

LIBERATION

| | |
|---|----|
| Declaration of the Revolutionaries of the C.P.I.(M) | 3 |
| Notes | 7 |
| The Thought of Mao Tse-tung | 17 |
| Mao-Tse-tung's Contribution to Marxism-Leninism | |
| — <i>N. Sanmugathan</i> | 19 |
| China's Changing Tide — <i>Anna Louise Strong</i> | 39 |
| A Canadian Professor Looks at China | 43 |
| Flames of Thai People's Armed Struggle | 47 |
| On Madurai Document — <i>'Deshabrati' Editorial Board</i> | 51 |
| Bankruptcy of China's Devotee of Parliament | 66 |
| Character of the Indian Bourgeoisie | |
| — <i>Bhowani Pathak</i> | 76 |
| Interview with a Revolutionary | 83 |

Editor-in-Chief:

SUSHITAL RAY CHOUDHURY

"Communists must always go into the whys and wherefores of anything, use their own heads and carefully think over whether or not it corresponds to reality and is really well founded; on no account should they follow blindly and encourage slavishness."

—Mao Tse-tung, *Rectify the Party's Style of Work.*

DECLARATION OF THE REVOLUTIONARIES OF THE Communist Party of India (Marxist)

An excellent revolutionary situation prevails now in our country with all its classical symptoms as enunciated by Comrade Lenin. But the neo-revisionist leadership of the CPI (M) has betrayed the people and the party. They have betrayed the cause of the Indian Revolution.

Despite all their revolutionary phrase-mongering it has now become crystal clear that these renegades have chosen the path of parliamentarism and class-collaboration and have shelved for good the revolutionary struggle for political power.

The great trust reposed in them by revolutionary comrades, when the latter in their glorious struggle against revisionism repudiated the leadership of the Dange clique, has been shamelessly betrayed. The process of betrayal had, of course, started before the organisational split came. The split itself was brought about not on the basis of ideology, but artificially, through the instrumentality of Dange letters in order to prevent consummation of the inner-party struggle into a genuine revolutionary split, which these neo-revisionists feared most. They, however, succeeded, though temporarily, in their game; this bunch of conspirators was able to incorporate surreptitiously into the Party's Programme formulations alien to Marxism-Leninism and Mao Tse-tung's thought. By disowning, in the name of independent analysis, the neo-colonial nature of our country and its semi-feudal, semi-colonial character as well as the strategy and tactics of democratic revolution following therefrom, they indirectly indicated that what was being built up in India was an independent capitalist economy and that the Indian big bourgeoisie had not exhausted its anti-imperialist role, and thus they managed to discard Comrade Mao Tse-tung's great blue-print for world revolution, specially

for the revolutions in the countries of Asia, Africa and Latin America, as presented in a concentrated form by Comrade Lin Pi-ao. With regard to the world communist movement their attitude of "non-committal" non-partisanship was a camouflage for their support to Khrushchov revisionism. Thus, nationally and internationally, the seeds of Titoism were cunningly sown, which in course of time sprouted forth into notorious Madurai resolutions.

It is profitable to recall here that since the inception of our party its leadership has been usurped at different phases by revisionists, adventurists and opportunists. As a result, glorious class-battles fought by revolutionary comrades and people under our Party flag have again and again been betrayed. The blood of workers, peasants and other toiling people as well as the blood of invaluable cadres of the Party has flown in profusion in many a sanguinary class-battle, and many a significant victory has been won, of whose fruits, however, the fighters themselves were deprived, thanks to the treachery of the persons at the helm of the Party. Time and again revolutionary elements inside the Party have conducted intense and principled inner-party struggles, time and again they have risen in open revolt; time and again international communist leadership has come forward to help and guide our Party; and every time the opportunist usurpers of the Party machinery—both of the right and of the 'left'—have treated these inner-party battles and fraternal offers of help and advice from the international leadership with utter cynicism and insolence.

Naxalbari came as a turning point in the history of our Party and country. The revolutionary comrades of the Darjeeling district of West Bengal rose in open revolt against the Party's revisionist leadership and politics as well as against the organisational slavery imposed by this leadership. But, unlike earlier inner-party struggles, this revolt was accompanied by revolutionary practice. It is a typical peasant war modelled on Comrade Mao Tse-tung's Thought and led by communists and the working class, opening up the real and

only way to India's democratic revolution. This great class battle of Darjeeling peasants at once received the warm fraternal care of the leader of world communism—the Chinese Communist Party led by Chairman Mao Tse-tung and at once it galvanised long-simmering inner-party struggles into open revolutionary revolt. Simultaneously, Naxalbari unleashed militant and armed peasant battles in different parts of the country, sometimes spontaneous and sometimes led by revolutionaries. But one of Naxalbari's great contributions to the Indian Revolution is that it has stripped naked the leadership of the Party and of other parties mouthing revolutionary slogans and has laid bare before the eyes of the world the utter hollowness of their revolutionism. They even openly joined hands with Indian reactionaries to crush this revolutionary peasant base with utmost military and police brutality.

Comrades must have noted that revolutionary peasant struggles are now breaking out or going to break out in various parts of the country. It is an imperative revolutionary duty on our part as the vanguard of the working class to develop and lead these struggles as far as possible. With that end in view all revolutionary elements inside and outside the Party working rather in isolation today in different parts of the country and on different fronts of mass struggle must co-ordinate their activities and unite their forces to build up a *revolutionary party* guided by Marxism-Leninism, the Thought of Mao Tse-tung. After the final and decisive betrayal at Madurai, the situation brooks no delay. Hence, this urgent need for co-ordination.

So we, the comrades of different states, who have been thinking and fighting on the above line, have decided after meeting in Calcutta to form an All-India Co-ordination Committee. On behalf of this Committee, we declare that its main tasks will be :

(1) To develop and co-ordinate militant and revolutionary struggles at all levels, specially, peasant struggles of the Naxalbari type under the leadership of the working class ;

(2) To develop militant, revolutionary struggles of the working class and other toiling people, to combat economism and to orient these struggles towards agrarian revolution ;

(3) To wage an uncompromising ideological struggle against revisionism and neo-revisionism and to popularise the Thought of Comrade Mao Tse-tung, which is Marxism-Leninism of the present era and to unite on this basis all revolutionary elements, within and outside the Party ;

(4) To undertake preparations of a revolutionary programme and tactical line based on concrete analysis of the Indian situation in the light of Comrade Mao Tse-tung's Thought.

Naxalbari has shown us the way to the Indian people's democratic revolution as much as it has unmasked the true face of the neo-revisionists at present controlling the Party. Now it is time to act and act we must here and now. It is time we start building a really revolutionary party. A great responsibility rests upon us and we must shoulder it as true revolutionaries and try to prove ourselves worthy disciples of Comrade Mao Tse-tung.

We call upon the revolutionary comrades still within the Communist Party of India (Marxist) to repudiate *openly* the neo-revisionist leading clique and its politics and *openly* to join hands with us who are striving to build a genuine Communist Party in our country.

NOTES

REACTION STEPS UP ITS OFFENSIVE

Faced with a revolutionary situation that they can hardly control the reactionary ruling classes have imposed in West Bengal an almost naked police-military rule. On the evening of November 21, they dispensed with the UF ministry which served them loyally as their screen for about nine months and set up a new one in its place. Simultaneously their police swooped upon the offices and homes of revolutionary comrades who, repudiating the treacherous leadership of Ranadive, Sundarayya, Namboodiripad, Jyoti Basu and Co., have been waging an uncompromising fight against the rule of the big landlords and the big bourgeoisie. Comrade Charu Majumder was removed from his sick bed and thrown into prison. Many militant comrades were arrested under the notorious Preventive Detention Act and warrants have been issued against many others. The number of arrests has exceeded five thousand and more are to follow. As the UF ministry was thrown out, Section 144 of the Cr. P.C. prohibiting meetings, processions and demonstrations was imposed throughout West Bengal. Curfew was declared in various parts of Calcutta, 24 Parganas and Nadia.

This, as expected, provoked the resentment and anger of the people. Hartal and General Strike were observed and unarmed people fought heroically with whatever they could lay their hands on against the armed might of the reactionary regime. They defied the lathis, tear gas shells and bullets of the police. At least eleven persons have been killed and many hundreds seriously injured. For more than a week, Calcutta was virtually a city under occupation and so, too, are towns like Krishnanagar, Nabadwip and Santipur, where the police and the military have set up their joint centre of operations. Large contingents of the Border Security Force, the Central

Reserve Police, besides the usual State police and National Volunteer Force, have been employed in crushing the resistance of the people. The Army was kept in readiness to take over in case of necessity.

THE ROLE OF THE "MARXISTS"

The upheaval that has shaken urban Bengal is the natural reaction of the people to what appears to be an attempt of the hated Congress rule to impose itself once again in West Bengal and to fascist attacks made on them. Though critical of the performance of the U. F. ministry, they can hardly reconcile themselves to the emergence of a Congress or Congress-backed ministry in West Bengal. But they have again been betrayed by their self-styled leaders, especially, the "Marxist" heroes. In early November, these heroes threatened to create a Vietnam in West Bengal if they were removed from office. (Was this not an insult to the intelligence of the people and the valiant struggle of the Vietnamese?) Later, they declared that a 'river of blood' would flow if the U.F. ministry was thrown out. But when the real challenge came, all these and other heroics turned into a whimper. It is not difficult to understand the motive and character of the leadership which denounces Naxalbari on the ground that the time is not ripe for such struggles and, at the same breath, threatens to create a Vietnam here. If this is not an adventurist slogan, what else is? The truth is, these "Marxist" leaders do not mean what they say. They use revolutionary phraseology to deceive the ranks and the masses. Before the overthrow of the Ministry, their slogan was "Defend the Ministry". After the overthrow, the demands of their 'Vietnam' type of struggle are: (a) the dismissal of the (Ghosh) Ministry, (b) the recall of the Governor and (c) fresh elections (see *People's Democracy* editorial dated November 28, 1967). Very revolutionary slogans, indeed! The same editorial declares: "Our Party, other democratic parties and forces and all progressive people in other States must take up the question and launch a broad agitation in defence of the people of West

Bengal and *against the dictatorship of the Governor.*" What these 'heroes' claim to fight against is not the dictatorship of the reactionary classes—the big landlords and the big bourgeoisie—a dictatorship that fleeces the workers, the peasants and the petty bourgeoisie—but the dictatorship of an individual. So with the recall of Dharmavira and appointment of some Sahay, Singh or Naidu, West Bengal will be rid of the dictatorship! The dismissal of the Ghosh Ministry and the imposition, perhaps, of the President's Rule will mean another wonderful victory for the people!! The final triumph will come during the mid-term poll in which, according to the "Marxists", 'the will of the people' will assert itself!!!

How do the "Marxists" propose to fight the mid-term poll? Who will be their allies in this 'revolutionary' struggle? They want to have as their allies all the other thirteen constituent parties of the United Front—the chief among which are the Bangla Congress, the Dange Revisionists, the S.S.P., the P.S.P. and the Forward Bloc. The leader of the Bangla Congress, Ex-Chief Minister Ajoy Mukherjee, prepared for a 'coup' on October 2 last and, in connivance with the Central Government, the same Governor Dharmavira and the Congress leaders of West Bengal, made every police and military arrangement to drown in blood the protest of the people. Is the declared ideology of the Bangla Congress different from that of the Congress? The "Marxists" themselves have accused—quite justly—the Dange clique of being lackeys of the big bourgeoisie and landlords. The S.S.P., the P.S.P., and the Forward Bloc are quite notorious for their hatred of communism and China. The "Marxists" will now have us believe that by 'imposing a major defeat on the clique of vested interests and dictatorial usurpers' with the help of these 'revolutionary' forces, they will win "a major part of the battle against the capitalist-landlord clique." (See *People's Democracy* editorial, dated November 28). How Marxist they are!

If a bigger majority in the Assembly could solve the problems of the people, these would have been solved in Kerala in the course of the last few months.

to quote Lenin :

"The 'mistake' of the leaders mentioned lies in their petty-bourgeois position, in the fact that instead of clarifying the minds of the workers, they are *befogging* them ; instead of dispersing petty-bourgeois illusions, they are *instilling* them ; instead of freeing the masses from bourgeois influence, they are *strengthening* that influence." (*A Dual Power*)

Lenin advised communists to utilize parliamentary elections, under certain conditions, but when or where did he ask them to join a Coalition Government? He taught Communists to utilize parliamentary democracy to expose this fraud not to embellish it as Ranadive, Sundarayya, Nambudiripad, Jyoti Basu and Co. are doing. Lenin warned :

"The capitalists, better organized and more experienced than anybody else in the affairs of the class struggle and politics, learnt their lessons faster than the others. Perceiving that the position of the government was untenable, they resorted to a method which for many decades, ever since 1848, has been practised by the capitalists of other countries in order to fool, divide and weaken the workers. This method is what is known as a 'coalition' government, i.e., a joint cabinet of members of the bourgeoisie and renegades from Socialism.

"In the countries where freedom and democracy have longest existed side by side with a revolutionary labour movement, in Great Britain and France, the capitalists have frequently and successfully resorted to this method. When they enter a bourgeois Cabinet the 'Socialist' leaders invariably prove to be pawns, puppets, screens for the capitalists, instruments for deceiving the workers." (*Lessons of the Revolution*)

Our 'Marxist-Leninists' have grown awfully fond of the kind of democracy that prevails in India today—the democracy of the exploiting classes—and are terribly keen on defending it and the Indian Constitution (which, needless to say, is an instrument of the big bourgeois-landlord dictatorship to maintain its stranglehold over the people). So their "Polit Bureau considers the dismissal of the West Bengal Ministry as an unashamed outrage on the provisions of the Constitution"

and holds that "this is the beginning of the offensive against democracy in India, the right of constituent States and preparation for a police state." (*People's Democracy*, November 26, 1967). So, we are led to believe the ruthless attacks of the big bourgeois-landlord government against the toiling people throughout India during the last twenty years, the attacks against the peasants of Telengana or Kakdwip, the workers of Calcutta or Jamshedpur, the national minorities of Mizoland or Kashmir, the P. D. Act, the D. I. R., the endless arrests without trial etc., were, instead of being attacks on democracy, intended to strengthen it! Whose democracy are these 'Marxists' defending—the democracy of the exploiting classes, the democracy of the privileged few, or the democracy of the exploited classes, of the toiling people of India? The answer is obvious.

As "pawns, puppets, screens" for the exploiters, they sent the police and the military to crush the struggle for democratic rights of the Naxalbari peasants and, recently, of the peasants of Dihi in of the 24-Parganas. As tools in the hands of the capitalists, they fired upon workers at Dum Dum and sought to terrorize the workers at Birlapur. With their loud slogan of defending the Constitution and democracy, which does not exist for at least ninety-five per cent of our people, these "renegades from Socialism" are out to hoodwink the Party ranks and the masses.

WHOSE "INSTRUMENT" ?

In the *New Situation and Party's Tasks*, the Central Committee of the C P I (M) claimed : "In a word the U. F. Governments that we have now are to be treated and understood as instruments of struggle in the hands of our people." As the "Marxist" leaders are apt to make this claim, it may be of interest to know how this 'instrument' actually worked during the last nine months. Let us examine the performance of the U. F. Government of West Bengal on three fronts—food, labour and land.

First, about the food front. During the period they remained in office the U. F. Government withdrew the levy orders on the jotedars, allowed them and other black-marketeers to reap profits this year, which they had never known before, and procured a mere 55,000 tons though the target had been 1,95,000 tons. But in his usual demagogic manner B.T. Ranadive said at the Calcutta rally of November 5: "But every action today becomes the beginning of a grim class struggle. The food procurement, for example, was only transfer of food from one class to another—from hoarders and profiteers to common man." In reality, the hoarders and profiteers were not touched at all, and whatever food was procured was obtained from the distress sale of the poorest peasants. It was indeed a grim class struggle—a struggle that robbed the poor peasants of their food for the year, gave fabulous riches to the hoarders and profiteers, raised prices of food sky-high, and preserved a rickety rationing system in urban areas to keep within bounds the anger and resentment of the workers and the petty bourgeoisie.

Did the U. F. Government propose to attack the hoarders and profiteers during the coming year? At a press conference, held in New Delhi, Mr Ajoy Mukherjee, West Bengal's Chief Minister, said: "The West Bengal Government has decided to procure 1,000,000 tons of paddy...out of this 600,000 to 800,000 tons are expected to be procured through the levy system and the rest from distress sale." (*The Statesman*, November 14, 1967). That is, twenty to forty per cent of the target for procurement was sought to be squeezed out from the poorest strata of the peasantry. The proportion would actually be much more, for this pro-jotedar government could hardly have forced the jotedars even to comply with the modest levy orders.

The U. F. Government, whatever the protestations may be, proposed to implement the same food policy as the Congress. Even certain members of the U.F. Committee felt, "at least on three salient points, viz, the slab system of levy, the role of rice mills on procurement and issue of licenses to wholesalers to operate in certain areas, the Cabinet had made a departure

from the 18-point programme." (*The Statesman*, November 2, 1967).

We may now turn to the industrial front. On October 27, Mr. Jyoti Basu said in Madras that 'the West Bengal Government's policy was 'not more strikes and lock-outs but more production.' (*The Statesman*, October 28). On November 7, *The Statesman* was hopeful that "there was possibility of a limited truce on the industrial front." In the report on the two-hour discussion between Ministers and leaders of the central trade union organizations, it said: "While Mr. Monoranjan Roy of the B P T U C suspected a 'political motive' behind the employers' present mood, Mr Kali Mukherjee (of the B P N T U C) said that unless the political parties cooperated with the Government to change the mood of workers, no significant improvement in the present atmosphere could be expected. The Chief Minister shared Mr. Mukherjee's sentiments.

"The Deputy Chief Minister is reported to have brushed aside as irrelevant the point sought to be made by Mr Niren Ghosh of the B P T U C that it was not workers, but the employers who were trying to create a law and order problem. To Mr Robin Mukherjee's complaint about mounting police interference in industrial disputes the Chief Minister firmly said that the police should intervene whenever it was thought necessary." (*The Statesman*, November 7).

Between March and September this year 120,000 men lost their jobs and there was lock-out in 269 mills and factories in West Bengal. (*Jugantar*, November 22). On November 19, the *Statesman* reported; "Altogether 38 factories in the 24-Parganas area have been affected by strikes, lock-outs and closures. About 50,000 operatives are involved."

How did the U. F. Government work as an instrument in the hands of the workers? It did so in two ways. "An order under Section 144 Cr. P. C. was promulgated in Birlapur, 24 Parganas, on Friday evening after a clash between the police and workers of Calcium Carbide Ltd., earlier in the day. Ninety-five persons were arrested up to Saturday morning, according to information reaching Calcutta...four factories,

including Calcium Carbide, were closed for the second day on Saturday. About 12,000 men are affected." (*The Statesman*, November 19). This illustrates one way: the other way was to paralyse the militant activities of the working class that might halt this offensive of the capitalists. That is why, the general strike that had been declared for September 11 by the Rastriya Sangram Samiti to resist this attack was called off at the insistence of certain constituent parties of the U. F. That is why, nothing has been done to help the cause of tens of thousands of workers who have been starving for weeks on account of lock-outs in their factories (Burn & Co., Indian Standard Wagon etc. etc.). The bourgeois press gleefully reported that though lock-outs were not withdrawn by the employers, there was not a single case of *gherao* or strike in November. (*Jugantar*, November 22).

Perhaps the U. F. Government served as an effective instrument in the hands of the peasants, the main force of the People's Democratic Revolution the "Marxists" are preparing for?

"The Government policy, the Minister [Mr Harekrishna Konar, member of the Central Committee, CPI (M)] recommended [in a note he presented at a meeting of the West Bengal Cabinet on November 7], should be to protect bargadars to enable them to harvest the paddy peacefully and, at the same time to see that owners got their due share." (*The Statesman*, November 8). That is, according to Mr. Konar, the status quo, the most abominable kind of feudal exploitation, against which in the past the CPI (M) and the Kisan Sabha asked the peasants to rise in revolt—must continue.

Mr Harekrishna Konar "instructed the ADMs," who met him at a conference in Writers Building on November 9 and conveyed to him their misgiving that trouble between jotedars and bargadars might break out over the share of the produce and vested land in specified areas in nine of West Bengal's sixteen districts, "to ensure co-ordination at all levels between the administration, police and land revenue officers so that the apprehended trouble could be tackled adequately." (*The Statesman*, November 11). That is, the bureaucracy and the

police must maintain close co-operation to crush all resistance of the poor peasantry against the present monstrous system.

Reporting that measures were finalized at a meeting of senior district officials and member, Board of Revenue, with Mr Harekrishna Konar, *The Statesman's* Staff Reporter added: "One hundred police camps will be set up throughout the district (24-Parganas). There will also be mobile courts with magistrates to settle disputes." (*The Statesman*, November 18).

It seems that till the last moment they held office, these "Marxist" lackeys of the big landlords and the big bourgeoisie served their masters loyally. One remembers what Lenin said:

"Nothing, absolutely nothing, was undertaken during this period (in the months after the February Revolution) to curb the capitalists. The Minister renegades from Socialism were mere talking machines for distracting the attention of the oppressed classes, while the entire apparatus of state administration actually remained in the hands of the bureaucracy (the government officials) and the bourgeoisie... The Ministers prated, but everything remained as of old." (*Lessons of the Revolution*).

Again, "whenever a bourgeois Minister could not appear in defence of the government, before the revolutionary workers or in the Soviets, a 'Socialist' Minister—Skobelev, or Tsereteli, or Chernov—appeared (or, more correctly, was sent by the bourgeoisie) and faithfully performed the work of the bourgeoisie; he would do his level best to defend the Cabinet, whitewash the capitalists and fool the people by making promise after promise and by counselling them to wait, wait, wait." (*Lessons of the Revolution*).

WHY THE DISMISSAL ?

If the U. F. Government served as faithful lackey of the big landlords and the big bourgeoisie, what then led to its dismissal ?

Naxalbari has kindled a flame that threatens to engulf large areas of the countryside. A revolutionary tide is about to sweep the country. "It is", to use the words of Comrade

Mao Tse-tung, "like a ship far out at sea whose mast-head can already be seen from the shore ; it is like the morning sun in the east whose shimmering rays are visible from a high mountain top ; it is like a child about to be born moving restlessly in its mother's womb." As part of the organ of bourgeois-landlord dictatorship, the U. F. Government set up hundreds of police camps, camp courts, mobile courts etc. to throttle this child at birth. Now when Comrade Charu Majunder has to be flung from his sick bed into prison, when hundreds of other revolutionaries have to be arrested or hunted after, when the organized violence of the state has to be let loose on the awakened peasantry, the unmasking of the "Marxist" leaders would have been complete and they would have lost their capacity to sow confusion among the Party ranks and the people, if the U. F. Government continued any longer. So they have been cast in other roles. When the bourgeois-landlord dictatorship comes forward to crush the struggles of the toiling people, especially of the peasants, which are now developing, with fire and sword, the "Marxist" leaders are asked to play the parliamentary game to disarm the workers, peasants and the petty bourgeoisie, and to isolate the pockets of agrarian struggle. It is not an accident that at Madurai these saboteurs openly declared their preference for the path of peaceful transition to Socialism.

The situation is indeed excellent. The toiling people hate the Congress, the so-called socialist parties and the Dange revisionists are already exposed. However they may try, this bunch of wily, crafty opportunists, called "Marxists," will also, like the other "Socialists" and Dange revisionists, go the primrose way to the everlasting bonfire. The emergence of the All-India Co-ordination Committee of revolutionary comrades is a significant fact. Genuine communists will rally round its banner and the prospect of revolutionary peasant struggles smashing the economic and political fetters of the reactionary classes in the countryside is not remote. These struggles led by revolutionary comrades, tempered in the fire of repression, will prove invincible.

(November 30, 1967)

(see page 89)

THE THOUGHT OF MAO TSE-TUNG

'Political power grows out of the barrel of a gun.'

—*Problems of War and Strategy*

'Weapons are an important factor in war, but not the decisive factor ; it is people.....that are decisive.'

—*On Protracted War*

The thought of Mao Tse-tung is a crystallisation of the rich experience of the Chinese people under his leadership in liberating themselves from external and internal oppression and building a socialist society. Through the study of his writings one can reach an understanding of the Chinese experience and, thus equipped, apply that experience to one's own circumstances.

When we attempt to apply them to a particular situation, Mao's ideas, as in the case of the two examples quoted above, may at first sight appear inconsistent. But on further examination they will be seen to reflect the many-sidedness of his analysis of the social forces which have to be understood for successful revolutionary struggle.

Understanding of the nature of the state in the era of imperialism and of the necessity of revolutionary struggle to overthrow it, is reflected in the statement that 'political power grows out of the barrel of a gun.' Understanding of the way in which, with correct leadership, masses in revolt against oppression are more than a match for the best-armed reactionaries, is summed up in the statement that men are more important than weapons. Both kinds of understanding are included in Mao Tse-tung's admonition to know your enemies and know your friends, since the whole purpose of class analysis is to be able to 'unite with real friends in order to attack real enemies.'

To know the class enemy of exploiters and oppressors

Reproduced from the BROADSHEET of August 1967

means to recognise the fact that history affords no example of a ruling class voluntarily abdicating power. Therefore the revolutionary overthrow of the class of exploiters and the wresting of state power from them by the exploited masses inevitably involves violent struggle. The major class contradiction today is between imperialism headed by the United States and the world's people who are trying to liberate themselves from imperialist oppression. This means that wherever there is a genuine people's struggle against exploitation it is bound to lead to a confrontation with imperialism. Imperialism will always attempt by whatever means possible to suppress such struggles. 'The imperialists will never lay down their butcher knives...till their doom.' Therefore the people's efforts to achieve real freedom from imperialism can only take the form of armed struggle.

Such armed struggles always involve two opposing forces, the people and the enemy. On the one side they are wars of imperialist aggression waged by professional armies, mercenaries and puppet troops. On the other, they are people's wars of national liberation waged by guerrilla fighters recruited *from* the people with the whole-hearted support *of* the people. It is obvious on which side morale will be higher. Thus, Mao says to the imperialist aggressors : 'You rely on modern weapons ; we rely on highly conscious revolutionary people.'

However highly developed modern weapons and technical equipments may be, wars are decided by sustained fighting of ground forces, by fighting at close quarters on battle-fields, 'by the political consciousness of men, by their courage and spirit of self-sacrifice.' It is Mao Tse-tung's profound understanding of the decisive effect of 'man's conscious activity in war', his revolutionary humanism, which is expressed in the assertion that 'men are more important than weapons.' This is complementary to the statement that 'political power grows out of the barrel of a gun.' Together they provide a key to the correct interpretation of our time, and to the revolutionary way forward.

MAO TSE-TUNG'S CONTRIBUTION TO MARXISM-LENINISM

N. SANMUGATHASAN

The position inside the international communist movement today bears a certain resemblance to the situation that existed immediately after the Great October Revolution in 1917. The success of Lenin and the Bolsheviks in leading the revolution in Russia had naturally discredited the old-line social democrats who had opposed revolution and instead preached peaceful transition through parliamentary means.

A great revolutionary intellectual ferment took place inside all the old social democratic parties of the Second International. Under the guidance of Lenin, the revolutionary left inside these social democratic parties broke with the revisionist theories of the leadership of the Second International and came forward to form the new Third Communist International. A similar ferment has been taking place inside the international communist movement during the past few years. Under the guidance of Comrade Mao Tse-tung, the greatest Marxist-Leninist alive, and inspired by the success of the Chinese Revolution as well as of the Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution, revolutionary groups from inside the old communist parties have been breaking away politically and organisationally from the revisionist leadership of these parties. Many

This article is reproduced from the RED FLAG of October 3, 1967, published from Colombo. The Editor of this weekly says in a note :

"This article has been written by Comrade N. Sanmugathasan, member of the Political Bureau of the Ceylon Communist Party, on the basis of discussions he had with leading members of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of China during his recent visit to China in May-June 1967."

new Marxist-Leninist groups and parties have emerged in recent times.

The study of Marxism-Leninism and the thought of Mao Tse-tung is important for the building of these new Marxist-Leninist parties. The most important requirement for these parties in order that they could fulfil their tasks as the vanguard of the working class is that they should be armed with Marxism-Leninism and the Thought of Mao Tse-tung. This question was stressed by Lenin in his two classical works, *Two Steps Forward, One Step Backward* and *What Is To Be Done* as well as by Stalin in *The History Of The Communist Party Of The Soviet Union (Bolsheviks)*.

Therefore, the most important task for the newly emerging Marxist-Leninist parties is to arm their respective parties with correct theory. This means to arm them with the theory of Marxism-Leninism. But, today, the study of Marxism-Leninism must also include the study of the Thought of Mao Tse-tung which is the Marxism-Leninism of the modern era. In other words, we must study the contribution made by Comrade Mao Tse-tung to the development of Marxism-Leninism. This is important not only for the Communist Party of China but also for all other Marxist-Leninist parties.

It is not presumed that it would be possible within the confines of one or two articles to deal exhaustively with all the contributions made by Comrade Mao Tse-tung, which are both rich and varied, to the development of Marxism-Leninism. Such a comprehensive study would need more time, energy and research. This article, therefore, is merely a step in that direction and a far from complete one.

Lenin used to say that Marxism is composed of the following three integral parts: (1) philosophy, (2) political economy and (3) the theory of class struggle. When we study the Thought of Mao Tse-tung we can see how he has developed these three component parts of Marxism.

PHILOSOPHY

On philosophy, a great number of questions can be touched upon. Let us take, for example, Comrade Mao

Tse-tung's speech at the Yen-an Forum on Art and Literature. This speech is indeed a very important one among the works of Comrade Mao Tse-tung. It is true that this speech deals with the principles of proletarian art and literature and that it creatively developed and gave a systematic exposition of the Marxist-Leninist theory on proletarian art and literature.

However, in this speech, Comrade Mao Tse-tung not only deals with art and literature, he also speaks about many other things pertaining to Marxism-Leninism. If we read this speech from a philosophical angle we can see that it is permeated with Marxist philosophy and that it deals with the relation between being and consciousness, between matter and mind. It deals with the main philosophical idea: where do ideas come from? It deals with the question of the individual and the masses, of politics and literature, of motive and effect.

Comrade Mao Tse-tung solved these questions with the aid of Marxist dialectics. In this way he gave an important exposition of Marxist dialectics. He stressed in detail the relation between motive and effect. Idealists only pay attention to motive and neglect effect. Mechanical materialists pay attention only to effect but not to motive. But Communist parties and Marxist-Leninists should pay attention both to motive and effect.

In the speech at the Yen-an Forum on Art and Literature, Comrade Mao Tse-tung raised five requirements for revolutionary workers on literature and art. They were: (1) Class Stand, (2) Attitude, (3) Audience, (4) Work and (5) Study of Marxism-Leninism.

CLASS STAND

By the class stand he meant the proletarian stand. If our class stand was wrong all ideas would be wrong. By attitude he meant the difference in our attitude towards the enemy, our allies and our own people. We must adopt different attitudes towards each of these sections. Towards the enemy our attitude must be to thoroughly expose them and

to firmly overthrow them. Our attitude towards our allies should be to unite with them while, at the same time, carrying out proper struggles against them. We unite with them as far as their progressive side is concerned and struggle with them as far as their erroneous side is concerned.

Our attitude towards the revolutionary masses should be to praise them and to sing for them. They may have short-comings and mistakes. But our attitude should be to be patient with them and help them with good intent. Thus, Comrade Mao Tse-tung made it quite clear that we should have a different attitude towards each of these sections.

This is a general theory of Marxism-Leninism. This is an important matter of principle in the class struggle and has great significance in the Great Cultural Revolution in China. It has also real significance for the realisation of the revolutionary alliance and for the fight against a handful of persons in authority in the Party who have taken the capitalist road.

The Thought of Mao Tse-tung has really creatively developed Marxism-Leninism. It has been elevated to a higher level. Therefore although it is twenty-five years since the speech on Art and Literature at the Yen-an Forum, it has real significance for today's Cultural Revolution. Although the speech deals with Art and Literature, it is permeated with Marxist-Leninist dialectics.

II

“ON CONTRADICTION”

Let us now take Comrade Mao Tse-tung's most important philosophical article, *On Contradiction*, and study it closely. It was written 30 years ago. In this article Comrade Mao Tse-tung has very obviously made a creative exposition of Marxist-Leninist dialectics.

Take the first sentence in this article : “The law of contradiction in things, that is, the law of the unity of opposites, is the basic law of materialist dialectics.” This is a most profound statement. It is a very short sentence but it would take a day to explain it.

Simply, this law means that motion is inherent in all forms of matter and that motion i.e. development takes place as a result of the development and clash of the contradictions that are always present ; and further, between the major contradictions and between the different aspects of each contradiction there is both identity and struggle ; and, that, through the process of developing contradictions a thing or a phenomenon changes into its opposite.

Thus, Comrade Mao Tse-tung states in one sentence the basic law of materialistic dialectics.

A most systematic exposition of Marxist dialectics by one of the founders of scientific socialism, Engels, is to be found in one of his most famous works *Anti-Duhring*. This is a very important book because it refutes all forms of fallacies spread so assiduously by Duhring. The most important mistake of Duhring was that he had negated the law of contradiction. He held that contradiction was artificial. Engels made a comprehensive criticism of Duhring and refuted his wrong theories. He established the fact that the law of contradiction was an objective law of matter. He stated that movement is contradiction i.e. to say, things are moving and developing because of inherent contradictions ; and that by the law of contradiction we mean the law of the unity of opposites.

BASIC LAW

That is why Comrade Mao Tse-tung has described the law of contradiction as not just another law of materialist dialectics but its most basic law. In the second sentence of his article, Comrade Mao Tse-tung has quoted Lenin's statement that “Dialectics in the proper sense is the study of contradiction in the very essence of objects.” It is, therefore, very important for us to understand that the law of contradictions, that is, the

law of the unity of opposites is the most basic law of materialist dialectics.

In his book *The Science Of Logic*, Hegel, the philosopher, had stated that there were three basic laws in dialectics. They were :

- (1) the law that quantitative and qualitative changes give rise to one another.
- (2) the law of the unity of opposites.
- (3) the law of the negation of the negation.

These were the three basic laws of dialectics put forward by Hegel. Marx and Engels recognised and affirmed these three basic laws of Hegel but put them in the opposite order.

Hegel had presented these three laws not as the law of objective dialectics but as subjective dialectics. That is, he did not regard these laws as inherent in objective things but only as governing the law of man's thinking i.e. in the logic of the thinking of men. In other words, Hegel interpreted dialectics from an idealist point of view.

However, according to Marx and Engels, the law of contradiction and the law of the unity of opposites was a law that is inherent in objective things whereas man's knowledge of contradiction is but a reflection of the objective law in man's thinking. Therefore, Marx and Engels had satirised Hegel and pointed out that he had stood truth on its head.

Marx and Engels reversed this position and pointed out that these laws of dialectics are inherent in objective things. This was made clear by Engels in his *Anti-Duhring* and *Dialectics in Nature*.

A new development arose in Lenin's time. The question arose as to which of the three laws of dialectics is the most basic. In the third sentence of his article, Comrade Mao Tse-tung refers to Lenin's article *On the Question of Dialectics* and points out that "Lenin often called this law (i. e. the law of contradiction) the essence of dialectics ; he also called it the kernel of dialectics."

Although Lenin pointed out that this law was the kernel of dialectics, he did not live to point out the relation between this

kernel and the other two laws of dialectics.

Later, when the philosophical circles in the USSR dealt with these things, they pointed out the three laws but put them in a different order. They put them in the following order :

- (1) the law of the unity of the opposites,
- (2) the law about quantitative and qualitative changes,
- (3) the law of the negation of the negation.

This was the formula used in the USSR for a long time.

In 1938, in *History of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union (Bolsheviks)*, Stalin presented 4 features of the dialectical method :

1. All phenomena are inter-connected and inter-dependent ;
2. All matter is in a process of motion and movement and development ;
3. Quantitative changes lead to qualitative changes ;
4. Everything develops on the basis of the struggle of the opposites.

Stalin, thus, put the law of the unity and struggle of the opposites as the last one instead of as the first one. When the philosophical circles in the USSR dealt with the three laws of dialectics or when Stalin wrote about the four features of the dialectical method, both sections were putting the law of contradiction and the law of the unity of the opposites on an equal footing with the other laws instead of treating it as the basic law of materialist dialectics.

DEVELOPED MARXIST DIALECTICS

Comrade Mao Tse-tung has systematically studied the laws of Marxist-Leninist dialectics and has developed Lenin's thesis contained in his work *On the Question of Dialectics*. Comrade Mao Tse-tung does not deny the law about quantitative and qualitative changes or the law of the negation of the negation. Engels had dealt with all these things in his *Anti-Duhring*. But, what Comrade Mao Tse-tung does point out clearly is that out of these three laws, the most basic law is that of the law of contradictions and the law of the unity of opposites. In this way, he has put this question in a

monistic way. He has refuted the theory of putting these three basic laws on a parallel footing.

For example, Stalin says that the second feature of the dialectical method is the law of motion or development. Actually, motion or movement is inherent in contradiction and this had been pointed out by Engels in his *Anti-Duhring* when he said "motion itself is a contradiction." If we grasp that the law of contradiction, i.e., the law of the unity of opposites is the most basic law of materialist dialectics, then we can understand that all the other laws of dialectics spring from this basic law.

Thus, it is clear that by asserting the primacy of the law of contradiction, the law of the unity of the opposites, Comrade Mao Tse-tung has creatively developed Marxist-Leninist philosophy and dialectics.

Although Mao Tse-tung's article *On Contradiction* is his most important contribution to Marxist philosophy, he has also developed Marxist philosophy on a number of other points.

Another important philosophical work of Comrade Mao Tse-tung is his article *On the Correct Handling of Contradictions Among the People*. In this work, he deals with the question of how to handle contradictions among the people as opposed to how to handle contradictions between the enemy and ourselves. He also deals with the theory of how contradictions of different natures can be converted into each other. He also uses the law of contradiction to explain how to deal with the struggle between different views and ideas inside the party.

Already, in his article, *On Contradiction*, Comrade Mao Tse-tung had pointed out that "Opposition and struggle between ideas of different kinds constantly occur within the Party; this is a reflection within the Party of contradiction between classes and between the new and the old in society. If there were to be no contradiction in the Party and no ideological struggles to resolve them, the Party's life would come to an end."

INNER-PARTY CONTRADICTIONS

This was the first time that Comrade Mao Tse-tung used the law of contradiction, the law of the unity of the opposites, to explain the question of opposition and struggle between different ideas within a party. This is a creative development of Marxism-Leninism.

In the past, in the history of the Communist Party of China and in respect of some comrades in other parties also, incorrect views prevailed about the attitude to opposition and struggle between contradictory ideas inside the Communist Party. Some comrades admitted the law of contradiction when they dealt with phenomena outside the Party. However, when they came face to face with contradictory views inside the Party, they failed to use the dialectical method and, instead, used the metaphysical approach. In other words, they failed to understand that contradictions are universal and would also exist inside the Party too as a reflection of the contradictions outside the Party. Therefore, when these comrades came across contradictions and struggles inside the Party, they thought that it was terrible and bad.

It was as an answer to such metaphysical approach that Comrade Mao Tse-tung pointed out the universality of contradiction and that, therefore, opposition and struggle between different ideas constantly occurs inside the Party too. This was nothing strange because it was a reflection of class contradictions outside and the struggle between the old and the new inside the Party. If these contradictions and the consequent ideological struggles to resolve them ceased to exist within the Party, then the life of the Party would itself cease.

Only if we understand this aspect of inner-party struggle and its virtual inevitability in any living and developing Party can we understand the struggle that developed inside the Communist Party of China against Liu Shao-chi and Teng Hsiao-ping.

When the imperialists saw the Cultural Revolution in China and the exposure of Peng Chen and Liu Shao-chi and Teng Hsiao-ping, they thought that the Communist Party of China

would be finished. When the Soviet revisionists saw the same phenomenon they also thought that the Communist Party of China would collapse and that the leadership of Comrade Mao Tse-tung would be overthrown.

Even some friends did not understand this question correctly and felt sad and thought that everything inside the Communist Party of China is not good. They did not understand that if such contradictions and ideological struggles to resolve them did not occur, then the life of the Party would come to an end.

The reasons why these comrades get these wrong ideas is that they do not look at these ideological struggles from a dialectical view-point. That is why, at the very beginning of the Cultural Revolution, Comrade Mao Tse-tung said that the Cultural Revolution was a sign of the sound development of the Chinese Party.

Therefore, comrades and friends should look at the phenomenon of the Chinese Cultural Revolution from this Marxist-Leninist dialectical standpoint. They will, then, realise that it is a good thing and not at all a bad thing. They will then realise the tremendous significance of the struggle against Liu Shao-chi and Teng Hsiao-ping and their wrong views. They will also understand that if this struggle had not been carried out, revisionism would have triumphed in China, capitalism would have been restored and China would have changed colour. This has been proved by the experience of the Soviet Union.

III

THE THEORY OF CLASS STRUGGLE

HOW has Comrade Mao Tse-tung developed the Marxist-Leninist theory of the class struggle? This matter is dealt with very brilliantly in an editorial of the *Peking People's Daily* under the heading *A Great Historic Document* (This has been reproduced in this year's 21st issue of *Peking Review*).

This article is a result of the attempt to study how Comrade Mao Tse-tung has developed Marxism-Leninism. A very important problem in the history of the development of Marxism-Leninism is raised in this article.

This article divides the history of the development of Marxism-Leninism into three stages. It describes three landmarks. To quote: "Marx and Engels founded the theory of scientific socialism, Lenin and Stalin developed Marxism, solved a series of questions of the proletarian revolution in the era of imperialism and solved the theoretical and practical questions of establishing the dictatorship of the proletariat in one country. Comrade Mao Tse-tung has developed Marxism-Leninism, solved a series of questions of the proletarian revolution in the present era and solved the theoretical and practical questions of carrying on the revolution under the dictatorship of the proletariat. These are three monumental milestones in the history of the development of Marxism."

Comrade Mao Tse-tung's special contribution to the development of the Marxist-Leninist theory of class struggle is that he gave a positive answer to the question whether classes and class struggles exist even under socialism.

The above-mentioned article poses this question clearly in the following way: "Are there still classes and class struggle in a socialist society, particularly, after the socialist transformation of the ownership of the means of production has in the main been accomplished? Do all the class struggles in society still centre round the question of the fight over political power? Under the conditions of the dictatorship of the proletariat do we still have to make revolution? Against whom should we make revolution? And how should we carry out the revolution?"

"Marx and Engels could not possibly solve this series of major theoretical problems at their time. Lenin saw that after the proletariat seized power, the defeated bourgeoisie still remained stronger than the proletariat and was always trying to stage a come-back. At the same time, the small producers were incessantly generating capitalism and the capitalist class

anew, thus posing a threat to the dictatorship of the proletariat. In order to cope with this counter-revolutionary threat and overcome it, it was therefore necessary to strengthen the dictatorship of the proletariat over a long period of time. There was no other way. However, Lenin died before he could solve these problems in practice.

"Stalin was a great Marxist-Leninist who actually cleared out a large number of counter-revolutionary representatives of the bourgeoisie who had sneaked into the party, including Trotsky, Zinoviev, Kamenev, Radek, Bukharin, Rykov and their like. But where he failed was in not recognising, on the level of theory, that classes and class struggle exist in society throughout the historical period of the dictatorship of the proletariat and that the question of who will win in the revolution has yet to be finally settled; in other words, if all this is not handled properly there is the possibility of a come-back by the bourgeoisie. The year before he died, Stalin became aware of this point and stated that contradictions do exist in socialist society and, if not properly handled, might turn into antagonistic ones.

"Comrade Mao Tse-tung has given full attention to the whole historical experience of the Soviet Union. He has correctly solved this series of problems in a whole number of great writings and instructions, in this great historic document (the reference is to the May 16, 1966 circular of the Central Committee of the Chinese Communist Party—Ed.) and in the most significant practice of the great proletarian cultural revolution personally initiated and led by him.

"This is a most important sign indicating that Marxism has developed to an entirely new stage. In the early years of the 20th century, Marxism developed into the stage of Leninism. In the present era, it has developed further into the stage of Mao Tse-tung's thought."

Marx and Engels raised the question of the revolution of the proletariat. They also raised the question of the dictatorship of the proletariat. "Lenin developed this theory and put it into practice by carrying out the Great October Revolution,

The Soviet Union became the first country where the dictatorship of the proletariat became a reality.

Comrade Mao Tse-tung developed this Marxist-Leninist theory of revolution and the dictatorship of the proletariat and carried out the revolution of the proletariat in his own country. The dictatorship of the proletariat became a reality in China, a country with a population of 700 million people. He also solved the question of how to make revolution in the present era in which imperialism is heading for total collapse and socialism is advancing to world-wide victory. He has also solved the question of how to make revolution under conditions of the dictatorship of the proletariat.

THREE LANDMARKS

The position can, therefore, be summed up as follows: Marx and Engels raised the question of proletarian revolution and the dictatorship of the proletariat. Lenin made this a reality in the Soviet Union. Comrade Mao Tse-tung not only made this a reality in China but also solved the question of how to make revolution under conditions of the dictatorship of the proletariat. He also solved the question of how to prevent the dictatorship of the proletariat from changing colour, of how to prevent the restoration of capitalism and of how to consolidate the dictatorship of the proletariat. It is obvious, therefore, that Comrade Mao Tse-tung has creatively developed the Marxist-Leninist theory of uninterrupted revolution.

The central question with regard to class struggle is the question of state power. The aim of the proletarian revolution is to seize state power. Marx and Lenin pointed out that he who only recognises class struggle is not yet a Marxist. A real Marxist is one who not only recognises the class struggle but also extends this recognition to the necessity for the dictatorship of the proletariat.

The question is whether, after the proletariat has seized state power, after the dictatorship of the proletariat has become a reality, it is still true to say that the central question with regard to class struggle is still the issue of state power.

It was impossible for Marx and Engels to have answered these questions in their time. As we have already shown, Lenin did realise that after the establishment of the dictatorship of the proletariat, the vanquished bourgeoisie will be stronger than the proletariat that vanquished it and that it always tries to stage a come-back; and that small producers would constantly give rise to capitalism and the capitalist class.

Lenin made this question very clear in his book *Proletarian Revolution and the Renegade Kautsky*. In this book, Lenin said that the period from capitalism to communism was a whole historical epoch; and that, throughout this historical epoch, before communism is established, the vanquished bourgeoisie was bound to attempt to stage a come-back; they were bound to turn their attempts into action.

This was a great Marxist-Leninist prophecy. Comrade Mao Tse-tung has only further developed this profound observation by Lenin. Take Lenin's remark that a whole historical epoch existed between capitalism and communism. Comrade Mao Tse-tung meant precisely this when he said that, after a socialist society had been established, it would take fifty, a hundred, years or more before communism is established.

This statement of Comrade Mao Tse-tung has been slandered as Trotskyism. In actual fact, it is Leninism.

OLD-LINE REVISIONISTS

The old-line revisionists, Bernstein, Kautsky etc., were against carrying out a socialist revolution in the Soviet Union. Their theory was known as the theory that production is everything. Thus, they held that because capitalist production in Russia was not developed—socialist revolution was impossible, and that the October Revolution could only pave the way for capitalism in Russia; and that when capitalist productive forces had reached a certain level in Russia, only then could it naturally and peacefully grow into socialism. This was their theory of the peaceful transition to socialism.

This fallacious theory was clearly expressed by Kautsky in 1918 in his pamphlet *On the Dictatorship of the Proletariat*

and also in his *Bolsheviks who are in a desperate situation inside the Russian Party*.

Later, Zinoviev, Trotsky and Bukharin used this theory of old-line revisionists to oppose the socialist revolution, socialist construction and the theory that socialism could be built in one country. At the 7th session of the Executive Committee of the Communist International, Trotsky made the statement that the superiority of socialist production in Russia could be shown not now but only after 50 years or 100 years.

When Trotsky enunciated this fallacy, Stalin seriously refuted him. Because, the superiority of the socialist system of ownership over the system of private ownership in the capitalist countries was made quite clear at the very beginning itself, immediately after the revolution, when private ownership was abolished and public ownership established.

Stalin pointed out that Trotsky's false theory was the same as that propounded by the social democrat economist, Sukanov, who held that, because production was not well developed, therefore the October Revolution could only pave the way for capitalism and not socialism. Therefore, the position of Trotsky was that he was opposed to socialist revolution and socialist construction.

Trotsky's false theory had nothing in common with the theory put forward by Lenin that the period from capitalism to communism was a whole historical epoch. It was also opposed to the theory enunciated by Comrade Mao Tse-tung that this period will take several decades or one century or several centuries. Both Lenin and Comrade Mao Tse-tung were discussing how long the period would be between capitalism and communism.

Those who distort these facts and try to slander Comrade Mao Tse-tung by identifying his views with those of Trotsky are not really attacking Trotsky but merely trying to prettify him. They are doing it either through ignorance or a deliberate intention to slander Lenin and Comrade Mao Tse-tung.

Stalin had already dealt with this false theory of Trotsky and identified it as the same as that put forward by the social democrat, Sukanov, who gave two reasons why socialist revolution and construction could not succeed in Russia. The first was that capitalist production was not sufficiently developed. The second was that the peasants in Russia were backward and their cultural level was low.

In his work, *On the Revolution in our Country*, Lenin pointed out that although the cultural level of the Russian peasantry was low, it had made the revolution along with the proletariat and that it was in favour of socialism. Lenin admitted that it was true that capitalist production was not so developed in Russia as in some European countries. But why was it impossible to greatly develop production after the proletarian revolution and under the dictatorship of the proletariat? From which book had Sukanov learnt that things could not be done this way? It was Napoleon who said: "Plunge into battle first before you want to see the outcome of it."

Lenin maintained that after the means of production of the bourgeoisie and the imperialists and the land of the landlords had been confiscated, it would be possible to develop production greatly.

WHICH ROAD?

The Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution initiated by Comrade Mao Tse-tung is precisely directed against the fallacy of Kautsky, Sukanov, Trotsky and Bukharin, which is a thesis opposing taking the socialist road and advocating taking the capitalist road.

The representative of these views in China today is Liu Shao-chi. In the summer of 1949 when China just won liberation, Liu Shao-chi said that because capitalist production was not sufficiently developed in China, it was not possible to take the socialist road. He said then that the problem in China was not that there was too much capitalism but too little. He also said that capital exploitation was not a crime

but a credit and that the workers were not against exploitation but would welcome it. Therefore, he held that, after liberation, China should take the capitalist road instead of the socialist road.

This is exactly the same theory as put forward early in respect of the Soviet Union by Kautsky, Sukanov, Trotsky etc., and which was known as the theory that production was everything. The Thought of Mao Tse-tung and the line advocated by Comrade Mao Tse-tung is sharply contrary to and diametrically opposed to the theory of these people. The Thought of Mao Tse-tung is the same as that of Lenin when he pointed out that, after the October Revolution, they should firmly oppose taking the capitalist road and should firmly take the socialist road.

What is the basic difference between the two lines contending in the Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution? The main question is the struggle between the two roads: Should China take the capitalist road or the socialist road? The struggle between these two lines existed in the past. It exists at the present and will exist in the future also.

That is why Comrade Mao Tse-tung has said that the present cultural revolution is only the first one and that, in the future, there would be many more.

The reason for this is that it is not merely a question of overthrowing the old exploiting classes and finishing with revolution for all time. New exploiting elements always crop up and a new bourgeoisie is always created. When Lenin dealt with this question in his book, *The Proletarian Revolution and the Renegade Kautsky* he pointed out that, throughout the historical period of transition from capitalism to communism, the former exploiting classes will try to stage a come-back and that they will try to turn their attempts into action. Here Lenin was referring to the former exploiting classes.

But in "*Left-wing*" Communism, an Infantile Disorder, he pointed out that not only will the old exploiting classes try to stage a come-back but that in socialist society a new

bourgeoisie would be created. Lenin raised these questions but, as has already been pointed out, died too early to have been able to solve these problems.

STALIN'S MISTAKE

Stalin was a great Marxist-Leninist who, as the *People's Daily* editorial referred to earlier points out, solved a number of theoretical and practical problems connected with proletarian revolution and the question of building socialism in one country. But, on the theory of the class struggle he made mistakes.

It is not correct to say that, after the October Revolution, Stalin completely neglected the question of the class struggle. Actually, before 1928, Stalin stressed very much that class struggles should be carried out in the Soviet Union. Stalin's speeches before 1928 to the Komsomol and to the Control Commission dealt with this problem. He criticised certain people for forgetting class struggles in times of peace.

But, what was his shortcoming? After 1928, when the problem of the kulaks had been solved, when collectivisation of agriculture was completed, when the first 5-year Plan was completed, he said classes had been entirely eliminated and no longer existed. This incorrect idea was clearly expressed in his report on the Soviet Constitution in 1936.

Stalin's shortcoming was that in the field of theory he did not recognise that, throughout the entire historical epoch from capitalism to communism and under the dictatorship of the proletariat, classes and class struggles would continue to exist in society. While Stalin recognised the existence of classes and class struggles before 1928, he did not recognise their existence after that period.

But the fact was that, even after collectivisation of agriculture and after the new Soviet Constitution, the class struggle against the bourgeoisie still existed. The danger of a restoration of capitalism still existed. However, facts taught Stalin and, in his last years, he was conscious of this in some ways.

Stalin perceived the truth about the existence of classes

and class struggles one year before he died. He then said that in socialist society contradictions shall exist and that if such contradictions were not properly handled they could become antagonistic ones. This view was expressed in his last work *Economic Problems of Socialism in the USSR*.

But, nevertheless, it must be stated that even in this book Stalin not only failed to state how the problem should be solved but also failed to give a clear exposition of the problem.

In the present era, Comrade Mao Tse-tung paid attention to all the historical experiences of the Soviet Union. The 50th anniversary of the October Revolution falls this year. It is going to be celebrated under conditions where the revisionists have seized power and carried out the restoration of capitalism. This is a bitter experience and deserves the serious attention and study by all Marxist-Leninists. There is also the experience of the Chinese Revolution.

It is as a result of studying these experiences that Comrade Mao Tse-tung has held that, in a socialist society and under the dictatorship of the proletariat, classes and class struggles exist although the form is different. Comrade Mao Tse-tung has not only elaborated this theory in his works but also, by personally initiating the Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution, correctly solved a whole series of questions concerning how to make revolution under conditions of the dictatorship of the proletariat.

This is the most important landmark in the development of Marxism-Leninism by Comrade Mao Tse-tung. It indicates that Marxism-Leninism has developed to an entirely new stage. Marxism, which was first developed to the stage of Leninism, has now been further developed to the stage of Mao Tse-tung's Thought.

The Communiqué of the Eleventh Plenary Session of the Eighth Central Committee of the Communist Party of China, which it adopted on August 12, 1966, states the question as follows:

"Comrade Mao Tse-tung is the greatest Marxist-Leninist of our era. Comrade Mao Tse-tung has inherited,

defended and developed Marxism-Leninism with genius, creatively and in an all-round way, and has raised Marxism-Leninism to a completely new stage. Mao Tse-tung's Thought is Marxism-Leninism of the era in which imperialism is heading for total collapse and socialism is advancing to world-wide victory. It is the guiding principle for all the work of our Party and country."

[*This article does not deal with the contribution of Comrade Mao Tse-tung to the development of Political Economy or his contribution to Marxist military thinking. We hope to deal with those problems at some later time.*]

Disrupting democratic centralism ?

Ours is centralism based on extensive democracy. There can be no correct centralization without democracy. Centralization means the concentration of correct opinions. Only on this basis can there be unified thinking and action. Erroneous centralization runs counter to democratic centralism. Opposition to erroneous centralization absolutely does not mean opposition to democratic centralism. On the contrary, it upholds democratic centralism.

—*Peking Review*, June 30, 1967.

CHINA'S CHANGING TIDE

Anna Louise Strong

Across the yard from my veranda stands the headquarters of the Peking Revolutionary Committee, the new "provisional organ of power". For a month I have heard by day the cheers of throngs coming from all parts of the city to pay tribute; at night the red neon lights of the building shine through a screen of trees. Is this really a new creation of world importance as they assert, or just a new city government? And why did the shake-up have to happen at all?

A year ago the Municipal Committee of the Communist Party held that building. Now that Committee has vanished. The setting up of the Revolutionary Committee on April 20 "marked the death of the former municipal Party Committee and people's council", as the Peking press declared. The same press hailed the new Revolutionary Committee as the most effective form of working-class dictatorship yet created. I heard the shouts last June that cheered the fall of the discredited party committee, as I hear the cheers for the new one now.

It took a year to make the change, a year of struggle which at times seemed confused to onlookers and perhaps even to participants. To get a clear account, I interviewed the 42-year-old woman philosophy teacher of Peking University who became suddenly famous last June when the broadcasting of her big-character poster, or Dadzebao, toppled the university president. Later that poster was hailed by Chou En-lai as "the first salvo of the cultural revolution" which ushered in the period of "mass democracy" and great debate. Nieh Yuan-tse is still a teacher of philosophy in Peking University. She is also now concurrently a vice-chairman of the Revolutionary Committee, one of the half-dozen top leaders in Peking's new organ of power.

In the reception room of the Revolutionary Committee, Nieh's slender figure, in jacket and trousers of harmonizing

shades of "Chinese blue", her sleek black hair and thin-rimmed spectacles indicated the teacher rather than the political figure. She is approachable, modest and intelligent. There was little hint of the fighter who put up a poster that fixed a date for history.

Nieh spoke of the need for the struggle. "In 1949 when we set up the People's Republic, we took power only from the top. We retained much of the old apparatus in government and in the national economy. In the long post-liberation years three influences came together—elements of the old apparatus, the ideology of the remaining bourgeoisie and revisionist ideology. These combined to produce a greatly swollen bureaucratic machine increasingly divorced from the people. These "anti-party elements pulled the apparatus toward reaction and corruption and prepared for eventual capitalist restoration."

For a long time, Nieh said, Chairman Mao Tse-tung has been fighting these tendencies. He opposed the widening wage gap and the ranks and epaulets for the army. But Mao is not omnipotent; he could not determine everything as he wished. "This old structure has now been smashed by the rising of the masses in the cultural revolution against all bourgeois survivals and tendencies", Nieh concluded.

Nieh's own struggle against "bourgeois tendencies" began years earlier in the university: "We revolutionary teachers saw that some people treated students of worker or peasant origin badly, and the authorities suppressed criticism of their activities some of which seemed to us to go counter to Mao's teachings." In 1964, in the "Four Clean-Ups" campaign, the left-wing teachers "exposed" Lu Ping, the university president and secretary of its party committee. He retaliated swiftly. For seven months Nieh and several other left-wing teachers were "detained" in a downtown hotel, under constant heckling. They learned from this that Lu Ping was protected by Peng Chen of the municipal party committee and by even higher authorities. A letter they sent through channels to Mao was delivered instead to their tormentors.

New forces, however, were gathering. On May 16, 1966, the Party Central Committee issued a circular condemning the actions of Peng Chen and revoking them. The circular was sent only to upper party organizations, but these included the university, where Nieh and her group took it as a clarion call. Seven teachers at once began to prepare a *Dadzebao*, or big-character poster, exposing Lu Ping's actions and connections. They posted it on a university wall on May 25; within four hours it was buried under hostile posters. For six days Nieh and her group could not go out of doors without meeting loud abuse and even physical attack. Then the words of the poster reached Mao and were broadcast over Peking Radio and hailed by the *People's Daily*.

'MASS DEMOCRACY'

That date, June 1, when what Mao calls "the first Marxist-Leninist poster" was broadcast, is today taken as the beginning of the active stage of the cultural revolution. It established the right of the people to challenge party secretaries and even party committees. It opened six months of "mass democracy" in posters and debates without limit. It was also the day on which the Central Committee removed Peng Chen from his post and ordered the reorganization of the Peking municipal committee.

The new municipal committee, however, fell quickly into the old habits of "controlling" the masses. This had to be changed by revolt from below. The process has taken a year. First there was the campaign by leaflets, posters, debates; then the moves to seize power. This began by organizing the Congress of Red Guards of Peking's universities, a task in which Nieh took part. It was not easy to build a "great alliance" with definite aims and discipline from Red Guards who had spontaneously created from two to 100 organizations in every university, all fighting each other. Their Congress was, however, achieved on Feb. 22, with Nieh as "head of the leading core".

Three parallel congresses followed. The Poor and Lower-Middle Peasants from Peking's 13 suburban counties and

districts set up their organization March 19. The Revolutionary Workers and Staff from industry and mining achieved their "great alliance" March 22 under the slogan: "Grasp revolution, push production". Finally the Red Guards of the Middle Schools held a unified congress March 25, which ended by singing the International.

These four congresses form the back-bone of the Peking Revolutionary Committee, set up April 20 by a mass meeting of 100,000 in the workers' stadium, while millions cheered in the streets or watched on television.

"What is your reason", I asked Nieh, "for thinking this Revolutionary Committee a better organ than any before?"

She gave several reasons. First, the members are "put in from the bottom" and retain contact with mass organizations which can at any time recall them. "If you saw a representative reporting to his factory or farm where all his fellow workers discuss his policies, you would see that the connection with working-class rule is very direct."

Next, the officials continue to work in factory or farm or school. "They remain part of the working class without extra salary as officials." I asked whether this was "practical". If they work in factories, how much time do they have to run city affairs?

Nieh replied that this difficulty is a serious one and many suggestions are being made to meet it. Basically it is hoped to develop a "widening participation by the masses in state affairs"; such as Marx and Lenin foresaw as the pre-requisite for the communist society.

Communism, in China's view, cannot come automatically by increasing wealth under public ownership, as Moscow seems to think. It requires three seizures of power: *first*, state power; *second*, public ownership of the means of production, and *lastly*, the battle for men's souls. Only when the wide masses attain a world outlook and a devotion to the common good can a nation pass to communism. This is the reason for the cultural revolution in China and the Revolutionary Committee in Peking.

A Canadian Professor Looks at China

A Canadian professor, Barry M. Richman, visited China in April-June, 1966. He is the Chairman of the International Business Program and of the Management Theory and Industrial Relations Divisions at the Graduate School of Business Administration, University of California, Los Angeles. He has also written about the industrial management systems of the Soviet Union and India.

To quote his own words: "With my Canadian citizenship and letters of introduction from a number of leading Canadian educators and businessmen, the Chinese were quite willing to issue me a visa, and this enabled me to undertake my first-hand study of industry and management. I visited 11 major cities and surveyed 38 enterprises in a wide range of industries as well as 3 of the country's largest retail department stores. In addition to interviewing and observing managers, workers, Communist party cadres, and trade union officials at work, I also met many key personnel at various central, provincial and municipal-level planning, industrial and commercial organisations."

We give below a few chosen quotations from his book, "Capitalists and Management in Communist China," published in January-February, 1967. We are indebted for these quotations to the American "Monthly Review."

THE CHINESE FACTORY

The Chinese do not seem nearly as concerned as the Soviets about economic inefficiency at the factory level resulting from the state planning and resource allocation problems. For the Chinese enterprise is not viewed as a purely economic unit where economic performance clearly takes priority. In fact, Chinese factories seem to pursue objectives pertaining to politics, education, and welfare as well as economic results...

Reprinted from the Red Flag, Colombo, of October 11, 1967.

The Chinese factory is a place where much political indoctrination occurs both at individual and at the group level, with the aim of developing the pure Communist man as conceived by Mao. It is a place where illiterate workers learn how to read and write, and where employees can and do improve their work skills and develop new ones through education and training. It is a place where housing, schools, recreational facilities, roads, shops and offices are often constructed or remodelled by factory employees. It is also a place from which employees go out into the fields and help the peasants with their harvesting.

Hence, if supplies do not arrive according to the plan, Chinese factory workers generally do not remain idle or unproductive—at least, by the regime's standards. In factories I visited where this type of situation arose, workers undertook some education or training during the period of delay in order to improve their skills; or they studied and discussed Chairman Mao's work; or as was the case at the Tientsin shoe and Wuhan Diesel Engine factories, they undertook various construction and modernization activities; or they worked on developing new or improved processes and products.

MATERIAL INCENTIVES

While the Soviet regime has accepted monetary incentives and self-interests as key motivating forces for both managers and workers, the Chinese regime takes a less sanguine view towards such rewards.

I found during my visits to 38 Chinese factories that piece-rate incentives for workers had been completely abolished. However, at about 80 per cent of the factories workers could still earn monthly or quarterly bonuses. And, interestingly enough, such bonuses were not based solely upon productivity; politics and helping co-workers were also key criteria.

EQUALITY

In a Soviet or American industrial enterprise there are generally clues which enable an out-sider to distinguish the

top managers from the workers, and perhaps even the top managers from the lower-level managers. During my visit to Russian enterprises a few years ago, observable differences in the salary and wage scales, working and living conditions, dress, appearance, education, work patterns, and even interpersonal contacts gave me adequate clues to guess who was who. But in Chinese enterprises there are fewer clues than probably in any other country in the world.

In order for a Western mind to make sense out of some of the more surprising and strange things going on in the Chinese factories, one must be aware of two pure communistic ideological tenets which the regime takes seriously and has gone a long way in implementing; (1) The abolition of classes, class distinctions and elites, and (2) The abolition of distinctions between mental and physical labour.

At Chinese enterprises there seem to be no really very substantial differences in the housing conditions of managers, technicians, Reds or workers. At the Nanking Chemical Fertilizer, Wuhan Iron and Steel Corporation, and Peking Cotton Textile No 3 enterprises, I spent quite a bit of time inspecting the factory housing. Top managers, lower-level managers, engineers, technicians, party cadres and workers are all integrated in the apartment houses, for which a nominal monthly rent—typically 1 to 4 yuan (Rs. 2 to Rs. 8) per room is paid.

All personnel eat together in the same canteen during working hours. Even though the larger factories have cars (some of them of U.S. models), top managers, key experts and party officials claim that they walk, ride bikes or take the bus to work. I was told that cars are only for official use or emergencies and are used by all personnel. One can tell usually very little from dress or personnel appearance in Chinese factories. Most personnel at all levels generally wear the conventional blue suits with caps—even the women.

Questions: In the absence of income and living standard differences, what does motivate the directors, party officials,

and experts to perform well and to improve their performance at Chinese enterprises?

Answer: Dedication, loyalty, identification with the country's goals and progress, a deep sense of commitment and purpose—all these must play significant roles, particularly for the Reds and possibly for many of the experts.

WORKER CONTROL

Elections and worker participation give the workers a sense of identification, loyalty, belonging, and commitment to their enterprises. They also keep managers on their toes, since they must at least listen to the workers. Perhaps more important to the regime is that workers' participation results in a form of bottom up control not only over economic performance but also over the proper interpretation of state policy and ideologically correct behaviour.

PHYSICAL LABOUR

During my visit to a Chinese factory, Peking Wool, I thought it was a joke or a strange aberration when, during lunch in the cafeteria, I was introduced to the director who was cooking dumplings in the kitchen. He was doing one of his two days a week of physical labour. I soon learned that all enterprise directors, vice-directors, party secretaries, and trade union leaders spend from one to two days each week in physical labour.

CONSUMER GOODS IN PLENTY

There is a surprisingly wide variety of consumer goods of relatively good quality in the stores, even in areas which are seldom frequented by foreigners, such as Wusih and Loyang. The largest Soviet department store—GUM in Moscow—does not come close to the large department stores in Peking, Shanghai or Tientsin in terms of variety or quality of consumer goods available. For example, Shanghai's general department stores No. 1 carries more than 50,000 different types of products.

FLAMES OF THAI PEOPLE'S ARMED STRUGGLE

The people's armed forces of Thailand, steeled in the tests of numerous battles, are speedily developing and expanding. Their struggle has inflicted heavy blows on the U.S. imperialists and their lackey, the puppet clique of Thailand.

The flames of armed struggle were kindled by the people's armed forces led by the Communist Party of Thailand in northeast Thailand two years ago.

Now the people's armed forces of Thailand carry out their activities in the mountains, jungles and rural areas in the northeast provinces of Thailand and in some places in the south, north and central parts of Thailand. Out of the 71 provinces of the country, guerrilla warfare and propaganda activities have been carried out by the armed forces in over twenty. The people's armed forces have won the support of the masses of the people of Thailand, especially, the peasants. The revolutionary situation in Thailand is excellent.

The great teacher of the revolutionary people of the world, Chairman Mao said: "Without a people's army the people have nothing." The people's armed forces of Thailand have grown up through learning from bloody lessons. Since U.S. imperialism helped the fascist militarist Sarit Thanarat establish military dictatorship at the end of 1958, this military dictator has banned all political parties and resorted to bloodthirsty suppression of communists and patriotic people who advocate peace, neutrality and democracy.

Since the end of 1963, Thanom end Praphas have followed in the footsteps of Sarit Thanarat, intensified their activities in pursuing the policy which brings disasters to the country and the people, and served as willing accomplices of U.S. aggression against Vietnam. Moreover, they have admitted U.S. aggressive forces into Thailand and turned that country into a U.S. military base for aggression against Vietnam and a U.S. Colony.

Reprinted from Red Flag, Colombo.

The people of Thailand know from personal experience that without armed struggle, the proletariat will not have their place, nor will the people. Thus more and more people have rallied around the Communist Party of Thailand and joined the ranks in the armed struggle. The Thailand independence movement and the patriotic front of Thailand were set up in November 1964 and January 1965 respectively. In order to drive away the U.S. imperialist aggressors and overthrow the Thanom-Prapas traitorous puppet clique, the people of Thailand are waging a courageous and persistent struggle.

The people's armed forces of Thailand have grown in strength through their heroic fighting in defiance of brute force and hearing no sacrifices. Since the founding of the people's armed forces, the Thanom-Prapas clique has called out its armed police in the "encirclement and suppression" campaign in an effort to stamp out the sparks of revolution. In this campaign conducted the reactionary troops and police, U.S. military advisers took the command and U.S. air commando squadron also played a direct part in the battle. With their skilful and flexible tactics, the heroic people's armed forces of Thailand have succeeded in smashing one enemy "encirclement and suppression" campaign after another and, subsequently, expanded their ranks. In less than two years, the people's armed forces have killed or wounded more than 700 enemy troops in the northeastern region, including a number of officers of the U.S. aggressor troops.

Recently, the people's armed forces of Thailand successfully repulsed the "dry season encirclement and suppression" campaign conducted by the U.S. and Thailand reactionaries. From November last year to June 4 this year, the people's armed forces were engaged in 172 battles with the reactionary troops and police, attacked and ambushed the enemy troops on 62 occasions, wiping out 258 enemy troops and police and reactionary local officials. In addition, they killed or wounded 81 secret agents. The people's armed forces also seized a large amount of weapons from the enemy and equipped themselves.

The Thailand people's armed forces are learning how to fight

a war in the course of fighting and are bringing in to full play the mobility and flexibility of guerrilla warfare to deal blows at the enemy. On August 1, the Thailand people's armed forces in the mountain areas Phrachuab Kirian province ambushed a so-called "expeditionary force" which was going there to suppress the local people. They set off a land mine under the jeep the "expeditionary force" was riding in and put out of action all ten men of this unit, killing lieutenant-provincial police.

At the beginning of May, the people's armed forces in a district in Chiang Rai province counter-attacked against the "mopping-up operations" of the reactionaries and adopted the tactics of concentrating superior forces to attack the enemies' weakest point and of carving up, encircling and annihilating the enemy. In this battle, the people's armed forces killed 15 enemy soldiers, wounded 20 and captured 11 and large quantities of arms, thus winning a victory in their efforts to defeat the "encirclement and suppression" campaign.

The fighters of the Thailand people's armed forces, who are waging a just struggle against U.S. imperialism and for national salvation, know that they are fighting in the interests of their people and nation. Therefore they are heroic and fearless in battle and can overcome tremendous difficulties.

For example, in November last year, the forces in That Phanom village in Nakorn Phanom province in their fight against the "encirclement and suppression" campaign being carried out by over 1,000 Thailand reactionary troops and police of two regiments commanded by U.S. officers, displayed great heroism and emerged victorious. In this battle lasting 21 hours the people's armed forces smashed many offensives by the enemy troops who were supported by helicopters and artillery. Later, the people's armed forces made a surprise appearance in the enemy rear, went for the enemy headquarters and successfully broke up the encirclement. In this battle the people's armed forces put out of action 87 enemy soldiers, including two U. S. officers killed.

The people's armed forces of Thailand are today actively

engaged in arousing the peasants in the rural areas to pave the way for the development and expansion of the guerrilla bases. They have gained warm support from the local peasants who have supplied them with their own grain. A struggle against thugs and local despots is also being waged by the masses led by the people's armed forces to do away with these sources of harm for the people. This has been heartily welcomed by the peasants.

Chairman Mao teaches us : "People of the world, unite and defeat the U.S. aggressors and all their running dogs ! People of the world, be courageous, dare to fight, defy difficulties and advance wave upon wave. Then the whole world will belong to the people, monsters of all kinds shall be destroyed. The heroic people of Tailand are now pressing forward along the path indicated by Mao Tse-tung's Thought.

MADURAI DOCUMENT RAISES

REVISIONIST SLOGAN OF PEACEFUL TRANSITION

Editorial Board, DESHABRATI

The People who serve the cause of reaction and implement a counter-revolutionary line under cover of revolutionary phrase-mongering, desperately try to keep up a revolutionary facade. They do not attempt to impose their line all at one go—no, that is too risky for them—they prefer to advance step by step and get their line accepted gradually.

This desperate attempt to keep up a revolutionary facade is revealed in all its ugly nakedness in that portion of the document where the neo-revisionist leading clique deals with the question of the form of transition to socialism. It is here that their revolutionary phrase-mongering utterly fails to hide their real face, the face of a lackey of the reactionary ruling classes. This portion of the document reads : "But the modern revisionists maintain that in view of the changed correlation of forces on an international scale as well as in each country in favour of the proletariat and its cause of socialism, and in view of the ever-increasing grip of the ideas of socialism on the minds of wide masses of the people, the universal law of violent revolution as propounded by Marx, Engels, Lenin and Stalin, forced on the proletariat by the bourgeoisie, and as universally accepted by all the Marxist-Leninists has become out-moded and hence to be discarded. In its place, they argue, the law of peaceful transition and parliamentary path is to be substituted ;" and further, "thus they seek to revise Marxism-Leninism on certain basic and fundamental issues of the proletarian revolution, issues such as the Marxist-Leninist concept of proletarian hegemony in the revolutions of the present era."

This is one of a series of articles now appearing in the Bengali Weekly DESHABRATI, criticising the Madurai ideological document produced by the neo-revisionist leading clique of the CPI (M). This article, originally in Bengali, was published in the DESHABRATI of November 2, 1967.

And so, the authors of the Madurai document remind us on more than one occasion of the important Marxist-Leninist concepts about the state. They have repeatedly stressed that the state is only an organisation of violence for the suppression of one class by another, that the bourgeois states are nothing but armed organisations for the violent suppression of the proletariat and the people. They have also not forgotten to refer to the fact that a fundamental question of every revolution is that of state power and that all the basic Marxist-Leninist teachings about revolution have revolved round this fundamental question.

Having done all this for our benefit, they pose a question—whether it will not be a violation of the tenets of Marxism-Leninism to consider the issue of socialist revolution or the national liberation revolution in isolation from the question of the state—and answering it themselves, they say: "Our answer should be clear and categorical that it is utterly un-Marxian to discuss the issue of revolution in isolation from the state."

Well, let us now see what Marxist criteria these Madurai revolutionaries place before us in opposition to the un-Marxian criteria noted above. They say: Marx, Engels and Lenin, as the foremost leaders of the world proletariat, did strive to achieve the socialist revolution by peaceful means wherever and whenever such an opportunity did open before them without allowing it to be missed. Guided by their great teachings and their practice, our Party, as correctly incorporated in our Party Programme, "strives to achieve the establishment of People's Democracy and socialist transformation through peaceful means", while, of course, not forgetting for a moment that the ruling classes seek to bar this road at every turn by resorting to violence and terror and hence the need to be ever vigilant and prepared to meet all such exigencies."

From the above it would appear that our Madurai revolutionaries have been, of course according to their own claim, following the teachings of Marx, Engels, Lenin and Stalin, and have not rejected the Marxist theory of the state. And it is on this point, they would have us believe that they are different from the revisionists. If they emphasize the necessity for a

peaceful transition to socialism and strive for it, it is only because—"It is a fact that violence is alien to the Marxist-Leninist ideals. The foremost thinkers, founders and leaders of Marxism-Leninism were always eager to find out ways and means to restrict, minimise and, if possible, to avoid bourgeois violence in the way of effecting the socialist revolution, since peaceful transition is advantageous to the proletariat. Any number of instances from the history of the working class movement can be cited to substantiate this proposition of ours."

So it is clear that if these people have some complaint to make about the revisionists, it is certainly not because the revisionists stand for a peaceful transition to socialism. Oh, no! These people themselves are striving for such a peaceful transition, because, as they allege, were not Marx, Engels, Lenin and Stalin themselves ever eager to strive for such a transition? These cunning agents of the reactionary ruling classes chide the revisionists for an entirely different reason. They say to the revisionists: Why on earth do you have to present the theme of peaceful transition as a general rule? What prevents you from referring to the universal law of armed revolution and then go on canvassing the peaceful path? Look, how we have referred to the Marxist teaching that the state and revolution should never be considered in isolation from each other, and then proceeded to deal with them as separate questions—why can't you follow our method, why do you need to avoid any reference to the question of the state? In other words, you have tried to revise Marxism by openly declaring that some of its basic theories have become out-moded and worthless with the passage of time—so, how can we help calling you revisionists and agents of the bourgeoisie? But we do not declare any Marxian theory as out-moded; on the contrary, we talk of applying them creatively in concrete circumstances and only then advocate the peaceful path. And look, how this simple trick has turned us into genuine Marxists and revolutionaries!

Following up, they say, "The thesis of peaceful transition advocated by the modern revisionists has nothing in common with either Marxism-Leninism or its tested method of examining

the question concretely, i.e., in relation to the state and its police-military apparatus."

So it transpires that the authors of the document have charted their course like this—they will talk of examining the question of transition to socialism in relation to the question of the state and the police-military apparatus of the state, and then will strive to establish people's democracy and pass over to socialism in a peaceful manner—and all this in the name of following the teachings and the practice of the great leaders of the proletariat. Their argument behind this seems to be—were not "the foremost thinkers, founders and leaders of Marxism-Leninism always eager" to take the peaceful path? If they could do it, why not we?

We may now study more closely how these henchmen of reaction try to advance their treacherous line. They present the entire practice of Marx-Engels-Lenin-Stalin in such a manner as to give the impression that these great revolutionaries always tried to adhere to the peaceful path although, in respect of social revolutions, they have taught us that the question of revolution cannot be considered in isolation from the question of the state. By this trick these henchmen want people to believe that merely a reference to the Marxist tenet that 'the question of social revolution cannot be considered in isolation from that of the state power' is about everything that Marxism teaches about the state and revolution. This is quite understandable, because a truthful presentation of the teachings of Marx-Engels-Lenin-Stalin in this regard would at once ruin their game and would clearly expose how they have presented the practice of those great leaders in a distorted manner. How long, do they imagine, genuine Marxist-Leninists are going to put up with this kind of knavery of theirs?

But in order to tear off the mask that these henchmen of reaction wear we must recall the essence of the basic teachings of Marxism regarding the state and revolution. Marxism teaches us that the state under capitalism is an organisation which protects the interests of the capitalists and landlords and, as such, it is essentially an organisation of armed power in the form

of police, military etc. That this armed power will be used to crush every attempt to overthrow the vested interests in capital and in land through a social revolution is axiomatic. That is why, whenever workers, or peasants or other exploited toiling people organise themselves as a class against the capitalist and landlord classes, whenever they want to advance along the path of class struggle in order to abolish classes, they will have to reckon invariably with this armed power at every step. So, in order to achieve victory in the social revolution, i. e., in order to abolish old class relations and to advance, step by step, towards a classless society on the basis of new class relations, the exploited classes must be able to smash the state power of the vested class interests. Since the essence of state power is the armed forces, state power can only be smashed by employing armed might. This is exactly what is meant when we say that Marxism-Leninism teaches us to consider the question of revolution in relation to the question of state power.

This is what Marx meant when he said that force is the midwife of history. When Lenin said that the settlement of major issues in the life of a nation can only be done by force (*Two Tactics*) or when Engels said that his main job was to prove the necessity of a violent revolution (*in a letter written in 1846*), this was precisely what they meant. Stalin, while defending Leninism, repeatedly pointed to this. It was precisely this idea that Mao Tse-tung developed when he said, "Political power grows out of the barrel of a gun," and "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."

Thus, it is evident that the foremost Marxist leaders of the world do not merely teach that the questions of state and revolution cannot be considered in isolation from each other, they go beyond this and call upon the people to smash the state power, which is armed power, with the help of the armed power of their own. This organic connection between the teachings and the practice of these great leaders, that is, the question of smashing

the bourgeois state apparatus, has been suppressed in the Madurai document deliberately. Otherwise, they would have been forced to repudiate openly this fundamental aspect of Marxism-Leninism on the issue of the state and revolution and to declare that state power, that is, the bureaucracy and the military, could be smashed peacefully and social revolution could be completed peacefully.

Even when their game is exposed, these people desperately try to cover up their treachery with phrases like "it needs always to be borne in mind that the ruling classes never relinquish their power voluntarily", and that "they seek to defy the will of the people and seek to reverse it by lawlessness and violence", and hence, "the need to be ever vigilant and prepared to meet all such exigencies." By all this, they perhaps try to brush up their renegade faces and demonstrate that they are behind none in appreciating the real nature of state power since they talk about "the need to be ever vigilant and prepared to meet all such exigencies." Well, one may ask what kind of "preparedness" they are talking about. Does this "preparedness", by any chance, mean preparedness to smash the state apparatus,—preparedness to destroy the armed power of the police and the military, which is the essence of state power? Of course, it is not this kind of preparedness they are talking about. The 'vigilance' and 'preparedness' that the Madurai document flaunts have an altogether different meaning. It is the preparedness for avoiding the repressive measures of the bourgeois state. In other words, it is preparedness to seize power and advance to socialism through people's democracy in a manner approved by the laws and rules of the bourgeoisie! This line, the way of accomplishing revolution within the four walls of bourgeois laws which they advocate, is clearly indicated in a single sentence, "they [the bourgeoisie] seek to defy the will of the people and seek to reverse it by lawlessness and violence." By saying this, they want to peddle the theory that the laws of the exploiting classes in a class society adequately protect the interests of the exploited classes, and that the bourgeoisie by violating these legal guarantees act against the laws. To put it bluntly, this theory

claims that the laws of the exploiting classes in a class society are founded on the will of the exploited masses and that the ruling classes defy the will of the people when they violate these laws. The Madurai document asks us to remain prepared and vigilant to defend the laws of the exploiting classes and prevent any violation of the same by the bourgeoisie.

This is how the Madurai document smuggles in a theory that strikes at the very basis of the Marxist theory of the state and, in actual practice, tries to make the bourgeois state and the existing bourgeois laws appear as effective instruments for furthering the cause of the people. True to this 'theory' of theirs, they publicly advocate a line of action, a line that preaches that the class interests of the peasants can be safeguarded by setting up commissions or camp courts. They contend that this line of action is merely a temporary tactical measure which it is necessary to adopt as the time for revolutionary action has not yet matured and as the organisation is still lagging behind. But the Madurai document clearly shows that this contention is false. This line of action follows from their theory that in a class society laws do not protect the interests of particular classes but embody the interests of the exploiters and the exploited alike and it is the ruling and exploiting classes that violate these 'pure' laws by having recourse to violence. So, these people call upon us to remain vigilant and prepared and to see to it that no one dares break the existing laws and resort to violence. Their argument is quite simple: it is the bourgeoisie, the ruling class, that breaks the laws; people have never violated and will never violate the laws. The people must defend the bourgeois laws and thus deny the bourgeoisie any excuse for resorting to violence—this is the essence of their theory of peaceful seizure of power and peaceful path; this is the objective they try to attain by asking people to remain vigilant and prepared. This is by no means a question of tactics; this is an alien outlook, a fully-developed theory of class collaboration, garbed in Marxist-Leninist phrases, that the Madurai document places before us.

It should not be difficult to realise why these veteran lackeys

of reaction choose to refer to the Marxist tenet that the issue of revolution can never be considered in isolation from the question of state power and have even launched an attack on the revisionist position on this score and why they suppress the fundamental question of revolution and advocate the peaceful path in the name of Marx, Engels, Lenin, and Stalin. These people seem to be a bit too much exercised over the question of the form of transition. That's laudable indeed! But, say, what of the seizure of power, that obstinate reality, which, must precede any 'transition'? Understandably, these 'anti-revisionist' Galahads maintain a studied silence over this most vital issue in their document. They have, and again understandably, thought it wise not to raise this question of the seizure of power, that fundamental teaching of Marxism-Leninism, before the working class and the toiling people. They are wise enough to realise that they cannot afford the luxury of taking the people into confidence, of truthfully raising vital issues like that of revolutionary seizure of power before the workers and peasants, when such actions will almost certainly expose their true colours and harm the basic interests of their masters—the reactionary ruling classes.

They have been very careful in avoiding any reference to the question of seizure of state power and bring in issues like the form of transition to People's Democracy as a ruse in order to bypass the fundamental question of revolution. By this trick they wish to nullify completely the teachings of Marxism.

Mao Tse-tung, the greatest living Marxist-Leninist, has defined revolution in the simplest manner. He says that revolution is the overthrow of one class by another. That is, we can develop and advance the cause of revolution only by advancing along the path of class struggle, struggle of one class against another. That is why, Marxism says that the history of class society is the history of class struggle. It should not be difficult for one to realise why in a document that discusses such distant issues as the form of transition to socialism, fails to refer to class struggle. Any reference to class struggle would force the authors of the document to deal with the issue of seizure of

state power. The seizure of state power is a culmination of class struggle. To talk of revolution and yet to ignore this issue amount to an attempt to smuggle in a line of class collaboration.

Before we can make a revolution we must know the nature of the state power we have to capture and also the manner in which to capture. Karl Marx himself gave an answer to these questions. In the history of class struggles in France, Marx wrote, "The working class cannot simply lay hold of the ready-made state machinery, and wield it for its own purposes." How then can they seize state power? To this, Marx answers—not merely the "transfer" of "the bureaucratic military machine from one hand to another, but to *smash* it, and that is a preliminary condition for every real people's revolution". Lenin says exactly the same thing; he says, "the proletarian revolution is impossible without the forcible destruction of the bourgeois state machine and the substitution for it of a *new one*."

Thus it is evident that seizure of state power does not mean laying hold on the ready-made state machinery; it means that the bourgeois state machine must be smashed and a state machine of the working class set up in its place. But what is a bourgeois state? It is the dictatorship of the bourgeoisie over the toiling people. And what is a dictatorship? According to Lenin, "Dictatorship is rule based directly upon force and unrestricted by any laws." As we have seen, bourgeois rule is only the dictatorship of the bourgeoisie and dictatorship is rule based directly upon force and unrestricted by any laws. From this it follows: "The revolutionary dictatorship of the proletariat is rule won and maintained by the use of violence by the proletariat against the bourgeoisie, rule that is unrestricted by any laws." [Lenin, *Proletarian Revolution and Renegade Kautsky*.]

The real significance of the Marxist theory that the question of the state and of revolution cannot be considered in isolation from each other, therefore, is that the proletariat must, in order to complete a social revolution, be able to smash the ready-made state machine of the bourgeoisie and to establish a new state of their own—a state that will be based directly on force, that is,

on armed power, and will be an unrestricted dictatorship of the proletariat. If the proletariat has to pass through an intermediate stage of People's Democracy before they can achieve socialism, they must necessarily establish a democratic dictatorship of the toiling people under the leadership of the proletariat and thence move forward. In other words, whatever be the stage of revolution, the proletariat must be able to establish dictatorship through class struggle. Only such a dictatorship can make it possible to pass over from the existing social system to a new and higher one. This transition from one social system to a new and higher one cannot be achieved in any other way. This is why, Marx, in a letter written to Joseph Weydemeyer on March 5, 1852, said: "No credit is due to me for discovering the existence of classes in modern society, nor yet the struggle between them. Long before me bourgeois historians had described the historical development of this class struggle and bourgeois economists, the economic anatomy of the classes. What I did that was new was to prove :.....2) that the class struggle necessarily leads to the *dictatorship of the proletariat*....." For the same reason Lenin, in course of his criticism of Kautsky, said in his *State and Revolution*: "Those who recognise *only* the class struggle are not yet Marxists;....Only he is a Marxist who *extends* the acceptance of the class struggle to the acceptance of the *dictatorship of the proletariat*."

Defining the state the Madurai document says: "The state is a special organisation of force, it is an organisation of violence for the suppression of some class'. The bourgeois states may vary in form but their essence is the same, i.e., in the final analysis, they are nothing but the dictatorship of the bourgeoisie. Similarly, the proletarian states may assume different forms, but their essence can be nothing but the dictatorship of the proletariat." So it is clear that these people do know the Marxist theory of the state. But their real game begins after this. If they have started their discussion about forms of transition with a reference to the Marxist definition of the state, they have done it solely for the purpose of covering up their anti-Marxist trickeries. Now we find that the above passage is immediately followed by another, which reads: "In view of

this irrefutably established scientific truth, the modern working class, in its fight for political power and social emancipation, at every stage of its development, is inevitably confronted with the bourgeois state, i.e., the special organisation of violence to suppress the working class." Anyone who is not conversant with the ways of our "Marxist" tricksters may feel inclined to conclude from the above that these people are following the path pointed out by Marx, Engels, Lenin, Stalin and Mao in this respect—the path of transition to socialism through the establishment of the dictatorship of the proletariat. The fact is, they are not. Look, what these people in the guise of Marxists say in the very next sentence: "Thus, the problem of how to meet this bourgeois violence with a view to putting an end to all violence in the relations of men is one of the key problems of the socialist revolution." With a skilful sleight of hand class struggle has been replaced by "relations of men" and a key problem of socialist revolution, namely, establishing the dictatorship after smashing the bourgeois state machine has been deliberately ignored and "the problem of how to meet this bourgeois violence" has been posed as the "key problem." By inducting the question "how", they artificially counterpose the non-peaceful and violent path to the peaceful one. And in posing to offer a solution of this 'problem' of their own creation, they say, "It is a fact that violence is alien to the Marxist-Leninist ideals." The role of violence as viewed from the standpoint of Marxist-Leninist ideals has been sufficiently discussed above and it is clear that the arguments of the Madurai document run counter to them; for, Marxism-Leninism puts class relations before relations between men. So, when Lenin says force and violence are alien to the ideal of socialism, he means that socialism abolishes exploitation of man by man and as such force is alien to it. But by this he never means that adherence to the ideals of socialism implies abandoning the use of force altogether and following the peaceful path in dealing with the class enemies. Precisely for this reason, Lenin, while criticising Kautsky's opportunism, said: "Socialism is opposed to violence against nations. That is indisputable. But Socialism is opposed to violence against men in general. Apart from

Christian-anarchists and Tolstoyans, however, no one has yet drawn the conclusion from this that Socialism is opposed to *revolutionary* violence. Hence, to talk about 'violence' in general, without examining the conditions which distinguish reactionary from revolutionary violence, means being a petty bourgeois who renounces revolution, or else it means simply deceiving oneself and others by sophistry." [Emphasis ours]

Every line of the Madurai document reeks with this stinking deception. The sly authors of this wretched document have avoided treading the beaten path of rejecting any Marxist theory in general as outmoded. Instead, they pick up instances when Marx and Lenin, in consideration of the concrete conditions prevailing at such times, advanced the call for a peaceful path, and thereby seek to justify their own advocacy of a peaceful path, which, they pretend and would have others believe, has been decided upon by them after consideration of the concrete conditions prevailing in India and not because the Marxist theory of armed revolution has become outmoded.

We should examine the instances they have cited. They have referred to what Marx and Engels thought in 1870-80, about peaceful transition in Britain and America and also to Lenin's comment on it. Lenin showed that if Marx and Engels thought of such possibilities, they considered them only as exceptions. Military-bureaucratic machines in Britain and America were not yet developed and this led Marx and Engels to believe that a peaceful transition in those countries was possible but that this would only be an exception. According to Lenin, with the establishment of the bureaucracy and the military apparatus, the basis of a capitalist state, any possibility of a peaceful transition in those countries was out of the question. The Madurai document also referred to this fact.

Alongside, the document refers to what Lenin said about the April-July period of 1917. That Lenin spoke of a peaceful transition because the primary condition for such a possibility, namely, arms in the hands of the people, was a reality at that time has also been noted in the document. By all this the authors seem to tell the revisionists, "Look, Marx and Lenin also spoke

of peaceful transition—not as a general rule, as you are doing in your folly, but only after analysing the concrete situation." This is precisely the attitude with which these crafty people try to hide their real face. Before quoting the above passage from Lenin, they quote from his article, *A Caricature of Marxism*, the following portion: "However, it cannot be denied that in individual cases, by way of exception, some small country, for instance, after the socialist revolution had been accomplished in a neighbouring big country, peaceful surrender of power by the bourgeoisie is *possible*, if it is convinced that resistance is hopeless and if it prefers to save its skin. It is much more likely, of course, that even in small states socialism will not be achieved without civil war, and for that reason the only programme of international social democracy must be recognition of civil war, though violence is, of course, alien to our ideals."

Why, one may ask, should these people quote this passage from Lenin? The reason is, of course, to prove that it is quite in keeping with Lenin's teachings to advocate peaceful transition if only as an exception and under special conditions even while recognising armed revolution as the general programme or the general rule. What wrong is there then, if these Madurai-wallahs advocate peaceful transition in the name of special conditions? What, according to them, are the special conditions? They say: "Our Party, keeping all these precepts of Marxism-Leninism in view and also taking note of the revolutionary changes that have taken place in the correlation of class forces in the world during the last half a century since the above pronouncements of Lenin, and particularly the developments following the socialist victory in the anti-fascist war, states in its programme..." etc. What do these people want to prove by quoting the above-mentioned passage from Lenin and immediately following that up with these words of their own? Do they want to show that their treacherous formulations have behind them Lenin's sanction? Do they want to prove that the socialist victory in the anti-fascist war and "revolutionary changes....in the correlation of class forces in the world during the last half a century" are exactly the things that Lenin meant

when he said, ... "after the socialist revolution had been accomplished in a neighbouring country?"

A revolutionary change in the correlation of class forces can only mean that the relations between the classes in a class society have undergone a basic change and that the ownership of capital and land by the exploiting classes has been replaced by that of the exploited classes. These people cynically declare that the establishment of a socialist system in a third of the world has brought about a basic and revolutionary change in the correlation of class forces in the remaining parts of the world. Even Khrushchevism dared not revise Marxism so blatantly. This explains why they had to quote this passage from Lenin rather abruptly—well, they must somehow bring in Lenin to justify their deliberate betrayal of Marxism.

It is probable that when in a small country, neighbouring a big socialist country, the dictatorship of the proletariat, which is based directly on unrestricted force, has been established, that country may progress towards socialism without having to use that force. Under such conditions the bourgeoisie may give up resistance and voluntarily surrender their power, the power of capital.

When Lenin said these words he was discussing the problem of implementing the dictatorship of the proletariat. Even while discussing the probabilities he always stressed that the prime factor must nevertheless be the establishment of the dictatorship of the proletariat. That is why, he never spoke of a voluntary and peaceful surrender of power by the state machine, that is, the bureaucracy and the military.

It is, however, ridiculous to argue in the name of Lenin that the bourgeoisie will ever surrender their armed power to the working class even when the working class has not seized state power or does not have its own armed power—merely because socialism has been established in a neighbouring big country. Only inveterate lackeys of the bourgeoisie can think of indulging in such clumsy falsifications of the teachings of Marxism-Leninism.

Let us conclude. These neo-revisionist lackeys of the bourgeoisie who produced this abominable perversion of revolutionary Marxist-Leninist teachings, namely, the Madurai document, are basically the same as the revisionists. The only difference between them is that while the revisionists have mostly given up their pretence of a Marxist facade, our neo-revisionists of the Madurai brand still think it to be advantageous to them to carry out their reactionary deeds behind the signboard of Marxism-Leninism.

The Bankruptcy of China's Devotee of Parliament

[The *People's Daily* reprinted on August 12 this article jointly written by the editorial boards of *Wen Hui Pao*, the *Chieh Fang Daily* and the *Party Branch Life*.]

Whether the proletariat is to seize power through armed struggle or by taking the "parliamentary road", this is the fundamental difference between Marxism-Leninism and revisionism. The whole history of the international communist movement teaches us that all revisionists, big and small, have been "devotees of parliament." Without exception they have all denied that revolution by force is the universal law of the proletarian revolution, they have all along taken the bourgeois parliament as a stock exchange, where they conduct transactions selling out the fundamental interests of the proletariat. They have turned themselves into the most despicable renegades of the working class.

Their most outstanding representative in China is the top party person in authority taking the capitalist road. He has all along been the biggest "devotee of parliament" in China and in the contemporary world.

In 1945, after victory in the War of Resistance Against Japan, the question put sharply to the whole Chinese people was, "Whither China?"

"To build a new-democratic country of the broad masses of the people under the leadership of the proletariat? Or to build a semi-colonial and semi-feudal country under the dictatorship of the big landlords and the big bourgeoisie? This will be a most complicated struggle." This most acute

Reproduced from the RED FLAG of Colombo.

struggle is a battle decisive for the choice between the two destinies and the two futures facing China.

Danger of Civil War

Upon final victory in the War of Resistance Against Japan, our great leader Chairman Mao pointed out: "it is necessary to be soberly aware that the danger of civil war is extremely serious because Chiang Kai-shek's policy is already set. Chiang Kai-shek's policy is civil war." And that in order to defend the fruits of victory, "our policy is to give him tit for tat and to fight for every inch of land."

It was precisely at this crucial moment that China's Khrushchov came out with his *Report on Problems in the Current Situation*. In this report he flagrantly opposed Chairman Mao's revolutionary line, raised the absurd, reactionary theory of "a new stage of peace and democracy" and clamoured for the "parliamentary road," saying that "the main form of struggle in the Chinese revolution has become peaceful and parliamentary, it will be legal mass struggle and parliamentary struggle." He also stated that "the whole work of the Party will undergo a change, all our organisations have to change to the point that non-armed struggle will be predominant. You must be capable of doing propaganda, making speeches and holding election campaigns so that people will vote for you."

China's Khrushchov's "Parliamentary Road"

In a word, he wanted to engage in legal struggle, and take the "parliamentary road."

This was the sinister programme mapped out by China's Khrushchov in his futile attempt to pursue the "parliamentary road" in China. This is another great exposure of his features as a renegade in promoting class capitulationism and national capitulationism.

Did "a new stage of peace and democracy" occur in China at that time as China's Khrushchov claimed? No, not at all.

At the time when China's Khrushchov was cherishing fond dreams of the "parliamentary road," Chiang Kai-shek was

sharpening his sword, holding peace talks while fighting the civil war. He used U. S. planes and warships to dispatch large numbers of troops to the front. The danger of an all-out, national civil war was imminent and it would break out at a moment's notice. This counter-revolutionary action of Chiang Kai-shek's was a slap in the face to China's Khrushov who was singing the stale tune of the "parliamentary road."

What is parliament? In capitalist countries parliament is only an ornament or a screen for bourgeois rule. The main pillar of the bourgeois state apparatus is armed force, not parliament. Whether the bourgeoisie carries out the parliamentary system or abolishes it, or what amount of power it gives parliament is always decided by the requirements of bourgeois rule.

It is a complete and vicious fraud to aspire to make the transition to socialism peacefully through the "parliamentary road" when the bourgeoisie controls the powerful state apparatus. In the present-day world we have only the tragic lesson of socialist countries which have peacefully evolved to capitalist countries but not a single precedent of a capitalist country making a peaceful transition to socialism.

Of course, under certain conditions the proletariat can utilize the parliamentary platform to expose the festering sores of bourgeois society, to educate the masses and to accumulate revolutionary strength so as to make preparations for seizing political power by armed force. But it is absolutely impossible to use parliamentary struggle to replace revolution by violence.

Desertion to the Side of the Bourgeoisie

Very early, Lenin pointed out: "Limiting the class struggle to the parliamentary struggle, or regarding the latter as the highest and decisive form, to which all the other forms of struggle are subordinate, is actually desertion to the side of the bourgeoisie against the proletariat."

The "legal mass struggle and parliamentary struggle" publicised by China's Khrushov is precisely "actually desertion to the side of the bourgeoisie against the proletariat."

In capitalist countries the "parliamentary road" is a blind alley. In semi-colonial China, especially in China after the victory of the War of Resistance Against Japan, the "parliamentary road" was even more of an impasse.

Quite early, Chairman Mao pointed out the following about old China under Chiang Kai-shek's rule: that internally she has no democracy but is under feudal oppression and that in her external relations she has no national independence but is oppressed by imperialism. It follows that we have no parliament to make use of and no legal right to organise the workers to strike. Basically, the task of the Communist Party here is not to go through a long period of legal struggle before launching insurrection and war, and not to seize the big cities first and then occupy the country-side, but the reverse."

Armed Revolution to Oppose

Armed Counter-revolution

The objective law for triumph of the Chinese revolution was to use armed revolution to oppose armed counter-revolution. This was the only road to victory for the Chinese revolution.

But after the victory of the War of Resistance Against Japan, China's Khrushov had the impudence to negate this objective law. Therefore, we would like to ask:

Could it be said that the characteristics of the Chinese revolution disappeared after the victory of the War of Resistance Against Japan? Did the basic law of the Chinese revolution not operate from then on?

Could it be said that the gang of butchers, headed by Chiang Kai-shek, who killed without batting an eyelid, became angels of peace and democracy after the victory of the War of Resistance Against Japan?

Could it be said that in dealing with the Chiang Kai-shek brigand clique who were armed to the teeth one could bring about peace & democracy just by making a speech and winning a few votes in parliament? If we had followed the "parlia-

mentary road" publicised by China's Khrushov at a time when the Kuomintang Chiang Kai-shek was sharpening his sword, cleaning his rifle and preparing to kill us, and had entered the cities with ballots as our admission, we would never have won the basic success of the democratic revolution, we would never have been able to enter Chiang Kai-shek's cities, but would only have lost our own cities instead, millions of people would have been killed and the future of the Chinese revolution would have been thrown away.

While China's Khrushov advocated the "parliamentary road", he also openly opposed armed struggle and urged handing over weapons to the Kuomintang. He openly put forth the view that "the army should also be reorganised", intending to reorganise our army "to become units of the National Army, National Defence Army, Security Troops and Self-Defence Forces." He wanted "to liquidate Party organisations" in the army, "...stop the (Communist Party's) direct leadership and command of the armed forces which should be placed under the unified command of the Ministry of National Defence." China's Khrushov even had the effrontery to say that such "compromise" "makes no change in the nature of the army but gives the army legality....This is a worthwhile and profitable deal."

Logic of a Renegade

This is the out-and-out logic of a renegade.

Actually, such "compromise" was the equivalent to putting one's finger-prints on a confession in the enemy's prison. To obtain such "legality" can only mean to be legal according to the law of Chiang Kai-shek and to the law of the Kuomintang. To realise such "unification" is to "unify" the Communist Party into the Kuomintang.

"It makes no change in the nature of the army" is the equivocation of a renegade. We would like to ask, without the leadership of the Communist Party whose army would it become? Whom would the guns point at? Once the nature of the army changes, the direction the muzzles point will change.

Without the army there can be no revolution, much less victory in the revolution.

In the ten years from 1936 to 1946, China's Khrushov never gave up the idea of handing over military power to the Kuomintang. Early in May 1936 while he was in the North China Bureau in charge of work in the white area, he wrote in a reactionary bourgeois journal under the pseudonym Tao Shung-hsing "A letter concerning the Communist Party". This sinister article advocated handing over the people's armed forces to the Kuomintang and making a "unified army with the same system and same organisation". This was entirely in keeping with Wang Ming's capitulationism. If we compare what China's Khrushov said in 1946 with what he said in 1936, we will find that the only difference is that he was even more determined to hand over the army and to hand it over more thoroughly. It was simply to curry favour with the U. S.-Chiang reactionaries so as to get a good official position in the Kuomintang government that China's Khrushov chose the moment of sharpest class struggle hastily to betray people's armed forces. He had absolutely no sense of shame.

Weapons in exchange for seats in Parliament

In the international communist movement, to hand over weapons to the enemy in exchange for a few seats in parliament and to win the post of vice premier or minister is no invention of China's Khrushov.

After the World War II, Thorez handed over weapons, Togliatti handed over guns, and the Greek Communist Party, though Athens was almost in its hands, handed over its guns. And the result? After the guns were handed over, "legality" was abolished; large numbers of true revolutionary party members were slaughtered and the blood of revolutionary martyrs became the wine in the cups of the enemy. What sort of "profitable" transaction was this? It was clearly a cheap sell-out of the cause of revolution and a monstrous betrayal of the people's interests.

Lenin said: "A bourgeoisie armed against the proletariat is one of the biggest, fundamental and cardinal facts of

modern capitalist society. And in face of this fact, revolutionary social democrats are urged to 'demand' "disarmament"! That is tantamount to complete abandonment of the class-struggle point of view, renunciation of all thought of revolution". China's Khrushov is just such an old-time opportunist who abandons all thought of revolution.

Tit for Tat

At that time, our great leader Chairman Mao alone stood firmly against this adverse revisionist current in the international communist movement. Giving tit for tat, he pointed out: "The arms of the people, every gun and every bullet, must all be kept, must not be handed over." This is a summation of the experience of the Chinese revolution and the international communist movement, a strategic concept of tremendous world significance, a wise policy in opposing Right capitulationism, and a fundamental guarantee of complete victory of the Chinese revolution and world revolution.

The Khrushov of China advocated the "parliamentary road" and opposed the seizure of political power by force of arms with such frenzy, because he feared revolution and war and the jaws of death; all he was interested in was winning promotion, filling his coffers in a comfortable way. When in jail, a man like this is bound to give himself over to the enemy and betray the revolution; in the face of violent revolution, he inevitably becomes terror-stricken and shouts himself hoarse calling for legal struggle. The needs of U. S. imperialism and Chiang Kai-shek, autocrat and traitor to the people, to dissolve and destroy the Communist Party, exterminate the proletarian revolution and maintain the reactionary rule of the U. S.—Chiang Kai-shek clique have been fully served by the ignominious traitorous activities of China's Khrushov.

Another Argument

In his all out advertisement of the "parliamentary road", China's Khrushov used another argument. This was the emergence, according to him, of "historically unprecedented

conditions" in China at that time. These conditions were said to be: three countries (Britain, the United States and the Soviet Union) were helping China's democratic movement; three political parties (the Kuomintang, the Communist Party and the Democratic League) in China favoured cooperation to bring about democracy in China; and the three principal classes of China (the working people, middle of the roaders of the middle bourgeoisie and part of the big bourgeoisie) demanded democracy in China. He wanted to take the "parliamentary road" precisely on the strength of this argument.

What nonsense! Under the pen of China's Khrushov, the U. S. and British imperialists had become Buddhas and were going so far as to help the "democratic movement" of China. Was this a fact? No! It was then the set policy of U. S. imperialism to help Chiang Kai-shek fight the civil war and turn China into a dependency of the United States. Under the signboard of promoting democracy in China, the U. S. government was re-inforcing Chiang Kai-shek's military strength in every possible way and was suppressing the Chinese people's revolution through Chiang Kai-shek's policy of massacring the people. When he described U. S. and British imperialism as helping China's democratic movement, was this Khrushov of China not clasping an enemy to his bosom and completely and unreservedly standing on the side of U. S. imperialism?

Three political parties "favoured cooperation" and three classes "demanded democracy in China"! This was yet more nonsense. There was absolutely no demand common to the big bourgeoisie and the working people. To wrest every ounce of power and every ounce of gain—was the principle of the Kuomintang and Chiang Kai-shek in dealing with the people. In August of 1945, in his essay, *On a Statement by Chiang-Kai-shek's Spokesman*, Chairman Mao pointed out explicitly that Chiang Kai-shek was the enemy of the people. However, half a year later, China's Khrushov went so far as to openly stand on the side of the people's enemy, reversing the verdict on Chiang Kai-shek, taking the enemy as people and describing the blood-thirsty butcher to be an angel who was "promoting peace and

democracy." Was he not serving as an out-and-out spokesman for Chiang Kai-shek?

Betrayal of Asian People

The practice of the Chinese revolution has totally destroyed the dream of China's Khrushchov. Casting aside all these absurd ideas, the Chinese people, under the guidance of Chairman Mao's revolutionary line, finally overthrew the reactionary rule of the Kuomintang in the course of three years' heroic battle, won great victory in the Liberation War and founded the People's Republic of China.

After the founding of New China, China's Khrushchov, his ambition undiminished, still obstinately advertised his capitulationist theory and vainly attempted to spread it throughout the world. In 1962 he wanted the Communist Party of Burma to "bury its weapons, reorganise its army into the 'Defence Forces' (Ne Win's reactionary army); and cooperate with Ne Win in the building of socialism." During his visit to Indonesia in April, 1963, he shamelessly lauded the road of "Nasakom" and in an unofficial conversation he made such nonsensical remarks as, "It will do good" for the Communist Party of Indonesia "to have more Party members in positions of minister in the government, to accumulate more experience in governing the country."

This is China's Khrushchov's great betrayal of the Chinese people, the Asian people and of people the world over. China's Khrushchov is the common enemy of the Chinese people and people throughout the world.

The 'devotee of parliament' in China has gone completely bankrupt. All the "devotees of parliament" in the world, big or small, have met a rebuff everywhere. With each passing day, the great truth of Chairman Mao that "political power grows out of the barrel of a gun" is being grasped by the proletariat, the oppressed people and oppressed nations throughout the world. The flames of armed struggle are burning vigorously in Burma, India, Southeast Asia, Africa, Latin America and other regions. The people are criticising the old world with the

gun. This is also the most powerful criticism of China's Khrushchov. Let us hold still higher the great red banner of Mao Tse-tung's thought, penetratingly criticise, thoroughly repudiate and completely discredit China's top "devotee of parliament" and the whole set of capitulationist nonsense he has advertised, and sweep it into the garbage bin of history.

The Character of the Indian Bourgeoisie

BHOWANI PATHAK (*Moni Guba*)

The Central Committee of the CPI(M) has recently adopted in its session held in Madurai (August 18-27) a long-winded resolution viz. "Divergent views between our Party and the CPC on certain fundamental issues of Programme and Policy." The resolution has two sections—the first one relates to the issues of programme and tactical line, while the second deals with the issue of the "code of fraternal relations" between fraternal parties.

There are quite a few instances in both the sections where the Chinese viewpoint has been presented in a distorted manner. Not only that, instances are there where the Chinese viewpoints have been misquoted. While the entire resolution has to be subjected to criticism, the scope of the present article is confined only to the question of the character and role of the Indian bourgeoisie.

The Programme adopted at the Seventh Congress of the CPI held in Calcutta says :

"The other broader sections of the national bourgeoisie which are either having no links altogether with foreign monopolists or having no durable links, which are not by themselves monopolistic and suffer at their hands in a number of ways, are objectively interested in the accomplishment of the principal tasks of the anti-feudal and anti-imperialist revolution.... This stratum of the bourgeoisie will be compelled to come into opposition with the state power and can find a place in the people's democratic front." (Para 106, pp. 46-47)

So, it becomes evident that the national bourgeoisie of India "will be compelled to come into opposition with the state power". Who then control the state machine? The Programme says that the present Indian state is "the organ of the class rule of

*Reproduced from the Bengali weekly DESHABRATI
of October 26, 1967.*

the bourgeoisie and the landlords, led by the big bourgeoisie, who are increasingly collaborating with foreign financial capital in pursuit of the capitalist path of development." (Para 56, p. 23 ; emphasis mine).

We can sum up from the above two statements of the Programme that the "Marxist" leadership has correctly divided the Indian bourgeoisie into two sections, namely, the big bourgeoisie and the national bourgeoisie. The first statement, with which we have no difference, defines the character of the national bourgeoisie. But what about the big bourgeoisie? The Madurai resolution says: "Hence our programme states that the present Indian Government is a bourgeois-landlord Government led by the big bourgeoisie which is compromising and collaborating with foreign monopoly capital." It further observes that this big bourgeoisie is, "by its nature, counter-revolutionary, inimical to the people...." (p. 5, emphasis mine).

According to the "Marxist" leadership, the character of the big bourgeoisie of India is that—

- (1) it is increasingly collaborating with foreign financial capital in pursuit of the capitalist path of development ;
- (2) it compromises with imperialism ;
- (3) it is by nature counter-revolutionary ;
- (4) it is inimical to the people.

Now let us examine how the Chinese Communist Party analyses the character of the Indian big bourgeoisie. Let us look at the Chinese viewpoint as presented by the "Marxist" leadership.

According to them, the Chinese Party "maintains that the Indian big bourgeoisie is a parasitic class fostered by British 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." (Resolution, p. 3).

The "Marxist" leadership, of course, differs with this assessment by the Chinese Party, because—as they say—"But the fact to be noted here is that, it is the industrial big bourgeoisie

which, today, has emerged as a powerful factor holding the leading position in the new state and government, and not the comprador element." (Ibid, p. 5).

The "Marxist" leadership does not agree with the view that the reactionary Indian state is led by the parasitic, comprador bourgeoisie; according to them, the leaders of the Indian state are the very powerful industrial bourgeoisie.

What is the difference between the comprador bourgeoisie and the industrial bourgeoisie?

Before going into this we should at first know what is actually the Chinese viewpoint. This is necessary, because the "Marxist" leaders have presented the Chinese viewpoint regarding the Indian big bourgeoisie in a distorted manner. The Chinese viewpoint is, in brief, that the main and basic feature of India's big bourgeoisie is their comprador character in spite of the fact that certain elements of the industrial bourgeoisie are present among them.

Now let us consider the difference between the industrial and the comprador bourgeoisie.

The industrial bourgeois are they

(1) who try to industrialise the country and, in particular, try to build up heavy and machine-building industry;

(2) who are self-reliant and take measures to create capital for the industrialisation within the country and do not depend on foreign capital for the same;

(3) who create their own market for purchasing raw materials for industry and for selling their manufactures and export more industrial goods than agricultural products to the world market.

In other words, the industrial bourgeoisie plays a healthy positive role in building up an independent national economy.

On the other hand, the comprador bourgeois are they,

(1) the growth of whose capital and trade depends on imperialism and imperialist assistance and, as such, they are unable to do away with foreign monopoly domination and ownership in the main branches of national economy and to build up an independent national economy;

(2) whose dependence on imperialist capital makes them build up, a few scattered enterprises apart, basically and mainly only such industrial enterprises that can assist in selling the products of the imperialist capital and facilitate the industrial expansion of the latter;

(3) who oppose the liquidation of feudal relations of production in the countryside because the perpetuation of feudalism there proves to be extremely profitable to the imperialists, who want our countryside to continue as a market for supplying raw materials to them;

(4) who, because of their abject dependence on imperialist capital and because their interests are basically and mainly interwoven with those of the imperialists, are ever eager to protect imperialist vested interests and, as such, prove themselves to be the main obstacle in the path of building an independent national economy.

In other words, the parasitic, comprador bourgeoisie does not play any positive role whatsoever in the economic, social and political life of the nation. Their role is basically and mainly a negative one.

What are the effects of a parasitic comprador economy on the social life? These are:

Exploitation and looting by foreign capital, political chaos, economic bankruptcy, unusual intensification of misery and hardship in the life of the people, and social and moral degradation.

One has only to compare this with the reality of the social, economic and political life in India during the last twenty years to realise whether the big bourgeoisie of India is parasitic or industrial. Supposing the Indian big bourgeoisie is industrial, not parasitic, what prevents them from building up an independent national economy? And if they can build up such an economy why not call them national bourgeoisie? Being Indian does not necessarily mean being national in character. Only such sections of the bourgeoisie, whose hopes and aspirations, aims and interests, are concurrent with those of the nation, can be called national bourgeoisie. The interests of the big bourgeoisie are opposed to

the national interests and this fact compels even our "Marxist" leaders to concede that the big bourgeoisie is by nature counter-revolutionary and inimical to the people. What makes them declare then that the character and role of the Indian big bourgeoisie are the same as those of an industrial bourgeoisie? How can the "Marxist" leaders get over this glaring self-contradictory position of theirs? If, as they assert, the big bourgeoisie is so powerful, why should it then increasingly submit to foreign finance capital for industrialisation?

To reconcile these contradictions between the real character and role of the big bourgeoisie on the one hand and its character and role as imagined by themselves on the other, the "Marxist" leaders have spun out an absurd theory whose mischief-making potentiality is great. This 'theory' will be taken up for criticism in a later article.

However, this theory of the "Marxist" leaders which attempts to prove that the big bourgeoisie is industrial bourgeoisie is neither new nor original. It was M. N. Roy and Abani Mukherjee who opposed Lenin's colonial thesis in the Communist International and stressed the industrial nature of the Indian big bourgeoisie. Roy's theory of 'de-colonisation' has deservedly earned a notoriety in the history of the international communist movement. Comrades who are interested in the history of the communist movement may go through the book, *India in Transition*, written by Roy and Mukherjee and find out for themselves how well the Madurai Resolution of the "Marxists" fits in with the theory fathered by Roy and Mukherjee.

One may ask of the "Marxist" leadership, if, as you claim, the Indian big bourgeoisie is industrial in character and if, as you say, they have persisted along the path of capitalist development all these twenty years and are still continuing along that path, what makes you give the slogan for an anti-feudal, anti-imperialist People's Democratic Revolution instead of a Socialist revolution?

Now let us find out how deep is the colonial, that is, the parasitic and comprador nature of our economy.

According to official statistics, 97 per cent of India's oil, 65 p. c. of rubber, 62 p. c. of coal, 73 p. c. of mining, 90 p. c. of

match industry, 89 p. c. of jute and 86 p. c. of tea are in the hands of foreigners. Of the total foreign capital investment, 64 p. c. is British and 27.6 p. c. is U. S. (including World Bank's investment). Indian capital thrives only on the basis of and with the assistance of this foreign capital. It is, therefore, evident that the character of Indian capital is nothing but parasitic. In its attempt to hide the existence and real face of foreign imperialism, the parasitic section of the Indian bourgeoisie has resorted to establishing joint enterprises with imperialist capital. Because, in certain cases, the Indian bourgeoisie happens to hold more than 50 per cent of the shares of such enterprises, our "Marxist" leaders have jumped to the conclusion that the Indian bourgeoisie is not parasitic but only collaborates with imperialism. Monopolists like Tata, Birla, Dalmia, Jain, Shriram, J. K., Martin Burn, Kirloskar etc. are the initiators of such joint enterprises. The fact that the Indian bourgeoisie holds more than half of the shares in some such joint enterprises does not in any way give them decisive control over them. On the contrary, their parasitic and subservient character is clearly evident even in such joint enterprises. As is known to all, share capital is of two types—ordinary and preference. The voting right is exclusively reserved for the holders of the ordinary shares while the holders of preference shares, who have no voting right, are entitled to receive only a pre-determined portion of the profit. The foreign imperialists distribute most of the preference shares among their Indian counterparts, keeping the ordinary shares for themselves. In this way, they exercise control over the capital and the policy. During the period from 1960-61 to 1965-66 the Controller of Capital Issues approved investment of new capital in 162 cases, in 99 per cent of which, foreign monopoly capital held between 50 and 100 per cent of the shares.

The existence of foreign imperialist capital and the infiltration of fresh imperialist capital are throttling the development of national industry, particularly, heavy industry and exposing ever more clearly the parasitic and subservient character of the nation's economy. In spite of this, we are asked to believe in the fairy-tale that our ruling class is the industrial bourgeoisie!

In the recent period, most of the foreign capital investments have been in industries like cigarette, sugar, soap-making, pharmaceuticals etc. which are most profitable.

We are told that considerable development of industry has taken place in the state sector, which, we are assured, is serving as an instrument for building up an independent national economy. The reality is, of course, different and we find that in this vaunted state sector also, the foundation of a parasitic, subservient, bureaucratic and colonial economy is being gradually laid.

The *Economic Times* of July 11, 1964, wrote: "It is reported that the Government of India has appealed to the U. S. businessmen to invest in this country at least 300 million dollars annually (i.e. 150 crores of rupees). The present rate of annual investment of private U. S. capital is 60 million dollars (i.e. 30 crores of rupees). The Government of India has requested them to increase this rate five-fold." [Retranslated from Bengali.—Ed]

The organ of the U. S. monopoly capital, the *Wall Street Journal*, wrote that the Government of India has given the following guarantees to tempt U. S. capital. They are:

- (1) 10 per cent rebate and abolition of super-profit tax;
- (2) capital and equipments to the tune of Rs. 25 lakhs can be installed for expansion of factories for which no permission from the Government will be required. The previous limit was Rs. 10 lakhs;
- (3) price control will be lifted from important industrial products;
- (4) special measures will be taken to exempt Indian companies from the existing tax on income from exports.

This is how, we are told, our rulers, the 'industrial' bourgeoisie, are attempting to build up an independent national economy and to consolidate their own class position *vis-a-vis* imperialism. This is, indeed, a novel way of doing this! The truth is, it is the way that precisely suits the interests and aspirations of the parasitic and subservient bourgeoisie and certainly not those of the industrial bourgeoisie, that is, national bourgeoisie.

Interview with a Revolutionary

(Subhas Ghosh)

We met the man whose name is inseparable from the historic peasant struggle of Naxalbari. He is Comrade Charu Majumder—a revolutionary of the new type, a soul dedicated completely and entirely to the cause of the revolutionary Indian people, to the cause of the Indian revolution. With his unbounded love for the oppressed people and faith in their limitless capacity and resourcefulness, spirit of self-sacrifice, modesty, constant endeavour to master the revolutionary essence of Marxism-Leninism and Mao Tse-tung's thought and eagerness to apply the same creatively in the concrete conditions of India, he best represents the courageous revolutionaries of Naxalbari, the path-makers of future India:

Comrade Majumder replied to various inquiries with his characteristic frankness and revolutionary ardour. In the course of the interview he covered a wide range of problems relating to the revolutionary struggle of the Indian people with an unusual depth of understanding—aspects of the Naxalbari struggle, the situation in the Indian countryside, the role of the working class in the present revolutionary struggle, the tasks of the revolutionary students etc.

Giving the lie to the inspired propaganda in the reactionary bourgeois and revisionist press that the Naxalbari struggle has petered out, he said that the fact is just the reverse. The revolutionary peasants in Naxalbari, far from being defeated, have successfully completed their first phase of struggle and are consolidating their gains and preparing for the second round. The reactionary government is perfectly aware of this fact and is intensifying its preparations by increasing still further the strength of the police force and the number of police camps. However, even such elaborate arrangements for their protection have not been able to restore confidence in the minds of the agents of the oppressive jotedars, who now find

security only in the police camps, while the jotedars themselves are leaving the villages for good and flocking to the towns for safety. The morale of the peasants, on the other hand, remains high as before and their determination has grown firmer.

The strength and determination of the fighting peasants have not only increased, but, what is of great importance, their political-organisational influence is increasingly and irresistibly spreading to the neighbouring areas.

Comrade Majumder repeatedly stressed the fact that the path that the revolutionary peasants in Naxalbari have taken is *the only* path for the victory of the Indian revolution. From their own experiences of struggle the revolutionaries have become convinced of the correctness of this, which is further confirmed by the statements made by the leaders of the international communist movement in support of Naxalbari. He said that the main task before all political workers now was to spread openly and widely the revolutionary politics of the Naxalbari struggle among broad masses of the peasantry and to help rouse their own initiative in organising and carrying on peasant struggles along the Naxalbari line.

He attached great importance to the role of the working class in this political campaign. He pointed out that the working class has a specially important role to play. Hence it is obligatory for us to propagate the revolutionary politics of the Naxalbari struggle not only among the peasants but also among the workers in the urban areas. It must be explained to them that the struggle of the Naxalbari peasants is an inseparable part of their own struggle and that the emancipation of the working class can only be achieved by strengthening, developing and carrying the revolutionary peasant struggle through to complete victory. The workers should themselves go to the village to spread the message of Naxalbari among the peasants. This would be a very good thing for building up revolutionary worker-peasant alliance in the context of peasant revolution. The workers in the industrial belt in and around Calcutta, who have close connections with the outlying

villages, can do this work quite easily. The non-Bengali workers will also be able to carry this politics to the rural areas in their respective provinces. Once the workers grasp the truth of this revolutionary politics, Comrade Majumder thinks, a new militant upsurge is bound to come about also in their own movement.

Giving a clear picture of the nature of the Naxalbari struggle he stated that from the very beginning the struggle was directed towards the overthrow of the feudal exploitation and domination in the rural areas. This fact has lent the struggle a very distinct political character. The peasants there are unitedly fighting against the forces of feudalism in the countryside. Their main enemy is the jotedars who are not tillers. The peasants have united against this enemy. However, individual peasants who have been corrupted and serve the interests of the jotedars are treated during the struggle as agents of the enemy in the same way as the striking workers, with good reason, treat the scabs not as workers but as the agents of the factory owner.

Dealing with the nature of exploitation in the countryside he categorically refuted the theory now finding favour among a section of the petty bourgeois pundits, namely, that capitalist exploitation and capitalist form of economy are predominant in the Indian countryside. He directly referred to the living conditions of the agricultural labourers in Bengal villages to elucidate his point. The *khet majoors*, he pointed out, are employed for three months a year at the most. For the rest of the year they are driven by poverty to work as bond-slaves for the jotedars and are subjected to the cruellest form of feudal exploitation and oppression. Comrades from South India have in their reports revealed facts which show, he said, that the conditions of the *khet majoors* there are basically the same. When such mediaeval forms of oppression and exploitation continue unrestricted in the countryside, to talk of capitalism being the predominant feature in the rural life is to advertise one's own isolation from the people. The

struggle in the countryside, he stressed, must therefore be directed against feudalism and imperialism, which preserves and protects feudalism.

Replying to the criticism of the Naxalbari struggle made by the neo-revisionist leadership of the C.P.I. (M) he said: "We earned the wrath of these leaders because we refused to keep the peasant struggles confined within the four walls of economism and dared to take the broad masses of the peasantry into confidence and, in defiance of the neo-revisionist convention, propagated for the first time the basic politics of the people's democratic revolution and the agrarian revolution among them. The neo-revisionist leadership does not rely on the revolutionary masses but believes that the masses are only to carry out their orders while the leaders 'make the revolution'. The policy of rousing the masses, so that they will themselves make the revolution, was an impermissible 'crime' in the eyes of the neo-revisionist leadership. However, we followed the 'mass line' as taught by Comrade Mao Tse-tung and repeatedly tested and corroborated in the entire course of China's victorious revolution. By rejecting the neo-revisionist policy of economism and following the Thought of Mao Tse-tung it was possible to organise the Naxalbari struggle and invaluable experience has been gained as to how to make a successful revolution in the countryside. Anyway, we duly kept the party leadership informed about our actions and requested them to circulate our views inside the party for inner-party discussion. The leadership, however, did nothing but suppress the same. In the circumstances we could not possibly wait for a 'change of heart' of our leadership and proceeded to organise the struggle."

Comrade Majumder referred to the growing trend among the students, namely, their eagerness to go to villages for political work. He said it was a good thing but the students should also know that going there for a few days or a few weeks will not produce any result. They should make up their mind to stay in the village and live and work with

the peasants permanently. Only those who could do this would be able to give real service to the peasants and to re-educate themselves. They must live with the poor peasants, eat with them and help them in all their work—and thus gradually become one of them. The students should remember that while they must propagate revolutionary politics among the peasants, the most important thing for them was to be able to learn from the peasants.

Those who are unable to go to the villages at present, should engage in doing propaganda work among the workers in the cities. Their aim should be to organise democratic struggles in the cities in support of the peasant struggles in the villages. For this it is necessary to make use of even the smallest opportunity. So there is much to be done in the cities also and the students can fruitfully engage themselves in such work.

Comrade Majumder showed a keen interest about the students. As he explained, the students are young and cherish noble sentiments and can readily grasp and support noble ideas; they are fearless, undaunted; they are not weighed down by selfish considerations and are not motivated by self-interests. These qualities make them an asset for the revolution. Therefore, the students are quite able to organise democratic struggles in the cities also and to rouse and rally the toiling masses around the revolutionary politics. It is obvious they would commit mistakes but that is only natural. They will learn from their own mistakes and gain experience and thus the bad thing can be turned into a good one.

Comrade Majumder concluded by expressing his views about the present situation and tasks of the revolutionaries in India. He said the time has come when all the revolutionaries who support the revolutionary politics of the Naxalbari struggle, who accept the Chinese Party and Chairman Mao as the leader of the international communist movement should get together and strive to build up a revolutionary party based

firmly on Marxism-Leninism and Mao Tse-tung's thought. The Madurai documents of the neo-revisionist leadership of the C.P.I. (M) have clearly shown that the revolutionaries still in the party have nothing to look forward to by submitting to the bureaucratic centralism of the revisionist leadership.

The necessity of systematically imbuing the masses with *this* [‘the inevitability of a violent revolution’] and precisely this view of violent revolution lies at the root of the *whole* of Marx's and Engels' doctrine. The betrayal of their doctrine by the Social-Chauvinist and Kautskyan trends which now predominate is brought out in striking relief by the neglect of *such* propaganda and agitation by both these trends.

—Lenin, *The State and Revolution*.

(from page 16)

COMRADE JANGAL SANTHAL'S MESSAGE FROM PRISON

Comrade Jangal Santhal, President, Siliguri Sub-divisional Krishak Samiti, and one of the leaders of the Naxalbari peasant uprising, has sent a message from prison through Comrade Kishan Chatterjee, a student leader of North Bengal, who was an under trial prisoner in the same gaol and now released on bail. This message shows how false and treacherous are the “Marxist” leaders like Harekrishna Konar, West Bengal's former Minister for Land and Land Revenue and member, Central Committee, C P I (M). Several weeks ago he saw Comrade Santhal in the prison and, afterwards, spread the canard through the bourgeois press that Comrade Santhal had realized his ‘mistake’. This knavish trick was meant to confuse and demoralize the fighting peasants and other comrades.

In the course of the message Comrade Santhal says :

“As the peasants of Naxalbari have launched a struggle to liberate themselves from the yoke of the age-old rule and exploitation by their feudal masters, the reactionary feudal elements and the agents of the ruling classes are frightened and their hired newspapers are ceaselessly spreading lies and slanders to disrupt this struggle...

“The so-called people's United Front Government have unmistakably taken the side of jotedars and landlords. With the help of the police and the military and in the same, old Congress style, they oppress the peasantry who have started this great struggle for realizing their just demands and dole out advice to the peasantry—who are exploited in every way possible—to solve their problem with the help of bourgeois laws. And this same “progressive” United Front government is firing upon peasants and workers to defend the interests of jotedars, landlords and the bourgeoisie. Those so-called revolutionaries, that is, those fashionable revolutionaries who have so long told us that the path to liberation of the exploited people of India is indeed the path of revolution, but who have, in practice, been pursuing the revisionist path, sing today the

same tune as the reactionaries, call this struggle of the Naxalbari peasants "adventurist" and oppose this struggle in the same old reactionary way. There is nothing surprising about it; when revolution breaks out in any country of the world, a section of revolutionary phrase-mongers deserts the path of revolution and is, at the end, cast into the dustbin of history. The same fate inevitably awaits the neo-revisionist clique of revolutionary phrase-mongers. There is only one road open—road to liberation from the yoke of the exploiting classes: it is the road that the peasants of Terai (the region at the foot of the Himalayas) have shown. So, today, my appeal to the people is: Organise struggles of the exploited masses everywhere, set up thousands of Naxalbaris all over the land. For, inner social contradictions inevitably lead to such struggles: no power on earth can check their onward march, and the struggle of the exploited against the exploiters is bound to end in victory."

AN INDIAN DEMOCRAT SPEAKS OUT

We have great pleasure in publishing the following letter, dated October 1, 1967, from Pandit Sundarlal to Mr Chen Chao-yuan, Charge de Affaires of the Embassy of the People's Republic of China in India. Today, the ruling classes, their revisionist agents and the bourgeois press are carrying on a vicious, frenzied propaganda to obscure the great truth that in their struggle to break the fetters of imperialism, feudalism and comprador capital, our people have to forge ties of friendship with Socialist China, which, to quote the words of Pandit Sundarlal, "is the greatest bulwark against all forces of imperialism, colonialism and reactionaryism." Pandit Sundarlal's letter will help dispel much of the misunderstanding and distrust that now cloud the relations between our people and the Chinese people and bring them nearer.

Pandit Sundarlal's Letter

Dear Friend,

Please accept and, if possible, please convey to the Government of the People's Republic of China, led by

Chairman Mao Tse-tung, the greatest revolutionary of the age and, in a sense, even of all ages, and also to the peoples of your great country my heartiest felicitations and congratulations on this your 18th National Day.

It is a great disappointment for me that I am physically unable to attend and participate in your function today at New Delhi. We are passing through some sort of an epidemic in this city just these days and I personally have been laid up with fever, cough etc. for the last four weeks or so. My physician advises me complete rest. This explains my absence from the function at your Embassy.

I need hardly tell you that I am as great a believer in India-China friendship and co-operation to-day as I was 16 years back when I visited your great country. Conditions historical, political and cultural, rural as well as urban, prevailing in my country have been and are so similar to those in China that I am convinced that for the solution of the various problems India is facing today, she can learn and benefit from no other country of the world as much as from your great country. I am therefore convinced the present clouds of suspicion and misunderstanding will melt away in due course and our two great countries will again march shoulder to shoulder for their mutual benefit as well as for the attainment of genuine freedom of all countries and for the establishment of genuine peace, progress and prosperity for all the peoples of the world. For me, this is not merely an idealistic but also the most objective and realistic view of things.

I am also convinced that in the international atmosphere prevailing today, the People's Republic of China is the greatest bulwark against all forces of imperialism, colonialism and reactionaryism and is also an invincible guarantee of world peace and world freedom. What more shall I say?

With my affectionate regards and all good wishes,

Yours fraternally,
Sundarlal

LIBERATION

Single Copy (Ordinary Number) ... Re. 1'00 (Postage extra)
Annual Subscription ... Rs. 12'00
Half-Yearly Subscription ... „ 6'00

Orders should kindly be accompanied by Money Orders.
No copy is sent by V.P.P.

Discount of 25 per cent is allowed to Agents on orders
for 5 copies or more.

All correspondence should be addressed to—

LIBERATION

Deshabrati Office
60A, Keshab Ch. Sen Street
Calcutta-9