

10

Liberation

August, '68

- * *Where Do Correct Ideas Come From ?*
- * *Is India Really Independent ?*
- * *Shackles of 1947 Must Be Smashed*
- * *China Points The Way*
- * *Real Face of Soviet 'Aid' To India*
- * *Support Afro-American Struggle*
- * *Kerala UF Govt. Unmasked*
- * *Flames of Naxalbari Spread*

LIBERATION

Where Do Correct Ideas Come From ? —Mao Tse-tung	... 3
Notes :	
<i>The Shackles of 1947 Must Be Smashed</i>	... 6
<i>Are They Marxists or Reaction's Henchmen ?</i>	
<i>How They 'Strengthen' 'Democratic' Movement</i>	
<i>Flames of Naxalbari Spread to Uttar Pradesh</i>	
<i>China Points the Way</i>	
Study "Problems of Strategy in China's Revolutionary War"	... 17
Make a Class Analysis of Factionalism	... 33
Soviet Revisionists Step up Over-all Collaboration With Indian Reactionaries	... 38
On the 20th Anniversary of Malaya's Anti-British War of Liberation	... 42
Is India Really Independent ?—S. Guna	... 49
Soviet "Aid" to India—What Does It Mean ? —Shankar Sen	... 61
Support Afro-American Struggle	... 73

Editor-in-Chief :
Sushital Ray Choudhury

We have always maintained that the revolution must rely on the masses of the people, on everybody's taking a hand, and have opposed relying merely on a few persons issuing orders. The mass line, however, is still not being thoroughly carried out in the work of some comrades; they still rely solely on a handful of people working in solitude. One reason is that, whatever they do, they are always reluctant to explain it to the people they lead and that they do not understand why or how to give play to the initiative and creative energy of those they lead. Subjectively, they too want everyone to take a hand in the work, but they do not let other people know what is to be done or how to do it. That being the case, how can everyone be expected to get moving and how can anything be done well? To solve this problem the basic thing is, of course, to carry out ideological education on the mass line, but at the same time we must teach these comrades many concrete methods of work.

—Mao Tse-tung

Where Do Correct Ideas Come From ?

—Mao Tse-tung

WHERE do correct ideas come from? Do they drop from the skies? No. Are they innate in the mind? No. They come from social practice, and from it alone; they come from three kinds of social practice, the struggle for production, the class struggle and scientific experiment. It is man's social being that determines his thinking. Once the correct ideas characteristic of the advanced class are grasped by the masses, these ideas turn into a material force which changes society and changes the world. In their social practice, men engage in various kinds of struggle and gain rich experience, both from their successes and from their failures. Countless phenomena of the objective external world are reflected in a man's brain through his five sense organs—the organs of sight, hearing, smell, taste and touch. At first, knowledge is perceptual. The leap to conceptual knowledge, *i.e.*, to ideas, occurs when sufficient perceptual knowledge is accumulated. This is one process in cognition. It is the first stage in the whole process of cognition, the stage leading from objective matter to subjective consciousness, from existence to ideas. Whether or not one's consciousness or ideas (including theories, policies, plans or measures) do correctly reflect the laws of the objective external world is not yet proved at this stage, in which it is not yet possible to ascertain whether they are correct or not. Then comes the second stage in the process of cognition, the stage leading from consciousness back to matter, from ideas back to existence, in which the knowledge gained in the first stage is applied in social practice to ascertain whether the theories, policies, plans and measures meet with the anticipated success. Generally speaking, those that succeed are correct and those that fail are incorrect, and this is especially true of man's struggle with nature. In social struggle, the forces representing the advanced class sometimes suffer defeat not because their

ideas are incorrect but because, in the balance of forces engaged in struggle, they are not as powerful for the time being as the forces of reaction ; they are therefore temporarily defeated, but they are bound to triumph sooner or later. Man's knowledge makes another leap through the test of practice. This leap is more important than the previous one. For it is this leap alone that can prove the correctness or incorrectness of the first leap in cognition, *i.e.*, of the ideas, theories, policies, plans or measures formulated in the course of reflecting the objective external world. There is no other way of testing truth. Furthermore, the one and only purpose of the proletariat in knowing the world is to change it. Often, correct knowledge can be arrived at only after many repetitions of the process leading from matter to consciousness and then back to matter, that is, leading from practice to knowledge and then back to practice. Such is the Marxist theory of knowledge, the dialectical materialist theory of knowledge. Among our comrades there are many who do not yet understand this theory of knowledge. When asked the source of their ideas, opinions, policies, methods, plans and conclusions, eloquent speeches and long articles, they consider the question strange and cannot answer it. Nor do they comprehend that matter can be transformed into consciousness and consciousness into matter, although such leaps are phenomena of everyday life. It is therefore necessary to educate our comrades in the dialectical materialist theory of knowledge, so that they can orientate their thinking correctly, become good at investigation and study and at summing up experience, overcome difficulties, commit fewer mistakes, do their work better, and struggle hard so as to build China into a great and powerful socialist country and help the broad masses of the oppressed and exploited throughout the world in fulfilment of our great internationalist duty.

—May 1963

This passage, written by Comrade Mao Tse-tung, is from the *Draft Decision of the Central Committee of the Chinese Communist Party on Certain Problems in Our Present Rural Work*, which was drawn up under the direction of Comrade Mao Tse-tung.

NOTES

THE SHACKLES OF 1947

MUST BE SMASHED !

Twenty-two years ago the contradiction between the Indian people and British imperialism became so acute that it erupted into an unprecedentedly violent revolutionary storm which swept through the country. A most significant thing was that, for the first time in 90 years after the Great Revolt of 1857, masses of soldiers, naval ratings and air-force men openly participated in revolutionary activities against their hated imperialist oppressors. This fact completely changed the character of the movement in two important respects : (1) the National Congress led by the Right-wing reactionary Gandhi-Nehru-Patel-Rajendraprasad-Rajagopalachari clique was unable to keep the upsurge under their control, and (2) the British imperialists were not only deprived of the help of this clique through which they used to disrupt people's movements from within, but were also unable militarily to suppress the roused people by naked force. The situation thus proved extremely favourable for the people and extremely dangerous for the imperialists and their lackeys. Common fear of the impending revolution brought the imperialists and the reactionary Congress leaders, representing the feudal and reactionary bourgeois interests, together. Jointly they set about opposing and hurling back the revolutionary tide. When the people were fighting heroic battles in the cities and many rural areas against the ferocious bloody oppression by the British and eagerly working for their overthrow, Nehru, Patel and other reactionary Congress leaders forsook the people openly and obediently joined the so-called Interim Government as apprentices under the British viceroy Wavell. Encouraged by this, the imperia-

lists at once struck with their most poisonous weapon by engineering largescale communal conflicts among the people in Calcutta, Noakhali, Bihar and elsewhere. This proved fatal for the cause of the revolution and helped to change the situation into a favourable one for the imperialists and the Congress counter-revolutionaries led by Nehru. It was on the basis of this that the imperialists and Nehru and Co. acted feverishly to work out a deal that would "stabilise" this favourable situation in the interests of the British imperialists and their Indian lackeys. In the process, the reactionary Congress leaders openly and cynically sold away such basic national interests as unity and independence of India and willingly accepted the partition of the country and the continuation of imperialist control in the form of Dominion Status. The so-called 'transfer of power' effected on August 15, 1947, once again demonstrated the truth, which the Marxist-Leninists in India have repeatedly stressed, that the Indian bourgeoisie is utterly incapable of leading the democratic revolution against imperialism and feudalism. On the contrary, they showed themselves up as utterly reactionary and capable of giving up even such vital national interests as independence and unity of the country for the sake of their own narrow class interests and the interests of the feudal lords and the imperialists. By betraying the people's interests and the basic interests of the country, the Indian ruling classes led by Nehru willingly chose for itself the role of a lackey of imperialism and an inveterate enemy of the Indian people.

However, the serious defeat of the revolutionary forces in 1945-47 was primarily due to the fact that the revisionist leadership of the CPI led by Joshi, Ranadive, Dange and Co. refused to break away from reactionary bourgeois influence and to allow the proletariat to take an independent principled stand and lead forward the anti-imperialist struggle of the people. On the contrary, they forced a

capitulationist line on the Party and toed the line of the reactionary Congress leaders. It is this which proved extremely helpful to the British imperialists and the Congress reactionaries in disrupting the revolutionary upsurge and made it possible for them to carry out successfully their evil designs against the people.

The transfer of power enabled the imperialists to confuse, disrupt and suppress the revolutionary masses of India much more effectively than they ever could themselves. Many years later, Mountbatten, the chief imperialist architect of the deal, openly gloated over this fact. He said :

"The danger lies, as always, in subversion. It is much less since Indian independence.

"From that point of view, the withdrawal of Britain had strengthened India's ability to destroy Communist cells and counteract Communist propaganda. They [i.e., the Congress rulers] put down the Communists whereas the British couldn't without arousing the Indians' sympathy for the Communists." [At a press conference at the Citadel, the military college of South Carolina, USA; *Hindusthan Standard*, Dec. 22, 1962].

At that time the imperialists were launching a general offensive against the revolutionary people of Asia. U.S. imperialism in China and the Philippines, the British in Malaya, the Dutch in Indonesia, and the French in Indo-China were carrying on bloody aggressive wars against the revolutionary national liberation movements. In India, for reasons stated above, the British imperialists commissioned the services of the Congress reactionaries led by Nehru for this purpose. The violent, cruel and bloody suppression campaign launched by the Nehru government during 1947-50 against the anti-feudal revolutionary struggle of heroic Telangana peasants and all progressive democratic people's movements, its banning of the Communist Party and progressive mass organisations, were objectively, actually

an integral part of the imperialists' bloody war of suppression against the revolutionary peoples of Asia. The Nehru government was merely carrying out in India what imperialists needed most but were unable to do themselves. The Nehru government was defending, on behalf of the imperialists, a most important base of imperialism in Asia against the anti-imperialist struggle of the Indian people. Thus, from the very first day of their coming into power, the reactionary National Congress leaders led by the arch-reactionary Gandhi, Nehru, Patel and Co. were branded by history as bitter enemies of the Indian people and of India's freedom, independence, unity and democracy.

The ruthless determination of the Nehru government to preserve the vested interests of imperialism, feudalism and the Indian bourgeoisie is clearly demonstrated from the following facts published by the Nehru government itself. During the period from August 15, 1947 to August 1, 1950, its police or armed forces opened fire on the people no less than 1,982 times, killed 3,784 persons and wounded nearly 10,000, jailed 50,000 and shot down 82 prisoners inside jails. A report in the British paper *New Statesman and Nation* (September 10, 1949) said, "In India, I am told on excellent authority, there are at least 100,000, and perhaps as many as 200,000 Communists and others 'detained';.....it means that the National Government of India has more people detained without trial than the British ever had at a single time."

What Nehru was doing in India was exactly what the imperialists were trying to do all over Asia, namely, preserving the old Asia, an age-old victim of imperialist plunder and oppression. But the new Asia, free from imperialist and feudal exploitation and oppression, was already emerging irresistibly in the vast plains of China. Nehru was championing the interests of imperialism and domestic reaction, which the people of India and Asia were trying to destroy. Nehru, and the government that he

led were, therefore, a natural and inveterate enemy of the revolutionary people of India and Asia, and more specifically of the emerging revolutionary China under the leadership of great Mao Tse-tung, which spearheaded the new Asia.

The thundering victory of the great Chinese Revolution in 1949 decisively split Asia into two—the Asia still under imperialist domination and struggling for national liberation and the new, independent, powerful and vigorous Asia shedding the brilliance of a thousand suns, represented by China.

Since the victory of the Chinese revolution, imperialism headed by the U.S. imperialists has been trying to achieve two things in Asia: to preserve whatever parts of Asia remained under their domination and to destroy China and peoples' revolutionary movements in all countries in order to restore the rule of exploitation and oppression there. For this, they chose India as their biggest and most important base—militarily, politically and economically. They put great reliance on Nehru to help them achieve their goal. Nehru was, in fact, the key man on whom the U.S. imperialists relied for their counter-revolutionary, anti-China, criminal designs. "Washington's hopes for a democratic rallying-point in Asia have been pinned on India,...and on the man who determines India's policy—Prime Minister Jawaharlal Nehru." (*New York Times*, October, 1949). And, "He [Nehru] is in a sense the counterweight on the democratic side to Mao Tse-tung." [Ibid, August 29, 1950]. It must be admitted that Nehru willingly accepted this new job from the U.S. imperialists. The entire policy of the Nehru government since 1949 was closely linked and directed to further the objectives of the U.S. imperialists in Asia.

Imperialism needed a "counterweight", an "alternative" show place opposed to New China, to smother, or at least to diminish the tremendous impact that China's brilliant success both in smashing the power of imperialism and

domestic reaction and in making amazing economic progress was having upon the oppressed peoples of Asia and Africa. In short, the revolutionary path, i.e., the "Chinese path," which is also the only correct path to liberation from bondage of imperialism and its lackeys, had to be challenged on behalf of world imperialism and reaction by upholding an 'alternative path' before the oppressed millions in India, Asia and elsewhere, the so-called "democratic path," in order to keep them away from the "Chinese path" and thus ensure imperialism's continued domination over them. And world imperialism led by the U.S.A. pinned its hopes on India and Nehru.

Everything of importance that was done in India under Nehru since 1949 was essentially the carrying out of this 'mission' of world imperialism—no more, no less. Opposition to New China and detracting from its immense growing revolutionary prestige in every way—this has been the pivot of Nehru's entire foreign policy. Consolidation of imperialism's economic and political positions in India itself formed the basis which guaranteed the continuation and deepening of this policy of hostility to China. And consolidation and development of imperialism meant nothing other than intensifying the cruel exploitation and oppression of the Indian people manifold. Hence, strengthening imperialism's position and determined hostility to New China boiled down, in the final analysis, to ceaselessly intensifying exploitation and oppression of the Indian people. Opposition to China and intensified exploitation and oppression of the Indian people have thus been the two aspects of the same policy which Nehru consistently followed in the interests of world imperialism led by the U.S.A. and of India's reactionary classes. Nehru policy may, therefore, be justifiably termed as one of opposition and hostility to both the Indian and the Chinese peoples.

'Parliamentary democracy', 'development' and 'non-

'alignment' have been the three main slogans with which the Congress rulers led by Nehru deceived the Indian people, basically served the U.S. imperialists and Indian reaction and consistently pursued its policy of hostility to China. For about two decades the Congress rulers have carried on their utterly reactionary policies under cover of these deceptive slogans. But how could such a thing happen for so long in India where the anti-imperialist and anti-feudal hatred of the people is so intense? The main reason for this lies in the treacherous capitulationist line followed by the revisionist leading clique of the Indian Communist movement.

The Dangeite renegades and the neo-revisionist leading clique of the CPI (M) have always been enthusiastic admirers and supporters of these deceptive slogans. All these years they have ceaselessly preached among workers, peasants and other toiling people the poisonous notions that India under the Congress rulers has attained genuine independence and sovereignty; that the so-called parliamentary democracy, despite its 'limitations', is something that should be defended and upheld by the people; that the so-called "industrialization" and 'development' mark a real advance toward "economic independence"; and that the so-called 'non-aligned' foreign policy of the Congress rulers is, despite 'limitations', a genuinely peaceful and progressive policy. Today, these renegades have become even more loud in defending, upholding and preaching these deceptive slogans of the Congress rulers. By doing this, they have tried to confuse the people's minds, blunt their class outlook and lull them into accepting, without protest, the ruthless and increasing exploitation and oppression to which they have been subjected by the imperialists and their lackeys. These renegades have thus actively helped the Congress rulers to carry on their reactionary policy with impunity and arrogance. Where is, therefore, any basic difference

between the revisionists and neo-revisionists, on the one hand, and the Congress rulers, on the other? They are merely the two sides of the same coin. Jointly, they are serving the imperialists and the Indian reactionaries to exploit and oppress the Indian people as they please.

But all the ravings of the Congress rulers and their lackeys, the revisionists and neo-revisionists, will never be able to hide the fact that India under Congress rule is neither sovereign, nor independent, nor democratic. Even today the Congress rulers, through the membership of the Commonwealth, owe allegiance to the British Crown. The so-called sovereign Parliament of India is based on a Constitution which was drawn up "in accordance with the proposals" of the British Cabinet Mission and as demanded by the British overlords (see the British government's Declaration of February, 1947). The Constituent Assembly, which framed this Constitution was elected on the basis of restricted franchise (of about 14%) under British supervision in 1946. Even Gandhi, while endorsing the Congress Working Committee's decision to enter this Assembly, had to admit that it was "not a free Assembly." (Speech at AICC session on July 7, 1946). Such, in brief, is the legal and formal position of the much-boasted sovereignty. India's 'independence' is only a clever device to hide its real dependence on the imperialists.

Lenin taught, "It is necessary constantly to explain and expose among the broadest masses of the toilers of all countries, and particularly of the backward countries, the deception systematically practised by the imperialists in creating, under the guise of politically independent states, states which are wholly dependent upon them economically, financially and militarily." (*Draft Theses on the National and Colonial Question*, June 1920). Lenin's description exactly suits today's India, and we must do exactly what Lenin taught us in this respect.

In India there is democracy only for the Indian ruling

classes and their imperialist and Soviet revisionist patrons, and only oppression and no democracy for the exploited Indian people. Why should then the Indian people defend the so-called 'parliamentary democracy'? On the contrary, to liberate themselves from their native and foreign oppressors, they must determinedly oppose this so-called 'parliamentary democracy' and overcome all false notions spread by the reactionaries.

The five-year plans and the so-called industrialization, the community development projects and development activities of the Congress rulers have nothing to do with the people's interests. These are only clever devices to enrich the foreign and Indian exploiters, intensify exploitation of India's labour and resources and are directed to turn India into a military-political-economic base of the U.S. imperialists against China and the revolutionary peoples of Asia.

The Indian people gain nothing from these plans, projects and developments other than increased exploitation and loss of rights. The so-called plans have in reality been executed under the advice, supervision and help of the U.S. imperialists and Soviet revisionists not only to expand their scope of exploitation but also to build up in India a war machine at the cost of the Indian people's blood and sweat, which could be used in the interests of the U.S. imperialists. As Nehru himself revealed on November 9, 1962, "No modern war could be fought without a proper industry and no industry could be built up without an agricultural background. Through the Five-Year Plans, India had been...strengthening the country, even from the defence point of view." (Speech in Rajya Sabha). He said, "India had tried in the past years to build up a base which could, when necessity arose, be turned into a proper war machine. It was so because without a base of this kind, it would not be possible to carry them through very long." (Ibid). He also made it clear

that the target of this "base building" and "war machine" was China. "It was also a question of judgment as to when this final challenge [from China] will come." (Ibid, *Hindusthan Standard*, November 10, 1962). He further said, "We thought of defence chiefly from the point of defence science, defence production, technicians and others because that takes time while a soldier being trained does not take very much time." It may also be remembered here that Nehru and others openly said that 80% of the Third Five Year Plan was directly connected with defence while the rest was connected only indirectly. How, in the face of all this, can one deny the fact that the five-year plans etc. are merely part of the general aggressive plans of the U.S. imperialists and are closely linked and co-ordinated with them?

The foreign policy or the so-called non-alignment policy of the Congress rulers has been, like its economic 'development', directed against China and the revolutionary people's movement in Asia. Not once did the Congress rulers genuinely support the national liberation movement of any country of Asia, Africa and Latin America. On the contrary, they have consistently tried to disrupt such movements and always helped the imperialists directly or indirectly in their bloody suppression campaigns against revolutionary peoples. They allowed the U.S. imperialists to use the Indian soil to carry on subversive activities in Tibet during and after the Chinese revolution. They gave all facilities to the British to recruit and train Gurkhas in India to be used for suppressing the Malayan people's struggle for liberation. The French imperialists were allowed to use Indian airports for sending troops etc. to suppress the liberation struggle in Indo-China. The Congress rulers even directly participated in suppressing the revolutionary people's movements in Burma and Nepal. They are following the British imperialist policy towards Nepal, Bhutan and Sikkim and are holding them in

subjugation by means of unequal treaties. They openly supported U.S. imperialist aggression against the Korean people. By supporting and forging close links with the present reactionary regimes of Japan, Malaysia, Indonesia and with the hated Chiang clique, the Congress rulers merely prove that they have become even more cynical and shameless in serving the interests of the U.S. imperialists. There has never been nor is there anything 'peaceful' or 'progressive' in the foreign policy of the Congress rulers.

The truth is, their so-called 'non-alignment' has essentially been a policy aimed at isolating China, splitting the socialist camp and thus helping the notorious 'containment of China' policy of the U.S. imperialists. Mr M. C. Chagla, former Indian Ambassador to Washington and later Indian High Commissioner in the U.K., explained the non-alignment policy like this: "India's present policy had prevented the two Communist countries [the Soviet Union and China] coming together and bridging the gulf which exists between them...Therefore...we might succeed by our non-alignment policy in bringing the West and Russia closer together and isolating China." (*Hindusthan Standard*, January 13, 1963). Dange, the arch reactionary, echoed the same at a meeting in Central Bombay. He said: "India's non-alignment policy was successful in isolating China from other Communist countries." (PTI, February 17, 1963).

In fact, after the Khrushchov revisionists had usurped power in the Soviet Union after Stalin's death, there began to emerge a world-wide counter-revolutionary ganging up between the Soviet revisionists, the U.S. imperialists and the Indian reactionaries. Till then, both U.S. imperialism and Nehru had been working jointly to split the national liberation movements of Asia, and to isolate China, by advertising the so-called 'Indian path' of 'peaceful' attainment of independence and the 'democratic'

path to progress. The three 'peaceful' frauds of Khrushchov renegades,—'peaceful co-existence', 'peaceful competition' and 'peaceful transition to socialism'—which were directly aimed at splitting the world Communist movement and people's revolutionary struggles, opened up great new scope for the U.S. imperialists and Nehru. China, the mainstay and base of world revolution, became the immediate common target of attack of Khrushchov revisionists, U.S. imperialists and Nehru government. Nehru played a most important role in building up this anti-China counter-revolutionary axis between Moscow, New Delhi and Washington, which began to work for isolating China from the revolutionary peoples of Asia and Africa (through Nehru) and from the world Communist movement (through the Khrushchov gang). Splitting the national liberation movement of the oppressed peoples and the world Communist movement became the two principal objects of this axis. China, which refused to yield and valiantly raised higher the banner of revolution and Marxism-Leninism, proved the main obstacle in their path. The battle-cry of the reactionaries and imperialists of the Moscow-New Delhi-Washington axis, therefore, became "beat down China!" The rapidly growing Indo-Soviet 'friendship' was merely an expression of this anti-China ganging up.

The active encouragement and help of the Soviet revisionists made the U.S. imperialists more aggressive and they ventured on new aggressive provocations against China. Nehru was neatly placed in the centre of this monstrous plan of the U. S. imperialists. The development of this Moscow-New Delhi-Washington axis with its edge directed against China, found its visible expression almost simultaneously in two incidents in 1959—the notorious Camp David meeting between Khrushchov and the U.S. President, and the first bloody clash

(Continued on page 78)

Study

"Problems of Strategy in China's Revolutionary War"

[The following article appeared in the "Liberation Army Daily" of China in December 29, 1966]

Historical Background

It is now 30 years since Chairman Mao's brilliant great work *Problems of Strategy in China's Revolutionary War* was published in December 1936. It is a scientific summing up of the rich experience of China's Second Revolutionary Civil War and a fruit of the victory of Chairman Mao's correct line over the erroneous lines of the "Left" and Right opportunists.

The First Revolutionary Civil War (1924-27) ended in failure as a result of the betrayal by the big landlord and big bourgeois classes represented by Chiang Kai-shek and because of the surrender of leadership by the Right opportunists inside the Party represented by Chen Tu-hsiu. White terror reigned over the whole country. It was at the critical moment in China's revolution that Chairman Mao, holding high the great banner of people's war, organized the famous Autumn Harvest Uprising, led the armed forces to the Chingiang Mountains, founded the Chinese Workers' and Peasants' Red Army and China's first revolutionary red base, set ablaze the raging flame of the Chinese revolutionary war and illuminated the future of the revolution.

The "Left" opportunist line in the Party at that time, particularly the third "Left" opportunist line represented by Wang Ming, however, opposed and denied Chairman Mao's correct line, and ruled out Chairman Mao's Red

Army leadership; as a result, the Red Army was forced to withdraw from the revolutionary base, bringing extremely serious losses to the Chinese revolution.

In January 1935, during the Long March, the Party's Central Committee called an enlarged meeting of the Political Bureau in Tsunyi, Kweichow Province, put an end to the "Left" opportunist leadership, firmly established Chairman Mao's leading position in the whole Party, and saved the Party and the Chinese Revolution. Since then, the Chinese revolution has always been under the wise leadership of our great leader Chairman Mao, going from victory to victory.

In order to eradicate the bad influence of the erroneous lines of "Left" and Right opportunism, to raise the Marxist level and proletarian military thinking of the whole Party, and to successfully lead the impending War of Resistance Against Japan (1937-45), Chairman Mao, after writing *On Tactics Against Japanese Imperialism* wrote this great work *Problems of Strategy in China's Revolutionary War* which is an overall summing up of the struggle between the two lines during the Second Revolutionary Civil War (1927-37).

Great Significance

Problems of Strategy in China's Revolutionary War splendidly epitomized the rich experience in China's revolutionary war and created a brand new proletarian military science. In this work, Chairman Mao applied dialectical materialism and historical materialism with genius and in a creative way, profoundly expounded the basic viewpoint of the proletariat in regard to war and the scientific method for studying war, made a thorough analysis of the special features of China's revolutionary war, made clear the objective laws of war and laid down a complete set of invincible strategic and tactical principles for waging people's war.

This great work is a masterpiece on military science, the most comprehensive, most complete, most systematic and on the highest level of Marxism; it is the first of its kind on proletarian military strategy and the military programme of the proletarian revolution.

This brilliant work is not only a great Marxist classic on military affairs, it is also a great Marxist classic on political science and philosophy; it applies not only to the field of military affairs, but also to all other field. It is a powerful ideological weapon for defeating imperialism, modern revisionism and the reactionaries of all countries.

The principles and theories expounded by Chairman Mao in this work are derived from practice and are universal truth tested through practice. The basic laws of China's revolutionary war made clear in this work are also the universal laws of all revolutionary wars. It not only served as the guiding principles that led China's revolutionary wars to great victories in the past, but it is also the guiding principle for our future war against aggression. It has made immeasurable contributions to the revolutionary struggles of the oppressed nations and peoples.

We are living in a new, great epoch of world revolution. People's revolution and revolutionary wars in Asia, Africa and Latin America are mounting, raging and developing vigorously. The proletariat and working people in Europe, North America and Oceania are in the midst of a new awakening. The development of the great proletarian cultural revolution in our country, which is without precedent in history, has pushed the socialist revolution to a deeper and more extensive new stage. But, U. S. imperialism and its accomplices are frantically escalating the war in Vietnam in an attempt to force war on the Chinese people. In these circumstances, a deeper study of this great work so as to master Chairman Mao's great strategic thinking is of vital strategic and realistic significance in guiding the present great proletarian cultural

revolution, in smashing surprise attacks by U. S. imperialism and its accomplices, in liberating Taiwan, in defending the motherland and in supporting the struggles of the world's revolutionary peoples.

Main Points for Study

As we study this great work, we should pay special attention to grasping the following questions :

I. Take Up the Gun and Use Revolutionary War to Wipe Out Counter-Revolutionary War

Chairman Mao has said : "*War* is the highest form of struggle for resolving contradictions, when they have developed to a certain stage, between classes, nations, states, or political groups, and it has existed ever since the emergence of private property and of classes." This is the most scientific, most complete definition on war given by Chairman Mao.

Revolution and revolutionary wars are unavoidable in class society. The brutal exploitation, oppression and plunder by the reactionary ruling classes is bound to provoke the oppressed peoples and nations to fierce resistance. To preserve their rule, the reactionary rulers invariably are the first to use bayonets and guns to deal with the revolutionary people. In these circumstances, the oppressed and exploited peoples and nations, who seek emancipation and who want to seize political power and win victory for the revolution, have to give tit for tat, take up arms and oppose counter-revolutionary armed force with revolutionary armed force and wipe out counter-revolutionary war with revolutionary war. Chairman Mao has said : "...it is only by the power of the gun that the working class and the labouring masses can defeat the armed bourgeoisie and landlords ; in this sense we may say that only with guns can the whole world be transformed." Historical facts prove that the oppressed and exploited

peoples and nations have obtained liberation and political power all because they have taken up arms, waged large-scale revolutionary war and wiped out counter-revolutionary war with revolutionary war. In China's revolution, it is under the leadership of the great leader Chairman Mao, after a protracted revolutionary war in which imperialism and the Kuomintang reactionaries, who were backed by it, were defeated, that we have gained political power and won victory for the revolution.

U.S. imperialism at present is the most vicious enemy of the people of the world, the ringleader of all reactionaries. Working hand in glove with the reactionaries of all countries it frantically plunders and oppresses the people, savagely suppresses people's revolutionary movements and forces war on the revolutionary people. Only by taking up the gun and by opposing counter-revolutionary war with revolutionary war can the people of all lands eventually overthrow U.S. imperialism and all reactionaries and gain people's rights and victory for the revolution.

In seizing political power, the revolutionary people must rely on the gun ; in defending it, they also must rely on the gun. People who have already seized political power can prevent and smash the internal and external enemies' subversion and aggression only if they constantly think of class struggle, hold the gun firmly in hand and remain highly vigilant at all times. At present, U. S. imperialism, in close co-ordination with the Soviet revisionist leading group, has shifted the emphasis of its global strategy to Asia, directing its spearhead against China. We must make full and good preparations for opposing a U.S. imperialist launched war of aggression, and be ready at any time to deal with the enemy and to fight a war at an early date, to fight a big war, a nuclear war, and all kinds of warfare and fight on several fronts. We must place all our work on a "fighting a war" footing. Should U.S. imperialism and its accomplices dare to force

a war of aggression on our people, we shall resolutely use revolutionary war to wipe it out completely.

The modern revisionists with the C.P.S.U. leadership as their centre, have given much publicity to "peaceful co-existence," "peaceful transition" and "peaceful competition," saying that under the condition that imperialism is in existence, "a world without arms, troops and war" can be realized; they speak of the revolutionary wars of the people of all lands as "adventurism" and the encouragement and support given to these revolutionary wars as "bellicose." This is a shameless sell-out of the revolutionary cause of the people of the world and a complete betrayal of Marxism-Leninism. They are the accomplices of U. S. imperialist aggression and plunder. To oppose imperialism, we must resolutely oppose modern revisionism and thoroughly expose its criminal activities of colluding with imperialism and selling out the revolutionary people.

Chairman Mao has emphatically pointed out that all revolutionary wars are just, that mankind's just war is the banner of mankind's salvation, a most lofty and glorious undertaking, and a bridge to a new era in world history. Every one of us revolutionaries must truly follow the teachings of Chairman Mao, resolutely support and actively take part in all just wars and contribute to the complete emancipation of the people of the world, the elimination of the root cause of war, and the establishment of a new world without imperialism, without capitalism and without the system of exploitation.

II. Rely On the Masses and Wage People's War

Chairman Mao has said: "The people, and the people alone, are the motive force in the making of world history." (*On Coalition Government*). The human factor and the political factor for ever remain the most fundamental factor for victory in war. Chairman Mao has also said: "A revolutionary war is a mass undertaking". "...active

support of the population, is the most important one [condition] for the Red Army." Provided that we closely rely on the people and are at one with the people, this army of ours can be invincible everywhere in the world.

During the Second Revolutionary Civil War, the Chiang Kai-shek reactionaries, on the strength of their troops being superior in numbers and in technical equipment, continuously carried out "encirclement and suppression" campaigns against the Red Army. But the Red Army, guided by Chairman Mao's thinking on people's war, had fully mobilized the masses in the base areas. Wherever the Red Army advanced to, the people's support followed; with the people fighting enthusiastically in co-ordination with the Red Army, the enemy was caught in a vast trap, was hit everywhere he went and found it difficult to move an inch with the result that "the fat ones wore out and became thin and the thin ones wore out and died." Whereas the Red Army, growing ever stronger in battle, won brilliant victories in four counter-campaigns against the "encirclement and suppression."

During the War of Resistance Against Japan and the Third Revolutionary Civil War, our army, guided by Chairman Mao's thinking on people's war, relying on the masses and together with them, defeated Japanese imperialism, toppled the reactionary Chiang Kai-shek dynasty which had the backing of U.S. imperialism, founded New China and established the great base for the world revolution.

The revolutionary practice of the world's people, especially that of the peoples of Asia, Africa and Latin America, too, has fully borne out that the only correct way for the oppressed nations and peoples to overthrow imperialist and reactionary rule and completely emancipate themselves is to rely on the masses and fight people's war. A most convincing example is the South Vietnamese

people who, by relying on people's war, have badly mauled armed-to-the-teeth U.S. imperialism.

No matter how modern weapons and technical equipment may advance, and how complex modern warfare may be, people's war always remains our most effective weapon in dealing with U.S. imperialism and its running dogs. Now that we have made our own guided missile nuclear weapons, it is a heavy blow to U.S.-Soviet collusion for nuclear monopoly and nuclear blackmail and a great inspiration to the revolutionary people throughout the world who are struggling valiantly. But, in future we will still rely on people's war to defeat the enemy. Chairman Mao said long ago: "...the atom bomb is a weapon of mass slaughter, but the outcome of a war is decided by the people, not by one or two new types of weapon." (*Talk With the American Correspondent Anna Louise Strong*). Any idea of simply counting on weapons to win victory is very wrong and very harmful.

For the broad masses to take part actively in and support revolutionary war, it is necessary to have wide and deep-going political mobilization, arm the people's minds with Mao Tse-tung's thought, raise their political consciousness to the maximum and bring their revolutionary initiative into play. The revolutionary people, armed with Mao Tse-tung's thought, fear neither hardship nor death and can overcome all kinds of difficulties and defeat every enemy.

Relying on the masses to wage people's war requires arming the entire people and turning all the people into soldiers. There must be strong people's armed forces under the absolute leadership of the Party to serve as the backbone in war and, at the same time, it is imperative to set up armed mass organizations on an extensive scale and to organize and arm as many people as possible so that they can take direct or indirect part in war. Hence the waging of people's war in which the main armed units are integrated with local armed units, regular troops with

guerrillas and militia, and the armed masses with the unarmed masses. The idea of abandoning people's guerrilla war and putting sole emphasis on the role of the main forces while neglecting that of local forces, militia and guerrillas is entirely wrong, and so is any idea of placing sole reliance on the main forces in war. The three-in-one integration of the main forces, local forces and militia is the traditional framework in our armed forces. In a future anti-aggression war, it will still be necessary to rely on the masses, militia and guerrillas. The hundreds of millions of people armed with Mao Tse-tung's thought constitute a vast and matchless force, the mainstay for defeating the enemy and the real iron bastion which no force on earth can destroy.

The Red Guards born in the great proletarian cultural revolution, are a generation of new people who have grown up nurtured by Mao Tse-tung's thought. Guided by the proletarian revolutionary line represented by Chairman Mao they dare to think, speak out, act, break through, and make revolution; they have performed everlasting meritorious deeds for the revolution. They are a shock force in the great cultural revolution and a powerful reserve force of the People's Liberation Army. In the event of war they will go to the battlefields and perform new meritorious deeds in fighting aggression.

The modern revisionists with the leading clique of the Soviet Communist Party at their centre ridiculously allege that rockets and nuclear weapons can decide everything in a modern war and that, against nuclear weapons, the militia is a mere heap of flesh, and so forth. This out-and-out weapons-decide-everything theory of the bourgeoisie is a big expose of these counter-revolutionary and revisionist renegades.

III. Carry Out Flexible and Mobile Strategy and Tactics And Concentrate Forces to Fight a War of Annihilation

Chairman Mao has made a masterly summary of the strategy and tactics of people's war in these phrases: "You

fight in your way and we fight in ours; we fight when we can win and move away when we can't." This means to fully exert our political superiority and the strength of the masses and to use our strong points against the enemy's weak points. We fight in such a way that you cannot hit us or even find us when you want to; when we want to beat you, we will score a direct hit and wipe you out. Strategically, we shall "pit one against ten," while tactically we shall "pit ten against one," concentrating our forces to fight a war of annihilation.

War of annihilation is the fundamental policy of our army's military operations. **Chairman Mao has said:** "Only by annihilating the enemy's effective strength can we smash his 'encirclement and suppression' campaigns and expand our revolutionary base areas.....Injuring all of a man's ten fingers is not as effective as chopping off one, and routing ten enemy divisions is not as effective as annihilating one of them." To fight battles of annihilation is the only way to deal the most effective blow to the enemy and gain victory. During the period of the Second Revolutionary Civil War, the big and powerful enemy amassed a force several times or even more than ten times the strength of the Red Army in their "encirclement and suppression" campaigns against the weak and small Red Army. Under the personal command of Chairman Mao, the Red Army used the method of concentrating forces to fight a war of annihilation and succeeded in wiping out large numbers of enemy troops and smashing the enemy's "encirclement and suppression" campaigns one after another. During the period of the War of Resistance Against Japan, our army's policy for military operations was to regard guerrilla warfare as basic while losing no chance of mobile warfare under favourable conditions. After eight years of bitter fighting it wiped out the enemy, grew stronger and scored great victories. In the Third Revolutionary Civil War, our army concentrated absolutely superior forces in every battle and

wiped out the enemy part by part. In the course of fighting, the bigger the military campaign, the larger the number of enemy troops wiped out and the more powerful our army became. In the three big world-shaking campaigns—Liaohsi-Shenyang, Huaihai and Peiping-Tientsin, 1.54 million enemy troops were wiped out. A total of more than 8 million Chiang Kai-shek bandit troops were knocked out in three years.

First and foremost in a war of annihilation is the concentration of a superior force. Only by concentrating a superior force it is possible to alter the situation between the two opposing sides, to change from an inferior position to a superior one, from passive to active, from weak to strong, and from defensive to offensive, so as to reach the goal of annihilating the enemy. The concentration of forces is a material basis for fighting a war of annihilation. It is necessary, therefore, to concentrate an absolutely superior force in every battle—that is, a force two, three, four and sometimes even five or six times the enemy's strength—encircle the enemy forces from all sides and strive to wipe them out completely without letting any out of the net.

In order to concentrate forces to fight a war of annihilation, it is essential to adopt the policy of luring the enemy deep into our area without fear of sustaining some temporary losses: some cities and areas must be abandoned on our own initiative in a planned way so as to let the enemy in and fight him. Only when the enemy is allowed in, will he be compelled to divide his forces, shoulder heavy burdens and commit mistakes. Only in this way can we gain time for concentrating a superior force to swallow the enemy up mouthful by mouthful and finally defend or capture cities or areas. The idea of dividing forces to defend every position and resisting everywhere out of fear of temporarily losing some territory and sustaining partial losses is entirely wrong since this can neither annihilate the enemy nor hold cities or areas.

The principle of concentrating forces to fight a war of annihilation seems to be easy to carry out but it is rather difficult in practice. Some people usually approve of this method of war. But when it comes to actual war, they often divide their forces either because they regard the enemy lightly or because the enemy so frightens them they lose their initiative; the result is that they find themselves in a passive position and unable to annihilate the enemy. Therefore, however complicated, serious and cruel the conditions they are in, the commanders at every level must be clear-headed from start to finish and concentrate forces to fight a war of annihilation by independently organizing and using their power.

The concentration of forces to fight a war of annihilation is not only the guiding thought for war but for our work in all fields. Whatever work is done, this method must be adopted. We cannot attempt to complete all parts of work in one stroke; they must be completed one by one. Just as a meal can only be eaten mouthful by mouthful, so factories can only be built one by one, and work can only be completed piece by piece. Nothing will be done well if all things are tackled at once without making a distinction between the primary and the secondary and if the forces are scattered. Only by concentrating forces and laying stress on the solution of one or two principal problems without let-up for a period of time—that is, to concentrate forces to fight a war of annihilation—can work be done well.

IV. Learn Warfare Through Warfare, Master Laws of War and Show Initiative in Directing War

Chairman Mao has said: "*The laws of war are a problem which anyone directing a war must study and solve.*" All those who seriously study and master the laws of war and act in accordance with them are able to direct a war correctly

and win it. Anyone who acts to the contrary is certain to be rebuffed and defeated.

Proceeding from the nature of Chinese society and its political, military, economic and other conditions, Chairman Mao made an all-round and penetrating analysis of the principal characteristics of China's revolutionary war, used his genius to make its basic laws clear, creatively solved a series of basic problems concerning directing a war, and guided the Chinese revolutionary war from one great victory to another.

In laying stress on learning warfare through warfare, Chairman Mao created a completely new method of studying and learning the laws of war. This is our chief method. To make revolution and wage a war is often not a matter of learning, before doing but of doing and then learning, for doing itself is learning. Only by following Chairman Mao's instructions and putting "daring" and "doing" above everything else, and courageously plunging into the practice of war—tempering ourselves in the teeth of storms and learning to swim in swimming—can we acquaint ourselves with the laws of war and master them.

The laws of war are the objective laws of the development of the contradictions between the two opposing sides. In order to understand and master them, one must make comprehensive and detailed investigation and study of the various aspects of war conditions. He must become acquainted with the conditions of his own forces and those of the enemy forces and with all other conditions affecting the war. From all this he discovers the laws of action and applies them in practice, so that he wins every battle he fights because he is clear about himself and his enemy.

Though the outcome of war is determined by the military, political, economic, natural and other conditions of the two opposing sides, it is also decided by their subjective ability in directing war. For us to be able to have the initiative in directing a war, the most fundamental thing is to make Chairman Mao's strategic ideas our guide

and his great practice our example, be good in the creative study and application of Chairman Mao's works in the practice of war and closely combine theory with practice. On the basis of definite material conditions, we give full play to our subjective momentum. In this way we can become both courageous and wise heroes directing and staging a colourful and magnificent drama.

Laws must be grasped both in fighting a war and in tackling other revolutionary work. At present, when we are carrying out the great proletarian cultural revolution, we must take Chairman Mao's thought as our guiding principle and the 16-point decision [of the Central Committee of the Chinese Communist Party concerning the great proletarian cultural revolution] as our weapon, courageously throw ourselves into the torrent of the revolutionary struggle and creatively and repeatedly study and apply Chairman Mao's works in the course of class struggle, making summaries and progress continually until we understand and master the laws of the development of class struggle. Only in this way can complete victory be won in the great proletarian cultural revolution.

V. Basic Guarantee for Winning Revolutionary War Is the Resolute and Thorough Carrying Out of Chairman Mao's Correct Line

Chairman Mao has said: "Our revolutionary war has proved that we need a correct Marxist military line as well as a correct Marxist political line." The Party's absolute leadership over war is the basic guarantee for carrying out the revolutionary war to the end and winning victory. The most fundamental thing about the Party's leadership over war is to carry out a correct leadership in line. Guided by the correct political and military lines worked out by Chairman Mao glorious victories were won in the Chinese revolution and revolutionary war.

Correct political and military lines do not emerge and develop spontaneously and smoothly, but only in struggle against the "Left" and Right opportunist lines. Back in the period of the First Revolutionary Civil War, a resolute struggle took place between the correct line represented by Chairman Mao and the Right opportunist line of Chen Tu-hsiu; the period of the Second Revolutionary Civil War saw the "Left" opportunist line overcome three times and the Right opportunist line of Chang Kuo-tao once; during the period of the anti-Japanese war, the Right opportunist line of Wang Ming was defeated. Since the founding of the Peoples Republic of China, several large-scale struggles have been carried out against the representatives of the bourgeois line who have wormed their way into the Party and the army. The struggle between the correct line represented by Chairman Mao and the wrong line of all shades has never ended. This was true during the entire period of the democratic revolution; it has also been true in the period of the socialist revolution and construction.

Chairman Mao has said: "Without combating and thoroughly overcoming these harmful tendencies which damage the revolution and the revolutionary war, it would be impossible to establish a correct line and win victory in this war." We must never forget this teaching of Chairman Mao and must wage a resolute and uncompromising struggle against all kinds of erroneous lines. Without defeating the erroneous lines, it would be impossible to thoroughly implement Chairman Mao's correct line and win victories in the revolution and in a revolutionary war.

The unprecedented great proletarian cultural revolution now unfolding in our country is to destroy bourgeois ideas on a big scale and vigorously establish the supremacy of Mao Tse-tung's thought and arm the 700 million people with his thought. This is the greatest preparation in the event of war in order to smash the aggression that U. S.

imperialism and its accomplices may launch against China. We must resolutely and thoroughly carry out the proletarian revolutionary line represented by Chairman Mao, criticize and repudiate the bourgeois reactionary line in a thorough-going way, and steadfastly carry the great proletarian cultural revolution through to the end. Comrade Lin Piao has said: "The proletarian revolutionary line of Chairman Mao is as incompatible with the bourgeois reactionary line as fire is to water. Only by thoroughly criticising and repudiating the bourgeois reactionary line and eradicating its influence can the line of Chairman Mao be carried out correctly, completely and thoroughly."

In accordance with Comrade Lin Piao's directive, we must hold still higher the great red banner of Mao Tse-tung's thought, defy death to defend and resolutely implement the correct line of Chairman Mao, and turn our army into a great school of Mao Tse-tung's thought and into a revolutionary army which is extremely proletarianized and extremely militant.

Make a Class Analysis of Factionalism

THIS article by the Commentator of "*Hongqi*" was printed in the "*Renmin Ribao*" on April 27 this year. The Commentator writes:

Different classes exist in class society. Within each class, there are different strata. In political struggle, each class and stratum will invariably differentiate into Left, middle and Right factions. This is a universal law independent of man's will.

The great proletarian cultural revolution has engulfed every class and every stratum in the torrent of class struggle. The different political forces have been more active than ever before, strongly expressing their own political tendencies and expressing their own factionalism. How to make a class analysis of factionalism by using Marxism-Leninism, Mao Tse-tung's thought, is a highly important question.

Lenin said: "The class division is, of course, the ultimate basis of the political grouping; *in the final analysis*, of course, it always determines that grouping." In class society, all class struggle is political struggle which is most fully developed in the form of struggle between parties and factions. Political parties and political factions are all instruments of class struggle.

Chairman Mao says: "Outside a party there exist other parties and inside a party there exist factions; this has always been the case." The capitalist class has different parties and factions. The Democratic Party and the Republican Party in the United States, for instance, are two factions representing the interests of the monopoly capitalist class. Likewise, there are different parties

and factions within the workers' movement. Within the First International, there was the struggle waged by the Marxists, who represented the proletariat, against the Proudhon, Bakunin, Lassalle and other factions who represented the bourgeois and petty-bourgeois trends. Before World War I, there existed within the Second International the struggle by the Left represented by Lenin against Bernstein and other revisionist factions. Kautsky was a middle-of-the-roader for a period and became a Rightist during the war. During the struggle in the Third International, Lenin and Stalin were the genuine Left, Bukharin was a Rightist, and Trotsky was "Left" in form but a Rightist in essence and he later became an outright counter-revolutionary. The opportunist, revisionist factions are the Rightists within the workers' movement, the special detachment of the bourgeoisie within the workers' movement. Their foundation is in the labour aristocracy and their ideology is in effect bourgeois ideology which finds expression within the working class and attempts to corrupt the working class.

Chairman Mao points out: "Apart from uninhabited deserts, wherever there are groups of people they are invariably composed of the Left, the middle and the Right. This will still be the case after thousands of years." This is the truth.

The party spirit is the concentrated expression of class character. Only the most conscious and advanced force of the proletariat, namely the vanguard of the proletariat, can completely and genuinely represent the class interests of the proletariat and the interests of the broad labouring masses, can possess the most intense proletarian party spirit. Such being the case, the proletarian revolutionaries represent precisely the proletarian party spirit. What we generally call the struggle between the proletarian party spirit and bourgeois factionalism is none other than the struggle between the proletarian party spirit and the bourgeois party spirit.

Chairman Mao points out: "In every branch of learning there may be many schools and trends; in the matter of world outlook, however, today there are basically only two schools, the proletarian and the bourgeois. It is one or the other, either the proletarian or the bourgeois world outlook." There are basically two schools in respect to the world outlook of the many factions that have emerged during the great proletarian cultural revolution. They are the partisanship of the two big classes.

Every faction and every manifestation of factionalism represents the interests, views and demands of different classes and different strata. In the complicated class struggle, it is necessary to make class analysis on the basis of people's actions in order to distinguish who is a genuine revolutionary in the full sense, who is a "revolutionary" in speech, and who is a counter-revolutionary. That is to say, we must judge not only by their slogans and speeches, but more important, by the fact of which class they actually stand for, which class line they follow, and which class benefits from their actions.

To be loyal to the great leader Chairman Mao, to Mao Tse-tung's thought and to Chairman Mao's proletarian revolutionary line, firmly to take the proletarian stand to unite the broad masses, fight against the bourgeois reactionary line and fight against the handful of renegades, special agents and diehard capitalist roaders in the Party with China's Khrushchov as their representative and against the counter-revolutionaries in society, and to be determined to carry the great proletarian cultural revolution through to the end—this is characteristic of a proletarian revolutionary, and is the party spirit of the proletariat.

The vanguard of the proletariat has consistently opposed unprincipled factional disputes, the mountain stronghold mentality and sectarianism. Just as Chairman Mao says: "There is no conflict of fundamental interests within the

working class. Under the dictatorship of the proletariat, there is no reason whatsoever for the working class to split into two big irreconcilable groupings." All proletarian revolutionaries must adhere to this teaching of Chairman Mao's and carry on the triumphant forward advance of our country's great proletarian cultural revolution.

To obstinately stick to the bourgeois reactionary stand, to oppose Chairman Mao's proletarian revolutionary line by using Right opportunism, Right capitulationism and Right splittism from the Right, or to undermine Chairman Mao's proletarian revolutionary line from the side of "Left" in form but Right in essence, that is, from the side of the ultra "Left"—these are obstinate expressions of the party spirit or factionalism of the bourgeoisie.

The petty bourgeoisie is an ally of the proletariat and an important force in the revolution, but since it lacks revolutionary firmness it is easily influenced by bourgeois factionalism. Therefore, it is imperative to be good at using Chairman Mao's proletarian revolutionary line to overcome the vacillation of the petty bourgeoisie. It is imperative to be good at using Chairman Mao's proletarian revolutionary line to strengthen the unity between the proletariat and the broad masses of other working people, to strengthen unity in the revolutionary ranks, to consolidate and develop the revolutionary great alliance and to follow closely Chairman Mao's great strategic plan.

The factionalism of the bourgeoisie must be resolutely exposed. There is great danger for those people who are influenced by bourgeois factionalism and who obstinately refuse to correct this, because they are likely to take the wrong side and even to be made use of by bad elements. Greater efforts should be made to educate the petty bourgeoisie. Chairman Mao teaches us: "We must be good at guiding those people in our ranks with petty-bourgeois ideas onto the path of the proletarian revolution.

This is crucial to the success of the great proletarian cultural revolution."

In the world there is neither party spirit which is above classes nor factionalism which is above classes. The non-partisan viewpoint is a hypocritical bourgeois viewpoint which claims to be transcending classes. Factional struggle is a manifestation of class struggle. If the class content of factionalism is taken away, it will be impossible to distinguish between right and wrong and will lead to erasing the distinction between the proletarian revolutionaries and the bourgeois reactionaries. This is precisely what the Right opportunists want in their opposition to the proletarian revolutionaries and in their negation of the great proletarian cultural revolution.

We oppose bourgeois factionalism precisely in order to safeguard and strengthen the factionalism of the proletarian revolutionaries, namely, the party spirit of the proletarian vanguards. Lenin said: "The interests of the open and widespread class struggle demand the development of the strict party principle." We must further develop the strict proletarian party spirit, and be staunch proletarian revolutionaries armed with Mao Tse-tung's thought. We must resolutely oppose the bourgeois Rightists, oppose the ultra "Left" that is "Left" in form but Right in essence, carry the struggle between the two lines through to the end and win all-round victory in the great proletarian cultural revolution.

Soviet Revisionist Renegades Step up Over-all Collaboration With Indian Reactionaries

THE Soviet revisionist renegade clique has carried out many sinister activities this year for all-round collaboration with the Indian reactionaries. By these sinister moves, it has further exposed its ugly neo-colonialist features.

The Soviet revisionist chieftain Kosygin led a big delegation to India at the end of January. During his stay in New Delhi, Kosygin reached agreement in principle with Indira Gandhi, Prime Minister of the reactionary Indian Government, on a series of important questions on all-round collaboration between the two countries and on working jointly to oppose China. After Kosygin's return to Moscow, Soviet delegations of various kinds went to India one after another. Between late February and early March, fifteen Soviet delegations visited India, including naval, oil, railway, civil aviation, culture and education, science, economic and "expert" on industrial development delegations.

One of the nefarious aims of Kosygin's visit to India was to plan joint actions in opposing China. It was decided that "information" about China was to be exchanged for "over-all use" by the United States, the Soviet Union and India. This counter-revolutionary act has revealed the Soviet revisionist clique as arch renegades, despicable scabs and accomplices of U.S. imperialism.

The Soviet revisionists have paid special attention to collaboration with India in the naval field. It was disclosed that the two countries have reached an agreement on this matter. Besides agreeing to supply submarines

and other naval vessels to India, the Soviet revisionists have also decided to help rebuild Vishakapatnam port at the Bay of Bengal and Port Blair in the Andaman islands into naval bases. India, on the other hand, allows Soviet vessels to anchor and undergo repairs in Indian ports. This is tantamount to providing naval bases to the Soviet revisionists.

The counter-revolutionary military collaboration between the Soviet Union and India is directed at the great people's Republic of China. The Soviet revisionist clique has been collaborating with U.S. imperialism and reactionaries in Southeast Asia to form an anti-China ring. Moreover, the Soviet revisionist clique, which is pursuing the policy of neo-colonialist expansion, has always cast a covetous eye on Southeast Asia. It has been doing all it can to extend its political influence and economic infiltration to this region.

What is worth noting is the fact that the agreements on the cultural, scientific and technical fields signed by the Soviet revisionists with India this year are aimed at serving the Soviet neo-colonialist policy. A case in point is the "scientific cooperation" agreement signed last February, which envisages "immediate cooperation" of the two countries in surveying the Indian Ocean. Obviously this is meant to pave the way for intensified collusion between the naval forces of the two countries.

The Soviet Union and India have also stepped up their collusion in the economic field. *The Hindustan Times* disclosed that following Kosygin's visit to India, the Soviet revisionists have sent five economic delegations to India to sign a number of agreements and contracts with the Indian reactionaries.

Intensified economic infiltration into and plunder of India in the name of economic "aid" is an important way for the Soviet revisionists to push their neo-colonialist policy. After it has restored capitalism at home, the

Soviet revisionist group is eager to secure markets abroad. Therefore it has attached special importance to India which has a population of 500 million. The Soviet revisionists have all along traded their high-priced and low-quality machinery for Indian agricultural produce and light industrial products. This is a replica of exchange of unequal values with which the imperialists have plundered the colonies and semi-colonies. To intensify their plunder of India, the Soviet revisionists have recently steadily stepped up their control over the Indian economy by trying to dovetail the economic plans of the two countries and setting up in India enterprises which directly serve their own interests. In plundering India under the pretext of "aid" the Soviet revisionists have fully revealed their neo-colonialist features.

The "Soviet-Indian cooperation" advertised by the Soviet revisionists is actually part and parcel of their reactionary policy of "U.S.-Soviet cooperation against China." The United States and the Soviet Union have all along been working hand in glove with each other in fostering the Indian reactionaries. In recent years, the U.S. imperialists have been badly mauled in their aggressive war in Vietnam, while at home their financial conditions are getting worse daily. Therefore they attempt to stabilize the Indian reactionary rule with vigorous Soviet "aid" to India.

In collaborating with the U.S. imperialists to prop up the Indian reactionaries, the Soviet revisionist renegade clique is reducing India to a joint U.S.-Soviet military base and semi-colony, thus bringing terrible disaster to the Indian people. The Indian people have come to see through Soviet revisionism's nature of sham support but real plunder, and of being their false friend but real enemy. They have realized that the Soviet revisionists are neo-colonialists donning the cloak of "socialism" and that both the U.S. and Soviet "aid" are cut of the same cloth.

The broad masses of the Indian people are awakening daily and rising in struggle to overthrow the rule of the Indian reactionaries, the agents of U.S. imperialism and Soviet revisionism.

The great teacher Chairman Mao teaches us: "*Make trouble, fail, make trouble again, fail again...till their doom that is the logic of the imperialists and all reactionaries the world over in dealing with the people's cause, and they will never go against this logic.*" No matter how frantically the U.S. imperialists, the Soviet revisionists and their flunkies, the Indian reactionaries, collaborate, they can never escape the punishment of history and their inevitable doom.

The new leading group of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union...are uniting with Imperialism headed by the United States and the reactionaries of various countries and forming a new "holy alliance" against communism, the people, revolution and China. But this counter-revolutionary "holy alliance" is doomed to bankruptcy and is already in the process of disintegration.

—Communique of the Eleventh Plenary Session of the Eighth Central Committee of the Communist Party of China (adopted on August 12, 1966)

On the 20th Anniversary of Anti-British War of Liberation

STATEMENT OF THE COMMUNIST PARTY OF MALAYA

THE following statement entitled "Hold High the Great Red Banner of Armed Struggle and Valiantly March Forward!" was issued on June 1, 1968 by the Central Committee of the Malayan Communist Party in commemoration of the 20th anniversary of the anti-British national liberation war. It reads:

On the night of June 20, 1948, the British imperialists launched a sudden attack on the people of Malaya and made wholesale arrests throughout the country, in a vain attempt to wipe out at one blow the revolutionary forces whose core is the Malayan Communist Party. But this vicious plot of the enemy met with ignominious failure. When the enemy carried out their countrywide suppression, the Malayan Communist Party, having made the necessary ideological and organisational preparations, resolutely led the people of various nationalities in taking up arms and opposing counter-revolutionary violence with revolutionary violence, and, consequently, took to the road of using the countryside to encircle the cities and seizing power by armed force. Since then the national democratic revolution of Malaya has entered a new historical period.

In the past twenty years, the armed struggle of the Malayan people has gone through a glorious course. In

the face of the prolonged and frantic attacks by the ferocious and cunning British imperialists, the Malayan Communist Party and the Malayan National Liberation Army led by the Party have fought heroically and tenaciously. Far from being annihilated, our Party and our army are growing from strength to strength, notwithstanding the heavy losses we sustained. The red banner of armed struggle has always been fluttering. This is a great victory for the Malayan people, a great victory for Marxism-Leninism, Mao Tse-tung's thought.

Under the sledge-hammer blows of the protracted armed struggle, British colonial rule in Malaya that has lasted more than a century has been shaken to its foundations. Attempting to save their colonial rule from its inevitable doom, the British imperialists have repeatedly changed their form of rule, and have even gone to the extent of conspiring with the U. S. imperialists and the Soviet revisionist renegade group in concocting the so-called "federation of Malaysia" and "republic of Singapore".

In the past 20 years, the struggle of the Malayan people has traversed an arduous and tortuous path. The revolutionary people have withstood tests and tempered themselves in the course of the protracted and fierce struggle. The Malayan Communist Party has gained a good deal of important experience and lessons from the advances and retreats during this period of struggle. The principal one is that, we must, whatever the circumstances, persist in following the road of using the countryside to encircle the cities and seizing power by armed force.

Experience has proved that "political power grows out of the barrel of a gun" and "Without a people's army the people have nothing" are great unshakable truths. The imperialists and their running dogs, Rahman-Lee Kuan Yew cliques, have relied on the gun to maintain their reactionary regimes and to carry out brutal oppression of

the people. All their clamours about "one man, one vote", "parliamentary democracy", "socialism" and so forth are nothing but insidious deceits. Only by taking up the gun and carrying out people's war can we overthrow their sanguinary rule. Socialism is possible only after their reactionary state apparatus has been thoroughly smashed and the people's political power has been established.

Experience has proved that armed struggle must be the main form of struggle and the army the main form of organisation, while other forms of mass organisation and mass struggle must be directly or indirectly co-ordinated with the armed struggle. It follows, therefore, that the centre of gravity of revolutionary work must be in the rural areas, and that it is imperative to consolidate and expand the rural base areas.

Experience has proved that only by mobilising the masses and relying upon them can we persist in and develop the armed struggle. It is imperative to make propaganda among the masses and to organize and arm them. So long as the broad masses of the people, especially the agricultural labourers, peasants and other working masses in the rural areas have been fully aroused, it is possible for us to build up powerful forces to defeat the enemy. In arousing the masses, it is necessary to adhere strictly to the mass line, actively guide the masses in waging political and economic struggles and, step by step, raise their political consciousness and lead them forward in the course of these struggles.

Experience has proved that "the united front is a united front for carrying on armed struggle." There can be no genuine anti-imperialist united front if it is isolated from the armed struggle. Only by holding aloft the red banner of armed struggle can we consolidate and broaden the national democratic united front which is led by the working class (through the Communist Party), having the

worker-peasant alliance as its basis and uniting with the petty-bourgeoisie, the national bourgeoisie and all anti-imperialist patriots. The Communist Party must maintain its ideological, political and organisational independence and its leading role in the united front.

Experience has proved that, only by firmly adhering to the policy of national unity based on national equality, and by resolutely opposing the national splittist and racialist policy practised by the colonialists and domestic reactionaries, can we succeed in extensively arousing the masses of workers and peasants of nationalities and, thus, in consolidating and developing the broad revolutionary unity among the people of all nationalities.

Experience has proved that the Malayan Communist Party is the sole, genuine vanguard of the working class as well as the staunch defender of the interests of the people of all nationalities. The Malayan Communist Party is a long-tested revolutionary party which is armed with Marxism-Leninism, Mao Tse-tung's thought. None but the Malayan Communist Party has the courage to lead the Malayan people in waging the protracted armed struggle under extremely difficult conditions and by relying on our own efforts. Only under the Party's leadership can the Malayan revolution be victorious.

In the final analysis, the practice of armed struggle during the past 20 years has confirmed that Mao Tse-tung's thought, Marxism-Leninism of the present era, is the guide to the Malayan revolution, and that the integration of the universal truth of Mao Tse-tung's thought with the concrete practice of the Malayan revolution is the only guarantee for achieving victory in the armed struggle of the Malayan people.

The present international situation is excellent. Socialist China has become the centre and base of the world revolution. China's great proletarian cultural revolution,

unprecedented in history, has entered the stage of winning all-round victory, and the dictatorship of the proletariat has become more consolidated. The extensive dissemination of the invincible thought of Mao Tse-tung has spurred the development in depth of the world revolution, thereby tolling the deathknell of imperialism, modern revisionism and reaction. The important achievements scored by the Albanian people in their revolutionization movement; the great victories won by the Vietnamese people in their war against U.S. imperialism and for national salvation; the vigorous development of the armed struggles waged by the peoples of Asia, Africa and Latin America; the new storm in the Afro-American struggle against violent repression in the United States; the new upsurge in the revolutionary struggles of the proletariat and progressive forces in Western Europe and North America, particularly the great storm caused by the workers, students and the broad masses in France; the increasingly grave political and economic crises experienced by the imperialist system and the disintegration of the revisionist bloc: all these have demonstrated that imperialism, modern revisionism and reaction are approaching closer and closer to their doom.

The situation in our country is also excellent. British imperialism is on its last legs. Availing themselves of this opportunity, U.S. imperialism and its satellites have intensified their infiltration into the country and are actively scheming to rig up a new military alliance. Having ganged up with imperialism, the Soviet revisionist renegade group are engaged in undermining our people's revolutionary struggle. At the behest of their imperialist masters, the Rahman-Lee Kuan Yew puppet cliques, who represent the comprador bourgeoisie and the landlord class, have frantically embarked on arms expansion and war preparations and redoubled their efforts in pushing on with their anti-communist, anti-people and anti-China policy. They are carrying out more brutal political persecution and more ruthless econo-

mic exploitation of the people. Currency devaluation has taken place. The price of rubber has dropped sharply and prices of daily necessities have been soaring. Exorbitant taxes and multifarious levies have become more numerous and heavier. The toiling masses have become poorer while unemployment has continued to increase and schooling opportunities have become less. The contradiction between the broad masses on the one hand and the imperialists, the Soviet revisionist renegades and the Rahman-Lee Kuan Yew puppet cliques on the other has become sharper with each passing day. Inspired by the victorious perseverance of our Party and our army in the armed struggle, there is a rising tide of struggle of workers, peasants, fishermen, students and people of other social strata against persecution and for genuine independence and better living conditions. All this has shown that the outbreak of a new revolutionary storm is inevitable.

The present task of the Malayan people of all nationalities is: to unite, give full play to the revolutionary spirit of daring to fight and daring to win victory, intensify our struggle in various fields, especially the armed struggle, launch a sustained and vigorous offensive against the enemy and fight to the end in order to overthrow the Anglo-American imperialists and their lackeys the Rahman-Lee Kuan Yew cliques, and realise a truly independent, unified and democratic Malaya.

The world has now entered a new epoch in which the great thought of Mao Tse-tung is the banner. Under the brilliant illumination of Mao Tse-tung's thought, people all over the world are unleashing a general offensive against the old world. Led by the Malayan Communist Party, the heroic people and commanders and fighters of the National Liberation Army of Malaya continue to march valiantly forward, holding high the great red banner of armed

struggle. Despite difficulties and obstacles on the way ahead, we are fully convinced that, under the guidance of the great thought of Mao Tse-tung, we are bound to achieve final victory.

Down with imperialism headed by the United States !

Down with modern revisionism with the Soviet revisionist renegade group as its centre !

Down with the Rahman-Lee Kuan Yew puppet cliques !

The Malayan people's armed struggle is bound to be victorious !

Long live the broad revolutionary unity of the Malayan people of all nationalities !

Long live the heroic Malayan National Liberation Army !

Long live the glorious Malayan Communist Party !

Long live the invincible Marxism-Leninism, Mao Tse-tung's thought !

Long live the great teacher and great leader of the world people, Chairman Mao, a long, long life to him !

Without a people's army the people have nothing.

—Mao Tse-tung

IS INDIA Really Independent ?

—S. Guna

THE neo-revisionist gentry, of late, has discovered that there exist serious differences between the glorious Communist Party of China and themselves on various issues connected with the Indian revolution. They hold that the first stage of Indian revolution, according to them anti-imperialist in character, is already over. Now the Indian revolution has stepped into the second phase of it. The picture given by their party programme, adopted in the Seventh Congress held in 1964, never gives in clear terms the characteristics of the Indian society. Even when it talks of it, it does make only a vague reference to their expectations unrealized by the Indian bourgeoisie. They are irked at the CPC's characterisation that India is semi-colonial and semi-feudal. Of course, they may accept the latter part of it but not the former one. They express their gratitude to the Indian bourgeoisie for having taken India along the path of independent development despite all the manoeuvres of British imperialism in the years that followed the formal "independence" of 1947. They bluster : "The British imperialists hoped that, despite the transfer of power, they will be able, by their entrenched positions in our economy to make our independence formal. But the course of historical development since then has been disappointing to the imperialists and their hopes were belied." (Programme). They babble that the so-called "independence" made it possible for the ruling bourgeoisie to "develop the country's economy on the lines of capitalism, to further strengthen its class position in society."

Another shameful, but a major evasion in their programme is their refusal to discuss the fundamental contradictions within the Indian society.

We, the genuine Marxist-Leninists, appraise that there are three fundamental internal contradictions. They are :

1. between feudalism and the various sections of the peasantry in the countryside,
2. between comprador-bureaucrat bourgeoisie and the proletariat in the cities and towns,
3. between imperialism and the people of India as a whole.

Of these, the contradiction between feudalism and the peasantry stands as the principal contradiction at present. This warrants an agrarian revolution in the vast countryside. Therefore, we maintain that the agrarian revolution is the main axis of the Indian revolution.

Their usual empty "Marxist" phrases can never save them for ever. They keep juggling all through that the Indian bourgeoisie is striving hard for industrialisation despite all its vacillations and compromises with imperialism. At times, they go to the extent of portraying the contradiction between the Indian ruling classes and imperialism to be an antagonistic one.

As regards the structure of the Indian state, they say that it is "the organ of the class-rule of the bourgeoisie and landlords, led by the big bourgeoisie, *who are increasingly collaborating with foreign finance capital in pursuit of the capitalist path of development.*" These renegades are bent upon establishing that the Indian bourgeoisie is independent in character despite their compromises with imperialists. They deny quite firmly that the Indian bourgeoisie is comprador in character. The neo-revisionists have been playing on the same string for quite a long time. "This ideological trend is, on the one hand, a product of the disintegration and decay of the Second International and, on the other hand, the inevitable fruit of the ideology of the

petty bourgeoisie, whose entire way of life holds them captive to bourgeois and democratic prejudices" (Lenin: *Imperialism, the Highest Stage of Capitalism*). They are representing their masters in a favourable light, side-tracking the revolutionary urge of the revolutionary masses, and trying to perpetuate the rule of the exploiting classes. Their objective role as the props of the Indian ruling classes, imperialism and modern revisionism has cost the oppressed masses of India heavily. They exclaim that the glorious Communist Party of China "maintains that the Indian big bourgeoisie is a parasitic class fostered by imperialism, that it represents the comprador-bureaucratic capital in India, and that the Congress Government acts as the chief instrument and the main mouthpiece of this comprador, bureaucratic monopoly capitalist class." (*Divergent Views Between Our Party and the CPC on Certain Fundamental Issues of Programme and Policy.*)

These "Marxists" assert without the least trace of shame that they "do not find any valid reason for the present Indian Government, which has a more wider social base when compared to most of its counterparts in several countries and which does not face the imminent threat of class revolution at home, opting to play the role of a 'puppet', 'stooge' and 'lackey' of imperialism." The so called "wider social base" of the Indian ruling classes could have been put to test if they held aloft the banner of revolution and if the party did not follow the path of bourgeois parliamentarism. Our understanding is that the Indian reactionary ruling classes now holding power and crippled in an economic crisis are not as strong as claimed by the neo-revisionists. Their "democracy" is not different from the farce of any other puppet, stooge or lackey of imperialism. Yet the neo-revisionists babble that "the assessment of the CPC leads one to conclude that the new Indian state is not a bourgeois-landlord state led by the big bourgeoisie, which pursues the capitalist path of

development in collaboration with foreign monopoly capital, but a puppet government, led by the bureaucratic capitalism, run by them, principally, in the interests of imperialism while reconciling themselves to live as parasites, depending on the crumbs thrown by their foreign masters" (Ibid).

The shameless "Marxists" cannot even make a correct analysis of the Indian society. They maintain that "it is the industrial big bourgeoisie which, today, has emerged as a powerful force holding position in the new state and government, and not the comprador element." So in the final analysis, their "anti-imperialist" struggle is just a sham one: it is not directed against the economic and political tentacles of imperialism which hold the Indian ruling classes in a thousand and one ways but it is an actual collusion with the comprador, bureaucrat bourgeoisie and their U.S. and Soviet masters. The anti-feudal task which they brag of is nothing but just the distribution of land to the landless (of course, by peaceful means): They never talk of agrarian revolution by which the political power will be seized by the armed peasantry. This can be done only when the peasants stand in battle array under the leadership of the proletariat. The devotees of parliamentarism and "peaceful transition" think of evading the question just by cursing the bourgeoisie for not having completed the bourgeois democratic revolution. The revolutions in other colonies and semi-colonies have clearly reasserted the opinion expressed in the 1928 Colonial Thesis of the Comintern. The task of the bourgeois democratic revolution in these countries will never be undertaken by the national bourgeoisie. It is the proletariat that alone can lead this revolution to victory.

Let us deal with some of the important problems arising out of our historic struggle against modern revisionism of both the brands, old and new.

Semi-colonial and Semi-feudal Structure of Indian Society

At the end of the Second World War the imperialists stood pinned down due to the waves of attack launched by the world proletariat. The onward march of the great Chinese Revolution and the emergence of people's democracies caused an alarm in the hearts of the imperialist war-mongers and colonial looters. In India, the heroic struggles waged by the workers, peasants, students and men of the army, navy and air-force shook British imperialism to its very foundations. The revolutionary struggle of the peasants of Telangana in the erstwhile princely state of Hyderabad started in 1946. The revolutionary people's war failed to get the blessings either of the Right-wing opportunist leadership of P.C. Joshi or of the B.T. Ranadive-Sundarayya Titoite-Trotskyite clique. Despite their betrayal, it was spreading like a wild fire. Meanwhile, the national liberation movement in India, as a whole, showed the tendency to grow militant. The reactionary leadership of the Indian National Congress, led by the notorious lackey of British imperialism, M.K. Gandhi, was equally worried as the Britishers, because they were in the wake of a development which questioned the bogey of non-violence and exposed the treacherous vacillations of the Indian national bourgeoisie. As E.M. Zhukov said in 1949: "Alarmed at the national liberation struggle of the peoples, which is rising at the present time to a particularly high level and which is being waged under the hegemony of the working class, confronted with the growing revolutionary activity of the broad masses, the big bourgeoisie in the colonies and semi-colonies has finally gone over into the camp of imperialist reaction and betrayed the interests of its country and people." (E.M. Zhukov, *Problems of National and Colonial Struggle after the Second World War*).

Zhukov continued: "As a result of the 'new policy' of

imperialism in the colonies and semi-colonial countries, the national big bourgeoisie is often being allowed by them to come to power along with the landlords and other feudal elements. It utilises this power for the most violent and ruthless suppression of the mass liberation movement of the workers, peasants, the progressive intelligentsia. The position of India shows that the national big bourgeoisie do not yield either to feudal or imperialist colonisers in their ruthless and reactionary nature. This contributes to the fact that the new bourgeois-democratic reformist forms and methods of administration which were *designed to mask the retention of imperialist domination in the colonies* are being rapidly exposed and rendered less effective." (Ibid)

The national bourgeoisie, which had sown narrow bourgeois nationalism among the masses, were in a position to win over the vacillating reformist elements in the working class movement in India. Being assisted by these reformist forces the bourgeois was able to retain his leadership of the anti-imperialist united front. In the final analysis, bourgeois nationalism served as a great help rendered by the Indian bourgeoisie to their Anglo-U.S. imperialist masters. We, Marxists, do differentiate the narrow aggressive nationalism from the revolutionary patriotism of the masses. We discard the former for it virtually attempts to split the international proletariat and all the other oppressed masses of the world from uniting for the common cause of fighting against and defeating imperialism and all the native reactionaries allied with them. Bourgeois nationalism is a weapon in the hands of the ruling classes to split the working masses in the name of nation, language, race, culture and other things. Bourgeois nationalism blurs the vigilance of the revolutionary masses and confuses them so that they may be led astray by the ruling classes. Ultimately, bourgeois nationalism benefits the colonialists and imperialists alone. It leads to the virtual capitulation

of the toiling masses and results in giving up the struggle against the imperialists, capitalists and feudal vultures.

As E.M. Zhukov put it, "Bourgeois nationalism is the most important ideological weapon utilized by the Anglo-American aggressive bloc for the purpose of strengthening the unstable colonial system." He added: "That is why a ruthless exposure of the reactionary bourgeois nationalistic ideology in all its diverse forms—be it Kemalism or Gandhism, Zionism or Pan-Arabism—accelerates the process of national and social emancipation of the colonial and dependent countries and razes to the ground the provocative designs of the imperialists and their agents." (Ibid). Our very experience confirms this far-sighted exposition. Therefore, unless we oppose and defeat all such filthy attempts of the imperialists and their lackeys, the question of fulfilling our tasks warranted by history is not possible at all. The 1928 Comintern Thesis on colonies and semi-colonies stressed the same. The bourgeois learns his nationalism in the markets and its degree varies with every political change that is brought forth.

Ever since its birth the Indian bourgeoisie, even after its transition from the trading capitalists into industrial capitalists, has remained dependent in character. They remain tied up to the apron-strings of the Anglo-U.S. imperialists even after attaining a sham independence and their three so-called five-year plans. The changes which were brought about in the Indian economy have not effected a fundamental change in the Indian life. The monopolistic trends in the industrial and financial institutions too have not changed this. For, *the development of India, on the whole, remains one-sided*; that too, conditioned by foreign capital.

That is why C.M. Maslennikov observed: "The imperialists attempted to extend their social base in the colonial countries and increasingly drew over to their side the national big bourgeoisie which served them as a weapon

for pumping out the wealth of the colonial countries, and for the still greater enslavement of the colonial peoples. With the assistance of the imperialists the ruling groups of the local bourgeoisie became centres of the anti-democratic struggle in the colonies and semi-colonies. In certain countries, as for example India and China, these groups of the national bourgeoisie have become converted through imperialist support into big monopolist comprador amalgamations." (*On Leading Role of Working Class in the National Liberation Movement of the Colonial Peoples*, 1949).

The neo-revisionists, through their Madurai resolution on the CPC, maintain that India is not semi-colonial and semi-feudal as the CPC asserts, but is an independent under-developed country. They conveniently forget about the swelling foreign capital and the economic and political manoeuvres of the Anglo-U.S. imperialists through their "aid", "assistance", and "support". Above all, they refuse to understand the essence of the collaboration agreements of the Indian bourgeoisie with the imperialist camp. They help the ruling classes by covering up the repatriation of profits out of these collaborations with the metropolis. Thus, their role is, virtually, to beautify the comprador bourgeoisie and their imperialist masters.

Of course, the "Four Families" in Old China were a clear example of monopolist associations in the old Chinese society. They were not just mercantile bourgeoisie as the neo-revisionists contend. The economic and political power in Kuomintang China was monopolised by them. They had grown fat with a tremendous concentration of capital and natural riches of the country in their hands only with the help of the U. S. imperialists. "They employed not only capitalist but pre-capitalist methods of exploitation and emerged as the most typical representatives of big financial capital which merged both with the state apparatus and foreign capital." (Maslennikov, Ibid).

Maslennikov said in his report :

"In exactly the same manner as the Chinese, the Indian monopolist amalgamations made tremendous profits during the War period and this substantially increased their economic strength. The Directors of Birla, Tata, Dalmia and other companies had no objection to the passing of anti-British resolutions by the Congress. But they in essence were and continue to remain agents and allies of British capital in India. The rule of foreign imperialists in India is advantageous to the Indian big bourgeoisie. It is interested in the assistance of British imperialism for a struggle against the people's movement. It betrayed the national liberation movement for the sake of its class interests. The Indian big bourgeoisie has assisted the British imperialists to establish in India after the War a regime which *under the outer form of 'independence' has preserved intact the colonial exploitation of the population by British monopoly capital.*" (Ibid).

The situation has not changed at all even today. The monopolist groups which still control India have not at all become independent in nature disowning all their comprador characteristics. The capitalist development in Old China and in the present India may vary in degree. But they are the same in essence. Just citing the degree of variation the neo-revisionist gang cannot alter the fact that the Indian bourgeoisie is comprador in nature.

Smash this counter-revolutionary bloc !

When the reality stands so, where is the question of India attaining true independence ? Due to the immaturity of the proletariat in India and because of a prolonged state of vacillation on the part of its vanguard, the Communist Party of India, the leadership of the national liberation movement fell into the hands of the treacherous Indian big bourgeoisie. The Indian big bourgeoisie through its leadership of the Indian National Congress made use of the mass

movements just for their own narrow ends so as to bargain and win a few concessions for its own class from British imperialism. The Indian big bourgeoisie has always been anxious not to allow the struggle of the toiling masses under its banner to assume an active and extensive form as that would spell their own doom, too. For, "real freedom implies freedom not only from the oppression of the colonisers but also from the oppression of one's 'own' national bourgeoisie." On such occasions of growing militant struggle of the proletariat and the toiling masses of India, being frightened by them the bourgeoisie colluded with the imperialists, overtly and covertly, to put down the revolutionary movements. Thus, we actually see the existence of some kind of bloc comprised of the imperialists and the big bourgeoisie. This is universally applicable. Lenin had emphasised that "a certain rapprochement has been brought about between the bourgeoisie of the exploited countries and those of the colonial countries so that very often, even in the majority of cases, perhaps where the bourgeoisie of the oppressed countries does support the national movement, it simultaneously works in harmony with the imperialist bourgeoisie, i.e., it joins the latter in fighting against all revolutionary movements and revolutionary classes." (Lenin, *The Report of the Commission on the National and Colonial Questions at the Second Congress of the Communist International*, July 26, 1920).

The Indian bourgeoisie is an ideal example of such a type. The path of treachery, national betrayal and compromise with imperialism was pursued by the Indian bourgeoisie ever since the first stage of the national liberation movement which was directed mainly against foreign oppression. A clear instance is the 1918-22 mass movements. Having this class of big industrial bourgeoisie of India in mind, Stalin pointed out :

"Dreading revolution more than imperialism, concerned more about its money bags than about the interests of its

own country, this section of the bourgeoisie, the wealthiest and the more influential section, is completely going over to the camp of the irreconcilable enemies of the revolution, having entered into a bloc with imperialism against the workers and peasants of its own country" (*Address to the University of the Toilers of the East*, 1925).

One of the main reasons for the failure on the part of the proletariat and the toiling masses of India was their inability to realise this treachery. As a result, the vanguard of the working class, the Communist Party of India, became just a radical appendage of the Indian bourgeoisie. So imperialism was not at all defeated, but it ruled directly until 1947 and continues to do so indirectly, now, by holding the Indian bourgeoisie by many strings. The toiling masses can never achieve genuine independence and freedom without smashing the counter-revolutionary bloc, which is the outcome of the wedlock between the imperialists and the Indian big bourgeoisie. Stalin pointed out :

"The victory of the revolution cannot be achieved unless this bloc is smashed. But in order to break this bloc fire must be concentrated on the compromising national bourgeoisie ; its treachery must be exposed, the toiling masses must be emancipated from its influence and the conditions necessary for the hegemony of the proletariat must be systematically prepared. In other words, it is a question of preparing the proletariat of India for the role of leader in the liberation movement and of dislodging, step by step, the bourgeoisie and its spokesmen from this honourable position. The task is to create a revolutionary anti-imperialist bloc and to ensure the hegemony of the proletariat within the bloc." (*Marxism and the National and Colonial Question*).

The Indian big bourgeoisie came forward to play the role of a "steward" of Anglo-U.S. imperialism by rallying all the reactionary and counter-revolutionary scabs of East Asia. It virtually turned India into a bastion of reaction and is actively marketing the so-called parliamentary democracy so as to boost the morale of all the anti-communist monsters of the East. It pretends to be the champion of peace in Asia, while at the same time it

connives with the imperialists to carry on their aggression on the Asian continent. Its economic policy forms the basis of its external policy. Its political standpoint is essentially anti-communist, though it has allowed the Communist Party with a revisionist leadership to function legally. The appearance of its internal "democracy" could have been put to test if the Communist Party had taken to a revolutionary path. Stalin had clearly pointed out that fascism is always supplemented by social democracy. The bourgeois always finds his rule comparably safe and stable through an alliance with the social-reformists and the renegades from socialism. Without the revisionist leaders of India the ruling classes could not have had such a lengthy phase of "peaceful development." This period of economic development ever since the betrayal of Telangana by the revisionists has not solved in any way the contradiction between the peasantry and feudalism in the countryside or the contradiction between the working class and the comprador bourgeoisie in the cities. The economic situation has remained as usual in doldrums. The entire semi-colonial and semi-feudal structure remains intact.

What was the status of India after the formal withdrawal of the British and the partition of India into India and Pakistan? No basic change worth mentioning took place after the so-called "independence" of 1947.

Since then, the diminishing pomp and glory of British imperialism in the world has affected little the economic interests of the British in India. But the U.S. usury capital, aided by the Soviet revisionists, has dragged India closer into its neo-colonial orbit. We shall deal with this in details. A thorough appraisal alone can enable us to get rid of all the illusions about the nature of the Indian society and the ruling classes. India's image of being a direct colony of the British until 1947, its evolution into a British Dominion within the Commonwealth following the fictitious independence of 1947, and its present status of being a neo-colonial satellite of U. S.-Soviet alliance, have not at all changed India's position in the world. Basically, it remains semi-colonial and semi-feudal within the orbit of the U.S.-Soviet bloc.

(To be continued)

Soviet "Aid" To India— What Does It Really Mean ?

—Shankar Sen

NOT only the Dangeite renegades but the neo-revisionists also are loudly praising Soviet 'aid' to India. According to them, the 'aid' that the Soviet revisionists give to India is socialist in nature and so is not merely different from but is the very opposite of U.S. 'aid', which is imperialist in nature. They also spread the false idea that a "peaceful transition" to socialism may after all be possible in India. While they have been forced now to talk about the building of 'neo-capitalism' in the Soviet Union, they continue to preach the false notion that the Soviet State is still socialist in nature and so, its 'aid' is fundamentally different from U.S. 'aid'.

First, let us take up the question of the so-called "peaceful competition," which covers the countries of Asia, Africa and Latin America, specially the newly independent ones. These semi-independent countries were under the heels of foreign capital at the beginning of this century and remain so even today. After the Second World War, foreign capital began to penetrate into these countries even more vigorously. Around 1960, the imperialists recognised a number of countries of Asia and Africa as independent. The Soviet revisionist ruling clique at that time came out with a thesis that the countries which were not imperialist or socialist, together constituted a "zone of peace", where the Soviet Union would compete with the imperialists in giving 'aid'. Those countries were assured that the worth of the 'aid' given by the 'socialist' countries was much greater than the

imperialist 'aid' and the more they depended on such 'socialist aid' the more would they advance towards socialism. The Soviet revisionists preached the theory that transition to socialism could be achieved by expanding the state sector industries.

The theory was being given currency that there was no such thing as the class-character of a state. There were only the people and the one thing that was required was to attain rapid and great advance in agriculture and industry. But every Marxist-Leninist knows that so long as the state exists we must judge which class or classes wield the state power. If the capitalist class wields the state power, all 'aid' must necessarily serve to develop and further the interests of the capitalist class and of no other. To reach socialism we must first make a revolution, that is, we must establish a state under the leadership of the proletariat. To believe that socialism can be attained through Soviet 'aid' simply means to give up the struggle for the seizure of power. To talk of building socialism through Soviet 'aid' is nothing but Right opportunism. By counterposing the so-called 'socialist' Soviet 'aid' to the imperialist 'aid' the neo-revisionist chieftains are playing exactly this dirty trick; they are thereby trying to throw out the entire theory of class struggle.

But one may ask: how is Soviet 'aid' in any way different from imperialist 'aid'? While the Soviet 'aid' is poured into the state sector, the U.S. imperialists give 'aid' for both the state and the private sector. The Soviet revisionist ruling clique fraudulently claims that socialism can be attained gradually by increasing the state-controlled capital. But in the case of India or of any other country such questions can be judged only from the standpoint of the class character of the state. The state-controlled capital is neither above class interests nor outside them. It was Kautsky and his like who refused

to admit this. The Indian followers of Kautskyism also refuse to admit this and praised Jawaharlal Nehru to the skies.

Here a question arises, namely, how can the enormous amount of foreign capital which has penetrated into India and other countries be done away with? The revisionists pretend as if no such question exists. Their Party programme presents socialism as something which has nothing to do with the abolition of classes through class struggle. The only thing that has to be done, according to them, is to go over from the principle of 'from each according to his ability, to each according to his work' to the principle 'from each according to his ability, to each according to his need.' But such going over can be possible only after power is seized by the working class, and not before. This is elementary Marxism. By concealing this truth, the revisionists in reality try to dispose of wholesale the theory and practice of seizing power through class struggle. It is class collaboration pure and simple, which they want.

Soviet Economic 'Aid'

Now let us turn to the question of Soviet economic 'aid' to India. Soviet 'aid' to India began with the Bhilai steel project in 1955. The list of the agreements with the Soviet Union upto 1964 can be divided into several parts:

1. Iron and steel industry and things related to it,
2. Machine building industry (heavy),
3. Manufacture of electricity generators,
4. Thermal power and hydro-electric power production,
5. Iron and other minerals,
6. Manufacture of pneumatic instruments, water pumps etc.
7. Others.

Let us first understand the role of the Bhilai iron and

steel factory. It is in the public sector of the India Government and is one of the four such factories under the Hindusthan Steel Limited—the other three being the Rourkella factory, the Durgapur factory and the Bhadravati factory in Mysore. There are other iron and steel factories in the private sector owned by the Tatas and Martin-Burn. The units in the state sector do not encounter any competition from any quarter in respect of the quantity, expenditure or selling price of the iron produced. The state sector is directed by a committee of bureaucrats. The Hindusthan Steel Ltd. (HSL) is autonomous in all respects in spite of the fact that it is under the Iron & Steel Ministry of the India Government. It pays taxes to the Government as all other limited companies do and its ownership is attributed to the President of India. It is therefore clearly seen that the capital of the factories comprising the HSL has been jointly provided by the Indian state and from foreign sources under guarantee of the India government by the Soviet state and the German and British capitalists dealing in steel. The HSL carries on its national and international business on the basis of profit-making, and is not restricted in this in any way. The budget of the HSL is beyond the scope of Parliament. It is a well-known fact that the HSL makes profit by selling iron and steel products to South Vietnam. Recently, the India Government sent 500 railway wagons to South Korea for carrying oil and coal and strengthening the U.S. base of aggression there. These wagons were built by the British-owned Braithwaite and Burn from the steel sheets supplied by the sheet-mill of the Soviet-sponsored Bhilai Steel unit of the HSL. This is quite understandable, because the HSL is out to make profit by any means and the policy of the Soviet revisionists and their 'aid' is to strengthen imperialism in every way. So, it is not at all surprising that the HSL should rush supplies to South Korea in order to strengthen the U.S. imperialists' anti-Chinese and anti-North Korea aggressive plan for destroying the socialist states. That the Bhilai

Steel should take a major part in this criminal deal, and thus strengthen U.S. war bases in South Korea and encourage and endorse the anti-Chinese cold war of the reactionary Indian government, which is always eager to serve its U.S. masters in order to earn a few dollars, is also not at all surprising.

We also find that the Soviet government has signed an agreement to buy one hundred thousand tons of railway steel tracks which Bhilai produces. The author is quite unable to tell whether these are bought by the Soviet government for use in their own country or for re-exporting them to other countries (in Africa?) in order to earn foreign exchange.

The above two instances clearly show how not only the imperialists but the Soviet revisionist ruling clique, which wears the mask of socialism, also exploits the cheap labour power available in India.

The neo-revisionists are the agents of imperialism and use the signboard of communism merely to deceive people. They never tire of singing the praise of the 'socialist' nature of the Bhilai project (see Programme of CPM, paras 17 and 20). By doing this they hope to hide the undeniable fact that there is no difference between the imperialists and the Soviet revisionists and that the Soviet and U.S. policies and interests have merged together and are inseparable as regards the economics and politics of the Bhilai Steel Project.

What is the reason for this pitiable condition in which the India-made steel finds itself to-day? The reason is that the so-called development and constructive activities are unable to consume fully the quantity of steel produced in the country. The Soviet revisionists are, however, little concerned with this and have managed to secure for themselves a huge contract to build another very large steel factory at Bokaro. When at present there is no market for so much steel in this country, why should the

Soviet overlords try to build this new steel factory? Their sole purpose is to utilize this channel to dump Soviet-made goods in this country and to have a share in the loot of the state funds of India. This is exactly what the Indian bourgeoisie and other foreign imperialists are doing. In this respect therefore, there is no difference between the Soviet revisionists and the Indian and foreign imperialist exploiters. We must be able to judge these things with appropriate seriousness.

Soviet propaganda organs claim that the rate of interest on the Soviet 'aid' is much lower than the rate of interest on other foreign aids. But this deceptive claim is proved worthless by the political and economic policy pursued by the HSL. The truth is, the Soviet revisionists extract much more than the so-called concessions and benefits they allegedly give to India. More of it later.

It has now become quite clear that the revisionist leading clique of the CPI concealed from the people the tremendous new penetration of foreign imperialist capital spearheaded by the Bhilai project in 1955. Even as late as 1964, when it was quite evident that the HSL was tied to the apron strings of foreign exploiters and not at all difficult to guess and realise the poisonous effects of Soviet 'aid' from the policies and actions of the Soviet revisionists, their "peaceful co-existence" with imperialism, the renegades who had usurped the CPI leadership did not do anything to expose all this. Were they ignorant fools not to notice all this or merely crafty agents actively helping the criminal designs of the Soviet traitorous ruling clique in India? To consider the Indian Khrushchovs fools is to make a fool of oneself. Let us however proceed.

The exports by HSL amounted to Rs. 2.3 crores in 1965-66, Rs. 9.3 crores in 1966-67 and Rs. 30.7 crores in 1967-68.

This autonomous body [HSL] directed by the seasoned

bureaucrats of 'free' India have organised the plunder of our country's resources and the exploitation of the available cheap labour power by the British, German and Soviet capital. And how are its exports used? To bolster up the neo-colonial system in Asia and for strengthening imperialist aggressive forces against socialist countries!

The internal and foreign policies of the Soviet renegades not only support this political policy of plunder but actually participate in such plunders. They have already taken one lakh tons of steel and are likely to take more.

Soviet 'Aid'

In Ore-Mining Industry

What has been the result of the so-called Soviet aid to increase the output of the iron ore mining in Korba and other places? No amount of bourgeois drum-beating about its being the largest mine in India or Asia can hide the truth that Soviet 'aid' in this field has simply meant making such arrangements that increasingly vast quantities of resources like ores, which are the raw materials of a colony, can be given away to the imperialists. Japan is the biggest customer of Indian pig iron. At present, India can export 4 lakh tons of pig iron and 8 lakh tons of steel. The only thing required is to arrange for subsidies from state funds so that the imperialists can buy steel at a cheap price from us and the Indian bourgeoisie can get their share of profit. This is only another crafty device for plundering the wealth and labour power of the Indian people. The Soviet renegades and their Indian lackeys, the neo-revisionists, prettify this criminal loot and represent it as progress towards socialism.

A more detailed investigation into the facts as to how the Indian state sector controlled by the bureaucracy serves as a contractor, a middle-man of foreign imperialist and Soviet capital will clearly reveal the neo-colonial strongholds in the industrial and financial organisations of the Indian

state. Marxist students of Indian economy will have to take up this task.

Heavy Machine-building Industry : Heavy Engineering Corporation In Ranchi

The neo-revisionists fraudulently claim that the Soviet 'aid' to the Ranchi project will go a long way in fulfilling India's needs for machine-building machines (see CPM Party programme, para 20).

True to their revisionist nature they have avoided any discussion regarding the policy pursued in the case of the Ranchi project. We find that Mahindra and Mahindra, the monopoly industrialists and monopoly producers of jeep cars in India, are the sole agents of the lathes produced by the Heavy Engineering Corporation at Ranchi. What does it mean? It means that the Soviet 'aid' given at the state level goes to fatten the big Indian bourgeoisie. Mahindra and Mahindra are also agents for importing lathes and other machineries from the Soviet Union. Another such agent is Karamchand Thapar who ranks third among the powerful group of managing agencies in India. Does not this fact confirm our above conclusion? The Soviet revisionists thought it best to fatten the big bourgeoisie and gave the agency to them instead of to the State Trading Corporation.

Electricity Generator Industry

Take, for instance, the case of the Neyvelli power project in Madras. The electricity generated here serves to provide electric light to about 70 per cent of villages in Tamilnad. That's good. But what about the power-driven irrigation pumps run by this electricity? More than half of the total number of power-driven irrigation pumps in the country have been installed in Tamilnad alone (numbering more than two lakhs) and are run by electricity. It is a patent fact that poor or middle peasants are quite unable to purchase such

pumps which cost from two and a half to three thousand rupees each. Only the rich peasants and the government can afford to have the pumps.

What does this mean? It is an attempt to increase agricultural production by helping the rich peasants to grow richer. In other words, the Soviet 'aid' here serves no other purpose than thwarting the development of agrarian revolution. But our neo-revisionist clique creates and preaches the myth that the Ranchi project and all other Soviet-aided projects serve 'to diminish our dependence' on others. By acting like this, they are simply upholding and praising the Soviet revisionists. If we consider the question of power-generating industry as a whole, we will see that the Soviet 'aid' in this field clearly serves to benefit and develop widely the middle bourgeoisie.

All this springs from the fact that the present Soviet revisionist ruling clique is pursuing a bourgeois counter-revolutionary policy. Every communist knows that after the October revolution the bourgeoisie of the colonies and semi-colonies were unable to lead the bourgeois democratic revolution. But the Soviet renegades preach the false theory that the bourgeoisie of such countries are still capable of leading the peasantry. When the neo-revisionists talk about improving the living conditions of the peasantry in the present set-up, they merely betray themselves as peddlers of this false theory. They are nothing but bourgeois gentlemen who don the mask of a Communist in order to peddle the counter-revolutionary revisionist theories which their Soviet mentors cook up. While the Dangeites clamour for one hundred Suratgarhs, the neo-revisionists modestly restrict their propaganda to such things as fertiliser, seeds and bombasts about distributing land to the peasants 'according to law.' Both make sure that dangerous talks about overthrowing feudalism do not find any place in their political vocabulary. There is nothing surprising, therefore, that the neo-revisionist leading clique

of the CPM should ignore the class interests of the oppressed peasantry and indirectly approve and endorse the reactionary nature of Soviet 'aid' which, in the final analysis, strengthens the reactionary classes and serves to put obstacles in the path of development of class revolution. The neo-revisionists and the Soviet revisionists are birds of the same stock. This is why the neo-revisionist leading clique so jubilantly sings the praise of Soviet 'aid.'

Indo-Soviet Trade

Here we are considering only trade with the Soviet Union and not with the East European countries of the Soviet bloc. The total amount of imports from the Soviets during the period 1961-62 to 1965 (upto October) was Rs. 291.04 crore and the exports from India to that country during the period amount to Rs. 251.92 crore. Not much, one would say, considering the period of about 4 years and a half. Recently an agreement has been signed to push up the annual trade turnover considerably (India's total annual foreign trade amounts to Rs. 2,500 crore).

What is the nature of this Indo-Soviet trade? The following items are purchased by the Soviet Union according to the recent agreement signed:—leather (raw, finished, tanned and dressed), cashew nuts (with shells); raw jute; oil-cakes (of mustard & other oil seeds); seeds; shoes; cotton goods; tea; steel materials. The *Trade Journal* (June 21, 1967) published by the Commerce Ministry gives these facts in details. The *Journal* gives the information that in pursuance of a decision taken on June 2, duty on jute and various jute goods was reduced in the interest of long-term trade with the Soviet Union and the East European countries of the Soviet bloc. The reductions were Rs. 300 per bale (from Rs. 900 to Rs. 600) in the case of jute carpet backing and special jute goods; Rs. 150 (from Rs. 900 to Rs. 750) on hessian goods; and Rs. 400

(Rs. 600 to Rs. 200) on gunny bags etc. The Indian government willingly sacrificed a sizeable portion of its income in the interest of the Indian and British capital in the jute industry and the Soviet Union and the East European countries. Does it not fully show that the Soviet revisionists have slyly taken advantage of the crisis in the jute industry to extract concessions? They are no better than the US imperialists who, taking advantage of this crisis, have begun to 'co-operate' with the research department of the Indian Jute Mills Association. One cannot fail to notice how the Soviet revisionists and the US imperialists make a common cause with the Indian and British capital to 'save' India's jute industry. Like a pack of hungry wolves, all of them are sucking the blood of the Indian people and take every opportunity to exploit India's cheap labour power.

The Soviet revisionists are a major exploiter of the Indian people. In accordance with the government decision of May 2, 1967, the India government bears the burden of a subsidy amounting to 10 to 20 per cent of the export prices of iron and steel. It means that the India government in order to satisfy the demands of the Soviet revisionists has agreed to sell iron and steel to them at a price lower than the normal. To fill in the gap, money is poured from the state funds collected by imposing unbearable burdens on the people. Through this manoeuvre of artificial lowering of the export prices, the Soviet revisionists have managed to extort a profit worth tens of crores of rupees from India in their deals for purchase of jute goods, steel and rails. For the neo-revisionist clique of the CPI (M), all this plunder of the Indian people by the Soviet revisionists is quite good and 'socialist' in nature. Poor lackeys of Soviet revisionists and Indian reactionaries as they are, they are charged by their masters with the job of proving before the people that the neo-colonial 'socialist' plunder by the Soviet revisionists is 'fundamentally' different from the plunder by the US imperialists.

Purchase of hide leather etc. :

India has the responsibility to supply hides and leather to her masters—Britain, West Germany, U. S. A. and the Soviet Union. Since the agreement signed with the Bell mission the U. S. imperialists have been taking hides etc. along with other things from India. The Soviet Union is doing the same. But there is no way to find out what price each of these countries pays for the raw hide and leather. The journal *Trade and Industry* (October, 1967) gives the export prices of all other goods except those of hide and leather, though the import price of each piece of hide is given. The journal gives lists of export agreements signed with the U. S. A. and the Soviet Union. Many of the items exported to these two countries are the same.

The neo-revisionist clique of the C P I (M) is determined to glorify the role of the Soviet revisionists. This is a main object of their Madurai document. They try to conceal the undeniable fact that like all other imperialists the Soviet revisionist clique is committing grave crimes against the interests of the people of colonies and semi-colonies and plundering the cheap labour-power of our country.

I would request my comrades and students of Marxism to pay due attention to this fact of Soviet neo-colonial plunder of India and thoroughly expose its real nature.

SUPPORT

the Afro-American Struggle :

Significance of Mao Tse-tung's Statement

THE two statements made by Mao Tse-tung in August 1963 and April 1968 (see BROADSHEET, May 1968) supporting the struggle of the Afro-American people in the U.S. have greatly deepened understanding of its significance. Although separated by some five years, both the statements embody the same basic principles.

Racial oppression, whether practised in the U.S., Southern Africa or Britain, is a product of colonialism and imperialism. Its roots lie deep in the history of the slave trade and imperial conquest of the lands where the people were of a different ethnic group from the imperial powers. Its history is the history of imperialist aggression and exploitation in which the black people, whether in the West Indies, Southern Africa or the U.S., have been the most exploited victims of capitalism. The imperialist basis of racialism is clearly recognised in the oppression of Africans by whites in Southern Rhodesia, and to a lesser extent in the exploitation of coloured immigrants in a former major colonial country such as Britain. There has not however, been the same awareness of the connection between racialism and imperialism in the U.S. The treatment of the black minority in the U.S. is akin to that of the African majority in South Africa because they both have the same class position—an enslaved source of the cheap labour which is necessary to imperialism. This needs to be stressed in order to bring home the essential identity between the struggle of the Afro-Americans for their emancipation and

the national liberation struggles of the peoples of Asia, Africa and Latin America. This Chairman Mao does in both his statements :

'The fascist atrocities of the U.S. imperialists against the Negro people have exposed the true nature of so-called American democracy and freedom and revealed the inner link between the reactionary policies pursued by the U.S. Government at home and its policies of aggression abroad.' (1963)

'Racial discrimination in the U.S. is a product of the colonialist and imperialist system.' (1968)

Because racial oppression affects all members of the black community, its class basis is often obscured. All black doctors and black businessmen, along with the humblest share-cropper, suffer the indignity of racial discrimination or more severe forms of oppression at some stage of their lives. The role of such professional people or members of the black bourgeoisie, is inferior to that of their white counterparts—rather similar in fact to that of middle-class elements in the colonies and semi-colonies who cannot enjoy the same status and privileges as their imperialist masters. The Afro-American workers are even more blatantly oppressed ; proportionally more of them than the whites are drafted to Vietnam and are unemployed.

In this situation, the class status of the majority of black people is too often ignored. This is the case even among the most militant sections ; in several of the "Black Power" formulations appeal is made to colour rather than to class. The fundamental fact is that the great majority of the 20 million Afro-Americans are *workers*, either in the rural areas or, increasingly, in towns and cities. As members of the working-class the Afro-Americans can and should find allies among those oppressed by and fighting against imperialism.

In his 1963 statement, Mao pointed out that the actual oppression against the black people originates in the

reactionary ruling circles who do not represent the workers, farmers and revolutionary intellectuals. In the 1968 Statement, he says "The contradiction between the black masses in the U.S. and U.S. ruling circles is a class contradiction." Because of their fundamental class position, the oppressed cannot be truly emancipated through class collaboration and class conciliation as preached by the ruling class or its adherents, whether pacifists such as Martin Luther King, or so-called communists who, following the Soviet leadership, look for a peaceful solution through "civil rights." "Only by overthrowing the reactionary rule of the U.S. monopoly capitalist class and destroying the colonialist and imperialist system can the black people in the U.S. win complete emancipation" (1968 Statement).

Developing Storm

Mao brings to the attention of the world the revolutionary *potentialities* of the Afro-American struggle. And the upsurge among the Afro-American people is capable of destroying the U.S. colonialist and imperialist system. Already, many uprisings, beginning with the Harlem disturbances of 1964 against police brutality, the Watts rebellion of 1965, the Chicago struggle of 1966, and the more developed ones in Detroit and Newark last year, have broken the chains that the advocates of class collaboration and conciliation tried to impose upon the movement. Describing the protests and struggle following the murder of Dr. King and the violent repression of Afro-Americans by the U.S. Government, Mao talks of a 'storm such as has never taken place before in the history of that country. It shows that an extremely powerful revolutionary force is latent in the more than twenty million black Americans' (1968 Statement).

From the dimensions of the developing storm Mao emphasises two points, both of the utmost importance. The

first is the unity of the struggle of the black workers and that of other sections of the American people, such as students and white workers, against U.S. imperialism. Having a common enemy, they must unite. Again he puts right the record. It is true that many sections of white workers are guilty of racial prejudice against their black fellow workers and act as viciously—as anyone will know who has seen the behaviour of 'poor whites' in Mississippi or Alabama, or for that matter of dockers and porters from the East End of London recently—but the real responsibility is that of the oppressors. Those London dockers or Detroit auto workers who manifest racial hatred are no more than tools of the real oppressors and instigators of violence: the monopoly capitalists who profit from the double exploitation of the black workers which the division between black and white makes possible. The real enemy must be isolated and attacked—not his creatures. The struggle of the black people of America is bound to merge with the American workers' movement to overthrow U.S. monopoly capitalism and the imperialist system.

How different is this formulation from the mechanical version still heard in various progressive circles, where lip service is paid to unity of white and black workers under such slogans as 'Black and white, unite and fight' (i.e. for higher wages, with the implication that this would solve the problem of racialism). Besides failing to take account of the real basis of discrimination and exploitation, the slogan equally fails to take account of the growing crisis in capitalist society, and ignores the significance of the Afro-Asian struggle. The Afro-American struggle is, in Mao's words, 'a tremendous aid and inspiration to the struggle of the people throughout the world against U.S. imperialism and must be resolutely supported not only by American workers and students but by people in all countries fighting imperialism.

Nature of the Struggle

The second point concerns the nature of the struggle. Against the violence done to them for centuries by their oppressors, who today are ready to use any weapons to defend property and privilege, the Afro-American can only fight with revolutionary violence. It is here, of course, that the ideological and practical contributions of Chairman Mao and the entire Chinese revolution are of the greatest help to the black people of the U.S. and all those in Asia, Africa and Latin America fighting for their national liberation. It is here, equally, that the Soviet leadership's withdrawal and total retreat from the revolutionary road is most apparent. Where Mao and the Chinese pledge their resolute support for the revolutionary struggles of the Afro-Americans, the Soviet leaders attribute good intentions to the Johnsons and Kenedys when they promise marginal reforms. Soviet papers condemn the Afro-American struggles as using 'blind violence' (*Izvestia*, April 16) exactly as does the *New York Times*. Tass speaks of the troops 'restoring order' and clearing the people from the streets (April 10). The Soviet trade union paper *Trud* (April 7) states that once the Vietnam war is over the U.S. Government could spend millions of dollars improving the living conditions of millions in the cities, ignoring the essential nature of U.S. monopoly capitalism which must divide and exploit the working class at the same time as it pursues imperialist war abroad.

The Chinese recognise that the Afro-Americans will not be liberated, nor U.S. imperialism overthrown, through begging for a few crumbs from the capitalist table. As the Afro-American struggle and the struggles of the American working class develop, it is the analysis of Mao Tse-tung not the distortions of the Soviet line, that will be vindicated.

NOTES

(Continued from page 16)

on the Sino-Indian border. To sub-serve the global interests of the U.S. imperialists and the Soviet revisionists, a so-called "border question" was artificially introduced into Indian politics and a phony 'border dispute' was created, in which Nehru, as before, played the most important role. Fomented, engineered and materially aided jointly by the U.S. imperialists and the Khrushchov gang, this 'border dispute' burst into an open conflict in October, 1962.

A host of Congress leaders starting from Nehru plainly admitted that the real issue involved in the bloody clash with China was not the few square miles of barren, uninhabited, mountainous territory. But they did it only after the clash had taken place. Why? The reason is, the Soviet revisionists and the U.S. imperialists needed a clash, and not a settlement, between India and China. Nehru himself noted this fact long before the emergence of this Moscow-New Delhi-Washington axis against China. During the Korean war, in a letter to Sri B. N. Rau, India's representative in the UNO, he wrote: "I see that both the USA and the U.K. on the one hand and the USSR on the other...are not anxious that India and China should be friendly towards each other." (*The Statesman*, December 7, 1965). However, later Nehru himself played a most significant role in setting India against China as required by Moscow and Washington. The border conflict of 1962 was essentially a confrontation between the forces of world imperialism and its accomplices and lackeys on the one hand, and the anti-imperialist forces of revolution on the other. And the rout of the Indian soldiers on the Himalayas merely epitomized the fiasco suffered by imperialism and its lackeys, the Soviet revisionists.

The basic interests of the Indian people are in complete harmony with the interests of the Chinese people. They have a common interest in fighting and destroying their common enemies—U. S. imperialism and its accomplices, the Soviet revisionists. And in the present era this is the most stable and unbreakable bond that binds the world's peoples into a revolutionary brotherhood. The friendship and solidarity between the peoples of India and China are unshakable precisely because it is based on their common struggle against U.S. imperialism and Soviet revisionists. It is clear as day light that those who are interested in preserving the system of exploitation and oppression in India, namely, the U.S. imperialists, the Soviet revisionists and their Indian lackeys, are the ones who go about condemning and vilifying China. Indeed, only the enemies of the Indian people can be the enemies of China and revolution. The enemies of the Indian and Chinese peoples are the same—imperialism and its lackeys.

The Congress rulers are willing lackeys of the worst enemies of the Indian people—U.S. imperialists, Soviet revisionists. They have proved themselves to be bitter enemies of Indian independence and liberation. They are the worst oppressors of the Indian people and of the various nationalities. The Congress rulers are the cruel bailiffs of the plunderers of the Indian people and enjoy all the 'freedom' in killing and oppressing the people. Holding the people in subjugation by unlimited violence and deception is their job which they perform gladly at the command of the U.S. imperialists and Soviet revisionists. There is absolutely no need for the people to suffer these Congress rulers even for one moment longer. The people have also nothing to do with the other existing political parties who live off the people to serve the forces of reaction. The most poisonous tools that the Congress rulers are now using against the revolu-

tionary Indian people are the revisionist renegades of the CPI and the CPI(M). The people can never liberate themselves from the clutches of exploitation and oppression unless they first thoroughly eliminate the revisionist poison spread by these disguised agents of reaction.

People, arise! Raise high the red banner of revolution and Mao Tse-tung's thought and advance determinedly along the path of Naxalbari! Close your ranks, defy difficulties, defeat revisionist poison and march unitedly forward to achieve genuine independence, national liberation and people's democracy! Smash the U.S. imperialists and Soviet revisionists and their lackeys! Support and unite with the valiant struggles of our Naga, Mizo and Kuki brothers and other oppressed nationalities against the Congress reactionary regime! Victory will surely belong to the Indian people!

ARE THEY MARXISTS OR REACTION'S HENCHMEN?

In the July 21 issue of *People's Democracy*, the central organ of the neo-revisionist clique, appeared two reports on Andhra—both quite illuminating. They once again unmask the real face of the "Marxists" and the role they are playing in the bitter class struggle now raging in several Andhra districts and elsewhere.

One of these reports, entitled "Stop this Landlord Police Congress eTerror in Telangana", informs the readers that in a letter to Brahmananda Reddy, Chief Minister of Andhra Pradesh, P. Sundarayya has cited innumerable instances of brutal attacks on peasants and Communists in Nalgonda, Khamman and Warangal perpetrated by landlords' armed gangs, Congressmen and the police since 1956. The neo-revisionist chieftain "has requested" the Congress Chief Minister to instruct the police officials, and the special police that are posted in these areas, not to aid the village landlords and their hired henchmen, in committ-

ing these atrocities." Sundarayya has appealed to the Congress Chief Minister to instruct the police officials and the special police "to do justice evenly and not to treat 'Communist supporters' as non-citizens, as sub-humans, against whom anything and any kind of atrocity can be perpetrated and justified and encouraged." Sundarayya's heart seems to be overflowing with the milk of human kindness!

The other report on "Andhra State Committee Decisions" enlightens the readers on the various steps taken by Sundarayya, Basava-punniah and Co. to dissolve District, Taluk and other Committees of the CPI(M), organize new ones in their place and to expel a large number of members from the party. What was their crime? Many of the rank and file comrades had raised the banner of revolt against the Sundarayya-Ranadive-Namboodiripad faction, insisted that the assessments of the Indian and the world situation by this clique must change and urged that not prayer, petition and "parliamentary" methods but resistance and revolutionary violence alone can smash the violent attacks of the landlord-police-Congress combine and overthrow their regime of plunder and oppression.

Between 1954 and 1964 about forty communist workers were murdered in Telangana and another ten to fifteen in Andhra area by the landlords. During the last two years about twenty Communist workers, ten of them in Telangana, were murdered. Some idea of the nature of the attacks by the landlord-police-Congress combine may be had from the following two instances:

"In Chandrugonda village (in Warangal) during the 1965 parliamentary by-election a Lambodi peasant supporter of CPI(M), Boda Bikya, was assaulted, his hands and legs were broken, his house was set on fire and his 7 years old son Rajya was tied hand and foot and burnt alive by Congress supporters.

"It was again in this same taluk that in 1965 August in

the village Maheswarapuram, in connection with the dispute about a field path between the peasants and the village landlords, the police opened fire, wounding a CPI (M) worker Chenna Reddy, who died in Warangal hospital, handcuffed, with no medical care whatsoever....

"It was after this shooting that the Reserve Police camped in the village, tortured 1000 persons, poured urine in the wounded persons' mouths when they asked for water, and raped 26 women including some who were pregnant."

All this resembles the vicious attacks of Diem on the people of South Viet-Nam. Naturally, in Sreekakulam and the districts of Telangana the question of resistance, the question of using revolutionary violence to combat these attacks, was raised by rank and file comrades. But the opportunist scum represented by Sundarayya-Ranadive-Namboodiripad-Rammurthy clique would not have anything to do with resistance on the ground that the legality of the party would then be endangered. Instead, they have now chosen to request the Congress Chief Minister to ask the police to do justice evenly to the oppressors and the oppressed, the exploiters and the exploited, the wolf and the lamb. The scum that calls itself Marxist has become Gandhian in its ideology! For it, the class struggle does not exist, or if it exists, the Congress Chief Minister and the police that is a part of the reactionary state machinery are all above classes!

The truth is, Sundarayya's letter is a sort of device to deceive the masses at a time when this gang is purging the party of all militant, revolutionary elements who alone can help the peasantry to defend itself. While keeping the peasantry defenceless in the face of attacks of the landlords and the police, they feign love and concern for the peasant victims and appeal to the Chief Minister, a leading member of the Congress Party—the main party of the big landlords and the big bourgeoisie—to intervene!

These sham "Marxists" are not non-combatants during the fierce class-struggle now raging in the country. Their entire tactics amount to this: while pretending to love for the peasantry they keep them defenceless and throw them to the wolves of landlords and the police and direct their fire against those comrades who stand by the peasantry. In Naxalbari when the heroic peasants took up arms to defend themselves and overthrow the regime of oppression and plunder, these impostors as the biggest partner of the U.F. Government in West Bengal did not hesitate to use the reactionary state machinery in its attempt to suppress the brave peasantry. At the same time they came down upon revolutionary comrades who led the peasants, with disciplinary measures and the violent slanders. So, like the Gandhites, they are waging the class struggle with a vengeance—as henchman of the reactionary classes and as enemies of the toiling people.

The brave peasants and the revolutionary comrades of Telangana and Sreekakulam have to fight on two fronts—the landlords' gangs and the police as well as reaction's agents masquerading as Marxists—in order to achieve victory. Communist revolutionaries of other parts of India send them their revolutionary greetings and express their firm solidarity with them.

HOW THEY 'STRENGTHEN' DEMOCRATIC MOVEMENTS

Everyday the "Marxists" and their allies—the Dange renegades, the R.S.P., the S.S.P. and others—seem to surpass all their previous records as agents of the reactionary classes: whenever they adorn the ministerial offices, they deny food and jobs to the people, seek to divert people's anger with talks of a sham struggle against the Congress government at the centre and try hard to suppress all expressions of discontent of the people, all democratic

movements, by fascist methods. During the first ten months of the rule of the "Marxist"-led ministry in Kerala, Namboodiripad said to a *Washington Post* correspondent, "people today have, ... even less food (and that at higher cost) than ten months ago. The problem of unemployment and lack of all-round economic development has also become worse during the last ten months." (*People's Democracy*, January 14, 1968). Since this interview the price of food ration has been considerably raised by Namboodiripad's government. This is the kind of relief the "Marxists" and their allies are offering to the people of Kerala and promising the people of West Bengal. And the manner in which they are "strengthening the democratic movements of the people" for making revolution at a convenient time in future is best illustrated by the news that has recently come from Kerala.

The employees of Namboodiripad's government were agitating for some time for some very just demands when the "Marxist"-led government refused to accede to them, seven hundred employees of the Kerala Secretariat went on one day's mass casual leave. Namboodiripad and his men have responded by imposing a salary cut of one day and what is most astounding of all, ordering a break of service of these seven hundred employees. That amounts to treating them as new entrants, who are forced to lose the benefit of all previous increments, seniority in service etc. and to start anew from the lowest rung of the ladder.

It is reported that these penal measures have received the support of the United Front Co-ordination Committee in Kerala. The utterly reactionary character of the United Fronts and United Front governments is demonstrated once again as it was demonstrated before in West Bengal.

In Maharashtra, West Bengal, Bihar, Uttar Pradesh and elsewhere government employees have again and again demonstrated their dissatisfaction with the miserable conditions of their service in various ways including mass

casual leave and strike. Even the governments led by notorious Congress bosses like Bidhan Roy and Prafulla Sen and bureaucrats like Governor Dharma Vira never dared impose a salary cut or order a break of service. Namboodiripad and his men have set an example for all other reactionary bosses to emulate. We know that when the present system torn with crisis, is on the verge of collapse, the "Marxists," the Dangeites and others have undertaken to stabilise it. ("I may now claim that one of the biggest achievements of our pre-election alliance and the post-election coalition Government is that we have shown that it is possible for the various non-Congress parties to come together and establish a relatively stable alliance on which a stable coalition Government can be built."—Namboodiripad during his interview with *Washington Post* Correspondent, *Ibid*). The task is difficult. Naturally, these degenerate lackeys of the ruling classes have to try to accomplish it.

Only a few days ago, several hundred retrenched policemen who were demanding reinstatement in service were mercilessly attacked with lathis on the orders of Namboodiripad's government. When these sham Marxists and their allies are treating the toiling people agitating for just demands with lathis and bullets and adopting all kinds of vindictive measures, they are full of servility towards the U.S. imperialists. During their demonstrations on the Vietnam Day this year, the youth of Kerala incensed by the brutalities of the American aggressors who are laying waste the whole of Vietnam, set on fire a van belonging to the U.S. Consulate. While anti-imperialist India acclaims this action of the youth of Kerala, an action which is a token of solidarity with the heroic Vietnamese people, the "Marxist" Chief Minister expressed "deep personal regret" for the incident in a letter to the U.S. Consul and promised to take severe action against the young men. When the influence of the Congress is declining, the "Marxists" and their allies have taken upon themselves the task of restoring

political stability to the present vicious system; naturally, they are servile to the Birlas and other Indian reactionaries and to the U.S. imperialists and hostile to the impoverished toiling people.

The mask of the "Marxists" and other traitors is falling off. In order to win victory the toiling people must get rid of all illusion about these agents of reaction planted among them and wage a fight on two fronts—against the reactionary ruling classes and against their agents who call themselves 'Marxists', 'Communists' and 'Socialists.'

FLAMES OF NAXALBARI SPREAD TO UTTAR PRADESH

A Correspondent writes :

The flames of Naxalbari is indeed spreading like wild forest-fire. It has now reached the Terai regions of Uttar Pradesh. It is truly heartening to see how the revolutionary people, the landpoor and landless peasants, imbued with the great revolutionary example of Naxalbari and the ever shining thought of Mao Tse-tung, are coming forward in thousands. They are showing unprecedented initiative, vigour and determination and are marching forward to establish their own political power. All this symbolises a completely new phenomenon which characterises the Indian countryside today. The revolutionary peasants are on the march and the Terai regions of Uttar Pradesh reverberate with the sound of their footsteps.

The revolutionary peasants in the Terai region of the Lakhimpur district in U. P., guided by the local Communist revolutionaries have taken to the revolutionary path, the path of Naxalbari. Infuriated at this, the zamindars and big landlords have been constantly trying to suppress them. Recently one day they sent a big gang of about a hundred hired goondas, armed with guns, in order to 'teach' the peasants 'a lesson'. The goondas managed to surround the revolutionary peasants and began to fire shots

at them. The firing continued for some time. But the peasants, who know the terrain like the palm of their hand avoided a direct clash immediately and took shelter and waited for their turn. They reorganised their forces and united with the local people attacked the armed goondas at a suitable time. Fifteen of the goondas were disabled, one of whom reportedly died later. Not one of the revolutionary peasants was injured or killed.

The news of this criminal attack on the revolutionary peasants and their vigorous and successful resistance created a new wave of enthusiasm among the peasant masses and greatly intensified their hatred and anger toward the oppressor landlords. Angry peasants surrounded the houses of a number of landlords, seized foodgrains, took away their guns, and duly punished them.

In order to suppress the newly-awakened peasant masses and to protect the landlords, the reactionary state government has despatched a large force of three thousand armed policemen and issued warrants of arrests against 75 revolutionary peasants. But the local population comprising mostly of oppressed peasants are actively supporting and helping the revolutionaries to foil every attempt of the police to find them. Frustrated and infuriated at this failure, the reactionary government is trying to organise a fierce terror-campaign against the revolutionary peasants and the people.

CHINA POINTS THE WAY

Anna Louise Strong, in her *Letter from China*, February 22nd, 1968, writes :

China is now the centre of world revolution and of the struggle against U.S. imperialism. Not a centre from which orders are issued. She is the centre, first, from which the thought of Mao Tse-tung spreads and this is her greatest gift to the anti-imperialist world revolution. The thought of Mao Tse-tung is the vital factor in unifying the world

struggle; ideological unity is the most important kind of unity. China is also the centre because Mao actively directs the Chinese revolution and constantly analyses world revolutionary experience. Since World War II, Mao has pointed the way for world revolution and continues to do so.

The role of the Soviet revisionists is the exact opposite of China's role. They hide the real nature of imperialism and distract people from struggle against it, but instead collude with U.S. imperialism to dominate the world.

Nonetheless the world's peoples move inexorably towards confrontation with U.S. imperialism, towards a world anti-imperialist front. What Mao Tse-tung predicted in 1949 is clearly coming to pass today:

'Imperialism has prepared the conditions for its own doom. These conditions are the awakening of the great masses of the people in the colonies and semi-colonies and in the imperialist countries themselves. Imperialism has pushed the great masses of the people throughout the world into the historical epoch of the great struggle to abolish imperialism.'

We regret that owing to unavoidable circumstances *A New Assessment of the History of the CPI* could not be published in this issue. It will however, be resumed in our next issue.

Regd. No. C 3432

LIBERATION

Price 1-00

Edited and Published by Nimai Ghose from 60A, Keshab
Chandra Sen Street, Cal-9 and Printed by him from
Pragati Printers, 59A, Bechu Chatterjee St., Cal-9.