covers all fields, i.e., economic, military, technological, cultural etc. It is a reality recognised by one and all, friends and foes. The progress is fundamentally of a different nature from that which appears in countries like India where foreign capital dominates in all fields. Why? China did not have a transfer of power from imperialists as our country had in August, 1947. The Chinese people, led by the Communist Party headed by Mao, fought arms in their hands against imperialism and feudalism, as represented by Chiang-Kai-sheik clique and others. There was a social revolution which liquidated imperialism and feudalism from their country (excepting Taiwan). The revolution, People's Democratic Revolution as it is called, continued and developed into Socialist Revolution. It is a continuous revolution. A correct Marxist-Leninist line which the

Communist Party of China is pursuing is a guarantee from restoration of capitalism. The Party and the people could successfully fight back such attempts at restoration. They are the masters of their future and the foreign domination has no place in any field of their life.

Unlike China, India had witnessed a transfer of power from British imperialists to Congress leadership which did not aim at liquidation of imperialism and feudalism, but has been protecting their interests although. Hence the domination of foreign capital, landlords and the hegemonism of two super powers. As a corollary our people could not become masters of our future. The development which India is having either in industry or in agriculture or in other fields is conditioned by foreign domination to serve foreign interests. Our own experience shows that the poverty, unemployment, social oppression, exploitation, plunder and what not, has become a matter of daily life for us whereas China is free from all these evils. Therefore, we can say that there is no comparison between the two countries. It is this objective reality which the communist revolutionaries took into account to work out the tasks of People's Democratic Revolution. Imperialist ideologues, revisionists and neo-revisionists are embellishing, day in and day out, the so-called 'aid' provided by imperialists and the Soviet Union, a super power, by hiding the fact that it is an 'aid' for continuing slavery and plunder with unequal terms.

Indian nationalism was and still is influenced and entrenched by imperialism. Together with it, the medieval despotism is in vogue, sometimes in a sophisticated form. It suits the interests of the present ruling classes, the comprador bourgeoisie and the landlords who are trained on these lines. These forces want the people to believe that India's progress can be favourably compared with that of China. There is no basis for such consolation, because facts do not confirm it. A genuine nationalism is directed against imperialism including liquidation of foreign capital and foreign domination in all fields of the country's life. Soviet Union is an imperialist power, which should be opposed by all genuine nationalists, i.e., anti-imperialist forces. But the revisionists and neo-revisionists are her firm supporters in India. Therefore, they are social imperialists as far as our country is concerned. Their opposition to American imperialism or Western imperialism can not hide this fact.

A genuine nationalism, a revolutionary nationalism at that, has been weak in India during the British colonial regime inspite of numerous armed revolts, and revolutionary struggles of the people against it. That was the reason why the British imperialism remained in India as long as it desired, and transferred power to the classes in whom it saw its interests safe. Even now, i.e., the period eversince the transfer of power (1947), the revolutionary nationalist trend is weak. The same weakness is reflected in connection with the agrarian revolution as well. Therefore, the history has placed the task of liquidating the imperialists together with the comprador bourgeoisie and the feudalism on the shoulders of the revolutionary proletariat. It has been the same eversince the success of October Revolution (1917). Chinese revolution, next only to October revolution, has provided this lesson for the world revolution. The communist revolutionaries in our country are performing the same task, the task of completing people's democratic revolution.

#### **Mao's Three Worlds Theory:**

##### **A Contribution to the Treasure of Marxism-Leninism**

Mao, as leader of Chinese revolution, has worked out strategy and tactics for it. They are applicable to all colonial and semi-colonial countries in a general way, while each country has its specific features to be taken into consideration in deciding strategy and tactics for this revolution. Such a stand-point is in accordance with Marxism-Leninism.

Mao as the leader of international communist movement fought against Modern Revisionism of the leadership of CPSU, which was again international in its character. As a result, Marxist-Leninist parties and groups have emerged in almost all countries, by breaking away from Modern Revisionism and have been defending Marxism-Leninism eversince. Since Modern Revisionism is appearing in various forms, certain forces, due to their inherent weaknesses in their Marxist-Leninist orientation and fast-changing world situation, are leaving the battle-front at various phases of ideological struggle going on on an international scale.

Mao, as the leader of socialist revolution in China, initiated and led successfully the Proletarian Cultural Revolution, unique in its nature with abundance of revolutionary experience. It has raised the socialist consciousness of the proletariat, the people and the entire party. It has given a new content and correct orientation

to the mass line which is being followed by Marxist-Leninists of various countries.

Crowning all this, Mao advanced the Theory of Three Worlds. To put it in Mao's own words, it is: *"In my view the United States and the Soviet Union form the first world. Japan, Europe and Canada, the middle section, belong to the Second World. We are the Third World". "The Third World has huge population. With the exception of Japan, Asia belongs to the Third World. The whole of Africa belongs to the Third World, and Latin America too". (February 1974).*

Marx and Engels, in their times, divided the countries, especially those of Europe into oppressor and the oppressed when they were dealing with the national question. Lenin, while characterising imperialism as the highest stage of capitalism, had divided the world into imperialist countries and the countries oppressed by imperialism, so as to lay bare inter-imperialist contradictions. He characterised imperialist wars as unjust because their objective is redivision of world among imperialist powers. He enjoined the proletariat to transform imperialist war into civil war to sieze power to establish dictatorship of the proletariat, and defended wars of liberation by oppressed countries as just wars. Once the October Revolution (1917) succeeded and Soviet Union emerged, the world was divided into two camps, imperialist and anti-imperialist, as was summed up by Stalin in his outstanding work *"Foundations of Leninism"* (1925).

We had experienced a different alignment of forces at the time of Second World War. It was an imperialist war to begin with between Fascist Germany, Italy and Japan on one hand, United Kingdom, France, United States etc, on the other, for the redivision of the world. The course of developments during this phase of War had shown clearly that the so-called great powers could not withstand the Fascist offensive and had to face defeat after defeat. Faced with this situation the antifascist section of the ruling classes who came to power in these countries joined hands with Soyiet Union as soon as Germany declared war on the latter. The anti-Fascist Front was complete and had come to stay. With this, the character of war changed from imperialist war to a war of liberation. Included in the Front were United Kingdom, France, United States which were Great imperialist powers. The theory that the world is divided into two camps, i.e., imperialist and anti-imperialist, is correct and valid for world revolution through out this period. It is so even today.

At the same time, formation of an anti-Fascist Front was quite in accordance with Marxism-Leninism because it facilitated the advance of world revolution in a given situation. The experience had proved that it was the only correct international line to defeat fascism in order to weaken imperialism and to advance world revolution.

The early years of post-Second World War saw the U.S. Imperialism, the strongest of all, as the leader of all imperialist powers together with their satellites organised in military bloc or otherwise. On the other side were Soviet Union, China, the socialist countries, the national liberation movements and the countries fighting for national independence. Inter-imperialist contradictions and a strong desire for national independence have created immensely favourable conditions for the national independence struggles. Immediate task of the world revolution at the time was a struggle against the American domination together with the revolutions in individual countries, which in turn needed the struggle against American imperialism, war, and local reaction in each country to begin with. The Communist parties in the concerned countries had their revolutionary programmes of action to carry out these tasks. At the same time, revisionism also had raised its head during the Second World War period itself (Browderism) culminating in Modern Revisionism of 20th Congress of C.P.S.U. which has become international in character.

With the emergence of Soviet Union as a social imperialist power, there has been a change in the correlation of forces in the international arena. Soviet Union has become another super power, contending for world hegemony. Thus the two super powers together are correctly characterised as belonging to the first world. Japan, Canada and European powers belong to the Second world because of their level of development, which is comparatively less than the super powers. Some of them are imperialist powers while others are not. All of them have contradictions of a basic nature as against two super powers as well as among themselves.

The rest of the countries of Asia, Africa, and Latin America belong to the third world in which China is included. The other countries are fighting for their independence and against the hegemonism of the two super powers. Since the contention for hegemonism is bound to lead to a war, the danger of war is inherent in the situation.

Thus the differentiation of the countries into three worlds is in accordance with Marxism-Leninism. The task of the international revolutionary proletariat is to carry on the struggle against the two super powers, by relying on the third world, and uniting with the Second World, to advance the immediate cause of the world revolution.

This is the essence of Com. Mao's Three Worlds Theory. International experience of last one decade proved that it is correct. There are some who claim to be Marxist-Leninists who, at the same time, deny that the theory is wrong and a departure from Marxism-Leninism. They are revisionists and neo-revisionists who are acting as mouthpieces of Soviet social imperialism. Marxism-Leninism-Mao Tsetung Thought will further develop in the struggle against all varieties of revisionism.

### War and Revolution

The huge build up of armaments, nuclear as well as conventional, by the two super powers has proved beyond doubt that the so-called *detente* is sham. On the contrary, hectic preparations are going on for war by them. Hence the danger of war is real. Soviet Union with all her weakness is a rising power which is aggressive because of her superiority in arms and offensive military line which she has adopted on a global scale. U. S. imperialism has become relatively weak, more so after the defeat in Vietnamese war. It is relying on other imperialist powers to make up the deficiency which it has at present. Notwithstanding all these adjustments, Soviet Union is a super power which is aggressive in words as well as deeds. It is this reason that enables us to characterise not to be more dangerous than U.S. imperialism.

There had been a respite of more than three decades for humanity not to undergo the sufferings of a third world war. At the same time, there have been regional and local wars -- they are still going on -- which have proved to be more disastrous than the first and second World War. The World War could not take place, not because the super powers were after *detente* but because of people's awareness and opposition to it. China's preparedness to face such an eventuality which was expressed in defeating U. S. imperialism in the war of aggression against Vietnam together with all-round preparations at home. A good number of countries some of whom are dependent on the super powers are opposed to be

drawn into such a war. Notwithstanding these positive aspects, the imperialist nature of the two super powers itself is a source of world war in the present situation, because U. S. imperialism wants to defend its global interests, while the Soviet Union wants to edge out the former only to step into its shoes.

In the context of the present international situation, Soviet Union is the main aggressor. This does not mean that the U.S. imperialism has already become a non-aggressor. The over-all situation is that there is the possibility of an imperialist war between the two super powers developing into a war of aggression against the second and third world countries, which are going to become its worst victims. Europe is the bone of contention between the two super powers and Western Europe is going to be the immediate target of Soviet Union. Hence the task of the world proletariat is to carry on struggle against the hegemonism of the super powers in general and the Soviet Union in particular. This applies to war of aggression as well. The proletariat in each country, while opposing hegemonism and fighting out aggression, will carry on the tasks of advancing the revolution in its respective country. Both these tasks are inseparable.

The socialist China will be one of the main targets of aggression by Soviet Union, at one stage or the other of the war when it breaks out. China's correct socialist diplomacy is winning her friends in the countries of second and third world. Besides this the world proletariat, true to its internationalism, will come to her help and to defend her, in all ways at its command. The task of defending China will not deviate the proletariat in the given country from the revolutionary path and the tasks it has to carry out to make its revolution a success. The same is the case with the revolutionary proletariat of our country.

The more the world proletariat is able to prevent the Third World War, the more the world revolution advances further and further. Therefore a situation wherein the war can be prevented atleast for a period will certainly help the cause of revolution and enables to strengthen the defences of one's own country against aggression. It is more important for China, which has to bear the brunt of the aggression, as was the case with Soviet Union in Second World War. In turn, advance of world revolution and revolution in individual countries will have its adverse impact on super powers' capacity to wage a war. At the same time, we should keep in mind that the revolutionary forces are weak in the countries of the two super

powers, and they are not able to prevent unleashing a war. Notwithstanding all these realities, the revolution is bound to advance whether there is an imminent danger of war or not. The Leninist theory that, as long as imperialism including social imperialism exists, wars are inevitable, holds good even to-day.

### Recent Developments in China

Com. Mao, the greatest Marxist-Leninist of the present era, the outstanding leader of the international proletariat, is no more. Two years have already elapsed since his death. (September 9, 1976). Com Chou En-lai died a few months earlier than Com. Mao. The enemies of socialist China and of international revolutionary communist movement were expecting a civil war and instability in the socialist political and economic system. But their hopes have proved in vain. The counter-revolutionary role of "Gang of Four" and their control of a part of the state apparatus was the basis for their hopes. But the attempts of "Gang of Four" were foiled by the people, army and the party headed by Com. Hua. A decade of Proletarian Cultural Revolution has raised the socialist consciousness of the people led by the proletariat to a higher level. A correct understanding of Marxism-Leninism and a correct orientation towards party's general line was restored and was developed further in the army, party ranks and the leadership. Taking all these factors together, the people, the army and the party were ready to face such an eventuality. They could stand the test of the time. The "gang of four" was suppressed, necessary changes were made in the leadership at various levels and a campaign was organised to expose the treachery and the revisionist theories of the Gang. The Eleventh Party Congress and the Fifth National People's Congress have summed up the experiences and consolidated the gains of the struggle. As a result the people, the army and the party are united more than ever.

These developments are not the domestic affairs alone of the Chinese Communist Party and the government. They have an international significance, because the defence of socialism in China is not the responsibility of the Chinese proletariat and the people alone. World proletariat has its own international responsibility towards this task. We, representing the revolutionary proletariat of our country, have supported the steps taken by the C.P.C. against the "Gang of Four" and such other measures in defence of Socialist Revolution.

China's socialist foreign policy is successful in winning friends and isolating enemies. The recent Peace Treaty signed by China and Japan, which includes struggle against hegemonism is a great achievement for world peace and a blow to Soviet hegemonism. Soviet Union's iron fist over East European countries is broken by strengthening the bonds with Romania and Yugoslavia. Soviet Union, once appeared to have succeeded in isolating China internationally, is now getting isolated, while China's unity with the Second and Third World countries is getting strengthened with every passing day.

Viet Nam, whose success in the war of liberation against American imperialism entirely depended on her people's participation and Chinese help, turned hostile to China, became expansionist power, waging a war of aggression against Kampuchea, and allowed herself to become an out-post of Soviet social imperialism. Viet Nam's drive against the Chinese nationals is a part of her anti-China policy. China, while fighting Vietnamese hostile and pro-Soviet measures, is helping Kampuchea in all possible ways in her struggle for independence, territorial integrity and against Vietnamese expansionism.

All this goes to show that China is building socialism, successfully even after Com. Mao's death, which shows the strength of socialist foundation. Communist revolutionaries in India hail these achievements as having international significance.

### Proletarian Internationalism

Communist revolutionaries all over the world have no international organisation like **Comintern** (Third Communist International.) which was dissolved, once its historical role (formation of the parties in most of the countries etc.,) was over. Therefore, there is no international centre of an organisational nature. Every party is independent in working out its own programme and tactics for the revolution of the respective country. How they carried out their responsibilities during the period of **Comintern** and after its dissolution is a matter for respective parties to be reviewed. The communist revolutionaries in India are yet to complete this task.

We have two types of experiences before us. Indian communist movement had its help and guidance from the Comintern before and after the party's formation. This by itself was not enough because the leadership had failed to apply Maxism-Leninism to the practice

of Indian revolution. As a result, the proletariat could not establish its hegemony over the national movement, not to speak of liberating the country from the British imperialism. That was the time when uncritical approach towards help and guidance was the order of the day in the communist movement. Post-Comintern period saw the party exercising its independence, not on the basis of Marxism-Leninism and proletarian internationalism, but on that of its departure from and culminating in joining the revisionist camp, i.e., modern revisionism and neo-revisionism. A good number of communist revolutionaries in our country were victims of the same disease as and when they broke away from neo-revisionism, in the name of Mao Tse-tung Thought. We know where they landed themselves. On the contrary, there were some who could take their stand independently, evolved a General Line (Fundamental Line) for the Party to be formed, based on Marxism-Leninism-Mao Tse-tung Thought together with our own revolutionary experience. It is this line which is developed, enriched and strengthened in its struggle against right and left opportunism. Together with its implementation it has come to stay with its own all-India organisation and a mass revolutionary movement under its guidance. This does not mean that everything is fine and we can relax ourselves. We are yet to form the party and go a long way to establish the hegemony of proletariat over the mass revolutionary movement in general and agrarian revolution in particular, all over India.

Chinese Revolution had a different type of experience. Chinese Communist Party was an important part of Communist International. It had evolved, implemented and developed its general line within the frame work of Comintern's line. It had corrected and improved the line when certain or major aspects of it proved to be wrong and harmful. It is in this process that the new theories have been added to the arsenal of Marxism-Leninism. (Mao's New Democracy, People's War, Guerilla Warfare, Proletarian Cultural Revolution, Three Worlds Theory etc.) The C.P.C. headed by Mao had exercised its independence within the frame work and on the basis of Marxism-Leninism alone. It never attempted to depart from it in any form what-so-ever. Had they not exercised their independence no successful Chinese Revolution and no Socialist China of today. We have to emulate the Chinese experience of correctly exercising the independence, which we enjoy, without for a moment departing from Marxism-Leninism-Mao Tse-tung Thought.

The neo-revisionists in our country claim to be Marxist-Leninists, and, at the same time, independent of C.P.S.U. and C.P.C.. Experience has proved that they are independent of Marxism-Leninism only to depart from it. They have ended up in aligning themselves with the ruling classes of our own country and the band wagon of Soviet social imperialism and Vietnamese expansionism. There are others who claim to be adherents of Mao Tse tung Thought as well who are taking a departure from the same in various forms. We will have occasion to comment on their views and practices.

Exercising independence has no meaning, rather dangerous, if it is a smokescreen to depart from Marxism-Leninism-Mao Tsetung Thought. By independence we mean: applying Marxism-Leninism-Mao Tsetung Thought to the practice of Indian revolution without copying any other country. Lenin has to say the following in this connection.

*".....the Social-Democratic movement is in its very essence an international movement. This means, not only that we must combat national chauvinism, but also that a movement that is starting in a young country can be successful only if it implements the experience of other countries. And in order to implement this experience, it is not enough merely to be acquainted with it or simply to transcribe the latest resolutions. What is required is the ability to treat this experience critically and to test independently. Anybody who realises how enormously the modern working class movement has grown and branched out will understand what a reserve of theoretical forces and political (as well as revolutionary) experience is required to fulfill this task" (What is to be done, Peking Edition, 1975, page 29)*

Here Lenin explicitly made it clear about the international character of the Social-Democratic movement. So is our communist revolutionary movement and those in other countries. He made it a point to make use of the experiences of other countries which apply to ourselves as well. He mentions about incipient nature of the "movement in a young country" like Russia, which needed such experiences. Ours is an old country in this respect with a history of more than five decades of communist movement. At the same time it is only less than a decade that we are having a basically a correct line which is based on our own experience as well. It is in this connection his formulation on the method of using these experiences, i.e., to have critical treatment and testing independently

etc., is relevant to us. More than seven decades of time has elapsed since he had advanced these ideas. The growth of working class movement during this period is enormous, varied and more than hundred-fold of what Lenin had in mind (October Revolution, Chinese Revolution etc.) Finally, a person or the leadership of a party can carry out this task when they understand the phenomenal growth of movement, which has a reserve of theoretical forces etc.

Those who are after "independence" do not bother about the international experience itself, not to speak of our own. Yet they want independence. It can only be an independence from Marxism-Leninism-Mao Tsetung Thought, which is a departure from it. As against this, the genuine communist revolutionaries will exercise their independence as Lenin enjoined us. We have some experience of it with positive results.

Proletarian internationalism is the basis of our relations with the socialist countries, proletarian revolutionary movements, national liberation movements and the struggles for independence. It is opposed opportunist internationalism which is being practised by revisionists of all hues.

We recognise China as centre of world revolution because it still fulfills all the prerequisites for such a centre just as it was the case with Germany during the times of Marx and Engels, and Russia of Lenin and Stalin. This does not mean that it is our organisational centre and the C.P.C. does not claim to have one. Therefore the question does not arise whether the C.P.C. is imposing organisational discipline or not. The professional slanderers alone can raise the question only to confuse and divert the attention of communist revolutionaries and the people in general.

We are of opinion that the C.P.C. is discharging international responsibilities on the basis of Marxism-Leninism-Mao Tsetung Thought and proletarian internationalism. We too have an international responsibility of the same nature towards C.P.C. The same is the case with parties and groups of communist revolutionaries in various countries. Once we renounce or underestimate these responsibilities, we cease to be proletarian internationalists. Departure from proletarian internationalism and adherence to Marxism-Leninism cannot go together.

Communist revolutionaries have their own programme and path which is the application of Marxism-Leninism-Mao Tsetung Thought

to the practice of Indian Revolution. Consequently, their policies and practices are dictated by and subordinate to the programme and path in a given situation. Marxism-Leninism-Mao Tsetung Thought is the granite foundation for the fraternal unity between the C.P.C. and the communist revolutionaries in India.

In our country there is a move towards normalisation of relations between the governments of India and China. It is full of *ifs and buts*. Presence of Soviet Union in India is the biggest obstacle for the normalisation. We do not equate normalisation with establishment of friendly relations, which we stand for. Even if the relations are normalised inspite of all these factors, there will not be any change in our line. We continue to oppose the present government of comprador bourgeoisie and landlords and its policies, mobilise and organise the people in this direction. At the same time, we treat the process of normalisation as a positive development, leading to further weakening of the position of the Soviet Union, however meagre it may be. The antagonistic nature of the two super power contradictions, the present government's swing towards U.S. imperialism, world economic crisis of a chronic nature in which India is also embroiled are the causes behind the moves. In spite of this there is no reason why we should not be positive about the moves. We demand that normalisation must be expedited and friendly relations must be established. Such a process serves our genuine national interests and weakens the super power position in our country. We mobilise and organise the people for this purpose, so that our country may take its rightful place in the world peoples struggle against imperialism in general and super power hegemonism in particular.

### Conclusion

True to our proletarian internationalism, we share the rejoices of Chinese people, the Communist Party and the Government headed by Com. Hua on the occasion of commemoration of 29th anniversary of success of Chinese revolution. The recent successes of their domestic and foreign policies have an international significance which help the cause of world revolution. The communist revolutionaries and people in our country draw inspiration from these achievements. The unity between China and people of India is a strong bulwark against imperialism in general and the superpowers in particular. While working for advancing the cause of revolution, we pledge that we will work for lasting friendship between the two. No force on earth can prevent us from performing this task.

Long Live The Friendship Between The People Of India And China.

Long Live Marxism-Leninism-Mao Tsetung Thought. (October 1978)

## October And Chinese Revolutions Show The Path Of Revolutions To The People Of The World

Every revolution has its own significance. But the October Revolution (November 7, 1917) in Russia and the successful revolution in China (1949) have a unique significance in that they have directed the destiny of mankind towards socialism. The October Revolution in Russia was socialist, whereas the Chinese revolution was people's democratic which, after its completion, had developed into socialist revolution. Some more countries have joined the stream after the Second World War. Abolition of exploitation of man by another man and oppression of one nation by another nation is possible only under socialist system. This has been conclusively proved and practised by these revolutions.

Building of socialism and passing over to communism is not a one day's job. Nor can it be achieved by legislations and rules. A prolonged struggle of the proletariat against world imperialism, capitalism and reactionaries in their respective countries is going on to win final victory. Such a struggle is armed and otherwise with success and defeats. The same is the case with individual countries. The experience of the two revolutions has amply proved this. It was possible to build socialism in Soviet Union of Lenin and Stalin in the same way. A socialist camp had emerged after the Second World War. It was a case of success of building socialism in one country and its extension beyond its border. The same has become an experience of defeats with the transformation of Soviet Union into a social imperialist super power.

The Chinese Revolution too had to traverse zig zag course. It was a protracted war of about three decades before it was finally victorious. Then it had to consolidate itself and start building socialism under conditions of imperialist encirclement. Guided by Marxism-Leninism-Mao Tsetung Thought, the Chinese leadership could carry on a successful struggle against internal and external enemies, broke the encirclement and are on way to isolate Soviet social imperialism, which has become the main enemy and a threat

to the countries of the world in general and China in particular.

Now that the two countries are having different social systems, the problems they are facing are fundamentally different. Soviet Union, as a social imperialist power, is facing the opposition and resistance of people and countries to her drive for hegemony over the world. In addition to this, the revolutionary proletariat of Soviet Union is still facing the task of completing the socialist revolution again. In China, preparations for facing a war together with building socialism are going on simultaneously. True to her proletarian internationalism, she is supporting the struggles for national independence, the national liberation movements, people's revolutions and the struggles for proletarian revolutions. Of course, the people of the two countries have no contradictory interests. On the other hand, they are faced with the common task of fighting imperialism, including Soviet social imperialism. While there is no contradiction between Chinese leadership and the people in relation to struggle against imperialism, there is one, more so a fundamental one, between the Soviet leadership and her people. Opportunists of all hues refuse to recognise this objective reality. While a section of them equate the present Soviet Union with that of Lenin and Stalin, the others are trying to dig out opportunism in the leadership of CPC before and after the death of Mao.

It is not necessary that with the death of an outstanding leader of the socialist country, its socialist path must undergo a reversal. Though it happened in the case of Stalin's death, it was not so after Lenin. It is not necessary that China must undergo the same change after Mao Marxist-Leninist forces are strong enough to defeat counter-revolutionary forces in China. Whereas the reverse was the case in Soviet Union after Stalin.

China is the biggest country of the world in relation to the population. She was one of the most backward countries when she was liberated (1949). The problems facing Chinese socialism have a direct bearing with them apart from the role of imperialism and social imperialism such as ideological and political influences of imperialism, bourgeoisie, and petty bourgeoisie which are trying to make inroads into the socialist society. Soviet Union's military encirclement and the threat of war created these problems. The party and the people are better prepared to face them more than ever. It is the result of relentless struggle the party carried on in defence of Marxism-Leninism-Mao-Zedong Thought.

We people in India have to learn from China because both our countries were victims of imperialist aggression for a prolonged period. While India was two years (1947) ahead of China in having transfer of power from British imperialists, while the latter had completed people's democratic revolution by 1949, they had different paths of development. India is having imperialist path of development all along. China is having a socialist path. She had Soviet Union's help when the latter was a socialist power. Eversince she is having a self-reliant and independent economy althrough. This is the fundamental difference between the two paths.

There are some who embellish the imperialist path of development, who claim that Indian technology is more developed than that of China. There is no valid reason for such a claim. China is not only self-reliant but also self sufficient with no unemployment and poverty etc. The Four Modernisations which are going on are not to overcome starvation and semi-starvation etc, which are already things of past. They are meant to build a modern and a powerful China with a high standard of living for the people and with a higher level of defence capability which can meet the requirements of the country against possible attacks of imperialism in general and Soviet Union in particular. Same is not the case with india. It is true that certain amount of development has taken place in various fields. It is also possible that India is more developed than China in a few sectors, which is being embellished day in and day out. But when we go deep into the affair, it becomes clear that in China the development which took place and is taking place is of an independent nature, whose fruits are reaching all the people. Whereas in India it is the topmost strata which is enjoying it leaving 90 per cent and more of the population in dire poverty, want etc. Even the official spokesmen admit this though they differ regarding percentages. Moreover, the development that is taking place in India belongs to foreign capital in which Indian capital has no say, not to speak of people. It has control only over outdated technology and development.

The same persons and some others say that China too is having foreign 'Aid' by abandoning the policy of self-reliance. The recent agreements signed between China and Western countries and those still being negotiated are quoted as instances in support of their contention. A closer analysis shows that there are fundamental differences in this respect also. The role of foreign capital in China

is not the same as that of India because the state in India is controlled by comprador bourgeoisie and landlords who are serving the interests of imperialism. As a result, the foreign aid agreements between India and western countries are unequal in nature. They are leading India to be more dependent on western countries. Foreign loans and more foreign loans are the slogans of the day for the ruling classes. Their insolvency can be seen in that the debt-servicing is being done by incurring additional foreign loans. It is happening because there is plunder and more plunder by foreign capital. The same is not the case with China. Of late she has signed trade agreements with western countries including US in connection with her Four Modernisations. Such a policy is correct and justified because 1) Treaties are on equal footing. 2) The imported foreign capital in all its forms is controlled by the dictatorship of the proletariat and not vice versa. 3) Such a policy is a mere concession to foreign capital, which is necessary in a given situation and is correct according to Marxism-Leninism-Mao-Zedong Thought.\* Bourgeois economists, revisionists and neo-revisionists do not recognise that India's economy is semi-colonial, semi-feudal and the regimes which are emerging, tied to imperialism as they are, are incapable of building independent economy.

A new feature in the Indian situation is the growing strength of communist revolutionaries and their organisation and a democratic movement, a new type of democratic movement at that, headed by the proletariat. The path of the development of this movement is the same as that of October Revolution (November 7) and the Chinese Revolution. The revolutionary proletariat of India, headed by communist revolutionaries, are advancing on the same path. Therefore the lessons of these revolutions are more important today than ever.

**Long Live October Revolution (November 7).**

**Long Live Chinese Socialist Revolution.**

**Long Live Marxism-Leninism-Mao-Zedong Thought.**

(15-10-1979)

\* See Lenin *On Concessions* in the Appendix.

## On Developments Inside China\*

The CC meeting was held in the middle of July, discussed and took decisions on some of the problems facing the organisation and the mass movement. It is aware that all problems can't be discussed and finalised in one or two meetings. Therefore it preferred to take some of the immediate issues together with a brief discussion on outstanding problems like review of the work done by the Central Committee, which will take sometime to be completed. We are not for indefinite discussions. We will expedite the work in such a way that it will be completed soon and organisation measures (extended meetings, conference etc) may follow:

The Central Committee took up developments in China, which have been a source of confusion among our ranks. It is heartening to see that they stood by our line of defending CPC, in the face of attacks from right and 'left' opportunism, which has always been an international phenomenon. In our country there are various forces among the revolutionaries who can be divided as follows:

1. Those who characterise CPC as revisionist after the death of Mao.
2. Those who support CPC from a right opportunist standpoint. For example CP and SNS\*\* groups of CPI(ML) and some others.
3. Those who basically agree with the policies of CPC. It means that the possibility of differences on secondary issues is not ruled out. Communist revolutionaries as represented by Unity Centre belong to this category. While supporting its policies we critically examine them and draw our own conclusions.
4. There are some others who say that they support CPC openly. But we are not clear how far their agreement or disagreement goes.

The material from China and elsewhere does not warrant any basic change in our attitude. At the same time we want to clarify our attitude on various important issues, some of which are controversial.

\*This was originally released as an inner-organisational letter.

\*\*CP for Chandra Pulla Reddy and SNS for Satya Narayana Singh.

- (i) Theoretical problems in connection with building socialism in China.
- (ii) Rehabilitation: Liu Shaoqi, Deng etc.
- (iii) Party-to-party relations: Yugoslavia, Italy.
- (iv) Cultural Revolution.

All these problems are connected with one or other aspect of Mao-Zedong Thought. We are aware that the present leadership is taking a series of measures to rectify the situation created by counter-revolutionary policies of Lin Biao and the "Gang of Four". The recent statements of the leadership raise a number of questions which make it necessary to clarify our stand-point towards them. The Cultural Revolution is one such issue. This doesn't mean that we are going to reconsider our basic positions.

Though we have not yet started writing openly on these subjects, we are explaining our standpoints during our discussion with our comrades and those outside. We have explained our position regarding some issues raised by CPI (M). Some problems of building socialism and some connected with party-to-party relations are dealt in the concerned article. We are aware that it is a beginning and much is to be done in this regard.

The question of Cultural Revolution is being discussed widely in our country and internationally. We hold that a cultural revolution is necessary in a given country even after victorious proletarian revolution and establishment of the dictatorship of proletariat. China is no exception to this. What form it should take is a matter to be considered by the party in power. To this extent, it is an internal matter of the party concerned. But it has its international aspect also because its repercussions extend and have their impact beyond the borders of the country. Accordingly Chinese cultural revolution had its impact on international revolutionary movement including our country.

As for the rehabilitation of Liu Shaoqi, Deng and others, it is culmination of the policy started while Mao and Zhou were alive, when Deng was rehabilitated and raised to a higher position. At the same time we are yet to know the basis on which he was

rehabilitated, i.e., whether he accepted the need for a cultural revolution etc. But the fact of the matter is that he was rehabilitated in 1974. On the other hand Liu Shaoqi's rehabilitation took place together with upholding his policy, basically which was denounced at the time of cultural revolution. Therefore, rehabilitation by itself is not a new development for us. But his policy together with the changed assessment of the Cultural Revolution is a matter for further consideration.

Relations with Communist League of Yugoslavia and Communist Party of Italy raise certain fundamental questions. These were the parties criticised for their revisionism during the *Great Debate*. At present, the problems involved are: every party and country can choose its own road to socialism in accordance with its specific features. But there are certain common factors for all countries in accordance with Marxism-Leninism. As a corollary, every party is free to apply Marxism-Leninism to the practice of its country's revolution. Such a standpoint raises a number of questions which have to be answered. We are going to take them up soon. It should be noted that CPC was having party to party relations with those who didn't accept Mao-Zedong Thought, and who at the same time, were opposed to Soviet hegemonism (North Korea, Rumania etc.). Adhering to proletarian internationalism is one thing and opposing hegemonism is another thing. Though both are not contradictory, they can't be equated as well. While anti-hegemonism is directed against the two super powers (presently), the sphere and content of proletarian internationalism is wider and deeper.

In this connection, it is not out of place to mention CPC's talks with CPI(M), though they were said to be not on party to party basis. CPC may have its reasons for this step, but our attitude towards CPI (M) doesn't undergo any change and we will continue our struggle against neo-revisionism as before.

As for the problems mentioned above, we will explain our position in detail. There are certain issues on which we are in full agreement with CPC (most of the foreign policy matters). There are some, mostly theoretical, which need further study. We will expedite it and have a comprehensive article or articles on the points mentioned. Some of them may be for publication while the rest will be for internal circulation. All this will be done within the framework of our basic standpoint and without delay.

Date : 18-7-1980

Central Committee,  
Unity Centre of Communist Revolutionaries of India (M.L.)

## Hold High The Banner Of Mao Tse-tung Thought!

It was four years ago that Com. Mao died. Enemies of Chinese Socialism and Mao Tse-tung Thought expected that there will be an end to both. That is to say: the capitalism would be restored in China and Mao Tse-tung Thought would be abandoned by the Chinese Communist Party. There are some who hold such views even now. There is no dearth of groups who call themselves revolutionaries and who claim that CPC has abandoned Mao Tse-tung, embraced revisionism and capitalism has been restored. Some go to the extent of characterising China as a super power adding to the already existing two super powers.

All this is a part of a slander-campaign engineered by the opportunists who are adapting themselves to the changing situation so that they may be of some use to the ruling classes and range themselves against the Indian as well as world revolution. Communist revolutionaries have taken it as a challenge and they are fighting such theories, opportunist as they are, to the bitter end.

In China discussions are going on and have virtually have come to an end as to the achievements and failures of the Chinese revolution including Cultural Revolution headed by Com. Mao. The leadership of the CPC has given an indication of what has happened and is about to announce the details soon.

We on our part have never accepted the theory of infallibility at any time. The leaders, how ever great they may be, are liable to commit mistakes, some times serious also. But that does not minimise the significance of their unique contribution to the world revolution and the theory of Marxism-Leninism. Mao was one of such outstanding leaders whose contribution is unique to the Chinese revolution as the head of the Party. His thoughts are known as Mao-Tse Tung Thought. It is quite possible that some mistakes, serious in nature, were committed during his lifetime, especially the last part of his life. But they do not in any way minimise his unique role as the leader of the revolution.

We have always held that Marxism-Leninism-Mao Tse-tung Thought are the doctrines which summed up the experiences of the international revolutionary movement in general and given countries in particular. They worked out new theories so that a correct road may be laid from time to time to make the world revolution, including that of individual countries, a success. Therefore, these doctrines represent the collective summing up of the revolutionary movement as a whole. No individual, however great he may be, can produce such doctrines if he does not study the experiences of the revolutions and the revolutionary peoples movements. Herein lies the significance of the collective experience for a revolutionary theory or a doctrine.

If Lenin had applied Marxism to the practice of Russian revolution in particular, and world revolution in general, Mao did the same for the Chinese revolution as well as world revolution. In view of this, rejecting Mao Tse-tung Thought amounts to rejecting the experience of Chinese revolution in particular and world revolution in general. Therefore, we oppose such views as a departure from Marxism-Leninism leading to revisionism. We know that the leadership of the CPSU and its followers have done the same and kept themselves outside the purview of Marxism-Leninism. It is a fact that Gang of Four and certain anti-Party elements utilised the critical situation and did the worst to halt the advance of Chinese socialism and the world revolution. Thanks to the strength of Mao Tse-tung Thought, the CPC could overcome the serious harm it has done and they are now on the road of strengthening the socialism with the help of four modernisations and their correct policies are leading them to success.

CPC's continuing support to the liberation movements all over the world together with the struggle for socialism is and should be an answer to those who slander it as a revisionist party. They are baseless and we reject them outright.

Our own experiences and the experience of world revolution show that while applying the theories of Marxism-Leninism-Mao Tse-tung Thought to the practice of one's own country's revolution, the leadership should be careful enough not to apply them mechanically. A living and creative application is different from a mechanical application. It has been our experience in the past that the leadership could not apply them to the practice of the Indian revolution in a way it should have done. In the name of

creative application some sections have departed from Marxism-Leninism itself. While carrying on relentless struggle against such theories and practices, we are guided by the Lenin's dictum which in part runs thus:

*"Secondly, the Social-Democratic movement is in its very essence an international movement. This means not only that we must combat national chauvinism, but that an incipient movement in a young country can be successful only if it makes use of the experiences of other countries. In order to make use of these experiences it is not enough merely to be acquainted with them or simply to copy out the latest resolutions. What is required is the ability to treat these experiences critically and to test them independently. He who realises how enormously the modern working-class movement has grown and branched out will understand what a reserve of theoretical forces and political (as well as revolutionary) experience is required to carry out this task. (Lenin, Collected Works, Vol.5 p.370. What is to be Done). (Emphasis ours).*

We, Communist revolutionaries in India, have been following this dictum of Lenin's from the beginning. We are continuing the same practice now. We evaluate the developments in CPC and elsewhere on the same basis and draw our conclusions and work out our programme accordingly. We are having a measure of success in this regard and we are confident that we will go ahead in this direction.

We observe proletarian internationalism in accordance with teachings of Marx, Engels and Lenin. We adhere to them and practise. Guided by Marxism-Leninism-Mao Tse-tung Thought, communist revolutionaries in India are advancing step by step by providing the correct leadership to the Indian Revolution. This is the humble homage which we are paying to Com. Mao at the time of the 4th anniversary of his death.

**Long Live Marxism-Leninism-Mao Tse-tung Thought!**

**Long Live The Indian Revolution!!**

Date : 14-9-1980

Central Committee,  
UCCRI (ML).

## **October And November Revolutions: Some Problems Facing International Communist Movement.**

There have been revolutions in Europe in 18th and 19th centuries which culminated in establishing the rule of bourgeoisie as against feudalism. But the first half of Twentieth Century witnessed two revolutions, one in Russia and the other in China, which have changed the face of the respective countries by putting an end to capitalism and feudalism and by building socialism. That Soviet Union has changed into a social-imperialist power, and some mistakes were committed during the course of Socialist construction in China, do not minimise the unique significance of these revolutions.

The revolutions have given an impetus to the proletarian revolutionary movements in the West and national liberation movements in the East. Formation and development of Third Communist International has provided the leadership to all these movements. As a result, a stage had arrived in the world revolutionary movement, wherein a world organisation was no more necessary to guide it from one centre. Every party had become sovereign in its respective country leading revolutions and revolutionary movements. Differences over strategy and tactics of the revolution in a given country were expected to be resolved by the parties concerned. At the sametime the parties were provided necessary help, when asked for, by the international leadership, which was headed by CPSU headed by Stalin and CPC headed by Mao, because these were the most mature parties who led the revolutions in their respective countries successfully, and who were capable of extending their help.

But the experience has proved that the help extended by them had their own limits and in some cases they proved to be incorrect also. More often the receiving parties were so immature, that they could not utilise the correct aspect of the help and reject the wrong aspect. Thus the short-comings belonged to both the sides, though the main responsibility lies with the leading party, so far as its

wrong advice, help and guidance is concerned. CPC headed by Mao had adopted this policy and led the revolution to a success. On the contrary, CPI and its leadership could not have a correct understanding and practice of Marxism-Leninism throughout its life, barring a few exceptions. That it could build a mass revolutionary movement and participated in the national movement is due to its revolutionary programme. But it could not establish the hegemony of the proletariat because of its wrong understanding and practice including wrong strategy and tactics.

### **Theory of Infallibility is Wrong**

From among the leaders of the World Communist Movement, Stalin and Mao have come up for criticism for their role as leaders of the parties and States of Soviet Union and China and the International Communist Movement. There are enemies of Marxism-Leninism and those who have departed from it. Bourgeois ideologues, Trotskyites and some others belong to this category. Theirs is denunciation and not criticism though they may concede some of their achievements. But there are those who take a critical attitude from Marxist stand-point. For them, it is not difficult to accept that they have committed mistakes of a serious nature, though all may not be unanimous on this score. Therefore, the experience has proved that even the greatest leaders of the calibre of Stalin and Mao are not infallible. So also the parties in general. This is a valuable lesson that we have learnt and a harsh lesson at that.

There are some who defend Stalin ardently as if he had been infallible. They are the upholders of theory of infallibility of Stalin, though they may denounce others. If the leaders of Albania (PLA) uphold the infallibility of Stalin, they denounce Mao and CPC. There are those who treat both Stalin and Mao as infallible. As a result, they defend rights as well as wrongs of these leaders.

The mistakes committed by the leadership are connected with the consolidation of the dictatorship of the proletariat and building socialism in Soviet Union and China. The experiences were first of its kind for Soviet Union and Stalin. Even then they are mistakes, sometimes serious in nature. Therefore, the theory that outstanding leaders are infallible is wrong. The same is the case with Mao. His contribution as the leader of the CPC and the Chinese revolution is unique in all fields, i.e., ideological, political, military, organisational and practical. His ideas in this respect are known

as Mao Zedong Thought. They continue to be alive and Mao Zedong Thought has come to stay. This does not mean that he was free from short-comings either in thinking or in practice, especially in the last part of his life. They must be assessed criticised and correct lessons should be drawn. The CPC leadership is seized of the matter. It has expressed its opinions on most of the subjects. More details are being awaited, which are likely to be available soon. Notwithstanding this, we can conclude that mistakes of serious nature were committed during this period which goes to show that even outstanding leaders of international communist movement are fallible.

### **Cultural Revolution:**

We have been upholding the Cultural Revolution in China, which has been initiated and guided by Mao, from 1966 onwards. The present Chinese leadership thinks that Mao's assessment of the situation was wrong and there was no need for a Cultural Revolution, which brought disaster to China, and impeded its development. We think that the problem has two aspects theory and practice. As far as the theory is concerned, we are one with Mao who said as following long back in 1940:

*"A cultural revolution is the ideological reflection of the political and economic revolution and is in their service."*

He says further:

*".....The cultural revolution ushered in by the May 4th Movement was uncompromising in its fight against feudal culture: there had never been such great and thoroughgoing cultural revolution since the dawn of Chinese history. Both in ideology and in the matter of cadres the May 4th Movement paved the way for the founding of the Chinese Communist Party in 1921 and for the May 30th movement in 1925 and the Northern expedition....." (On New Democracy)*

Quite in accordance with Marxism-Leninism, Mao has summed up the experience of May 4th movement and said that Cultural Revolution was necessary for the success of New Democratic Revolution. At the same time, its role is characterised as one of serving political and economic revolution. It is necessary during New Democratic as well as Socialist revolution. We support this theory. We are firmly of opinion that India needs cultural revolution

more than any country because of predominance of imperialist culture which is in its decaying stage. To some extent, it is sophisticated and decadent to a greater extent. Feudal and semi-feudal culture is appearing, not only in its crudest forms. They are deep-rooted among top strata, have influenced and continue to influence even today. They are an impediment to the development of the revolution.

It is not necessary that cultural revolution should always be the harbinger of political and economic revolutions. People of a given country decide their own course of revolution. But the essential feature of it is that it is a part of New Democratic and Socialist revolutions.

In China there was a cultural revolutionary movement even before establishing dictatorship of people's democracy. It facilitated the revolution to consummate as early as possible. But the Cultural Revolution which was started during the stage of Socialist revolution was not of this character. Of course, it was guided and led by the CPC and the dictatorship of proletariat. It has borne the features of political revolution in setting aside constitutional authority and running the administration by the "revolutionary" committees. Party committees were reorganised and considerable part of the leadership at various levels was removed and replaced by new leadership. While the former were called Capitalist Roaders, the latter were embellished as genuine revolutionaries. There were some serious mistakes of a serious nature, on economic front, which retarded the development of the country. Thus, it has, instead of serving the interests of Socialist revolution, retarded it.

In this connection, we should not ignore the conditions existing when the Cultural Revolution was started. The Modern Revisionism led by CPSU had gripped the major part of world communist movement, extending its influence even to some of the parties which were following basically a correct Marxist-Leninist line. CPC could not be free from such influences. Secondly there was a threat of war of aggression from Soviet Union. China had to prepare herself to meet all eventualities including the need to defend the country. These conditions have hastened the leadership to start cultural revolution. But they are no excuses for it because it is the correct assessment of the situation that decides the need, the form and the content of cultural revolution. According to the CPC leadership the assessment was wrong and there was no need for cultural revolution. Hence it was possible for resolving the differences within

the frame-work of party and State Constitution.

Every revolution destroys the old set up and creates new. It spreads chaos in the length and breadth of the country. Besides this, when the cultural revolution was terminated by the present leadership, and the situation was brought to normal by arresting the "Gang of Four", the change was smooth though there have been disturbances here and there. It shows that people had fully supported the change-over.

We support the theory that cultural revolution is a part of new Democratic and Socialist revolution and serves the political and economic revolutions in the two stages. We are applying it to the practice of Indian revolution. At the sametime its form and content has to be decided by us. If we commit mistakes it is we who are responsible and nobody else. It was CPC headed by Mao which had decided to start the cultural revolution and the present leadership has decided to terminate it. Thus the people and CPC together with its leadership proved to be better judges than ourselves to decide what is correct and what is wrong.

There is an international aspect of the cultural revolution of China. That it has influenced the communist movements in other countries is indisputable. Our country is no exception. Late Charu Majumdar's clique was emboldened by Lin Biao and the Gang of Four, by its ultra "left" line and carried on its activities over the length and breadth of the country which led to the disruption of revolutionary movement and organisation. Therefore it can safely be said that the serious mistakes committed by the parties more so those who are in power, have their international impact. The same is the case with the mistakes of the CPC leadership during the cultural revolution. It must be noted that we have never followed Charu's line and braved his opposition till his clique was crumbled to pieces.

What is the difference between those who opposed cultural revolution and ourselves? Those who are opposed to Marxism-Leninism-Mao Zedong Thought are opposed to cultural revolution as such. Apart from this the difference is: they are opposed to Mao Zedong Thought whereas we accept and apply it to the practice of our revolution. Some may accept in words the need for cultural revolution. But they don't realise the need for people's participation all-through. They think that cultural revolution comes about by party decisions and party's internal discussions. In short, they don't

realise its mass revolutionary character. They are also open parliament parties who have no revolutionary movement behind them. Or there can be none because of their opportunism. On the contrary we are for a mass revolutionary cultural movement during the period when we prepare the people for peoples democratic revolution or the socialist revolution as the case may be. When the peoples democratic dictatorship of the proletariat is established, there will be a cultural revolution or a revolutionary movement, whose form and content will be decided according to the given situation. These are the fundamental differences and there is no common point between the two.

### **The Question of Rehabilitation.**

To rehabilitate a comrade or comrades, who are either wrongly degraded, or who corrected their short-comings and mistakes, is a correct principle of party organisation which must be observed by all parties. CPC has been adhering to it all-through. Deng was rehabilitated when Mao was alive. It was a starting point for all those who were deserving. (It is quite possible that some were rehabilitated even before Deng). The present leadership has expedited this process. The termination of cultural revolution has facilitated it.

We Communist revolutionaries are careful in this respect. We are firmly of the opinion that none should be punished without any substantial reason whatsoever and victims, if any, should have ways and means to get rehabilitated. We should have necessary provisions for this purpose. Correct way of rehabilitation will go a long way in developing, improving and unifying the party.

### **Party-to-Party Relations.**

We are working in a new situation when there is no international organisation for world communist movement. Every party, group and organisation is independent with its own line. All claim to be Marxist-Leninists and some add Mao Zedong Thought. They have their alignments on local, national and international level. Therefore certain amount of mutual relations have already been established between them.

Revisionsim and opportunist internationalism has been the basis of the relations between some of them. CPSU and its associates belong to this category. PLA (Albania) is attempting to rally some

groups on the basis of denunciation of Mao Zedong Thought and opposition to the present leadership of CPC.

There are some who are independent in the real sense of this term. (Rumania, North Korea etc). They have condemned Soviet aggression against Afghanistan and Vietnamese aggression against Kampuchea either directly or indirectly. A party like CPI (M) which claims to be one belonging to such category but supported CPSU and Vietnam openly, cannot be included in this category.

The present situation demands that all anti-hegemonistic forces should be mobilised and united so that the onward march of hegemonism of Soviet Union is halted and defeated. Among them there are those who treat Soviet Union as a social imperialist power. There are those who treat Soviet Union as a socialist power. But oppose some aspects of its policies, more so, the drive for hegemonism. In spite of their limitations, they are anti-hegemonistic forces to reckon with. In isolating Soviet Union and Vietnam, these forces had an important role to play. The leadership of the CPC is unifying these forces by having relations with them. For this purpose, it is strengthening such relations which were already existing, and restoring some, which were broken earlier. The measures taken by the leadership in this direction, during the last four years are standing examples. Such attempts are likely to continue.

But this does not solve our problem. Because the question of Marxism-Leninism of these parties comes up for discussion. Who is to decide about the genuineness of Marxism-Leninism of a given party? It is the party of the country which can decide about it. Others can have their own opinions. The parties are sovereign and therefore there should be no outside interference. There can be a criticism from a fraternal party or parties which should be discussed on the party to party basis. When the mistakes of the party cross beyond certain limits leading to departure from Marxism-Leninism and embracing revisionism, a party has the right to criticise it openly and it cannot be called interference in internal relations of other party.

Where to draw a line between sovereignty and interference is a subject for further discussion and clarification. Suffice it to say that every party has the right to apply Marxism-Leninism to the practice of its country's revolution. It is likely to commit mistakes. But it should learn by its own experiences and correct itself. When

there are more than one party or group it is they who will settle accounts with each other resulting in emergence of a party of Marxism-Leninism.

A party's correct attitude towards proletarian internationalism arises out of its correct application of Marxism-Leninism. Mistakes may be committed by it in this respect. That does not amount to renouncing proletarian internationalism because they can be corrected. If they are not corrected in time leading to departure from Marxism-Leninism, they are bound to renounce proletarian internationalism as well.

Proletarian internationalists, as we are, we should denounce every war of aggression and act of aggression. Conversely, those who do not denounce them are opportunists and do not deserve to be called Marxists-Leninists. There are some who denounce naked aggressions like Soviet Union's war against Afghanistan, but take a neutral stand or ignore the issues like Soviet Union and Vietnams border clashes with China. They cannot be called proletarian internationalists. If they have reservations about such issues which are part and parcel of war and peace, we have the right to have the reservations about their proletarian internationalism. It so happens that the parties, groups, organisations, and individuals take their own time to realise hegemonist and aggressive character of a party leadership and the government. They realise only when it commits aggression. Vietnam is a case as an example. Some had illusions about its peace intentions because of the past. But when it committed aggression against Kampuchea they have opened their eyes, saw its real face in all its naked form, and then characterised it as a naked aggression. Therefore, while keeping the doors open for their becoming real internationalists, we will have our reservations till they join our ranks in this respect.

Therefore, the relations based on anti-hegemonism can not be equated to those based on proletarian internationalism. The former can be a part of the whole but not the whole.

#### **Building of socialism in a country and the question of restoration of capitalism.**

Every country will build socialism according to the specific features of its own while the basic principles of socialism are applicable to one and all countries. Basing on these specific features and advancing world revolution, these countries will add new

experiences in building socialism, communist parties, guided by Marxism-Leninism, can alone sum up these experiences and draw correct lessons to advance further. China is advancing in this direction in spite of the ups and downs it had to face in the past. Soviet Union had taken a different path, the path of Modern Revisionism and social imperialism. It was not difficult to realise this because of its aggressive wars against Czechoslovakia (1968) and Afghanistan (1979-80) together with its global strategy and connected activities. But it is difficult to understand the restoration of capitalism in small states, from which the information is scanty. We should have sufficient and correct information before we come to a conclusion that capitalism has been restored in a given country. More often, acting as a party or state on the dictates of Soviet Union becomes a reliable basis for such characterisation.

Therefore, while upholding the principle that every country has the right to choose its path of socialism, restoration of capitalism in any form should be opposed. Opposition to hegemonism, and proletarian internationalism should be guiding lines for its relations with other parties and states.

#### **Attitude towards National Liberation Movements.**

In spite of the Soviet Union's betrayal and counter-revolutionary role, national movements all over the world are advancing. Formerly, they were directed against imperialism in general and US or a specific power (France) in particular. Now another super power, Soviet Union, has appeared on the scene. Liberation movements are going on. Its aggression against and colonisation of Afghanistan is more naked than ever. In the name of supporting liberation movements it is extending its "sphere of influence", and control over the countries. Vietnam, Angola, Ethiopia were countries where Soviet Union has entered as a supporter of national liberation movements and is staying there as a master.

Apart from struggles led by Communist parties of Burma, Malaysia and Thailand, there are others which are led by non-communist forces as is happening in Afghanistan. Besides this, even the States and governments are fighting for independence especially from the two super powers. Iran, after completing its revolution against US imperialism is fighting against its restoration. It is now fighting Iraqi aggression backed by Soviet Union. Afraid of the consequences of direct intervention, Soviet Union is penetrating into Iran through

Iraq. Therefore, Iran's struggle for independence and liberation is not only directed against Iraq but also against Soviet social imperialism and US imperialism.

US, weakened by chronic economic crisis, regional and local wars, is losing its control over the countries on whom it was a big boss earlier. Therefore it is becoming easier though not smooth sailing for these countries to free themselves from the shackles of US imperialism. Thus they are having independence which varies in degrees for each country. They are threatened by Soviet Union and theirs is a life and death struggle against it. At the sametime, they are showing a remarkable tenacity in upholding their independence from Soviet Union with a measure of success. That it is an invincible power is exploded and proved to be a myth in Afghanistan. Struggle for independence in Soviet-controlled countries is going on and communist revolutionaries are coming to the forefront in this struggle.

The struggle for independence by non-communist revolutionary forces is a present-day feature which has to be taken into account by all communist revolutionaries. The Three Worlds Theory, as advocated by Mao, proved to be correct by the developments that are taking place. The present Chinese leadership is correctly applying this theory.

### Conclusion

That the Chinese Revolution is a continuation of the Great October Revolution (1917) is indisputable. Soviet Union has become a social imperialist power. China is advancing towards building and consolidating socialism. We in India have so many parties, groups etc., who claim to be Marxist-Leninists. They are confusing the people and revolutionary ranks by advocating wrong and opportunist theories, slander against CPC being part of it. Though some of the theories and practices are yet to be clarified the line that CPC is adopting is basically correct and is in the interests of Chinese socialism and world revolution. Of course, there are ups and downs and a zig-zag path which is quite natural and inherent in the situation. The strength of Marxism-Leninism-Mao Zedong Thought is such that they can be overcome. We take this opportunity to greet the people of Soviet Union who are fighting against the social imperialism. We greet the Chinese people, CPC, and its leadership for their successful march towards socialism.

**Long Live Marxism-Leninism-Mao Zedong Thought!**

**Long Live October and November Revolutions!**

(26-10-1980)

## Some Problems Relating To Socialist Revolution In China

The Chinese Revolution (1949) was a New Democratic Revolution under the leadership of the proletariat, in an Asiatic country with semi-colonial and semi-feudal society. Therefore it was first of its kind also. It is quite natural that our people who were fighting against British imperialism were interested to know the experiences of this revolution so that they may apply them in their struggle, keeping the specific conditions of the country in view. The then Communist Party, the vanguard of the proletariat, has failed in this task. At certain stage (1949), a major section of the leadership of the Party had the audacity to question the correct theories which the Chinese Communists had developed by summing up the experiences of the revolution. It was wrong to expect this (learning from others) from a leadership which did not learn anything even from the experiences of revolutionary movement in our own country.

But the influence of the onward march of Chinese Revolution especially during anti-Japanese war, on the revolutionary national movement in our country was heavy. It began to take a definite shape when a medical mission led by Dr. Kotnis was sent to China by the National Congress, inspite of its having a reformist leadership. Though its purpose was to provide medical help to the revolutionary people of China, it was an expression of solidarity between the anti-British national movement of our country and the national liberation struggle of China against Japan.

There was another aspect of the influence which was deeper and more significant, which was on the revolutionary movement led by the then Communists. They were inspired by the victories of People's Liberation Army and the meagre Chinese Marxist literature that trickled into our country. Notable was Mao's *New Democracy* which explains all out-standing problems of Chinese revolution. The explanation applies to the revolutions of colonial and semi-colonial countries as well. The main problems are: The United Front, armed struggle, and the Communist Party which can lead them. The armed

struggle in Telangana was heavily influenced by it. At one stage, the leadership of the Andhra Provincial Committee proposed (1948) this line, as it was applied to the revolution of our country, which was rejected by the then Central leadership (the Polit-Buro). It was the beginning of the major rift in the Communist movement of our country which had widened as years passed resulting in the present CPI, CPI (M). Communist revolutionaries and the groups of various hues. In a sense, the division is between those who advocate the above line and those who oppose it. We, Communist revolutionaries, have worked out a general line basing on this strategy and are building the revolutionary movement according to it.

Almost all the groups who claim to be revolutionary and are said to have accepted Mao Zedong Thought, have differences on all outstanding problems facing Indian revolution. Though the struggle started for its correct application as long back as 1948, it could not last long. It was discontinued sooner (1951) only to start again in 1967-68. The struggle is going on for a decade and more and it will continue. We are confident that the struggle will result in resolving all out-standing problems facing the Indian revolution. Whether there were any individuals and sections of the Communists who were outside CPI and CPI(M) and at the same time worked for teachings of Mao is a point to be considered, because there are claims to this effect. It should be noted that not all revolutionaries inside the CPI had abandoned the teachings of Mao after 1951. In fact a good number of them who left CPI were those who followed the teachings of Mao. But there was no systematic and organised struggle to apply them to the practice of Indian revolution. Those who came out of CPI(M) were unanimous in their acceptance of Mao Zedong Thought.

## 2

The controversies regarding out-standing problems of Indian revolution are one thing. As we have said earlier, they are related to the application of Marxism-Leninism-Mao Zedong Thought in general and Communist revolutionaries in particular. A discussion is going on and the problems will be settled sooner or later. There are others who reject Mao Zedong Thought as such. They are outside the framework of Communist revolutionaries. A struggle is going on by way of settling accounts with them. This is another aspect of the problem.

There is another aspect, which is related to Chinese revolution in its two stages, the New Democratic and Socialist, CPC and its leadership role in the two stages and various periods. This is not the place where we can explain the gamut of controversies. Suffice it to say that the entire question was controversial ever since 1948 when it assumed a unique significance in that it was a successful revolution, first of its kind in a colonial and semi-colonial country which demanded a closer and careful study and application to our revolutionary practice, though our own experience will be the basis for it. In the recent past the controversy was related to the events which took place immediately after Mao's death (1976) till today. While the trend of the events was becoming clear every passing day the *Resolution on Certain Questions in the History of Our Party Since the Founding of the People's Republic of China* of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of China sets at rest most of the controversies if not all.

Let us go into some of the controversies which are connected with Cultural Revolution including Cultural Revolution itself. They were inside the CPC which were recently settled by its CC itself. Those who characterise the present CPC leadership as revisionist have already taken their positions in these controversies by defending Cultural Revolution and all the theories connected with it. Our own breakaway groups, past and present, have more or less identical views though some of them were having in the form of doubts and reservations. Therefore the controversies are not CPC's internal affair alone. They extend to Communist Revolutionaries and others in our country who accept Mao Zedong Thought. Hence their importance.

## 3

In China, the dictatorship of all revolutionary classes was established when the power was seized by the Communist Party and the People's Liberation Army on October 1, 1949. The national bourgeoisie was one of them. Com. Mao had to say the following about it:

".....There remain the national bourgeoisie; at the present stage, we can already do a good deal of suitable educational work with many of them. When the time comes to realise socialism, that is, to nationalise private enterprise, we shall carry the work of educating and remoulding them a step further. The people have

a powerful state apparatus in their hands -- there is no need to fear rebellion by the national bourgeoisie." (*On the People's Democratic Dictatorship*).

Instead of forcible elimination, Mao advocated educating and remoulding the national bourgeoisie. And it was done accordingly, during a long period of more than one and a half decade, till 1966. There is nothing to show that the work of education and remoulding of national bourgeoisie had ended in a failure. On the contrary, Mao had approvingly stated that such work was done even by 1949.

Mao had explained this phenomenon in relation to the theory of contradictions also. He said:

*"In our Country, the contradiction between the working class and the national bourgeoisie comes under the category of contradictions among the people. By and large the class struggle between the two is a class struggle within the ranks of the people, because the Chinese national bourgeoisie has a dual character in the period of the bourgeois-democratic revolution. It had both a revolutionary and a conciliationist side to its character. In the period of socialist revolution, exploitation of working class for profit constitutes one side of the character of the national bourgeoisie while its support to the Constitution and its willingness to accept socialist transformation constitute the other. The national bourgeoisie differs from the imperialists the landlords and the bureaucratic capitalists. The contradiction between the national bourgeoisie and the working class is one between the exploiter and the exploited and is by nature antagonistic. But in the concrete conditions of China, this antagonistic contradiction between the two classes, if properly handled, can be transformed into a non-antagonistic one and be resolved by peaceful methods. However, the contradiction between the working class and the national bourgeoisie will change into a contradiction between ourselves and the enemy if we do not handle it properly and do not follow the policy of uniting with, criticising, and educating the national bourgeoisie, or if the national bourgeoisie does not accept this policy of ours (*On the Correct Handling of Contradictions Among the People: Mao*).*

Mao was clear in stating that contradictions among the people are different from those between people and the enemy. While the former are non-antagonistic, the latter are antagonistic. Therefore, they can and should be resolved by peaceful means, i.e., by education

and remoulding. This was what he stated earlier in 1949 in his article, *On People's Democratic Dictatorship*. Nine years of experience (1949-57) had proved that the national bourgeoisie can be educated and remoulded. That is why Mao had confirmed that this policy was correct by characterising the contradiction between the working class and the national bourgeoisie as being non-antagonistic. The policy continued and non-antagonistic relations also continued till recently when the national bourgeoisie was eliminated as a class. He was clear that it should not be equated with the imperialists, the landlords and the bureaucrat capitalists with whom the people have antagonistic contradictions. The national bourgeoisie accepted the policy of education and remoulding, which was not changed so that the contradictions did not turn into antagonistic.

Mao, after mentioning about contradictions in a capitalist society, said the following about those in socialist society:

*".....The case is quite different with contradictions in socialist society; on the contrary they are not antagonistic and can be ceaselessly resolved by the socialist system itself.*

*"In socialist society the basic contradictions are still those between the relations of production and the productive forces and between the super structure and the economic base.....In saying that the socialist relations of production correspond better to the character of the productive forces than did the old relations of production, we mean that they allow the productive forces to develop at a speed unattainable in the old society. So that production can expand steadily and increasingly meet the constantly growing needs of the people (*On the Correct Handling of Contradictions Among the People*).*

Mao gives examples from the Chinese experience to explain these formulations, which we are not repeating. All this goes to show that the basic contradiction in the Chinese socialist society is between the relations of production and productive forces. And the contradictions are not antagonistic contradiction because antagonism is one form, but not the only one form of the struggle of the opposites.

*"In human history, antagonism between classes exists as a particular manifestation of the struggle of opposites. Consider the contradiction between the exploiting and the exploited classes. Such contradictory classes coexist for a long time in the same society,*

*be it slave society feudal society or capitalist society, and they struggle with each other; but it is not until the contradiction between the two classes develops to a certain stage that it assumes the form of open antagonism and develops into revolution....."*

**(Mao : On Contradiction).**

In a class society there exists a basic contradiction between the two opposing classes. For example; a slave-owner and a slave; feudal and a serf; capitalist and a worker. In the course of existence of these class societies there was a period in which there was no antagonism and the opposing classes lived more or less peacefully. There was a time when antagonism developed and revolutions and revolutionary upheavals took place. Under imperialism there were less peaceful conditions and more of antagonisms leading to revolutions and revolutionary movements.

Under conditions of socialism, we don't have a class society like that of capitalist etc. since the national bourgeoisie, an exploiting class, was educated and remoulded to be eliminated. Even while it was an exploiting class, the working class being in power, the contradiction between the national bourgeoisie and the working class, even though basic, was non-antagonistic because it was part and parcel of the people. Therefore the basic contradictions in the socialist society are between production relations and the productive forces and between the super structure and the economic base. They can be resolved peacefully.

In this connection Mao has said:

*"With overthrow of bureaucrat-capitalist class, the contradiction between the working class and the national bourgeoisie has become the principal contradiction in China: therefore, the national bourgeoisie should no longer be defined as an intermediate class". (Selected Works - Vol.V. p.77).*

This was written in 1952 as a note by way of correcting an error found in a document. This formulation is related to the period of transition and the principal contradiction at the time was between working class and the national bourgeoisie. In spite of being the principal contradiction, it was handled properly and correctly by the People's Democratic State and the party. Therefore it did not take an antagonistic form even in that period.

The Chinese working class had overthrown the landlord and bureaucrat-capitalist classes to seize power from them and not from the national bourgeoisie which was an ally during the stage of New Democratic Revolution. The CPC allowed it to continue as one among the people during the stage of socialist revolution and eliminated it peacefully, as a class by education and remoulding. In China, there is a danger of war of aggression from Soviet social imperialism. But the war is not imminent. Therefore, the principal contradiction is between production relations and productive forces though the contradiction between socialism and imperialism remains as ever. The given comment is not clear whether the contradiction is antagonistic or not antagonistic with the elimination of national bourgeoisie as an intermediary class. In view of this, there is no basis whatsoever to say that the contradiction between the working class and the national bourgeoisie is antagonistic and it is correct to say that in Socialist China, the basic contradictions are between production relations and productive forces and between the super structure and the economic base.

#### 4

Once we are clear about basic contradictions and the principal contradiction in Chinese socialist society, it is not difficult to find out the direction of the class struggle under conditions of socialism. When the Chiang Kai-shek clique was overthrown and the dictatorship of people's democracy was established after a prolonged armed struggle, the ruling classes were revolutionary classes headed by the proletariat. And the national bourgeoisie was one of them. The class struggle at the time took an antagonistic form between the remnants of overthrown classes, i.e., imperialism, landlords, and bureaucratic capitalists (counter-revolutionaries etc.) on one hand and the revolutionary classes who established their dictatorship. There was a class struggle between the working class and the national bourgeoisie which took the non-antagonistic form due to the policy of educating and remoulding which CPC adopted.

The class struggle took the same non-antagonistic form between other classes, i.e., working class and peasantry etc.

During stage of socialist revolution which is continuing now and will continue for a long time to come there is a dictatorship of the proletariat which is getting consolidated every passing day. There has been a controversy that: Since the national bourgeoisie, true

to its class nature, is opposed to socialism, the class struggle between the working class and the national bourgeoisie should take antagonistic form. It was adopted as the policy for one decade from 1966 to 1976 till Mao's death. This is the period of Cultural Revolution as it is called. The experience has proved that the theory and practice of class struggle between the working class and the national bourgeoisie taking antagonistic form was wrong because the bourgeoisie could be eliminated as a class through education and remoulding and the resistance from it was little or negligible. This is quite in accordance with what Mao said on the subject:

*"Today, matters stand as follows: The large scale turbulent class struggles of the masses, characteristic of times of revolution, have in the main come to an end, but class struggle is by no means entirely over" (Mao: 'On Correct Handling of Contradictions Among People').*

Mao explained further why the "class struggle is by no means entirely over" and adds: "In other words, time is needed for our socialist system to become established and consolidated for the masses to become accustomed to the new system and for government personnel to learn and acquire experience". Mao had made it clear beyond doubt that there will be class struggle under conditions of socialism, under conditions of dictatorship of proletariat. But it is of a different nature than that of a revolution when it is intense and turbulent. The class struggle which goes on during this stage takes a non-antagonistic form because it takes place between working class and its allies. This can happen because China was a semi-feudal country where the New Democratic Revolution was successful under the leadership of the Chinese proletariat. The dictatorship of people's democracy which was established as a result of this took the path of socialism. The New Democratic China transformed into Socialist China without a second revolution of new democratic type. At the same time it is a revolution. We call it continuous revolution in this sense.

Mao was also the author of the theory that bourgeoisie is a class against which the class struggle would be of an intense and turbulent nature, which goes against his earlier theory Socialist construction had to pay a heavy price by its practice because the target of intense class struggle was widened to hit the national bourgeoisie, which was uncalled for and which was undergoing a transformation by the policy of education and remoulding, and on the verge of being

eliminated as a class. That there could be resistance from incorrigible elements is obvious. But they could be dealt with in accordance with law.

In this connection, let us understand what Lenin has said in relation to this subject when there was a dictatorship of the proletariat in Russia:

*"In Russia, the dictatorship of the proletariat must inevitably differ in certain particulars from what it would be in the advanced countries owing to the very great backwardness and petty-bourgeois character of our country. But the basic forces - and the basic forms of social economy - are the same in Russia as in any capitalist country so that the peculiarities can apply only to what is of lesser importance". (Economics and Politics of the Era of Dictatorship of Proletariat).*

Here he compares and contrasts Russia with more advanced countries where there was no socialism as yet. But he did not extend it to the semi-colonial and semi-feudal countries of the East (Asia). He mentions certain particulars of Russia, being a backward country. Semi-colonial and semi-feudal country like China was not only more backward than Russia but differed fundamentally from it in that, it was a country oppressed by imperialism. Therefore the national bourgeoisie bore a different character than that of Russia, with a dual role, revolutionary as well as conciliationist. In Russia, bourgeoisie was counter-revolutionary during the state of bourgeois democratic revolution. With these characteristics and the proletarian policy of education and remoulding, the bourgeoisie is not the same as that of Russia. Therefore what Lenin said about peculiarities to be applied to what is of lesser importance assumed more importance than ever regarding China simply because it was a semi-colonial and semi-feudal country where socialism is being built.

Lenin says further:

*"Socialism means the abolition of classes. The dictatorship of the proletariat has done all it could to abolish classes. But classes can not be abolished at one stroke.*

*And the classes still remain and will remain in the era of dictatorship of the proletariat. The dictatorship will become unnecessary when the classes disappear. Without the dictatorship of the proletariat, they will not disappear.*

"Classes have remained, but in the era of the dictatorship of the proletariat, every class has undergone a change and the relations between the classes have also changed. The class struggle does not disappear under the dictatorship of the proletariat. It merely assumes different forms" (Emphasis by Lenin).\*

Lenin emphasised that there will be classes in the era of dictatorship of the proletariat. He also emphasises that every class undergoes a change. This should apply to the classes in Chinese society where there is a dictatorship of the proletariat. He also speaks of different forms of class struggle which obviously include non-antagonistic (He had in mind working peasant etc.) because antagonism, according to Mao, is only a form but not the only form.

Lenin has something to say about the exploiters and their resistance as following:

*"Having over-thrown the bourgeoisie and conquered political power, the proletariat has become the ruling class; it wields state power, it exercises control over means of production already socialised; it guides the wavering and intermediary elements and classes; it crushes the increasingly stubborn resistance of the exploiters. All these are specific tasks of the class struggle -- tasks which the proletariat formerly did not, and could not have, set itself".*

Here Lenin speaks of a different role of the proletariat as a ruling class, which was not there when it was struggling for power. The tasks mentioned here are hard to perform for a class which is new to power. Lenin also speaks of intermediary elements and classes. Finally, he speaks of stubborn resistance of exploiting classes and the need to crush it by the dictatorship of the proletariat. In China, CPC and Mao adopted a policy of education and remoulding of the exploiters, i.e., the national bourgeoisie and the rich peasants with success. This is a policy of class struggle of a non-antagonistic form. There were those who were not amenable to this policy. They were dealt in accordance with the prevailing law. There was no need to developing a turbulent class struggle for this purpose.

Then we have the following from Lenin which was mis-interpreted and wrongly applied to conditions in China:

*"The class of exploiters, the land owners and capitalists has not disappeared and can not disappear all at once under the*

\*See Lenin *On Concessions* in the Appendix.

*dictatorship of the proletariat. The exploiters have been smashed but not destroyed. They still have an international base in the form of international capital of which they are a branch. They still retain certain means of production in part, they still have money, they still have vast social connections. Because they have been defeated, the energy of their resistance has increased a hundred and a thousand fold.....:*

(All these extracts are taken from the **Economics and Politics of the Era of the Dictatorship of the Proletariat**. Collected Works.....Vol.30)

What Lenin said about the dictatorship of the proletariat in Russia applies to China as well with a difference which is the result of peculiarities of Chinese revolution. China consists of not only the mainland but Taiwan also. Taken together, we can have a comprehensive understanding of what Lenin said and what has happened in China. Taiwan has been the centre of Chiang Kai-shek's counter-revolution and US imperialism ever since the revolution ended in victory. It continues even today. The class of exploiters and their international base is there in Taiwan which is a part of China. Once it was strong and today it is too weak to pose a danger. It should be noted that China has been trying for a peaceful unification with Taiwan all along in spite of its being a centre of counter-revolution and US imperialism. Inside mainland they retained certain means of production in part; they have money; they still have vast social connections inside mainland as well, as Lenin said. Though they were deprived of means of production, the money and social relations are playing counter-revolutionary role, which is being handled firmly according to the law. This is going on today when there is socialism and dictatorship of proletariat. Though a small section of national bourgeoisie or its individuals have joined the counter-revolutionaries, by and large, the entire bourgeoisie was eliminated as a class through education and remoulding. It is one of the forms of class struggle. Therefore, the bitterest part of the struggle waged by overthrown classes can be seen from authorities in Taiwan and, to some extent, in mainland itself.

Therefore, there is no reason to contend that the entire bourgeoisie (national) had gone counter revolutionary in China under conditions of dictatorship of proletariat. In the same way, there is no point in the argument that the dictatorship of the proletariat should have used the same measure of force as was done in Russia.

The Cultural Revolution started by Com. Mao was the result of wrong theories which are inconsistent and opposed to his own theories on contradictions and class struggle though there was the question of assessment of internal situation of the CPC also. Treating the national bourgeoisie under conditions of dictatorship of the proletariat on par with overthrown classes by New Democratic Revolution was one of them. Secondly, the nature and content of the class struggle was treated to be the same as directed against those classes.

Com. Mao's earlier theories bore a different meaning than what was imparted to the Cultural Revolution of 1966-76. It was: Cultural Revolution was a revolution directed against imperialist and feudal culture; it is part of New Democratic Revolution and subordinated to it. During the stage of Socialist Revolution it is directed against bourgeois culture; it is a part of Socialist Revolution and subordinated to it. But the Cultural Revolution which was started in 1966 had nothing in common with this theory, with the result, it had given a serious blow to the building of socialism. Since it lasted for about 10 years, the harm done by it was more than what it would have been by committing small mistakes.

Here is what Com. Mao says about the New Democratic Culture:

*".....New Democratic Culture is the proletarian-led, anti-imperialist and anti-feudal culture of the broad masses."*

Mao defines Cultural Revolution as following:

*"A cultural revolution is the ideological reflection of the political and economic revolution and is in their service. In China there is a united front in the cultural as well as in the political revolution.  
(On New Democracy)*

It is clear that just like new democratic culture is anti-feudal and anti-imperialist, socialist culture is proletarian culture which is opposed to bourgeois culture. In the same way, the proletarian cultural revolution is directed against bourgeois culture and the remnants of imperialist and feudal culture.

But the Cultural Revolution which was started in 1966 had a different connotation. Here is what the Resolution of the Central Committee, CPC (August 1966) says:

*Although the bourgeoisie has been overthrown, it is still trying to use the old ideas, culture, customs and habits of the exploiting classes to corrupt the masses, capture their minds and endeavour to stage a come-back. The proletariat must do just the opposite: it must meet head on every challenge of the bourgeoisie in the ideological field and use the new ideas, culture, customs and habits of the proletariat to change the mental outlook of the whole society.*

Here the starting point itself took a wrong direction. The bourgeoisie (national) was not overthrown in China when the stage of socialist revolution had begun. Instead it was educated and remoulded and eliminated as a class, as is explained earlier. On the contrary, imperialism, landlords and bureaucratic capitalists were overthrown. They were trying to stage a come-back during the stage of socialist revolution also. It is quite natural that a section of the bourgeoisie refused to get remoulded and joined the enemy camp. But it did not make any fundamental difference in the role of the bourgeoisie. Therefore by treating bourgeoisie on par with already overthrown classes, the target of the attack was widened and got diverted. At the same time, it is still necessary to carry on struggle against bourgeois ideology, which is one of the chief tasks of the dictatorship of proletariat. But the struggle takes a non-antagonistic form.

The resolution further says:

*At present our objective is to struggle against and crush those persons in authority who are taking the capitalist road, to criticise and repudiate the bourgeois academic authorities.....*

Here the Cultural Revolution crossed its limits and passed on into the realm of political revolution. If there were deviations which lead to capitalist road, a struggle could be carried on to eliminate them, in accordance with the principles of party organisation. There was no need to seek other ways to crush them than the party and legal channels available to dictatorship of the proletariat. If the parts of the super structure -- education, literature, arts etc., -- do not correspond with the socialist economic base, they can be changed accordingly, to facilitate the consolidation and development of socialist system. But the cultural revolution took a different course.

The resolution further says:

*Since the cultural revolution is a revolution, it inevitably meets*

with a resistance. This resistance comes from those in authority who have wormed their way into the party and are taking the capitalist road.

The attempts at restoration of capitalism have to be fought on two fronts: It has to be fought inside the party. It is likely that there were differences on the policy to be adopted in this respect. Building socialism in a former semi-colonial and semi-feudal country like China is a new experience and there are likely to be differences on the policies to be adopted. Instead of seeing them as differences, perhaps serious also, they were treated as attempts at restoration and the advocates of the line were branded as Capitalist Roaders. It must be noted that most of the comrades who differed with the policies of cultural revolution were not new comers. They were veterans belonging to the period of Long March. How can they worm their way into the Party (CPC) when they themselves were established as leaders?

There is a difference between resistance and resistance. One may take antagonistic form and another may take a non-antagonistic form. While educating and remoulding the national bourgeoisie, the proletariat is bound to meet with resistance from it before it transformed itself so as to get eliminated. By and large, this is mostly non-antagonistic form of resistance. A few of them put up stiff resistance which was put down by the dictatorship of the proletariat. This policy will continue as long as there are counter-revolutionaries putting up resistance.

Russian communists had to meet a different type of resistance in the form of civil war waged by the overthrown classes for about three years. Lenin had said the following in this context:

*"The dictatorship of proletariat means a persistent struggle, bloody and bloodless, violent and peaceful, military and economic, educational and administrative -- against the forces and traditions of the old society. The force of habit, of habit in millions and tens of millions, is a most formidable force....."* (*"Left"-wing Communism -- An Infantile Disorder*).

That there will be a continuous struggle as long as there is a dictatorship of the proletariat is obvious. Sometimes it takes the form of the bloody struggle and some other times bloodless. The same is the case with violent and peaceful forms. Unless there is a war which is bloody and violent, the struggle takes the bloodless

and peaceful form, once the counter-revolution is crushed. Lenin speaks of military and economic, educational and administrative fields but not political. Whereas Cultural Revolution was developed into a political revolution for which there was no theoretical or objective basis whatsoever. China had to face intense resistance both at home and abroad when it was encircled by both U S imperialism and Soviet Social imperialism (upto 1971). But when the encirclement was broken and relations with US were normalised, situation had improved to a greater extent, though the problem of Taiwan continued to exist in a different form.

The Chinese revolution had undergone civil war and anti-Japanese national war for about more than two decades. Therefore, some of the tasks of New Democratic Revolution, including Cultural Revolution, were completed in a major part of China, by the time the dictatorship of people's democracy was established. The rest of them were completed by the dictatorship itself. This was not the case with Russia, where all the tasks were completed only after the proletariat had seized power. Therefore, the amount of resistance was more in Russia than what it was in China, though Taiwan is a monument of such resistance in varying degrees, for the last three decades and more. Added to this, there is Dalai Lama, the representative of Tibetan counter-revolution, who staged an unsuccessful revolt in Tibet and who is now taking shelter in India, carrying on his counter-revolutionary activities. He is having the patronage and protection of Indian reaction.

Therefore it is inobjective and wrong to say that the national bourgeoisie which was re-educated and remoulded played a counter-revolutionary role and men in "authority" were its representatives. The fact of the matter was, there are others who are counter-revolutionaries (imperialists, landlords, bureaucratic capitalists) who are to be treated as such. Therefore the class struggle was off the mark, widening the target was wrong and disruptive. The Cultural Revolution which was conducted as a political revolution was wrong. Instead there were possibilities of working out ways and means so as to allow the people to participate and implement mass line to carry on Cultural Revolution as a part of socialist revolution. Mao did not adopt such a course. Instead, he adopted the course of political revolution which had disastrous effects on socialism in China. Linbiao affair and the activities of the "Gang of Four" are only the extreme cases.

These are the main points to be understood about the recent developments in China in the recent past (1966-76).

## 6

These developments in China are a much-talked subject in our country. For that matter, it was the case with every phase of Chinese revolution. We can not say that the discussion will come to an end with the CPC leadership adopting a resolution on the subject (*Resolution on Certain Questions in the History of Our Party Since the Founding of the People's Republic of China*). There will be differences on the Resolution also. So the discussion will continue. We have come across persons who claim to be revolutionaries and who go on discussing about China endlessly, not bothering what is happening around them. That apart, there are some parties, groups and individuals who were waiting for a day when the present leadership of the CPC would denounce Mao Zedong Thought outright. But to their disappointment it did not materialise. Therefore they are busy working out their own theories -- wrong theories at that -- that the present leadership's adherence to the Marxism-Leninism-Mao Zedong Thought is not genuine. There is no basis for such a contention.

We in our country have been supporting Cultural Revolution in all its aspects with the understanding that a struggle is going on against non-proletarian ideologies, more so against reactionary ones with participation of the masses of the people, which is necessary to build socialism. We thought that it is new to the Marxism-Leninism and it is essential to the socialist countries to have it. We understood the excesses within this frame-work alone. At the same time we had our own opinions of Charu Majumdar's application of it to Indian Revolution. We had never reconciled with it and carried on struggle against it. (See: *The Left Trend Among Indian Revolutionaries*)\* Therefore it was not difficult for us to understand the struggle which was going on inside CPC and China, though we had our own limitations. It is but natural that the communist revolutionaries who are busy with building a mass revolutionary movement and a revolutionary organisation to lead it are in a better position to understand the nature and content of the struggle which has been going on in China, than those who are isolated from the people.

\*An extract from this work is published in p.33.

We are firmly of opinion that the resolution adopted by the Central Committee of CPC is basically a correct appraisal of the developments ever since the founding of the People's Republic of China. It is necessary that the communist revolutionaries in our country review our own work, and learn from our experiences so that we may advance further.

On the occasion of 32nd anniversary of founding the People's Republic of China, we are greeting the CPC, and the people of China, together with its leadership, and wish its success in building socialism.

**Long Live Chinese Socialist Revolution.**

**Long Live Marxism-Leninism-Mao Zedong Thought.**

(17-10-1981)

## Twelfth Congress Of Communist Party Of China

The much-awaited 12th Congress of Communist Party of China is concluded with a note of confidence in the present as well as future. Some expected that there would be chaos and disorder in China after Mao Zedong. Contrary to the expectations there was consolidation and development in all directions.

The present Chinese leadership introduced many changes in internal policies though the independent foreign policy continued to be the same. The Four Modernisations, i.e., modernising the Industry, Agriculture, Defence and Science and Technology, which were hampered due to "Cultural Revolution" were revived. Modernisations are going in full swing with certain amount of success. This is meant for strengthening socialist system in China. The individual economy which is introduced is to supplement socialist economy and to strengthen it. Foreign capital is being used for the purpose of Four Modernisations. Since the dictatorship of the proletariat is guiding and controlling the individual economy and import of foreign capital, there is no danger of their influencing, not to speak of overwhelming, the socialist economy in China. The Congress has not only endorsed this policy, but it has worked out a place of action for future two decades. The Chinese leadership is confident that China will become highly modernised and industrially developed country.

Besides working for a high level of material civilisation, the Congress has given a call to build a high level of socialist spiritual civilisation.

Some were of the view that the present leadership would bury the Mao Zedong Thought, just as Khrushchev had done about Stalin and his contribution towards development of Soviet Union into a highly developed country. But it did not happen. Instead the Congress proclaimed that the ideology of the Communist Party of China will continue to be Marxism-Leninism-Mao Zedong Thought with such corrections as were necessitated by the Cultural Revolution. Such corrections were made by Mao to some of the theories advocated

by Stalin. Therefore one can safely conclude that the Party will continue to have the same ideology as it had in the past. But there will be no such thing as treating Mao as God or demi-God, to which Mao himself was opposed though he was treated as such while he was alive.

The process of normalisation of China's relations with US started when Mao and Chou were alive. China was opposed to US supply of arms to Taiwan and maintaining relations with it independent of China. As long as US continues this policy, the process of normalisation is bound to receive setbacks. US, a super power, is bound to face a defeat in this policy also, as is the case with other policies. Those who thought that China will align itself with US and reconcile with it are disappointed to find that it is not so. It is maintaining its opposition to the policies of US hegemonism. It opposed US-backed Israel's war against Lebanon. It did not take sides with US as against Soviet Union in Polish affairs. It did not support US when it extended its "sanctions" against Soviet Union in a bid to stop Britain, France and West Germany from supplying finance and capital equipment to Soviet Union for its pipeline project meant for supplying gas for Western Europe. Chinese policy of importing technology etc, from US, does not make any change in its policy of opposition when there is a need for it.

China's relations with Japan are closer. It is necessary for its modernisation because it is a developed country situated next to its door. At the same time it is opposing Japanese militarism, which has raised its head openly in the recent past. It scored its initial success, and the Japanese authorities have come down and agreed to delete references in the text books which glorify Japanese militarism, which has caused havoc not only to China, but the countries of East as a whole.

China's relations with Soviet Union continue to be antagonistic because of the latter's hostility by maintaining a large contingent of armed forces, equipped with highly sophisticated nuclear weapons, along the borders including those of Mongolia. The border dispute apart, such concentration of troops has been a source of hostile relations between the two countries. Added to this, Soviet Union's stationing of troops in Afghanistan, a bordering country, has only worsened the situation. It is following such policies which go to show that it is for world hegemony. Therefore it has to be fought as a super power endangering the world peace and the national

independence of weak countries. In particular, China is opposed to war with Soviet Union on theoretical as well as political grounds as it has made clear so many times. But there are some, including Soviet Union, who say that China wants war with it. But they should know that China, a backward country till recently, is busy with its programme of modernisation. Therefore it can not afford a war with Soviet Union, the strongest military power in the world. This is the demand of practical politics. Therefore their stand does not hold water. Though there is no possibility of the two countries coming together on ideological level the relations can be normalised once Soviet Union abandons its hostile policies towards China. But it is a far cry, as long as wisdom does not dawn on Soviet Union. China's attitude towards recent developments in East and West Europe is a pointer to show that it is not interested in opposing Soviet Union blindly. But it is consistent in opposing all its hegemonic policies.

China is supporting the liberation movements all over the world. Those who say that it is not supporting them, can not substantiate their contention with facts. Hence their asseertion is blind. The Chinese leadership has clarified often that it is not for *export* of revolutions. It thinks that the revolution in a country is the concern of its people. Hence the *export* of revolutions is neither possible nor necessary. The governments who are afraid of the revolutions in the respective countries, more so of ASEAN, should take note of this fact. If they continue to harbour such fears, they are bound to remain in the camp of one or the other super power. They should also know that the revolutions will end in succes sooner or later.

The reports from China show that all these subjects were discussed in the Congress and appropriate decisions were taken. They provide the country the stability and the prosperity it required. The changes which are brought in the structure of the party are such that all the senior leaders are in the keyposts and we can expect that the same policies will continue in future also.

We, in our country, are much concerned about China because it is our neighbour. Mrs.Gandhi and pro-Soviet parties are raising a hue and cry about developing closer relations between China and Pakistan because they are neighbours. Their relations are helping maintaining peace and stability in South Asia. Added to this, they help Pakistan in defending Pakistan's national independence and sovereignty. There is no reason why India should be afraid of

their friendship. China is desirous of normalising its relations with our country also. The delegations from our country are returning satisfied with the good-will of Chinese people and the authorities towards our country. It is time that we normalise our relations with China. China is seeking normalisation in spite of Mrs.Gandhi's closest relations with Soviet Union and it is her responsibility to prove that such relations are not a hurdle. But the fact of the matter is that the relations have proved to be a hurdle. The border dispute is said to be another hurdle in this respect. It can be resolved if the government of India has an independent policy of its own. After all, such disputes are political and not territorial. Therefore a political settlement is possible if it follows an independent foreign policy uncontrolled by Soviet Union. Once the relations are normalised both countries will benefit.

Democratic and anti-imperialist forces all over the world are happy to see that socialist China is advancing under the present leadership. But a section of revolutionaries and those who claim to be so, are not able to see the specific conditions in which socialism is built in China. As result, they are drawing wrong conclusions that the leadership is revisionist, and has taken a capitalist road, and renounced socialism. Their understanding is wrong and inobjective. If the experience is any guide, they should have already revised it. By adopting such an attitude, they are harming not only international communist movement but the revolution in our country also

Likewise, the CPI and CPI(M) are opposed to CPC in varying degrees from their revisionist and neorevisionist standpoints. They have been slandering against CPC that it is opposing Soviet Union blindly and has gone to the extent of lining up with US. Themselves being revisionists, they can not see Soviet Union as a social imperialist super power even after its occupation of Afghanistan. That apart, they proved to be wrong in their contention that CPC is collaborating with US, as explained above. They have no ground to stand on that it is opposed to liberation movements because facts are contrary.

The 12th Congress of Chinese Communist Party is undoubtedly an important milestone for building socialism in China.

(20-9-1982)

APPENDIX  
**Lenin On Concessions**

(We are publishing the text of a speech by Lenin. This will serve as a guideline to understand some of the present developments in China, particularly China's dealings with West and Japan. The text is taken from Volume 31 of Lenin's **Collected Works**, Moscow 1966. It is published in the said edition under the title 'SPEECH DELIVERED AT A MEETING OF CELLS' SECRETARIES OF THE MOSCOW ORGANISATION OF THE R.C.P (B) NOVEMBER 26, 1920'. -Editor).

In the first written question submitted, a comrade asks whether it is true that all institutions of administration are to be transferred to Petrograd. That is inaccurate. The rumour has arisen from the fact that the Moscow Soviet has had the idea of transferring non-essential institutions from Moscow to Petrograd because of the housing-shortage in the Capital. It appears that Petrograd can accept up to 10,000 Soviet office-workers, who number 200,000 in Moscow. To study all aspects of the matter a committee has been set up, which is now working. Its findings will be submitted to the Council of People's Commissars. So you see that this rumour is inaccurate in some respects.

The second question and the third ask about concessions. You will allow me to dwell on the subject.

In one of his books, Spargo, the American Socialist, a man who is something like our Alexinsky, and has a vindictive hate of the Bolsheviks, speaks of concessions as proof of the collapse of communism. Our Mensheviks say the same thing. The challenge has been made, and we are ready to take it up. Let us consider the question in terms of the facts. Who has got the worse of it, we or the European bourgeoisie? For three years they have been calumniating us calling us usurpers and bandits; they have had recourse to all and every means to overthrow us, but have now had to confess to failure, which is in itself a victory for us. The Mensheviks assert that we are pledged to defeating the world bourgeoisie on our own. We have, however, always said that we are only a single link in the chain of the world revolution, and

have never set ourselves the aim of achieving victory by our own means. The world revolution has not yet come about, but then we have not yet been overcome. While militarism is decaying, we are growing stronger; not we, but *they* had the worse of it.

They now want to subdue us by means of a treaty. Until the revolution comes about, bourgeois capital will be useful to us. How can we speed up the development of our economy whilst we are economically weaker country? We can do that with the aid of bourgeois capital. We now have before us two drafts of concessions. One of them is for a ten-year concession in Kamchatka. We were recently visited by an American multimillionaire, who told us very frankly of the reasons behind the treaty, viz., that America wants to have a base in Asia in case of a war against Japan. This multi-millionaire said that if we sold Kamchatka to America, he could promise us such enthusiasm among the people of the United States that the American Government would immediately recognise the Soviets of Russia. If we gave them only the lease, there would be less enthusiasm. He is now on his way to America, where he will make it known that Soviet Russia is a far cry from what people believed her to be.

We have till now been more than a match for the world bourgeoisie, because they are incapable of uniting. The Treaties of Brest-Litovsk and Versailles have both divided them. An intense hostility is now developing between America and Japan. We are making use of this and are offering a lease of Kamchatka instead of giving it away gratis; after all Japan has taken a huge expanse of our territory in the Far East, this by force of arms. It is far more to our advantage to run no risk, grant a lease of Kamchatka, and receive part of its products, the more so for our being unable, in any case, to run or exploit it. The treaty has not been signed, but it is already being spoken of in Japan with the utmost anger. Through this treaty we have aggravated the differences between our enemies.

The second kind of concession is represented by our granting the lease of several dessiatines\* of timberland in Archangel Gubernia

\*Dessiatine—a Russian unit of land measure equal to 2.7 acres—Ed.

which, despite all our efforts, we cannot fully exploit. We are arranging a kind of checker-board pattern, with sections of timberland we shall be exploiting alternating with the leased sections, so that our workers will be able to learn the use of felling equipment from their neighbours. All this is very much to our advantage.

And now for the final aspect of the question.

Concessions do not mean peace; they too are a kind of warfare, only in another form, one that is to our advantage. Previously war was waged with the aid of tanks, cannon and the like, which hindered our work. The war will now be conducted on the economic front. They may perhaps try to restore the freedom to trade. But they cannot get along without us. Besides they have to submit to all our laws, and our workers can learn from them, in case of war and we must always be prepared for war against the bourgeoisie. The property will remain in our hands by virtue of the laws of war. I repeat: concessions are a continuation of war on the economic front, but here we do not destroy our productive forces, but develop them. They will no doubt try to evade our laws and deceive us, but we have the appropriate bodies to deal with that such as the All-Russia Cheka, the Moscow Cheka, the Gubernia Cheka, and so on, and we are sure that we shall win.

Eighteen months ago we wanted to sign a peace that would have given Denikin and Kolchak a vast territory. They turned this down and in consequence lost everything. We have mapped out the right road to world revolution, but this road is not a straight one, but goes in zigzags. We have weakened the bourgeoisie, so that it cannot overcome us by force of arms. They used to ban our conduct of communist propaganda, but there can be no question of that at present, and it would be ridiculous to demand such things. They are decaying from within, and that gives us strength. We do not imagine that we shall defeat the world bourgeoisie by force of arms alone, and the Mensheviks are wrong in ascribing that intention to us.

I did not hear Comrade Kamenev's report on the Conference but I shall say that the latter teaches us a lesson: no matter how the struggle proceeded and whatever memories remain, we must

put a complete end to everything. It should be remembered that the consolidation of our forces is the main and most important task. Tasks of economic construction await us. That transition will be difficult after six years of war and we have to tackle the problem with united forces, on the platform of the All-Russia Conferences' resolutions, which must be carried out. The struggle against red-tape methods, and economic and administrative work call for unity. What is expected of us is propaganda by example: the non-Party masses have to be set an example. It will be no easy matter to carry out the resolutions, but we must concentrate all our forces on that task and set about working in all earnest. I call upon you to do that.

### **Concessions And The Development Of Capitalism**

The Soviet government is inviting foreign capitalists to obtain concessions in Russia.

What is a concession? It is a contract between the government and a capitalist who undertakes to organise or improve production (for example, felling and floating timber, extracting coal, oil, ore, etc.) and to pay the government a share of the product obtained, keeping the rest as his profit.

Is it right for the Soviet government to invite foreign capitalists after expelling the Russian land-owners and capitalists? Yes, it is because, seeing that the workers' revolution in other countries is delayed, we have to make some sacrifices in order to achieve a rapid and even immediate improvement in the condition of the workers and peasants. The sacrifice is that over a number of years we shall be giving away to capitalists tens of millions of goods of valuable products. The improvement in the condition of the workers and peasants is that we shall immediately obtain additional quantities of petroleum, paraffin oil, salt, coal, farming implements, and so forth. We have no right to forego the opportunity of immediately improving the condition of the workers and peasants, for impoverishment makes it essential, and our sacrifices will not be fatal.

But is it not dangerous to invite the capitalism? Yes, it does

imply a development of capitalism, but this is not dangerous, because power will still be in the hands of the workers and peasants, and the land-owners and capitalists will not be getting back their property. A concession is something in the nature of a contract lease. The capitalist becomes, for a specified period, the lessee of certain part of state property under a contract, but he does not become the owner. The state remains the owner.

The Soviet government will see to it that the capitalist lessee abides by the terms of the contract, that the contract is to our advantage, and that, as a result, the condition of the workers and peasants is improved. On these terms the development of capitalism is not dangerous, and the workers and peasants stand to gain by obtaining a larger quantity of products.

(April 25, 1921)

(Reproduced from **Collected Works.V.I.Lenin, Vol.32.**)

## The Proletarian Line Publications

—(Written by Com. D.V. Rao)

- |   |          |
|---|----------|
| 1) People's Democratic Revolution in India - an explanation of the programme    | Rs. 16/- |
| 2) Agrarian Revolution and Our Tasks  | 3/-      |
| 3) Refutation of wrong trends advocating withdrawal of Telangana Armed Struggle | 5/-      |
| 4) An Anthology of articles   | 2/-      |

**Read !**

### **The Proletarian Line**

Monthly Organ of the  
Communist Revolutionaries of India

**Subscription Rates :**

Annual        Rs. 50/-  
Half Yearly    Rs. 25/-

For details :

Editor, THE PROLETARIAN LINE,  
16-2-146/6, Malakpet, Hyderabad-500 036.

**Why should the Indian people accept  
Marxism-Leninism and Mao Zedong  
Thought?**

.....      .....      .....

.....      .....      .....

**The people of India should accept  
the ideology which can be a guide to  
Indian people's revolution. Marxism-  
Leninism and Mao Zedong Thought is  
such a revolutionary ideology.**

**—D. V. Rao  
(P. 9 and P. 11)**