

# Liberation

May '68

1. Serve The People
2. Statement By Mao Tse-tung
3. The Co-ordination Committee  
—Its Nature and Object
4. The Role of The Individual  
In Making History And Lenin
5. The Revolutionary Path Is The  
Only Path
6. History of The CPI
7. China Creates New Educational  
System
8. Fascist Dictatorship In The  
Soviet Union

## LIBERATION

Serve the People— <i>Mao Tse-tung</i>	...	3
Statement by Comrade Mao Tse-tung in Support of the Afro-American Struggle	...	5
Notes :		
<i>The Betrayal</i>	...	7
<i>To be or not to be with them</i>	...	12
<i>Kosygin's Sinister Mission</i>	...	16
<i>Stop This Offensive</i>	...	91
<i>About Ourselves</i>	...	92
The Co-ordination Committee —Its Nature and Object	...	17
Soviet Union Under Revisionist Rule	...	26
A New Assessment of the History of the CPI— <i>Bande Ali Khan</i>	...	39
China Creates New, Proletarian System of Education— <i>Asit Sen</i>	...	52
The Role of the Individual In Making History and Lenin	...	58
The Revolutionary Path Is The Only Path— <i>Manab Mitra</i>	...	65
The Growing Struggle of Nagas and Mizos Against Oppression	...	86
Rebellion is Right !	...	93

Editor-in-chief :  
Sushital Ray Choudhury

Quotation from  
Chairman Mao Tse-tung

"The present upsurge of the peasant movement is a colossal event. In a very short time, in China's central, southern and northern provinces, several hundred million peasants will rise like a mighty storm, like a hurricane, a force so swift and violent that no power, however great, will be able to hold it back. They will smash all the trammels that bind them and rush forward along the road to liberation. They will sweep all the imperialists, warlords, corrupt officials, local tyrants and evil gentry into their graves. Every revolutionary party and every revolutionary comrade will be put to the test, to be accepted or rejected as they decide. There are three alternatives. To march at their head and lead them? To trail behind them, gesticulating and criticizing? Or to stand in their way and oppose them? Every Chinese is free to choose, but events will force you to make the choice quickly."

("Report on an Investigation of the Peasant Movement in Hunan", 1927)

## Serve The People

—Mao Tse-tung

[A speech delivered at a memorial meeting for Comrade Chang Szu-teh, held by organisations directly subordinate to the Central Committee of the Chinese Communist Party]

Our Communist Party and the Eighth Route and New Fourth Armies under its leadership belong to the camp of revolution. This camp devotes itself to the liberation of the people and works entirely for their interests. Comrade Chang Szu-teh<sup>1</sup> belonged to our camp.

Death awaits all men but its significance varies with various persons. The ancient Chinese writer Szuma Ch'ien said, "Although death befalls all men alike, in significance it may be weightier than Mount Tai or lighter than a swan's down."<sup>2</sup> In significance, to die for the interests of the people is weightier than Mount Tai, but to work hard and die for the fascists, for those who exploit and oppress the people, is lighter than a swan's down. Comrade Chang Szu-teh died for the interests of the people, and his death is weightier in significance than Mount Tai.

If we have shortcomings, we are not afraid to have them pointed out and subjected to criticism, because we are serving the people. Any one may do this to us, no matter who he is. So long as he is right, we will correct ourselves immediately. If what he proposes will benefit the people, we will accept it. The idea of "picked troops and simplified administration", for example, was put forward by Mr Li Ting-ming,<sup>3</sup> a non-Party man; since he made a good suggestion that would benefit the people, we have adopted it. If in the interests of the people, we persist in doing what is good as well as rectifying what is wrong, our camp will surely thrive.

We came from all corners of the country, and have met together on the road leading to a common revolutionary goal. Along this road we shall yet march with the vast majority of the Chinese people. Today we are already exercising leadership

over a population of 91 million<sup>4</sup> in the base areas, but this is not enough, and to liberate the entire nation the number must be further increased. In times of difficulty our comrades must be able to see our achievements and the bright side of things and screw up their courage. Since the Chinese people are suffering and we have the duty to save them, we must exert ourselves in struggle. Struggle necessarily entails sacrifice, and death is a common occurrence. But if we keep in mind the interests of the people and the suffering of the great majority, then we see that to die for the people's sake is to die a worthy death. Nevertheless, we ought to avoid as much as possible unnecessary sacrifices. Our cadres should be concerned about every soldier, and all people in the revolutionary ranks should care for each other and love and help each other.

From now on, if any one in our ranks who has done some good work passes away, there should be a funeral procession and a memorial meeting to render him honour whether he is a cook or soldier. This should become a regular practice. And it should also be introduced among the common people. When some one dies in a village, hold a memorial meeting for him. This will serve to express our mourning for the deceased and to unite all the people.

September 8, 1944

<sup>1</sup> A soldier in the Guards Regiment of the Central Committee of the Chinese Communist Party and a Party member serving the people with great devotion. He joined the revolution in 1933, took part in the Long March and was wounded in service. On September 5, 1944, when making charcoal in the mountains of Ansai county, northern Shensi, he was killed by the sudden collapse of a kiln.

From "Letter to Jen Shao-ching" by Szuma Ch'ien (about second century B.C.), famous Chinese writer and historian, author of the *Historical Records*.

An enlightened member of the gentry in northern Shensi once elected Vice-Chairman of the Shensi-Kansu-Ningsia Border Region Government.

This was the total population of the Shensi-Kansu-Ningsia border region and that of all other liberated areas in North, Central and South China.

## Statement by Comrade Mao Tse-tung

*Chairman of the Central Committee of the  
Communist Party of China, in Support of  
the Afro-American Struggle Against  
Violent Repression*

*Following is the full text of the statement by Chairman Mao Tse-tung issued on April 16, 1968 in support of the Afro-American struggle against violent repression :*

Some days ago, Martin Luther King, the Afro-American clergyman, was suddenly assassinated by the U.S. imperialists. Martin Luther King was an exponent of non-violence. Nevertheless, the U.S. imperialists did not on that account show any tolerance towards him, but used counter-revolutionary violence and killed him in cold blood. This has taught the broad masses of the black people in the United States a profound lesson. It has touched off a new storm in their struggle against violent repression sweeping well over a hundred cities in the United States, a storm such as has never taken place before in the history of that country. It shows that an extremely powerful revolutionary force is latent in the more than twenty million black Americans.

The storm of Afro-American struggle taking place within the United States is a striking manifestation of the comprehensive political and economic crisis now gripping U.S. imperialism. It is dealing a telling blow to U.S. imperialism, which is beset with difficulties at home and abroad.

The Afro-American struggle is not only a struggle waged by the exploited and oppressed black people for freedom and emancipation, it is also a new clarion call to all the exploited and oppressed people of the United States to fight against the barbarous rule of the monopoly capitalist class. It is a tremendous aid and inspiration to the struggle of the people throughout the world against U.S. imperialism and to the

struggle of the Vietnamese people against U.S. imperialism. On behalf of the Chinese people, I hereby express resolute support for the just struggle of the black people in the U.S.

Racial discrimination in the U.S. is a product of the colonialist and imperialist system. The contradiction between the black masses in the U.S. and U.S. ruling circles is a class contradiction. Only by overthrowing the reactionary rule of the U.S. monopoly capitalist class and destroying the colonialist and imperialist system can the black people in the U.S. win complete emancipation. The black masses and the masses of white working people in the U.S. have common interests and common objectives to struggle for. Therefore, the Afro-American struggle is winning sympathy and support from increasing numbers of white working people and progressives in the U.S. The struggle of the black people in the U.S. is bound to merge with the American workers' movement and eventually end the criminal rule of the U.S. monopoly capitalist class.

In 1963, in the "Statement Supporting the Afro-Americans in Their Just Struggle Against Racial Discrimination by U.S. Imperialism" I said that "the evil system of colonialism and imperialism arose and thrived with the enslavement of Negroes and the trade in Negroes, and it will surely come to its end with the complete emancipation of the black people." I still maintain this view.

At present, the world revolution has entered a great new era. The struggle of the black people in the U.S. for emancipation is a component part of the general struggle of all the people of the world against U.S. imperialism, a component part of the contemporary world revolution. I call on the workers, peasants and revolutionary intellectuals of all countries and all the people who are willing to fight against U.S. imperialism to take action and extend strong support to the struggle of the black people in the U.S. ! People of the whole world, unite still more closely and launch a sustained and vigorous offensive against our common enemy, U.S. imperialism and its accomplices ! It can be said with certainty that the complete collapse of colonialism, imperialism and all systems of exploitation, and the complete emancipation of all the oppressed peoples and nations of the world are not far off.

## NOTES

### THE BETRAYAL

As expected, the so-called Plenum of the Central Committee of the CPI (M) held recently at Burdwan, has put the final seal of approval on an ideological and political line that is essentially revisionist. Sometime ago, Chinese comrades said that those who were neutral on the issues facing the world communist movement would soon take the opportunist road and end by joining the counter-revolutionary camp. While the great ideological battle raged, the leaders of the CPI (M) pretended to remain neutral between Marxism-Leninism and revisionism ; but their words as well as deeds showed that they were pursuing a revisionist, counter-revolutionary line. Theirs was indeed a sham neutrality as we pointed out in the April issue of *Liberation*. It is good that at Madurai and later at Burdwan, they had to define their stand on the ideological issues. But these wily, crafty men have tried their utmost to combine their sham loyalty to the Marxist-Leninist principles with their real support to revisionist theories and policies of the leading clique of the CPSU. They have sought to cover up their betrayal with Marxist phraseology but the mask can hardly conceal their true features.

Last year, the Naxalbari peasant revolt exposed the counter-revolutionary character of this neo-revisionist clique more effectively than anything before. It is no secret that these men worked as tools of the reactionary classes and as a part of their state machinery to drown the peasants' struggles in blood. Burdwan has completed the unmasking of these agents of reaction who masquerade as Marxists. There is no doubt that the document that they have adopted will stick like a thorn in their flesh and hasten the doom from which no counter-revolutionary can escape. "Opportunism's present triumph", to use the words of Lenin, "will be short-lived."

On all major issues dividing the Marxist-Leninists from the revisionists, the bunch of opportunists known as the leaders of the CPI (M) has chosen to toe the revisionist line. Like the Soviet revisionists, they hold that the principal contradiction today is the contradiction between the socialist camp and the imperialist camp. They reject what the Chinese comrades and Marxist-Leninists everywhere else declare: "The contradiction between the revolutionary peoples of Asia, Africa and Latin America and the imperialists headed by the United States is the principal contradiction in the contemporary world." (Lin Piao, *Long Live the Victory of People's War*). They deliberately distort the meaning of the formulation in the Moscow statement of 81 Parties—"The socialist system is becoming the decisive factor in the development of society"—and declare like Khrushchev and his men: "the socialist system is becoming the decisive factor determining the course of world development." The Moscow statement of 1960 correctly pointed out that in the development of society, the socialist system is becoming *decisive*, meaning *final*, and will face no rival system. The capitalistic system which once embraced the whole world has started disintegrating since the October Socialist Revolution. After the Second World War, the process of disintegration has been quite rapid, the socialist system which came into existence in 1917, has widened its boundaries and strengthened its position. Now the world is faced with two parallel systems, one socialist and the other capitalist. While the socialist system is growing, the capitalist one is decaying. So, according to the laws of development, the socialist system will become in future the only system embracing the whole world. The neo-revisionists have changed the whole line to present an utterly anti-Marxist view of social development. Like the Soviet revisionists, they hold that the course of development is determined decisively by the socialist system; thus, they negate the essence of dialectics which, as Lenin showed, is the study of the contradictions inherent in the thing itself. So, the inherent contradictions within capitalism-imperialism, which will cause further disintegration and final collapse of capitalism-imperialism have been carefully

evaded. These have been evaded deliberately with the purpose of undermining the role of the national liberation struggles in colonies and semi-colonies and class struggles in capitalist countries.

Like the revisionists, this bunch of opportunists has also raised the slogan of peaceful transition. They pay lip-service to Marxism when they blame the revisionists for rejecting the universal law of violent revolution as out-moded. But, at the same time, they declare: "It is a fact that violence is alien to the Marxist-Leninist ideals. The foremost thinkers, founders and leaders of Marxism-Leninism were always eager to find out ways and means to restrict, minimise and, if possible, to avoid the bourgeois violence in the way of effecting the socialist revolution, since peaceful transition is advantageous to the proletariat." The Ranadives are again at their old game—the game of prostituting Marxism-Leninism. In an article (published in *Liberation* No. 2) the Editorial Board of *Deshabrati* pointed out, "When Lenin says force and violence are alien to the ideal of socialism, he means that socialism abolishes exploitation of man by man and as such force is alien to it. But by this he never means that advance to the ideals of socialism implies abandoning the use of force altogether and following the peaceful path in dealing with the class enemies. Precisely for this reason, Lenin, while criticising Kautsky's opportunism, said: 'Socialism is opposed to violence against nations. This is indisputable. But Socialism is opposed to violence against men in general. Apart from Christian-anarchists and Tolstoyans, however, no one has yet drawn the conclusion from this that socialism is opposed to revolutionary violence. Hence, to talk about 'violence' in general, without examining the conditions which distinguish reactionary from revolutionary violence, means being a petty bourgeois who renounces revolution, or else it means simply deceiving oneself and others by sophistry.'"

"The necessity of systematically imbuing the masses with *this* [the idea of the inevitability of violent revolution] and precisely this view of violent revolution," said Lenin in *The*

*State and Revolution*, "lies at the root of the entire theory of Marx and Engels. The betrayal of this theory by the now prevailing social-chauvinist and Kautskyite trends expresses itself strikingly in both these trends ignoring such propaganda and agitation." Following in the footsteps of Kautsky and other renegades from socialism, the opportunist heroes of the CPI(M) carry on an altogether different kind of propaganda and agitation while swearing hypocritically by Marx, Engels and Lenin. "There is no denying the fact," declare these lackeys of the reactionary classes, "that the proletariat would prefer to achieve the revolution and win power by peaceful means. Marx, Engels and Lenin, as the foremost leaders of the world proletariat, did strive to achieve the socialist revolution by peaceful means wherever and whenever such an opportunity did open before them without allowing it to be missed." With shameless impudence they write, "Guided by their great teachings and their practice, our Party, as correctly incorporated in our Party Programme, 'strives to achieve the establishment of People's Democracy and socialist transformation through peaceful means', while, of course, not forgetting for a moment that the ruling classes seek to bar this road at every turn by resorting to violence and terror and hence the need to be ever vigilant and prepared to meet all such exigencies." On this issue there is no essential difference between them and the Dange revisionists. Agreeing with the then Home Minister Nanda that there has been "a new orientation in the world communist movement" in favour of peaceful transition, Basavapunniah wrote: "Unlike the earlier rare and exceptional possibilities of the peaceful transition of the socialist revolution new additional possibilities of it in some countries has been visualized, under the new world conditions that are obtaining today...it is expected that all this would greatly restrain the ruling classes from resorting to the adventures of violence, and in some countries at least certain possibilities have arisen for such a peaceful path to be explored and utilized by the Communists of those countries. It is exactly on the basis of this new assessment that we have introduced this new concept of peaceful transition

to Socialism in our Party Programme. The formulation of this concept as well as the general warning against the danger of violence, usually unleashed by the ruling classes, is exactly similar to the one put forth in the Programme of the Dangeites." (Basavapunniah: "Letter to Nanda", *People's Democracy*, January 30, 1966). Is this the voice of a Marxist-Leninist or of a revisionist—a lackey of imperialism and domestic reaction?

Swearing openly by "a new orientation in the world communist movement", that is, by the Khrushchevite theory about peaceful transition, these opportunists are eager to explore and utilise the peaceful, parliamentary road. So it is not accidental that these enemies of revolution are completely silent on the question of seizure of power and the smashing of the reactionary state machine.

The "Marxist" heroes are out to discover a new path for the Indian Revolution, which will be neither like the Russian nor like the Chinese. The search has been going on for more than forty years and they are yet to announce the results of their labour.

When they reject the Chinese path, they repudiate the authority of the greatest living Marxist-Leninist, Mao Tse-tung, who teaches us that this path is not peculiar to China alone, that the peoples of all colonial and semi-colonial countries of Asia, Africa and Latin America must follow this path to liberation from the yoke of imperialism, feudalism and comprador capital. Their "Indian" path, the path along which these opportunists have been travelling, is actually the path of class collaboration and betrayal of the vital interests of the toiling people. That is why, they enter into alliances with the most reactionary and rabidly anti-communist parties in order to form coalition ministries which act faithfully as the tools of imperialism, feudalism, and comprador capital. What common interests, however partial or temporary, can there be between the party of the working class and parties representing the interests of big jotedars and landlords and the big bourgeoisie? The "Indian" path is also not peculiar to India: this is the path pursued everywhere by social

democrats and revisionists who have gone over to the enemy—the path which has led to the degeneration of mighty communist parties like those of France, Italy and Indonesia.

So China, the centre of the world revolution, is the main target of attack of theirs as of their masters—the U.S. imperialists, the Soviet revisionists and the domestic reactionaries. They may make trouble a little longer but they are sure to fail; the rising tide of revolution will soon sweep away all the vermin.

### TO BE OR NOT TO BE WITH THEM

To demarcate themselves from the neo-revisionist clique or not—that is the question all Marxist-Leninists, still within the CPI(M), must now answer.

Comrades from Andhra placed an alternative draft on ideological issues at the Burdwan Plenum and, as expected, it was rejected by that rigged body. In the course of his speech, one of the comrades declared: "Our differences with the CC draft are fundamental, matters involving basic principles...". He condemned the CC draft for refusing 'to expose ruthlessly and mercilessly the revisionist theories and policies of the leadership of the CPSU and their pernicious effects' and for serving as 'an apologia for Soviet revisionism'; for refusing 'to locate the class roots of Soviet revisionism and to see the antagonistic class contradiction between Marxism-Leninism and modern revisionism'; for refusing to treat 'Soviet revisionism as the class enemy' and for advocating a policy of united front with Soviet revisionism; for refusing to recognise 'the leading role of PRC and CPC in the fight against imperialism and Soviet revisionism,' for 'treating the CPC leadership as left sectarian and for adding its own contribution for the spread of anti-China propaganda in our country'; for refusing to see 'the decisive role of the National Liberation Movement in the final disintegration of imperialism' and to recognise 'People's War as the universal form of struggle applicable to all backward countries, including India, in their struggle against imperialism'; for refusing to take 'the criticism of the CPC on our policies and tactics of struggle in a

comradely spirit and for advocating a reformist line instead of a revolutionary path of struggle.'

The comrade from Andhra exposed the policy of hostility towards China pursued by these neo-revisionist leaders for quite some time. In this Connection he referred to the *unanimous* report made to the 81 parties conference in 1960 on behalf of the Indian delegation which happened to include Namboodiripad and Ramamurti. In this report the delegation *unanimously* supported the Soviet position on the China-India border question and opposed the Chinese stand on it.

In its report on ideological discussions in the different states the Polit Bureau bewailed: "...We want to draw the attention of the Plenum delegates to the fact that in spite of the Central Committee decision that the Party Programme and other Central Committee decisions, like New Situation and Our Tasks, etc. are not open for discussion, these comrades (who met at the Andhra State Plenum) challenged all these documents, and a discussion was forced in Plenum. We, P. B. members present at the time, could not stop it when the overwhelming majority of the delegates who had assembled there were in no mood to accept the Party Programme and other Central Committee decisions, on the ground that they do not accept the Central Committee's ideological positions and as such the Party Programme which was based on a certain ideological basis and all other Central Committee decisions following the Party Programme were to be changed." The same thing also happened in Trivandrum, but in Quilon the move to initiate the discussion was overruled by C. H. Kanaran.

Speaking on the question of People's War and peaceful transition, the comrade from Andhra ridiculed the *New Situation and Our Tasks* and showed that the analysis of the 'new' situation (the economic crisis leading to the initial stages of the political crisis) and the slogans are exactly the same as offered by the revisionist chief Ajoy Ghosh to the Third Party Congress in 1953 and as recorded in the resolution of the Third Congress. Condemning the parliamentary path and the U. F. Governments, the comrade from Andhra said: "The whole

crux of the matter is that instead of basing agrarian revolution as the apex of our work, elections, mass agitation and limited mass strike struggle, slipping from election to election has become the main apex of our entire party work. Practice has revealed that instead of using the non-Congress governments as instruments of struggle, subordination of the mass struggles to the preservation of the U. F. Governments has dominated the whole of our work. Not only that, In spite of the establishment of non-Congress governments mass struggles have again begun to occur throughout India. Government has been threatening these movements with repression. Intensified repression is being resorted to against certain sections of the movement. Instead of rousing the masses to the necessity of resisting this repression and preparing the Party ideologically, politically, organisationally to meet this repression, we are restricting the scope and the intensification of the mass struggle all in the name of preserving the legality of the Party in the face of repression. *It is in the context of these rising struggles Naxalbari Peasant Struggle has acquired a symbolic importance for the path of the Indian revolution. Instead of taking lessons from it and taking steps to prepare the Party for such types of struggle in various parts of the country, we resorted to wholesale condemnation of the struggle.* Comrades, we have not raised the perspective of the path of struggle from the point of academic discussion. Our movement in Srikakulam, Nalgonda, Warangal, Khammam are being subjected to intensified repression from landlord-goonda-police combine. Police camps are being set up, mass arrests, beatings, thousands involved in cases, even shootings and raping of women are being resorted to. The question of resistance to this repression, the forms of resistance have come to the forefront. Because of lack of a clear perspective of the path of struggle, the leadership is not able to gear the Party and the masses for resisting this repression, and take the movement to a higher level."

What unites Marxist-Leninists with these rank opportunists, the neo-revisionist leaders of the CPI (M)? It is obvious

that everything divides Marxist-Leninists from these apologists of Soviet revisionism; it is obvious that there is nothing that is common between Marxist-Leninists and the counter-revolutionaries who follow the peaceful parliamentary road, the road of class collaboration and capitulation to foreign and domestic reaction; it is clear as daylight that everything divides Marxist-Leninists from the sham Marxists who have substituted nationalism for socialism, who have exposed themselves as utterly chauvinist, bourgeois and liberal on the China-India border dispute, on the issues affecting the right of self-determination of the Kashmiris, the Nagas, the Mizos etc. Lenin said that "the opportunists are in fact a non-proletarian element hostile to the socialist revolution,"—"bourgeois enemies of the proletarian revolution."

At the Burdwan Plenum the Andhra comrades correctly pointed out that the contradiction between the Soviet revisionists, the chief ally of U.S. imperialism, on the one hand, and the Socialist camp and the people of the world, including the Soviet people, on the other, is an antagonistic one. That is why, they rightly declared that the unity in action between the Soviet revisionists and the Chinese comrades is impermissible. No doubt, the contradiction between the leading clique of the CPI(M), a contingent of modern revisionism, on the one hand, and Marxists-Leninists and the toiling people of India, on the other, is antagonistic, too. The question is, is it permissible for Marxist-Leninists to continue in the same party with those who have repudiated Marxism-Leninism, the thought of Mao Tse-tung and who violate all principles of proletarian internationalism? Is it permissible for revolutionary comrades to belong to the same party with revisionist traitors who work as agents of reaction to put down revolutionary struggles and undermine People's War? Soon after the start of the First World War when the leaders of the Second International and the established socialist parties of Western Europe betrayed socialism and surrendered to the bourgeoisie of the respective countries, Lenin said:

"The aims of socialism at the present time cannot be fulfilled,

and real international unity of the workers cannot be achieved, without a decisive break with opportunism, and without explaining its inevitable fiasco to the masses." (*The War and Russian Social-Democracy*)

We strongly hold that any wavering on this question at the present moment, any failure to repudiate *openly* the treacherous politics and organisational leadership of this detachment of modern revisionism, will only strengthen it, raise illusions among the people that joint work with it under its organisational leadership is still possible, and confuse and undermine the revolutionary struggles that are breaking out. We believe that unity with it may even cause degeneration among the revolutionary comrades themselves. Speaking on united action with the Khrushchvite revisionists, Comrade Enver Hoxha pointed out at the Fifth Congress of the Albanian Party of Labour: "Actually, to co-operate with revisionists, to take united actions with them, is to slip gradually into the revisionist positions, to accept their treacherous line." To maintain even formal unity within the same party with the neo-revisionists, the bitter enemies of the Indian revolution, may prove to be much worse. On the other hand, an *open* repudiation of them ideologically, politically and organisationally, a decisive break with them, can release fresh revolutionary energy and enthusiasm among our people, sow confusion and despair among revisionists and neo-revisionists, and hasten their doom.

#### KOSYGIN'S SINISTER MISSION

What brought the world's revisionist chief, Kosygin, to New Delhi a second time in the space of less than three months? It is interesting to note that on both occasions the visits had been announced only a few days or hours before they took place. The earlier visit in January occurred when Kosygin's mentor, Tito, was here. Kosygin came again in April after his talks with Ayub and after issuing a joint communique with Ayub on the need to revive the Tashkent spirit. "After 90 minutes of face to face talks with Mrs Gandhi at which only a

(Continued on page 87)

## The Co-ordination Committee of the Revolutionaries of C.P.I.(M)—Its Nature and Object

Last November, a number of comrades of some States met in Calcutta and decided to form an All India Co-ordination Committee of the revolutionaries in the C.P.I.(M). A provisional Committee, which consisted of some members present at the first sitting, was formed and it set before it the basic aim of consolidating all the revolutionaries in India and of going ahead, step by step, towards the formation of a revolutionary party. There was not much secrecy about this sitting and the Co-ordination Committee formed here circulated quite publicly a Declaration at the end of the sitting.

Notwithstanding the quite open nature of this sitting, the bourgeois newspapers lost no time in concocting imaginary and fantastic news about it. The bourgeois press was then full of stories, e.g., a third Communist Party and its Polit Bureau have been formed in Calcutta, the Polit Bureau has been sitting for seven days, so on and so forth. It is difficult to say how the general readers were disturbed by these news; but they surely disturbed the revolutionary comrades. Failing to understand the real nature and significance of the sitting, the genuine revolutionary workers were filled with suspicion whether some people were again arbitrarily trying to foist a leadership on the revolutionaries. The revolutionary comrades of India have seen enough and been deceived enough. So, their suspicions were quite justified. However, in many group sittings held on the demand of the revolutionary comrades, efforts have been made to explain the formation of the Co-ordination Committee and its basic aims. In consequence, confusions and doubts have largely been dispelled. But it is impossible through these small group-sittings, to consolidate and contact the innumerable revolutionaries who have either

come forward or have been still coming forward. So, it appears that confusions, doubts and questions have been still persisting among many comrades. The Co-ordination Committee, therefore, feels it necessary to place before all revolutionary activists how it views the problem of building up a revolutionary party.

Before we say anything on this, we quote the relevant extract from the Declaration of the Co-ordination Committee. This extract reads :

“Comrades must have noted that revolutionary peasant struggles are now breaking out or going to break out in various parts of the country. It is an imperative revolutionary duty on our part as the vanguard of the working class to develop and lead these struggles as far as possible. With that end in view, all revolutionary elements inside and outside the party working rather in isolation to-day in different parts of the country and on different fronts of mass struggle must co-ordinate their activities and unite their forces to build up a revolutionary party guided by Marxism-Leninism, the Thought of Mao Tse-tung.”

In the quoted extract one can find that the problem of party-building has not been made vague by indiscriminate wording. There was none in the Co-ordination Committee who had even the ghost of an idea that a party had been formed in the Calcutta sitting; rather the sitting put some concrete suggestions about some urgent and imperative tasks the accomplishment of which is necessary for the formation of a revolutionary party. The first thing to be done for the formation of such a party is not merely the co-ordination and unification of the revolutionary comrades but the co-ordination and unification of their activities and their forces. This is the idea that has been emphasised in the Declaration. The Declaration, of course, does not mean by revolutionary comrades those who only mouth revolutionary phrases. According to the Declaration, revolutionary comrades are those who have been participating in various fields of people's struggles. The most important thing is that such wording

in the Declaration is not fortuitous. In fact, it is the profound understanding of the scientific method of forming a revolutionary party that has prompted the use of such language. This understanding has most powerfully been expressed in the Declaration where it says : “As the vanguard of the working class, it is our imperative revolutionary task to lead and unfold peasant struggles everywhere in the country.” The Declaration on the one hand, states that to carry out this task well a revolutionary party based on Marxism-Leninism and enriched by Mao Tse-tung's thought, must be formed ; on the other hand, it emphasises clearly that this task of party-building is only possible through the co-ordination of revolutionary activities and consolidation of revolutionary forces. So far as the inter-relation between revolutionary activity and a revolutionary party is concerned, the Declaration has, in this way, sought to uphold this scientific idea that in the life of a revolutionary the authority is revolution itself, and not the revolutionary party. This means that the completion of the revolution is the ultimate aim and the revolutionary party is the indispensable organisational means to this end. Without a staunch revolutionary party, revolution cannot be brought to a successful consummation. That is why, there is the urge for forming a revolutionary party. A party is formed not for the sake of formation, but for the completion of the revolution, and, if it is so, then we have to acknowledge this hard reality that the birth and growth of a genuinely revolutionary party is possible only through the storm and stress of sharp revolutionary class struggles. Such a revolutionary party can never come into being merely through an ideological revolt or struggle. Even ideological struggles, divorced from revolutionary class struggles, are no struggles at all. They are reduced to mere phrase-mongering. The above extract from the Declaration has sought to emphasise the relation between revolution and the struggle for the formation of a revolutionary party.

Quite naturally the authors of the Declaration proceeded from this understanding when they met for the first time.

Consequently, they studiously avoided the mechanical process of convening a conference of the revolutionary comrades and forming a revolutionary party therefrom. Instead, they laid the entire stress on organising revolutionary struggles in every sphere and on the fundamental task of co-ordinating them. But such struggles can never be organised and carried on continuously if they do not synchronise with uncompromising struggles against all types of revisionist ideas and practice. So the Declaration gave a call for ideological struggle and called upon all to disseminate Mao Tse-tung's thought, Marxism-Leninism of our times, among the masses. Thus, according to the Declaration, the fundamental basis of unity of the revolutionary comrades is Marxism-Leninism and Mao Tse-tung's thought, Marxism-Leninism of the present era. Naturally the Declaration fully disregards the slightest possibility of unity with those who profess to be Marxist-Leninists but are not ready to accept Mao Tse-tung's thought. Because, refusal to accept Mao Tse-tung's thought to-day amounts to the rejection of Marxism-Leninism itself.

If there is a correct analysis of the Declaration of the All India Co-ordination Committee, then this truth will inevitably come out that the scientific idea that should guide the formation of a truly revolutionary party did not escape the cautious notice of the comrades who assembled in Calcutta. It is this caution that led them to avoid any mechanical solution of party-formation.

According to the definition given in the Communist Manifesto, the communists are the most advanced and resolute section of the working class. By way of explaining this, it has been said that a communist is one who remains firm in the frontline of the battle and who, having mastered the course of social development, successfully turns the course of history to its ultimate goal. That is why, Lenin calls the Communist Party the highest form of class organisation. Obviously, such a vanguard can never be formed without revolutionary class struggles which, again, can never be carried

forward without a revolutionary theory. It means that a revolutionary theory becomes worthy of acceptance only when it shapes itself in the midst of struggle. In other words, a revolutionary theory comes into existence through revolutionary activities and its correctness is tested when it is applied to the field of revolutionary struggle. Such is the inseparable link between revolutionary theory and revolutionary practice. It is, of course, true that some of the fundamental principles of revolutionary theory have already proved themselves correct through the process of their repeated application in the course of history. They need not be tested anew. We can accept them as ready weapons. But this acceptance does not mean confining oneself to the mere acknowledgement of them. The test of a revolutionary is not whether he accepts them or not. The test of one's revolutionary mettle is whether one is trying to translate these theories into practice by applying them to the concrete conditions. It is thus seen that one cannot claim to be a real revolutionary without taking part in struggle, let alone enriching the revolutionary theory. Although a revolutionary is born in the course of his successful participation in class struggles at a certain stage, his revolutionary character does not fully develop at the very inception. Because, the true revolutionary at a certain stage of class struggle may, turn a deserter of the revolutionary camp at a more acute stage of class struggle or be a victim of dangerous deviations. So, the revolutionary character, too, like everything else, follows an evolutionary course through severe class struggle. Being tempered in the fire of class struggle, it is possible for one, only at a certain stage of development, to be transformed into a true revolutionary. Revolutionary authority, too, is thus created in the process of unceasing class struggle. Any effort to form a revolutionary party ignoring this stern reality is bound to degenerate and be artificial and mechanical. It is for this reason that the Co-ordination Committee has laid all stress mainly on the organising and sharpening of class struggle at all levels. In the process of this continuous struggle alone, the revolutionary party will be born and, following an

evolutionary course, it will, at a certain stage, attain all the quality of a true revolutionary party. It is by no means possible to organise or develop class struggles by the isolated efforts of individuals or groups, nor is it possible for a well-organised revolutionary party, claiming revolutionary authority, to grow except through the process of struggle. Under the circumstances, the comrades who attended the Calcutta sitting took the only natural course left open to them for overcoming these difficulties. They gave a call to integrate and co-ordinate all revolutionary activities at different levels. It is needless to explain to any revolutionary that such integration demands voluntary submission to some sort of minimum discipline. As a basis of this unity, they have put forward such tasks as are acceptable to all revolutionaries at the initial stage. These tasks are: organisation of class struggles at all levels, particularly the Naxalbari type of struggle in the countryside and, along with that, uncompromising ideological struggle against all brands of revisionist ideas and the extensive propagation of the thought of Mao Tse-tung. It has already been said that without a revolutionary party, revolution can never be successfully accomplished. It is for this reason that all attention has been drawn to the task of building up a revolutionary party. Again a revolutionary party cannot have a sound footing without revolutionary strategy and tactics. So, the Declaration could not but refer to the task of framing documents regarding strategy and tactics. It is to be noted that nowhere in the Declaration is there any hint that a party has been formed and its programme formulated and that revolutionaries are asked to stand by them. Rather, the framers of the Declaration have appealed to the revolutionary activists to close their ranks and co-ordinate the class struggles so that a real advance may be made towards the formation of a party and framing of a programme necessary for it, guided by the scientific principle that the foundation of a revolutionary party is laid through the process of revolutionary struggles; the comrades of the Co-ordination Committee did not hastily form a party. On the same ground, they could not accept this

attitude that a committee representing various groups who have been waging ideological struggles would serve the purpose of such a party. The Co-ordination Committee also did not lose sight of this hard fact that the revolutionaries, either as individuals or as groups, are, more or less, contaminated by petty bourgeois ideas and are victims of revisionist thinking and habits. Since the communist movement for the last forty years has been, in the main, revisionist and since it has passed through many petty bourgeois deviations, it is needless to say that all comrades are, to some extent weighed down by these perverted ideas and practices. Mere repudiation of revisionist leadership or the desire to follow revolutionary politics will not automatically make one fool-proof against revisionism. So, it will be the height of petty bourgeois mentality to think that although some comrades are burdened by revisionism, others are completely free from it. Besides, there are sharp differences on political questions among these groups. So, the proposition that the problem of party-building can be solved by the creation of a centre, consisting of the representatives of different groups, is without any substance. For, difference of opinion is not confined to a few groups alone. There are innumerable comrades who belong to no groups and yet have come forward to take part in revolutionary politics. These comrades have their own differences and we can never ignore them. The fact is that a large number of rank and file comrades, guided by no leadership, had been waging sharp ideological struggles since 1962, and it was in 1964 when the party was formally split that they consolidated themselves in the CPI (M). The urge to consolidate the revolutionary forces led them to consolidate themselves. It is not a fact that these comrades veered round the thirty-two persons of the old leadership because they had accepted them as true revolutionaries. Since no alternative leadership or authority had emerged from the rank and file comrades at that time, innumerable revolutionary comrades gathered round a section of the old leadership, which had broken away from the undivided party, as these comrades found in it a suitable ground to stand upon at the initial stage. Quite

naturally all these forces were consolidated at the Seventh Congress. But even after the Congress, inner-party struggle went on as before. The mighty revolutionary force that we see today is the culmination of ceaseless ideological struggle that has been going on since 1962. This force is no accidental by-product, nor is it the creation of the fostering care of one or more groups. It is true that after the Party Congress many individual comrades and groups had been earning the displeasure of the leadership and some of them had to come out of the party openly. In inner-party struggles, some comrades gradually began to put up an open fight against the leadership; but no group ever thought of open revolt and mobilised its strength for the purpose. Though the revolutionary forces had been gathering strength through inner-party struggle, it had been after all, a very slow process. Then came the Naxalbari peasant struggle which unleashed, on a wide scale, a mighty force that over-shadowed all sorts of group efforts. The party leadership was tested anew not on the basis of the political thesis of this or that group, but in the context of Naxalbari peasant struggles. This led to the widening and deepening of the ideological struggle. In the light of these events, the proposal that the problem of party-building can be solved by the creation of a centre, representing various groups, is absolutely inadmissible. In that case, something would have been imposed on the revolutionaries. The question may now arise: if a centre, representing different groups, is not fit to impose its decision, is it permissible for a single group to do that? Certainly not. That is why, the Co-ordination Committee did never assume the role of a group and for that very reason did not evolve any formula for uniting with other groups. The emergence of a mighty revolutionary force, in the wake of the Naxalbari struggle, opened the eyes of many comrades and this led them to think that these forces must be consolidated; but as there was no party to do that, it was through class struggles that this consolidation must be effected. Out of this consideration some comrades met in Calcutta and formed a Co-ordination Committee. Their object was to take the initiative of placing before the revolutionary comrades

a proposal that a revolutionary party can only be built up by grasping revolutionary politics and sharpening class struggles. Besides, Naxalbari event, there was another which made this meeting possible. As a sequel to the Deshabitaishi incident, the Deshabrati came into existence.\* The unprincipled political attack launched by the neo-revisionist leadership against the organisers of the Deshabrati had its opposite effect. Comrades of different states started contacting the office of the Deshabrati. Under the impact of Naxalbari struggles, the comrades had been groping for revolutionary politics. These contacts paved the way for the Calcutta meeting in November. To say that the November sitting was organised by a particular group or that they had formed a party, is a mere travesty of the truth. The comrades of the Co-ordination Committee have done only this that they have taken the initiative of leading the class struggles and uniting the comrades who take part in them. This initiative is an indispensable prerequisite to party-building. The Co-ordination Committee is only an initiative-taking body and any one, taking a similar initiative, will have equal right in it. That is why, the members of this committee did not deem it necessary to convene a representative conference with great fanfare. The comrades of the Co-ordination Committee are fully aware that, if what has happened in Naxalbari is repeated in several other areas, the question of party-building will not remain confined to the whims and caprices of a few comrades. That is why, the Co-ordination Committee has laid the utmost stress on organising struggles. This is the real nature of the Co-ordination Committee and this is how it views the question of party building.

\* This refers to the coup d'état by the neo-revisionists for ousting the revolutionary comrades from the editorial board of the Deshabitaishi, the weekly organ of the C. P. I. (M) in Bengali. In consequence, the revolutionaries in the C. P. I. (M) brought out the Deshabrati, their weekly organ in Bengali.

## Soviet Union Under Revisionist Rule

### I

#### Soviet Renegades Exercise Fascist Dictatorship

—Hsiao Chin

The Soviet revisionist ruling clique, while energetically collaborating with U.S. imperialism and reactionaries in all countries in the suppression of the revolutionary people in the world, is at the same time persecuting the revolutionaries at home.

#### WHITE TERROR

This clique is enforcing a Fascist dictatorship over the Soviet revolutionary people in the Soviet Union. Special agents are active in every corner of the country. In the schools, hotels and public centres, agents in the guise of students hide behind newspapers to spy upon progressive students and teachers and keep a close watch on passers-by. According to one middle-school teacher, police agents and spies are everywhere. At any moment revolutionary people are liable to be accused of the crime of "carrying out anti-Soviet activities". A member of a firebrigade team said that the number of secret policemen and agents had trebled compared with the past in the district where he was working. Some carried small tape recorders to take down the conversations of the masses. These recordings are used as "evidence" in persecutions.

#### BLOODY SUPPRESSION

The Soviet revisionist ruling clique carries out cruel suppression and bloody slaughter of the revolutionary people who rebel against its reactionary rule.

Cruel suppression of the workers occurred in Chimkent, South Kazakhstan last June, when the bus workers demonstrated against the actions of policemen who without provocation had beaten a driver to death. The demonstrators raided and burned the provincial police station and a nearby public security centre. The local authorities used army tanks and armoured cars to suppress the bare-handed demonstrators. Ten were killed, and many others were wounded or arrested.

At the beginning of last year, the Soviet revisionist ruling clique added another clause to their criminal code, declaring that anyone who "discredits" the existing social political order or spreads "rumours" against the Soviet revisionist clique is to be sentenced to three years imprisonment. Some Soviet youth demonstrated against this clause, and were mercilessly suppressed. Two of them were thrown into prison.

#### CONCENTRATION CAMPS

Some Soviet intellectuals declare that the Soviet revisionists have set up a number of Fascist-type concentration camps in which several thousand "political prisoners" are secretly detained, under inhuman conditions, including forced labour and a semi-starvation diet. They are exposed to all kinds of arbitrary treatment by the administration. It has recently been disclosed that the public security organisations carried out large-scale arrests in West Ukraine at the beginning of last year. The arrested were put into camps. A run-away from a secret concentration camp said that many people of various nationalities were shut up in the camp, under the worst possible conditions.

#### MENTAL HOSPITAL

A large number of "mental hospitals" have been set up, precisely for the purpose of curtailing the political rights of the Soviet revolutionary masses.

The brutal Fascist dictatorship has aroused the indignation of the revolutionary people throughout the country. A great number of individual and collective letters of appeal and

protest have been sent to the government and Party organizations. The reply has been the sack from their work, a summons to go to police court and threats of arrest. In some cases their punishment has taken the most shocking form of reprisal—forcible confinement in a “mental hospital.” A woman Party member, living in Lenin’s home town, persisted in maintaining the correct Marxist-Leninist proletarian stand and in following Mao Tse-tung’s thought. She was expelled from the Party and confined in a “mental hospital,” for being critical both of the revisionist home and foreign policies. This shows the evil character of the Soviet revisionist ruling clique in their vicious persecution of the Soviet revolutionary people.

In the hands of the revisionist ruling clique with Brezhnev and Kosygin as the chieftains, the socialist state created by Lenin has degenerated into an out-and-out Fascist dictatorship. But the Soviet working people, with their glorious revolutionary tradition, will never submit. Chairman Mao, the great leader of the revolutionary people of the world, says: “...Although the leadership of the Soviet Party and State has now been usurped by revisionists, I would advise comrades to remain firm in the conviction that the masses of the Soviet people and of Party members and cadres are good, that they desire revolution and that revisionist rule will not last long.” The Soviet people are sure to rise in revolution under the banner of Leninism, overthrow the rule of the reactionary revisionist clique and bring the Soviet Union back to socialism.

## II

### “Liberalization” and Westernization in Culture

The Soviet revisionist ruling clique is restoring capitalism in all spheres. Shocking developments in the realm of culture have taken place. Taking advantage of its usurped state power, the propaganda media it controls and the literary and art positions it has captured, this clique is publicizing reac-

tionary bourgeois ideology day and night and spreading the decadent culture and way of life of the Western bourgeoisie to poison and corrupt the minds of the Soviet people. It hopes in this way to preserve its reactionary bourgeois rule.

Chairman Mao has said: “In the world today all culture, all literature and art belong to definite classes and are geared to definite political lines.” Revisionist culture today is an important means of the revisionist ruling clique to enslave the Soviet people spiritually and completely serves its revisionist political line.

### Literary Works Become More Reactionary And Degenerate

To meet revisionist political needs, Soviet literary circles have turned out great quantities of reactionary and counter-revolutionary works. Many of these so-called new creations are violently against Stalin, viciously attack the dictatorship of the proletariat and the socialist system, vilify revolutionary wars, preach bourgeois humanitarianism and the philosophy of survival, and publicize the decadent way of bourgeois life, and so forth.

Ehrenburg’s memoirs *People, Years, Life* attacks Stalin more and more ferociously in one volume after another. *The Fourth Company* by V. N. Sobko and *The Shield and the Sword* by V. M. Kozhevnikov are poisonous weeds of the same nature.

One after another, works are coming out attacking the dictatorship of the proletariat and the socialist system. For instance, Kholopov’s novel about a young docker paints a very gloomy picture of rural and urban life in the Soviet Union in 1937. Kazakov’s novel *Nestor and Tyr* shamelessly prettifies the rich peasants and smears the agricultural collectivization movement.

Works depicting so-called insignificant people and preaching the Western way of life are on the increase. *The Story of Six Companions* by A. T. Gladilin, through describing the so-called growing up of six middle-school students, acclaims

the debauched bourgeois way of life. The aim of the novel's principal character is to make money quick, buy a car and have pleasant drives everywhere on Sundays.

The Soviet literary world is full of works publicizing the philosophy of survival and the horrors of war. They talk about the need to approach major war and psychological problems artistically and take cognizance of man's complicated "spiritual world" in the war. *Zosya* by Bogomoilov and *Love Conquers All* by O. Gonchar are poisonous weeds of this nature.

The Soviet revisionist ruling clique encourages literary circles to callously rehabilitate reactionary writers who were criticized for their vicious attacks on the socialist system and the dictatorship of the proletariat, and lauds them to the skies. These include Zoshchenko and Akhmatova who were severely denounced in the early post-war years and G. Serebryakova who was sentenced to imprisonment in the period of Stalin's leadership. The Soviet revisionist ruling clique also decided to publish Pasternak's reactionary novel *Doctor Zhivago*, which viciously attacks the October Revolution, and it has also brought out the memoirs and a collection of poems of this counter-revolutionary scribbler.

This clique has further encouraged reactionary writers to attack the socialist system and the dictatorship of the proletariat by giving them monetary awards, prizes and medals. Soon after the 23rd Congress of the C. P. S. U. a decision was made to set up a new "State prize," to be awarded to 60 persons every year, ten to those in the literary and art fields, with each prize-winner getting 5,000 roubles. There are also prizes under various other names. In February 1967, the Soviet revisionist ruling clique awarded the title "Socialist Labour Hero" to seven writers at one go. Topping the list was Mikhail Sholokhov, the notorious chieftain of revisionist literature, also known as a "bosom friend" of Khrushchev's.

#### Counter-Revolutionary Plays Dominate Soviet Stage

Fulfilling the Soviet ruling clique's "aims and tasks" in spreading the horrors of war and peddling the philosophy of

survival, the Soviet stage has shown many plays filled with the virus of pacifism. According to *Soviet Culture*, when Konstantin Simonov's *The Living and the Dead*, a novel which distorts facts about the anti-fascist war of the Soviet people and flings mud at the Soviet armymen, was adopted for the stage, the theme of the horrors of war was given even greater predominance.

Another type of play performed is on the so-called theme of "repudiating the Stalin cult," but this is actually a camouflage for villifying the dictatorship of the proletariat. Acclaiming *Man Alive*, which was all the rage on the Soviet stage for a time, for its theme attacking the dictatorship of the proletariat, the *New York Times* said that in it "a frank version of the seamy side of a Russian's Stalinist experience is offered."

Plays banned under Stalin's leadership have been put on again. These include *Snow-storm*, which flagrantly attacks the purge of the counter-revolutionaries and was criticized when it first came out in the 40s.

Plays glorifying the decadent way of life of the high-salaried strata and spreading the poison of bourgeois individualism have been staged, with a widespread pernicious influence. *104 Pages About Love*, which advocates a life of "eat, drink and be merry, for tomorrow you die", was staged in Moscow and Leningrad simultaneously as soon as it came out. No less than four touring troupes put it on during the theatrical season in Dniepropetrovsk.

Many plays by bourgeois writers in the West have also been staged and received lavish praise. *Pravda* admitted that "plays by foreign authors make up most of the repertoire of the (Soviet) theatres" and that these are plays "glorifying the way of life of bourgeois society."

#### Flooded With Western Films

Soviet screens are flooded with American, British, French, Italian and other Western films. The American Film *It's a Mad, Mad, Mad, Mad World* was shown in 42 Soviet cinemas in 1966. "Heroes" in Western films who are madmen,

adventurers, murderers and robbers, have become the examples for many Soviet youngsters to imitate. One person wrote in *Soviet Culture* to the effect that many children committed crimes after seeing murder scenes in Western films.

The peddling of Western films by the Soviet revisionist ruling clique has aroused dissatisfaction on the part of the ordinary Soviet working people. Speaking of the U. S. gangster films, a Soviet woman angrily remarked, "How can we allow gangsterism which corrupts our young people, to be given great publicity? Who is responsible for this sort of propaganda?"

The Soviet revisionist clique has sent a number of films publicizing the horrors of war, pacifism and class reconciliation to western film festivals. For instance, the film adapted from Dmitri Shostakovich's gutter opera *Katerina Izmailova*, which was criticized and repudiated under Stalin's leadership, was sent to the international film festival in Cannes, France last year. Lauding this event, the *New York Times* described it as "interesting evidence of the cultural revisionism taking place in Russia."

Learning from obscene American Dances Rock 'n' Roll, the twist and other such obscene American dances are prevalent in the Soviet Union. Encouraged by the "imitate America" policy of the ruling clique, many Soviet art troupes have added imitations of these Western dances to their repertoire. The Moiseyev Dance Ensemble and the Moscow Bolshoi Ballet Theatre are no exceptions. During its visit to the United States in 1962, the latter went so far as to include "strip-tease" in its programme. Even the U.S. ruling clique was "amazed" by this performance.

The growing zeal with which certain Soviet ensembles are learning from the United States has attracted much attention and has won the plaudits of the Western press. *Life* magazine on June 26, 1964 carried a full-length report under the caption "Russia's Rockettes". The report says: "Well, it's happening. Moscow has started to go Broadway".

The imported dances from the West have been poisoning

the minds of the Soviet youth in every way. Dance halls, it was reported in the Soviet press, were crowded with groups of young people "reeling, marking time and moving convulsively" all night long. Even in the All-Russian competition, "pairs of dancers were found imitating the manners and fancy dress shown in the pages of foreign advertisement."

#### Decadent Western Music Can Be Heard Everywhere

The Khrushchev revisionists invited a U. S. jazz band to perform in the Soviet Union. Khrushchev and other big and small Soviet chieftains were present to applaud.

Jazz festivals have been held every year in the Soviet Union since Brezhnev and Kosygin came to power. Last year, one took place in Tallinn, capital of the Union Republic of Estonia, lasting four days. Jazz bands from some Western countries were invited to attend to give it added lustre. Tass reported that the Tallinn jazz festival, which "has become a well-established tradition", "will be held every year" in the coming years and "will be on an ever larger scale."

Fostered by the Soviet revisionist clique, Western jazz is spreading fast in the Soviet Union. This vulgar music can be heard everywhere in the country, in cities and the countryside, in factories, shops and schools.

In order to restore capitalism, the Soviet revisionist ruling clique has gone all out to stage a counter-revolutionary comeback in the ideological field. But its criminal manoeuvres run directly counter to the trend of history and the aspirations of the Soviet people. Its vicious efforts to spiritually poison and enslave the Soviet people are meeting with resistance from and are denounced by those of the Soviet people who are politically awakened. The day is not far off when the Soviet revisionists will be punished by history.

### III

#### Going All Out With a Revisionist Line In Education

The educational system laid down by the Soviet revisionist ruling clique is a bourgeois education system through and

through, it is a hotbed for cultivating intellectual aristocrats and bringing up the younger generation as revisionist successors.

The Soviet ruling clique has been using high-sounding phrases such as educating the youth in communism and training builders of communism developed in an all-round way to cover up the bourgeois nature of Soviet education. These are only words to deceive people. The very purpose of the Soviet schools is to train the younger generation as revisionists, people who separate themselves from the labouring people and stand above them and who are filled from top to bottom with the bourgeois world outlook. By doing so they aim to preserve and consolidate the revisionist positions of the Soviet ruling clique.

#### REVISIONIST IDEAS INSTILLED

Basing themselves on the Programme of the C.P.S.U., a programme which aims at restoring capitalism in an all-round way, the Soviet revisionists are doing all they can to instil revisionist ideas into the students' minds.

The ruling clique has compiled and published large numbers of revisionist textbooks which tamper with Soviet history, oppose Stalin in a big way, and attack the dictatorship of the proletariat. They are crammed with the revisionist fallacies about "peaceful co-existence," "peaceful transition," and "peaceful competition," "Party of the entire people" and "state of the whole people." Among these books which are against Marxism and against Mao Tse-tung's thought, *History of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union*, *The Principles of Marxism and the Principles of Marxist Philosophy* are the most poisonous.

The Soviet revisionists also preach bourgeois humanitarianism in education and advocate that the youth should always follow the principle that men are friends, comrades, and brothers, no matter whether they are the exploiters and oppressors or the exploited and the oppressed. In total disregard of the reality of the ruthless class struggle taking place in the Soviet Union and other parts of the world,

they have gone so far as to declare that for them communism means magnanimity. They also cram the young people full of the revisionist nonsense about a world without weapons and war, openly obliterating the distinction between just and unjust wars and shamelessly declaring that in the Soviet Union children will not be allowed to see textbooks dealing with war because every war brings calamities to the people.

#### DISCRIMINATION AGAINST LABOURING PEOPLE

Under the Soviet educational system, it is obvious that treatment as between the poor and the rich differs vastly and an extreme inequality prevails. On the one hand are the sons and daughters of the bourgeois privileged strata who enjoy every kind of favourable treatment and on the other are the sons and daughters of the workers, peasants and other working people who are discriminated against and always get unfair treatment.

The system of stipends is used to make the students chase after material incentives. They are encouraged to take the road the intellectual aristocrats have taken. If they do not get good marks for their book knowledge they are not granted stipends. But the better their marks the bigger the stipends given them. And so, it costs the sons and daughters of the privileged strata, with the better schooling they have received, no great efforts to get better marks, bigger stipends, and the title "first-class students." After graduation they will also get better jobs and other favourable treatment in all respects.

On the other hand, the sons and daughters of the labouring people who study in the higher educational institutes in the Soviet Union are discriminated against. The Soviet press minces no words in disparaging the young toiling people, saying that they are incapable and are not the sort of people who can dedicate themselves to science. The Soviet revisionists also use the selective examination system to expel students who are from worker's and peasant's families. *Sovietskaya Rossiya* disclosed that the number of students expelled from the Urals University in the five years from 1962 to 1967 has

increased by almost 200 per cent. Students who had worked for some years before entering the university constituted the great majority of those expelled.

#### Fame, Money and Social Position as a Means To Corrupt the Youth

According to the educational theories of the Soviet revisionists, marks for book knowledge are the sole yardstick for measuring a student. They loudly publicize the idea that knowledge is the "highest arbitrator" with the result that students are led on to the road of divorcing themselves from reality and labour, solely hunting for book knowledge and failing to acquire a socialist political understanding.

Under an education system of this kind, students are only concerned with chasing after better marks in their study and they strive for fame and material gains. Dishonesty in examination is neither a rarity nor a secret. In Moscow University, Communist Youth League branches in certain classes are known to take a lead in organizing their members to cheat in examinations.

Beginning from the third year, a university student in the Soviet Union starts preparing his graduation thesis. If he proves to be "talented" he will be promoted to be a research student. If he completes his research course he becomes a candidate for the doctorate degree. And so the training given to him as a "talented" student comes to an end. Afterwards, he relies on his own "ability" to rise in society.

The Soviet revisionist education system serves to widen the differences in social position and furnishes a ladder for the sons and daughters of the privileged strata to climb to the upper echelon of society. A university diploma is a passport to an official position and getting rich. A diploma means everything. The difference in education received determines the future social position of the youth.

A university graduate may climb to the position of scientist, professor and manager. The salaries of these people are vastly higher than those of the workers and peasants. An engineer gets 100-300 roubles a month, a factory director, 300-1000 roubles, and a professor, 350-2500 roubles, while a worker gets only 35-90 roubles a month.

#### IV

### Soviet Revisionists Actively Serve U.S. "Two Chinas" Plot\*

The Soviet revisionist renegade clique has resorted to every despicable means recently in active collaboration with U.S. imperialism in its criminal plot of creating "two Chinas".

Under the pretence of publicizing the Olympic games, *New Books, U.S.S.R.*, No. 6 of February 5, 1968, a bulletin published by the "International Publishers" of the Soviet Union, printed in a picture in its inside cover the so-called "national emblem" of the Chiang Kai-shek gang. What is more, the Soviet revisionists provocatively sent bundles of this number of the bulletin to the Chinese side. This is another evidence of the crimes committed by the Soviet revisionist renegade clique against China.

The Soviet revisionist renegade clique has long been following U.S. imperialism in its plot to create "two Chinas". In the pictorial "For People of the World" printed by the Soviet "Young Guard" publishing house in 1965, was carried a picture of the Olympic games with the so-called "national flag" of the Chiang Kai-shek gang. As a flagrant political provocation against the 700 million Chinese people, copies of this pictorial were sent to China.

In recent years, especially, after the world-shaking great proletarian cultural revolution in China was launched, the representatives of the Soviet revisionist clique have publicly sat around the same table with the Chiang Kai-shek gang's "representatives" at so-called international conferences. They attended together more than ten conferences sponsored by U.N. organisations in Southeast Asia, including the Conference of the Asian Development Bank on Planning, the Asian Conference on Children and Youth in National Planning and Development, the Conference of the U.N. Economic Commission for Asia and the Far East, the

\*Reprinted from *News from China*

Meeting on the Role of Broadcasting and Television in Education in Asia, the Conference of the World Fellowship of Buddhists, the 13th Meeting of the Asian Advisory Committee and the Asian International Fair.

Meanwhile, the press and periodicals of the Soviet revisionist ruling clique deliberately propagated that China's province of Taiwan is a "state". In two articles in the 21st and 37th issues of the Soviet periodical *Abroad* in 1966, the Soviet revisionists disassociated Taiwan from China and called it a "state." In a news item on July 28 last year, Tass blatantly described Taiwan as a "state." On July 6, 1966, the Soviet paper *Pravda* had the audacity to call Chiang Kai-shek, the public enemy of the Chinese people, the "president of the Kuomintang." Of late, the Soviet revisionists made redoubled efforts to advocate the "two Chinas" fallacy. On February 13 this year, *Pravda* quoting an American imperialist element, preached that "both Taiwan and Peking should be members of the United Nations."

Despite the fact that the Chinese Government had lodged repeated protests with the Soviet authorities, the Soviet revisionists still worked actively in close collaboration with the U.S. imperialists in their criminal activities to create "two Chinas." Instead of putting a stop to such acts, they went from bad to worse, behaving still more despicably, blatantly and arrogantly.

Our great leader Chairman Mao has pointed out: "A flunkey who allows himself to be led by the nose by U.S. imperialism will only end up in the same grave as his master." Taiwan is an inalienable part of the sacred territory of the People's Republic of China. The Chiang Kai-shek brigands entrenched in Taiwan are traitors who have long been spurned by the 700 million Chinese people. By subserviently serving the U.S. imperialists in their criminal plot to create "Two Chinas," the Soviet revisionists will certainly come to no good end.

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

—Bande Ali Khan

[ Continued from the previous issue ]

### XII. Sixth Comintern Congress

The Sixth Congress of the Communist International was held in Moscow from July 17 to September 1, 1928. Although Roy was still a member of its Executive Committee, he did not attend the Congress. Due to his bungling in China, he was then in much disgrace and it was difficult for him to face the Congress.

Seven delegates, claiming to represent India, attended the Congress: Sikander Sur (Shaukat Usmani), Clemens Dutt, Mohammed Shafik, Golam Khan, Luhani, Raza, Mazut (Habib Ahmed Nasim) and Narayan (Saumyendranath Tagore).\*

As a matter of fact, none of these delegates were proper representatives of the Indian Party and had no authority to speak on its behalf. Usmani, after being released from

\* Tagore went to Moscow in 1927 with a certificate from Muzaffar Ahmad that he represented the Workers' and Peasants' Party. Actually, as yet there was no All India Workers and Peasants Party—it existed only in Bengal and some other provinces. The fact is that Ahmad of that time liked Tagore, who considered himself to be the Lenin of India. The arrogance, impudence and vanity of this arm chair revolutionary knew no bounds and ideologically and temperamentally he had much similarity with Bakunin and Trotsky. Later, these two fell out and called each other names. Muzaffar Ahmad has strong personal likes and dislikes and has a special preference for the sons and daughters of aristocrats and bureaucrats and for sycophants. It is on this basis, and not on the merit of work or Marxist principles that Ahmad has run the Party, specially in Bengal, for the last 40 years. He, like the other party leaders is a past master in group politics. These

prison, of his own accord went to Europe to attend this Congress by defying the leading members of his party. Clemens Dutt was a member of the CPGB. Luhani had no other qualifications than his associations with Roy. Shafik, Nasim and Raza, like Usmani, were disqualified by the comrades in India. As to Tagore, he was not a member of the Party; he has been all his life rabidly anti-party, anti-Communist, a staunch individualist and a Trotskyite and has subsequently done a lot of harm to the cause of the proletariat. The entire affair shows in what a miserable state the CPI was at that time.

The Sixth Congress was a very important session. It was held at a critical moment of the international working class movement and many vital questions on theory, strategy and tactics, particularly regarding the Indian anti-imperialist movement, were discussed. The defeat of the Communist Party of China in the revolution of 1927 was a great shock to international communism and, naturally, the Soviet Party's attention was all the more directed towards India and it was constantly repeated in the Soviet press that the errors of the Communist Party of China should be carefully analysed so

petty, personal, sectarian quarrels were one of the main reasons why the CPI never grew into a Marxist-Leninist party. Ahmad's theoretical contribution, like that of most of the leaders of the Party, is nil. Nor did he ever encourage others to do it.

Ahmad, to prove his modesty, says: "In 1921 Communist Parties were formed also in China and France. Comrades with the comrades of these countries we were most insignificant; at least I was very conscious about my incompetence. My knowledge of Marxism was very superficial. However, I plunged into the endless ocean depending on two things: one was my reliance on the people and the other my faith in the guidance of the International." [*Bharater Communist party garar pratham juga* (Bengali)] The fact is that it is quite natural that one starts party work with only a little knowledge of Marxism, but one goes on mastering it through work, struggle and study as the Chinese leaders did, and as the Indian leaders did not. The result is that the CPC learnt to think for itself, the CPI never did. The Chinese stood on their own legs, the

that they would not be repeated in India. The Congress gave so much importance to the Indian problem that one of the Indian delegates, Usmani, was elected to the presidium and was seated third from Stalin. At such a Congress the contribution of the Indian delegates was hardly of any importance. Roy at least could stand up and, rightly or wrongly, could put forward a point of view and make an impression on his audience, but none of these delegates had a fraction of his qualities, although they were as bad as Roy in factional intrigues.

The theory of decolonisation provoked a lot of discussions in the Congress, for on such questions depended the main question—the attitude to be taken towards the Indian National Congress. The term was new—it had been introduced only about nine months before and caused a lot of confusion. The Russian delegates firmly spoke against it and some of the British delegates, including R. P. Dutt, supported it.

The Sixth Congress adopted the first complete general programme for the international Communist movement. This programme was the first such document formulated since the Inaugural Address, written by Marx and adopted by the

Indians always looked for outside guidance; the Chinese have made an epoch-making revolution and are in the forefront of the international anti-imperialist struggle, while the Indian leaders continue to commit blunder after blunder and in 40 years have not even succeeded in building up a Marxist party.

Ahmad's above-mentioned pamphlet of 30 pages (this is the most important achievement of this founder-member of the Party during his 40 years of party life!) is a typical example of the putrified sectarian outlook of the Indian party leaders. After reading this 'history' of the early stage of the Party, one gets the impression that the members did not have to face any problem, any principle, any theoretical question; it only gives some personal details (here also he left out the names of many whom he did not like!)—who met whom, where did he go, where did he sleep, how many times did he go to prison, whose uncle became a Congress Minister later on, etc—which are not even primary facts, and therefore are of no significance for the party history. Such infantile irrelevant chatter can hardly be beaten.

First International in 1864. This brilliant Marxist analysis of the world situation was basically the work of Stalin.

The Congress divided the post-war years into 3 general periods: (1) Extremely acute crisis of the capitalist system and of direct revolutionary action culminating in the victory of the proletarian revolution in Russia on the one hand, and in a series of severe defeats of proletarian uprisings in West European countries, particularly of the German proletariat in 1923, on the other; (2) beginning of the capitalist offensive and a period of gradual and partial stabilisation of the capitalist system; (3) finally, the third period in which capitalism is exceeding the pre-war level, rapid development of technique and accelerated growth of cartels and trusts; it is also a period of intense development of the contradictions of world capitalism, rise of fascism, intensified liberation struggle in the colonies etc.

"This third period, in which the contradiction between the growth of the productive forces and the contraction of markets becomes particularly accentuated, is inevitably giving rise to a fresh series of imperialist wars amongst the imperialist states themselves; wars of imperialist states against the USSR; wars of national liberation against imperialism and imperialist intervention, and to gigantic class battles. The intensification of all *international* antagonisms ...will inevitably lead—through the further development of the contradiction of capitalist stabilization—to capitalist stabilization becoming still more precarious and to the severe intensification of the general crises of capitalism."\*

This conception of the "third period" was ridiculed by the Social Democrats and capitalists as a glaring example of Communist wishful thinking. But the next few years gave this analysis a devastating confirmation, with the development of the Great Economic Crisis of 1929, the victory of Fascism in Germany in 1933, and the outbreak of World War II in 1939.

\* *Inprecor*, Nov. 25, 1928

The Sixth Congress devoted much time to war danger and fascism. The resolution pointed out: "War is inseparable from capitalism. From this it follows that the 'abolition' of war is possible only through the abolition of capitalism." The resolution differentiated between just wars of oppressed peoples against their oppressors and unjust wars of the imperialist states.

The programme of the CI discussed the character of the revolution in different countries. Regarding the colonial and semi-colonial countries it said:

"The principal task in such countries (China, India etc.) is, on the one hand, to fight against the feudal and pre-capitalist forms of exploitation, and to develop systematically the peasant agrarian revolution; on the other hand, to fight against foreign imperialism for national independence."

"...the central task is to fight for national independence."

"In the colonies and semi-colonies where the proletariat is the leader of and commands hegemony in the struggle, the consistent bourgeois democratic revolution will grow into proletarian revolution in proportion as the struggle develops and becomes more intense."

The programme emphasised again and again that the Communist Parties in the colonial and semi-colonial countries "must openly advance, conduct propaganda for, and carry out the slogan of agrarian revolution, rouse the broad masses of the peasantry for the overthrow of the landlords and combat the reactionary and mediaeval influence of the priesthood, of the missionaries and other similar elements.

"In these countries, the principal task is to organize the workers and the peasantry independently (to establish class Communist Parties of the proletariat, trade unions, peasant leagues and committees and—in a revolutionary situation, Soviets etc.), and to free them from the influence of the national bourgeoisie, with whom *temporary* agreements may be made only on the condition that they, the bourgeoisie, do not hamper the revolutionary organization of the workers and peasants and that *they carry on a genuine* struggle against imperialism."

Another lasting contribution of the Sixth Congress was the Thesis adopted by it on the "*Revolutionary Movement in the Colonies and Semi-colonies.*" This is the most important document on the colonial question since Lenin's Colonial Thesis at the Second Comintern Congress in 1920.

✓ The Thesis characterised the revolutionary struggles in the colonies as a bourgeois democratic revolution, and emphasised that "Along with the national-emancipatory struggle, the agrarian revolution constitutes the axis of the bourgeois-democratic revolution in the chief colonial countries." It analysed in detail the role of all the classes in the colonial liberation struggle. The leadership of the revolution was in the hands ✓ of the bourgeoisie. But this bourgeoisie has proved itself to be treacherous. In India it betrayed the great anti-imperialist movement of 1919-22 and in China the revolutionary expedition of 1926-27. It analysed the shifting position of the national bourgeoisie under the contradictory pressures of foreign imperialism and of revolutionary proletariat and peasantry. A part of the bourgeoisie, more specially the trading bourgeoisie ✓ (the comprador), directly serves the interests of imperialist capital. The other section of the colonial bourgeoisie, specially those who reflect the interests of native industry, though they support the national movement, vacillate and compromise with imperialism. Another characteristic of this bourgeoisie is that it is by its immediate interests so closely bound up with landlordism, with usury capital and with the exploitation of the peasant masses in general, that it takes its stand not only against the agrarian revolution but also against every decisive agrarian reform. Under such circumstances the proletariat must come forward and take up the leadership of the bourgeois-democratic revolution. A solid organisation of the working class and of the peasantry was indispensable. The key task was the building of a strong Communist Party capable of undertaking the complex struggle and of giving general political leadership, and bringing about the establishment of "the dictatorship of the proletariat and peasantry." "Without the hegemony of the proletariat, an organic part of which is the leading role of the Communist

Party, the bourgeois democratic revolution could not be carried through to an end, not to speak of the socialist revolution."

The thesis specially laid stress on the revolutionary role of the peasantry and on the urgency of their being organised by the Party. "The peasantry," it said, "along with the proletariat and in the character of its ally, represents a driving force of the revolution. ....The proletariat can achieve its leading role in relation to the peasantry only under the conditions of unflinching struggle for its partial demands, for complete carrying through of the agrarian revolution, and only if it will lead the struggle of the wide masses of the peasantry for a revolutionary settlement of the agrarian question."

The Communist Parties in the colonial countries, the Thesis emphasized, must from the very beginning demarcate themselves in the most clear-cut fashion, both politically and organisationally, from all the petty-bourgeois groups and parties. "The Communist movement in all circumstances must unconditionally preserve the independence of the proletarian movement and its own independence in agitation, in organisation and in demonstrations."

### XIII. *The Parasitic Nature of Imperialism or the Theory of Decolonization?*

*The Revolutionary Movement in the Colonies and Semi-colonies* also gave a final blow to the decolonisation theory which was being propagated by M. N. Roy, R. P. Dutt and Saumyendranath Tagore. The Thesis called it an "imperialist lie," and said that "Communists, both in the imperialist and in the colonial countries, should completely expose this lie."

As in all colonies and semi-colonies, so also in India, "the development of productive forces and the socialisation of labour stands at a comparatively low level. This circumstance, together with the fact of foreign domination and also, the presence of powerful relics of feudalism and pre-capitalist relations, determines the character of the immediate stage of the revolution in these countries."

The Thesis pointed out that the contradictions between imperialism and the independent development of the colonies had sharpened. The role of imperialism is to mercilessly and dangerously exploit the colonies and enslave the colonial people and thereby strengthen its own position. It is a parasite sucking the blood from the economic organism of the colonies.

Capitalism in every imperialist country has proceeded by way of development of the productive forces, while the specific colonial forms of capitalist exploitation, put into operation by imperialism, in the final analysis hinder the development of the productive forces of the colonies concerned. The carrying through of the minimum of constructive activities (railways, harbours etc.) is indispensable both for military domination of the country and for the trading needs of the imperialist countries. Only under the pressure of special circumstances the imperialists are compelled to co-operate in the development of big industry in the colonies to a limited extent. But as soon as that pressure is removed, the imperialists immediately revert to the policy of repressing and retarding the economic development of the colonies.

A basic economic factor of colonialism is that the agrarian economy is not freed from pre-capitalist exploitation. This factor in itself is a great hindrance to economic development.

The profits obtained in the colonies are, for the most part, not spent productively in the country, but are sucked out of the country. "Thus the fundamental tendency of colonial exploitation acts in the direction of hindering the development of the productive forces in the colonies, of despoiling them of their natural riches, and above all, of exhausting the reserves of human productive forces in the colonial countries." Consequently, so long as the economic stranglehold of imperialism remains over the colonies, they cannot have an all-round independent development of their national economy, specially their fullest industrialisation. "Thus the specific character

of the development of the colonial countries is specially expressed in the fact that the growth of productive forces is realised with extreme difficulty, spasmodically, artificially, being limited to individual branches of industry."

The inevitable result of this is that the pressure of imperialism on the colonial and semi-colonial countries is reproduced each time in a higher degree. The continual hindrance to independent and all-round development more and more deepens and sharpens the antagonism between the colonial peoples and imperialism and leads to revolutionary crises, national liberation movement, armed struggle etc.

After the Sixth Comintern Congress the decolonisation theory was quietly buried and it was almost forgotten. But when during the anti-Fascist War the Communist International was dissolved in 1943, suddenly it was resurrected by no other person than M. N. Roy himself. He wrote :

"By 1928, there could not be any illusion about the revolutionary role of the nationalist bourgeoisie. The fact of their seeking to compromise with Imperialism could not be disputed. But a Marxist should discover the cause of that fact. The cause was gradual disappearance of the monopoly of imperialist finance and the consequent 'decolonisation' of India. The benefit of the process all went to Indian capitalism."\*

Roy is dead, but his ghost lives on. The theory of decolonisation appears in a new garb. There are some leftists in India today who deny the neo-colonial character of India. They deny the more intensified "bleeding" process of the national wealth of India by imperialist monopoly capital. They deny that India today is far more dependent on foreign capital than it was during the British rule. They also deny that the present stage of Indian revolution is bourgeois democratic revolution. They claim that India is an independent country, that her independent capitalist class is developing her industries independently, that India is now exporting finance capital, and that India has become one of the advanced capitalist countries of the world, etc. They therefore assert that the present stage of the Indian revolution is socialist revolution. The same old wine in a new bottle.

\* M. N. Roy : *The Communist International*, p. 48

## Chapter II : 1929-39

### I. Favourable Conditions in India

1928-29 was a very turbulent year in India. Trade Union activities increased and many strikes took place. The boycott of the Simon Commission was followed by *hartals* all over India on a mass scale. Bhagat Singh's case roused the youth of India and intensified the revolutionary movement. The Congress initiated the Bardoli peasant movement and the Workers' and Peasants' Party became very active. Leftist Congressmen formed the Independence of India League. Agitation over the Public Safety Bill pushed the nationalist movement much to the Left.

The All-India Trade Union Congress had become a force by 1928. It was established in July 1920. But for sometime it did not make much headway. At the Fourth Comintern Congress it was pointed out that "The Communists had not done much in connection with the great trade union movement in India and the large number of strikes which convulsed the country".\*

From 1923, however, Communists intensified their activities on the trade union front. In that year they established the Girni Kamgar Union in Bombay. In 1928, a terrific strike wave in big industrial cities shook the whole country. There were 203 strikes and more than five lakhs of workers participated in them. The Girni Kamgar Union made history by leading the Bombay textile workers' strike which lasted for nearly six months from April 26 to October 6, 1928. Similar strikes took place in Calcutta among the jute workers. Most of these strikes were led by the Communists.

Nehru presided over the AITUC session held at Nagpur in November-December, 1929. In his address he expressed

\* B. Ashe : "India and World Opinion", *World News and Views*, February 3, 1940.

strong sympathy towards Communism. "The lot of the worker", Nehru said, "cannot be improved much by the goodwill of an employer [obviously a criticism of Gandhi's theory of trusteeship of the employers and landlords] or even of a Government....It is the system that is wrong...which is the natural outcome of capitalism and imperialism, and if you would do away with the system, you will have to root out both capitalism and imperialism and substitute a saner and healthier order." The "class war," Nehru added, was the creation not of the Socialists or Communists but of the "capitalists and imperialists" who have "reduced the great majority of mankind into wage slaves who are worse even in many ways than the slaves of old." The objective of the labour movement, Nehru asserted, could only be a "new order." He concluded that an attempt must be made "to get our national movement also to adopt it."\*

On the controversy of affiliating the AITUC to the Second or Third International, Nehru ruled out the Second summarily, since it had betrayed its principles and had become the experiment of a new type of imperialism, "Labour Imperialism," and "aided the forces ranged against us." On the Third International, Nehru spoke favourably but even then he advised the AITUC not to affiliate itself with it for two main reasons : (1) Due to the restrictions imposed by the Government affiliation with it would not be effective ; (2) "With all my sympathy for the Communist viewpoint ; I must confess that I do not appreciate many of their methods. ...To affiliate with the Third International must mean an adoption of their methods in their entirety."

In order to check the increasing Communist influence in

\* Mitra : *Indian Quarterly Register*, 1929, Vol II, Pp. 425-28. Commenting on one of Nehru's socialist speeches at an AICC meet, the *Lahore Tribune* (Nov. 6, 1928) made a prophetic remark : "He (Nehru) believed in full-blooded socialism, but would not bring that before the Congress now because very few understood it. A time, however, would come when the Congress, for the sake of its own existence, would adopt the socialist programme in full." The time, indeed, came in 1955 at Avadi !

India, the Government introduced a Public Safety Bill in the Central Legislature in September 1928. It became known as the Anti-Communist Bill. It was designed to provide legal means for expelling foreign agitators from India and obviously its immediate target was Spratt and Bradley, both of whom were very active in the trade union and Communist movements. The Government spokesmen tried their best to raise the bogey of Communism, but the Indian representatives, both nationalists and moderates, opposed the Bill. The debate centred round Communism, Soviet Russia, labour movement etc. Indian representatives opposed the Bill not because they favoured Communism, but because of British discomfiture at the increased Communist activities; they also hoped that such a situation would increase their bargaining power against the British. They also thought that if such a repressive measure went unchallenged, the British Government would soon introduce other Bills which might go against the interests of the nationalists. As a result of a tremendous agitation against the Bill all over India, it was defeated.

Other forces were also working which pushed the nationalist movement to the left and created more favourable conditions for the Communist movement. After Jawaharlal's Independence resolution at the Madras Congress session, the Congress called an All Party Conference to draft a constitution for an independent India. It met in February 1928 and appointed a drafting committee under the Chairmanship of Motilal Nehru. The constitution that was produced by this Committee known as the "Nehru Constitution," favoured Dominion Status rather than full independence outside the British Empire. Subhas Bose and Jawaharlal opposed it. Srinivas Iyengar who had just returned from the Soviet Union, denounced it. These leaders then joined and founded the Independence for India League. On November 3, at a meeting at Delhi it declared its objective as "the achievement of complete independence for India and reconstruction of Indian society on a basis of social and economic equality." It was also decided that it would affiliate itself with the League against Imperialism.

## II. Workers' and Peasants' Party

Following Roy's previous instructions, the Indian Communists had been forming Workers' and Peasants' parties in different provinces. At the time of the Sixth Comintern Congress, the Workers' and Peasants' Parties had already been formed in Bombay and Bengal, and preparations were being made to form it in some other provinces. The question of WPP also involved much debate. British delegates wanted to continue with it, while the Russian delegates asked for its liquidation. The Thesis said: "Special 'Workers' and Peasants' Parties' whatever revolutionary character they may possess, can too easily, at particular periods, be converted into ordinary petty bourgeois parties, and accordingly, Communists are not recommended to organise such parties. The Communist Party can never build its organisation on the basis of a fusion of two classes, and in the same way also it cannot make it its task to organize other parties on this basis, which is characteristic of petty bourgeois groups. ...The union of all Communist groups and individual Communists scattered throughout the country into a single, illegal, independent and centralized party represents the first task of Indian Communists."

## China Creates New, Proletarian Educational System

After 16 months and the winning of the decisive victory in the great proletarian cultural revolution to clean up all the muck of the past, the proletarian revolutionary teachers and students of universities and colleges, middle and primary schools, are resuming classes. Back in the class rooms, they are enthusiastically creating a completely new, proletarian educational system in the course of practice, turning their schools into big, red schools of Mao Tse-tung's thought.

From the summer of 1966 on, the nation's revolutionary teachers and students (many of whom are Red Guards) have played an important role in the cultural revolution. Battling with the handful of counter-revolutionary revisionists in their own schools and also going out into society to spread Mao Tse-tung's thought, they have made an invaluable contribution in the struggle between the two classes, two roads and two lines. During this lengthy period when classes were suspended both teachers and students have experienced a deep-going tempering in the fiery class struggle of the cultural revolution.

During this period the handful of counter-revolutionary revisionist in the educational field were unearthed and the revisionist line in education represented by China's Khrushchev was criticized and repudiated by the masses. The mass of revolutionary teachers and students and revolutionary masses of the people insistently demanded that the old educational system and principles and methods of teaching be overhauled according to the Decision of the Central Committee of the Chinese Communist Party Concerning the Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution, drawn up under the personal guidance of Chairman Mao. As the Decision states, this is "a most important task" of this great cultural revolution.

Chairman Mao said on May 7, 1966: "While their (the students') main task is to study, they should in addition to

*their studies, learn other things, that is, industrial work, farming and military affairs. They should also criticize the bourgeoisie. The period of schooling should be shortened, education should be revolutionized, and the domination of our schools by bourgeois intellectuals should by no means be allowed to continue."* This is the basic guideline followed by the revolutionary teachers and students in revolutionizing education.

### Use Mao Tse-tung's Thought to Rear the younger Generation

In their new school term which began on October 20, 1967, Shanghai primary schools are making great efforts to put Mao Tse-tung's thought to the fore, to put proletarian politics to the fore.

Upwards of 100,000 new pupils were enrolled in Shanghai primary schools this term. Right from the start these schools put a big effort into improving political and ideological education. For example, the Guanglinglu Primary School organized its pupils of higher grades to study "the three constantly read articles"<sup>1</sup> and the People's Liberation Army's "The Three Main Rules of Discipline and Eight Points for Attention"<sup>2</sup> and Chairman Mao's five requirements<sup>3</sup> for successors to the revolutionary cause of the proletariat, holding up before them the P. L. A. as their model and training them in the P.L.A.'s tradition of the "three-eight working style."<sup>4</sup> They all do military training as well.

The subjects generally taught in the primary schools of Shanghai, the biggest industrial centre of China, are *Quotations From Chairman Mao Tse-tung*, Chinese, arithmetic, general knowledge, revolutionary songs, drawing and military physical training. Pupils also take part in industrial and farm work. Most of the textbooks used are new, compiled during the great proletarian cultural revolution. They give prominence to the three great revolutionary movements of class struggle, the struggle for production and scientific experiment. For instance, in studying arithmetic in the lower grades, pupils are given sums to do in which they are asked

to work out how much certain workers or poor or lower-middle peasants are exploited by the capitalists and landlords. This enables them to learn arithmetic as well as to receive a profound lesson on classes and class-struggle. Many schools have worked out supplementary teaching material on the principle that they must (a) publicize Mao Tse-tung's thought; (b) be closely linked to the current situation; (c) be aimed directly at solving pupils' current ideological problems and (d) take into account the ages of the pupils of different grades. Many primary schools have also invited workers, poor and lower-middle peasants, and men from the P.L.A. to give lessons and guidance.

Before the new term started, revolutionary cadres and teachers of all Shanghai primary schools spent part of their summer vacation studying Chairman Mao's directives concerning educational work, and also in carrying out criticism and repudiation of the revisionist educational ideology and educational system advanced by China's Khrushchev, in which the stress is put exclusively on "knowledge before all else," "getting good marks", and "going on to the next grade of education." In this way, they heightened their understanding of Chairman Mao's revolutionary line and thinking on education. Riding the crest of this new revolutionary enthusiasm they are effectively using Mao Tse-tung's thought to bring up successors to the revolutionary cause of the proletariat.

#### Reforming Teaching and Study Through Repudiating the Revisionist Line

With the aim of successfully conducting the classes on Mao Tse-tung's thought, class struggle and the great proletarian cultural revolution and in the course of exposing and repudiating the revisionist line in education, the Kongjiang Middle School in Shanghai, which resumed classes eight months ago, has made attempts to work out ways of reforming teaching and study and has gained some valuable experience in this field.

This school was set up in a working class district by the Party and government some ten years ago especially for workers' children. But the handful of capitalist roaders inside the Party were against the principle of "education serving proletarian politics, and education being combined with productive labour" as proposed by Chairman Mao. They were against getting students to develop in an all-round way—morally, intellectually and physically—so that they became labourers with a socialist consciousness and culture as proposed by Chairman Mao. In fact, they selected this precisely for carrying out their revisionist line in education, trying to turn workers' children into bourgeois intellectual aristocrats working against their own class interests.

One of the measures they introduced was the forming of "rapid-advance classes" for students with the highest marks. In these classes, students were encouraged to compete freely and a few "star pupils" were given special tuition.

The Red Guards and the revolutionary teachers and students point out that this practice invariably led students into studying for personal ends. It divorced them from proletarian politics, from the workers and peasants and productive labour, and made them successors to the bourgeoisie.

Investigation and analysis revealed that when the revisionist educational line prevailed, the leadership of the Kongjiang Middle school was actually controlled by a handful of bourgeois intellectuals. These were the ones who were working their hardest to implement the revisionist black line. The revolutionary teachers and students have gained a better understanding that "*the domination of our schools by bourgeois intellectuals should by no means be allowed to continue.*" They have resolved to wipe out the revisionist black line in education and turn their school into a big, red school of Mao Tse-tung's thought.

As they teach and study, the revolutionary teachers and students and the Red Guards are constantly breaking new ground and summing up experience in teaching and studying

according to Chairman Mao's instructions. In addition to overall arrangements combining school education with productive labour and learning from the Chinese People's Liberation Army, they go to factories, rural people's communes, army units, shops and other schools to collect opinions and suggestions. In this way, they aim to work out better ways of transforming the old educational system and old teaching principles and methods.

A brand-new relationship between teachers and students is also taking shape. They regularly hold joint meetings to criticize and repudiate the revisionist educational line and work together to prepare lessons, discuss ways to improve tuition and study and sum up experience.

The revolution in education goes ahead vigorously as institutions of higher learning, middle and primary schools throughout the country resume classes while making revolutions. Revolutionary teachers and students and the Red Guards all regard education as a major activity with a close bearing on the training of successors to the revolutionary cause of the proletariat. They take the educational revolution as a glorious historic mission that is theirs to accomplish. They say that this revolution is "a great cause that has never been undertaken by our predecessors." With the revolutionary spirit of toppling all irrational convention and with a high proletarian sense of responsibility, they are determined to criticize and repudiate thoroughly the revisionist educational line represented by China's Khrushchev and firmly establish the proletarian educational line of Chairman Mao.

#### NOTES :

- (1) *Serve the People, In Memory of Norman Bethune and The Foolish Old Man Who Removed the Mountains.*
- (2) The Three Main Rules of Discipline are—(a) Obey orders in all your actions; (b) Do not take a single needle or piece of thread from the masses; and (c) Turn in everything captured. The Eight Points for Attention are—(a) Speak politely; (b) Pay fairly for what you buy; (c) Return everything you borrow; (d) Pay for anything

you damage; (e) Do not hit or swear at people; (f) Do not damage crops; (g) Do not take liberties with women; and (h) Do not ill-treat captives.

- (3) The five requirements for successors to the revolutionary cause of the proletariat are: They must be genuine Marxist-Leninists and not revisionists like Khrushchev wearing the cloak of Marxism-Leninism. They must be revolutionaries who whole-heartedly serve the overwhelming majority of the people of China and the whole world, and must not be like Khrushchev who serves both the interests of the handful of members of the privileged bourgeois stratum in his own country and those of foreign imperialism and reaction. They must be proletarian statesmen capable of uniting and working together with the overwhelming majority. Not only must they unite with those who agree with them, they must also be good at uniting with those who disagree and even with those who formerly opposed them and have since been proved wrong in practice. But they must especially watch out for careerists and conspirators like Khrushchev and prevent such bad elements from usurping the leadership of the Party and the state at any level. They must be models in applying the Party's democratic centralism, must master the method of leadership based on the principle of "from the masses, to the masses," and must cultivate a democratic style and be good at listening to the masses. They must not be despotic like Khrushchev and violate the Party's democratic centralism, make surprise attacks on comrades or act arbitrarily and dictatorially. They must be modest and prudent and guard against arrogance and impetuosity; they must be imbued with the spirit of self-criticism and have the courage to correct mistakes and shortcomings in their work. They must never cover up their errors like Khrushchev, and claim all the credit for themselves and shift all the blame on others.
- (4) The "three-eight" working style: The Chinese People's Liberation Army, under the leadership of the Communist Party and Chairman Mao, has fostered a fine tradition. This fine tradition is summed up by Chairman Mao in three phrases and eight additional characters, meaning firm, correct political orientation; a plain, hard-working style; flexibility in strategy and tactics; and unity, alertness, earnestness and liveliness.

## The Role Of The Individual In Making History And Lenin

—Asit Sen

[ From the Bengali weekly *DESHABRATI* of April 18, 1968 ]

In unison with the reactionaries of the world the revisionists and neo-revisionists are presently working themselves up to the point of being hysterical and shout : "History is never made by the whims of any individual, but is made by the people. And look, what the Communist Party of China is doing today—it is raising high Mao Tse-tung and his little Red Book ! Is it not placing an individual above the people ? And that, too, at a time when the people are digging the grave for burying capitalism and imperialism all over the world. And to think that all this is being done under the leadership of Mao Tse-tung himself !" In the name of fighting the so-called 'personality cult,' the 20th Congress of the C.P.S.U. gave the green signal for building up this world-wide united front of the imperialists, revisionists and reactionaries, which we see before us today. At that time, the Soviet Party under Khrushchev launched a campaign to obliterate Stalin's name from history. Though they first took up Stalin, their real purpose was, however, to lay the basis for obliterating many other names whenever they would feel it necessary. And all this crime was committed in the name of Lenin. Today, these traitors again drag in Lenin's name in justification of their anti-Mao Tse-tung campaign. It has become necessary to discuss Lenin's teachings from this viewpoint on the occasion of Lenin's 98th birthday.

How should we understand the maxim : people make history ? After a thorough analysis of the development of human society Marx discovered the truth that before everything else, man must be able to eat in order to live. And for this,

he must struggle against the forces of Nature. Man had to carry on this struggle against Nature at the very beginning of his existence and it was through this struggle that men became organised in a society. In his attempt to control and change the forces of Nature, man has to unite with Nature and enter into certain relations with it. It is this which forms the structure of human society. Man's social policies, politics and all other manners and customs depend on this structure. This is why, Engels once remarked that the entire history of man's civilisation at a particular stage is the history of man's extent of conquest of the forces of Nature upto that time. Herein lies the true essence of the maxim that people make history.

But history never moves forward along a straight path, nor is it simple. Because, at a given stage in its struggle against Nature, the socially organised man has to resort to division of labour, which in turn divides the society itself into various classes. At a particular stage the collective or social ownership of the instruments, which man devises for changing Nature, gives place to private ownership. Under such conditions, different sections of the society enter into different relations with the means of production. These differing relations of production divide the society into two classes having mutually opposed interests, namely, the exploiters and the exploited. Such a class society gradually gives birth to the organisation—the state, which aims primarily at holding the structure of the existing social system in tact. So it becomes the main objective of the state to keep the class conflicts subdued and within the bounds of the existing social structure. Thus, human history, which began as one of the struggle for man's survival between man's labour power and the forces of Nature, began to be subjected to the new complexities born out of the class society. To unshackle history of such complexities and to move it forward, class struggle becomes inevitable, and it becomes unavoidable to deal with the organisation of the state. In other words, after the appearance of class society, history has to move forward

through intense class struggle. That is why, Marx and Engels began the *Communist Manifesto* with these words: "The history of all hitherto existing society [excepting the primitive communistic society] is the history of class struggles."

With this the maxim "people make history" takes on a particular meaning. In a society which is divided into antagonistic classes—one class holding back the development of the forces of production, while the other struggling to unshackle these forces and move history forward—in such a society we cannot help judging the term 'people' from a class point of view. As Lenin pointed out, the people are divided into various classes, and if we try to present them not in the context of their relations of production, we are sure to confuse people with the classes.

At any particular stage of history, a particular class moves history forward while another tries to hold it back. So, viewed from the point of the development of history in a given period, a particular class becomes 'the people' while another becomes the enemy of the people. In the present era Mao Tse-tung has established this scientific analysis of the people on a still firmer basis.

But we cannot have a full understanding of the saying, 'people make history' only by an analysis of the disposition of classes. Because, the classes struggle against each other by becoming organised politically. That is why, Lenin said that the classes are guided by their respective political parties. The real significance of these words lies in the fact that in order to smash the existing mutual relations between the classes and to build a new system of relations, we immediately come up against the problem of the seizure of political power. Since the state, that is, the political organ of power, tries to keep the class struggle suppressed, the class struggles must necessarily find their expression in the struggle for the seizure of political power. For the same reason, the different classes also necessarily get organised in different political organisations. It follows, therefore, that the working class also has to build up its own political

organisation in order to carry on the struggle for the seizure of political power. But such organisation can never grow up spontaneously on its own. Because, the political consciousness that is necessary to build up such an organisation never comes of itself. The working class must be trained politically at every step in the course of struggle. Only an advanced contingent which has been trained in this way is able to build up the political organisation of the working class. The question arises, who, then, can train up such a contingent, and on what basis?

This is where the necessity of the leaders, of individuals, is felt.

After the stage of capitalism has been reached, the basic responsibility to move history forward falls on the shoulders of the working class. Marx made a thorough-going analysis and showed why and how such responsibility has devolved upon the working class. Marx's theory is a most potent weapon in the hands of the working class in its march toward creating an altogether new chapter in human history. Quite a few people before Marx thought of liberating the working class from exploitation and presented many a theory for that purpose. But none of such theories proved capable of liberating the working class as they were divorced from the hard reality. This explains why such persons, however learned they might be, could never have any definite role in creating a new history. But Marx is different. He discovered the path of advance of a particular class which at a given stage of development of history possesses the key to progress. Marx was, therefore, not merely an individual but the representative of an entire class which is the maker of history at the given period. The role that Marx played as an individual in history is, therefore, quite obvious.

In this way, particular individuals appear as promoters of history's development at different periods. Such individuals become the symbols of the historical role of an entire class. For this reason, the history of social development while being

the history of the class struggle, nonetheless, become inseparably connected with the *activities* of particular individuals.

This being so, any attempt to wipe out such personalities from history in the name of fighting the personality cult is clearly a manifestation of an urge to hold back the progress of history. On the other hand, it becomes absolutely necessary for a class to remember and to uphold such individuals since they faithfully represent the interests of that class.

After Marx and Engels, Lenin was exactly such an individual at a given period. It was he who developed Marxism through practice to meet the requirements of the era in which capitalism grew into a world system, that is, imperialism. He thoroughly analysed the basis of the imperialist economy and showed how the uneven development of capitalism opens the way for colonial expansion and also why the transition to socialism will develop unevenly. He thoroughly smashed the Trotskyite theory of simultaneous world-wide socialist revolution by making concrete analysis of concrete conditions and armed the working class with the theory of the possibility of establishing socialism in a single country. He enriched the Marxian theory of the dictatorship of the proletariat and correctly pointed out the historical role of the political party of the working class. He not only drew the scientific conclusion that the dictatorship of the proletariat can be established only by the political party of the working class but actually founded such a party which the Russian working class needed and made it an iron-like strong organisation. He analysed the methods by which the working class can hit at the weakest link of imperialism and establish its dictatorship through its own political party. In the course of this analysis he also pointed out the truth that a particular type of alliance between the workers and the peasants constitutes the basis of the dictatorship of the proletariat. In this way, Lenin provided the Russian workers, nay, the entire toiling people of the world with correct weapons at the right time so that the working class could perform its historic tasks. Naturally, in doing this, he had to carry on a fierce and relentless struggle all through

his life against various deviations. When one-time genuine Marxists like Plekhanov and Kautsky deserted the camp of Marxism and began to distort Marxism, Lenin had to undertake a great responsibility in fighting them. Because, it is a thousand times easier for a renegade from Marxism to confuse the working class than a class enemy. Only a close study of Lenin's works will reveal what fierce struggle he had to wage against all kinds of heinous trickeries, and how he had to carry out repeatedly the task of defending the purity of Marxism. But merely a born genius, who is no participant in class struggle would never have been able to carry out such tremendous responsibilities. Lenin's was a genius which grew out of a process—the process of intense class struggle which lies at the root of the development of history. Such a genius transforms itself into a historical genius because it relies on the people, participates in intense class struggle closely linked with the people and is able to make a concrete analysis of concrete conditions with the help of a keen perception. In such circumstances, the genius becomes inseparably linked with the making of history itself, in spite of the fact that it is possessed by a single individual. This is why, we commemorate such genius on the occasion of the birthday of the individual who possessed this genius. It is, therefore, meaningless to observe the birthday of such an individual if he is not seen in the right perspective, that is, the vast practice and the deep reliance on the people, which gave birth to the genius itself. Engels once remarked about Marx that while he (Engels) and others were at best merely talents, Marx was a genius. It was Engels again who explained the essence of Marx's genius. He said that Marx was before all else a revolutionist. His real mission in life was to contribute in one way or another to the liberation of the proletariat and the toiling people from exploitation.

We have, therefore, only one reason to remember Lenin today, on the occasion of his birthday, which is to complete the vast revolutionary work he had initiated in order to create a new history. Only thus can we observe his birthday

in a proper manner. This being so, it is quite understandable why the workers, peasants and the toiling people all over the world today feel inspired by Mao Tse-tung's thought. It must be realised that the work initiated by Lenin can never be fulfilled without imbuing ourselves with the thought of Mao Tse-tung. This is so, because Lenin and Mao together constitute the whole of the one and the same historical genius. To attack Mao while pretending to uphold Lenin simply means to try to hold back history in the name of Lenin, to tear away Lenin from the people—the makers of history—and present him as an *avatar*, that is, as a god. The real aim of this is to deprive the people of their means to create history. Today, when we are remembering Lenin, we must also bear this in mind. Herein lies the great significance of observing Lenin's birthday for the people of the world who are digging the grave of capitalism and imperialism.

## The Revolutionary Path Is The Only Path

—Manab Mitra

The Indian people are a great revolutionary people. The entire history of India demonstrates that they have never submitted to their oppressors. They have been carrying on anti-feudal struggle for many centuries and an anti-imperialist struggle for more than a century. During these struggles they have frequently risen up in arms against the feudal lords and the imperialists, and established a glorious revolutionary tradition. Innumerable peasant revolts in all parts of India, freedom struggles of various oppressed nationalities, the great revolt of the oppressed Indian soldiers and people in 1857 against the British, numerous workers' struggles in this century, the great uprising of the Indian people and the navy, airforce and army men in 1946, the great Telangana peasant struggle of 1946-50 and the most recent Naxalbari peasant struggle—all these conclusively prove this fact. All patriots and revolutionaries have always enthusiastically applauded and drawn inspiration from these revolutionary feats of the Indian peasants, workers and soldiers. They have cherished and admired the revolutionary heroism, death-defying determination and the spirit of sacrifice demonstrated by the masses. The Marxist-Leninists have always joined all patriots and revolutionaries in supporting whole-heartedly this glorious revolutionary tradition of the Indian people. Indeed, they firmly base all their activities on the interests of the people, on their revolutionary tradition, and strive to develop this tradition ceaselessly by rousing and encouraging the millions of Indian people to take matters into their own hands and add ever newer and ever brighter chapters to their own glorious revolutionary tradition. Because, they

fully realise that the most fundamental contradiction in India today, that is, the contradiction between the Indian people and the three monsters exploiting and oppressing them, namely imperialism, feudalism and the bureaucrat-comprador bourgeoisie, is an antagonistic contradiction. And so this contradiction can only be resolved through the revolutionary struggle of the people and complete elimination of these three monsters from the national life. It is never possible to resolve this contradiction in any other way. Only a complete and final victory of the Indian people's anti-imperialist anti-feudal struggle can achieve India's liberation. This is both historically inevitable and politically necessary for India's progress.

Hence, it is a good thing that the masses are waging a fearless struggle against imperialist-feudal exploitation and oppression. This shows that the Indian people have correctly grasped the most important issue in India today and adopted the correct method to solve it.

All Marxist-Leninists, revolutionaries and patriots must therefore, encourage the people's revolutionary struggle and not discourage it; they must help it to develop in every way and never try to hold it back; they must whole-heartedly support it, and not oppose it. On the contrary, they must resolutely oppose everything that hinders it, and support everything that widens and deepens it. This is the basic standpoint of all Marxist-Leninists, revolutionaries and patriots. It is precisely this which binds them closely with the millions of Indian peasants and workers, who constitute the "real iron bastion" which the imperialists and reactionaries with all their atomic bombs and rockets can never defeat or destroy. It is also precisely this close link between the Marxist-Leninists and revolutionaries with the revolutionary masses that guarantees victory of the Indian people's national liberation movement. Again, it is precisely this that most clearly and thoroughly demarcates the Marxist-Leninists from the revisionists and opportunists of all hues.

### Neo-Revisionists Always Opposed Revolution

The neo-revisionist leading clique of the C. P. I. (M) however, like their counter-parts, the renegade Dangeites, take a directly opposite standpoint. These neo-revisionists and revisionists have always persisted in opposing the revolutionary struggles of the Indian people against imperialism and feudalism. Since they jointly usurped leading positions in the Indian Communist movement 30 or more years back, these anti-Marxist opportunists have not, even for once, genuinely supported or helped the heroic Indian people's revolutionary struggles. On the contrary, they have always, under one pretext or another, collaborated with the utterly rotten reactionary leading clique of the National Congress led by the Gandhi-Nehru-Patel-Rajendraprasad-Rajagopalachari group, opposed and betrayed the revolutionary struggles of the masses and thus served the interests of the imperialists and the feudal lords.

Just after the Second World War, the Indian workers, peasants and soldiers rose up in a mighty revolt against the British imperialists who were then completely isolated politically and unable militarily to suppress this upsurge. An excellent situation prevailed to drive out the British oppressors and to strike smashing blows at their main prop—the feudal lords and princes. All patriots and revolutionaries, including the Marxist-Leninists in the C. P. I. whole-heartedly supported this anti-imperialist upsurge and ardently desired to develop and carry it through to its victorious culmination. But the anti-Marxist opportunist leading clique of the Party, headed by P. C. Joshi, shamelessly betrayed the people's anti-imperialist revolutionary upsurge, prevented the Party from leading this movement and forced the Party to surrender completely to the dictates of the traitorous leading Congress clique led by Gandhi-Nehru and Co., who were at that time busily co-operating with the British to put down and destroy the popular upsurge and divide up the country. This action of the Party's leading clique exactly suited the requirements of the British imperialists.

But even this combined attack of the imperialists and the Congress reactionaries, aided by the traitorous leading clique of the C. P. I., could not completely put out the flame of the revolutionary struggle. On the contrary, it raged still more vigorously in Telangana of Hyderabad, led by the revolutionary comrades in the C. P. I. who refused to toe the counter-revolutionary line of the Party's leading clique and supported enthusiastically the revolutionary actions of the masses. There the revolutionary armed struggle of the peasants spread quickly to about 3000 villages with a total population of about 30 lakhs. The brutal military actions launched by the reactionary Nehru government failed to suppress the revolutionary peasants' struggle. It was then that the traitorous leading clique of the C. P. I. headed by Ranadive came out to give a helping hand to the Nehru government. Inside the Party they introduced the Trotskyite-Titoite political theories to demoralise, confuse and detract the revolutionary comrades who were actively leading revolutionary struggles in Telangana and elsewhere, used worst kinds of intimidations to beat down the voice of criticism and wildly wrecked Party organisations. When even such criminal actions proved insufficient to prevent the development of Telangana struggles, the counter-revolutionary leading elements Dange and Ajoy Ghosh openly collaborated with Nehru and Co. and shamelessly helped the Nehru government in putting down the revolutionary struggle. They went so far as to direct the most militant and revolutionary elements of the Telangana struggle to lay down arms and surrender quietly to the butchers sent by Nehru. These shameless traitors even directed comrades to seek out such elements and hand them over to the military. What Nehru's military was unable to do, was peacefully achieved through the active collaboration of the traitorous leading clique of the C.P.I. "Telangana of Hyderabad, the scene of the biggest Communist rebellion, testifies that all the troops and tanks of the Indian army could not wipe out the popular support of Communists..." [Chester Bowles in *Ambassador's Report*, Comet Book Edition, p. 95]. And again, "guerri-

lla fighting continued spasmodically until the Communists themselves changed their programme of violence two years later." [Ibid, p. 79]. Thousands of the glorious revolutionary fighters, the most heroic and best elements, were thus cruelly and deliberately surrendered by the leading clique to the tender mercy of Nehru's butchers, to undergo inhuman torture, persecution and death.

Since then these anti-Marxist usurpers, taking advantage of their control of the Party machinery, systematically smuggled in all sorts of poisonous anti-Marxist anti-internationalist formulations in the Party programmes. In this way they sought to transform the Party into a vegetating bourgeois party and thereby to subvert the anti-imperialist anti-feudal revolutionary struggles of the people. In this respect they were actively aided and assisted by the Khrushchev revisionist gang. The most pernicious of such formulations was the one of "peaceful" path, the so-called parliamentary path.

#### Violent Revolution—An Unalterable Marxist Principle

Chairman Mao has said: "Revolutions and revolutionary 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...". This is a universal truth, and a fundamental principle of Marxism-Leninism. The Indian people, who are being mercilessly exploited and oppressed by the imperialists, feudal lords and the bureaucrat-comprador bourgeoisie, can also accomplish a leap in social development and win political power only through revolutions and revolutionary wars and by overthrowing their biggest exploiters and oppressors. To deny this is to deny Marxism-Leninism and to betray the Indian revolution. Lenin pointed out in *The State and Revolution* that the inevitability of a violent revolution "lies at the root of the whole of Marx's and Engels' doctrine" and that "systematically imbuing the masses with *this* and precisely this view of violent revolu-

tion" is a "necessity." Lenin said: "In the final analysis, force alone can settle the great problems of political liberty and the class struggle, and it is our business to prepare and organize this force and to employ it actively, not only for defensive purposes, but also for the purpose of attack." [*Two Tactics*, Selected Works, 2 vol. ed., Vol. I, p.361]. Can the oppressed classes win political power peacefully from the oppressor classes which are armed to the teeth? This is what Lenin teaches in this respect: "An oppressed class which does not strive to learn to use arms, to acquire arms, deserves to be treated like slaves." Further, "Our slogan must be: The arming of the proletariat for the purpose of vanquishing, expropriating and disarming the bourgeoisie. These are the only tactics a revolutionary class can adopt." [*War Program of the Proletarian Revolution*, *ibid*, p. 745]. It is precisely this Marxist-Leninist principle of the inevitability of a violent revolution that the great Chinese Party led by Mao Tse-tung firmly upholds in its pioneering struggle against the Soviet revisionists. Marxist-Leninists all over the world, including India, enthusiastically support the wise and correct line put forward by the Chinese comrades. The Chinese comrades pointed out that "the acknowledgment or non-acknowledgment of violent revolution as a universal law of proletarian revolution, ... has always been the watershed between Marxism and all brands of opportunism and revisionism, between proletarian revolutionaries and all renegades from the proletariat." [*The Proletarian Revolution and the Revisionist Khrushchov*, pp. 5-6]. Further, the entire experience of the revolutionary movements in the world after the Second World War has shown that in every country without exception, where the so-called peaceful parliamentary path was adopted and the revolutionary path rejected, the revolution suffered set-back, and imperialists and reactionaries were strengthened and the revolutionary people and Marxist-Leninists were subjected to even more intense and brutal suppression. On the other hand, revolution gained tremendous victories and the imperialists and reactionaries were thoroughly defeated and eliminated precisely in those countries where the

Marxist-Leninists and revolutionaries firmly persisted in the revolutionary path and rejected the so-called peaceful path, as in China, Vietnam etc.

How can the Marxist-Leninists of India ever fail to take note of this living experience and historical lesson provided by the present-day international revolutionary movement?

#### Renegades From Marxism-Leninism

Flouting all the teachings of Marxism-Leninism and rejecting the revolutionary line pursued by the international Communist movement under the leadership of the great Chinese Party and Mao Tse-tung, the neo-revisionist leading clique of the C. P. I. (M) upholds the traitorous line of the so-called "peaceful" path advocated and led by the Soviet revisionists. In their programme they wrote: "The Communist Party of India strives to achieve the establishment of People's Democracy and socialist transformation through peaceful means." This is nothing but an open rejection of the revolutionary international line of the world's Marxist-Leninists and adoption of the poisonous Khrushchevite revisionist line in toto. These shameless renegades even gave an undertaking to the Police Minister of the Congress government that they would not even think of an armed revolt. Sundarayya, the General Secretary of the Party, wrote in *People's Democracy* of September 19, 1965: "When I met Nanda in the first week of December [1964], .... I told him:

"Do not believe your police reports. Use your political judgment. We are not thinking of any armed struggle of any type. ... We are a legal party and function openly. As long as we have these democratic rights, we are not children to throw them away and resort to so-called underground." Sundarayya further wrote: "Let me once again categorically deny the slander that we are preparing to go underground for making preparations for a Telangana-type armed struggle..." "If we have had any thought of going underground, I would not have gone to Nanda, the Home Minister, and the President of our Republic to plead with them not... to launch repression

against our Party... ." Thus the deal was complete : keep us out of jail ; instead of the "police reports," have reliance on us and see how we keep the entire activity of the Party exposed under your police surveillance. Establishing people's democracy and socialism with the approval of the ruling classes and their police-agents ! What revolution or revolutionary activity in any country has ever been organized and conducted under the surveillance of police-agents, informers and the military of the ruling classes, those very elements revolution aims to sweep away ? According to these neo-revisionist traitors, the revolutionaries must agree to expose themselves and all their activities, all their plans to the meanest of the mean among the police-agents for the benefit of the ruling classes. Obviously this is not the way to make revolution but the most cynical betrayal of revolution. Only the revisionists, and incorrigible opportunists who have completely and finally given up the path of revolution and are determined to serve the reactionary classes can ever think of giving such a traitorous undertaking that the people would never rise up in revolt against their oppressors. Our neo-revisionists are exactly such people.

#### No Different from the Dangeites

Faithfully following the instructions of the Soviet revisionists, the neo-revisionist leading clique of the CPI (M) preaches, proclaims and pursues the so-called peaceful parliamentary path and rejects the revolutionary path. As on all other major questions, in this respect too, the neo-revisionists are essentially the same as the Dangeites. There is no way to differentiate between the two. They shamelessly try to outbid even the reactionary Congress rulers in defending and preserving the rotten artifice of the so-called "parliamentary democracy" imposed by the British imperialists on India to cover up the cruel rule of the imperialists and their lackeys. As Sundarayya wrote : "Now it is Nanda and the Government of India that are destroying the parliamentary democracy, that are trying to destroy the democratic path of development. We must fight them and

defeat them so as to.....save parliamentary democracy." [*People's Democracy, September 12, 1965*]. These renegades are ever eager to obliterate even their superficial 'differences' with the Dangeites in order to be in the good books of the Congress rulers. "It will be interesting.....to note that the relevant passages regarding the possibilities for, and the limitations of, the peaceful path are almost similar in our Programme and the Programme of the revisionists. This is the most telling refutation of the canard by the Congress rulers....., that our Party stands for the insurrectionary method while the revisionists are the champions of the peaceful parliamentary path." [*E.M.S. Namboodiripad, The Programme Explained, p. 74*].

#### Destroyed Party's Revolutionary Character

To serve their reactionary masters—the imperialists and their Congress lackeys, and to oppose the revolutionary struggles of the masses in a thoroughgoing manner, the neo-revisionist leading clique of the C. P. I. (M) has also taken measures to incapacitate the Party organisationally and reduce it to a vegetating parliamentary party in order to make it harmless and acceptable to the ruling classes. For this purpose they collaborated closely with the Dangeites in the united party to introduce a so-called three-tier system at all levels of the Party. For instance, to the central leading bodies—the P.B. and the C.C.—was added a so-called third body styled as the National Council of 101 members which was to meet after every 8 months. It was a device to concentrate still more the real power in the hands of the hard-core of the revisionist leading clique and simultaneously to bereft the Party of even the semblance of a truly Leninist revolutionary party capable of leading the masses on to the revolutionary path efficiently and carrying on revolutionary activity in the face of all persecutions and intimidations of the enemy classes. The three-tier system proved unworkable even in carrying on the peaceful parliamentary activities for which it was meant. The neo-revisionists, at their Calcutta Congress in 1964, not only retained in fact the three-tier system but made it even

more unwieldy and unworkable than the previous one. The neo-revisionists not only enlarged their C.C. even more than its previous counterpart, the CEC, but also provided for a so-called "plenum" to replace the National Council. This "plenum" is even more unwieldy than its previous counterpart and is to meet at intervals of 12 months. In this way the Party has been made even more slow-moving and flabby. The only thing such a party can do is to vegetate perpetually in the morass of parliamentarism. The organisational structure devised by the neo-revisionists precludes all possibilities of the Party participating in any meaningful way in revolutionary activities, not to speak of leading the revolutionary struggles of the masses. This was precisely what the neo-revisionist leading clique aimed at achieving at the Calcutta Party Congress. They even assured the Police Minister of the government that the changes in the Congress of organisational structure were in no way meant to foster or facilitate revolutionary struggles. In a letter written on 7.1.65, by five P. B. members of the neo-revisionist leading clique of the C.P.I. (M) and addressed to Sri Lal Bahadur Shastri, then Prime Minister of the Congress government, it was pointed out that "the [Party's] constitutional amendments provided for more democratic functioning than before.....Where is the question of any provision 'suited to conspiratorial and subversive activities' in all this." [*Reply from Prison, p. 10.*] Further, these five members of the neo-revisionist leading clique shamelessly confessed that the fraudulent slogan of peaceful parliamentary path was meant to keep the party away from the revolutionary path and revolution. Pointing their finger to the passage in their party programme in which it is stated that "the party will obviously utilise all the opportunities that present themselves of bringing into existence of governments, pledged to carry out a modest programme of giving immediate relief to the people," these neo-revisionist chieftains, servitors of reaction as they are, assured the Prime Minister thus: "In the face of this can anyone believe that our party is preparing for armed struggles." [*Ibid, p.18.*]

Further, these renegades have completely destroyed inner-Party democracy and the method of criticism and self-criticism and substituted bureaucratism and liberalism for these.

There can be no doubt that the neo-revisionist servitors are not even thinking in terms of any revolutionary armed struggle of any type, not to speak of organizing or preparing for such struggles. It is also certain that as struggles become more acute they will try heart and soul to rid the Party of all vestige of revolutionary characteristics. It is evident that the Party under their leadership can serve only reaction and can never serve the people or the revolution.

#### 'United Front' : Reaction's Weapon to Oppose Revolution

In recent months, the neo-revisionists and the Dangeite renegades have been straining themselves to the utmost to prove to the people what a unique and wonderful thing the so-called United Front is. In Kerala, West Bengal and several other states like U.P. and Bihar they succeeded, with the approval of the ruling classes, in holding ministerial offices. It seems this 'wine of success' has gone to their head and they have become even more loud in singing the praise of the U. F. and the so-called non-Congress governments. They have become even more shameless and openly peddle these U.F. governments as an alternative to the revolutionary path. They think it very good because such propaganda can confuse the mind of people about the class realities and thus disrupt the development of revolutionary struggles.

As everyone knows, the so-called U. F.'s, in every state without exception, consist of all sorts of rotten opportunists, representatives of vested interests, seasoned anti-Communists, counter-revolutionaries, careerists and political adventurers of all descriptions. It is precisely such people who lead and constitute the majority of the so-called U. F.'s in every state. What business can any revolutionary or Marxist-Leninist have in uniting with them? How can these reactionaries ever support or help to further people's cause? Have these rotten eggs then changed their nature fundamentally and become

champions of people's cause overnight? Nothing of the sort. For example, in West Bengal, Sri Ajoy Mukherjee, the veteran and incorrigible anti-Communist reactionary, who leads the U.F., openly proclaims his unshaken adherence to the reactionary Congress ideals and policies and Gandhism. Last October, even as he was leading the so-called U. F. government in West Bengal, he almost openly conspired with the Congress bosses in New Delhi and in the State to drive out the neo-revisionists from his government, who, he mistakenly believed, were carrying on revolutionary activities. He later withdrew because, as he admitted afterwards, he found out that the neo-revisionists were as genuinely anti-Chinese and opposed to revolution as any other constituent of the U. F.

What makes the neo-revisionists unite with such elements? What is there common between them and people like Ajoy Mukherjee? What binds them together so firmly? Clearly, the bond that binds the neo-revisionist 'champions of people's cause' to the other reactionaries in the U. F., is nothing sacred. Indeed, it is the common urge to oppose revolution and people's revolutionary struggles, that is so firmly binding the neo-revisionists with the renegade Dangeites and other reactionaries in the U. F. This is precisely the common platform on which the neo-revisionists unite and work jointly with the reactionaries, anti-Communists, crypto-Congressites, opportunists and the Dangeites.

This so-called U.F. is a product—a negative product, of the development of class struggle of the Indian people against the imperialists and other reactionaries. It is a product born directly out of the requirements of the reactionary ruling classes of India, which are fast getting isolated from the masses. Their chief political weapon, Congress, has been blunted and has lost much of its effectiveness in the face of the growing struggles of the people. In order to make up for the loss and continue their cruel rule of exploitation and oppression the ruling classes have been forced to rally all their forces, to unite them under their flag in order to make a last desperate effort to preserve and continue their rule by deception, i.e.,

through the so-called parliamentary institutions. Although they will inevitably have recourse to naked bloody dictatorial rule before they are overthrown by the people, they realise that it is much cheaper and better for them to rule by deception, i.e., by maintaining the facade of the so-called parliamentary democracy even as, in fact, they continue to reap many of the benefits of an open dictatorial rule. The so-called U. F. serves exactly this purpose. Making a virtue of the obvious, the neo-revisionists shamelessly masquerade as anti-Congress heroes who have brought about the downfall of the wretched Congress rule. They then make a show of providing a stable non-Congress government which exactly suits the requirements of the reactionary ruling classes. For, whose stability it is that the U. F. governments try to bring about? Certainly, the people have nothing to look forward to and can never enjoy any stability under the rotten rule of the imperialists and their lackeys. The stability that the U. F. governments shout about is nothing but the political stability of the ruling classes whose chief organ Congress has virtually become useless. In the background of the rapid decay of the Congress, an alternative stable government that would serve reaction has become an urgent necessity for the ruling classes. The neo-revisionist leading clique of the C. P. I. (M) has consciously come forward to carry out this task. The revisionist chieftain Namboodiripad pointed exactly to this fact in his replies to Bernard Nossiter of the *Washington Post*, the semi-official organ of the U. S. imperialists. He said: "the main feature of the political situation in India today is the rapid decline in the influence and the power of the Congress, accompanied by the absence of any single party which can replace it. Only a combination of parties can meet the situation." [*People's Democracy, January 14, 1968.*] He said that they have achieved successes in this regard: "I may now claim that one of the biggest achievements of our pre-election alliance and the post-election coalition Government is that we have shown that it is possible for the various non-Congress parties to come together and establish a relatively stable alliance on which a stable

coalition Government can be built." [Ibid.] He pointed out that such stability "is of tremendous significance for the country as a whole." [Ibid.] Further, in his opinion, "Such a combination of parties should necessarily include the Communists and Socialists and other secular democratic radical parties." Undoubtedly such achievements are of "tremendous significance" for the ruling classes.

How did the U. F. governments score such 'big achievements' of 'tremendous significance'? These were achieved by faithfully implementing the reactionary policies of the ruling classes, by intensifying the exploitation and oppression of the people still further and giving consistent protection to the jotedars, blackmarketeers, capitalists and a free hand to the murderous police force. In spite of the fraudulent claims of the neo-revisionists and the Dangeites that these governments could provide "immediate relief to the people" and "give great fillip to the revolutionary movement of the working people" [see programme of C. P. I. (M)], it turned out that under the U. F. governments, the miseries and hardships of the people increased by leaps and bounds and their rights were curtailed and their movements were discouraged, condemned and brutally suppressed by the U. F. governments and leaders.

—'People today have, ... even less food ( and that at higher cost ) than ten months ago [ that is under Congress rule ]. The problem of unemployment and lack of all-round economic development has also become worse during the last ten months.' [Namboodiripad's replies to *Washington Post*, *Ibid.*]

—'Industrialists were unanimous in acclaiming it [ the "industrial policy" statement of the Kerala U. F. government led by Namboodiripad]. On the other hand, the trade union movement was highly critical of some passages in the statement which may well go contrary to the right of the working class for collective bargaining and their freedom of organization and struggle' [Ibid].

The Bengali evening daily, *Gana Sakti* [ GS ], organ of the West Bengal neo-revisionists, had to admit—

"The racketeers in food, hoarders and profiteers continue

to rule the roost today exactly in the same way as they did under the Congress regime...the utter failure of the [U.F.] government to bring to book the black-marketeters and to dehoard food is the root cause of this state of affairs" [GS, July 21, '67]. "The U. F. government has proved itself utterly a failure on the food front... The common people are smarting under the twin curse of food scarcity and price-rise. Faced with such an intolerable situation, they have become desperate and are holding up trains and squatting on the streets." [ GS, July 16 ].

—"The profiteers, hoarders and the dishonest traders have been able to establish with impunity unfettered control over the entire market of the State. And what did the [ U.F. ] government do ? It chose the role of a helpless and silent spectator to all this." [ GS, Sept. 14 ]

When the people themselves took the initiative to dehoard food and force profiteers to sell at reasonable prices, the neo-revisionists and their U.F. colleagues consistently discouraged such actions and tried in every possible way to quench the anger of the masses against the hoarders and profiteers. Not content with that, the U.F. government even employed its reactionary police force to persecute, harass and arrest those who dared to rise up against the hoarders and profiteers.

Industrialists and capitalists carried out with impunity their policy of exploiting and oppressing the workers and employees and the U.F. government eagerly provided all sorts of protection for these money-bags, including the help of the police. On the other hand, it mercilessly beat up, arrested and killed workers and employees when they dared to protest and resist the attacks of the money-bags, as happened at Birlapur and Dum Dum.

But the most to benefit were the feudal lords and the racketeers. In fact, aided and assisted by the U. F. and the Congress, the jotedars in the villages intensified their exploitation and oppression of the peasant masses to an unprecedented scale during the U. F. regime. Encouraged by the implicit

support of the U. F. government, the jotedars and racketeers began to squeeze the people with a savage fury unknown even during the corrupt Congress regime. They made 200-300 percent more profit during the U. F. regime than they ever could under the Congress.

The people, angered at the merciless and increasing exploitation and at the silent support of the U. F. government began to move on their own to hit back and resist the attacks of reaction. It is then that the neo-revisionists and the U. F. took off their mask of 'progressiveness' and revealed their ugly reactionary nature. They re-introduced the hated reactionary P.D. Act and unleashed a terror campaign against the resisting people. They began to kill mercilessly peasants, employees and students. A cruel police-raj of repression and persecution was established in the State under the leadership of the U. F. and with whole-hearted support from the neo-revisionist leading clique. Bloody repression campaigns were let loose in the colliery areas, at Ranaghat, Howrah and other places. For more than seven days the people of Nabadwip fought valiantly against the butchers of the U. F. government. In all such repression campaigns the neo-revisionists and the U. F. got all-out support from the Congress bosses and other reactionaries. It became impossible to differentiate between the Congress and the U. F. who co-operated closely with each other in repressing the valiant people.

But nowhere were the pseudo-'anti-Congressism' and sham progressivism of the revisionists and the U. F. exposed so clearly as in the case of Naxalbari. There thousands of revolutionary peasants led by the revolutionaries in the C.P.I. (M), raised the banner of revolt against their ferocious oppressors—the feudal lords. They drove out these oppressors and salvaged food and land from their clutches. All revolutionaries and Marxist-Leninists in India and all over the world were elated at this. But the reactionary Congress regime, the imperialists and reactionaries of all kinds including our neo-revisionist counter-revolutionaries were greatly angered at these revolutionary acts of the Naxalbari peasants.

With the armed forces requisitioned from the Central Congress government and their own armed police force the U. F. government launched a most brutal campaign of terror and persecution against the revolutionary peasants of Naxalbari. They encouraged and assisted the affected jotedars to build up a private army of goondas and scoundrels recruited locally as well as from other States like Bihar and U. P. In all this, the neo-revisionists took the leading and most prominent role. The Congress reactionaries assisted in every way in this traitorous action of the neo-revisionists and their U. F. accomplices.

The experience of the U. F. governments in Kerala, West Bengal and other States has conclusively proved to the workers peasants and the toiling people that these governments are, despite their protestations of anti-Congressism, no different from the rotten Congress regime. The U. F. governments have proved themselves champions of reaction and vested interests and not champions of the people's cause. The U. F. governments are as merciless and brutal in opposing the revolutionary masses as the Congress, and no less; on the other hand, they have been as staunch and firm in protecting the interests of the imperialists and feudal lords as the Congress. Facts show that the U. F. governments cannot give even 'immediate relief' to the people, nor guarantee minimum democratic rights to the people. On the contrary, they make people's miseries even more acute than before, and curtail and trample underfoot minimum rights of the people even as the Congress reactionaries do.

#### Neo-Revisionists—Spearhead of Reaction

The slogan of peaceful parliamentary path that the neo-revisionists have raised is a slogan of renegades from Marxism-Leninism and revisionists. It has never been the slogan of Marxist-Leninists and revolutionaries nor can it be. This is so because it is based upon the rejection of class struggle and the laws of social development. It has always been the slogan of the traitors to people's revolution. Lenin in his days had to wage repeated struggles against the advocates of the peaceful

path. Now, that treacherous banner has been picked up by the modern revisionists led by the Soviet revisionist ruling clique.

The neo-revisionist leading clique and the Dangeites have joined hands to proclaim this fraudulent slogan of peaceful parliamentary path to deceive the people, confuse their mind and to sow all sorts of illusions about the imperialists and their lackeys. In this way, they want to disrupt the revolutionary solidarity of the people and frustrate their revolutionary strivings. When the imperialists, the feudal lords and their chief political weapon, Congress, are discredited and getting isolated and losing their hold on the people as never before, this fraudulent revisionist slogan suits them ideally to continue their rule. Indeed, it is the neo-revisionists and the Dangeites who have taken upon themselves the onerous burden of protecting and preserving the rule of the imperialists and reactionaries by beautifying in every possible manner the parliamentary ornaments and hiding the reactionary state apparatus, glorifying the so-called 'democracy', and 'independence' and 'non-alignment' of the Congress regime and hiding the brutal dictatorial powers, the constant persecution and oppression of the people, the neo-colonialist domination of U.S. imperialism and the Soviet revisionists and the utterly reactionary nature of the anti-China anti-people policies of the Congress government.

Hence, the neo-revisionists have become the chief standard-bearer of the enemies of the Indian people. They have willingly undertaken this burden to oppose the revolution. Clearly, the revolutionary masses will have to direct their main political attack against these neo-revisionist call-boys of imperialism and reaction. This is so, because neo-revisionism is in essence the ideology of imperialism. It is a variant of the ideology of the most reactionary class—imperialism, and not a variant of Marxism-Leninism. It is the most poisonous ideology which tries to corrode Marxism-Leninism and eats away the vitality and vigour of revolution. Neo-revisionism, which is only another name of modern revisionism, is therefore, the most pernicious enemy of the Indian people and the most poisonous

weapon in the hand of the enemies of the Indian people. Indeed, neo-revisionism is the spearhead of reaction in India. Led by the great Chinese Communist Party and Mao Tse-tung the Marxist-Leninists of the world have been waging a fierce principled battle against this treacherous counter-revolutionary line of the modern revisionists. Under these conditions there is absolutely no scope for any Marxist-Leninist or revolutionary to remain neutral or 'non-aligned' in this Great Debate between the Marxist-Leninists and the modern revisionists. Because the issue is: to make revolutions or not; to overthrow the exploiters and oppressors, destroy their state apparatus and establish people's own revolutionary state apparatus or to submit to the imperialist man-eaters and their lackeys; to win genuine national independence and democracy for the toiling people or to remain under the heels of imperialism and reaction. Silence or neutrality here has only one meaning—supporting the imperialists and reactionaries and opposing revolution and the revolutionary people.

The Indian people know from their long experience that the imperialists, feudal lords and the reactionaries are a pack of blood-thirsty and ferocious wolves. They know there is only one way to deal with them and only one way to rid themselves of these monsters—the path of determined struggle, an unrelenting tit-for-tat struggle. It is only thus that they can really overthrow their exploiters and oppressors. The imperialists and reactionaries have never stopped their cruel persecution, killing and exploitation of the Indian people. Nor will they ever stop being so as long as they exist. So, what should the people do? Should they fold their hands and pray for 'a change of heart' of these monsters—as the neo-revisionist chieftains Jyoti Basu and Hare Krishna Konar did in respect of the jotedars and the hoarders of people's food? Or, should they stand up on their own legs, defy difficulties, and wage a determined struggle and win back the control of their own country and of their own lives from the hand of their exploiters and oppressors in a thorough-going manner? All Marxist-Leninists, revolutionaries and patriots unreservedly support the people in attaining

their just and revolutionary goals, because this is the only path for the liberation of India.

#### Naxalbari Path—The Only Path for Liberation

How must the Marxist-Leninists and revolutionaries therefore, conduct their struggle against neo-revisionism? What is the most effective way to criticise and struggle against it? The pre-condition for waging a successful struggle is to be able to sharply draw a line of demarcation between ourselves and neo-revisionism. It is not enough, however, to demarcate ourselves in words only, it is far more important for us to demarcate ourselves really, that is, in practice also, that is, organisationally and practically. Without this we cannot wage a really effective struggle against neo-revisionism and develop revolution.

For defeating the enemies of revolution and win victory we must thoroughly base ourselves on the thought of Mao Tse-tung, which is the highest development of Marxism-Leninism, and combine this with revolutionary practice. It has been repeatedly proved in our country that whenever we have based ourselves on the thought of Mao Tse-tung and acted accordingly, we have scored unprecedented successes in developing the revolutionary struggle. In Telangana, the armed revolutionary struggle was waged under the banner of Mao Tse-tung's thought and great successes were scored owing to this. It was precisely because of this that the U. S. imperialist oppressors of India were greatly worried. In the words of Chester Bowles, the U. S. Ambassador to India: "The Hyderabad Communists skilfully operated under Mao Tse-tung's description of guerrilla tactics" [*Ambassador's Report* p. 80]. And further, "I believe that if the Communist parties in India and other free Asian nations shifted their primary allegiance from Moscow to Peking their prospects would improve dangerously." [*Ibid.*, p. 89]. It is precisely because the imperialists and reactionaries were so frightened at the development of the Telangana revolutionary struggle that the revisionist traitorous leading clique of the C. P. I. led by

#### THE REVOLUTIONARY PATH

Ranadive, launched at that time such a vicious attack against the Chinese Party and personally against Mao Tse-tung. Today, the flame of Telangana has been re-kindled even more brightly and with even greater splendour in Naxalbari where the revolutionaries have raised high the great banner of Mao Tse-tung's thought and revolution. The successes of Naxalbari are even more rapid and deeper. This is so because thousands of revolutionary peasants there have grasped the thought of Mao Tse-tung, and are acting accordingly. What wonder the imperialists and the ruling classes of India have got even more frightened than they were 20 years ago during the Telangana struggle. The all-out political-military attacks against the Naxalbari revolutionary peasants testify to this. Is it strange, therefore, that the neo-revisionists should once more begin to attack revolutionary China, the Chinese Party and Comrade Mao Tse-tung even more wildly? This is only natural.

The imperialists and their mouthpiece, the neo-revisionists have begun a chorus against the revolutionaries who lead and support the Naxalbari struggle, against the revolutionary Indian people and against China and Mao Tse-tung. The Soviet revisionists are also zealously throwing their weight on the side of these reactionaries. But the combined force of imperialism, Soviet revisionism and Indian neo-revisionism is no match for the revolutionary Indian people. They are inexorably taking to the path Naxalbari has shown. The neo-revisionists, along with their masters—the imperialists, Soviet revisionists and their lackeys will be swept away before long into the dung-heap of history by the mighty revolutionary storm of the many-million strong Indian people. The air is already filled with the smell of the coming storm.

‘In the final analysis, national struggle is a matter of class struggle’

—Mao Tse-Tung

## The Growing Struggle of Nagas And Mizos Against Oppression

Ne Win was in New Delhi in mid-March to plot with the reactionary Indian Government the stepped-up suppression of the Naga and Mizo armed forces along the India-Burma border. This shows how alarmed the Indian and Burmese reactionaries are in the face of the rising, large-scale armed struggle of these national minorities in India's north-eastern frontier areas.

The Naga and Mizo forces have launched repeated attacks this year. In one Mizo ambush alone, 26 Indian soldiers were killed and many others wounded. Since then, the guerrillas in Nagaland, the Mizo Hills and the Union territory of Manipur have been preparing for large-scale operations.

The Nagas, Mizos and Kukis have been closing their ranks against their common enemy. In Manipur, the Nagas and Mizos have strengthened their ties. The Mizos have moved to Manipur's Churachandpur area in large numbers, and they have settled down and established close contact with the local Kukis. Having co-ordinated their activities and reorganised, some Naga armed units are recruiting new members.

All this had greatly alarmed the Indian reactionaries. Besides buying over some traitors and supplying them with weapons to kill their fellow Nagas and Mizos who refuse to submit to the reactionary rule, they have intensified their collusion with the Burmese reactionaries.

*Reprinted from a foreign journal.*

To prepare the public for joint suppression, reactionary government officials and bourgeois papers in India have recently come out with such blatant propaganda nonsense as, “the Nagas in India are moving to Burma in groups,” “the armed Nagas have their headquarters in Burma,” etc.

In fact, the reactionary governments of India and Burma have long been collaborating in this matter. The Indian *Statesman* has disclosed that, early in 1966, they reached agreement on a joint patrol of the Indian-Burmese border. More secret talks were held between the two governments last year. The Nagas and Mizos have taken up arms because of ruthless class oppression by the Indian big landlords and big capitalists. This is inevitable. The Indian reactionaries may collude with their Burmese counterparts for suppressive measures or resort to other tricks, but they cannot hold back the courageous struggle of these nationalities who rebel to defend their right to exist.

### Notes

(Continued from page 16)

Russian interpreter was present”, reported *The Statesman's* political correspondent from New Delhi, “Mr Kosygin told waiting reporters that ‘all possibilities’ existed for the improvement of relations between India and Pakistan”. How tireless are the revisionist chiefs and their friends, the U. S. imperialists, in their efforts to “improve” the relations between India and Pakistan!

When Kosygin came in January, the Indian economy was crumbling under the weight of the joint exploitation by all kinds of sharks—the imperialists and Soviet revisionists, the Indian comprador and bureaucratic bourgeoisie and feudal classes. Factories were closing down, lay off and retrenchment were the order of the day, the export trade faced an

evergrowing crisis. There was political gloom and disintegration within the ruling party, the Congress; on the other hand, the Naxalbari peasant struggle had lighted up a new path for the toiling people of India and inspired them with faith and courage. Far from being crushed by the guns of the reactionary ruling classes, the struggles of the national minorities in the eastern regions were gaining in strength and spreading to new areas. As *People's Daily* wrote, the year 1967 marked the turning point in the history of the Indian revolution. It is no wonder that the revisionist chief felt the urgent need of rushing to the help of the reactionary Congress government so that it might continue to play the role assigned to it in the joint U. S.-Soviet conspiracy against the Indian revolution, against national liberation movements and against Socialist China.

During his talks with his hosts, Kosygin promised to buy as many wagons and rails as India could send. There was also talk of fitting India's fourth five year plan to the Soviet economic plan and of reorganizing Indian industrial production to suit the needs of Soviet economy. Far from restoring economic stability, this intensified exploitation of the Indian people by the ruling classes of the Soviet Union will, no doubt, cause further instability and deeper crisis, and the contradiction between our people and foreign exploiters will surely grow even more sharp. Indian economy, which was once an appendage to British economy, is now being made an appendage to the economy of various countries including Britain, but chiefly to the economy of the U. S. A. and the Soviet Union. What was once a satellite of Britain has now been a satellite of different imperialist countries, chief among which are the U. S. A. and the Soviet Union. India, indeed, provides the classic example of U. S.-Soviet collaboration for joint world domination.

Today, India occupies a pivotal position in the counter-revolutionary global strategy of the U. S. A. and the Soviet Union. For, if India is lost to them, the whole world will be lost. That is why, they are trying to build up India as a powerful

citadel of reaction both for offensive and for defensive purposes. They are strengthening India's reactionary ruling classes so that these can stem the tide of the Indian revolution. At the same time they are trying to use this citadel for aggression against Socialist China. That is why, the Soviet revisionists have recently delivered to the reactionary government of India 100 Soviet S U-7 supersonic fighter-bombers for use against China. They are also supplying 4 submarines to the Indian government for reasons that are obvious. As everybody knows, submarines are meant not for defensive but for offensive purposes. According to a report in the *Sunday Telegraph* of London, India decided to conclude a defence pact with Soviet Russia "providing Ocean bases for Soviet warships in the Andaman and Nicobar islands. In return, Russia is to supply the Indian Navy with four conventional W. class submarines and 17 other warships."

"Together with Washington," wrote Inder Jit in the *Economic Times* of February 6, 1968, "Moscow stands for geo-political status quo and realises that Peking is the greatest menace both to world peace and to Soviet integrity....According to Moscow, this can be done best by a friendly India with its large human and material resources. But then India's effectiveness depends upon its relationship with Pakistan. In its global strategy for peace and prosperity (sic!), the Soviet Union thus treats the Indian sub-continent as a single unit. All its actions and moves have to be viewed in this context. Tashkent was not proposed off-the-cuff. It marked the beginning of a new well-considered policy." It is the needs of this policy that brought Kosygin to Pakistan and India. It is a policy whole-heartedly approved by the U.S. imperialists. One may recall the words of U. S. Vice-President Hubert Humphrey spoken in a television broadcast on January 16, 1966: "It is a fact that the Soviets are trying to build a containment wall around China. This was part of the reason for Tashkent and that was well done." But this "containment wall" is being breached in Laos, Thailand, Burma, even in the eastern regions of India itself. And with the passing of time, the holes in the "containment wall" get bigger and bigger and

threaten to demolish it. Only recently the heroic people of Vietnam have rained shattering blows on the U.S. imperialists.

So, feverish activities are being carried on by the Soviet revisionists and other reactionaries to mend the holes, that is, to stifle the national liberation struggles, to stop the People's War in Vietnam by bringing the Vietnamese leaders to the conference table and thus to save U. S. imperialism. One of the objects of Kosygin's visit to India was surely to utilise the services of the Indian stooges for this purpose. Another object was to bring the reactionary ruling classes of India and Pakistan close to each other and to build together with them a "Holy Alliance" against China and the national liberation struggles. Kosygin offered material sops to the Pakistani rulers in the form of a steel mill and other kinds of "aid". What other inducement Kosygin offered we do not know. But the eulogy of the Tashkent spirit in the joint communique issued by Kosygin and Ayub and the subsequent visit of Kosygin to New Delhi suggest that Kosygin's mission was not wholly unsuccessful. Today, the main contradiction between the ruling classes of India and those of Pakistan is over the question of Kashmir. But another factor is emerging which is likely to force this contradiction into the background. This factor is the revolutionary struggle of India's peasantry and the growing revolt of the national minorities in Nagaland, Mizo areas, Manipur, Assam etc. Already the reactionary governments of India and Burma are co-ordinating their activities to suppress this revolt which extends over a vast area. (As everyone is aware, Ne Win's recent visit to New Delhi was intended to step up these activities). It will be difficult in no distant future for the Indian reactionaries to maintain their rule over a wide region if East Pakistan is unhelpful. It seems that a conspiracy is afoot to present a united front against the struggles of the national minorities and the agrarian revolution that is breaking out. The task of organizing this front has been assumed by the Soviet revisionist traitors. To accomplish their revolution, the Indian people will have to fight and overthrow not only the rule of the domestic reactionaries but also the indirect rule of the

U.S. imperialists and Soviet revisionists. The task is extremely difficult but it is no less noble. For, the triumph of the Indian revolution will mean the final doom of imperialism and its chief ally, revisionism.

#### STOP THIS OFFENSIVE

Comrade Jangal Santal and six other comrades, who were sent to prison by the United Front ministry for fighting for the cause of the Naxalbari peasantry, have been tried in a bourgeois court and sentenced—each to seven year's rigorous imprisonment. This was only expected. The toiling people know from their experience that the law, like the police and the military, is an instrument with which the ruling classes maintain their system of exploitation and oppression in a reactionary state like India. That is why, those like Comrade Jangal Santal, who dare to fight for the interests of the toiling people, are sent to jail or meted out worse punishment while goonda gangs maintained by the landlords and the industrialists, are quite free to kill and plunder and burn the huts of the poor peasants and workers until these killers are restrained by revolutionary violence. This has happened in Naxalbari and every other place where the toiling people have put up any resistance. Today, this is happening on a very wide scale in the districts of Andhra—Srikakulam, Nalgonda, Khammam, Warangal and Krishna. The tribal peasants and the revolutionary comrades who lead them there are under vicious attacks by the police and landlords' gangs, particularly in Srikakulam. Interested politicians are trying to put a caste colour on the intense class struggle that is now going on in several districts of Andhra.

Democrats all over India should raise their voice of protest against the inhuman atrocities which are now being committed by the police-goonda combine on the toiling peasantry and raise the demands :

Stop this offensive against the peasantry !

Release all political prisoners !

Withdraw all warrants of arrest against political workers !

Revolutionary comrades in different parts of India can

come to the help of the brave peasantry of Naxalbari, Srikakulam and Telangana only by developing revolutionary struggles in their own places.

#### ABOUT OURSELVES

A comrade from Bapatla (Andhra) has taken us to task for writing in a language which is difficult to understand. He has written :

"You are not at all following the teachings of Chairman Mao Tse-tung who teaches us that the language should be simple and easily understandable even to a layman."

We plead guilty to the charge. We have tried this month and shall try in future to write in a language that is simple and easy to understand.

Some time ago a comrade from Guntur asked us why we did not publish reports on the struggle now going on in Srikakulam. Unfortunately, we have not received any report from comrades there and our appeals to comrades to send us reports of struggles breaking out in Srikakulam, Telangana, Champaran and other places have been fruitless till now. We know from the bourgeois papers that a brave struggle is being waged by the peasants of Srikakulam and is now under savage attacks by the landlord-goonda-police combine. For lack of reports we cannot do our duty to the fighting peasantry there. We again appeal to comrades to send us reports of struggles.

It is not sometimes possible to acknowledge letters and reply to criticisms. But our comrade critics should know that we take note of every bit of criticism. So we took note of the very just criticism made by one of our comrades, Samir Majumder. He correctly pointed out that the sentence—"The seizure of state power is a culmination of class struggle"—in the article "Madurai Document Raises Revisionist slogan of Peaceful Transition" (*Liberation*, No. 2, p. 59) is wrong and misleading. We regret that faulty translation was responsible for this serious mistake and did not faithfully convey the idea expressed in the original article in Bengali. We thank him heartily for pointing out this mistake and invite comrades to send us their criticism, more of it, so that *Liberation* may prove to be a more effective weapon of struggle against all reactionaries, including revisionists and neo-revisionists.

## Rebellion is Right !

#### JAMMU AND KASHMIR

Jammu and Kashmir has repudiated the leadership of the Ranadive-Sundarayya clique. The State Committee of the Democratic Conference, which functioned as a unit of the CPI(M), has unanimously decided to sever all its relations with the CPI(M). In a statement issued by the Committee, it has denounced the leadership of the CPI(M), which, according to the Committee, has been pursuing a revisionist line, ideologically, politically and organisationally. The Committee has declared that the touchstone of a Communist today is his attitude to the thought of Mao Tse-tung. It has taken upon itself the following tasks among others : the propagation of Mao Tse-tung's thought and an uncompromising struggle against revisionism and neo-revisionism, formation of a new revolutionary Marxist-Leninist Party, the development of peasants' revolutionary struggles, the waging of militant class battles of all other toiling people and the fight against economism.

The full text of the Statement of the State Committee of the Democratic Conference, Jammu and Kashmir, will appear in the next issue of *Liberation*.

#### TAMILNAD

Revolutionary comrades from nine (out of fourteen) districts of Tamilnad met in March and decided to set up a state Co-ordination Committee. The following is the declaration of the State Co-ordination Committee :

#### Declaration of the Revolutionaries of the Communist Party of India (M), Tamilnad

The struggle against alien (Revisionist) ideology inside the Indian Communist Movement took a leap during the time of India-China border clash in 1962. It fully brought to light

the hideous nature of the traitorous Dange clique when they went in for all out support to the ruling bourgeoisie. In the elections that followed, particularly in Tamilnad, by their support to the ruling comprador big bourgeoisie in the name of 'supporting the progressives in opposition to the reactionaries', the revisionists fully exposed themselves before the eyes of the people. In its Bombay Conference, the clique shamelessly declared that its goal is National Democracy and the path leading to it is Parliamentarism, fully proving thereby that it is a Party of the bourgeoisie.

In its Calcutta Thesis, the Ranadive-Ramamurthi clique paraded themselves as champions warring against alien ideology inside the Party and declared their goal to be People's Democracy! By putting forward this slogan, these bogus 'Marxists' usurped the leadership of the Marxist Party. They played a hoax by publicising the Dange Letters, thereby preventing the ideological struggle against revisionism inside the Party taking a logical course and exposing those traitors who paraded under the garb of Revolutionaries. The path of attaining People's Democracy, as chalked out by this clique, stands fully exposed by their actions in clinging to parliamentarism and their unshaken belief in the Constitution. Their clinging to parliaments and the Constitution fully shows to which class these people owe their allegiance.

During India-Pakistan border clash, these pseudo-Marxist leaders—in their unshaken loyalty to the Indian bourgeoisie—outdid the Dange clique by their shameful statements.

When the Indian reactionaries staged their shameful antics before the Chinese Embassy, the stand which these 'Marxists' took made it clear, without any shadow of doubt, that they are class collaborators of reaction.

They joined hands with all reactionaries in a 'holy' crusade to drench in blood the heroic struggle of Naxalbari peasants, the torch-bearers of the Indian Revolution.

Their document at the Madura Conference has torn as under their pretensions regarding the International Communist Movement. Paying lip-service to Marxism-Leninism

and waving Red Flag (only to oppose it) these traitors have proved themselves to be the disruptors of the International Revolutionary Movement.

As far as Tamilnad is concerned, whether it be the old revisionists or neo-revisionists, they openly tail this ruling party or that.

The general path of Indian Revolution is illuminated by Marxism-Leninism and the light of Mao's thought. All other paths are lighted and inspired by the bourgeoisie. Mao's thought is the supreme living thought of this era of decay of imperialism and that is the only thought which can guide us to wrest power from the Indian big bourgeoisie—the servants of imperialist capital.

Nothing can be more illusory than to think of capturing state power from the bourgeois-rulers without smashing their state machine with which they suppress the toiling masses. There is no short-cut to smash this instrument of class rule. The general line of Indian Revolution is that of Naxalbari, which is guided by the thought of Mao Tse-tung. It is the one and only line for the successful completion of Indian Revolution.

All the manifestations of revolutionary situation as defined by Great Lenin are now present in our country. History imposes upon us the sacred duty of organising a Revolutionary Party to effectively lead the revolutionary battles that are bursting forth in several parts of the country.

At this historic moment, the revolutionaries of the Marxist Party from different parts of India met at Calcutta and formed a Co-ordination Committee. They have called on us by their historic declaration to come forward to build up a Revolutionary Party. They have laid down its general line of action. We, the revolutionaries of Tamilnad, greet and welcome this historic declaration.

We call on the revolutionaries both inside and outside the Marxist Party to carry forward the torch of Naxalbari movement into the nooks and corners of Tamilnad, at the

same time exposing the machinations of the traitors who lead the Marxist party.

We call upon the revolutionaries inside all working class movements to organise a revolutionary party to carry out our historic duty.

Let the glorious torch lit at Naxalbari light the path of revolution in Tamilnad.

### **KARNATAK**

Revolutionary comrades of the different districts of Karnatak met in April and set up the State Co-ordination Committee. The following is the Statement issued by the Committee :

#### **Formation of the Karnatak State Co-ordination Committee of The Revolutionaries of the CPI (M).**

The Karnataka State Co-ordination Committee of the Revolutionaries of the CPI (M) was formed at Mangalore on 14th April '68, in accordance with the call given by the All India Co-ordination Committee in November, '67. At this meeting the Committee resolved to carry on revolutionary work in accordance with the Declaration of the All India Committee, i.e.,

1) To develop and co-ordinate militant and revolutionary struggles, especially peasant struggles of the Naxalbari type under the leadership of the working class.

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

3) To wage an uncompromising ideological struggle against revisionism and new type revisionism and to popularise the Thought of Chairman Mao Tse-tung, which is Marxism-Leninism of the present era and to unite on the basis all revolutionary elements within and outside the party.

The Committee also called upon all the revolutionary comrades still within the CPI(M), Karnataka State, to repudiate openly the neo-revisionist leading clique at all levels and their politics, and openly to join hands with us who are striving to build a genuine Communist Party.