

5

Liberalisation

March 1968

- *Historic Turning Point In The Indian Revolution*
- *Important Questions During Agrarian Reform In China*
- *History of the CPI*
- *Rebellion Is Right*
- *U S Imperialism—Biggest Exploiter Of India*
- *British Rule Totters In Hong Kong*
- *Take Up The Task Of Building A Revolutionary Party*

LIBERATION

Notes :	...	3
' <i>A Magnificent Victory</i> '		
<i>The Great Betrayal</i>		
<i>More On Phrases and Facts</i>		
' <i>The Struggle For Democracy</i> '		
' <i>Marxist</i> ' Apostles of Non-violence		
UNCTAD-II		
US Imperialism—The World's Biggest Exploiter	...	17
Important Questions During Agrarian Reform In China— <i>Jen Pi-Shih</i>	...	21
British Rule Totters In Hongkong	...	45
A New Assessment Of The History Of The CPI— <i>Bande Ali Khan</i>	...	50
US Imperialism—Biggest Exploiter Of The Indian People	...	69
Take Up The Task Of Building A Revolutionary Party— <i>S. R.</i>	...	75
People's War Carried To New Heights In South Vietnam	...	84
Historic Turning Point In The Indian Revolution	...	88
Rebellion Is Right !	...	92

Editor-in-chief
Sushital Ray Choudhury

Revolutions and revolutionry wars are inevitable in class society and without them, it is impossible to accomplish any leap in social development and to overthrow the reactionary ruling classes and therefore impossible for the people to win political power....

—Mao Tse-tung,
On Contradiction

Statement about ownership and other particulars

Liberation

Form IV

Place of Publication :	Calcutta
Periodicity of its publication :	Monthly
Printer's Name :	Nimai Ghosh
Nationality :	Indian
Address :	60A, Keshab Chandra Sen Street, Calcutta-9
Publisher's name :	Nimai Ghosh
Nationality :	Indian
Address :	60A, Keshab Chandra Sen Street, Calcutta-9
Editor's name :	Nimai Ghosh
Nationality :	Indian
Address :	60A, Keshab Chandra Sen Street, Calcutta-9
Owner's name	Nimai Ghosh
Address :	60A, Keshab Chandra Sen Street, Calcutta-9

I, Nimai Ghosh, hereby declare that the particulars given above are true to the best of my knowledge and belief.

2. 3. 1968.

Sd. Nimai Ghosh
(Publisher)

NOTES

'A MAGNIFICENT VICTORY'

At last President's Rule has been set up in West Bengal. One of the three demands of the United Front has been fulfilled and this has been hailed by the leaders of the CPI(M) as a great victory for the people. Their 'momentous' "struggle for the preservation of democracy" was passing through the third phase and was, according to many cynics, about to peter out when, thanks to a fresh rift in the Congress camp, this 'magnificent victory' was achieved by the people. The Legislative Assembly has been dissolved, the Congress-PDF coalition has been removed from office and the President has taken over the administration of the State. The bureaucracy will rule, as it ruled before, but now without the trappings of parliamentary democracy. The date for the mid-term election, on which our CPI(M) leaders have staked so much, is yet to be announced and so another 'great struggle for democracy' will naturally have to be waged for bringing that 'great' day near. And when the consummation so devoutly wished for—the victory of the United Front at the mid-term poll—is achieved, there will be, one may be quite sure, all the difference between Tweedledum and Tweedledee!

Out of the struggle just over has emerged a 'hero' who, aided by very powerful Congress bosses at the centre, brought about the downfall of the Congress-PDF coalition. He had done a similar trick only three months before: Sri Ashu Ghosh, a Congress MLC, had used quite dubious means to win over certain members of the UF and had reduced it to a minority in the Legislative Assembly. This man (against whom two court cases of defalcation and misappropriation of large funds are pending), who made the Ghosh ministry, has now chosen to unmake it for reasons of his own. The UF found in this erstwhile enemy a convenient ally and rushed with offers of support to him. What else, besides the Speaker's rulings, could the UF do to bring pressure on Governor Dharam Vira to dissolve the Ghosh ministry? Despite the fact that the ceremonial jail-going was going on, the people, even the rank and file comrades, were feeling quite indifferent and listless and even frustrated. So Sri Ashu Ghosh and the Speaker turned out to be the main architects of the people's victory—the forced resignation of the Ghosh ministry and proclamation of President's rule, which have added so much lustre to the cause of the UF. Who knows whether this man will one day blossom out as a rival of Sri Ajoy Mukherjee, another ex-Congressite, for the leadership of the UF! His talent for ministry-breaking is proof enough that he is destined for higher things.

THE GREAT BETRAYAL

The swift political changes in West Bengal, as in several other states of India, are an evidence of the deep political crisis with which the ruling classes are confronted. The year 1966 showed the mood of the people. Waves of struggle swept over the entire country. The sullen, discontented people clashed with the police and the military in futile rage from time to time almost in every part of the country. Strikes, even general strikes and *hartals*, were frequent. The petty bourgeois youth, especially, the students, were in the van of the struggle but the workers and peasants, too, participated. But one could feel that these struggles, almost spontaneous outbursts of anger against the government, leading to general strikes and *hartals*, always tended to end in a blind alley. Countless men and women displayed wonderful initiative, courage and spirit of self-sacrifice; but these struggles, which, no doubt, increased the isolation of the Congress, the main party of the ruling classes, from the people, could not bring about any change in the conditions of their life nor could they affect the regime of unbridled exploitation and oppression. It was such upheavals in West Bengal that secured for many leaders and workers of the CPI(M) their release from prison. The main task of the communists was to lead the toiling people out of the blind alley and along the road to revolution. Their duty was to raise still higher the consciousness of the toiling people, to build up a genuine united front of exploited classes and groups, and to lead them, chiefly, in the struggles in the countryside where the enemy is comparatively weak—in the struggles for dehoarding food and against evictions, for land and people's democracy. What have the leaders of the CPI(M) done since their release from prison? It is necessary to examine this record in view of the fact that the CPI(M) propagandists, Ranadive, Harekrishna Konar and other small fry, are trying to represent their Gandhian civil disobedience movement for toppling the Ghosh ministry and for the mid-term poll as a revolutionary struggle in defence of democracy. In a recent article entitled "The Struggle for the Preservation of Democracy or Armed Revolution" Konar has been eloquent in stressing the necessity of defending parliamentary institutions and thus preserving democracy while the bourgeois-landlord state, faced with a growing crisis, is trying to scrap them. He has been equally eloquent in decrying the slogan of "armed revolution", accused us of helping the Congress rulers objectively and hurled at us many choice, oft-repeated invectives. Before entering into a discussion of certain basic questions, without which the deliberate distortions of these unashamed lackeys of foreign

and domestic reactionaries cannot be exposed, we propose to examine briefly their policies and deeds since their release from prison in about May, 1966.

Immediately before their release, the policies of the reactionary ruling classes—the policies of enriching themselves by impoverishing the toiling people, by denying them even food and other necessities of life—drove the people of West Bengal into a frenzy. Demonstrations of their anger led to violent clashes for days all over the State—especially in the 24 Parganas, Nadia, Asansol, Siliguri, Calcutta. General strike and *hartal* were observed throughout the State for three days. After coming out of prison on the crest of this wave of struggles, the "Marxist" leaders hesitated and fumbled and then betrayed them. Assuring the people that they would announce a programme of action—which they put off doing several times—they applied brakes to the struggle and then, after several months, called a general strike. Afterwards, they plunged deep into negotiations with different parties about electoral alliances and adjustment of seats for the coming General Election. At the same time they published in *Deshhitaishie* (the Party's Bengali organ) a series of articles entitled "The Struggle Against Revisionism and the Sectarian Trend," in which the main attack was directed against those comrades who were trying to uphold a revolutionary line. In the name of fighting sectarianism, they started in earnest their fight against a correct revolutionary line.

But the workers, various sections of teachers, students, office employees, peasants were waging their struggles, almost unaided, against the policies of the reactionary ruling classes when the "Marxist" leaders had before them only one objective—how to contest and win a maximum number of seats in the Legislative Assembly. All class-battles were subordinated to the battle for the ballot-box. They not only refused to help the peasants' struggles for dehoarding food and against evictions, the struggles of the working class and the petty bourgeoisie for better living conditions, they deliberately sabotaged such struggles, for instance, the struggles of the tea garden workers in North Bengal and the State Transport workers in Calcutta. Only, in the Naxalbari area of Siliguri, communists led the peasants in the struggle for food and succeeded in saving 85 per cent of the harvest from the clutches of the *jotedars*. The "Marxist" leaders, a bunch of crafty opportunists, had already joined the camp of reaction when they exerted their utmost to hold in leash the people's struggles in the name of isolating the Congress at the poll.

MORE ON PHRASES AND FACTS

Ranadive, Harekrishna and other "Marxist" propagandists declare that they never sow any parliamentary illusions; that, on the contrary, they use parliamentarism in order to expose it as a fraud; that by joining the U.F. Governments, which, according to their tall claim, are instruments of class struggle, they seek to develop class struggles. Let us see how these claims can be reconciled with facts. What are the facts? Did the "Marxists" fight the General Election to disillusion the people about the parliamentary road? Did they tell the people that grim class struggle, not the ballot box, would alone enable the toiling people to seize power? Did they ask the people to prepare for agrarian struggles which, according to their Programme, form the axis of the People's Democratic Revolution? Facts tell a different story. Instead of breaking the illusions of the people about the parliamentary road, they only strengthened them during the election campaign. They promised the people that if they could set up a government ousting the Congress, they would at least provide relief to the masses. Even as late as January 1968 E.M.S. Namboodiripad said in reply to the questions of a *Washington Post* correspondent: "...despite the limitations described above (the provisions in the Constitution and policies pursued by the Congress at the centre), the State Government can do small things by way of giving partial relief to the people (*People's Democracy*, January 14, 1968). And *People's Democracy* wrote in its editorial of February 25, 1968:

"...it (the dismissal of the Ghosh ministry) is a defeat for the West Bengal and all-India Congress leadership who secretly plotted and exploited their position in the Government to satisfy their mad lust for power and to prevent the United Front Ministry from giving relief to the people at the expense of their masters—the capitalists and landlords." One feels tempted to ask Ranadive, Konar and Co. what relief was given by the U.F. Government to the people of West Bengal during its regime of nine months. For the Kerala experience we may refer to Namboodiripad himself, who said in reply to the *Washington Post*:

"People today have, on the contrary, even less food (and that at higher cost) than ten months ago. The problem of unemployment and lack of all-round economic development has also become worse during the last ten months." (*People's Democracy*, 14. 1. 68)

Therefore, the claim of the "Marxist" leaders that they were educating the people about the futility of parliamentarism is utterly hollow. For months before the elections they sought to set up electoral fronts with all sorts of reactionary and

opportunistic parties like the Bangla Congress, the PSP, the Forward Bloc, the SSP, the Gorkha League, the Dange revisionists etc. The spread of revolutionary politics was to them not the main thing: the main thing was the number of seats in the Legislative Assembly they could secure. And so, during the election campaign they sowed all kinds of illusion instead of uprooting them from the minds of the people. To use the words of 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*)

The claim of these sham Marxists that they used the U.F. Government as an instrument of class struggle is also no more than a demagogic stunt. After joining the U.F. Government in West Bengal, the West Bengal Committee of the CPI(M) declared:

"Further the [U.F.] Ministry is formed on the basis of a conglomeration of fourteen parties with different policies and ideologies and they are united with the aim of serving the people's interests. It has to function on the basis of a non-class outlook." ("W. B. State Committee Reviews Elections, Charts Immediate Tasks", *People's Democracy*, 16. 4. 67—Emphasis added). In the name of a non-class outlook, these treacherous leaders made this open declaration of abandoning class-struggle and surrendering the outlook of the proletariat and its interests to the outlook and interests of reactionary exploiting classes represented by the Bangla Congress and the like. Let us refer to Lenin again: "... the only choice is—either bourgeois or socialist ideology.

There is no middle course (for mankind has not created a 'third' ideology, and, moreover, in a society torn by class antagonisms there can never be a non-class or an above-class ideology). Hence, to belittle the socialist ideology in any way, to turn aside from it in the slightest degree means to strengthen bourgeois ideology." (*What is to be Done?*) And this is what these renegades from socialism actually did during the nine months they held office in West Bengal.

A few instances will suffice. First, while in office these renegades did not adopt any legislative measure or issue any ordinance that could serve the interests of the poor peasantry at the expense of the exploiting classes.

What prevented them, for instance, from reducing the ceiling on land holdings from 25 acres per family to, say, 10 acres per family or 2 acres per head? What prevented them from increasing the share of the share-croppers from 60 per

cent of the produce (which they do not actually get) to, say, 75 or 80 per cent? They did nothing of the kind though the provisions in the Indian Constitution did not certainly stand in their way. Instead, in a Note prepared and submitted by him to the Cabinet, the "Marxist" Land and Land Revenue Minister of the U. F. Government, Harekrishna Konar, recommended: "The Government policy 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." Again, "Officers, the Note said, should see that landowners were given their due share of the produce." (*The Statesman*, Nov. 8, 1967)

This shameless lackey of the *jotedars* has the cheek to claim that his government was serving the interests of the poor peasantry and acting as an instrument of struggle in their hands!

Secondly, when the struggle of the Naxalbari peasantry against evictions started, a struggle which, Konar has admitted, was just, Konar's Government issued hundreds of warrants for arrest of the leaders and ordinary peasants. Instead of withdrawing those warrants and putting in prison, instead, the *jotedars* who were evicting share-croppers in defiance of the existing laws, Konar shamelessly advised the peasant and their leaders to surrender to the police and not to evade arrest—in other words, to surrender to the *jotedars*. Even before listening to the communist and peasant leaders of Siliguri, he openly condemned their alleged excesses. His government unleashed the police against the peasants fighting for their just rights, and the police fired upon and killed eleven of them, of whom seven were women and two children. As a member of the Cabinet Mission that visited Siliguri, Konar called upon the peasants to withdraw their movement or to face the brutal repression that would follow. There was not a word in the statement issued by the the Cabinet Mission condemning the looting, arson, murder etc., which were being perpetrated by the goonda gangs organized by the Congress and the SSP. Then two things happened. On the one hand, the State Government, of which the "Marxists" were members, acted in close co-operation with the Central Government in using the state machinery to try to suppress the struggle of the peasantry. They sent several contingents of the armed police to the area, set up a large number of police camps and sought to terrorize the peasantry by firing upon peasants and making indiscriminate arrests. On the other hand, the leaders of the CPI(M) dissolved the Darjeeling District Committee and Siliguri Local Committee of the Party, which were leading the struggle, without going through even the formality of a charge-sheet against them, set up ad hoc Committees in their place, expelled the militant comrades

from the Party and started a vicious campaign of lies and slander against them and all others who supported the cause of the Naxalbari peasantry. The militant comrades were dubbed "left adventurists," "C. I. A. agents" etc. etc. They published from time to time the names of militant comrades and even of sympathisers who opposed their counter-revolutionary line so that the police could easily identify them. This was, indeed, class struggle *par excellence*!

Thirdly, frightened out of their wits that the message of Naxalbari might spread to other areas, these sham Marxists helped to set up police camps, camp courts etc. in different districts to put down by fire and sword all resistance of the poor peasantry against the most abominable kind of feudal exploitation. Reporting that measures were finalized at a meeting of senior district officials and member, Board of Revenue, with Harekrishna Konar, *The Statesman's* Staff Reporter said:

"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*, 18. 11. 67)

And in various places, besides Naxalbari, the police fired upon militant peasants and arrested hundreds of them during the U. F. regime.

At the same time this bunch of traitors tried to sabotage the struggle of the poor peasantry from within. On October 20, 1967, *The Statesman* reported: "As Secretary of the Krishak Sabha, Mr Konar had also issued circulars to his organization's units asking Sabha workers to impress upon the bargadars the need for avoiding clashes with *jotedars* who might try to use force to take away paddy from the fields. The Sabha should organize its workers so that bargadars could deposit their produce at panchayat khamsars. Thereupon BDOs (Block Development Officers) and JLROs (Junior Land Revenue Officers) should be requested to distribute paddy, after thrashing, among bargadars and *jotedars*." This is, indeed, quite a novel way of developing class struggle—perhaps the Indian path which our "Marxist" leaders have discovered!

Fourthly, according to a report in the Bengali daily *Jugantar* of November 22, 1967, 120,000 men lost their jobs and there was lock-out in 269 mills and factories in West Bengal between March and September 1967—the first seven months of the UF regime. Nothing, absolutely nothing, was done to curb the capitalists. But every step was taken to paralyse the militant activities of the workers. Even the general strike, that had been declared for September 11 to

resist the offensive of the big bourgeoisie, was called off. At the same time, the "Marxist" Deputy Chief Minister was prating of industrial peace. On October 6, *The Statesman* reported: "We do not want strikes and lock-out. We seek an amicable settlement of labour disputes," commented the Deputy Chief Minister Mr. Jyoti Basu (CPI-M) after the Cabinet meeting." On October 27, Jyoti Basu said in Madras that "the West Bengal Government's policy was not more strikes and lock-outs but more production." (*The Statesman*, 28.10.67). Jyoti Basu, according to a report in *The Statesman* of October 24, said: "The West Bengal Government acknowledged the fact that efforts should be made to harmonize relations in industry. It had therefore decided to meet industrialists and trade union leaders soon...Mr. Jyoti Basu felt the trade union leaders were partly responsible for the present state of affairs." This was certainly the way of developing class struggle with a vengeance! To develop it still further they sent the police to fire upon and arrest workers at Dum Dum, Birlapur and other places.

Fifthly, the U. F. Government did absolutely nothing to curb the activities of black-marketeers and profiteers. The price of rice soared to the all-time high of Rs. 4'00 and Rs. 4'50 per kg. Levy orders on *jotedars* were withdrawn and a paltry amount of 55,000 tons was procured by the UF Government from the distress sale by the poor peasantry. The "Marxist" leaders asked the people not to dehoard stocks of food themselves but to inform the police or the BDO's of such stocks. These "Marxists" were quite enamoured of the police and the bureaucracy of this semi-colonial semi-feudal state!

'THE STRUGGLE FOR DEMOCRACY'

Ranadive, Konar and others talk loudly of the urgent importance of "the struggle for the preservation of democracy". The slogan implies that democracy prevails in India, but is now under attack. In an article in *Deshhitaishie* of February 9, 1968, a "Marxist" wrote: "India is an independent state—a bourgeois state." That presupposes that the bourgeois democratic revolution has been accomplished in India. If that is a fact, why then do the "Marxist" leaders describe in their Programme the present stage of revolution as People's Democratic revolution? Why don't they characterize it as the Socialist revolution? When did the bourgeois democratic revolution take place in India?

We hold that India is a semi-colonial, semi-feudal country. The real struggle for democracy in India is the struggle against the remnants of feudalism, imperialism and comprador capital. Any manoeuvre to sabotage this struggle is a counter-revolutionary one. The present UF agitation for restoring the

UF ministry in the name of defending bourgeois parliamentary institutions and bourgeois democratic rights is also, as we have shown elsewhere, a counter-revolutionary manoeuvre to dupe the masses and divert them from the path of revolution. These "Marxist" heroes are fighting for *preserving* bourgeois parliamentary institutions which do not really exist. The Indian Parliament is not a bourgeois institution but an organ of the dictatorship of the imperialist-feudal-comprador combine that rules India today. In the very first issue of *Liberation* we wrote: "It was the British imperialists who planted parliamentary democracy on the Indian soil as a screen for the imperialist-feudal dictatorship over the toiling people of India. When the British handed over political power to their Congress agents, this ready-made organ of class-rule was adopted unaltered by the new ruling classes, the comprador-bourgeoisie and the landlords. The Central Legislative Assembly of the British colonial days, elected by the propertied and privileged classes, was given the high-sounding name of the Constituent Assembly and served as the parliament of the 'Sovereign' Republic until the early months of 1952." It is the Central Legislative Assembly of the old colonial days that blossomed out into the Parliament of semi-colonial, semi-feudal India. The Constitution itself contains provisions which withdraw the bourgeois democratic rights that it makes a show of offering. That is why, the detention of a citizen without trial, which amounts to denial of all democratic rights, is quite legal in India but in no bourgeois democratic state. In 1950, Ranadive said:

"Mir Sahib's amendment that I did not know Marxism, actually prostituted it is correct."

Ranadive seems too modest. We think Ranadive and "Marxists" of his ilk know a little of Marxism but they have ever been prostituting it—with a deliberate purpose. They too, like the Dangeites, are out to sabotage the real struggle for democracy in the countryside and in urban areas with false slogans about the defence of non-existent bourgeois democracy from attacks of fascism. The recent Indonesian experience, as the Polit Bureau of the Communist Party of Indonesia has pointed out, shows that disaster overtook it and foreign and domestic reaction could triumph, only because the Party failed to develop armed struggles in the countryside for the elimination of the remnants of feudalism and because the Party was enamoured of the parliamentary road.

"MARXIST" APOSTLES OF NON-VIOLENCE

The "Marxist" heroes have developed an aversion for violence—an aversion perhaps greater than that of the Gandhites. In his article, Konar writes: "Violence, according

to the founders of Marxism-Leninism, is opposed to the ideal of life of the working class; the working class wants to bring about the transformation of society in a peaceful manner." (Translation ours) These apostles of non-violence seem to be better Marxist-Leninists than Marx and Lenin himself. Let us refer to Lenin:

"We have already said above, and shall show more fully later, that the theory of Marx and Engels of the inevitability of a violent revolution refers to the bourgeois state. The latter *cannot* be superseded by the proletarian state (the dictatorship of the proletariat) through the process of 'withering away', but as a general rule, only through a violent revolution. The panegyric Engels sang in its honour, and which fully corresponds to Marx's repeated statements (see the concluding passages of *The Poverty of Philosophy* and the *Communist Manifesto*, with their proud and open proclamation of the inevitability of a violent revolution; see what Marx wrote nearly thirty years later, in criticising the Gotha Programme of 1875, when he mercilessly castigated the opportunist character of that programme)—this panegyric is by no means a mere 'impulse', a mere declamation or a polemical sally. The necessity of systematically imbuing the masses with *this* and precisely this view of violent revolution lies at the root of the *entire* theory of Marx and Engels. The betrayal of their theory by the now prevailing social-chauvinistic and Kautskyite trends expresses itself strikingly in both these trends ignoring such propaganda and agitation." (*The State and Revolution*)

Referring to Herr Duhring, Engels said: "It is only with sighs and groans that he admits the possibility that force will perhaps be necessary for the overthrow of an economy based on exploitation—unfortunately, because all use of force demoralises, he says, the person who uses it. And this in spite of the immense moral and spiritual impetus which has been given by every victorious revolution!"

Like the Gandhites, these renegades are trying to impose on the toiling people reactionary ideas and ideals—"dull, insipid and impotent" as Engels called them—in order to disarm the people.

Ranadive, Konar and Co. deny that a revolutionary situation exists in India. We may refer them to the article "The Revolutionary Situation: Has It Matured?" published in the February issue of *Liberation*, but we are not quite sure whether it will in any way improve their "entirely warped outlook" and "distorted understanding of politics which has become a second nature" (to quote Ranadive who used the words to describe himself).

We treat with contempt the base anti-Marxist calumny against our people, which Konar has indulged in when he says: "One should not forget that though a match-stick can kindle a prairie fire, it cannot do so in a damp place." What has so long held in leash the revolutionary struggles of our people is the treacherous leadership of the CPI and the CPI (M), which, as Mao Tse-tung said, talks about 'arousing the masses of the people' day in and day out and then becomes scared to death when the masses do rise. But the masses are rising in spite of them. Can't they hear the sound of the revolutionary peasants marching in Naxalbari, in the Dooars (in North Bengal), in Purnea, in Champaran, in Betiah (in Bihar), in Sreekakulam (in Andhra) and in many other parts of the country? Don't they know that brave Telengana is rising, again, seventeen years after the infamous betrayal by their party bosses and is eager to march in the van of India's peasantry? These opportunists choose not to hear, for these revolutionary struggles together with the struggles of the Nagas, Mizos, Kashmiris and other oppressed nationalities for the right of self-determination shall hasten their own doom like that of their masters—foreign and domestic reactionaries.

UNCTAD—II

The Second UN Conference on Trade and Development (UNCTAD-II) opened on February 1 in New Delhi. The UNCTAD-I was held in Geneva in 1964 and a charter—the Algiers Charter—was adopted in October last year by a Ministerial meeting of 77 "developing" countries, i.e., countries which continue to be mercilessly exploited by the handful of imperialists.

This is the eighth year of the so-called "Development Decade" (1960-69) announced by the UN with the blessings of the US imperialists, Soviet revisionists and their lackeys, the Indian rulers. As was to be expected, the entire benefits of this "development" artifice have gone exclusively to the imperialists, most of all to the US imperialists, and their accomplice the Soviet revisionist regime in the form of enormous increase in profits, intensification of exploitation of and domination over the so-called "developing" nations. The latter have been further weakened, and their political-military-economic dependence on the imperialists and Soviet revisionists has become alarmingly greater.

The average growth-rate of the exploited countries before the 'development decade' was 4.7% annually, and now it is 4.5%. In India the rate has gone down below the average to about 2.5%. "In the mid-1960's the developing countries have been

able to buy, for a given volume of their traditional exports, one-tenth less imports than at the beginning of this period." (*Algiers Charter*, quoted in *Indian Express*, Feb. 1, 1968). The Charter estimates the loss owing to this as 250 crores of dollars annually. In other words, after the "Development Decade" began, the imperialists have forced the "developing" countries to make a free gift of 11% more goods and services. According to an estimate published in *The Economic Times*, UNCTAD supplement, Feb. 1, the index of export prices of these countries fell from 122 to 99 during 1951-66 and enabled the imperialist robbers to make a profit of 6,300 crores of dollars in 15 years on this account alone. On the other hand, the imperialist countries raised the prices of their manufactured goods. "During this time (1952-53 to 1967) there was an almost unbroken rise in the prices of manufactured goods. The terms of trade of the developing countries were thus severely affected..... Many of them exported much more, but gained little extra earnings from the increased quantities." ("Commodity Problems and Policies" by E.M. Ojale, Director, Commodities Division, FAO; *ibid.*)

The importance of these "developing" countries in world trade has decreased during the "Development Decade", and their share in total world exports declined from 34% in 1950 to 25.8% in 1955 and then to 20% in 1966. On the other hand, the share of the imperialist countries rose from 60% in 1950 to 68% in 1966. The rate of this increase was greater during the "Development Decade" than before it; it grew at an annual rate of 5.3% during 1955-59 and jumped to 8.8% during the first six years of the "decade". The imperialist countries increased the value of their exports by 6,500 crores of dollars during the 12 years from 1953-54 to 1965-66 and the Soviet and East European revisionist countries by 1,000 crores of dollars, while the "developing" countries could increase theirs by only 300 crores. This adverse effect was reflected in the deterioration of the terms of trade for the "developing" countries, which is estimated to have deteriorated by 16% to 20% during 1951-66.

Translated into concrete reality affecting the lives of more than two-thirds of the world's population, the above facts can be summed up in a few lines:

"By and large, and year after year, the miners, the plantation workers and agriculturists of the poor countries of the southern hemisphere have been working longer and longer hours to obtain the same machinery needed for their countries' modernisation".

(*Indian Express*, UNCTAD-II supplement)

By this piracy in trading, the imperialists force the "developing" countries to swallow their bait of "aid". To quote the Algiers Charter again: "This has aggravated the problem of the increasing indebtedness of developing countries. The external public debt alone has increased from 10 billion (1000 crore) dollars in 1955 to 40 billion (4,000 crore) dollars in 1966. While the debt service payments (payments of interest etc.) averaged half a billion (50 crore) dollars annually in the mid-1950's, these have already increased to four billion (400 crore) dollars and may offset the entire transfer of resources before the end of this decade if present trends continue." Take the case of India. During the First Plan period the average annual burden of "debt servicing" was 5 crores of dollars, which increased to 115.2 crores of dollars during the Third Plan period and is expected to rise to 305 crores during the Fourth Plan (?) period. In the second year of the "Development Decade" India could meet the "debt service" requirements by using up 10% of her export earnings, in the eighth year "debt service" mops up 22% of her export earnings.

The "developing" nations, especially the smaller ones, which suffer most from imperialist plunder, could not be expected to endorse this open and cynical plundering by the "rich" imperialist countries. Some of them, naturally India was not one of them, did speak out against this state of affairs and criticised the working of the UNCTAD-II, which is manipulated by the imperialists and the revisionists. The Chilean delegate said: "It is beautiful to see the concern of developed countries for the interests of the members of their group". [*Economic Times*, 16. 2. 68]. The Burmese delegate said: "I might be going back (from the conference) not only as a disappointed delegate, but as a more confused economist." (*Ibid.*) More down to earth were delegates from smaller countries like Ecuador, Togo and Sudan, who spoke in anxious desperation. Declaring that Ecuador lived in "permanent anxiety" that its traditional markets for bananas would be closed, her delegate reported that she was "forced to dump thousands of tons of first class bananas into rivers" for want of markets. Togo and Ecuador stated that the third UN "cocoa conference" held in Geneva in December, 1967 had been a "fiasco". Sudan complained that due to sterling devaluation the price of some of her primary commodities depreciated by more than 14.3%. Malaysia complained that the price of rubber fell by 57% in the last 6 years and calculated the loss suffered by 14 "developing" countries on this account during that period at 417.2 crores of dollars.

Ceylon suffered a loss of 6.7 crores of dollars owing to price fluctuations in tea, silk etc.

In violent contrast to this was the attitude of the imperialists led by the USA who continue to control the UN and its agencies, including the UNCTAD, and of the Soviet revisionists, who have joined the US imperialists as partners in exploiting and dominating the "developing" countries. The enormous increase in their share of loot afforded by the so-called "development" farce organised by them seem only to have whetted the appetite of the US imperialists for further intensification of the exploitation of the "developing" countries. They cynically "wanted the UNCTAD to find practical ways to attract larger flows of private resources from the industrialised countries to the task of development."

(The US delegate's speech, *Indian Express*, February 6). The US delegate cynically boasted—"the nature of our own bilateral programmes is such that we have a large pipeline, large enough we hope to carry us over our present difficult years..." (*ibid*). This is an open declaration that the US imperialists are determined to solve their present financial crisis at the cost of the "developing" nations. Both the US imperialists and the Soviet revisionists exploit India and other countries through this contrivance of the so-called "bilateral programmes", which they effectively use to subjugate and dominate the "developing" countries economically, politically and militarily. The Soviet delegate in his speech declared his country's readiness to "co-operate with other countries" for "taking appropriate measures on bilateral basis." (*Indian Express*, February 8.) Lauding the Indo-Soviet trade arrangements, Mr. Dinesh Singh, India's Commerce Minister said: "If this sort of arrangement was possible with USSR, why not with other countries?" (*Economic Times*, January 29, 1963).

What are these "bilateral programmes" which the US imperialists boast about, Soviet revisionists shout about and Indian reactionaries laud shamelessly? At the request of the UNCTAD Secretariat, the Centre for Afro-Asian Research of the Hungarian Academy of Sciences prepared and submitted a report in which it opposed the bilateral system of assistance and suggested multilateral arrangements. In the words of George Woods, President of the World Bank, "Upto now, bilateral programmes of assistance had had as one of primary objectives helping high-income countries themselves. They have looked toward tactical support of diplomacy, toward holding military positions thought to be strategic." (*Economic*

[Continued on page 95]

U. S. Imperialism: The World's Biggest Exploiter

The countries of Asia, Africa and Latin America suffer continuous aggression, control, rapacious plunder and exploitation at the hands of the imperialists, colonialists and neo-colonialists. The United States—the centre of the world's monopoly capital—is the biggest exploiter of all.

Let's look at a few facts.

I. Investment

This is one way U. S. imperialism keeps the major branches of production and economic life-lines of many countries under its thumb. U. S. monopoly capital owns or controls 60 per cent of the world's known resources.

The United States controls the large plantations, big enterprises, transport and communications, national and international tele-communications, banking and insurance, and foreign trade of many countries and even the domestic commerce of some countries. This brings enormous profits. The United Fruit Company, known as the "Green Devil", owns 2.5 million hectares of land in eight Latin American countries. The U. S. companies own one-third of the total cultivated land in the Dominican Republic. The United States reaps a profit of more than 2,000 million U. S. dollars a year out of its investments in Latin America. It is estimated that from 1957-1962 the profits and interest gained by U. S. firms from countries in Asia, Africa and Latin America amounted to no less than 18,000 million U. S. dollars.

Oil is one of the main fields for plunder. U.S. imperialism controls all the oil produced in Saudi Arabia and the Bahrein Island, half of it in Kuwait and 80.2 percent of the known oil reserves in Latin America. According to the figures published by official U.S. sources, which may not tell the whole story, the oil profits obtained abroad by U. S. companies in 1962 amounted to 1,716 million U. S. dollars. Oil companies mainly owned by U. S. monopoly capital make an annual net profit of

21,800 U. S. dollars per oil worker in Venezuela and 40,000 dollars (U. S.) in Kuwait.

The United States plunders and controls non-ferrous and rare metals in Asian and African countries. Such rare metals as uranium, beryllium, tantalum, niobium, lithium needed in the manufacture of rockets and missiles and in atomic industries in the United States are almost wholly imported from Asia, Africa and Latin America.

2. The Market and Prices

Through control and manipulation of these, U. S. imperialism buys agricultural and mineral products chiefly from countries in Asia, Africa and Latin America, but sells manufactured goods to them at high prices. From 1951 to 1961 the prices of agricultural and mineral products exported by these countries fell by 39.2 per cent. In the same period the prices of imported machinery and equipment, which they urgently need in their economic development, went up by 31.3 per cent. Through this the Asian, African and Latin American countries suffered a total loss of 41,400 million U. S. dollars in the period 1952-61. Of all the imperialist countries, the United States got the biggest share. In 1962 alone, by means of non-equivalent exchange it took 1,700 million U. S. dollars from Latin America. International market prices often fluctuate as much as 40 per cent, to the disadvantage of the Asian, African and Latin American countries.

3. 'Economic Aid'

This is a typical neo-colonialist instrument for extending control and exploitation in the recipient countries, interfering in their internal affairs or even subverting their governments. Actually U. S. "aid" is a form of usury. Countries pay 5 to 8 per cent interest annually for U. S. loans.

The U. S. imperialists, in giving foreign "aid", impose on the recipient countries many exacting conditions of a most aggressive character. Under unequal treaties the recipient countries have to make many commitments such as facilitating exports of goods and capital by U. S. firms and supplying raw materials and

economic information to the United States. Political and military conditions are often attached.

With 3,500 million dollars of aid, U. S. imperialism has helped bring about "peaceful evolution", *i.e.*, the restoration of capitalism in Yugoslavia. 6 000 million dollars have bought over India's reactionary bourgeoisie which pursue an anti-China policy. Now millions of dollars are being spent to intensify the sanguinary war against the people in South Vietnam.

Since it began receiving U.S. "aid" in 1950, Thailand has been forced to close down almost three-fourths of its textile mills. India, which receives more U. S. 'aid' than any other countries, reduced its grain acreage by 447,000 hectares and its cotton acreage by 412,000 hectares during the period from 1959 to 1962. Such are the disasters brought about by U. S. "aid".

Prince Norodom Sihanouk, the Cambodian head of State, has repeatedly pointed out that U. S. "aid" is like poison, that it brings nothing but calamity (crises, division, coup d'etat, disturbance, war) to the countries it is supposed to help. Firmly rejecting U. S. "aid" Cambodia has achieved great success in building its economy by its own efforts. Its political independence, too, has become more secure.

4. Pumping of "Surpluses"

U. S. imperialism dumps its 'surplus' grain in Asia, Africa, and Latin America in order to alleviate its own crises in agricultural production, to grab huge profit, and to control and plunder the buying countries.

The dumping of U. S. grain has seriously affected the grain production and export of the traditional grain-exporting countries in these areas. Many countries face a growing shortage of food as a result of the grave damage done to grain production. The per capita output of grain in the three continents in the year 1961-62 was far less than the annual average in the pre-war period of 1934-38. In Asia it fell by 3'8 per cent, in Africa by 5'8 per cent and in Latin America by 15'1 per cent. Consequently, the average diet in many countries is only half to two-thirds of that normally needed for subsistence. In some areas in West Africa it is only one quarter of the normal amount.

U. S. imperialism also unscrupulously exploits the Asian, African and Latin American countries through such means as maritime shipping and the insurance business.

U. S. imperialism tries hard to assume the air of a wealthy philanthropist. But people can see clearly that the Dollar Empire has been built by plundering the fruit of labour of the Asian, African, and Latin American peoples. Every dollar is stained with their blood and sweat.

U. S. monopoly capital has brought unemployment, starvation impoverishment and disaster to many countries in Asia, Africa and Latin America. In them, the struggle for political and economic independence is the struggle against U. S. imperialism, the most ferocious enemy of the world's people and the biggest plunderer of their wealth.

We should rid our ranks of all impotent thinking. All views that overestimate the strength the enemy and underestimate the strength of the people are wrong.

—Mao Tse-tung,

*The Present situation
and Our Tasks*

Important Questions Arising During The Agrarian Reform in China

—Jen Pi-shih

(Jen Pi-shih, member of the Chinese Communist Party's Central Committee, spoke on several important questions arising during the agrarian reform to an enlarged session of the Northwest People's Liberation Army's Front Committee, January 12, 1948. Describing the agrarian reform movement for the abolition of age-old feudal and semi-feudal exploitation in China as the greatest people's movement in Chinese history, and the basis for the victorious development of the People's Liberation War, Jen Pi-shih, discussed the following six questions: the criterion for demarcation of classes in rural areas; firm unity with the middle peasants; policy towards landlords and rich peasants; policy towards industry and commerce; the intelligentsia and enlightened gentry; and the question of revolutionary order.

We are reproducing this report made in January, 1948, as we believe, it may render valuable help to our comrades in understanding the present situation in India's countryside.)

What I want to speak about is several questions from the agrarian reform. These are several important questions, but are not the whole question of agrarian reform. The agrarian reform movement of the various liberated areas has obtained great achievements within the vast liberated areas, given rise to an ardent mass movement, and has already thoroughly wiped out, or is now thoroughly wiping out, the feudal and semi-feudal system of exploitation, which has existed in China for thousands of years, enabling tens of millions of Chinese peasants to "fan shon" ("fan shon" is the term used in the liberated areas to describe the peasants' overthrowing of the feudal system and the establishing of a new democratic system politically, socially, economically and culturally. The words "fan shon" literally

mean "to turn one's body over" and are somewhat similar colloquially to the English expression "to get up on one's foot"). This is the greatest people's movement in the history of China, and is also the basis on which the war can to-day victoriously develop. This is what imperialism and the Chinese Kuomintang reactionaries are most afraid of. The Agrarian Conference of September, last year, conducted an over-all discussion on the question of agrarian reform, and made many important decisions. Based on the results of the Agrarian Conference, the Central Committee of the Chinese Communist Party published the Basic Program On Chinese Agrarian Law, proposing that the governments of the various liberated areas should carry it out. The publication of the Basic Program on Chinese Agrarian Law clearly and precisely pointed out before the people of the whole country the direction and methods of our Party's agrarian policy. With regard to this direction and method, we should firmly support them.....But the work of agrarian reform is a laborious and complicated one.it is further necessary to correctly and concretely solve the various questions arising during the practical movement of the peasants. Based on the recent decision of the Central Committee, I now speak about the following questions, which occurred in the course of the great movement, and which must receive the attention of the entire Party.

WHAT IS THE CRITERION FOR DEMARCATING RURAL CLASSES ?

The Central Committee recently re-issued two documents of 1933: "How to Analyse Classes" and "Decision on Some Questions From Agrarian Struggles," (we shall reprint these valuable documents which may serve as a guide to our comrades in the next issue of *Liberation*—Ed.) as reference documents for the demarcation of rural classes for the various areas. Although they are 1933 documents, they are in general still applicable to-day. They contain precise stipulations concerning landlords, rich peasants, middle peasants, poor peasants, farm labourers etc. The Central Committee has issued these two documents because mistakes have occurred in some localities in the demarcation of class standing. The criterion for

demarcation of class standing of many people has been determined incorrectly so that the line of demarcation between the enemy and ourselves is not clearly known. Chairman Mao tells us that we must clearly draw the line of demarcation, clearly distinguish between the enemy and ourselves, isolate and distintegrate the enemy, and must not isolate ourselves. If the class standing of many people is determined incorrectly, this disorders our ranks.

THE CASE OF TSAI-CHIAAI

Now I cite a case from the Shansi-Suiyuan area demonstrating the seriousness of this danger. According to the Shansi-Suiyuan Sub-Bureau speaking last month on the correction of errors in determining class standing in the administrative village Tsai-chiaai in Hsingshion county, out of the total 552 households in the whole administrative village of Tsai-chiaai, excluding one natural village Chaorhshang (equivalent to hamlet or settlement—Ed.) 124 households or 22.46 percent of the total number of households were determined as landlords or rich peasants. According to general estimates, landlords average approximately 5 percent under the old regime. Added up together, landlords and rich peasants average approximately 8 percent of the total households and approximately 10 percent of the population. In the old liberated areas, many landlords and old-type rich peasants have already become members of other classes. The number of landlord and rich peasant households should be less than 8 percent, but the number of landlord and rich peasant households in Tsai-chiaai exceeded the 8 percent by nearly twofold.

Later, as a result of re-determination on the part of the sub-bureau working through the peasantry congress committee based on the principles of the 2 documents "How to Analyse Classes" and "Decisions on Some Questions from the Agrarian Struggles", it was considered that among the 124 households, 11 households of bankrupt and declining landlords, and 20 households of "producing rich peasants" or 31 households in all, could be re-determined as well-to-do peasants. Thus, the number of landlords and rich peasants could be reduced to 93 households,

or 16.84 percent of the total number of households. Later, the time standard for determination was shortened from 1937 to 1940. Thus, the landlords and rich peasants of all Tsai-chiaai's 579 households (including Chaorhshang) could be reduced to 71 households. This is still 12.26 percent of the total number of households. If we consider landlords who have engaged in labour for 5 years and rich peasants who have ceased to engage in exploitation 3 years as middle peasants, then the number of landlord and rich peasant households should be even smaller.

Hsingshion county's Tsai-chiaai may be taken as a place in this area where landlords and rich peasants are comparatively concentrated. Most of the villages in this county do not have as many landlords and rich peasants as Tsai-chiaai. But the experience of Tsai-chiaai teaches us an important lesson: we must demarcate classes and carry out agrarian reform in accordance with the actual situation, and must absolutely not artificially demarcate those who are not landlords and rich peasants as landlords and rich peasants, thus erroneously enlarging our "area of attack", disordering the revolutionary front, helping the enemy and isolating ourselves. This is an extremely important question, and must receive the attention of comrades of the whole Party.

But how did the comrades working in the agrarian reform at Hsingshion's Tsai-chiaai erroneously demarcate class standing? It is reported that the reassigning of 81 households into the lower classes was owing to the following reasons: (1) 15 households were determined incorrectly because their fathers or grandfathers had exploited people. They themselves had by 1937, a year before the establishment of the Democratic Anti-Japanese Government, or before, exploited others very little or not at all; (2) 5 households were wrongly determined because they had in their early years enjoyed the livelihood of landlords or rich peasants, but since before the anti-Japanese war (the latter half of their lives) they had laboured and did not exploit others, or exploited only very slightly; (3) 7 households were determined incorrectly because they had many possessions though they were industrious labourers engaging in only slight exploitation; (4) 3 households were determined incorrectly because though they

mainly engaged in labour themselves, and exploited others very little or not at all, they had been adopted or sold to landlords or rich peasants as sons, when very poor in their early years; (5) 1 household (in the widow and orphan category) was determined incorrectly because being without labour power, there was a period when the orphan hired others. His father was a peasant and he himself became a peasant when he grew up—that is to say, he accidentally lost labour power and hired full-time farm labour. (6) Apart from these, in the determining of class standing in the past, the political attitude of those whose economic conditions and relations of exploitation were very difficult to determine, was often used to assign them to the lower or higher classes.

EXPLOITATION THE ONLY CRITERION

To sum up, in Tsai-chiaai, and other parts of Shansi-Suiyuan in the past, so many criterions as exploitation, history, livelihood, and political attitude were used to determine class standing. Aside from exploitation, the taking of any other conditions as criteria for demarcating class standing is entirely wrong. Thus, in the one administrative village of Tsai-chiaai alone more than 50 households or approximately 300 persons were demarcated incorrectly into the enemy camp. This is not isolating the enemy but is self-isolation. What a serious mistake it is to send people from our own ranks into the camp of the enemy!

And what was the attitude of the peasants towards the incorrect determination of the class standing of such a number of persons? Comrades of the sub-bureau say that during the discussion by the committee of the Peasant Congress, all committee members endorsed the method for demarcating classes of 1933 in "How To Analyse Classes" but were afraid to rectify. Some said that quite clearly there were poor peasants and farm labourers who felt that the class enemy had been worked up to too many, but they did not dare to speak. They were afraid that others would say they were covering up for landlords or rich peasants. The majority of the committee members said that there were some so-called producing rich peasants who were in

fact middle peasants, and were demarcated as rich peasants by straining the point. They said that their not serving in the army was disadvantageous to us. They said moreover that demarcating "producing rich peasants" engaging in slight exploitation as middle peasants would cause the middle peasants to produce without fear and is beneficial to production. It may be seen from this that the peasants are not satisfied with having a large number of people demarcated incorrectly as landlords or rich peasants. They consider that this is making too many enemies and their own strength is thus weakened, and it endangers the development of production. This is a very correct way of looking at things.

It must be pointed out here that I am raising the question of the incorrect determination of class standing at Hsinghsion's Tsai-chiaai only as an example. It can be affirmatively stated that in other villages of the Shansi-Suiyuan Area in North China, East China, Central China, the Northeast and the Shensi-Kansu-Ningsia Border Region of the Northwest, there is sure to be quite a number of cases of the sort as incorrect determination of class standing that took place in Tsai-chiaai, or cases more or less similar to this. All leading comrades of the liberated areas and all comrades engaging in agrarian reform work must seriously examine this question of determining class standing, and publicly and definitely rectify mistakes they have committed. Even if only a single person is determined incorrectly, this must nevertheless be rectified.

Such criterions of determining class standing as were employed at Tsai-chiaai are incorrect. But what, after all, is the correct criterion for determination of class standing? This is the first thing we must clarify. There is only one criterion for demarcating class standing: that is, determine the various classes according to the various relationships of people to the means of production. The only criterion for demarcating classes is the various relationship of exploiter and exploited produced by the possession or lack of the means of production, how much and what are possessed and how they are employed.

WHO ARE RICH, MIDDLE, AND POOR?

What are the means of production? The means of production in industry are factories, machinery, raw materials and other capital. The means of production in agriculture are land, plowing animals, agricultural implements, houses etc. The only criterion for demarcation of rural classes is the various relationships of exploiter and exploited produced from the possession or lack of land, plowing animals, agricultural implements, houses and other means of production, how much and what is possessed, and how they are employed (tilling himself, hiring labour or renting out).

Based on the above criterion, it is very easy to differentiate between the various class standings in the rural areas. The principal class standings in the rural areas can in general be demarcated as follows:

- (1) Those who possess much land, do not labour themselves, specially relying on exploiting the peasants' landrent, or concurrently engage in usury, profiting without working, are landlords. *Landlords*
- (2) Those who possess much land, plowing animals and farm implements, participate themselves in the principal labour, and at the same time exploit the hired labour of peasants are rich peasants. China's old-type rich peasants are strongly feudal in nature. Most of them concurrently engage in usury or rent out a portion of the land. On the one hand, they labour themselves, thus being similar to peasants and on the other hand they engage in feudal or semi-feudal exploitation, thus being similar to landlords. *Rich Peasants*
- (3) Those with land, plowing animals and agricultural implements, labouring themselves and not exploiting or only slightly exploiting other peasants, are middle peasants. *Middle Peasants*
- (4) Those with little land, agricultural implements, etc., labouring themselves and at the same time selling a portion of their labour power are poor peasants. *Poor Peasants*
- (5) Those not possessing land, plowing animals or agricultural implements, selling their own labour power, are farm labourers. *Farm Labourers*

The principal class standings in rural areas should in general be demarcated thus. But should all those who rent out land or hire full-time labourers be dealt both as landlords or rich peasants

without exception? There are exceptions, too. For example, those who have lost labour power like widows, orphans, cripples and invalids may be permitted to rent out their small plots of land. Others like doctors, primary school teachers and workers, whose families have a little land and cannot concurrently till it because of their employment and who can just maintain themselves, also cannot be considered as landlords and rich peasants although they rent out their land or hire others to till it. Aside from these, there are some other complex circumstances which must be stipulated in detail. The things spoken of here are some of the most typical conditions.

How to differentiate between rich peasants and middle peasants is a question which must be dealt with very carefully. Speaking in general, middle peasants do not exploit others, but [even] those [who do] both only slight or incidental exploitation should still be considered middle peasants. On this question, the Central Committee of the Chinese Communist Party recently decided to adopt a policy more liberal than in 1933. This is, those engaging in slight exploitation (such as hiring others to herd cattle or sheep, hiring part-time labourers, or labourers on a monthly basis, or even one full-time labourer or so; perhaps renting out a little land or lending out small loans), the income from which does not exceed 25 per cent of their gross income, are still considered middle peasants or well-to-do middle peasants. This is more lenient than the stipulation in 1933 limiting the income from this kind of exploitation to not exceeding 15 per cent of the gross income. Only those whose exploitation exceeds 25 per cent of the gross income for 3 successive years are considered rich peasants.

IN NEW AND OLD LIBERATED AREAS

In new areas, landlords or rich peasants, who had already gone bankrupt and become middle or poor peasants a year before the establishment of the democratic regime should be recognised as middle or poor peasants. The fact that one year can determine this change in class standing is because under those circumstances they are forced down by the extortion under Kuomintang rule. But with regard to peasants who climb from

poverty and become rich through long years of accumulation and hard labour and become landlords or rich peasants, 3 years are required before they can be considered as landlords or rich peasants.

In old liberated areas with regard to the landlords and rich peasants who have declined under the democratic regims because of just distribution¹ of burden, reduction of rents and interests, "settling up accounts" struggles or other reasons, all landlords who engage in agricultural labour and do not again exploit others for 5 successive years should have their class standing changed to peasants (determined as middle peasants, poor peasants or farm labourers in accordance with the actual conditions) while rich peasants who have ceased their exploitation for 3 successive years should also have their class standing changed to middle peasants. But those among them who still retain many feudal possessions should give up their surplus possessions for distribution to the poor farming people. After the landlords and rich peasants have changed their class standing, whether or not they may join peasants' union and poor peasants' league should be decided individually by the peasants' union and poor peasants' league after examination.

In the 1933 "Class Analysis," it is stated: "With regard to elements in the Red Army from landlord or rich peasant families, regardless of whether they are commanders or fighters, and on condition that they resolutely battle for the interests of the workers and peasants, they and their families have the right of being distributed land. But recently in some places, only considering social origin and not political manifestation, the land already distributed to Red Army fighters of landlord and rich peasant origin who resolutely do battle for the interests of the workers has been reconfiscated. This is incorrect." This was the measure taken with regard to Red Army commanders and fighters of landlord and rich peasant origin in 1933. At the present time, with regard to the small number of landlords and rich peasants, who have been permitted to join the People's Liberation Army, and who have separated themselves from their families, received revolutionary education,

and undergone the tests of battles; if they are resolute and brave in battle and do not engage in activities to cover up for landlords and rich peasants or disturb agrarian reform, they should also have their class standing changed, and should enjoy the treatment of revolutionary military men in general. Because they have taken part in sanguinary combat, their time limit for the change should be made shorter than that required for those engaged in civilian work. In the army, landlords, rich peasants and other exploiters who satisfy the above conditions and who have served for 2 full years, and the intelligentsia from families of landlords, rich peasants or other exploiters who have served for a full year, can be changed to the class standing of revolutionary military men. The land and property distributed to these people themselves and their families must not be less than that of the peasants in general (and should not be more than that of peasants in general). Those fallen in action, disabled, or retired should be treated as revolutionary military martyrs and disabled or retired veterans.

But as for those who manifest vacillation in battle or commit such crimes and those who manifest opposition or disruption in the agrarian reform, even if they have been in the army for a very long time, they should still be resolutely expelled.

Is there any danger in changing the class standing of landlords who labour for 5 years and rich peasants who do not exploit others for 3 years? I think there is no danger. Because their land and property (for rich peasants, it is requisition of their surplus property, not all their property) have been equally distributed, and they also have these many years of labour, they can therefore be reformed. With regard to landlords and rich peasants in the liberated areas whose class standing has not changed, during this period of deepening agrarian reform struggle, it is advisable to suspend their rights to join the army, in general, for the time being, with the exception of individuals who obtain permission. As for taking part in stretcher bearer corps and other work in support of the front, this should still be allowed to them.

FIRMLY UNITE ALL MIDDLE PEASANTS

Elimination of the feudal classes is a ruthless struggle. We must rely on the poor peasants and farm labourers as the backbone, satisfy their demands, and firmly unite with all the middle peasants before we can do this well. The 8th Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union (1919) specially emphasised that the importance of uniting with the middle peasants is necessary, and stated furthermore that confusing the rich peasants with the middle peasants is "against all the principles of Communism." The question is posed thus seriously because encroaching on the interests of the middle peasants necessarily causes them to vacillate and can even be utilised by the landlords and rich peasants, causing the poor peasants and farm labourers to become isolated. Should this happen, the revolution would fail.

20% MIDDLE PEASANTS

The middle peasants under the old regime made up approximately 20 percent of the population. In old liberated areas in general, they made up 50 percent more or less. After the thorough, equal distribution of land, the overwhelming majority of the people in the rural areas become middle peasants with only a minority who are not middle peasants. In the past, in the fight against Japan, the middle peasants contributed not a little strength and money. They have done meritorious work in the fight against Japan. Also at the present time in fighting the KMT reactionaries, they are relied on for a large part of the man-power and grain. In our liberation army at present, 30 to 40 percent are middle peasants. If we injure the interests of the middle peasants, or even go so far as to stand in opposition to them, this will cause us to be defeated in the war. In the economic construction of new democracy, in the process of development from individual economy to collective co-operative economy, the main reliance is on the new and old middle peasants. They have rich production experience which deserves to be learned by poor peasants and farm labourers. Their production implements are also comparatively better made and

can help the poor peasants and farm labourers. In the future the middle peasants can travel with us onto Socialism. Therefore the middle peasant is our permanent ally.

But according to available information, in many places of all liberated areas where the agrarian reform movement has been not in motion, a "leftist" tendency to encroach on the interests of the middle peasants and to exclude the middle peasants has occurred. This kind of tendency is manifested in the following questions:

INTEREST ENCROACHED

First of all, the class standing of some middle peasants has been determined incorrectly. For example, in the above mentioned Tsai-chiaai administrative village alone, there were more than 50 households of middle peasants and well-to-do peasants (and even some poor peasants) who were erroneously determined as so-called producing rich peasants or bankrupt landlords. In many places, those whose class standing has been erroneously determined also have their possessions confiscated and in some cases, they have even been beaten.

Secondly, it is expressed in not wanting the middle peasants to take part in managing affairs. The middle peasants doubt whether they are still wanted or not. Except for the old areas in which equal distribution has already been carried out, it is necessary for the poor peasants and farm labourers to unite and organise the poor peasants' leagues to act as the backbone leading the agrarian reform movement. But some places have arrived at a state where the poor peasants and farm labourers practically run everything. This is erroneous. For example, in the electing of delegates to the peasants' congress or members of committees, only poor peasants and farm labourers, and no middle peasants, are elected; in making decisions on many important questions, such as determining class standing, distributing the fruits of the agrarian reform and apportioning tax burden and services, middle peasants are not allowed to participate. This causes the middle peasants to feel that their fate is completely in the hands of the poor peasants and farm labourers and to manifest great uneasiness.

Thirdly, it is expressed in not giving consideration to the middle peasant on the question of public duties, especially, in increasing the middle peasants' burden. In some places, it has been discovered that only the poor peasant-farm labourer group discusses and makes decisions on the apportioning of the public grain tax; and, because, after agrarian reform, the landlords and a rich peasants are not in position to meet their responsibilities, the public grain burden is placed on middle peasants and even the delivering of public grain is apportioned more to them. This way of doing things is also bound to arouse the opposition of the middle peasants.

Aside from all these, in the distribution of the fruits of agrarian reform there are cases in which nothing at all is distributed to middle peasants. This causes the middle peasant to feel that at the time of struggle, his participation is wanted, and he loses much time from his work; whereas at the time of distributing the fruits, there is no share for him, and he is not even allowed to take part in the meeting to distribute the fruits.

The above tendency to encroach on the interests of the middle peasants and not to give them consideration, and to exclude them is extremely dangerous. It is a tendency of anti-Marxist ultra-leftist adventurism, which should receive the attention of the whole Party, and this erroneous tendency must be resolutely rectified. Otherwise, it will isolate us and lead the revolution towards defeat.

THEY ARE EXPLOITED TOO

The poor peasants and farm labourers have some differences with the middle peasants, but they can be settled. The middle peasants in the old society are in general exploited and oppressed. On such basic question as opposing imperialism, striking down KMT reactionary regime, wiping out the feudal system and demanding political democracy, they have all the conditions for common struggle together with the poor peasants and farm labourers under the leadership of the Communist Party. The difference between them lies mainly with the dissatisfaction

of the poor peasants and farm labourers over the insufficient firmness displayed by middle peasants in struggling against the landlords and rich peasants, sometimes vacillating and hesitating.

This kind of weakness on the part of the middle peasants really exists, but only [if] the leadership principles instructed by Chairman Mao Tse-tung are carried out, namely, resolutely leading the middle peasants to struggle against the feudal classes and to win, and at the same time not injuring their interests and giving them political education, they can be led in concerted struggle. Secondly, in the equal distribution of land, well-to-do middle peasants may be unwilling to hand out part of their land. The equal distribution of land is the most thorough and best method of wiping out the feudal system. In the equal distribution of land, the overwhelming majority of the middle peasants neither hand out land nor have land distributed to them. Only a small number of well-to-do middle peasants may give out a little land (their other possessions cannot be touched at all) while lower middle peasants may be distributed some land. The middle peasants under the new regime obtain many political, economic and cultural benefits, and therefore the middle peasants in general are in favour of the equal distribution of land. But in the carrying out of the equal distribution of land, it is necessary to talk things over with the middle peasants and obtain their agreement. If, when a portion of the land of well-to-do middle peasants is drawn on, the well-to-do middle peasants themselves express opposition, concession should be made to them and their land should not be touched. In the distribution of the fruits of agrarian reform, it should be explained to the poor peasants and farm labourers that a portion of the fruits should be distributed to the middle peasants for the sake of unity. To sum up, attention must be given to uniting all the middle peasants on all kinds of question. It should be understood that the uniting of 90 per cent of the rural population is the basic condition for our wiping out of feudalism and winning the war. No matter what, the "area of attack" should be confined within the sphere of the true feudal exploiting classes and should absolutely not be permitted to overstep this sphere. In the

places originally ruled by the Kuomintang to which the People's Liberation Army arrives, the "area of attack" must be narrowed down even more. In such places, at first only the big landlords, big evil gentry, tyrants, landlords' armed forces, the "pao chia" system and special service agents should be struck at. Then, in accordance with conditions of military success and the consolidation of base areas and the level of consciousness and organisation of the masses, gradually proceed to the wiping out of the entire feudal system.

HOW TO UNITE

To unite all the middle peasants, we should, first of all, see to it that their interests are not infringed on and their class standing is determined correctly. Those who have already been determined incorrectly must be re-determined. It must be explained to them that, in the past, mistakes were made because the analysis of classes had not yet been learned. Those whose things have already been confiscated should as far as possible receive them back. If those things have already been distributed and used, they should be compensated for by drawing on a portion of the fruits of confiscation from the landlords. If those things include surplus grain of the middle peasants which the poor peasants and farm labourers urgently need, such grain may be borrowed. If middle peasants contribute some grain on their own volition for calamity relief, that, of course, is very good.

Secondly, the middle peasants must certainly be absorbed in the managing of affairs. Middle peasants must be among the delegates to peasant congresses and members of peasant union committees, so that the middle peasants really enjoy political rights. In places where the poor peasants and farm labourers are in the majority, the middle peasants may occupy approximately one-third of the peasants' congress and the peasant union committee, with the poor peasants and farm labourers occupying approximately two-thirds. In old liberated areas where the middle peasants are in the overwhelming majority (among them being many middle peasants who have risen from the poor peasants and farm labourers), the percentage occupied by the middle peasants should be raised. The poor peasants and farm labourers

may occupy approximately one-third, and the middle peasants occupy two-thirds. Each level of government organisation should have the participation of middle peasants. On all questions, such as determining class standing, apportioning the distribution of burden, distributing land and property etc., the poor peasants' leagues (or groups) may discuss them first, but they must be finally passed by the peasants' unions, comprising all the peasants, before they may be carried out. Moreover, in the meetings, the middle peasant's opinions should be carefully respected and his good opinions should be adopted. If middle peasants hold incorrect opinions, they should be patiently persuaded or given appropriate criticism. But [though] criticisms are under special conditions even necessary, struggle is still for the fundamental principle of uniting all the middle peasants.

Thirdly, the just and equitable distribution of public duties must be achieved. For example, the public grain burden, support to the front and all other mobilisation of man-power and financial power, must absolutely not be all placed on the middle peasants because the landlords and rich peasants cannot bear them. This is what the middle peasant fears the most, and is also incorrect. Appropriate consideration for the poor peasants and farm labourers on the matter of public duties is necessary, but it must not vary too greatly from that of middle peasants, and the final distribution of all public duties must be discussed and passed by the peasant union, comprising all the peasants.

So long as the class standing is not incorrectly determined, the interests of the middle peasants are not infringed on and they are absorbed into managing affairs, and so long as the distribution of public duties is just and equitable, day-to-day consideration is given to middle peasants, and they are constantly educated, the entire body of middle peasants can surely be united very well. This then is in accordance with the principles of Communism. Leading organs must be constantly attentive and conduct inspection at all times; if tendencies to infringe on the interests of, or exclude, the middle peasants are discovered, they must be [made] public. It must be made known to all and be published in the newspapers.

(NOTE: The term "producing rich peasant" used in the text is an incorrect term formerly employed by some workers in the Shansi-Suiyuan area, incorrectly classifying as rich peasants some peasants who did not engage in exploitation, but whose family possessions were comparatively numerous or whose standard of living was comparatively high. Taking quantity of possessions or standard of living, instead of relationship and degree of exploitation as criterion in demarcating people as rich peasants, is entirely wrong, and Jen Pi-shih employs this term in criticising its incorrectness.)

METHODS OF STRUGGLE AGAINST LANDLORDS AND RICH PEASANTS

Economically to eliminate the landlords as a class is no easy thing. It is a fierce battle. After the landlord class has been overthrown politically, they devise all possible schemes to maintain their strength economically, scheming at all time for a restoration. Landlords and rich peasants exhaust all methods of boring their way into the government and party, giving their daughters in marriage to working personnel, buying over stooges, bad personnel and bad party members. Therefore, the consistent carrying out of agrarian reform requires much of delicacy and art in leadership. Only when the masses of the people are really set in motion, can the feudal classes be eliminated. Simple and hasty methods must absolutely not be applied.

The elimination of the landlord class and the wiping out of the feudal system consists mainly in confiscating the property of the landlord class—land, grain, plowing animals, agricultural implements, etc.—and requisitioning the surplus property of the rich peasants for distribution to the peasants. The most basic of these is distribution of the land. The government should issue agricultural loans to help the peasants solve their difficulties after the distribution of the land, the peasants must be called on to produce industriously, improve agricultural technique, develop the mutual aid co-operative movement so that the livelihood of the peasants will be improved. The democratic government and the People's Liberation Army have sufficient public grain in the interests of conquering the enemy, so that daily increasing quantities of grain and raw materials are sold as commodities providing the urban population and industries with sufficient agricultural products.

The struggle against landlords should be differentiated from the struggle against rich peasants. The Basic Program on Chinese Agrarian Law stipulates the abolition of the rights of land ownership of the landlord class, and the confiscation of the landlords' plowing animals, agricultural implements, buildings

and other property. With regard to rich peasants, apart from the land, which is equally distributed in common, only the surplus portion of the above named property is requisitioned, and not total confiscation. Struggling against the rich peasants in the same way as against the landlord is not only confusing the above differentiation, but, even more important, may lead to fear and vacillation on the part of the middle peasants.

As for the methods of struggle against landlords, distinction should also be made between big, medium and small landlords, between despotic and non-despotic landlords. Big landlords and tyrants should be dealt with more sternly as a warning to other landlords. Those who give up their land and property need not necessarily be dealt with through mass meetings.

SOCIAL SECURITY

We adopt a policy of elimination toward the class exploitation system of the landlords, but we do not adopt a policy of elimination toward the landlord as a person. All landlords, with the exception of the small number of traitors and civil war criminals tried and convicted by the courts, should be given land and property neither more nor less than the peasants, in accordance with the Basic Program On Chinese Agrarian Law. They should be made to work, and reformed. This is because landlords, after participating in labour, are no small productive force. This is also because if we do not distribute necessary land and property to them, they will rob, steal and beg, bringing about social insecurity and the peasants will thus suffer. Even criminal elements, whose crimes are not of a degree deserving to be given the death penalty by the courts, must also be given the necessary share of land and property. Only thus can there be social security. If the landlord has industry and commerce sufficient to support his livelihood, land of course need not be distributed. If his industry and commerce is too small to support his livelihood, it is necessary to distribute a portion of land to him.

RICH PEASANTS—NEW TYPE

There should also be a differentiation between dealing with new-type and old-type rich peasants. Some poor farming

people in the past have through labour and production in the democratic regime risen to become new-type rich peasants. In this period of equal distribution of the land, they should be treated as well-to-do middle peasants. During equal land distribution, their land in excess of the level of middle peasants in general can only be drawn upon with their agreement. If they themselves do not agree, their land should not be drawn upon. In the past, we encouraged this kind of rich peasant people like Wu Wan-yu (well-known labour hero of the Yen-an Border Region—*Editor*), for instance, to develop their production. This played a great role in stabilising the middle peasants and stimulating their production enthusiasm.

POLICY ON INDUSTRY AND COMMERCE

Industry and commerce in general should be protected. Not even industry and commerce operated by landlords and rich peasants should be confiscated. It should likewise receive the protection of the democratic government. The Party's policy is only to confiscate the industry and commerce of bureaucratic capital and really big despotic counter-revolutionary elements, and place them under the ownership of the State or the people. Furthermore, it is definitely laid down that of this industry and commerce to be confiscated, that which is needed by the national economy must be enabled to continue and not cease operations; and still less should it be damaged or be arbitrarily dispersed. But what about landlords who during the period of reduction of rents and interests sold their land and invested in industry and commerce—can confiscation be carried out against them? Both in the past and in the present, we protect and encourage this sort of industry and commerce because this is beneficial and necessary for the prospering of China's economy. In acquiring the landlord's hidden wealth, it must be stipulated that the landlord is not permitted to destroy his industry, on pain of punishment.

Partial and temporary interest must be subordinated to the over-all, long-term interests. For example, if the landlord operates coalpits, the peasants may, from the point of view of their present partial interest, show their hands in support of

confiscating and distributing them, because if everyone is distributed a portion of the tools and materials from the coalpits, it may temporarily solve their own problems. Under these circumstances, we must persuade the peasants to understand the advantages of having the coalpits in existence intact, and that if dispersed, the coalpits will be ruined and they themselves will have no coal to burn. This would hinder the economic development of the liberated areas.

If we want to be independent, public-operated, private-operated and people's co-operative handicraft industry, and rural agriculture must be enabled to develop, producing large quantities of necessary goods and grain for the People's Liberation Army so that our trade with the outside can maintain equilibrium or even a favourable trade balance and not rely on goods from areas controlled by Chiang Kai-shek or America.

At present, the government trading companies within the liberated areas do not yet have the strength to set up stores universally. Co-operatives have not developed universally, and are sometimes badly run. Therefore, the existence of private commerce is necessary. Merchants, of course, engage in exploitation; the commercial activity of merchants, in itself, does not produce any value. But the question is not to destroy commerce, but to give leadership to commerce. While this sort of policy is beneficial to the people, it is also beneficial to legitimate merchants.

We must collect taxes from industry and commerce, but we must fix proper tax rates and we must see to it that they are not too heavy. This sort of tax rate should be based on the principle of not affecting their operations and development.

THE INTELLIGENTSIA AND ENLIGHTENED GENTRY

The majority of professors, teachers, scientists, engineers, artists, etc., come from landlord, rich peasant or capitalist families. But the work they themselves do is a sort of mental labour. Toward these mental labourers, the democratic regime should adopt policies of protection, and should as much as possible win them to serve the People's Republic.

Under the KMT rule, the overwhelming majority among them lead a life economically very difficult and politically very unfree. Among them, moreover, are not a few unemployed. As for their opportunity for scientific creations and inventions, this is extremely slight. The overwhelming majority, seeing all sorts of corruption and reaction of Chiang Kai-shek's and American imperialism, express dissatisfaction with the Kuomintang rule and American imperialist aggression. If we carefully guide them politically and ideologically, and give them proper education and reformation, their knowledge and technique can serve the new democratic state of the Chinese People's Republic.

As for the students, regarded in the light of the experience of the student movement in Kuomintang-held cities during the past few years and our movement for reformation of ideology and style of work and cadre-examination, the overwhelming majority of students are dissatisfied with Chiang Kai-shek's reactionary dictatorial rule and demand democracy. Only a part of them, or only a very small part, are incorrigible reactionary elements, specially working against the revolution and disrupt the student movement. Therefore, we should help students and the intelligentsia to progress and draw them into the struggle against imperialism and for democracy.

If we want to build a new democratic country, we must have knowledge. For example, in establishing a hospital, if we want to establish departments of medicine, surgery, gynaecology, pediatrics, dentistry etc., we must have many doctors, medical assistants and nurses.

This personnel can only be trained after many years of study and forging in practical work. At present, we still do not have many specialists. We must unreservedly win over and use China's existing intelligentsia and specialists to work for the people. On the one hand, we use this group of intelligentsia, and on the other hand, we re-educate and reform them, correcting the habits of slighting the people and isolation from the masses among many of them. Most of them have enthusiasm for construction, and in the great construction

work of new democracy, most of them can certainly make progress.

In eliminating the feudal system, we must guard against the excluding of all intelligentsia who have connections with the feudal system. This is detrimental to the people's cause. At the same time, we must pay even more attention to the training of the intelligentsia of worker and peasant origin enabling the workers and peasants who have emancipated themselves to obtain knowledge and train the finest among them or their sons to become intelligentsia and shoulder the tasks of construction.

During the anti-Japanese war, there was a group of enlightened gentry like Li Ting-ming and others who took part in the governments and the people's congresses. This was entirely correct and necessary. This had a very good effect on the whole country. In the past they fought Japan together with us, and now they fight Kuomintang reactionaries together with us. They have shared hardships in common with us. A deliberate attitude must be adopted towards those people. Their land must be distributed, but not through mass meetings. If they make mistakes, they may be criticised but their persons should not be violated. Those with meritorious deeds in the past, who at present approve of agrarian reform and the striking down of KMT reactionaries, may still continue to work.

THE QUESTION OF VIOLENCE AND CAPITAL PUNISHMENT

The Communist Party is resolutely opposed to unwarranted beating and killing, and to the adoption of corporal punishment of criminals. Indiscriminate beating and killing and corporal punishment are the products of feudal society. They are only practiced by the feudal lord towards his serfs and the warlord towards his soldiers.

During the agrarian reform movement not a few cases of beating people and incidents causing death have occurred, and this is the more so because there are impurities within the party; landlords, rich peasants, opportunist elements and

Jumpen proletarian elements seize opportunities to create trouble, thus giving rise to phenomena of indiscriminately beating people or incidents causing death. Some persons whose crimes did not deserve death-penalty were killed. This should have our serious attention.

We are opposed to indiscriminate killing of people, but this does not mean that there is no capital punishment at all. With regard to really arch counter-revolutionary elements and arch tyrannical elements whose crimes are really extremely great and who the people of the whole country say should be executed, after they have received death sentences by the people's courts, and their sentences have been approved by a government organ (committees organised by county, subregion or higher levels of government), they should be executed and their crimes published (no one may be executed in secret). But no one must be arbitrarily accused of crimes and sentenced to death. Except in war where the killing of many of the enemy is unavoidable on the firing line, arbitrary and mistaken killing not only cannot solve problems, but furthermore may put off the solution of problems and even lead to temporary defeat of the revolution. This is because it must of necessity lose the sympathy of the masses of people and meet with the opposition of many people. Landlords and rich peasants in the Chinese countryside occupy approximately 10 per cent of the population. Their number amounts to approximately more than 30,000,000. After the system of feudal exploitation has been thoroughly done away with, and land and property equal to that distributed to peasants are distributed to them so that they rely on their own labour for a livelihood, they can then be gradually remade into forces creating wealth for society and beneficial to society. If many landlords and rich peasants who do not resolutely sabotage the war or agrarian reform are arbitrarily killed, this will not only lose the sympathy of the masses and isolate ourselves, but moreover will be a loss to the country's labour power so that society produces less wealth. If the family of those killed cannot make a living

because they lack labour power, this will further increase the burden on society.

We also oppose the beating of people. In the course of the mass movement, if the real righteous indignation of the masses leads them to raise their hands against their oppressors whom they hate passionately, Communists should not stand in their way. Communists should sympathise with the righteous indignation of the masses, otherwise we may become estranged from the masses. But Communists and working personnel of the democratic government should not, under non-combat circumstances, organise physical attacks against people.

The examination of cadres and party members in rural areas who have committed mistakes, at Party meetings attended by the masses, is a very good method. At the same time, we should explain to the cadres being examined that, they must earnestly admit their errors to the masses and must guarantee that no future retaliation is permitted on pain of punishment by the government in accordance with the law. At the examination meeting, the examined must have the full right of stating their case—not allowing them to state their case is undemocratic. No matter whether in the rural areas, in the cities, in the army, in the organs of schools, in any meeting to examine any party member or cadre, the examined will have the right to state their case.

Aside from this, the masses must also be granted the right of direct removal from office of any working personnel under examination, or of suggesting removal. With regard to the worst among them, whose actions have violated the law, the masses have the right to accuse them before the people's court. We persuade the masses not to beat people, but if we do not give the masses such rights, they will not dare to criticise. To sum up, in the examination of cadres and party members, or in dealing with individual elements among the masses, the principle of using verbal criticism as much as possible and telling reason and not permitting the beating of people should be adopted. As a result of this stipulation, the masses will dare to criticise and the examined will also have the opportunity to state their case.

British Rule Totters in Hong Kong

—Cheng Chih

The British imperialist authorities in Hong Kong have mobilized the whole of their police force, garrison army, law courts and prisons in an attempt to enforce their ban on the study and propagation of Mao Tse-tung's thought by the Chinese residents.

By ransacking schools and trade unions, forbidding the publication of progressive newspapers, and arresting and killing innocent people, they hope to halt the spreading influence of China's great proletarian cultural revolution.

Through these repressive measures, the British authorities wish they would be able to consolidate their century-old colonial rule in Hong Kong and to subject the Chinese residents to lasting oppression and exploitation. In addition they have tried to use Hong Kong as a U. S. base for the war of aggression against Vietnam. In 1965, U. S. warships anchored in the port of Hong Kong on 340 occasions, and the following year the number rose to 390. Hot from their murderous missions in Vietnam, they docked for repairs and re-provisioning. British imperialism has also co-ordinated with U. S. imperialism in making Hong Kong the venue for the cooking up of the "two Chinas" plot.

AGAINST BRITISH PERSECUTION

The tremendous tide of China's cultural revolution is irresistible, however, and is overrunning every obstacle placed in its way. The actions of the British imperialists show their fear. They try to prevent Chinese workers from studying the thought of Chairman Mao Tse-tung.

Among the many jailed were workers from the Hong Kong Plastic Flower Factory. They had been robbed of their precious little red books. But piecing together remembered phrases, they were able to recite a number of quotations from

Chairman Mao's works. The prison guards tried to stop these mass recitals. The workers immediately declared, "No one can deny us the right to love our great leader Chairman Mao! We'll say and sing what we like!"

THE DAZIBAO IS A NEW WEAPON

Chairman Mao says, "The *dazibao* is an extremely useful new weapon." The patriotic Chinese people in Hong Kong determined to make full use of this weapon, and posted up *dazibao* (big-character posters) everywhere, exposing the old and new crimes of the British authorities there. The *dazibao* and slogans followed one after another on the walls of the "Government House" and the buildings in all the busy thoroughfares. Some of the most popular slogans read:

"Patriotism is no crime; resistance to violence is justified!"

"We will win! The British rulers of Hong Kong will be defeated!"

"Long live Chairman Mao!"

The British authorities, scared by these expressions of public opinion, hastily promulgated a series of "emergency decrees" aimed at the banning of the writing and display of *dazibao* and slogans. "Riot police" were sent out under cover of darkness to tear them down or paint them over and hunt down those who had posted them.

Scorning the "emergency decrees" and "riot police", more and more *dazibao* and slogans appeared. They now cover the walls of the courts, police stations, army quarters, post offices, airfields, railway stations, schools, British-owned enterprises, villages and the sides of public buses. One *dazibao* read, "*Dazibao* is a call to arms against the British authorities. The more they forbid our *dazibao*, the more we will put them up. We'll wage a tit-for-tat struggle!"

WORKERS' JOINT STRIKES

The working class of Hong Kong is the main force in the struggle against British persecution. On June 10, 1967, ten thousand workers and members of the staff of the British administration launched a joint strike. The strikers included

the workers at the British-owned Star Ferry Company and the Hong Kong Dairy Farm Ice and Cold Storage Co., Ltd. Two weeks later, on June 24, they were joined by the workers of twenty trades, including public transport and the port administration.

These strikes dealt heavy blows at the reactionary British rule, deflated the arrogance of the imperialists and boosted the morale of the patriotic Chinese residents.

In many British organizations and enterprises there was complete chaos. The British authorities and British firms suffered heavy financial losses and personal difficulties as deliveries of milk and meat to British officials and capitalists, the U. S. Consulate, British army and navy garrisons and the police were stopped. A total of 17,000 pounds of milk went bad at the British-owned Dairy Farm Ice and Cold Storage Co., Ltd.

There was a rush to draw money from the banks, and the Hong Kong and Kowloon banks registered a drop of 1,500 to 2,000 million Hong Kong dollars in savings during May and June. The rush was so big that the Hong Kong and Shanghai Banking Corporation had to issue 560 million dollars' worth of new currency to meet the demand during the month of May. In the months of May, June and July, 1,300 million Hong Kong dollars, the equivalent of the total inflow of the past two years, flowed abroad.

STUDENTS ARE COURAGEOUS

Learning from the rebel spirit of the Red Guards, Hong Kong students fought in the vanguard of the mass movement against British persecution. They set up their own committees and "combat groups" in Chinese-run schools, British-run schools and in schools controlled by the Catholic church. They declared themselves rebels against the education of slavishness to foreign imperialism, which has been enforced in Hong Kong for a century.

Supporting the workers' strikes and publicizing Mao Tse-tung's thought, the students went into streets to hold big demonstrations and give performances. They carried out

these activities right under the nose of the "riot police." Among their slogans were :

"Smash slave-making education !"

"Destroy all anti-China textbooks !"

"Down with the poisonous American way of life !"

"To love our own country is no crime !"

THE BRITISH ARMY IN FASCIST ACTION

The British authorities have resorted to fascist methods of suppression. In the small hours of July 13, they sent out the army to support the police in an attack on the General Motorcar Union, the Hong Kong Branch of the Bus Workers' Union and the Kowloon Dockers' Union. They smashed up union offices, arrested union members and murdered a number of Chinese workers.

On July 16, the British army and "riot police" attacked the Workers' Clinic at Tsunwan, the Kowloon Bus Branch Union, the Chinese workers' welfare departments of the Taikoo Dockyard and the Taikoo Sugar Refinery, the Hong Kong Branch of the Hong Kong-Kowloon Metals Union and the Workers' Club of the Hong Kong-Kowloon Federation of Trade Unions. Later on, they made night raids on the Workers' Children's School at Mongkok, the Women's Western Clothing Union and the Chinese Stationery Innovation Union. Large numbers of patriotic workers were unwarrantably arrested in this large-scale fascist action.

Parallel with these outrages, the British fascist authorities forcibly attempted to strangle the progressive press. Between July 11 and 15, they kidnapped and arrested three reporters of the Hsinhua News Agency and five local patriotic reporters.

Chairman Mao teaches : "Make trouble, fail, make trouble again, fail again...till their doom ; that is the logic of the imperialists and all reactionaries the world over in dealing with the people's cause and they will never go against this logic..."

A "PEOPLE'S WAR"

The patriotic people of Hong Kong valiantly fought back British fascism in the city and the surrounding rural areas, in

the streets, the factories, and even inside the police stations, courts and jails. They launched a "people's war" in response to the call issued by the Committee of Hong Kong-Kowloon Workers of All Trades to Fight Against British Persecution.

In the early morning of July 14, for two hours the workers of the Kowloon Dockyard bravely defended their union headquarters against several hundred soldiers and police, who fired tear gas, wooden projectiles and carbines at them. They fought with bottles, stones, sticks, and other improvised weapons.

On the afternoon of July 15, the police station in the city's eastern district was rocked by an explosion. Terrified policemen scrambled out, some still wearing only their under-pants. Patriots had tossed fishermen's explosives in. That same night more patriots lobbed explosives into the British navy apartments in Happy Valley, causing the British Marines to scatter helter-skelter.

Within the next few days, three other police stations and a police box suffered similar explosions. Home-made bombs also exploded among British troops and "riot police" in the streets.

On July 9, the Chinese residents at North Point, employing guerrilla tactics, engaged the enemy in a seven-hour street battle, which continued until midnight. Patriotic Chinese in the Wanchai District made full use of a maze of alleys and lanes to exhaust the enemy by "sparrow-hop" fighting—now coming together, now dispersing, now attacking, now retreating.

The patriotic people in Hong Kong have powerful support from the 700 million Chinese people and the revolutionary people of the whole world. Their morale is high. Inspired by Mao Tse-tung's thought and the great proletarian cultural revolution, they are confident that they will triumph in the end and settle accounts for all the crimes that British imperialism has continued to commit there for more than a century.

A New Assessment of the History of the C.P.I. : I. 1919-1928

—Bande Ali Khan

[Continued from the previous issue]

V. The Fourth Comintern Congress : Nov.-Dec. : 1922

Labour unity and the united front of workers were the main issues at the Fourth Comintern Congress. The deep split among the workers was caused by the war—treachery, class collaboration and hostility to the Soviet Union of Social Democracy. Everywhere the working class movement was at a low ebb and capitalist reactionaries were taking advantage of it. Fascism—extreme imperialist reaction—was raising its head.* Mussolini had just captured power in Italy.

Lenin knew that under these circumstances organic political unity with the revisionist traitors was unthinkable. But partial cooperation on certain vital common issues was possible in both political and industrial spheres. Hence the policy of united front became necessary. In carrying through such united front tactics, Lenin laid it down as an indispensable condition that the Communist Parties must retain their full right of political criticism ; otherwise, the working class could not be protected from the ingrown treachery of the revisionists.

The CI resolution said : “Owing to the fact that the proletariat of all countries, with the exception of Russia, did not take advantage of the weakened state of capitalism to deal it the final crushing blows, the bourgeoisie—thanks to the aid of the social reformists—managed to suppress the militant revolutionary workers, to reinforce its political and economic power and to start a new offensive against the proletariat.”

* The total number of trade unionists declined everywhere : in France from 2 million to 600,000; in Italy from 2 million to 700,000; the same happened in England, the United States, Czechoslovakia etc. Only Germany and Austria, which were still passing through revolutionary crisis, were able to maintain their position.

The United front tactic inevitably raised the basic question of the possibility of forming united front governments. The fourth Congress laid down certain basic principles, which showed sound Marxist foresight and the correctness of which was to be borne out fully during the next generations down to our own day.

The CI anticipated the following possibilities : (1) a liberal workers' government as in Australia and one likely to be formed in England ; (2) a Social Democratic workers' government (in Germany); (3) a workers' & peasants' government—likely in Czechoslovakia and the Balkans ; (4) a workers' government in which Communists could participate ; and (5) a real proletarian workers' government which the CP alone could form. The resolution pointed out that the first two were not revolutionary workers' governments, but disguised coalitions between the bourgeoisie and anti-revolutionary reformists.

“Such Workers' Governments are tolerated at critical moments, by the weakened bourgeoisie, in order to dupe the workers as to the class character of the state, or with the aid of corrupt leaders, to divert the revolutionary onslaught of the proletariat and to gain time. The Communists cannot take part in such governments. On the contrary, they must ruthlessly expose their true character to the masses.”

The communists may support, under certain circumstances, non-communist workers' governments, but in that case they must quite openly tell the masses that it is impossible to establish a real workers' government without a revolutionary struggle against the bourgeoisie.

The 3rd and 4th types of government, with participation of the communists, are not proletarian dictatorship, nor are they historically inevitable transition forms of government towards proletarian dictatorship, but they, if formed, may serve as starting points for the struggle for dictatorship.

For the Fourth Congress invitations were sent to five Indians—M. N. Roy, Nalini Gupta, Subhas Chandra Bose, Dange, and Chira Ranjan Das (son of C. R. Das, one of the leaders of the Indian National Congress). Of these, only Roy

was able to attend the session. During the debate on the colonial question, while dealing with the Turkish Revolution led by Mustafa Kamal Pasha, Roy supported the Leninist strategy regarding the role of the colonial bourgeoisie in the democratic stage of the revolution. Roy said that, "although we know there is danger of the colonial bourgeoisie always compromising with the imperial bourgeoisie, we must always on principle stand for them; that a bourgeois national movement in the colonial countries is objectively revolutionary, therefore it should be given support."

But Roy's acceptance of the Leninist line was not unconditional; it was hedged with all kinds of reservations, particularly, regarding India. "But we should not overlook the fact", Roy continued, "that this objective force cannot be accepted as unconditional, and that particular historical reasons should be taken into consideration. The bourgeoisie becomes a revolutionary factor when it raises the standard of revolt against backward, antiquated forms of society—that is, when the struggle is fundamentally against the feudal order, the bourgeoisie leading the people. Then the bourgeoisie is the vanguard of the revolution."

In the rest of his speech, Roy was back to his own anti-Marxist, anti-Leninist theory as put forward in his *India in Transition*: "Contrary to the general notion, India is not under the feudal system."** "The nationalist bourgeoisie is not pitted against an old order of social production",† the Indian

* *Fourth Congress of the Communist International, Abridged Report*, Lond., quoted by Overstreet and Windmiller, p. 51

** Roy: *India in Transition*, p. 17. Roy says in his *Memoirs* (p. 553) that his purpose in writing this book and calling it *India in Transition* was to demonstrate "the basic feature of the contemporary Indian society being gradual decay of feudal economy and the slow but steady rise of capitalism."

† Roy: "The Empire and the Revolution." *Labour Monthly*, Oct, 1922. Long afterwards Roy wrote in his *Memoirs* (1964): "My contention, when I disagreed with Lenin at the Second World Congress was that, if the nationalist movement succeeded under the leadership of the bourgeoisie, it would only mean transfer of power to the native ruling class; that would be no social revolution." (p. 537)

bourgeoisie [i.e., the Indian National Congress] has very little revolutionary potentiality, so "the other element" [Socialist Revolution?] must be encouraged. "There come a time," Roy said, "when these people are bound to betray the movement and become a counter-revolutionary force. Unless we are prepared to train politically the other social element, which is objectively more revolutionary, to step into their places and assume the leadership, the ultimate victory of the nationalist struggle becomes problematical for the time being.... We have to develop our parties in these countries (like India) in order to take the lead in the organisation (of the united anti-imperialist front)". During this period the two words—the Congress (the Indian National Congress) and the bourgeoisie—practically became interchangeable in Roy's writings.

As at the Second Comintern Congress, so at the Fourth Congress, Roy, relying on a fundamentally wrong assessment of the Indian social and economic conditions, advocated the same un-Marxist line for the CPI. Although there was some capitalist development in India at the time, the basic feature of the Indian economy remained overwhelmingly feudal and as yet there was no sign of its dying out; on the contrary, it was being strengthened day after day. Even today 80% of the Indian people live in villages under feudal relationships.

At this time there was no proletarian party in India. The proletariat was still immature politically. They had just begun to take part in the political movement as an independent class. Under such conditions it is only by taking part actively in the bourgeois democratic liberation movement that the proletariat could build up a Communist party and, through the mobilization of the proletariat and the peasantry, could establish its leadership in the bourgeois democratic revolution. Roy also had the good intention of building up the Party, but his line of skipping over an essential stage of revolution, i.e., the bourgeois democratic stage, led him to petty-bourgeois ultra-leftism and to revolutionary phrasemongering.

It is interesting to note that in the Colonial Commission of the CI, Roy reported that the Central Committee of the Communist Party of India, meeting at Bombay on September 5, had requested £ 120,000 from the Comintern : £ 35,000 for Party work ; £ 70,000 for labour organisations and £ 15,000 for the *Socialist*. Whether such a large sum was sanctioned by the Comintern or not, we cannot say, but the question is : Was there any CPI or CC in India at that time ? More significant was the exorbitant sum of more than 2 lakhs of rupees for the small weekly *Socialist* that Dange had just started in Bombay. Obviously, Dange was at his trade right from the beginning of the CPI.

Though Roy's anti-Leninist line was criticised by some Comintern leaders and his political integrity began to be doubted, the Comintern continued to accept Roy as the leader of the Indian Communist movement because, firstly, it expected that eventually Roy might correct himself and accept the Leninist line and, secondly, there was no one who could replace Roy at that time. It must be said in Roy's favour that he was tremendously energetic and studied avidly and wrote in profusion, which are some of the essential qualities for a revolutionary—qualities which have been conspicuously lacking all throughout among the CPI leaders.

VI. The Gaya Congress and the Communists :

The dictatorial suspension of the great mass movement* by Gandhi after the Chauri Chaura incident in February 1922 came as a great shock to the Comintern leaders. From that time they changed their attitude towards Gandhi. In the chaos and disillusionment that engulfed the Indian political

* The then Governor of Bombay said : "He (Gandhi) gave us a scare. Gandhi's was the most colossal experiment in world history, and it came within an inch of succeeding." (quoted by Michael Becher, *Nehru : A Political Biography*, pp. 78-79). Even Nehru was angry : "If this was the inevitable consequence of a sporadic act of violence, then surely there was something lacking in the philosophy and technique of a non-violent struggle." (*Autobiography*, p. 83)

movement, many turned towards Communism. Many intellectuals began eagerly to read Communist literature.

In 1921 Roy sent Nalini Gupta to India to co-ordinate the scattered Communist groups that were just being formed and to establish centres for receiving communist literature from abroad and to arrange its underground circulation. Gupta reached India towards the end of the year with Roy's "Programme" for the Congress. Hazarat Mohani printed the programme in his own name and circulated it among the Indian leaders.

In 1922, 5 groups of communists were already working in India under different leaderships—Muzaffar Ahmad at Calcutta, Dange at Bombay, (in 1921 Dange had attracted some attention by writing a pamphlet on "Lenin and Gandhi"), Usmani in the UP, Singaravelu Chettiar in Madras, and Mohammed Sadiq at Lahore.

From Berlin, Roy had started publishing his monthly journal *Advance-Guard* mainly for spreading Communist ideas in India. The Government became alarmed and took measures to stop it. A large number of copies of its December 1922 issue, containing Roy's "Programme" for the Gaya Congress was confiscated by the British Government. But, curiously, on December 21, 5 days before the Gaya Congress, the semi-official Reuters circulated the whole "Programme" in the Indian press, describing it as the work of a Bolshevik. For the bourgeoisie all over the world the very word "Bolshevik" symbolised at that time everything wicked—violence, destruction, barbarism. By circulating the "Programme" and by branding it as a Bolshevik plot the Government expected to frighten away the Congress leaders and it worked.*

* According to Overstreet and Windmiller, Reuters' despatch was the result of a deliberate British policy of frightening the Congress leaders ; it was "an example of the brilliant manoeuvres that helped a handful of clever Englishmen to rule over 300,000,000 Indians for about 200 years." (*Communism in India*, p. 65).

Although Roy believed that the Congress leaders were treacherous, he was in contact with some of them, and regularly sent them Communist literature. Among them, C. R. Das had the reputation of holding radical views. Roy was in direct communication with him and it is likely that Das was somewhat influenced by Communism. About two months before the Gaya Congress, Das declared at a political conference at Dehra Dun :

"The liberals fight shy of revolution. What is revolution but a part of that growth the totality of which we call revolution... Revolution means complete change. I am sorry, most of our non-cooperators are still enamoured of parliamentary government. I do not want the sort of *Swaraj* which will be for the middle class alone. I want *Swaraj* for the masses, not for the classes. I do not care for the bourgeoisie. How few they are."*

Before this, no Congress leader had talked of *swaraj* for the masses; no doubt, it was a revolutionary statement at that time. But at the Gaya Congress Das made a hasty retreat from this position. In Das's presidential speech there was nothing about *Swaraj* for the masses. Das took much pain to explain his faith in non-violence. He surveyed the revolutions in England, France and Italy and concluded that violence had not paid in the long run anywhere. Dealing with the Russian Revolution, Das said :

"The shape it has now assumed is due to the attempt to force Marxist doctrine and dogmas on an unwilling genius of Russia. Violence will again fail... I expect a counter-revolution. The soul of Russia must struggle to free itself from the socialism of Karl Marx... In the meantime the fate of Russia is trembling in the balance." Though for Das revolution and violence were synonymous, he assured his audience that he did believe in revolution, a non-violent revolution. Replying to the terrorists who believed that *Swaraj* could only be attained by force and with whom Das had been maintaining connections, he said that he did not question

**The Tribune* (Lahore), Nov. 4, 1922.

their "courage, sacrifice and patriotism," but he was "one of those who hold to non-violence on principle."* At the Gaya Congress, Singaravelu, as the leader of the communists, fought for a mass programme.

How different are the roles of C. R. Das and his Chinese contemporary Sun Yat-sen under similar conditions! While Sun Yat-sen went forward to anti-imperialist and anti-feudal mass liberation struggle, C. R. Das, who could have played a similar role in India, after being defeated by Gandhi at the Gaya Congress, formed the *Swaraj* Party, renounced mass struggle and introduced in Indian politics parliamentarism, which he had denounced only a few months before—the disease which fatally infected later even the CPI. C. R. Das was also the first to introduce in Indian politics the demagogic slogan of breaking the Constitution "from within".

In the "Programme" Roy said :

"British rule in India was established by force and is maintained by force; therefore it can and will be overthrown only by a violent revolution. We are not in favour of resorting to violence if it can be helped; but for self-defence, the people of India must adopt violent means, without which the foreign domination based upon violence cannot be ended."

This was the tone all throughout the "Programme". Roy's over-emphasis on "violence"—an inheritance from his terrorist past—caused a lot of harm and retarded the formation of the CPI. The main emphasis of Gandhi and the Congress was on non-violence. So in order to oppose it, Roy could not think of anything better than "violence". As a tactic this over-emphasis on "violence" was wrong. The enemies of Marxism often use the term "violence" to denounce revolution and to frighten the people. Marxists insist on "the seizure of power". Objective conditions prevailing in India in those days suggested that instead of putting emphasis on violence,

*"Congress Presidential Addresses", 1911-1934, Madras, pp. 572-75.

more important aspects of the anti-imperialist movement and of Communism should have been emphasized. The Congress was full of "respectable" middle class people; they were not the elements to go to the barricade. In general they did not know anything about Bolshevism or Communism. They called all these "foreign" ideologies "anarchism" and identified them with violence and destruction. Roy had seriously underestimated the influence of Gandhi and his feudal ideology and non-violence. And yet there were a large number of Congressmen, and some even among the leaders, who paid only lip-service to non-violence (they took it only as a matter of tactics and not as a question of principle) and were prepared to allow its own course. Therefore, under the circumstances, it was a serious mistake to give primary importance to abstract questions of non-violence and violence instead of to the mass movement and to the programme of bourgeois democratic revolution. As a matter of fact, the masses did join the non-cooperation movement and surcharged it with a high revolutionary potential as the Chauri Chaura incident and many other events proved. Due to wrong tactics of Roy, the Gaya Congress turned out to be a bad defeat for the Communists and progressive elements in the Congress.

VII. Peshawar and Kanpur Communist Conspiracy Cases :

On February 15, 1923 *Avance-Guard* became *Vanguard*, the "Central Organ of the communist Party of India."

In 1923 there was as yet no Communist Party in India. The small groups of communists in Calcutta, Bombay, Madras, Kanpur and Lahore remained scattered. Many of Roy's contacts in India were of doubtful character, some of them were spies. The different communist groups were quarrelling amongst themselves. These were not mainly ideological disputes, but generally individual, sectarian quarrels. The Comintern wanted that these groups should meet together, unite and form an all-India Communist Party.

At this time Dange was bringing out the weekly *Socialist*

from Bombay and Sadiq *Inquilab* (in Urdu) from Lahore. *Langal* in Bengali came out from Calcutta.

In a memorandum Roy proposed that there should be two parties—one, an underground CP and another, an open and legal workers' and peasants' Party (WPP). Roy also advised that the communists should "leave out of our propaganda the controversy of violence vs. non-violence." Roy seemed to have learnt from the Gaya experience!

But the projected all-India Conference did not take place due to personal and group rivalry in India. Actually, this rivalry was a projection of the rivalry and intrigues in Europe between Roy, Chattopadhyaya, Abani Mukherji etc. When Roy was trying to hold an all-India conference under Singaravelu's leadership, Chattopadhyaya and Mukherji were arranging another conference under the leadership of Mani Lal. None succeeded, and the result was that a unified Communist Party in India could not take shape.

In June, 1923, the Executive Committee of the Communist International sent a message to the projected WPP conference. It said that the workers and peasants must no longer remain an adjunct to bourgeois nationalism. The workers must come forward as an independent political force and take up the leadership of the liberation movement. The message made it clear that the Comintern was not against the Congress as such, but only against its leadership and its policy of non-violent passive resistance and surrender. The Comintern still regarded the Congress as a "revolutionary factor." What the message said next went against Roy's theory and tactics :

"The Indian bourgeoisie is a revolutionary factor, because its interests are objectively in conflict with imperialism. The struggle for national liberation is a revolutionary movement. In leading this movement the political party of the workers and peasants must act in cooperation with and give fullest support to, the bourgeois parties in so far as they struggle against imperialism in some way or other."*

* Kanpur Case Evidence, Exhibit No. 50, quoted by Overstreet, p. 60

Meanwhile, many of the Indian communists in Moscow became restless and wanted to come back to India illegally crossing the frontier and to start work there. While crossing the North-West frontier, ten of them were arrested. They were brought to Peshawar in May, 1923, and charged with conspiring against the government. Saukat Usmani, Ghulam Hussain and Muzaffar Ahmad were also arrested in this connection, but they were kept interned under the Regulation III of 1818. This was the first case against communists in India.

Upto 1924, the Indian communists had hardly achieved anything. Whatever little there was, the Government was determined to crush. It increased its vigilance on the leaders and tightened up its censorship methods. Thousands of copies of Roy's *Vanguard* sent from Europe were seized. In July, 1923, Dange wrote to Roy that he would function as an "open organizer" because he was being too strictly watched to set up any illegal apparatus. Since Roy was away from India for a long time, it was not difficult for Dange to bluff him. "Elements for an illegal apparatus," Dange wrote to Roy, "are absolutely lacking in the people about. Gandhism has destroyed the mentality and elements of secrecy."* Dange was vastly exaggerating.

Roy's main channel of sending *Vanguard* and *Inprecor* was through R. C. L. Sharma, a resident at Pondicherry. Roy thought that Pondicherry being French, this address was quite safe. But Sharma was closely connected with the Government Intelligence Service.

After the Peshawar conspiracy case came the Kanpur Bolshevik Conspiracy case on February 27, 1924. The accused were Nalini Gupta, Muzaffar Ahmad, Dange, Usmani, Ghulam Hussain, Chettiar, Sharma and M. N. Roy. Only the first four were tried. Hussain turned approver; Chettiar was certified to have been too ill to attend the Court at Kanpur from distant Madras; Sharma was allowed to escape to Europe and Roy was out of reach. In the Kanpur case the

*Quoted by Overstreet, p. 66.

judge was H. L. Holme, the same man who in the Chauri Chaura trial had broken all records by passing death sentences on 172 accused persons.

None of the accused took up a bold stand during the trial. None came forward to defend Communism in the Court. Dange's conduct was particularly questionable. While others denied everything, Dange admitted that he was in correspondence with Roy.* Roy was frankly contemptuous about the behaviour of the accused. He wrote in November 1924: "Poor fellows! If they could only have put up a better defence, four years in prison would have been worth-while. We must have better Communists than this lot.....By God, What fools!...With a better lot in the dock and less stupid

* *Current*, a Bombay Weekly, published on March 7, 1964 some letters written by Dange to the British authorities during the Kanpur trial, which conclusively prove that he has been an agent of the Government inside the Party. In one of these letters addressed to the Governor-General, Dange promised to work for the Government. These letters are now preserved at the National Archives at Delhi. On March 13, the secretariat of the CPI (this was before the split), without seeing the letters and solely relying on Dange's words, announced that these letters had not been written by Dange, that they were forged. By that time Dange had become Chairman of the Party. No one can deny that these letters bear Dange's own handwriting and his own signature. In one of the letters, signed by Dange and Nalini Gupta, these two said that they were prepared to sign a bond if they were released. Under such circumstances, the pronouncement by the Secretariat of the Party that these letters were "forged" only shows to what depth of degeneration the Party leadership has sunk. Instead of expelling this imperialist agent straight away, the revisionist CPI leaders still keep him as the Chairman of their Party. What is still more astonishing is that the Soviet Party also accepts him as such and when the Soviet Prime Minister Kosygin comes to India, he even gives him the honour of an interview for an hour (January 30, 1968)!

Other Party leaders who subsequently joined the CPI (M) made a tremendous noise about these Dange letters. Particularly Muzaffar Ahmad, being a co-defendant with Dange in the Meerut case, came out with a lot of

heads at the Bar the Kanpur case could have been an epoch-making event in our political history.”**

Due to all these arrests, trials and convictions of the communist leaders there was complete demoralisation among the communists in India for some time to come.

VIII. The Fifth Comintern Congress : June-July 1924 :

The second attempt at a German Revolution failed in October 1923 due to the revisionist treachery of some leaders on the one hand and the Trotskyites' ultra-leftism on the other. In Bulgaria a Peasants' government was overthrown, a communist uprising was suppressed and a fascist regime was set up. In Italy, Mussolini had consolidated his position. Lenin passed away on January 21, 1924, at the age of 54.

Obviously, the great revolutionary movement in Europe that had followed the First World War had just spent itself and the capitalists, aided by the Social Democrats, managed to save their system for the time being. There was also improvement in the industrial and financial situation in

“revelations” about Dange (*Desh hitaishee*, April 24, 1968).

- Two questions arise about the belated righteous indignation of these leaders. Firstly, why did not Ahmad, who claims to have known many “fishy” things about Dange right from the beginning, reveal them before? These leaders could have easily taken some steps against Dange specially when the British Party seriously drew their attention against Dange. They did not dare take any steps against Dange for the simple reason that they were afraid that their own “fishy” affairs would also be revealed in that case. Secondly, why have Ahmad and other leaders made it a purely “personal” issue and carefully avoided the more important ideological questions inseparably connected with the whole affair? They have deliberately avoided ideological issues because that would have conclusively proved that during the whole forty year-period they were equally guilty as the Dangeites for not carrying out any ideological struggle within the Party and that they were equally responsible for revisionism and all kinds of revisionist vices and corruption that crept into the Party.

** Quoted by Overstreet, p. 68

Germany due largely to American subsidy. In England and France, too, there was considerable pick-up. This led to “a partial, relative and temporary stabilization of capitalism.”

At this Fifth Congress the term Marxism-Leninism was used for the first time.

This Congress also came to the conclusion that the next stage of the World Revolution had shifted from Europe to Asia.

Much attention was given to the Bolshevization of the Communist Parties. These Parties came into existence after 1919, except in the Soviet Union. Party building became a stiff task in all countries. Many opportunist and adventurist elements had entered the Parties and their leadership. Many Party leaders in Germany, France and the USA were expelled. Even the highly developed CPSU was not spared.

Soon after the Fifth Comintern Congress, Stalin brought more clarification about the Communist policy towards India. In his famous address to the Communist University of the Toilers of the East on May 18, 1925, he said :

“It is impossible to advance the revolution and win complete independence in the colonies and dependent countries where capitalism has developed without isolating the conciliatory section of the national bourgeoisie, without freeing the petty-bourgeois revolutionary masses from their influence, without conducting a policy making for the hegemony of the proletariat, without organising the advanced elements of the working class in an independent Communist Party.....

What is important and new in the conditions of existence of colonies such as India is not only that the national bourgeoisie has split into a revolutionary and a conciliatory party; most important is it that the conciliatory section of this bourgeoisie has already come to an agreement on fundamentals with imperialism, Fearing revolution more than imperialism, more concerned about its money bags than about the interests of their own motherland, this part of the bourgeoisie, the wealthiest and most influential, has both feet in the camp of the irreconcilable enemies of the revolution,

forms a coalition with imperialism against the workers and peasants of its own country. The revolution cannot be successful unless this coalition is broken."

Stalin's emphasis was clear : (1) The Indian bourgeoisie has split—"the wealthiest and most influential" section, i.e., the big bourgeoisie, has compromised and gone over to imperialism ; the rest, i.e., the middle and small bourgeoisie, still retains its revolutionary character ; (2) the Communist Party must organise the workers and peasants and must assume the leadership of the liberation movement.

The Comintern was obviously dissatisfied with Roy's work. The Fifth Congress appointed a Commission to review the whole colonial question and prepare detailed recommendations. This commission included, among others, Stalin, Maniulsky, Katayama and Roy. It rejected once again Roy's strategical formulation and stressed that the Party should concentrate on building mass organisations of peasants and workers and a united anti-imperialist front together with the Congress.

Roy, however, still insisted on his basic disagreement with the Comintern strategy so much so that Maniulsky, Chairman of the Colonial Commission, was provoked into charging Roy with deviation. The Comintern press reported :

"Some deviations were recorded by the Commission. Roy, as at the Second Congress, exaggerated the social movement (i.e. the Communist and Leftist forces) in the colonies to the detriment of the national movement... He goes so far as to say that the national movement has lost its character of the united front of all the classes of an oppressed country, that a new period was beginning, in which the class struggle was becoming transported into the colonies. The truth is that a just proportion should be looked for between the social movement and the national movement. Can the right of self-determination become a contradiction to the interest of the revolution? Had Roy put the question in this manner, one could discuss it with him."*

* *International Press Correspondent*, Aug. 12, 1924

The Fifth Congress laid down that there should be "very close contact between the sections (of the Comintern) in the imperialist countries and the colonies of those countries." Since then the Communist Party of Great Britain through its Colonial Commission began to take an active interest in the affairs of the Communist Party of India. In January 1925 the CPGB sent Percy Glading to study the Indian situation. After his return to England in April he reported that "no Indian Communist groups existed at all." However, from that time the CPGB increased its activities regarding India and Roy's influence began to decline. Roy had been a member of the Executive Committee of the Communist International and the head of its Eastern Section.

IX. Initial stage of the CPI :

About this time one Satya Bhakta (this was not his real name ; he assumed this name when he was in Gandhi Ashram) took the responsibility of organising a Communist Party and called a conference of all Communists at Kanpur in December, 1925. Singaravelu presided. He said :

"Indian Communism is not Bolshevism, for Bolshevism is a form of Communism which the Russians have adopted in their country. We are not Russians. Bolsheviks and Bolshevism may not be needed in India... We are one with the world communists but not with Bolsheviks."*

Satya Bhakta's plan was completely exposed on the question of the name of the Party. He insisted that the name should be the Indian Communist Party, and not the Communist Party of India. He also made it clear that he did not believe in the Communist International, the Party should be completely Indian and wholly "independent". In short, what Satya Bhakta advocated was "National Communism"—a contradiction in terms, for one of the basic principles of Communism is its internationalism.

Muzaffar Ahmad (he was released from prison only a few days before the Kanpur Conference), Ghate, Nimbkar,

* *Mitra : Indian Annual Register*, 1925, II, p. 367

Joglekar, Bagerhatta, who were present at the conference, defeated Bhakta's plan and formed their own committee with Ghate and Bagerhatta as joint secretaries. Soon, however, Bagerhatta's doubtful activities created suspicion among others; like Satya Bhakta, Bagerhatta also completely disappeared from the scene. Ghate then became the General Secretary of the Party.

In 1927—from January to April—Saklatwala's tour in India was a memorable event. He was a nephew of Jamshedji Tata. Since his stay in England he had been actively participating in the socialist movement. After the Bolshevik revolution he was appointed a member of the Anglo-Russian Committee. He was a founder member of the CPGB and was the first Communist member of the British Parliament. He was a very effective orator and during his extensive Indian tour, he drew lakhs of people who listened to him with rapt attention wherever he went. India had never before witnessed such huge mass meetings under the Red Flag. After an interview with Gandhi, Saklatwala opened a lengthy correspondence with Gandhi, some of which was published. This immensely helped to expose the anti-people and reactionary attitude of Gandhism and popularised Communist ideas. One of the results of Saklatwala's criticism of Gandhi was that the Bombay Corporation refused to vote Saklatwala a farewell address when he sailed for England. It is no exaggeration to say that Saklatwala's Indian tour was a landmark in the history of the Indian Communist Party and the beginning of a mass Communist movement in India.

On May 31, 1927 there was a Communist conference in Bombay where Ghate was elected general secretary and Muzaffar Ahmad, Dange and K. S. Iyenger to the presidium. There was a discussion regarding the question of affiliation of the Party to the Communist International. Some comrades were in favour of immediate affiliation, but Dange opposed it. All comrades were naturally concerned about further police repression and wanted to avoid any ground for the accusation that they were members of an international

conspiracy. This sort of argument is one thing and quite understandable, but when Dange said that he was an "Indian Communist" and not a "Bolshevik", that was another thing altogether. Finally, the meeting resolved that "the CPI looks up to the CPs of the world as well as to the International for lead and guidance in the work undertaken by this party in this country."

Towards the end of 1927 Philip Spratt and Ben Bradley came to India. They were both members of the CPGB. Party work in India thenceforth considerably increased.

Another important event of 1927, so far as the CPI was concerned, was the Congress of Oppressed Nationalities held at Brussels in February. The initiative for this important international conference was taken by the CPGB. It was attended by an Indian delegation which included Jawaharlal Nehru. This Congress organised a permanent body, known as the League against Imperialism, to organise and help anti-imperialist movement in the colonial countries.

After attending the Brussels Congress Nehru sent a report to the All-India Congress Committee, in which he said: "The great problem of the near future will be American imperialism, even more than the British imperialism.... Or it may be, and all indications point to it, that the two will unite together in an endeavour to create a powerful Anglo-Saxon bloc to dominate the world."*

During the stay in Europe this time Nehru became a convinced socialist. But he understood Marxism very superficially, and could not understand, in his own words, "the fine points of Communism"; he was only impressed with its "broad features" and was attracted by "the tremendous changes taking place in Russia."**

Nehru visited the Soviet Union in the summer of 1927. He wrote at that time that the Soviet Union "seemed to hold forth a message of hope to the world.... So I turned inevitably with goodwill towards Communism; for whatever its faults, it was

* Mitra: *Indian Quarterly Register*, 1927, II, p. 153

** Nehru: *Autobiography*, pp. 161-63

at least not hypocritical and not imperialist." One day Nehru went to visit President Kalinin and was much impressed by the fact that the President "lived in two or three rooms simply furnished with no evidence of luxury or grandeur."* (And yet when Nehru came to power, he clearly forgot to apply in India this lesson or Gandhi's so much advertised preachings on plain living!) Nehru was also impressed by the Soviet Union's "attitude to education and specially her gallant fight against illiteracy," which was "to an Indian the most interesting and instructive part of her new policy."† (Also in this field, compared to Russia, what did Nehru achieve during his long reign of 17 years?)

* Nehru : *Soviet Russia*, p. 26

† Nehru : *Soviet Russia*, p. 133

U. S. Imperialism— Biggest Exploiter of Indian People

U. S. imperialism is the biggest enemy and exploiter of the 500 million Indian people.

U. S. imperialism has in the past years steadily intensified its aggression against India in all spheres. Under the cover of "aid", it has been pursuing craftily and viciously a neo-colonialist policy towards India, exploiting and plundering the Indian people ruthlessly, and gradually turning India from a colony of bankrupt British imperialism into a semi-colonial country controlled by several colonial powers, old and new, led by U. S. imperialism.

U. S. DOMINATION REPLACING BRITISH MONOPOLY IN INDIA

Today, U. S. imperialism has already broken Britain's monopolistic position in India and established its own domination over the country, having a firm grip on its economic lifeline and complete control over its reactionary ruling clique.

U.S. imperialism has become the biggest creditor of India. Up to August this year, U.S. economic "aid" to India totalled 7,800 million U.S. dollars (not including loans from the World Bank under U.S. control), making up 60 per cent of the total amount of foreign aid received by India, far exceeding the amount from British imperialism. The U.S. "aid" to India has exceeded its 5,900 million-dollar "aid" to the Chiang Kai-shek reactionaries of old China by 1,900 million U.S. dollars.

U.S. imperialism has become the biggest trader with India. In 1965-66, U.S. trade with India made up 38 per cent of India's total imports and 18 per cent of India's total exports, while India's imports from Britain have dropped to 16 per cent and exports to 18 per cent, of the total. India has become one of the biggest markets for U.S. commodities in the world.

The rate of increase of private U.S. investments in India

also far exceeded that of the British. During the period from 1948 to 1966, the total amount of foreign investments in India increased 4 times, while U.S. investments increased 21 times.

By 1963-64, U.S. investments accounted for 61 per cent of the total foreign capital flowing into India, exceeding that of Britain and ranking first. U.S. capital is mainly concentrated in the key economic departments of India.

What is particularly noteworthy is that surplus agricultural produce is the main instrument by which U.S. imperialism penetrated into and exercised control over India. An Indian economist has said that this is a lethal weapon in the U.S. diplomatic arsenal. Seizing on India's food shortage in the past years, the United States dumped large quantities of "surplus" agricultural products on India and became its biggest food "supplier." Since 1951, U.S. imperialism has dumped on India "surplus" agricultural products to the total value of 4,500 million U.S. dollars, or 58 per cent of the total U.S. "aid" to India. Of this, foodgrains amounted to 51 million tons, or one third of the total U.S. grain export. The more U.S. agricultural produce dumped on India, the deeper the crisis of India's agriculture and the greater India's reliance on U.S. agricultural produce. This has become a vicious circle. Now food supplies in big and medium Indian cities all depend on U.S. grain.

Furthermore, U.S. imperialism also intends to turn India into a dumping ground for U.S. cotton and tobacco. Last year, the U.S. even demanded that India reduce half of its acreage under cotton and large area under tobacco. The traitorous India government obeyed the order and set up a committee to carry out this work in betrayal of India's national interests.

Through the dumping of its agricultural produce, U.S. imperialism has controlled half of the Indian currency in circulation (20,700 million rupees) thus having a vital grip on India's finance and economy. The Indian weekly *Blitz* has pointed out that since India has so much of her currency mortgaged to the U.S., "America knows that India will have to agree to whatever terms it dictates and, if need be, can have a pound of flesh."

With the influx of U.S. "aid", commodities and capital, the United States quickly has a strangle hold on India's economic life-line and set up side by side with British imperialism and Soviet revisionism separate spheres of influence in various economic departments of India. At present, U.S. imperialism has gained control over India's agriculture, the foundation of Indian national economy, and over India's communication, transport, electricity, petroleum, chemical, atomic energy and other key industrial departments, with Britain retaining its superior position in the textile industry and in plantations and the Soviet Union controlling part of the government-run heavy industries.

Through its "aid", U.S. imperialism has the power to decide the policies and lines of the Indian Government. The U.S.-controlled "aid-India consortium" held a meeting every year to discuss the question of "aid" to India. At this meeting, the consortium first of all examined India's economic plan, state budget and policies to see whether they conform to U.S. needs or not. Last year, the U.S. ordered India through the World Bank to devalue the rupee by 36.5 per cent. The reactionary India government carried this out obediently and brought heavy losses to the Indian people.

Through its "aid", U.S. imperialism dispatched over 1,500 "experts" and "advisers" to work in the economic, political, military and cultural fields in India, forming a complete network which controls the entire country. In face of U.S. imperialist aggression and control, the Indian journal *Blitz* exclaimed: An American East India Company has emerged, which is swallowing up India's economy, freedom and sovereignty.

U.S. PLUNDERS INDIA RUTHLESSLY

U.S. imperialism plunders India's natural resources and wealth through its "aid" and exploits and robs the Indian people right and left. U.S. imperialism is the biggest plunderer of the Indian people.

U.S. imperialism robs India's industrial raw material and strategic resources in large quantities. In 1951, when the U.S.

Congress first discussed the question of "aid" to India, a member of the Foreign Affairs Committee of the U.S. House of Representatives said covetously: "India possesses a number of materials regarded by the United States as 'strategic' or 'critical'." The first U.S.-India wheat loan agreement stipulated that India must pay with the strategic materials, manganese and mica. The more the U.S. "aids" India, the greater the flow of Indian strategic materials to the U.S. The former U.S. Ambassador to India Bunker admitted in an article published in the *New York Times* in 1959 that two thirds of the total amount of mica the U.S. needed for its guided missile and electric industries, one third of the manganese needed by its iron and steel industry and one half of the castor oil needed by its aircraft industry came from India.

U.S. imperialism rakes in huge profits in India. U.S. capitalists enjoy the special privileges of paying less or being exempted from income tax and of having the right to fix the prices of their products as they like. U. S. investments in India net on the average a profit of 13 to 15 per cent and some even try to reach 20 per cent. This far surpasses the average profit of 10.2 per cent the U.S. gets from the whole world. By building factories in India, the U.S. aggressors can get their capital back in a few years' time and reap enormous profits. For example, the U.S. Standard Vacuum Oil Company opened an oil refinery in *Bombay*. The company got back 60 per cent of its investment in one year and the whole of it in two years.

U.S. imperialism charges high interests for loans. By the end of 1966, India owed the U.S. loans amounting to 7,200 million dollars at an annual interest of 6 to 7 per cent. In fiscal year 1965-66 alone, India paid 63 million dollars to the U.S. as interest.

U.S. imperialism makes huge profits by compelling India to buy expensive U.S. commodities. According to U.S. regulations, India must spend some 80 to 90 per cent of U.S. "aid" to buy U.S. goods, which are often 30 to 50 percent higher in price those than in the world market. As a result, U.S. exports to

India increased by 270 percent while its imports from India increased only by 70 per cent in the past ten years. Consequently, India's trade deficit with the U.S. reached 18,600 million rupees (2,480 million U.S. dollars), which account for 44 per cent of India's total foreign trade deficit.

U.S. imperialism has also laid down that half of its "aid" commodities must be shipped by U.S. vessels and freight charges paid in dollars. U.S. freight charges are 50 or more percent higher than those of other countries.

The ways and means by which the U.S. imperialists rob the Indian people are innumerable. Every dollar the U.S. imperialists squeezed from India is stained with the blood and sweat of the Indian labouring people!

U.S. IMPERIALISM BUYS OVER AND FOSTERS PRO-U.S. COMPRADORES IN INDIA TO SERVE AS U.S. LACKEYS AND TOOLS

Through their "aid", the U.S. imperialists buy over and foster pro-U.S. compradores to serve them as running dogs and tools. One of the U.S. methods is to set up "U.S.-Indian joint enterprises" to buy over big financial groups which control India's economic and political lifeline. There are now 487 big U.S.-Indian joint enterprises. In some companies the U.S. owns 50 to 70 per cent of the shares. The U.S. gives priority to these "joint enterprises" in extending loans. The Tata family alone has borrowed over 150 million dollars of loans from the U.S. and the World Bank. On the other hand India's national industries and commerce are boycotted and the number of them that have gone bankrupt is increasing.

Another means of the U.S. is to directly buy over big shots and important officials in the reactionary Indian government. Indian bureaucrats including some ministers of the reactionary Indian Government were bought over by the U.S. a long time ago.

No one can deny the fact that the reactionary Indian ruling clique has already become a loyal lackey of U.S. imperialism which is the overlord of the traitorous reactionary Indian government.

THOROUGH BANKRUPTCY OF REVISIONIST FALLACY

With a view to writing off the anti-imperialist struggle of the revolutionary Indian people, the Indian revisionists, under the cloak of Marxism-Leninism, have deliberately covered up the truth about the U.S. imperialist aggression against and control over India. They alleged that India is an 'independent' country and that the Indian Government which is only "collaborating" and "compromising with" imperialism is not its lackey. Accordingly, they argued, the spearhead of struggle should not be directed against the imperialists.

However, the hard facts of U.S. imperialist aggression, control and exploitation of India has laid bare the renegade features of the Indian revisionists who act as apologists for U.S. imperialism. India is a semi-colonial country controlled by several colonial powers, old and new, headed by U.S. imperialism. The relations between the reactionary Indian ruling group and U.S. imperialism are those between a master and its lackey. In order to liberate themselves, the Indian people must resolutely make a national-democratic revolution and overthrow the monstrous rule of U.S. imperialism and its lackey, the reactionary Indian government.

The broad masses of the Indian people have endured suffering and tribulation caused by the cruel oppression and exploitation by U.S. imperialism and its lackey. The economic and political crises are becoming acute daily. An increasing number of the Indian people have realised the truth elucidated by Chairman Mao, the great leader of the world's revolutionary people: "U.S. imperialism is the most ferocious enemy of the people of the world." They have realised that U.S. imperialism has become the biggest international exploiter and the main bulwark of colonialism in the present era. Surging anti-U.S. flames are blazing in the vast land of India. The Indian people are resolved to take the road to liberation as pointed out by Chairman Mao for the oppressed people and wipe out U.S. imperialism and its lackey, the reactionary Indian government, with revolutionary armed struggle.

Take up the Task of Building A Revolutionary Party

—S. R.

[This is an English version of an article published in the Bengali Weekly *Deshabrati* of January 11, 1968. —Editor, *Liberation*]

Analysing the experiences of the Chinese Revolution, Chairman Mao Tse-tung said in his *On the People's Democratic Dictatorship* :

"A well-disciplined Party armed with the theory of Marxism-Leninism, using the method of self-criticism and linked with the masses of the people; an army under the leadership of such a Party, a united front of all revolutionary classes and all revolutionary groups under the leadership of such a Party—these are the three main weapons with which we have defeated the enemy." [*Selected Works*, Vol. 4, p. 422]

It is not fortuitous that Chairman Mao, in mentioning the three main weapons, took up the question of a revolutionary Party, a Party "armed with the theory of Marxism-Leninism, using the method of self-criticism and linked with the masses of the people" at the very beginning. By this, Chairman Mao has upheld a universally applicable Marxist-Leninist scientific principle, and pointed out how the truth of this principle was confirmed by the experience of the Chinese Revolution also.

The history of the Russian Revolution also shows how in the beginning of the first revolutionary upsurge in the twentieth century Lenin raised the question "of an organisation of struggle, and of political agitation among the masses." (*Where To Begin*, Collected Works, Vol. 5, p. 18). Lenin said: "Without a strong organisation skilled in waging political struggle under all circumstances and at all times, there can be no question of that systematic plan of action,

illuminated by firm principles and steadfastly carried out, which alone is worthy of the name of tactics." (*Ibid*)

Today no one in the international working class movement dare deny in principle the necessity of a party of the working class. But the experiences of the international communist movement show that it is not enough to accept in principle the necessity of such a party. The actual building up of such a party in practice is no less difficult and complex a problem. How and in what manner can the Party establish close and firm links with the broadest sections of the people? How and in what manner can the Party be kept constantly and fully armed with the Marxist-Leninist theories? How can the method of self-criticism be applied fruitfully and efficiently? How should the party discipline be built up creatively?

We must be able to find out satisfactory solutions to these practical problems relating to Party building. And in solving these problems it becomes necessary at times to carry on big and long-drawn struggles inside the Party.

A close study of Lenin's *What Is To Be Done?* shows how even Lenin himself had to wage a fierce ideological struggle over the question: what should be the nature and substance of the Party's political agitation?

There is a certain breed of Marxists who, in practice dis-claims even the highest principle of Marxism, namely, that the toiling classes must win their liberation through their own efforts. They are afraid to follow the path indicated by Chairman Mao Tse-tung and are, therefore, afraid unreservedly to declare before the whole world: "The people, and the people alone, are the motive force in the making of world history" (*On Coalition Government*, Selected Works, Vol. 3, p. 257), and that "The masses are the real heroes, while we ourselves are often childish and ignorant, and without this understanding it is impossible to acquire even the most rudimentary knowledge." ("Preface & Postscript to *Rural Surveys*, Selected Works., Vol. 3, p. 12).

These "Marxist" heroes are in reality nothing but quacks

and have only one prescription to offer to the working class and the toiling people, namely, immediate economic demands and "palpable results." It often happens, however, that these people choose to become windbags in order to hide their real nature and begin to shout—"the political struggle of the working class is merely the widest, most developed, and most effective form of economic struggles", "lend the economic struggle itself a political character as far as possible," "the economic struggle is the most widely applicable method of drawing the masses into active political struggle", etc. These, incidentally, are typical examples of the wretched propaganda of the Economists since Lenin's days. At other times these people even talk about the politics of ministry-making and -breaking. But they always take good care to avoid referring to the fundamental question in politics, its higher form, i.e., the question of state power.

Lenin had to carry out a fierce ideological struggle at the first stages of Party building against these pseudo-Marxists and to demolish their theories.

From our own bitter experiences we have learnt that there is no dearth of such "Marxist" leaders in our country also. They also utter the same pseudo-Marxist phrases as referred to above or some variants of them. Their latest additions to such vocabulary are phrases like—"the trade union movement should not be kept confined to the level of trade unionism but should be conducted with a political perspective". [According to newspaper reports, a conference of workers' representatives (?) held under the auspices of the Rashtriya Sangram Samity (a joint body of various trade unions in West Bengal) on December, 31, last year took this profound decision.—S. R.]

The real trouble with these pseudo-Marxists is that they are mortally afraid to go beyond the existing limits set by the bourgeois system. What they really aspire to is to secure for themselves "respectable" positions inside the bourgeois set-up with the help of the people by posing before them as their leaders. They talk politics all right but only of a

low order. In all their agitation and propaganda they scrupulously avoid all talks of politics of the highest order, the real question—the question of state power. These unscrupulous opportunists pretend that their hearts are “melting” at the misery of the workers and other toiling people and claim to be their leaders, but are, in reality, nothing but willing vehicles of bourgeois ideology in the workers’ movement. The bourgeoisie, i.e., the people in “high places”, invariably look down upon the workers and other toiling people, i.e., the men of the “lower depths” as the rabble and fools. The pseudo-Marxists have nothing in common with the great leaders of Marxism-Leninism—Marx, Engels, Lenin, Stalin and Mao Tse-tung, and have nothing of the great love and sympathy that these leaders had or have for the people of “the lower depths”. These opportunists have no faith whatsoever in the intelligence of the down-trodden masses and so are unable to follow Lenin, who always dared to tell the plain truth to the working class. At the beginning of the Russian Revolution, this is what Lenin said :

“The change-over from boom to crisis will not only teach our workers that united struggle is a permanent necessity, it will also destroy the harmful illusions that began to take shape at the time of industrial prosperity. By means of strikes, the workers were able in some places to force concessions from the employers with comparative ease, and this “economic” struggle assumed an exaggerated significance ; it was forgotten that trade unions and strikes can, at best, only win slightly better terms for the sale of labour-power as a commodity. Trade unions and strikes cannot help in times of crisis when there is no demand for this “commodity”, they cannot change the conditions which convert labour-power into a commodity and which doom the masses of working people to dire need and unemployment. To change these conditions, a revolutionary struggle against the whole existing social and political system is necessary ; the industrial crisis will convince very many workers of the justice of this statement.” (*Another Massacre*, Collected Works., Vol. 5, pp. 26-27. Emphasis mine—S. R.)

Lenin, in the very beginning, taught the working class :

“Strikes, therefore, teach the workers to unite ; they show them that they can struggle against the capitalists only when they are united ; strikes teach the workers to think of the struggle of the whole working class against the whole class of factory owners and against the arbitrary, police government. This is the reason why socialists call strikes ‘a school of war’, a school in which the workers learn to make war on their enemies for the liberation of the whole people, of all who labour, from the yoke of government officials and from the yoke of capital.

“‘A school of war’ is however, not war itself. When strikes are widespread among the workers, some of the workers (including some socialists) begin to believe that the working class can confine itself to strikes, strike funds, or strike associations alone ; that by strikes alone the working class can achieve a considerable improvement in its conditions or even its emancipation. When they see what power there is in a united working class and even in small strikes, some think that the working class has only to organise a general strike throughout the whole country for the workers to get everything they want from the capitalists and the government...*It is a mistaken idea.* Strikes are *one* of the ways in which the working class struggles for its emancipation, but they are not the only way ; and if workers do not turn their attention to other means of conducting the struggle, they will slow down the growth and the successes of the working class...Furthermore, even in those countries where workers’ unions exist openly and have huge funds at their disposal, the working class can still not confine itself to strikes as a means of struggle. All that is necessary is a hitch in the affairs of industry (a crisis, such as the one that is approaching in Russia today) and the factory owners will even deliberately cause strikes, because it is to their advantage to cease work for a time and to deplete the workers’ funds. The workers, therefore, cannot under any circumstances, confine themselves to strike actions and strike associations.” (*On Strikes* ; written at the end of 1899 ; Collected Works., Vol. 4, pp. 317—18.)

While a crisis was approaching and while taking up the task of building the Party, Lenin stressed before the Russian workers the need for training in other methods also, and to what did he point out in particular ?

The experience of the Russian Revolution as well as of the entire international working class movement has made it abundantly clear that "political power grows out of the barrel of the gun". This simple formulation of Chairman Mao crystallises a rich experience and is directly based upon Lenin's teachings and is the continuation and development of Lenin's heritage. Similarly, the formulations of Chairman Mao that in the final analysis it is the people that decide the course of human progress and about the role of "the conscious activity of man" reflect his profound understanding of the same and are the direct successor to the great confidence that Lenin had in the working class.

But why do we need to remember all this today when we are proceeding towards building up a genuinely revolutionary party in India ? Are we then opposed to the strike actions of the workers and employees, or to general strikes ? Absolutely not. Strikes are "a school of war". No genuine Communist can ever think of opposing them as a policy.

But we do want our workers and employees to become fully conscious of all the aspects of the strike action, its effectiveness and its limitations from a truly Marxist-Leninist point of view ; we do want them to raise their consciousness to a higher level and train themselves in such a manner that they become able to use and direct the weapon of strike actions to help develop and advance the genuinely revolutionary stream, namely, the agrarian revolution. We know what a great role the strike actions play in educating the masses about the necessity of united action. But we also want to tell the working class that strike action is only one of many weapons in their hands and that they cannot afford to confine all their activities to handling that weapon alone. They must necessarily be able to train themselves up in order to use other forms of struggle, other weapons also. Today they must

also be able to forge the new weapon—the weapon of the revolutionary struggles of the peasants. In the present conditions of India this has become the main political task before the Indian working class.

Lenin set forth certain features characteristic of a revolutionary situation in a given country. Judging by these, we find that an excellent revolutionary situation is prevailing in India today. What is more, the revolutionary peasant struggle in Naxalbari, led by the revolutionary comrades of the Darjeeling district and guided by the ever-shining Thought of Mao Tse-tung, the greatest living Marxist-Leninist of our day, has opened up before us the path along which the Indian Revolution can advance to victory. The people's revolutionary struggle in our country has to follow this path to victory. This is the path of the revolutionary struggle of the people waged under the leadership of the working class organised around a clear-cut political programme and based upon the alliance of the workers and the peasants ; this is the path to establish and develop, under the leadership of the working class, revolutionary peasant bases in the rural areas, to create liberated zones by overthrowing the feudal forces in the villages and to expand these zones through a long, fierce, protracted and bloody struggle until imperialism and its lackeys, the comprador and bureaucratic bourgeoisie and feudalism are overthrown and the entire country is liberated. The most urgent task before the working class today is, therefore, to begin to prepare for this in every manner possible. But the revisionists, neo-revisionists, right-wing petty-bourgeois pseudo-Marxists—the leaders of the CPI (M), Dangeite and other left parties—who claim to be Marxists, have chosen to rally behind Sri Ajoy Mukherjee, a thoroughly anti-communist Gandhite and faithful adherent of the reactionary Congress Party's policies and ideals, just at this moment and launched a "crusade" of so-called civil disobedience movement in order to get back their lost ministerial *guddis* and also for distracting people's attention to a quite different direction considered 'safe' for the ruling classes.

Unfortunate though it is, still the fact is that perverted politics continues to be spread even from the platform of the central organisations of the working class because they are dominated by the revisionists and neo-revisionists. So it is evident that today the task of building up a genuine revolutionary working class party can be carried out successfully only by waging a determined and powerful ideological struggle. And during this ideological struggle, we must repeatedly and tirelessly explain before the working class and other toiling people the essential question in politics—the question of state power and the question of the highest form of class struggle as well as the orientation of this struggle, i.e., the specific form it will take in this country. In order that we may successfully carry out this task, it is imperative for us to take all-round measures to build up a genuinely revolutionary party—which, Chairman Mao teaches, is the first of the three weapons necessary to make a successful revolution.

No doubt, the task is difficult. Moreover, the ruling classes have turned their spearhead of attack against us and thus made it more difficult. Still we are proud of it, of being reaction's main target. And it has never been possible for the reactionary rulers in any country to subdue the determination of revolutionaries through persecution and repression. We, the revolutionaries in the CPI(M) and outside, shall with all modesty strive to become, through unsparing and hard labour, worthy disciples of Lenin and Mao Tse-tung in this country. We have no doubt whatsoever that we shall be able to win over all genuine revolutionaries and all honest political workers seeking a change to our side.

And we shall never forget what Lenin taught us :

“To establish and consolidate the Party means to establish and consolidate unity among all Russian Social-Democrats (read : the Indian Communists—S.R.) ; such unity cannot be decreed, it cannot be brought about by a decision, say, of a meeting of representatives ; it must be worked for. In the first place, it is necessary to develop a common Party literature—common, not only in the sense that it must serve

the whole of the Russian movement (read : the Indian movement—S. R.) rather than separate districts, that it must discuss the questions of the movement as a whole and assist the class-conscious proletarians in their struggle instead of dealing merely with local questions, but common also in the sense that it must unite all the available literary forces, that it must express all shades of opinion and views prevailing among Russian Social-Democrats (read : revolutionaries in the Indian Communist movement—S.R.), not as isolated workers, but as comrades united in the ranks of a single organisation by a common struggle. Secondly, we must work to achieve an organisation especially for the purpose of establishing and maintaining contact among all the centres of the movement, of supplying complete and timely information about the movement, and of delivering our newspapers and periodicals regularly to all parts of Russia (read : all parts of India—S.R.). Only when such an organisation has been founded, only when a Russian (read : Indian—S. R.) socialist post has been established, will the Party possess a sound foundation, only then will it become a real fact and, therefore, a mighty political force.” (*Draft of a Declaration of the Editorial Board of ISKRA and ZARYA* ; Collected Works., Vol. 4, pp. 323-24).

In our country the revisionists and the neo-revisionists have exposed themselves. Therefore, it is only they, who will be excluded from having any say in this great task of building a genuinely revolutionary party in our country.

NOTES

ISKRA (The Spark) : The first all-Russian illegal Marxist newspaper founded by Lenin in 1900. While in exile in Siberia, Lenin evolved a plan for its publication abroad. It played an important role in building the Marxist revolutionary party of the working class in Russia. *Iskra* became the centre for the unification of Party forces, for the gathering and training of Party workers in Russia. Lenin was, in actuality, its editor-in-chief and the leading figure.

ZARYA (Dawn) : A Marxist scientific and political magazine published legally in Stuttgart in 1901-02 by the *Iskra* Editorial Board.

What is a true bastion of iron? It is the masses, the millions upon millions of people who genuinely and sincerely support the revolution. That is the real iron bastion which it is impossible, and absolutely impossible, for any force on earth to smash. The counter-revolution cannot smash us; on the contrary, we shall smash it.

—Mao Tse-tung

People's War Carried To New Heights in South Viet Nam

In a matter of six days, the enemy forces 1.2 million strong were caught unawares and soundly trounced. It is a spectacular achievement, without precedent in history. By their actions around the end of January and in early February, the liberation fighters and people of south Viet Nam have added a brilliant chapter to the world annals of people's revolutionary wars. They are continuing the offensive to seize new victories.

According to a special communique issued by the Command of the South Viet Nam People's Armed Forces, in the six days from the night of January 29 to February 4, the liberation armed forces and people of south Viet Nam wiped out more than 50,000 enemy troops, including over 10,000 of the U.S. aggressors, and disintegrated 200,000 puppet troops. Many American and puppet army units were wiped out. Of the three armoured regiments annihilated two were U.S. regiments and of the 29 battalions annihilated, nine were U.S. and one Australian.

During the short span of time, the south Vietnamese armed forces and people mounted surprise attacks on more than 50 cities and towns in the enemy-occupied areas, including

such big cities, provincial capitals and military strongholds as Saigon, Da Nang and Hue. A number of nerve centres and key departments of the U.S.-puppet clique were hit hard. Assaults were made on thirty airfields, including Da Nang, the biggest U.S. airbase in south Viet Nam, and the radio broadcasting stations in six major cities were destroyed. Many enemy logistic bases, dumps and depots for strategic stockpiling also came under attack. The enemy lost more than 1,500 aircrafts. Hundreds of guns of different calibre, and over 4,000 tanks, armoured cars and other military vehicles were destroyed. Fifty warships and gunboats were sunk or heavily damaged, and enormous quantities of arms, ammunition, petrol and other war supplies were captured or destroyed.

Premier Chou En-lai in his February 2 message to Nguyen Huu Tho, President of the Presidium of the Central Committee of the South Viet Nam National Front for Liberation, extended warmest congratulations to the heroic South Viet Nam People's Liberation Armed Forces and south Vietnamese people on their brilliant victories. He described these as an indication that the south Vietnamese people's war has reached a new and higher level of development. The victories, he stated, once more proved the infinite might of a people's war. "The 700 million Chinese people armed with Mao Tse-tung's thought vow to provide a powerful backing for you!" he declared.

U.S. imperialism, the so-called super-power of the capitalist world, which has thrown half a million of its own troops into the south Viet Nam battlefield, now finds there is not a single spot throughout the land that is safe for its forces of aggression. Conclusively U.S. imperialism has been shown up as a paper tiger. All these facts have once again confirmed the great truth pointed out by Chairman Mao Tse-tung: "A nation, big or small, can defeat any enemy, however powerful, so long as it fully arouses its people, firmly relies on them and wages a people's war."

The world-shaking victories of the Vietnamese people's war ring out a new paean of the triumph of revolutionary heroism.

In the battles, the Vietnamese people displayed their indomitable determination to press ahead against all difficulties, their defiance of sacrifice and danger, their high sense of organisation and discipline. Innumerable are the soul-stirring exploits of revolutionary heroism which they performed.

The Vietnamese people's new victories in their war to resist U. S. aggression and save their country have punctured the arrogance of U. S. imperialism and lifted high the morale of the revolutionary people all over the world. They are a tremendous contribution to the anti-imperialist cause of all peoples and a brilliant example for all the oppressed of how to mobilise and rely on one's own people to defeat a powerful enemy.

In the small hours of January 31, shock troops of the South Vietnam People's Liberation Armed Forces, co-ordinating with the efforts of the people, stormed into the U.S. "embassy" building and the puppet president's residence in Saigon and for six hours occupied the lower floors of the U.S. "embassy". Simultaneously they launched assaults on the office of the general staff of the puppet army, the command of the puppet navy, the headquarters of the puppet police, Radio Saigon, Tan Son Nhut Airfield and three U.S. army barracks. Radio Saigon went off the air and the airfield was declared temporarily closed. Whisked away from his residence under heavy security guard when the attack on the "embassy" took place, U.S. "ambassador" Ellsworth Bunker went into hiding.

Reports by the western press and news agencies said that Johnson passed two sleepless nights after receiving the news of the attack on the U.S. "embassy" in Saigon and that, in order to cope with the situation, "his official appointments have been reduced to the minimum permitted by protocol," and that he "has been maintaining a hectic work pace." In the first eight hours after the attack, he received some 25 "urgent messages" from Saigon. And he was so worried about the situation that he simply could not sit still in his office waiting for the telegrams from the communication centre in the White House, but time and again had to ring up asking how things stood.

The full-scale offensive was characterised by close co-ordination between the armed forces and civilians, between cities and the countryside. The attacks were made from both within and without. The offensive was mounted in response to the call to battle issued by the Presidium of the Central Committee of the South Vietnam National Front for Liberation. The Liberation Armed Forces, together with the local people and the various patriotic armed forces, launched fierce attacks on all fronts. Fighting in close co-ordination with the various revolutionary armed forces, the people of all strata rose up to overthrow the local administration of the traitors and running-dogs, smashed enemy rule, wiped out puppet officials whose hands were stained with the blood of the people, freed more than 20,000 people from enemy prisons, and established revolutionary administrations. Patriotic officers and men in the puppet forces turned their guns against the enemy and joined in the fighting.

In south Viet Nam today, the people's political and armed forces have rapidly grown in number and strength. The vast ocean of people's war has now engulfed not only the broad rural areas but the cities. All the facts prove that the Liberation Armed Forces can choose at will the time and place for battle and can penetrate into the most closely guarded hide-outs of the U.S. aggressors and their running-dogs. It is now not a question of whether the Vietnamese people can or cannot win, or of whether they can win big or small victories—it is now a fact that they are going to win without fail and have already won great victories. Though in dire straits, the U.S. imperialists obviously refuse to reconcile themselves to their defeat. They are planning new ventures to widen their war of aggression against Viet Nam. But no matter how many more stakes the Johnson administration may throw into the war, it has no hope of saving itself from total defeat.

Not a word about workers and their
struggle.

Historic Turning Point In The Indian Revolution

[An assessment by the Communist Party of China, the leader of the international Communist movement.]

Nineteen sixty-seven marks a turning point in the history of the Indian revolution. Under the guidance of the invincible thought of Mao Tse-tung, the Indian people have finally embarked on the only correct road for the Indian revolution—the victorious road along which Chairman Mao led the Chinese people to seize political power by armed force. The revolutionary line upheld by the revolutionaries in the Indian Communist Party has been winning one victory after another, while the line of "peaceful transition" pursued by the Indian revisionists is steadily going on the rocks. The revolutionary situation in India is better than ever.

A big Asian country with a population of 500 million, India occupies an extremely important strategic position in the world proletarian revolution. The great Lenin pointed out more than 40 years ago: "In the last analysis, the outcome of the struggle will be determined by the fact that Russia, India, China, etc., account for the overwhelming majority of the population of the globe." Now, the revolutionary people of India led by the revolutionaries in the Indian Communist Party are determined to take the road of the Chinese revolution, to oppose armed counter-revolution with armed revolution. This is not only a great turning point in the history of the Indian revolution, but is also of immense significance for the development of the world proletarian revolution.

The struggle between the two lines and the two roads which existed in the Indian Communist Party for a long time has intensified in the past few years. The revolutionaries in the Indian Communist Party, under the guidance of Mao Tse-tung's thought, have firmly opposed the parliamentary road of "peaceful transition" pursued by the usurpers of the Party's leadership, the renegade Dange clique and the handful of revisionist chieftains whose representatives are Namboodiripad and Jyoti Basu.

These revolutionaries in the Indian Communist Party resolutely proclaimed that "the strategy employed by the great leader Mao Tse-tung is one which the Indian Marxists should

HISTORIC TURNING POINT

89

adopt" and that "we shall have to strive earnestly to be apt pupils of Comrade Mao Tse-tung." Abiding by Chairman Mao's brilliant teaching "political power grows out of the barrel of a gun," they explicitly pointed out that in India "the only correct path of the people's democratic revolution is: to build up revolutionary bases in the rural areas through an agrarian revolution under proletarian leadership, and subsequently to encircle the urban centres by expanding these revolutionary bases; to organize people's liberation forces from among the peasants' guerrilla forces and to lead the revolution to victory by capturing the cities."

And so at the beginning of 1967, a spring thunder-storm burst over India. In Naxalbari and other places of Darjeeling District revolutionary peasants rallied by the revolutionaries in the Indian Communist Party, lit the flames of armed struggle.

The revolutionaries in the Indian Communist Party led the landless or land-poor peasants in Darjeeling District, who were oppressed and exploited to the limit by the landlords, to mount tempestuous attacks on the landlords, the plantation owners and the reactionary government; they took back the land and wrested arms or grain from them. They organized small armed groups and set up "people's courts" to punish those local tyrants and evil gentry who put up stubborn resistance, and defended by armed force the fruits of their agrarian revolution. Between March and June last year the peasants engaged in 220 armed actions. The privileges which the feudal landlords enjoyed for thousands of years and foreign plantation owners for a century, and the "law" and "order" imposed on the peasants by the reactionary government were all shattered to pieces. Every bit of the "dignity" and "prestige" built up by the landlords or plantation owners was swept into the dust. The landless or land-poor peasants, now proud and elated, lifted up their heads. The movement struck terror into the hearts of the landlords and plantation owners. The top rank of landlords and plantation owners and those of the second rank fled to Calcutta, while the third rank and the still lesser fry vanished into the smaller cities and county towns. Urgent reports or appeals for rescue poured into the offices of the reactionary government and filled the Indian reactionaries with fear.

The armed struggle waged by the Naxalbari peasants greatly inspired the revolutionaries in the Indian Communist Party and the revolutionary people in all India. The Indian revolutionaries set up in various places committees in support of the Naxalbari peasants' struggle, and rallied the people to support the armed revolution. They translated and published

large quantities of Chairman Mao's writings, widely propagating Mao Tse-tung's thought. They published many periodicals and books, and printed leaflets to spread the truth about the seizure of political power by armed force and to expose the small handful of revisionists within the Party who sabotage armed struggle. Following the example of the Indian Communist Party revolutionaries in the Darjeeling area, many revolutionaries went deep into the rural areas where they are now striving hard to "develop the Naxalbari type of movement" and to build up "more Naxalbaris."

The furious flames of the peasants' movement quickly spread in the vast Indian countryside. According to the skimpy disclosures made by the Indian press, the "Naxalbari-type" of peasants' land struggles have developed in 50 places in eight states and areas under the direct control of the Central Government. The peasants in these places, with arms in hand, regained the land forcibly occupied by the landlords and the reactionary government, and they seized the crops on the land illegally controlled by the landlords. During harvest time in India, the peasants in quite a number of places organized "peasants' committees" or "people's committees" and launched a movement of "no share to the landlords" and "no taxes to the government."

These facts indicate that a vigorous situation has emerged in the Indian revolution.

Nineteen sixty-seven is also a year during which the "parliamentary road" followed by Nambudiripad, Jyoti Basu and such other Indian revisionists was further exposed and went up in smoke.

This "parliamentary road" is a mixture of the fallacy of "peaceful transition" advocated by old-line revisionists Bernstein and Kautsky and the "Doctrine of Non-Violence" advocated by Gandhi. The Soviet revisionist renegade clique and China's Khrushchov have made great efforts to support and propagate this "parliamentary road", the so-called "Indian road," in an attempt to prevent the Indian people and other oppressed nations and peoples from taking the victorious road of the Chinese revolution.

Hiring themselves out to the Indian reactionaries, the Indian revisionists have promised never to use armed force to overthrow the reactionary Indian Government. Since these revisionists, the Indian reactionaries calculated, can be used both as tools for carrying out the reactionary policies of the Congress Party and as ornaments for dressing up Congress "democracy", the Indian reactionaries allowed them to run

in the February "general elections" of 1967. The revisionists were also given seats and official appointments in the so-called "non-Congress governments" in West Bengal and Kerala.

In taking the "parliamentary road," the Indian revisionists have completely exposed themselves as shameful renegades, and accomplices of the Indian reactionaries into the bargain. They took part in the reactionary regime's suppression of the people and its massacre of many revolutionary people. Their hands are stained with the blood of Indian people.

The "parliamentary road" of the Indian revisionists has gone bankrupt once again in 1967's "experiment." This is a heavy blow not only to the Indian revisionists but also to the Soviet revisionist renegade clique and to China's Khrushchov.

The inspiring events of the successive victories of the revolutionary line, and the increasing failure of the revisionist line in India in 1967 forecast a bright future for the development of the Indian revolution.

In regard to the tasks of the Indian revolution, the revolutionaries in the Indian Communist Party put forward the following as the main ones at present: to spread among the people Mao Tse-tung's thought, the acme of Marxism-Leninism in the present era; to carry further the struggle against the old and new types of revisionism; to make a specific analysis of India's objective conditions in accordance with the brilliant thought of Mao Tse-tung, and formulate the programme and tactics for the Indian revolution on this basis; and to give impetus to the peasant revolutionary struggle and develop Naxalbari-type movements. The revolutionaries in the Indian Communist Party and India's revolutionary people now are striving for the realization of these tasks.

Under the brilliant light of Mao Tse-tung's thought, the revolutionary people of India will surely score still greater victories in their future struggles! In spite of the fact that the Indian revolutionary struggle may be protracted and tortuous, the Indian people will gain the final victory in the revolution. That is certain. A new India with genuine independence and people's democracy will certainly emerge in the East!

Rebellion Is Right !

[The Andhra comrades have dealt a stern blow against the neo-revisionist leadership of the C. P. I.(M). By an overwhelming majority, the Andhra State Party Plenum, held in the second week of January, threw out the anti-Chinese revisionist Madurai Drafts and adopted instead new drafts based on Mao Tse-tungs' thought. The neo-revisionist organ *People's Democracy* (vide January 28 issue), while reporting the Andhra Plenum, completely suppressed this fact. The Andhra comrades have done a very good thing in rejecting the neo-revisionist line and courageously upholding the revolutionary line of Naxalbari, and the banner of Mao Tse-tung's thought. Their action is just and right and will inspire the revolutionary comrades in and outside the Party to intensify still more their developing struggle against the counter-revolutionary line of the revisionist chieftains of the CPI(M) and their Dangeite and Soviet patrons.

We print below a report of the Andhra State Party Plenum which appeared in the Andhra press, followed by reports on the struggle of the revolutionary comrades against the revisionist line of the neo-revisionist chieftains in Orissa and Delhi.

—Editorial Board, *Liberation*]

ANDHRA :

The Andhra press reported that the Andhra State Plenum discussed the ideological draft (Madurai Drafts). Three members of the Provincial Secretariat placed two documents in resolution form exposing the overall revisionist trends in the Madurai Drafts. Among other things the documents pointed out how the central leadership was striving to establish contacts with the revisionist East European Communist Parties and how cunningly this leadership avoided clarification of the principal contradiction in the present-day

world and inveigled the Khrushchevite concept of peaceful transition etc.

Two PB members including the General Secretary harangued the Plenum for a pretty long time (together they took away about half of the time of the Plenum's deliberations) with a view to pushing through their revisionist line but all their attempts failed. Finally the house adopted a resolution in the light of the two documents placed by the three Secretariat members rejecting in toto the Madurai Drafts of the CC and requesting the CC to prepare a new draft on the lines of the two critiques submitted by the the three Secretariat members. The voting was as follows : supporting the CC drafts (Madurai Drafts)—52 ; rejecting C C drafts—158 ; neutrals—8.

DELHI :

Delhi CPI(M) Captured by Revolutionaries ; Neo-Revisionist Leadership repudiated.

A general body meeting of the Delhi State Communist Party (Marxwadi) convened at the initiative of the leading comrades of the Party was held on 14. 1. 68. About one hundred twenty-five comrades, representing about 90% of the membership, came to attend. The meeting lasted for about 8 hours. About two dozen comrades participated in the discussion. The consensus of opinion was that the top leadership of the Party must be repudiated for their neo-Revisionism ; the imposed adhoc Committee, a substitute for the State Committee, be disowned and the call of the Revolutionaries to form a genuine Communist Party be endorsed. The meeting unanimously passed the following resolutions :

"This general body meeting of Delhi Communist Party (Marxwadi) held on 14. 1. 68 has come to conclude that the top leadership of the Party has been usurped by another brand of opportunists, the neo-Revisionists, who are hardly a shade different from the renegade Dangeites they so clamorously repudiated only a few years ago, for, like their predecessors, they, too, tread the parliamentary path ; have faith in peaceful transition ; prefer empty trade unionism to

Party building, violate the Leninist principle of Democratic Centralism in Organisation, and moreover, so distort and misinterpret the thesis of People's Democracy in respect of Indian Revolution that it becomes tantamount to the thesis of National Democracy of the Dangeites. In the opinion of this meeting, these neo-Revisionists are all the more dangerous to the cause of communist revolution in India because they preach revolution but practise reformism".

"This general body meeting of Delhi Communist Party (Marxwadi) held on 14. 1. 68 holds that by arbitrarily imposing an adhoc Committee as substitute for State Committee, the Central leadership has violated the Leninist principle of democratic centralism, committed an outrage on the Delhi Party and thereby betrayed its traditional weakness for puppets to carry out its nefarious designs of neo-Revisionism. The adhoc Committee has already proved worthy of its master maker by shattering the communist organisation in the State to pieces. This meeting rejects this adhoc committee with scorn, repudiates all its actions and decides to reconstitute its leadership at all levels in the state".

"This general body meeting of Delhi Communist Party (Marxwadi) fully endorses and wholeheartedly supports the call of the Revolutionaries of the Party as released through the pages of 'Liberation' No. 2 to form a genuine Communist Party of and for revolution to be effected along the general line of Marxism-Leninism culminated to-day in the thought of Mao Tse-tung. The meeting hereby assures the All India Co-ordination Committee of every effort and co-operation for the cause upheld by them".

ORISSA :

The severe defeat in Andhra have rankled the neo-revisionist overlords of the C.P.I.(M). They seem to have become more cautious and resorted to the tactic of sowing confusion among the revolutionary comrades. This is what they are doing in Orissa. The Madurai Drafts were rejected at the district level by the comrades of Cuttack, Baleswar, Koraput, Sundargarh etc., and a state plenum convened by the neo-revisionist State Committee was attended by only eleven people and ended in a fiasco. The revolutionary comrades in Orissa are firmly upholding the banner of Mao Tse-tung's thought and are determined to stick to the policy of developing agrarian revolution and building up a genuinely revolutionary Party.

[Continued from page 16]

Times, February 10, 1968). Our experience in India fully corroborates this statement. The bilateral arrangements are being also used currently by the US imperialists and their Soviet accomplices as bribes to disrupt the coming together of the exploited countries in the UNCTAD-II. The famed "77" is already affected by this treacherous manipulation.

What role India is playing in this UNCTAD business? Her neo-colonial status, her all-round dependence on the US imperialists and the Soviet revisionists, her willingness to continue to serve the interests of her dictating patrons of Washington and Moscow and lastly the mortal fear of a roused people, which her rulers share with their masters were all faithfully reflected in the Indian Prime Minister's inaugural address. It is more like a moan than a speech—the moan of a class that sees its doom approaching, the moan of India's reactionary ruling class trapped inextricably in internal crises, haunted by the spectre of a people rising up in revolt, and reeling at the blows daily raining on it from the angry masses. In a most shameless manner the P. M. desperately appeals to the US imperialists and Soviet revisionists for bolstering up India's reactionary classes against the angry people. "Unless we sense this urgency and use our energy to eradicate the economic causes which make for conflict, men and women will be impelled to revolt, and to use violent means to bring about change," appealed the distressed P. M. (*Sm. Gandhi's speech, Economic Times*, Feb. 2, 1968). She is "haunted by the fear" that the "historic opportunity" presented by UNCTAD-II may "again be missed," and that the "situation is a source of anxiety." Haunted, afraid and anxious, she notes with exasperation that "growing numbers in the developing countries are beginning to look upon external capital and know-how, not as aids to their own strength and achievement of economic freedom, but as bonds which increase their dependence on dominant economies," and she immediately jumps forward to absolve these "growing numbers" of sinners of their sins, —sins of daring to suspect the imperialists and showing concern for the fate of their own countries and proposes that "We must all plead guilty." (*Ibid*). She is fully convinced that salvation for India and other poor nations must lie not with themselves but in the hands of the US imperialists and their Soviet accomplices, who in her estimation constitute "the international community." "The elimination of poverty and the development of impoverished regions are now widely accepted as international obligations," she asserts, and suggests that "In order to discharge them, it is

imperative that the international community finds ways and means to intervene effectively...." (*Ibid*). According to Sri Dinesh Singh, UNCTAD-II's President, "a broad consensus had emerged recognising that economic development was an international responsibility". (*Indian Express*, 23. 2. 68) The cringing submissiveness to foreign exploiters of our country is an expression of the Indian reactionary ruling class's readiness to subordinate India's vital interests to those of the foreign exploiters, and to conduct the affairs of the country according to the dictates of the US imperialists and Soviet revisionists. This is precisely why the US and the Soviet revisionists were so concerned about "India's progress". In the words of George Woods, "Those who believe,...that India is engaged in a task of deep meaning for all the developing countries, must be gravely concerned by the uncertainties that cloud her national life." (*Economic Times*, Feb. 10, 1968). The US imperialists and the Soviet revisionists have indeed a vital common interest in India, which is to turn her into a base against China and the rising people's revolutions. To quote Woods "India is an exceptionally dramatic case because of its size and its location on the troubled Asian continent." (*Ibid*).

ca. the
the
line
of
Co-
th

The UNCTAD-II is destined to prove itself another frustrating experience for the "developing" countries and another US-Soviet joint manoeuvre to strengthen their joint domination over these countries. The Indian people will never agree with or approve Sm. Gandhi's proposals to bring India under joint US-Soviet domination. UNCTAD-II in New Delhi has only one lesson for the Indian people—to sharpen vigilance against and resolutely oppose the counter-revolutionary conspiracy of US-Soviet-Indian ruling circles against the peoples of India, China and the whole of Asia.