

LIBERATION

Notes		3
Greetings from Ceylonese Comrades	16
Spring Thunder Over India		
	— <i>People's Daily</i>	20
The November Revolution and the C. P. I.		
	— <i>Promode Sengupta</i>	25
The Development of Underdevelopment		
	— <i>A. G. Frank</i>	33
Indian Revolution	— <i>N. Sanmugathan</i>	49
On the Character of the Party		
	— <i>J. V. Stalin</i>	59
Time to Build up a Revolutionary Party		
	— <i>Charu Majumder</i>	62
"Marxist" Leaders in their True Colours		
	— <i>An Indian Communist</i>	70
On the Madurai Document		
	— <i>Deshabrati Editorial Board</i>	90
U.P. Comrades Revolt	100
Ranadive Tries to Deceive		
	— <i>Sushital Roy Choudhury</i>	106
Burma on the Road to Liberation		
	— <i>Thakin Ba Thein Tin</i>	120

Editor-in-Chief :

SUSHITAL ROY CHOUDHURY

QUOTATION FROM CHAIRMAN MAO TSE-TUNG

Therefore the united front, armed struggle and Party building are the three fundamental questions for our Party in the Chinese revolution. Having a correct grasp of these three questions and their interrelations is tantamount to giving correct leadership to the whole Chinese revolution.

Introducing "The Communist"
(October, 1939)

NOTES

LIBERATION

LIBERATION appears at a time when India is in the throes of an acute economic and political crisis, when the class struggle within our country and outside grows sharper and sharper, when the imperialists and their stooges, aided by the Soviet revisionists, are waging a brutal, fascist war against the peoples in three continents. In India, the big bourgeoisie, big landlords and their masters, the US and British imperialists, are bleeding the people white. To deceive the starving, super-exploited people of this country the ruling classes seek to preserve the facade of parliamentary democracy and resort from time to time to the worst kind of chauvinism—a game in which revisionists and neo-revisionists have joined them. On the other hand, brutal, fascist attacks are being made on the working class and the peasantry and on the national minorities whenever they rise in revolt.

But the forces of liberation are marching from victory to victory all the world over. Seven hundred million Chinese people, who are in the van of the world-wide struggle for freedom, world peace and socialism, are building a socialist society with amazing swiftness. The Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution has swept away from the minds of the Chinese people the thoughts and habits alien to socialism and ensured a future which will not tolerate reversion to capitalism as in the first socialist state of the world. The heroic Vietnamese people, applying correctly Mao Tse-tung's strategy and tactics of People's War, are dealing shattering blows to the most powerful of all imperialisms. The people of Southeast Asia have taken to the path of armed struggle against imperialism and its native stooges. Revolutionary storms are also blowing over Africa and Latin America. Within the USA, the citadel of world reaction, the

Afro-Americans, supported by sections of poor whites, are valiantly fighting to break the age-old fetters of slavery. Here, in India, an unprecedented revolutionary situation is fast developing. The brave peasants of Naxalbari, armed with Mao Tse-tung's thought, have raised the banner of revolt against feudal oppression, against the rule of the reactionary classes. For the first time in India's history, the revolutionary peasant movement led by the working class has been able to smash a weak link in the feudal-comprador bourgeois-imperialist chain despite all the terror unleashed by the rulers. Naxalbari marks the beginning of a new era in India's history—the beginning of the end of the old regime of exploitation by imperialism and its parasites. The message of Naxalbari, the message of agrarian revolution led by the working class as the only path to complete national liberation and socialism, is spreading and dispelling from the minds of our peasantry and working class the gloom of despair and instilling into them a revolutionary consciousness and a revolutionary urge. Naxalbari has smashed the barrier, the barrier erected by revisionist politics to isolate the toiling people of India from the world revolutionary forces battling against imperialism and all reaction—in China, Vietnam, Burma and other countries. It is Naxalbari which has given the revolutionary working people of India their rightful place as a contingent of the world revolutionary forces.

Naxalbari has also torn the mask off the neo-revisionist clique led by Ranadive, Namboodiripad, Sundarayya, and Co., and spells its doom. The perfidy of these neo-revisionist leaders like that of the Dangeites knows no limit. When the long-delayed social revolution is breaking out, they are acting as the last reserve of the reactionary ruling classes, which are now caught in the meshes of a deepening economic and political crisis. Hiding their real intentions under a cloak of left phraseology, they have discarded Marxism and stepped forward to defend the old hated regime, but the revolutionary forces will no doubt cast them into the dustbin of history and march

forward towards People's Democracy and Socialism.

Liberation dedicates itself to the noblest of all causes—the liberation of the toiling people. It dedicates itself to the cause of the Indian Revolution and takes the pledge to wage an uncompromising fight against the imperialists and native reactionaries including the revisionists and neo-revisionists.

Liberation sends its warmest fraternal greetings to the great Chinese comrades, the valiant Vietnamese comrades, the brave comrades in Burma, Thailand, Laos, Indonesia, Ceylon, the U. S. A and all other countries, who, guided by the thought of Mao Tse-tung, Marxism-Leninism of our era, are fighting relentless battles for national liberation, world peace and socialism.

"MARXISTS" AS DEFENDERS OF PARLIAMENTARY DEMOCRACY

In a circular dated October 17, 1967, to all Party units, the Polit Bureau of the CPI. (M) says :

"These events [the "attempted coup" of October 2 in West Bengal and the diabolical plans of the Chief Minister working secretly with the Congress Government at the centre to massacre five thousand political workers and throw into prison a few thousand more] show to what lengths the ruling classes are prepared to go in their desperate attempts to get over the deep economic and political crisis in which they are now caught. They are prepared to attack the very basis of parliamentary democracy to save their hated rule."

The PB has again raised "the slogan of mid-term elections for a fresh verdict of the people" and urged "all Party units to continuously hold meetings and demonstrations throughout the country, to rouse public opinion and the democratic forces to these dangers that are threatening the very fabric of parliamentary democracy and rally their support to defend it."

It is interesting to recall that the same slogan, the slogan to strengthen Parliamentary institutions and to extend demo-

See

Li 6, I,
3, p. 7.

cracy, was raised by the CPI during the election campaign in 1962—before the split (cp. Election Manifesto of the CPI, 1962).

Parliamentary democracy of which both the Dangeites and "Marxists" are so enamoured, is, as every Marxist knows, the organ of the dictatorship of the exploiting classes over the toiling people. Engels said that "the contemporary representative state is an instrument of exploitation of wage labour by capital." "A democratic republic", added Lenin, "is the best possible political shell for capitalism, and, therefore, once capital has gained control of this very best shell (through the Palchinskys, Chernova, Tseretelis & Co.), it establishes its power so securely, so firmly, that *no* change, either of persons, of institutions, or of parties in the bourgeois-democratic republic, can shake it.

"We must also note that Engels very definitely calls universal suffrage an instrument of bourgeois rule."

[*The State and Revolution*]

It was the British imperialists who planted Parliamentary democracy on the Indian soil as the organ of the imperialist-feudal dictatorship over the toiling people of India. When the British handed over political power to their Congress agents, this ready-made organ of class-rule was adopted unaltered by the new ruling classes—the comprador-bourgeoisie and the landlords. The Central Legislative Assembly of the British colonial days, elected by the propertied and privileged classes, was given the high-sounding name of the Constituent Assembly and served as the Parliament of the Sovereign Republic until the early months of 1952. The facade of parliamentary democracy has served the reactionary ruling classes well and the revisionist leaders of the CPI have all these years shared and instilled, to quote the words of Lenin, "into the minds of the people the wrong idea that universal suffrage 'in the modern state' is really capable of expressing the will of the majority of the toilers and of ensuring its realization."

Now that the various contradictions—between imperialism and the people, between feudalism and the peasantry, between the bourgeoisie and the working class—have been growing sharper and sharper, the reactionary ruling classes of India are finding it increasingly difficult to preserve the facade of parliamentary democracy. They are ready to scrap the parliamentary institutions whenever there arises a threat to their regime of oppression and exploitation and whenever they are unable to rule in the old way. So when the people are again and again rising in revolt against the bourgeois-landlord state, when a vast wave of struggle for land and food and national liberation, of which Naxalbari is only the prelude, is about to sweep the country—the reactionary ruling classes have pressed their last reserve, the neo-revisionists—Namboodiripad, Ranadive, Jyoti Basu, Sundarayya and Co.,—into the battle to save their hated rule. Faced with a fast developing revolutionary situation, these neo-revisionists have betrayed Marxism-Leninism and joined the counter-revolutionary camp. By waving the banner of parliamentary democracy they indeed seek to defend the joint dictatorship of the comprador-bureaucratic bourgeoisie and landlords. Their campaign in defence of parliamentary democracy and their call for mid-term elections are nothing but a clever ruse to screen from the people the sharp social contradictions, to divert their attention from the urgent revolutionary tasks of developing peasant struggles under the leadership of the working class on the Naxalbari line and to paralyse the revolutionary section of workers and peasants. But their attempt is doomed to fail. Despite their left phraseology they can hardly conceal their true character—the character of unashamed lackeys of the ruling classes.

UF GOVERNMENT AND THE ROLE OF "MARXISTS"

It is worth recalling a formulation of this treacherous clique. After they had joined the coalition governments in

West Bengal and Kerala, the West Bengal Committee of the CPI (M) made the following declaration in a communique entitled "W. B. State Committee Reviews Elections, Charts Immediate Tasks" (*People's Democracy*, April 16, 1967):

"Further the [UF] Ministry is formed on the basis of a conglomeration of fourteen parties with different policies and ideologies and they are united with the aim of serving the people's interests. *It has to function on the basis of a non-class outlook.*" (Italics ours). What a gem of a Marxist formulation! Can there be any "non-class outlook" in a class-ridden society? In the name of "a non-class outlook" the treacherous leaders of the party of the working class surrendered the proletarian outlook, proletarian politics, to the outlook and politics of the exploiting classes represented by the Bangla Congress and the like. So they never hesitate to join hands with other reactionaries to hunt and shoot down brave peasants and peasant women trying to break the shackles of feudal exploitation and throw hundreds of others into prison. They even outdo other counter-revolutionaries in vilifying the revolutionaries of the Party who are leading the struggle of the peasants. They share responsibility for a food policy which denies food to the people and enables the jotedars and blackmarketeers to reap a harvest of gold out of the misery and suffering of the people. They have not also hesitated to fire upon and murder workers.

After October 2, the vile surrender has become more and more glaring though the renegades seek to cover it up with militant slogans. "We do not want strikes and lock-out. We seek an amicable settlement of labour disputes," commented the Deputy Chief Minister, Mr Jyoti Basu (CPI-M) after the Cabinet meeting." (*The Statesman*, October 6, 1967). More than 60,000 workers lost their jobs in West Bengal during the first six months of the coalition government; there is lock-out in several large factories and industrialists are insisting on more retrenchment of workers but the "Marxists", who have done little to defend the workers, go on prating of conciliation, arbitration and industrial peace. Their policy has encouraged

G. D. Birla to praise Namboodiripad and to declare, "I am very happy in Kerala. I do not mind the Communists running the Government there." (*The Statesman*, October 24, 1967). In answer Jyoti Basu, Polit Bureau member, CPI (M), said: "The West Bengal Government acknowledged the fact that efforts should be made to harmonize relations in industry. It had therefore decided to meet industrialists and trade union leaders soon." "Mr. Jyoti Bassu," *The Statesman's* Staff Reporter added, "felt the trade union leaders were partly responsible for the present state of affairs. While recession played its part, in 'a few cases' labour might have demanded 'too much' and 'in many cases employers wanted to teach labour a lesson.'" (*The Statesman*, October 24, 1967). Is this the voice of a Marxist or of a flunkey of the bourgeoisie?

"Mr. Harekrishna Konar, CPI-M Minister for Land and Land Revenue, told reporters informally after the meeting that in the struggle between jotedars and bargadars on the land front, **there would in future be much less of the 'impatience and childishness' displayed by certain sections of the peasantry from time to time in the past.**..... He also said that he would urge the Cabinet to utilize military personnel in the coming procurement drive if such a need arose." (*The Statesman*, October 6, 1967). On the one hand, the Government of Jyoti Basu and Harekrishna Konar are bringing units of the Central Reserve Police, setting up police camps in the villages and perfecting the state machine to drown in blood any struggle of the share-croppers and landless agricultural labourers for food and land: on the other hand, Mr Konar and his men are trying to sabotage the struggle from within in the face of attacks from the jotedars and their Government. "As Secretary of the Krishak Sabha," reported the *Statesman* on October 20, 1967, "Mr Konar had also issued circulars to his organization's units asking Sabha workers to impress upon the bargadars the need for avoiding clashes with jotedars who might try to use force to take away paddy from the fields. The Sabha should organize its workers so

that bargadars could deposit their produce at panchayat khamars. Thereupon BDOs and JLROs should be requested to distribute paddy, after thrashing, among bargadars and jotedars." [Emphasis ours—Ed.]. To quote Lenin, "**Revolutionary-democratic phrases to gull the rural Simple Simons, bureaucracy and red tape for the 'benefit' of the capitalists—that is the essence of the 'honest' coalition.**" (*The State and Revolution*).

These lackeys of the big landlords and the bourgeoisie claim that by continuing in the UF Governments they are strengthening the Party, building mass organizations and extending the party's mass-base, and thus preparing for the Revolution to come. That the claim is hollow is not difficult to prove. How can you strengthen a Communist Party by repudiating Marxism-Leninism, making fascist attacks on the revolutionaries within the Party and by preaching bourgeois ideology? How can you build mass organizations by siding with the reactionary classes in class-battles and firing upon workers and peasants? How can you prepare for the Revolution by opposing class struggles and destroying and disrupting the Party and mass organizations? Naxalbari has torn the mask off them and made it possible for a genuine Communist Party, rid of their influence, to emerge.

These neo-revisionists contend that by clinging to office they are providing relief to the people. It is utter revisionism to hold that in this era of rapid disintegration and decay of the capitalist system it is possible to offer relief to the basic masses in a semi-colonial country like India without bringing about any changes in the relations of production and the character of the State. They deliberately ignore what Lenin said :

"The entire history of the bourgeois-parliamentary, and also, to a considerable extent, of the bourgeois-constitutional, countries shows that a change of ministers means very little, for the real work of administration is in the hands of an enormous

army of officials. This army, however, is undemocratic through and through, it is connected by thousands and millions of threads with the landowners and the bourgeoisie and is completely dependent on them. This army is surrounded by an atmosphere of bourgeois relations, and breathes nothing but this atmosphere. It is set in its ways, petrified, stagnant, and is powerless to break free of this atmosphere. It can only think, feel or act in the old way. This army is bound by servility to rank, by certain privileges of 'Civil' service, the upper ranks of this army are, through the medium of shares and banks, entirely enslaved by the finance capital, being to a certain extent its agent and a vehicle of its interests and influence.

"It is the greatest delusion, the greatest self-deception of the people, to attempt, by means of this state apparatus, to carry out such reforms as the abolition of landed estates without compensation, or the grain monopoly etc. This apparatus can serve a republican bourgeoisie creating a republic in the shape of a 'monarchy without a monarch', like the French Third Republic, but it is absolutely incapable of carrying out reforms which would seriously curtail or limit the rights of capital, the rights of 'sacred private property', much less abolish those rights. That is why it always happens, under all sorts of 'Coalition' cabinets that include 'socialists' that these socialists, even when individuals among them are perfectly honest, in reality turn out to be either a useless ornament or a screen to divert the people's indignation from the government, a tool for the government to deceive the people. This was the case with Louis Blanc in 1848, and dozens of times in Britain and France, when socialists participated in Cabinets. This is also the case with the Chernovs and Tseretelis in 1917. *So it has been and so it will be as long as the bourgeois system exists and as long as the old bourgeois, bureaucratic state apparatus remains intact.*

[Lenin: *One of the Fundamental Questions of ^{the} Revolution*, Collected Works, Vol. 25, pp. 367-368.] 373 :

in my edition there are verbal changes

SOVIET 'AID' TO INDIA

According to a message from Moscow, dated October 13, 1967, about half of the 'aid' of one billion roubles (Rs 825 crores), which the Soviet Union promised in July last year to grant India for 1966-70, will be channelled into industry. At a Press conference in the Soviet capital, Mr Fakhruddin Ali Ahmed, India's Minister for Industry, declared that "the development of the Indian engineering industry was 'inseparable' from Soviet aid. He has worked with Soviet officials to arrange co-operation in the field of engineering and 'the signing of an appropriate agreement is expected later.' "

It may be of interest to know that the loan the USSR has agreed to grant for 1966-70 far exceeds Soviet economic 'aid' to this country during ten years of Khrushchov's premiership. Another interesting thing is that Soviet 'aid' is increasing at a time when US 'aid' is declining. In its lust for world domination US imperialism has so overstretched itself that for the last few years it has been faced with a severe balance of payments crisis. This crisis caused mainly by overseas military expenditures, foreign 'aid' programmes (90 per cent of which are tied to exports) and private capital investment in foreign countries is forcing the US government to reduce its foreign commitments. It is chiefly through foreign military and economic 'aid' that the US imperialists maintain their neo-colonial regime in the underdeveloped countries of the world. But the mounting costs of their aggressive war in Vietnam and of the massive military build-up in Southeast Asia make it increasingly difficult for them to pour as much 'aid' in countries like India as is needed by reactionary regimes to survive. That is why, imperialist 'aid' to these regimes is being supplemented on an increasing scale by Soviet 'aid'.

Soviet 'aid' is usually hailed by reactionaries and revisionists of all hues as disinterested, generous and without strings. Is this praise really deserved? Is its nature really progressive

—altogether different from that of imperialist aid? If it is progressive, it would have helped India to break the shackles of foreign capital and enabled her economy to develop along independent lines. But facts prove the contrary. In 17 years from 1948 to 1965, foreign capital investments in the private sector in India increased from Rs. 255 crores to about Rs 1000 crores and investments of private US capital from Rs 11 crores to Rs 250 crores (this includes the capital invested by the World Bank in the private sector). India's total debt to the US imperialists until the end of the last year amounted to about Rs. 5500 crores. For meeting the huge balance of payments deficit, for keeping the wheels of her industry moving and for feeding quite a large section of the population, the reactionary rulers of India are chiefly dependent on the 'bounty' of the US imperialists. India's reactionary ruling classes would not have survived so long but for this vast 'aid' which has strengthened her neo-colonial fetters. As long as the Indian state is the state of big landlords and the comprador bureaucratic bourgeoisie, the mainstay of imperialism in the country, the question of independent development can hardly arise.

Marxism teaches us that from whatever source 'aid' may be received, it goes to enrich and strengthen the ruling class at the expense of the toiling people. Even communists have been duped too long by the revisionist theory that Soviet 'aid' can help Indian economy to develop along independent lines despite the imperialist stranglehold over it. Far from attacking this stranglehold, Soviet 'aid' has only strengthened it.

How can Soviet 'aid' be disinterested when the Soviet revisionists have seen to it that Soviet economy is based on the profit motive? If economic relations within the country are ruled by the principle of buying cheap and selling dear, can the economic relations with a foreign country be guided by a principle of an opposite character? It is absurd to think that Soviet 'aid' is Socialist aid when capitalism is being restored in the Soviet Union.

The Soviet 'aid' to India has only forged new shackles—of the neo-colonial kind—and is as 'disinterested' and 'unselfish', as the imperialist 'aid'. By using this weapon of 'aid', the Soviet revisionists have extended their influence over India's ruling classes as the junior partner of imperialism. Today the Soviet Union occupies the third place in India's foreign trade and is the chief supplier of military hardware. The Soviet 'aid', which India has so far received, has been invested in heavy industries controlled by Indian bureaucratic capital. The U. S. S. R. has been able to tighten her grip over some of the vital sectors of India's industry: she controls a fourth of the steel output, half of the oil refineries and a fifth of the electricity generated in India. She maintains a monopoly of the work of designs and supply of machinery and machine tools for the enterprises set up with her help. Let us take the example of the Bokaro Steel Plant now under construction. The Soviet rulers have refused to associate Indians with the work of designs and insist on having entire control over the steel works during the period of its construction.

Like the imperialists, the Soviet revisionists are forcing India to buy at high prices Soviet goods which are poor in quality. They also force India to spend the entire amount of 'aid' on purchases in the Soviet Union: that is, the entire 'aid' is tied to exports. It is also worth noting that the Soviet leaders exact prices for machines and machines-tools, which are 20 to 30 per cent higher than the prevailing international prices. That is why, the *Economic Times* commented that though the rate of interest on Soviet loans appears to be a mere 2½ per cent, the actual rate which is quite high lies concealed in the exorbitant prices of the goods supplied by the Soviet Union. She has plans of building industries in India in collaboration with Indian capital and of exporting their products to the markets in South-east Asia and Africa. These are only some of the ways in which the U. S. S. R. seeks to exploit the labour and resources of India and to control her economy together with the US imperialists.

The very pattern of trade between India and the Soviet Union is neo-colonial in character. The Soviet Union buys cheap from India primary or semi-processed products like jute, tea, wool, leather and tobacco and sells this country at high prices machines, machines-tools, tractors and other products of her industry.

India is a typical example that shows how by wielding the weapon of 'aid' the Soviet revisionists seek to buy up the Indian reactionaries, collaborate with US imperialists to maintain these reactionaries in power, do everything possible to prevent revolutionary developments and establish their domination over a foreign country jointly with the US imperialists.

It is the objective needs of capitalism, which the Soviet revisionists have restored in their country, that force them to collaborate with the US imperialists and build up their own neo-colonial empire. That is why in the name of "International Socialist Division of Labour," they have tried to stifle the economic development of the other socialist countries. To quote from the *Progressive Labour* of February-March, 1967, "Under the International Division of Labour the Soviet Union's allies supply food, raw materials and capital to the Soviet Union and, in turn, the Soviet Union force manufactured items on her allies." "In the final analysis," remarked the *Times Review of Industry* (February, 1964). "the COMECON members cannot maintain their development without help from the U. S. S. R., and any possible aspirations to greater political independence on the part of the East European countries must be governed by this knowledge." The Soviet Union is building up a sphere of economic and political domination and, to quote again from the same issue of the *Progressive Labour*, "Like any other nation which is developing an economy based on private profit, the Soviet Union needs areas to exploit."

That is why, the Soviet revisionist clique is feverishly trying to prop up every reactionary regime on earth with economic and military 'aid', to help the US imperialists to "contain" socialist China and to do everything conceivable to put out the flame of national liberation war. That is why, "The US", as *The Broadsheet* of October, 1966, said, "is no longer afraid of the Soviet Union's influence in India, and indeed counts on its help."

Because of the immense prestige that the Soviet Union still enjoys among exploited peoples, its revisionist rulers are as deadly enemies as the U. S. imperialists. Soviet "aid" is indeed a Trojan horse used by U. S. imperialism to ensure their joint domination over India and countries like India.

CEYLONESE COMRADES GREET 'LIBERATION'

9, De Mel Street,
Colombo 2.
Ceylon.
October 16, 1967

The Liberation,
C/o Deshabrati Office,
Calcutta,
India.

Dear Indian Comrades,

At this moment, when you, the fraternal revolutionaries in India, are to publish an English journal in the name of *Liberation*, allow us, the Marxist-Leninists from Ceylon, to extend our revolutionary greetings to you, your organ *Liberation*, through you to all the Marxist-Leninists and revolutionaries in the sub-continent of India.

Comrades !

Today, the world revolutionary situation is very excellent. Hurricane of revolution spreads all over the world, particularly in Asia, Africa and Latin America. These three continents have now become the "area of revolutionary storms." Resolute struggle for national liberation and independence is being waged all over the world. We are living in a period when world imperialism headed by US imperialism is approaching its total destruction with its allies, the modern revisionist traitors with the leading clique of the CPSU as their centre and all kind of reactionaries. At the same time, world revolution, socialism, is marching towards its world-wide victory. The US-led imperialists now face serious difficulties and are being violently attacked by the peoples' forces.

The leadership of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union has become the arch traitor to the people who fight for national liberation and for Socialism. Colluding with US-led imperialists, these renegades of the Great October Revolution are dreaming of US-Soviet world domination. Today, they have

entered into an unholy alliance against People's China and heroic Albania, vanguards of the international communist movement, and peddles a violent campaign against them. At a time when they celebrate the 50th anniversary of the Great October Revolution, they have restored capitalism in the Soviet Union and betrayed the holy cause of Lenin and Stalin. They have degenerated the first workers' state into bourgeois dictatorship.

Comrades !

The Thought of Mao Tse-tung is Marxism-Leninism of our era. Comrade Mao inherited and defended Marxism-Leninism and developed it into entirely new heights. He correctly, comprehensively and creatively applied Marxism-Leninism and solved a series of questions. He made a vast contribution to the development of Marxism-Leninism. Under his correct and incomparable leadership, the Chinese revolution achieved nation-wide victory. Comrade Mao is a genius and the greatest Marxist-Leninist alive. We are living in the era of Mao Tse-tung, i.e., the era in which world imperialism is heading for its doom and world socialism is marching towards its success. Therefore, Marxism-Leninism of the present time is the invincible Thought of Mao Tse-tung. It is a powerful and vigorous ideological weapon for opposing imperialism and for opposing revisionism. Whoever disagrees with this is not a genuine Marxist-Leninist, but only a revisionist.

In this era of Mao Tse-tung, the world progressives heard the good news of armed rebellion in your country. The land of so-called "Gandhism" has now been shaken with the people's armed uprisings. Well-advertised "followers" of the "non-violent" method of Gandhi and Nehru, the Indian people are now furiously rising like a volcano. They divorced themselves from the humbug of "non-violence." Today, we see their determination to wage a resolute struggle against the reactionary Congress government.

As a result of its utter reactionary policy, the reactionary Congress rule brought India into starvation and famine. They

have become an obedient servant of foreign imperialists and revisionists. They make room for the imperialists, bureaucrat-comprador capitalists, feudalists to continue their exploitation. They barbarously suppress the people's movement and are further sharpening their weapons for assault on the people's just struggles.

Therefore, the Indian people have now found that it is impossible to make ends meet. Therefore, now they wage various forms of struggle against the Congress running dogs of imperialism and challenge the tyrannical rule of big bourgeoisie and landlords.

When such an excellent situation prevails all over the sub-continent of India, a handful of modern and neo-revisionists attempt to betray the people's struggle, particularly, of peasants. Instead of encouraging these struggles against the Congress reactionary rulers, modern revisionists led by Sripath Amrit Dange and neo-revisionists led by the "distinguished invitee" of the Soviet revisionist leaders, at the 50th anniversary of betrayed-October Revolution, tell the people to fully engage in parliamentary forms of struggle. They try to divert the attention of the Indian people from violent struggles. Especially, the neo-revisionists have become the devotees of bourgeois "parliamentary democracy", and of constitutionalism. Following a capitulationist policy, these neo-revisionists surrendered themselves to the renegade Dange clique and, at the same time, made alliance with ultra-reactionaries like the Swatautra Party in the "fourth general elections." In the ideological field, they follow a so-called line of "liberalism" between Marxism-Leninism and modern revisionism. They seek a "broadest united front" between China and the Soviet Union, between revolutionaries and the agents of imperialists. By their "mild" policy and "middle" path, these neo-revisionists obviously serve the Indira reactionary regime and the Soviet revisionist masters; and have caused damage to the Indian revolution.

Now, when the revisionists in the mask of "communists"

have already done their betrayal, it has become the duty of Marxist-Leninists and genuine revolutionaries in India to carry the people's struggle forward and to lead the masses to people's democratic revolution.

We believe that you will do your bounden-duty persistently and vigilantly. We believe that you will carry the fight against both modern and neo-revisionism and will identify them as the main danger to the Indian revolution. We feel that you will draw a series of lessons from Indonesia.

Ceylonese revolutionaries, as well as the world revolutionaries, know that, only by applying the ever-victorious Thought of Mao Tse-tung, the Marxism-Leninism of our time, not only the Indian revolution but also the world revolution can succeed.

At this moment, when your English-language monthly, the "Liberation", is to be published, we greet you with the great hope that you will wage a brave fight against all of our common enemies: imperialism, bureaucrat-comprador capitalism, feudalism, and modern and neo-revisionism, and that you will arouse and lead the masses against the Congress running dogs of imperialism. We are sure that you will carry it through your new English monthly, the "Liberation". We salute and greet the monthly, "Liberation", the organ of our fraternal Indian revolutionaries.

We are sure that you will defeat the Congress tyrannical rule and lead the people's democratic revolution; Expose and sweep away the modern and neo-revisionists in your ranks; Cast away all illusions on bourgeois "parliamentary democracy"; Build a genuine Marxist-Leninist leadership; Hold high the revolutionary red banner of Marxism-Leninism, the invincible Thought of Mao Tse-tung; Carry forward the tradition of Telengana and Naxalbari; and Take all roads possible to win the final victory.

WITH COMMUNIST GREETINGS,

Marxist-Leninists from Ceylon
A. C. M. SALY.
A. S. M. CASSIM.
ASOKA L. HANDAGAMA.

NAXALBARI IN THE EYES OF CHINESE COMRADES
SPRING THUNDER OVER INDIA

[We reproduce from Indian journals the following editorial in the Peking PEOPLE'S DAILY of July 5, 1967.

—Editor, LIBERATION]

A peal of spring thunder has crashed over the land of India. Revolutionary peasants in the Darjeeling area have risen in rebellion. Under the leadership of a revolutionary group of the Indian Communist Party, a red area of rural revolutionary armed struggle has been established in India. This is a development of tremendous significance for the Indian people's revolutionary struggle.

In the past few months, the peasant masses in this area, led by the revolutionary group of the Indian Communist Party, have thrown off the shackles of modern revisionism and smashed the trammels that bound them. They have seized grain, land and weapons from the landlords and plantation owners, punished the local tyrants and wicked gentry, and ambushed the reactionary troops and police that went to suppress them thus demonstrating the enormous might of the peasants' revolutionary armed struggle. All imperialists, revisionists, corrupt officials, local tyrants and wicked gentry, and reactionary army and police are nothing in the eyes of the revolutionary peasants who are determined to strike them down to the dust. The absolutely correct thing has been done by the revolutionary group of the Indian Communist Party and they have done it well. The Chinese people joyfully applaud this revolutionary storm of the Indian peasants in the Darjeeling area as do all Marxist-Leninists and revolutionary people of the whole world.

It is an inevitability that the Indian peasants will rebel and the Indian people will make revolution because the reactionary Congress rule has left them with no alternative. India under
◊ Congress rule is only nominally independent; in fact, it is

nothing more than a semi-colonial, semi-feudal country. The Congress administration represents the interests of the Indian feudal princes, big landlords and bureaucrat-comprador capitalists. Internally, it oppresses the Indian people without any mercy and sucks their blood, while internationally it serves the new boss, U.S. imperialism, and its number one accomplice, the Soviet revisionist ruling clique, in addition to its old suzerain British imperialism, thus selling out the national interests of India in a big way. So imperialism, Soviet revisionism, feudalism and bureaucrat-comprador capitalism weigh like big mountains on the backs of the Indian people, especially on the toiling masses of workers and peasants.

The Congress administration has intensified its suppression and exploitation of the Indian people and pursued a policy of national betrayal during the past few years. Famine has stalked the land year after year. The fields are strewn with the bodies of those who have died of hunger and starvation. The Indian people, above all, the Indian peasants, have found life impossible for them. The revolutionary peasants in the Darjeeling area have now risen in rebellion, in violent revolution. This is the prelude to a violent revolution by the hundreds of millions of people throughout India. The Indian people will certainly cast away these big mountains off their backs and win complete emancipation. This is the general trend of Indian history which no force on earth can check or hinder.

What road is to be followed by the Indian revolution? This is a fundamental question affecting the success of the Indian revolution and the destiny of the 500 million Indian people. The Indian revolution must take the road of relying on the peasants, establishing base areas in the countryside, persisting in protracted armed struggle and using the countryside to encircle and finally capture the cities. This is Mao Tse-tung's road, the road that has led the Chinese revolution to victory, and the only road to victory for the revolution of all oppressed nations and peoples.

Our great leader, Chairman Mao Tse-tung, pointed out as long as 40 years ago: "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, war lords, corrupt officials, local tyrants and evil gentry into their graves."

Chairman Mao explicitly pointed out long ago that the peasant question occupies an extremely important place in the people's revolution. The peasants constitute the main force in the national-democratic revolution against imperialism and its lackeys; they are the most reliable and numerous allies of the proletariat. India is a vast semi-colonial and semi-feudal country with a population of 500 million, the absolute majority of which, the peasantry, once aroused, will become the invincible force of the Indian revolution. By integrating itself with the peasants, the Indian proletariat will be able to bring about earth-shaking changes in the vast countryside of India and defeat any powerful enemy in a soul-stirring people's war.

Our great leader, Chairman Mao, teaches us: "The seizure of power by armed force, the settlement of the issue by war, is the central task and the highest form of revolution. This Marxist-Leninist principle of revolution holds good universally, for China and for all other countries."

The specific feature of Indian revolution, like that of the Chinese revolution, is armed revolution fighting against armed counter-revolution. Armed struggle is the only correct road for the Indian revolution; there is no other road whatsoever. Such trash as "Gandhi-ism", "parliamentary road" and the like are opium used by the Indian ruling classes to paralyse the Indian people. Only by relying on violent revolution and taking the road of armed struggle can India be saved and the

Indian people achieve complete liberation. Specifically, this is to arouse the peasant masses boldly, build up and expand the revolutionary armed forces, deal blows at the armed suppression of the imperialists and reactionaries, who are temporarily stronger than the revolutionary forces, by using the whole set of the flexible strategy and tactics of people's war personally worked out by Chairman Mao, and to persist in protracted armed struggle and seize victory of the revolution step by step.

In the light of the characteristics of the Chinese revolution, our great leader, Chairman Mao, has pointed out the importance of establishing revolutionary rural base areas. Chairman Mao teaches us: In order to persist in protracted armed struggle and defeat imperialism and its lackeys, "it is imperative for the revolutionary ranks to turn the backward villages into advanced, consolidated base areas, into great military, political, economic and cultural bastions of the revolution from which to fight their vicious enemies who are using the cities for attacks on the rural districts, and in this way gradually to achieve the complete victory of the revolution through protracted fighting."

India is a country with vast territory; its countryside where the reactionary rule is weak, provides the broad areas in which the revolutionaries can manoeuvre freely. So long as the Indian proletarian revolutionaries adhere to the revolutionary line of Marxism-Leninism, Mao Tse-tung's Thought and rely on their great ally, the peasants, it is entirely possible for them to establish one advanced revolutionary rural base area after another in the broad backward rural areas and build a people's army of a new type. Whatever difficulties and twists and turns the Indian revolutionaries may experience in the course of building such revolutionary base areas, they will eventually develop such areas from isolated points into a vast expanse, from small areas into extensive ones, an expansion in a series of waves. Thus, a situation in which the cities are encircled from the countryside will gradually be brought

about in the Indian revolution to pave the way for the final seizure of towns and cities and winning nation-wide victory.

The Indian reactionaries are panic-stricken by the development of the rural armed struggle in Darjeeling. They have sensed imminent disaster and they wail in alarm that the peasants' revolt in Darjeeling will "become a national disaster." Imperialism and the Indian reactionaries are trying in a thousand and one ways to suppress this armed struggle of the Darjeeling peasants and nip it in the bud. The Dange renegade clique and the revisionist chieftains of the Indian Communist Party are vigorously slandering and attacking the revolutionaries in the Indian Communist Party and the revolutionary peasants in Darjeeling for their great exploits. The so-called "Non-Congress" government in West Bengal openly sides with the reactionary Indian Government in its bloody suppression of the revolutionary peasants in Darjeeling. This gives added proof that these renegades and revisionists are running dogs of U. S. imperialism and Soviet revisionism and lackeys of the big Indian landlords and bourgeoisie. What they call the "Non-Congress government" is only a tool of these landlords and bourgeoisie.

But no matter how well the imperialists, Indian reactionaries and the modern revisionists may co-operate in their sabotage and suppression, the torch of armed struggle lighted by the revolutionaries in the Indian Communist Party and the revolutionary peasants in Darjeeling will not be put out. "A single spark can start a prairie fire." The spark in Darjeeling will start a prairie fire and will certainly set the vast expanses of India ablaze. That a great storm of revolutionary armed struggle will eventually sweep across the length and breadth of India is certain. Although the course of the Indian revolutionary struggle will be long and tortuous, the Indian revolution, guided by great Marxism-Leninism, Mao-Tseung's Thought, will surely triumph.

NOVEMBER REVOLUTION AND THE CPI PROMODE SENGUPTA

This year the Soviet Union and the world proletariat are celebrating the 50th anniversary of the first great successful proletarian revolution. Today, after fifty years, the people of the Soviet Union and the proletariat of all countries are faced with a serious contradiction.

Fifty years ago, the Russian proletariat led by Lenin and the Bolshevik Party seized power by a violent revolution and established the Soviet regime of proletarian dictatorship. That was a revolution in the real sense of the term, the profoundest revolution in the history of mankind, a revolution which for the first time in history ended exploitation of man by man in a large part of the world. But today the Soviet leaders have denounced the Marxist-Leninist doctrine of proletarian revolution and the dictatorship of the proletariat. In its place they are trying to establish the anti-working class and anti-Marxist revisionist doctrine of peaceful transition to socialism.

When the Soviet and other Revisionists all over the world are trying their best to distort the fundamental principles of Marxism-Leninism, it is most urgent that those principles should be recapitulated while celebrating the fiftieth anniversary of the glorious November Revolution.

The most important factor for the success of the November Revolution was the formation of the Bolshevik Party by Lenin on the firm foundation of Marxist revolutionary principles in the days when the working class movement was dominated everywhere by strong currents of Revisionism. This most important factor for a proletarian revolution, i.e., the decisive role of a proletarian revolutionary party in a revolutionary situation, must be stressed again and again. It must be remembered that during the post-First World War period a revolutionary situation matured in many countries—Germany, Austria, Italy, Hungary, etc., but everywhere it failed, while

only in Russia the revolution had been led to a successful culmination. This could not have been merely accidental; it certainly had a serious reason. One of the main reasons why revolution succeeded in Russia was that Lenin, foreseeing the development of revolutionary crisis, had formed the Bolshevik Party in time and began to prepare the working class and the peasantry for that eventuality, whereas in other countries there was no Marxist revolutionary party.

Of all the contemporary Socialist leaders, it was only Lenin who, right at the beginning of his political activities, saw with complete clearness the whole character of that maturing revolutionary epoch and, what is more, he drew practical, concrete conclusions, i.e., he prepared for it. Lenin derived this farsightedness, and unique strength from the basis of Marxism, which he brought to new life, rescuing it from the hands of the Revisionist pedants, philistines and traitors. Lenin himself has pointed out how the success of Bolshevism and of the building of the party was the outcome of decades of tireless preparatory work, both in theory and practice:

"Russia has attained Marxism, the only revolutionary theory, by dint of 50 years travail and sacrifice, through the greatest revolutionary heroism, the most incredible energy, by unselfish pursuit, training, education, practical tests, disappointments, checking up and comparison with European experience. Thanks to the emigration forced by the Tsar, revolutionary Russia, in the second half of the nineteenth century, came into possession of rich international connections, and of an excellent grasp of the forms and theories of the revolutionary movement such as no other country had."

(*Left-Wing Communism.*)

Marx died in 1883 and Engels died in 1895 and it was just about that time that Lenin took up the red banner of Marxism and waged a most uncompromising struggle against all kinds of revisionism, both indigenous and foreign. The Russian Social

Democratic Labour Party consisted of all sorts of groups—Revisionists, Mensheviks, Economists, Liquidators, Trotskyites, Legal Marxists and Bolsheviks, a hodge-podge of Marxists and opportunists, of friends and foes of revolution. Bolsheviks were the only party to remain faithful to Marxism and the only party which prepared for the coming revolutionary crisis. Lenin's *What is to be Done, Two Tactics of Social Democracy in the Democratic Revolution, One Step Forward, Two Steps Back, Materialism Empirio-criticism* were the theoretical preparation.

During the Revolution of 1905-6 the Bolsheviks were in the forefront of the movement and consequently it was they who had to bear the brunt more than anyone else. Many of them were killed, thousands were imprisoned and some had to go into exile. In the period of reaction that followed, the Menshevik opportunists came to the forefront declaring that there was no longer much scope for revolutionary activity, that it was necessary to 'liquidate' the illegal revolutionary party and concentrate instead on building legal trade unions and a legal workers' party with a limited programme of demands for some concessions.

At the other extreme, some 'left' Bolsheviks, known as Otsovists, took up a passive sectarian line advocating boycott of the Duma elections, thus denying the necessity in a period of reaction to utilise every smallest legal possibility alongside illegal work. They indulged in all kinds of "Left" phraseology as a screen, but in essence renounced mass struggle.

This was the most difficult period for Lenin and his followers. But instead of compromising or softening, they upheld revolutionary principles of Marxism more than ever before and thus instead of being wiped out they became firmly rooted in the working class due to their militant and consistent policy. Bolsheviks also penetrated among the peasantry. The Menshevik leader, T. Dan, while writing the official history of Menshevism, ruefully admitted: "Whilst the Bolshevik section of the party transformed itself into a battle-phalanx, held together by iron discipline and cohesive guiding resolution,

the ranks of the Menshevik section were ever more seriously disorganised by dissension and apathy."

In spite of inhuman repression, a new wave of struggle began with the Lena gold miners' strike in 1912 when 500 were killed and wounded. Workers all over Russia came out in thousands, not in tears, but in militant protests. Defying Tsarist terror, strikes, mass demonstrations and meetings were held when revolutionary proclamations were made and workers expressed their resolution to fight. They were mainly organised by the Bolsheviks. This revolutionary strike movement continued with vigour in 1913 and 1914. Peasants also joined the movement. There were also many lock-outs.

These manifestations, wrote Lenin, "have clearly shown that Russia has entered the phase of a rise in the revolution." (*Revolutionary Rise* : Selected Works, I, p. 537). The revolutionary crisis began to mature and the situation became similar to that of 1905. The country was heading for a new revolution.

At a critical time like this the treacherous character of the Menshevik revisionists was becoming clear to the masses and unity with them in a single party was assuming the character of betrayal of the working class and its party. Unity for what, unity on what principles—became a vital question. It was the Mensheviks, who, by denying the fundamental principles of revolutionary Marxism, had destroyed the basis of unity. The Mensheviks wanted *formal* unity, while Bolsheviks were trying to restore *real* unity based on a firm Marxist revolutionary programme. For the sake of revolution the split became inevitable. At the Prague Conference of the RSDLP in 1912 the Bolshevik Party was formed as a separate party.

By this split, by this so-called 'disunity' the Party was immensely strengthened and in its turn, it also strengthened the unity of the workers and the party. In fact, a Marxist revolutionary party strengthens itself by purging its ranks of opportunist elements. This is a vital Marxist-Leninist principle which the Communist Party of India never followed during

its 40 years of history. The important fact was that by splitting with the opportunist Mensheviks, the Bolsheviks created a new party of a *new type*, quite different from the usual Social Democratic parties of the West, one that was free of vacillating and opportunist petty bourgeois elements and capable of educating and leading the proletariat and the peasantry in a struggle for the seizure of power and establishing dictatorship of the proletariat.

Before the war in a controversy with the anti-revisionist, German Marxists, Lenin emphasised the need for organising a separate revolutionary party. (See Lenin's answer to the "Janus Pamphlet"). The German leaders like Rosa Luxemburg opposed Lenin's idea on the ground that it would split the working class and thereby weaken them. How wrong they were (and how correct Lenin was) was proved when the revolutionary crisis broke out after the war. The German revolutionaries hastily formed the Spartacist Bund, but they were unable to cope with the revolutionary situation and the German revolution failed.

When the war came, the advance of the revolutionary movement was interrupted for the time being. The opportunist leaders of the Second International, far from opposing the imperialist war according to their previous promises, betrayed the cause of socialism and of international solidarity by siding with their respective imperialist rulers and incited the people against each other on the plea of defending the fatherland—a plea that was also adopted by Indian revisionists on another occasion. As opposed to this Lenin gave the correct Marxist slogan: "Transform the imperialist war into a civil war"—turn the war into a war against the capitalist class for the victory of socialism. For a socialist to denounce only the enemy-imperialism and support one own's imperialism was nothing but treachery. The Revolution that broke out in Russia in March 1917 and destroyed the Tsarist regime was a spontaneous revolution, from the below, of the workers, soldiers and peasants. At that time the Bolshevik leaders

were either in prison or in exile. Although the February Revolution was the work of the working masses and soldiers alone, power fell into the hands of those who played no part in the revolution—the bourgeoisie and their agents, Socialist Mensheviks. They set up a Provisional Government.

But the workers, impelled by their class instinct and historical experience, did one thing—they set up Soviets (Councils) of workers' and soldiers' Deputies, as they did in 1905. Thus a sort of Dual power came into existence, of the bourgeois Provisional Government on the one hand, and of the Soviets on the other. In the beginning the Bolsheviks were in a minority in these Soviets; the majority of the workers' Deputies were still politically inexperienced and were under the spell of the Menshevik and Socialist Revolutionary demagogy. It soon became evident that this Dual power could not continue long. One class or the other must dominate and rule; either the bourgeoisie would establish its own dictatorship, or the working class with its ally, the poor peasantry must go forward to seize power and establish the dictatorship of the proletariat. There was no *via media*, there could be no compromise on this issue at such a turning point of history. Had there been no Bolshevik party, experienced and steeled through years of struggle, to guide the Soviets, the bourgeoisie organised in the Provisional Government would have eventually crushed the Soviets and would have established their own dictatorship.

The eight months from March to November, from the First to the Second Russian Revolution of 1917, were a vital period of rapid unfolding of the class struggle, of successively clearer revelation of the role of each class and its leaders. This was the period when the Bolsheviks under the guidance of Lenin and Stalin prepared for the seizure of power by the working class, by the Soviet, led by a *single* party, the Bolshevik party, the Communist Party. Stalin has summarised this period as follows:

1. "All through the period of preparation for October (November) the Party invariably relied in its struggle

upon the spontaneous upsurge of the mass revolutionary movement;

2. While relying on the spontaneous upsurge, it maintained its own undivided leadership of the movement;
3. This leadership of the movement helped it to form the mass political army for the October (November) insurrection;
4. This policy was bound to bring it to pass that the entire preparation for October (November) proceeded under the leadership of *one* party, the Bolshevik Party;
5. The preparation for October (November), in its turn, brought it about that as a result of the October (November) insurrection power was concentrated in the hands of one party, the Bolshevik party."

[*Problems of Leninism*, p. 111]

For the seizure of power, the first and foremost task of the Bolshevik Party was to create a *mass political army* which is quite different from a ready-made professional army. A revolutionary party creates its army in course of the struggle itself, in course of sharp class-conflict when the masses themselves become convinced about its necessity through their own experience. The Bolsheviks did succeed in building up such an army in the period between March and November.

What line did the Bolshevik Party follow in order to bring about this effective leadership? The leadership of the Paris Commune of 1871 was divided between two parties, none of which could give effective leadership, and that was one of the main reasons for its defeat. Under conditions of imperialism such divided leadership does not lead to the victory of the dictatorship of the proletariat. For creating an effective leadership the Bolshevik Party took the line of isolating the *compromising* forces within the working class movement. In that critical and decisive period of the revolution in Russia the compromising forces were mainly the Mensheviks and the Socialist Revolutionaries. Such petty-bourgeois parties became the

most dangerous social support of imperialism by their policy of compromise with the vested interests.

Another characteristic feature of this period was the winning over of the general masses of the peasantry by the Bolshevik Party. The Mensheviks and the Socialist Revolutionaries had promised land to the peasantry, so they had considerable influence among them. But due to their class interests they were unable to fulfil these promises. The Mensheviks in the Provisional Government refused to confiscate the land belonging to the landlords and distribute it among the peasantry. Only the Bolsheviks supported the demand of the peasantry for land and thus forged the alliance between the proletariat and the peasantry.

The Bolsheviks during this period supported another popular demand—immediate termination of war and the establishment of peace. The first two decrees that were passed by the Soviet Government were on peace, demanding immediate armistice and peace negotiations, and on land proclaiming: "landlord ownership of land is abolished forthwith without compensation." Private ownership of land was abolished for ever and it was replaced by state or public ownership. 400,000,000 acres of land that had formerly belonged to the landlords and monasteries were distributed among the peasantry. Thus the bourgeois democratic revolution, which the bourgeoisie and the petty-bourgeoisie were unable to carry through, was completed by the proletarian dictatorship; it was only on this basis that the road to socialist revolution was opened up.

Needless to say, the Communist Parties that were subsequently formed throughout the world were greatly influenced by the lessons of the November Revolution. Of all these parties, the Chinese Party learnt the lessons of the November Revolution best and under Mao Tse-tung's leadership applied those lessons successfully in Chinese conditions and thereby developed and enriched the Marxist theory of proletarian revolution and the dictatorship of the proletariat. And by

[See Page 133]

THE DEVELOPMENT OF UNDERDEVELOPMENT

Andrew Gunder Frank

[In reproducing this remarkable article by a very distinguished writer on the pattern of economy in underdeveloped countries including India, and its causes, we gratefully acknowledge our indebtedness to him and to the MONTHLY REVIEW of September, 1966, where it first appeared.]

—Editor, LIBERATION]

We cannot hope to formulate adequate development theory and policy for the majority of the world's population who suffer from underdevelopment without first learning how their past economic and social history gave rise to their present underdevelopment. Yet most historians study only the developed metropolitan countries and pay scant attention to the colonial and underdeveloped lands. For this reason most of our theoretical categories and guides to development policy have been distilled exclusively from the historical experience of the European and North American advanced capitalist nations.

Since the historical experience of the colonial and underdeveloped countries has demonstrably been quite different, available theory therefore fails to reflect the past of the underdeveloped part of the world entirely, and reflects the past of the world as a whole only in part. More important, our ignorance of the underdeveloped countries' history leads us to assume that their past and indeed their present resemble earlier stages of the history of the now developed countries. This ignorance and this assumption lead us into serious misconceptions about contemporary underdevelopment and development. Further, most studies of development and underdevelopment fail to take account of the economic and other relations

between the metropolis and its economic colonies throughout the history of the world-wide expansion and development of the mercantilist and capitalist system. Consequently, most of our theory fails to explain the structure and development of the capitalist system as a whole and to account for its simultaneous generation of underdevelopment in some of its parts and of economic development in others.

It is generally held that economic development occurs in a succession of capitalist stages and that today's underdeveloped countries are still in a stage, sometimes depicted as an original stage of history, through which the now developed countries passed long ago. Yet even a modest acquaintance with history shows that underdevelopment is not original or traditional and that neither the past nor the present of the underdeveloped countries resembles in any important respect the past of the now developed countries. The now developed countries were never underdeveloped, though they may have been undeveloped. It is also widely believed that the contemporary underdevelopment of a country can be understood as the product or reflection solely of its own economic, political, social, and cultural characteristics or structure. Yet historical research demonstrates that contemporary underdevelopment is in large part the historical product of past and continuing economic and other relations between the satellite underdeveloped and the now developed metropolitan countries. Furthermore, these relations are an essential part of the structure and development of the capitalist system on a world scale as a whole. A related and also largely erroneous view is that the development of these underdeveloped countries and, within them of their most underdeveloped domestic areas, must and will be generated or stimulated by diffusing capital, institutions, values, etc., to them from the international and national capitalist metropolises. Historical perspective based on the

underdeveloped countries' past experience suggests that on the contrary in the underdeveloped countries economic development can now occur only independently of most of these relations of diffusion.

Evident inequalities of income and differences in culture have led many observers to see "dual" societies and economies in the underdeveloped countries. Each of the two parts is supposed to have a history of its own, a structure, and a contemporary dynamic largely independent of the other. Supposedly, only one part of the economy and society has been importantly affected by intimate economic relations with the "outside" capitalist world; and that part, it is held, became modern, capitalist, and relatively developed precisely because of this contact. The other part is widely regarded as variously isolated, subsistence-based, feudal, or precapitalist, and therefore more underdeveloped.

I believe on the contrary that the entire "dual society" thesis is false and that the policy recommendations to which it leads will, if acted upon, serve only to intensify and perpetuate the very conditions of underdevelopment they are supposedly designed to remedy.

A mounting body of evidence suggests, and I am confident that future historical research will confirm, that the expansion of the capitalist system over the past centuries effectively and entirely penetrated even the apparently most isolated sectors of the underdeveloped world. Therefore, the economic, political, social, and cultural institutions and relations we now observe there are the products of the historical development of the capitalist system no less than are the seemingly more modern or capitalist features of the national metropolises of these underdeveloped countries. Analogously to the relations between development and underdevelopment on the international level, the contemporary underdeveloped institutions of the so-called backward or feudal domestic areas of an underdeveloped

country are no less the product of the single historical process of capitalist development than are the so-called capitalist institutions of the supposedly more progressive areas. In this paper I should like to sketch the kinds of evidence which support this thesis and at the same time indicate lines along which further study and research could fruitfully proceed.

II

The Secretary General of the Latin American Center for Research in the Social Sciences writes in that Center's journal: "The privileged position of the city has its origin in the colonial period. It was founded by the Conqueror to serve the same ends that it still serves today; to incorporate the indigenous population into the economy brought and developed by that Conqueror and his descendants. The regional city was an instrument of conquest and is still today an instrument of domination." The Instituto Nacional Indigenista (National Indian Institute) of Mexico confirms this observation when it notes that "the mestizo population, in fact, always lives in a city, a center of an intercultural region, which acts as the metropolis of a zone of indigenous population and which maintains with the underdeveloped communities an intimate relation which links the center with the satellite communities." The Institute goes on to point out that "between the mestizos who live in the nuclear city of the region and the Indians who live in the peasant hinterland there is in reality a closer economic and social interdependence than might at first glance appear" and that the provincial metropolises "by being centers of intercourse are also centers of exploitation."

Thus these metropolis-satellite relations are not limited to the imperial or international level but penetrate and structure the very economic, political, and social life of the Latin American colonies and countries. Just as the colonial

and national capital and its export sector become the satellite of the Iberian (and later of other) metropolises of the world economic system, this satellite immediately becomes a colonial and then a national metropolis with respect to the productive sectors and population of the interior. Furthermore, the provincial capitals, which thus are themselves satellites of the national metropolis—and through the latter of the world metropolis—are in turn provincial centers around which their own local satellites orbit. Thus, a whole chain of constellations of metropolises and satellites relates all parts of the whole system from its metropolitan center in Europe or the United States to the farthest outpost in the Latin American countryside.

When we examine this metropolis-satellite structure, we find that each of the satellites, including now-underdeveloped Spain and Portugal, serves as an instrument to suck capital or economic surplus out of its own satellites and to channel part of this surplus to the world metropolis of which all are satellites. Moreover, each national and local metropolis serves to impose and maintain the monopolistic structure and exploitative relationship of this system (as the Instituto Nacional Indigenista of Mexico calls it) as long as it serves the interests of the metropolises which take advantage of this global, national, and local structure to promote their own development and the enrichment of their ruling classes.

These are the principal and still surviving structural characteristics which were implanted in Latin America by the Conquest. Beyond examining the establishment of this colonial structure in its historical context, the proposed approach calls for study of the development—and underdevelopment—of these metropolises and satellites of Latin America throughout the following and still continuing historical process. In this way we can understand why there were and still are tendencies in the Latin American and world capitalist structure which seem to lead to the

development of the metropolis and the underdevelopment of the satellite and why, particularly, the satellized national, regional, and local metropolises in Latin America find that their economic development is at best a limited or underdeveloped development.

III

That present underdevelopment of Latin America is the result of its centuries-long participation in the process of world capitalist development, I believe I have shown in my case studies of the economic and social histories of Chile and Brazil. My study of Chilean history suggests that the Conquest not only incorporated this country fully into the expansion and development of the world mercantile and later industrial capitalist system but that it also introduced the monopolistic metropolis-satellite structure and development of capitalism into the Chilean domestic economy and society itself. This structure then penetrated and permeated all of Chile very quickly. Since that time and in the course of world and Chilean history during the epochs of colonialism, free trade, imperialism and the present, Chile has become increasingly marked by the economic, social, and political structure of satellite underdevelopment. This development of underdevelopment continues today, both in Chile's still increasing satellization by the world metropolis and through the ever more acute polarization of Chile's domestic economy.

The history of Brazil is perhaps the clearest case of both national and regional development of underdevelopment. The expansion of the world economy since the beginning of the sixteenth century successively converted the Northeast, the Minas Gerais interior, the North, and the Center-South (Rio de Janeiro, Sao Paulo, and Parana) into export economies and incorporated them into the structure and development of the world capitalist system. Each of

these regions experienced what may have appeared as economic development during the period of its respective golden age. But it was a satellite development which was neither self-generating nor self-perpetuating. As the market or the productivity of the first three regions declined, foreign and domestic economic interest in them waned; and they were left to develop the underdevelopment they live today. In the fourth region, the coffee economy experienced a similar though not yet quite as serious fate (though the development of a synthetic coffee substitute promises to deal it a mortal blow in the not too distant future). All of this historical evidence contradicts the generally accepted theses that Latin America suffers from a dual society or from the survival of feudal institutions and that these are important obstacles to its economic development.

IV

During the First World War, however, and even more during Great Depression and the Second World War, Sao Paulo began to build up an industrial establishment which is the largest in Latin America today. The question arises whether this industrial development did or can break Brazil out of the cycle of satellite development and underdevelopment which has characterized its other regions and national history within the capitalist system so far. I believe that the answer is no. Domestically the evidence so far is fairly clear. The development of industry in Sao Paulo has not brought greater riches to the other regions of Brazil. Instead, it converted them into internal colonial satellites, de-capitalized them further, and consolidated or even deepened their underdevelopment. There is little evidence to suggest that this process is likely to be reversed in the foreseeable future except insofar as the provincial poor migrate and become the poor of the metropolitan cities. Externally, the evidence is that although the initial development of Sao Paulo's industry was relatively autonomous

it is being increasingly satellized by the world capitalist metropolis and its future development possibilities are increasingly restricted. This development, my studies lead me to believe, also appears destined to limited or underdeveloped development as long as it takes place in the present economic, political, and social framework.

We must conclude, in short, that underdevelopment is not due to the survival of archaic institutions and the existence of capital shortage in regions that have remained isolated from the stream of world history. On the contrary, underdevelopment was and still is generated by the very same historical process which also generated economic development: the development of capitalism itself. This view, I am glad to say, is gaining adherents among students of Latin America and is proving its worth in shedding new light on the problems of the area and in affording a better perspective for the formulation of theory and policy.

V

The same historical and structural approach can also lead to better development theory and policy by generating a series of hypotheses about development and underdevelopment such as those I am testing in my current research. The hypotheses are derived from the empirical observation and theoretical assumption that within this world-embracing metropolis-satellite structure the metropolises tend to develop and the satellites to underdevelop. The first hypothesis has already been mentioned above: that in contrast to the development of the world metropolis which is no one's satellite, the development of the national and other subordinate metropolises is limited by their satellite status. It is perhaps more difficult to test this hypothesis than the following ones because part of its confirmation depends on the test of the other hypotheses. Nonetheless, this hypothesis appears to be generally confirmed by the non-autonomous and unsatisfactory economic and especially

industrial development of Latin America's national metropolises, as documented in the studies already cited. The most important and at the same time most confirmatory examples are the metropolitan regions of Buenos Aires and Sao Paulo whose growth only began in the nineteenth century, was therefore largely untrammelled by any colonial heritage, but was and remains a satellite development largely dependent on the outside metropolis, first of Britain and then of the United States.

A second hypothesis is that the satellites experience their greatest economic development and especially their most classically capitalist industrial development if and when their ties to their metropolis are weakest. This hypothesis is almost diametrically opposed to the generally accepted thesis that development in the underdeveloped countries follows from the greatest degree of contact with and diffusion from the metropolitan developed countries. This hypothesis seems to be confirmed by two kinds of relative isolation that Latin America has experienced in the course of its history. One is the temporary isolation caused by the crises of war or depression in the world metropolis. Apart from minor ones, five periods of such major crises stand out and seem to confirm the hypothesis. These are: the European (and especially Spanish) Depression of the seventeenth century, the Napoleonic Wars, the First World War, the Depression of the 1930's, and the Second World War. It is clearly established and generally recognized that the most important recent industrial development—especially of Argentina, Brazil, and Mexico, but also of other countries such as Chile—has taken place precisely during the periods of the two World Wars and the intervening Depression. Thanks to the consequent loosening of trade and investment ties during these periods the satellites initiated marked autonomous industrialisation and growth. Historical research demonstrates that the same thing happened in Latin America during Europe's seventeenth-

century depression. Manufacturing grew in the Latin American countries, and several of them such as Chile became exporters of manufactured goods. The Napoleonic Wars gave rise to independence movements in Latin America, and these should perhaps also be interpreted as confirming the development hypothesis in part.

The other kind of isolation which tends to confirm the second hypothesis is the geographic and economic isolation of regions which at one time were relatively weakly tied to and poorly integrated into the mercantilist and capitalist system. My preliminary research suggests that in Latin America it was these regions which initiated and experienced the most promising self-generating economic development of the classical industrial capitalist type. The most important regional cases probably are Tucuman and Asuncion, as well as other cities such as Mendoza and Rosario, in the interior of Argentina and Paraguay during the end of the eighteenth and the beginning of the nineteenth centuries. Seventeenth and eighteenth century Sao Paulo, long before coffee was grown there, is another example. Perhaps Antioquia in Colombia and Puebla and Queretaro in Mexico are other examples. In its own way, Chile was also an example since, before the sea route around the Horn was opened, this country was relatively isolated at the end of the long voyage from Europe via Panama. All of these regions became manufacturing centers and even exporters, usually of textiles, during the periods preceding their effective incorporation as satellites into the colonial, national, and world capitalist system.

Internationally, of course, the classic case of industrialization through non-participation as a satellite in the capitalist world system is obviously that of Japan after the Meiji Restoration. Why, one may ask, was resource-poor but unsatellized Japan able to industrialize so quickly at the end of the century while resource-rich Latin American countries and Russia were not able to do so and the latter

was easily beaten by Japan in the War of 1904 after the same forty years of development efforts? The second hypothesis suggests that the fundamental reason is that Japan was not satellized either during the Tokugawa or the Meiji period and therefore did not have its development structurally limited as did the countries which were so satellized.

VI

A corollary of the second hypothesis is that when the metropolis recovers from its crisis and re-establishes the trade and investment ties which fully re-incorporate the satellites into the system, or when the metropolis expands to incorporate previously isolated regions into the worldwide system, the previous development and industrialization of these regions is choked off or channelled into directions which are not self-perpetuating and promising. This happened after each of the five crises cited above. The renewed expansion of trade and the spread of economic liberalism in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries choked off and reversed the manufacturing development which Latin America had experienced during the seventeenth century, and in some places at the beginning of the nineteenth. After the First World War, the new national industry of Brazil suffered serious consequences from American economic invasion. The increase in the growth rate of Gross National Product and particularly of industrialization throughout Latin America was again reversed and industry became increasingly satellized after the Second World War and especially after the post-Korean War recovery and expansion of the metropolis. Far from having become more developed since then, industrial sectors of Brazil and most conspicuously of Argentina have become structurally more and more underdeveloped and less and less able to generate continued industrialization and/or sustain development of

the economy. This process, from which India also suffers, is reflected in a whole gamut of balance-of-payments, inflationary, and other economic and political difficulties, and promises to yield to no solution short of far-reaching structural change.

Our hypothesis suggests that fundamentally the same process occurred even more dramatically with the incorporation into the system of previously unsatellized regions. The expansion of Buenos Aires as a satellite of Great Britain and the introduction of free trade in the interest of the ruling groups of both metropolises destroyed the manufacturing and much of the remainder of the economic base of the previously relatively prosperous interior almost entirely. Manufacturing was destroyed by foreign competition, lands were taken and concentrated into latifundia by the rapaciously growing export economy, intra-regional distribution of income became much more unequal, and the previously developing regions became simple satellites of Buenos Aires and through it of London. The provincial centers did not yield to satellisation without a struggle. This metropolis-satellite conflict was much of the cause of the long political and armed struggle between the Unitarists in Buenos Aires and the Federalists in the provinces, and it may be said to have been the sole important cause of the War of the Triple Alliance in which Buenos Aires, Montevideo, and Rio de Janeiro, encouraged and helped by London, destroyed not only the autonomously developing economy of Paraguay but killed off nearly all of its population which was unwilling to give in. Though this is no doubt the most spectacular example which tends to confirm the hypothesis, I believe that historical research on the satellisation of previously relatively independent yeoman-farming and incipient manufacturing regions such as the Caribbean islands will confirm it further. These regions did not have a chance against the forces of expanding and developing capitalism, and their own

development had to be sacrificed to that of others. The economy and industry of Argentina, Brazil, and other countries which have experienced the effects of metropolitan recovery since the Second World War are today suffering much the same fate, if fortunately still in lesser degree.

VII

A third major hypothesis derived from the metropolis-satellite structure is that the regions which are the most under-developed and feudal-seeming today are the ones which had the closest ties to the metropolis in the past. They are the regions which were the greatest exporters of primary products to and the biggest sources of capital for the world metropolis and which were abandoned by the metropolis when for one reason or another business fell off. This hypothesis also contradicts the generally held thesis that the source of a region's underdevelopment is its isolation and its pre-capitalist institutions.

This hypothesis seems to be amply confirmed by the former super-satellite development and present ultra-underdevelopment of the once sugar-exporting West Indies, Northeastern Brazil, the ex-mining districts of Minas Gerais in Brazil, highland Peru, and Bolivia, and the central Mexican states of Guanajuato, Zacatecas, and others whose names were made world famous centuries ago by their silver. There surely are no major regions in Latin America which are today more cursed by underdevelopment and poverty; yet all of these regions, like Bengal in India, once provided the life blood of mercantile and industrial capitalist development—in the metropolis. These regions' participation in the development of the world capitalist system gave them, already in their golden age, the typical structure of underdevelopment of a capitalist export economy. When the market for their sugar or the wealth of their mines disappeared and the metropolis abandoned

them to their own devices, the already existing economic, political, and social structure of these regions prohibited autonomous generation of economic development and left them no alternative but to turn in upon themselves and to degenerate into the ultra-underdevelopment we find there today.

VIII

These considerations suggest two further and related hypotheses: One is that the latifundium, irrespective of whether it appears as a plantation or a hacienda today, was typically born as a commercial enterprise which created for itself the institutions which permitted it to respond to increased demand in the world or national market by expanding the amount of its land, capital, and labor and to increase the supply of its products. The fifth hypothesis is that the latifundia which appear isolated, subsistence-based, and semi-feudal today saw the demand for their products or their productive capacity decline and that they are to be found principally in the above-named former agricultural and mining export regions whose economic activity declined in general. These two hypotheses run counter to the notions of most people, and even to the opinions of some historians and other students of the subject, according to whom the historical roots and socio-economic causes of Latin American latifundia and agrarian institutions are to be found in the transfer of feudal institutions from Europe and/or in economic depression.

The evidence to test these hypotheses is not open to easy general inspection and requires detailed analyses of many cases. Nonetheless, some important confirmatory evidence is available. The growth of the latifundium in nineteenth-century Argentina and Cuba is a clear case in support of the fourth hypothesis and can in no way be attributed to the transfer of feudal institutions during

colonial times. The same is evidently the case of the post-revolutionary and contemporary resurgence of latifundia particularly in the North of Mexico, which produce for the American market, and of similar ones on the coast of Peru and the new coffee regions of Brazil. The conversion of previously yeoman-farming Caribbean islands, such as Barbados, into sugar-exporting economies at various times between the seventeenth and twentieth centuries and the resulting rise of the latifundia in these islands would seem to confirm the fourth hypothesis as well. In Chile, the rise of the latifundium and the creation of the institutions of servitude which later came to be called feudal occurred in the eighteenth century and have been conclusively shown to be the result of and response to the opening of a market for Chilean wheat in Lima. Even the growth and consolidation of the latifundium in seventeenth-century Mexico—which most expert students have attributed to a depression of the economy caused by the decline of mining and a shortage of Indian labor and to a consequent turning in upon itself and ruralization of the economy—occurred at a time when urban population and demand were growing, food shortages became acute, food prices skyrocketed, and the profitability of other economic activities such as mining and foreign trade declined. All of these and other factors rendered hacienda agriculture more profitable. Thus, even this case would seem to confirm the hypothesis that the growth of the latifundium and its feudal-seeming conditions of servitude in Latin America has always been and still is the commercial response to increased demand and that it does not represent the transfer or survival of alien institutions that have remained beyond the reach of capitalist development. The emergence of latifundia, which today really are more or less (though not entirely) isolated, might then be attributed to the causes advanced in the fifth hypothesis—i.e., the decline of previously profitable agricultural enterprises whose capital was, and whose currently produced economic

surplus still is, transferred elsewhere by owners and merchants who frequently are the same persons or families. Testing this hypothesis requires still more detailed analysis some of which I have undertaken in a study on Brazilian agriculture.

IX

All of these hypotheses and studies suggest that the global extension and unity of the capitalist system, its monopoly structure and uneven development throughout its history, and the resulting persistence of commercial rather than industrial capitalism in the underdeveloped world (including its most industrially advanced countries) deserve much more attention in the study of economic development and cultural change than they have hitherto received. Though science and truth know no national boundaries, it is probably new generations of scientists from the underdeveloped countries themselves who most need to, and best can, devote the necessary attention to these problems and clarify the process of underdevelopment and development. It is their people who in the last analysis face the task of changing this no longer acceptable process and eliminating this miserable reality.

They will not be able to accomplish these goals by importing sterile stereotypes from the metropolis which do not correspond to their satellite economic reality and do not respond to their liberating political needs. To change their reality they must understand it. For this reason, I hope that better confirmation of these hypotheses and further pursuit of the proposed historical, holistic, and structural approach may help the peoples of the underdeveloped countries to understand the causes and eliminate the reality of their development of underdevelopment and their underdevelopment of development.

ONLY THE THOUGHT OF MAO TSE-TUNG CAN LEAD

INDIAN REVOLUTION TO SUCCESS

N. Sanmugathanan

[We reproduce this article from the RED FLAG of Colombo by Comrade Sanmugathanan, Polit Bureau member, Communist Party of Ceylon, who recently returned from China after an interview with Comrade Mao Tse-tung.

— Editor, LIBERATION]

INDIA today is in the throes of a rapidly maturing revolutionary situation unprecedented in this huge sub-continent ever before. The Indian ruling Congress Party received a severe drubbing in the last general election. It is out of power in the majority of the states. In the centre, it hangs on by a perilous majority which can, at any time, cave in.

The Indian Government is today unable to govern in the accepted sense of the word i.e. to provide the people with the necessary minimum food or even to maintain law and order. Millions are starving. The death toll is anybody's guess. The sufferings of the Indian peasants, who form the overwhelming bulk of the Indian population and who, at the best of times, only eked out a sub-human existence, are today suffering untold hardships.

These sufferings have been made worse as a result of the reactionary policy of the Indian Government in mortgaging the Indian economy to the tender mercies of American imperialism and by its wasteful expenditure in financing its "border clashes with" China and Pakistan at the bidding of its American masters.

The extreme reactionaries in India, like the Jan Sangh, and the Swatantra Party are trying to push India even.

more to the right and to make it drop all pretences and follow an openly pro-American line.

The revolutionary masses of workers, peasants, students and revolutionary intellectuals have carried out heroic resistance against the effects of the neo-colonialist policies of the Indian government which has retaliated with massive repression which has claimed many lives. The situation has developed to such an extent that, even according to reports in the Indian press, revolutionary bases where peasants are setting up their own political power after having driven away the landlords and government officials have begun to appear.

EXCELLENT REVOLUTIONARY SITUATION

It would appear that the political and economic situation now prevailing in India is almost tailor-made for revolution—a situation in which the Government is unable to govern and the governed refuse to be governed in the old way.

In this favourable and excellent situation there seems to be only one thing that is lacking in India—a genuinely revolutionary leadership based on Marxism-Leninism and the Thought of Mao Tse-tung. When a major section of the Communist Party of India broke with the Dange revisionist clique, Marxist-Leninists all over the world hoped that it would re-form itself as a genuinely revolutionary party, based on Marxism-Leninism and the Thought of Mao Tse-tung and free from modern revisionism and opportunism.

Even the Government of India took it seriously and believed that its rejection of the class collaborationist policies advocated by the Soviet revisionist henchman, Dange, would logically propel it in a revolutionary direction. So much so, when the Government of India succumbed to imperialist pressure and started its anti-Chinese adventure, it labelled this group as agent of China and jailed most of its leaders—some of them for over three years.

When, on the eve of the last general elections, the necessity to conform to the pretensions of bourgeois democracy and a developing mass movement forced the release of this group of communists who had rebelled against the Dange revisionist clique, they stepped out of jail as virtual 'heroes.' The heightened mass resentment against the anti-peoples' policies of the Congress government along with the reputation of the sacrifices they had made gave them immense mass prestige. All over the country, the leaders addressed mass meetings which, in size, surpassed those ever addressed by Gandhi and Nehru. It clearly proved that the people did not believe the anti-China lies spread by the reactionary Congress government.

But what did the Communist Party of India, which now began to call itself "Marxist" (in order to differentiate itself from the Dange revisionist clique), do with this enormous revolutionary capital that it had accumulated? Just as the French and Italian communists, who had accumulated tremendous prestige and power at the end of the Second World War because of the leading part they had played in the war of resistance to the Nazis, squandered this precious capital by surrendering their arms and opting for the parliamentary method and thereby betraying the tremendous revolutionary possibilities that existed in Europe at that time; so also these neo-revisionists, despite their label of 'Marxists', instead of giving a bold lead to the revolutionary movement that was developing in India, opted to play the parliamentary game and brought a lot of relief to the imperialists and the Indian reactionaries. [Emphasis ours—Ed.]. They failed to realise that parliament was an institution invented by the bourgeoisie in order to deceive the people and act as a veil to cover the naked dictatorship of capital and to distract peoples' attention from the real seats of power, the armed forces. They failed to grasp the truth taught by Comrade Mao Tse-tung that political power grows out of the barrel of a gun.

DANGEISM WITHOUT DANGE

In fact, except for a lot of quibbling in words and arguments about whether Dange was or was not a British spy, what this group did after coming out of jail was no different from the policies carried out by the Dange revisionist clique. Just as the present Soviet revisionist ruling clique is carrying out Khrushchovism without Khrushchov so this neo-revisionist group carried out Dangeism without Dange. [Emphasis ours—Ed.]. That is why it was able in certain states to reach agreements for electoral united fronts with the Dange revisionist clique. That was also why this group was able to form governments in Kerala and West Bengal with the aid of the Dange revisionist clique. This fact alone should have clearly revealed the real nature of the neo-revisionists. Even the meanest intellect must understand that Marxism-Leninism and modern revisionism cannot mix. There cannot be a united front between these two diametrically opposed points of view. If the aberration of one such united front takes place in any country, it only means that one point of view has triumphed and the other surrendered. In India, it was not the Dange revisionist clique that surrendered.

That such a fate was in store for the communists who broke with the Dange clique could have been discerned at the time of the Sino-Indian border dispute when they failed to take a proletarian internationalist attitude. Instead, they surrendered to the national hysteria and chauvinism engendered alike by the reactionary government and the bourgeois press and the modern revisionists and.....If the working class and its party cannot take a different class point of view from that of its own bourgeoisie, then there is no use of speaking about Marxism-Leninism.

We have had the opportunity of reading through two documents adopted at the 7th Congress of this Party, held in October-November, 1964. They are entitled "Programme

of the Communist Party of India" and "Fight Against Revisionism." We shall deal with the more glaring ones.

UN-MARXIST

These documents postulate the theory of dividing the democratic stage of the revolution into two stages—a first stage directed chiefly against foreign imperialist rule which is supposed to have come to an end and a second stage directed against feudalism which is not yet completed. They also postulate that a new Indian national state had come into existence.

To separate the fight against foreign imperialism and that against feudalism and the big bourgeoisie into different compartments is utterly un-Marxist. These forces of reaction are inter-linked and one cannot be overthrown without overthrowing the others. What happened in India in 1947, as in Ceylon, was a deal between British imperialism and the Indian bourgeoisie which was in alliance with the feudalists. By partitioning India, British imperialism strengthened its influence over both countries. British imperialist domination over India did not cease. It increased and was further augmented by the penetration of American and West German capital. There is more foreign imperialist capital exploiting Indira Gandhi's India than in British India.

India is a perfect example of a neo-colonial country where the strings that tie the Indian economy to foreign imperialism are unseen and manipulated from behind while a Nehru or an Indira Gandhi maintains the formal facade of 'independence'. The main enemy of the Indian people, therefore, continue to be foreign imperialism, feudalism and the big bourgeoisie. The task of the working class and its party is to unite all the forces that can be united against these forces and bring into existence a united front under the leadership of the working class for the complete overthrow of these reactionary forces.

If this is understood, the fallacy of posing the question about the existence of an Indian national state can easily be understood. It must be understood that the repressive state machinery built up by British imperialism continues untouched to this day. Only the colour of the skins of some sections have changed. How can such a brutally repressive state machinery, fashioned by the British imperialists and used in the interests of the reactionary forces, act in the interests of the people? How can it be called a National State? To do so would only create dangerous illusions.

A NATIONAL STATE ?

The theory of national democracy and of a state in which the working class can gradually establish its hegemony and take the country on the path of non-capitalist development and go over to socialism is a revisionist concept put forward by Khrushchov in his notorious speech before the counter-revolutionary 22nd Congress of the CPSU.

Marxism-Leninism teaches only one theory about the State. That is that it is an instrument of oppression of one class by another and that the duty of the working class and its allies is to smash the oppressive state machinery of the imperialists and the big bourgeoisie and to replace it by means of the dictatorship of the proletariat. Anything else is revisionism.

It is the failure to understand this basic concept of Marxism that has led this neo-revisionist group to abandon revolution and adopt the parliamentary path. By failing to give a correct answer at their Congress to the crucial question as to the means by which a People's Democratic Dictatorship can be established in India, it laid the basis for its degeneration to constitutionalism and parliamentarism. [Emphasis ours—Ed.]

How can the working class and its allies come to power? Is it by peaceful and parliamentary means? Or is it through revolution? This is one of the basic and fundamental questions which separates Marxist-Leninists from modern revisionists. It must also be understood that the postulation contained in the Moscow Declaration of 1957 and the Statement of 1960 about the possibility of two methods of transition—the peaceful and the non-peaceful one—is fundamentally wrong. The Chinese comrades have now admitted that they agreed to this compromise formulation at that time only in order to avoid a split in the international communist movement at that time. The correct position is that there is only one path—that is the revolutionary path.

A glaring weakness of the documents adopted at the Congress of this neo-revisionist group is the total failure to analyse the differences that have cropped up inside the international communist movement and to make a serious assessment of the role played today by the modern revisionists as a prop to the tottering regime of foreign imperialism and the big bourgeoisie which have called it up as their last reserve in their hour of doom. Neither at the Congress, nor subsequently in their periodicals or in the speeches of their leaders have they dealt with this problem.

OPPORTUNISM

It would appear that this was the result of a deliberate decision to put off discussion of the controversy inside the international communist movement till after the general elections. The only reason for such a decision seems to be that the party was afraid that if they took any stand against modern revisionism it would prejudice their chances of coming to an electoral agreement with the Dange revisionist clique. This is nothing but crass opportunism.

Hence arose the ridiculous situation whereby the alleged 'Marxists' fought the elections in Kerala in a united front.

with the Dange revisionist clique. In West Bengal, they fought each other but came together after the elections to form a coalition government. In Tamilnad and Andhra they fought each other tooth and nail. How opportunist can you get?

Having formed ministries in two states in alliance with the modern revisionists and other anti-Marxist groups, these neo-revisionists are now wallowing in the mire of parliamentarism. [Emphasis ours—Ed.]. Worshipping at the shrine of constitutionalism and parliamentarism, all their energies are spent in operating the bourgeois-landlord state machinery and in working within the four corners of the imperialist-bourgeois constitution and in mustering all their powers to prevent a dissolution by the Central Government.

BETRAYAL

Their worst crime of betrayal is their attitude to the revolutionary struggles of the workers and peasants, particularly to the.....uprising of the Naxalbari peasants who courageously rose up against centuries of feudal oppression [Emphasis ours—Ed.]. Instead of welcoming these struggles and giving them leadership, these neo-revisionists described these political actions by the long-suffering peasants as economic struggles and allowed the police force of their own State Government, in which an alleged 'Marxist' is Deputy Chief Minister and Minister of Finance, to suppress the peasants, to kill and imprison them and subject them to unlimited repression.

What kind of Marxists are these? What difference from the social-democrats of Western Europe? Paying lip service to the demands of the peasants but allowing their police force to kill them? [Emphasis ours—Ed.]. We hope that before they died the peasants had time to read the hypocritical declarations of support to them by B. T. Ranadive and Basavapunniah.

Now, when the Chinese Communist Party, as the foremost Marxist-Leninist Party in the world today, points out these errors and severely criticizes these neo-revisionists for their gross betrayal and points out the correct revolutionary path, they shout that it is interference in the internal affairs of their Party by the Chinese Party! Well might they accuse the great Lenin of interference in the internal affairs of other parties when after the October Revolution he called upon the revolutionary left inside the old social-democratic parties of the Second International to break with their revisionist leadership both politically and organisationally and to form themselves into new, revolutionary communist parties!

Today, for Marxist-Leninists to watch with folded hands alleged 'Marxists' commit serious mistakes which amount to gross betrayal of the revolutionary movement is almost to become partners in the crime ourselves. The Chinese comrades did right in criticising these errors of the neo-revisionists also. It is in that same spirit that this article is written.

It is easy to join the international anti-China front, headed by the US imperialists and the Soviet revisionists and reactionaries of all countries, and to heap abuse on the Chinese Party. But let us remember one thing. Just as, in the years after the Great October Revolution, the touchstone of a genuine Marxist-Leninist was his attitude to the Soviet Union, so today it is his attitude to the Communist Party of China and the Thought of Mao Tse-tung. Just as, in the days of Lenin, whoever attacked Leninism was fundamentally attacking Marxism, so today, whoever attacks the Thought of Mao Tse-tung is fundamentally attacking Marxism-Leninism. [Emphasis ours—Ed.].

The thought of Mao Tse-tung is the creative development of Marxism-Leninism of the era in which world imperialism is nearing its doom and socialism is marching towards world-wide victory. It is the beacon light that

illuminates the path of revolution not only for China but for all oppressed peoples, including the Indian people.

The Indian people have a rich revolutionary tradition. The conditions are ripe for a revolutionary change. All they need is a genuinely revolutionary party which will master Marxism-Leninism and the Thought of Mao Tse-tung, profit by the example of the Chinese revolution, boldly rouse the peasants who form the overwhelming section of the Indian population, set up revolutionary base areas, build up and expand the revolutionary...forces, deal with the armed suppression of the imperialists and the reactionaries—who are temporarily stronger than the revolutionary forces—by persisting in protracted...struggle and using the countryside to encircle and finally capture the cities.

This is the flexible strategy and tactics of people's war worked out personally by Comrade Mao Tse-tung and which led to the nation-wide victory of the Chinese revolution. Comrade Mao Tse-tung has taught: "The seizure of power by armed force, the settlement of the issue by war, is the central task and the highest form of revolution. This Marxist-Leninist principle of revolution holds good universally, for China and all other countries."

It is only by following these correct Marxist-Leninist precepts that the Indian revolution can be led to success. The revolutionaries in the Communist Party of India must decisively reject the futile path of parliamentarism and get down to the task of painstakingly gathering together all the revolutionary forces and mobilising and preparing them for the coming revolution.

but
not
workers



ON THE CHARACTER OF THE PARTY

Joseph Stalin

[Excerpts from the record of an interview Stalin gave to a German communist journalist in 1925.]

To achieve Bolshevisation it is necessary to bring about at least certain fundamental conditions, without which no Bolshevisation of the Communist Parties will be possible.

1) The Party must regard itself not as an appendage of the parliamentary electoral machinery, as the Social-Democratic Party in fact does, and not as a gratuitous supplement to the trade unions, as certain Anarcho-Syndicalist elements sometimes claim it should be, but as the highest form of class association of the proletariat, the function of which is to lead all the other forms of proletarian organisations, from the trade union to the Party's group in Parliament.

2) The Party, and especially its leading elements, must thoroughly master the revolutionary theory of Marxism, which is inseparably connected with revolutionary practice.

3) The Party must draw up slogans and directives not on the basis of stock formulas and historical analogies, but as the result of a careful analysis of the concrete internal and international conditions of the revolutionary movement, and it must, without fail, take into account the experience of revolutions in all countries.

4) The Party must test the correctness of these slogans and directives in the crucible of the revolutionary struggle of the masses.

5) The entire work of the Party, particularly if Social-Democratic traditions have not yet been eradicated in it must be reorganised on new, revolutionary lines, so that every step, every action, taken by the Party should naturally serve to revolutionise the masses, to train and educate the broad masses of the working class in the revolutionary spirit.

6) In its work the Party must be able to combine the strictest adherence to principle (not to be confused with sectarianism!) with the maximum of ties and contacts with the masses (not to be confused with khvostism!); without this, the Party will be unable not only to teach the masses but also learn from them, it will be unable not only to lead the masses and raise them to its own level but also to heed their voice and anticipate their urgent needs.

7) In its work the Party must be able to combine an uncompromising revolutionary spirit (not to be confused with revolutionary adventurism!) with the maximum of flexibility and manoeuvring ability (not to be confused with opportunism!); without this, the Party will be unable to master all the forms of struggle and organisation, will be unable to link the daily interests of the proletariat with the fundamental interests of the proletariat and with the fundamental interests of the proletarian revolution, and to combine in its work the legal with the illegal struggle.

8) The Party must not cover up its mistakes, it must not fear criticism; it must improve and educate its cadres by learning from its own mistakes.

9) The Party must be able to recruit for its main leading group the best elements of the advanced fighters who are sufficiently devoted to the cause to be genuine

spokesmen of the aspirations of the revolutionary proletariat, and who are sufficiently experienced to become real leaders of the proletarian revolution, capable of applying the tactics and strategy of Leninism.

10) The Party must systematically improve the social composition of its organisations and rid itself of corrupting opportunist elements with a view to achieving the utmost solidarity.

11) The Party must achieve from proletarian discipline based on ideological solidarity, clarity concerning the aims of the movement, unity of practical action and an understanding of the Party's tasks by the mass of the Party membership.

12) The Party must systematically verify the execution of its decisions and directives; without this, these decisions and directives are in danger of becoming empty promises, which can only rob the Party of the confidence of the broad proletarian masses.

In the absence of these and similar conditions Bolshevikisation is just an empty sound.

IT IS TIME TO BUILD UP A REVOLUTIONARY PARTY

Charu Majumder

The Central Committee of the Communist Party of India (Marxist) has adopted a political line which is basically anti-revolutionary, opposed to Chairman Mao Tse-tung's Thought and Marxism-Leninism and based on class-collaborationist and revisionist ideology. At its Madurai meeting, the C. C. has made a declaration in favour of peaceful transition to Socialism and has chosen the path of the country's progress through parliamentary democracy.

Despite high falutin polemics on the international ideological disputes, it has, in fact, wholly rejected the ideological stand of the great Chinese Party, and the Thought of Chairman Mao. While keeping silent about the capitalist revival in the Soviet Union it has discarded straightway the postulate of Comrade Stalin's last writing, Economic Problems of Socialism in the U.S.S.R., and has at the same time opposed the line of the great Chinese Party by its open declaration that the Soviet Union is still a member of the socialist camp. What it all implies is lending support to the revisionist Soviet policy on the Vietnam issue in the international sphere and discovering a progressive role of Soviet economic aid and trade-relations and welcoming them. On the issue of peasant struggles the C. C. has adopted without any pretence the Menshevik political line and ended by opposing the peasant struggle.

Naturally, the C. C. meeting at Madurai has dragged down the party to the level of a revisionist bourgeois party.

Therefore, to the genuine Marxist-Leninists there remains open no alternative but to oppose this policy. Now that the Madurai Resolution has been adopted it is obvious that the Central Committee is not a revolutionary Committee. Hence it is the revolutionary duty of every Marxist-Leninist to declare war against this Central Committee. The ulterior motive of the conceited bombast in which the whole of the C. C. Resolution is couched is but to deceive the revolutionary section inside the party, and more, to act secretly as a stooge in the interests of U.S. imperialism, Soviet revisionism and Indian reactionary forces.

The only purpose the Marxist-Leninists have behind all ideological discussions is how to apply the ideology in the objective conditions existing in their own countries. An abstract discussion of ideological issues as such has no revolutionary significance because its truth is subject to test through its application in the particular context. The C.C. has discussed the international ideological issues as abstract concepts, and what it has done concretely in that respect has in reality led it openly to declare the Soviet type of revisionism as the only path for India, and hence its opposition to the great party of China.

Its bourgeois outlook reveals itself in its stand on the issue of nuclear arms stockpile. It has not explained the real character of the joint nuclear monopoly by America and Russia, but has only aired a semblance of criticism in this vein: "Why has not the Soviet Union exchanged with China the secret of nuclear science?" The nuclear weapon is being used today as the most formidable weapon in the fight for power in the international arena. Under such circumstances, the collaboration between America and Russia turns out in fact to be a collaboration for world domination. This plain truth has been covered up behind much pettifoggery. The C. C. has ignored an event like exchange of nuclear secrets between America and Russia and so, the logical conclusion to be arrived at therefrom has not been

arrived at by it. The only reason is that it considers the international ideological dispute to be a conflict of national interests that occurs between bourgeois countries and so fails to understand its real significance. That is, it refuses to see that this struggle is, in truth, a struggle to preserve the purity of Marxism-Leninism—a struggle between the revolutionary ideology and the counter-revolutionary ideology.

By refusing to refer to the reactionary character of the Indian government and by pointing out that "the Congress party still holds considerable political influence among the people", it tries to beautify the reactionary Indian government before the people. By keeping silent about the country-wide mass upsurge it has refused to lead these mass movements and by its policy of continuing in the U. F. Governments it has indirectly supported every step taken to suppress the mass movements and justified these anti-people activities. Without the slightest attempt to analyse the class-character of the different partners of the U. F. governments it has unhesitatingly given the directive to win over these constituent parties in favour of the Communist Party Programme through persuasion. If this is not undiluted Gandhism, what else is? Words and phrases such as class, class-interest, class-struggle and so on find no place in the C. C. analysis. That is to say, by discarding the Marxist outlook and cursorily inserting a few Marxian terms, the C. C. has in fact rejected the entire doctrine of Marxism-Leninism.

By spinning out the yarn that the Congress still retains a mass base, the C. C. has tried to exaggerate the strength of the Indian reactionary forces. They cover up the undeniable fact that the economic crisis of this government is ripening into a political crisis through mass upheavals and thus, they underestimate the strength of the people. When the weakness of the reactionary Congress government is clearly revealed even to the common man, the C. C.

is trying its best to pacify the people by magnifying the strength of the government out of all proportions. This brazen canvassing in favour of the reactionary government would have put even the Congress to shame. Even when American imperialism and Soviet revisionism in spite of their giving all possible help are failing to revive people's confidence in the government, the C. C. like a faithful lackey comes forward in defence of this reactionary government. The C. C. has thus proved to be an ally and friend of American imperialism, Soviet revisionism and the Indian reactionary government.

The C. C. is trying to show that it does not recognise the leadership of any other Party. The bourgeoisie has always been saying that the Communist Parties toe the line of the Soviet Party. The C. C. is trying to counteract this bourgeois propaganda by declaring that it does not accept any other Party's directives or analyses. We, communists, believe in a single scientific doctrine, known as Marxism-Leninism, the Thought of Mao Tse-tung. If we acknowledge the truth of a science, we must necessarily acknowledge the authority of those who have developed it. Those who had wished to be Marxists without being followers of Lenin were cast eventually into the cesspool of history. The Thought of Mao Tse-tung is today the highest form of Marxism-Leninism and those who are opposing this international Marxist authority are doomed to take refuge in the fold of imperialism.

India is a semi-colonial, semi-feudal country. So the main force which can change the colonial condition in this country is the peasantry and their anti-feudal struggle. No change is conceivable in this country without agrarian revolution. And it is the agrarian revolution that proves to be the only path towards the liberation of this country. Not only has the C. C. maintained silence over this question of agrarian revolution, but the C. C. is determined to oppose the revolutionary struggles of the peasantry wherever they

have resorted to them. What intense hatred for the militant peasant revolutionaries of Naxalbari, what glee at the temporary success of the repressive policy of the reactionary U. F. government has found expression in the words of the C. C. spokesman! As befits a faithful agent of the bourgeoisie, they insist on a pre-condition: they must receive the guarantee of success before they will condescend to lend their support to the struggle!

Today the duty of each and every Marxist-Leninist is to oust the C. C. from the revolutionary front. That alone can release the flood-tide in the movements and pave the way towards the final victory. Far from being a partisan, this revisionist reactionary C. C. is an enemy of every kind of anti-imperialist, anti-colonial struggle. It is only by severing all ties with this C. C. and its evil ideology that a revolutionary party can grow and develop. The smashing of this bourgeois ideology is the only guarantee for the growth of revolutionary ideology. Without uprooting this reactionary ideology the Indian revolution cannot advance even a step. So for all genuine revolutionaries in the party submission to this political centralism can only mean acceptance of bourgeois authority. Therefore, the primary pre-condition, without which it is impossible for a revolutionary party to grow, is to defy the centralism of this C. C.

The first task towards building a revolutionary party is the propagation and dissemination of revolutionary ideology, that is, the propagation and dissemination of Mao Tse-tung's Thought. The only path of the people's democratic revolution is to build up revolutionary bases in the rural areas through agrarian revolution under the proletarian leadership and subsequently to encircle the urban centres by expanding these revolutionary bases; to organise people's liberation forces from among the peasants' guerrilla forces and to lead the revolution to victory by capturing the cities that is, to put into

practice the tactics of people's war as formulated by Chairman Mao. This is the only correct Marxist-Leninist line for the liberation of India. A vigorous campaign in favour of this line is to be launched not only among the party members and sympathisers but also among the broad sections of the masses. Only thus can revolutionary struggles and a revolutionary party grow and develop. Only by propagating this mass line we can make the people conscious of the hollowness of the bourgeois reactionary documents of the C. C. and overcome the influence of this reactionary leadership on the struggling masses. Chairman Mao teaches us that we must ceaselessly propagate this mass line on all fronts. This teaching has a special significance for India. That there are a large number of revolutionary workers in the party is true, but it is equally true that the party has over a long stretch of time been inured to the rut of revisionism and bourgeois pattern of activities. As a result, there persist among the revolutionary party workers old revisionist habits, which are reflected in the trend of economism in every sphere, in the manner of functioning characteristic of economism and in the manifestations of militant economism. The experience in our area has shown how, despite their acceptance of the revolutionary ideology, the old party organisers on the peasant front or in the workers' unions hesitate to propagate it among the masses and how, faced with a revolutionary struggle, they get panicky, lose all confidence in the masses and in many cases even choose the path of open opposition. This does not in all cases assume the form of open opposition but is reflected in their lack of confidence in people's strength and exaggeration of the enemy's strength. The harmful effects of the actions of such party workers can be effectively overcome provided there is a sustained campaign in favour of this mass line among the larger section of the militant masses around these party workers. In such

cases, those workers who have in them a genuine revolutionary urge may overcome their weakness.

We shall be faced with such a situation in every area, for the party members cherish many revisionist ideas as they have long been accustomed to the revisionist way of functioning. They cannot get over them in a day or two; only sustained revolutionary practice can enable them to do so. The campaign in favour of this mass line of our party would draw into the fold of the party new revolutionary cadres from among the vast revolutionary masses outside the party. These cadres would by their vigorous revolutionary consciousness remove the inertia within the party and instil a dynamic revolutionary energy.

It is only through long-drawn and hard struggles that the revolution in India can be brought to its successful culmination, since this vast country of fifty-crore strong population happens to be a strong base of the imperialist powers and the mainstay of Soviet revisionism. So with the victorious completion of the revolution in India the doomsday of imperialism as well as of Soviet revisionism would fast draw near. Hence it is nothing strange or unnatural that they would rush in to oppose the revolution in India, the citadel of world reaction. In this situation, to think of an easy victory is nothing but wishful thinking. Nevertheless, our victory is certain, since this country spreads over a vast area with a population of fifty crores. So all the might of the imperialists and revisionists will fail to stop the tide of revolution in this country.

But revolution can never succeed without a revolutionary party—a party which is firmly rooted in the Thought of Chairman Mao Tse-tung, a party composed of millions of workers, peasants and middle-class youth inspired by the ideal of self-sacrifice; a party that guarantees full inner-party democratic right to criticism and self-criticism and whose members freely and voluntarily abide by its discipline; a party that allows

Repeatedly
mass line

cm's
idea
of
a
party

its members to act not only under orders from the above but to judge each directive with full freedom and even to defy wrong directives in the interest of the revolution; a party which ensures voluntary job-division to every member who attaches equal importance to all sorts of jobs ranging from high to low; the party whose members put into practice the Marxism-Leninist ideals in their own lives and, by practising the ideals themselves, inspire the masses to make greater self-sacrifices and to take greater initiative in revolutionary activities; the party whose members never despair under any circumstances and are not cowed by any predicament but resolutely march forward to overcome it. Only a party like this can build a united front of people of different classes, holding different views in this country. Only a ^{re}volutionary party like this can lead the Indian revolution to success.

The great ideal that Chairman Mao-Tse-tung holds high before all Marxist-Leninists is bound to be realised. Only then can we bring into existence a new democratic India and this new democratic India will then resolutely march forward towards socialism.

THE "MARXIST" LEADERSHIP IN ITS TRUE COLOURS

SHAM CRITICS OF SOVIET REVISIONISM, BUT GENUINE ANTI-CHINA COUNTER-REVOLUTIONARIES

An Indian Communist

For once, after the 7th Congress held in Calcutta in 1964, this gang of despicable double-dealers have come out in their true colours as the most modern of revisionists amongst the whole lot. The Madurai Central Committee meeting held recently has adopted a draft on ideological controversies in the International Communist Movement and a resolution on Divergent views between the Marxist Party and the Communist Party of China on certain fundamental issues. An explanatory article on the above has appeared in the Onam special of the Malayalam Party organ *Deshabhimani* by the 'veteran' revisionist E. M. S. Namboodiripad. Sri Ranadive has, in the September 24 issue of the *People's Democracy*, come out with another lengthy article on India-China relations. All these four documents run into hundreds of printed pages and it is not my intention here to waste time on a detailed criticism of each one of them. For if I do so, I too will run the risk of being ignored by the bulk of party members as these documents themselves usually are.

SHAM CRITICS OF MODERN REVISIONISM

One thing is very clear. The Communist Party of China has forced this gang to unmask themselves. But for the recent exposure by the C. P. C., these people heading the Indian Party would have continued to delude the ranks by their subtle pro-China posture. Look, what they say after the C. P. C. denounced them as revisionist

chieftains: "But there is no escape from this unpleasant reality and it would be grievously wrong on the part of our party either to gloss over these differences or to hush them up." Yes, far too long have you glossed over and hushed up things, gentlemen. Now the C. P. C. has made your escape impossible. Don't you try to be good boys by giving a clean certificate to the C. P. C. for their fight against modern revisionism headed by the Soviet leaders. Who wants your certificate now when the battle is virtually over? What were you, gentlemen, doing when the great life and death struggle for the mere survival of Marxism-Leninism was being waged on a world scale? At that crucial period one of you was undergoing free treatment at the citadel of Revisionism and in the bargain making secret deals with the Soviet chieftains in an effort to unite with the Dange clique. Another was engaged in the production of a "classical" treatise on Indian economy in collaboration with the very same revisionist academicians. A third one was operated upon in an East German hospital and tried his hand on further dirty deals. And now, when Soviet revisionism is completely exposed, you are coming out with a clean certificate to the C. P. C.: "Above all, the yeoman's service the C. P. C. has rendered to the world working class and the communist movement in fighting against and exposing the menace of modern revisionism and in defence of Marxism-Leninism cannot but be gratefully acknowledged by every Communist in the world." Will you kindly explain to the ranks when exactly you came to the realisation that modern revisionism was a menace? Surely you did not realise this even as late as May-June 1957, when you allowed one of your P. B. members to lend his name to the Indo-Soviet Cultural Society's State Special Conference in Kerala. How can we say you have realised this even today when you are planning to send several of your P. B. members one after another to the capitals of East European revisionist vassals? Even now

haven't you continued to impose a ban on advertising in your Party journals of literature against revisionism by C. P. C. ? Menace of modern revisionism, indeed ! And all the while sharing seats on the cabinet and *T. U.* and *Kisan committees* with the revisionist Dange clique ! Who wants the "grateful acknowledgement" from such double-dealers as you ?

The fact is that your revisionism has landed you into a miserable jam. You cannot openly side with the Soviets—they are so thoroughly discredited. Besides, the Dange clique has already occupied that position. You cannot accept the C. P. C's leading role in the International Communist movement today—because you had always been anti-China to the core. Yet you see all around you the tremendous impact of the C. P. C's irreconcilable struggle against imperialism and modern revisionism ! So you are trying to continue your double-dealing by hoodwinking that section of your ranks which is stirred by this impact and to capitalise on this sentiment among the broad sections of our people. But it is too late now. Your game is up. You are caught in an avalanche from which there is no escape. Very soon you will be another clique. The following admission of yours only justifies this forecast : "Special note is taken of the fact how the Communist Party is very weak and even non-existent in the greater part of the country and how it is menaced with the onslaught of revisionism organised in the shape of the Right Communist Party."

CODE OF CONDUCT DOES NOT APPLY TO REVISIONISTS

You declare that in 1964, you made a "decisive break" with Indian revisionism by adopting a Programme, a Report, a Declaration and a Resolution. These may all be very fine things you have done. But you never broke with the citadel of World Revisionism, i. e., the Soviet

leading clique. Even today you are insincere in your convictions about the real role of the C. P. S. U. leaders. At one place in the ideological Draft you say : "Modern revisionism led by Khrushchov and pursued by the present C. P. S. U. leaders, has done the greatest damage to the cause of the working class and the communist movement in the world." Just a few lines in advance you have this to say about the Soviet Union : "However our criticism of the compromising and collaborationist policies pursued by the revisionist leadership of the C. P. S. U. and the Soviet state does in no way imply the totally erroneous idea (!) that the Soviet Union has become an ally of U. S. imperialism or is working for sharing world hegemony with American imperialism and for the division of spheres of influence in the world, as this is tantamount to nothing short of placing the Soviet Union outside the Socialist camp." At another place in the same document you have let the cat out of the bag by stating, "the Soviet leaders whom we, too, consider as advocates of modern revisionism." So, according to you, modern revisionism was led by Khrushchov. The present C. P. S. U. leaders are only pursuing it. You admit it has done the greatest damage. Yet you want the Soviet Union to be still inside the socialist camp. And finally you expose yourselves, when you state that the Soviet leaders are just ordinary "advocates of modern revisionism." Lenin says, "The inevitability of revisionism is determined by its class roots in modern society. Revisionism is an international phenomenon." You cannot fight revisionism in just your own country without striking at its international roots. You say you made a decisive break with Indian revisionism in 1964. But all these years it is an established fact that you were flirting with Soviet revisionism, your journals were giving publicity to Soviet writers, your book-shops were (and are even now) doing very brisk trade in revisionist books and journals, your central organ praised

Khrushchov for his far-sightedness, you equated the Soviet Union with PRC by giving the slogan that you are neither "anti-Soviet nor anti-China" and by indulging in a host of similar other activities. It was not a fight against revisionism that you were conducting all these years inside the country but a mere faction fight—one clique against another, a sham fight to delude the ranks. Since revisionism is an international phenomenon, it is futile to fight it in isolation in a single country. And since you did not conduct a genuine fight against international revisionism, your frequent outbursts against the so-called Indian revisionists could only be taken as a cover to hide your own revisionism, which has got hardened with the years. And being revisionists, you have no right to seek protection under the code of conduct governing fraternal relations between Communist parties. This code applies only to parties based on Marxism-Leninism and proletarian internationalism and not to parties based on revisionism and narrow nationalism.

How can the Soviet leaders or for that matter the Tito clique seek shelter under this code of conduct? Revisionism and Marxism-Leninism are antagonistic contradictions and not non-antagonistic, as you try to make out. One or the other has to survive. There is no third course. Remember, revisionism is a menace. One cannot afford to be tender and friendly towards a menace. One just wipes it out, lock, stock and barrel, if one sincerely wants Marxism-Leninism to survive.

YOU ARE BASICALLY ANTI-CHINA AND ANTI-WORKING CLASS

Now about your so-called pro-China sentiments. After the Madurai C. C. meeting, the reactionary press and political leaders of all hues came out with loud statements like "Look, didn't we say so! The Marxist party is toeing the China line. Madurai resolutions confirm our early

warnings." You kept mum about these statements. These were to your liking. You wanted the ranks to believe this lie. This was the only way left for you to stop the revolt that was in the offing inside the party. Look, what your scare-crow dialectician B. T. Ranadive writes in *People's Democracy* (Sept. 24th): "The working class must fight this danger (the danger of American War against China), warn the people and hold high the banner of friendship between the two countries and the two peoples. Whatever may be the difficulties (sic) created by the border clashes, and other events, the basic fight for settlement and for friendship between the two countries must go on." What lofty sentiments! What braggadocio! What cheek on the part of a leader to shout out that the basic fight for friendship must go on, when at every crucial turn in the history of India-China relations, he and his colleagues in top party positions were as virulent in their anti-China activities as the pro-American lobby itself or were giving the green signal to these very reactionaries by their calculated silence. We know what fight you put up during 1962 and 1965 crises. We know what your P. B. stated during the recent embassy crisis. Besides, we also know what one of your veteran revisionist leaders in Kerala said about China in 1962 and 1965 and again in 1967 at the time of the embassy crisis. Did any one of you contradict these virulently anti-China statements of this Soviet agent and did you expel him from the party for such open anti-China activities? Yes, messieurs, the Revisionists, your call for a basic fight for friendship with China is, in Comrade Mao Tse-tung's words, very much like that of those false friends and double-dealers who have "honey in their lips and murder in their hearts."

It is well-known that you made short shrift of those comrades in the ranks who sincerely advocated the C. P. C. line on international issues; you branded them as American agents, agent-provocateurs, extremists etc. It was they

who held high not only the banner of "friendship between the two countries and the two peoples," as you declare, but also held high the banner of friendship between the two parties, which, to a communist, is the precondition for basic friendship at all other levels. You talk of the anti-China tirade of the Soviet leaders "as strengthening the hands of the extreme reactionaries in India" (B. T. R.). But gentlemen, what is your Madurai resolution on "Divergent views between our party and the C. P. C." but a crude piece of anti-China tirade? Listen to what you yourselves say: "It is at this very critical juncture that a dangerous attack comes against it, [the Marxist party] from the CPC." (Madurai resolution). Perhaps, according to your dialectics, this is how you propose to conduct your basic fight for friendship with China. Again, to quote your Namboodiripad from his latest article in the *Onam Special of Deshabhimani*, "Just as the CPSU did in the past so now the CPC also started interfering in the internal affairs of our party and started advocating a political line which did not correspond to the realities of the Indian situation." (Translation mine).

Just four years ago, in 1963, Dange in his reply to a *People's Daily* article entitled "Mirror for Revisionism" had this to say: "But why should they [the CPC] arrogate the right to interfere in our inner-party affairs, tell us what to do or not to do with our bourgeoisie, and also who among us 'is true Marxist revolutionary' or not or who is 'splitting the party'." (Quoted from *Questions of Ideology in the International Communist Movement* No. 7, Page 82)

This cannot be fortuitous. What Sripad Dange said just four years ago, Sri Namboodiripad and the other "Marxist" leaders are saying today. Criticism to them means only crass interference in their internal affairs. All they want other brother parties to do is to leave them alone. They may continue to commit hundreds of mistakes, and cause immense damage to the Communist

movement as a whole, yet these "Marxist" leaders want all these mistakes of theirs to be glossed over by brother parties. As for criticism from within the party, they know how well to deal with it with an iron hand. At such times, no codes of conduct for inner-party criticism are assiduously upheld and the constitution of the party itself is just so much scrap of paper for them. When the C.P.C. criticised Dange in 1963, perhaps you, breakaway Revisionist chieftains, took it as a good riddance. But now when it is your turn to be criticised, you are agitated and call it crass interference.

Gentlemen, nobody is going to be deluded by the honey on your lips. The murder in your hearts stands out fully exposed today. The Naxalbari peasant revolutionaries have done the job. The great betrayal of the Naxalbari peasants' action and expulsion of thousands of party members from the party is evidence enough of the wrecking activities you have undertaken. The CPC is only doing its internationalist duty when it starts exposing you. When they did it before, it was Dange who barked. Earlier still it was Khrushchov's turn to get the beatings from them. Now it is yours. You cannot escape from the inevitable doom that awaits all revisionists. Today the international communist movement is stronger than ever. It has overthrown the Soviet revisionist leadership from its leading position in the movement and replaced it with the CPC. What is more, it has placed the CPSU leading clique in its rightful place i. e., outside the pale of the international Communist movement. Things are going to be different from now on for all types of revisionists wherever they hide in any part of the world. The world working class of which the Indian working class is a national contingent will see to it that they are smoked out and exterminated from each country as inevitably as the C.P.S.U. leaders were smoked out and exterminated from the international Communist movement.

The murder in your hearts can be clearly seen from just some deliberate omissions in your C. C. document. While talking eloquently about "the tremendous victories scored by the Chinese Republic," you have not a word to say about the earth-shaking Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution or the invincible Thought of Mao Tse-tung. You say the C.P.C. rendered "yeoman's service to the world working class and the Communist movement in fighting and exposing the menace of modern revisionism and in defence of Marxism-Leninism", and you demonstrate the honey on your lips by "gratefully acknowledging" this yeoman's service. But the murder in your heart stands out exposed when you try to cover up the fact that it was with Mao Tse-tung's Thought that the CPC armed itself and the Chinese people and together with them fought and isolated modern revisionism both internally and externally on a world scale. You, pigmies of the Marxist Party, do you or do you not accept the fact that Mao Tse-tung's Thought is Marxism-Leninism of the era in which imperialism is heading for total collapse and socialism is advancing towards worldwide victory? All your tall talk about the PRC being a shining example and the "grateful acknowledgement" of the yeoman's service rendered by the C.P.C. etc., is just so much honey on your lips to cover up the murder in your heart, if you do not answer this all important question. You can answer either way, but if, instead, you are proposing to remain silent, that too will be properly understood for what it is really worth, by the revolutionary ranks inside the country, i.e., your basic anti-China stand.

Lenin says, "Marxism is not a dogma but a guide to action." Action in turn enriches Marxism. It does not stand still at any time. Marxism developed into Marxism-Leninism through the action of the world working-class and especially the Russian Bolsheviks led by the Great Lenin in the fight against the renegades of the Second International on the eve of and during the Great October

Revolution in Russia. It got consolidated through the post-Revolution practice of the world working class and especially by the Soviet working class headed by the C.P.S.U. (B) and Stalin. Marxism-Leninism developed into Mao Tse-tung's Thought by the action of the world working class and, especially, the Chinese working class, during the anti-fascist world war period and the practice of the C.P.C. led by Com. Mao Tse-tung, which led to the victory of the Great Chinese Revolution. It got consolidated in the struggle of the world working class and especially of the Chinese working class, in the life and death struggle against modern revisionism and the subsequent Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution in China. If you, drafting long, voluminous drafts and resolutions in the latter part of 1967, cannot have a word in these documents about the Thought of Mao Tse-tung or the Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution, you are only stepping into the shoes of the old-time revisionists, Bernstein and Kautsky and will only meet with the same fate as did those "worthies" of the Second International. What more evidence is required to prove that you are basically anti-China, anti-working class and utterly revisionist?

To you, only Marx, Engels, Lenin and, sometimes, Stalin exist—Mao Tse-tung does not exist at all—in the great galaxy of builders of the proletarian world outlook. Perhaps one of you, say Namboodiripad, covet the fifth place. Well, gentlemen, go ahead, all luck to you, but don't let it be said that a timely warning was not sounded before your inevitable fall into the little filthy dust-bin of history.

ACCADEMIC DISCUSSION, A MEANS OF HOOD-WINKING THE RANKS

Your academic discussion of programme issues, the character of the Indian state and your 'great' discovery of the difference between present-day Indian capitalism and

the Indian bourgeoisie, on the one hand, and the pre-liberation capitalist development of China and the Chinese bourgeoisie, on the other, and your characterisation of this difference as a very important factor which the C.P.C. (which, you insinuate, is non-Maxist-Leninist) has not taken into account and has ignored, your antics at defining the Indian big bourgeoisie, and compartmentalising them into various categories as commerical or comprador, trading, bureaucratic, industrial, middle and non-big etc. are all part of the old game of trying to be profound theoreticians and dialecticians—in short, great guys—before the ranks, greater than even those simple folk who have conducted mighty revolutions in bigger chunks of this good earth and that too very successfully. In the past your bluster did only one thing and that is, it successfully kept away the great bulk of the Indian revolutionary-minded workers and peasants from the party. As you yourselves admit, "Ours is a very small party compared to the bigness of the country in which it is operating and the tasks it is confronted with," and the fact that the C. P. "is very weak and even non-existent in the greater part of the country"—in this 46th year of the establishment of the party—only go to confirm this. Thanks to the C. P. C. and the revolutionaries in the Indian Communist Party, this is not going to be the case in the future. Your bluster is no more going to trick the ranks. That is why, you are now hitting out in desperation at criticism from any quarter.

Behind all this hullabaloo about the difference between our big bourgeoisie and the Chinese big bourgeoisie is the refusal to learn the lessons of the Chinese revolution and an obsession to stick to formulations made by the world Communist movement before the Chinese Revolution. According to you, even in this third stage of the general crisis of capitalism, "Capitalism has developed in India and its class position in society is getting strengthened." "The economic crisis in the country is" only

"deepening and fast enveloping one sector after another of the nation's economy. Further it has also extended to the political sphere and a political crisis has set in and is likely to mature with speed." "The crisis is causing growing mass discontent among the people." "It offers tremendous opportunity to the working class and its Communist party to take big strides." But you bemoan that the political "level of the proletariat is in a deplorable state." So what to do? Just shunt along, hoodwink the ranks, cling to your positions and pass long resolutions and in the final analysis become appendages of the reactionary ruling classes.

You do not see that people in several parts of the country, in step with the general pattern of struggle in the whole of the Asian continent, have taken up arms and established armed bases inside the country. The Naga base is there right on our soil for the last ten years and more. The Mizo base is there for over two years. Now the Naxalbari base has sprung up since March this year. Are these not on the Indian soil? Your documents have not a word about these developments. Besides these, all over India, people are taking to stones, brick-bats and sticks to beat down the reactionary police every other day. This is a growing process inside the country. And here you are talking about a "deepening" economic crisis, sitting in your comfortable offices, dreaming of capturing the central cabinet during next general elections, and discussing the "special" features of the Indian big bourgeoisie. Gentlemen, you are counter-revolutionary revisionists. You forget the simple Marxist truth that without the Indian Communist Party incorporating the lessons of the Chinese Revolution into the practice of the Indian Revolution, no revolution in India will ever succeed, just as the Chinese Revolution would never have succeeded if the C.P.C. had not incorporated the lessons of the Great October Revolution into the practice of the revolution in China. You

assiduously work to cover up the lessons of the Chinese Revolution from the Indian working class and Indian peasants and then bewail that the political level of the proletariat is deplorable. Gentlemen, who can possibly be responsible for such a "deplorable" level of the proletariat excepting you who had been working overtime to shut off the East Wind from the Indian working class and the Indian peasantry? But now your game is up.

Instead of trying to be modest and learn the lessons of the Great Chinese Revolution, you are attempting to pit the formulations of the Communist International against the formulations of the C.P.C., which, in addition, you completely distort to suit your own requirements. Yes, the C.P.C.'s reading is that "the Congress government represents the interests of the Indian feudal princes, big landlords and bureaucrat-comprador-capitalists." (*People's Daily* editorial, July 5th, 1967). Comrade Mao Tse-tung has this to say about the Chinese bourgeoisie:

"There is a distinction between the comprador big bourgeoisie and the national bourgeoisie.

"The comprador big bourgeoisie is a class which directly serves the capitalists of the imperialist countries and is nurtured by them; countless ties link it closely with the feudal forces in the countryside. Therefore it is a target of the Chinese Revolution and never in the history of the revolution has it been a motive force."

... ..

"The national bourgeoisie is a class with a dual character.

"On the one hand, it is oppressed by imperialism and fettered by feudalism and consequently is in contradiction with both of them. In this respect it constitutes one of the revolutionary forces. In the course of the Chinese Revolution it has displayed a certain enthusiasm for fighting imperialism and the government of bureaucrats and warlords.

"But on other hand, it lacks the courage to oppose imperialism and feudalism thoroughly because it is economically and politically flabby and still has economic ties with imperialism and feudalism. This emerges very clearly when people's revolutionary forces grow powerful.

"It follows from the dual character of the national bourgeoisie that at certain times and to a certain extent, it can take part in the revolution against imperialism and the governments of the bureaucrats and warlords and can become a revolutionary force, but that at other times there is the danger of its following the comprador, big bourgeoisie and acting as its accomplice in counter-revolution."

[*Chinese Revolution & Chinese Communist Party* :
Selected Works, vol. 2, pp. 320-21.]

In addition to the comprador character a section of our big bourgeoisie has also the bureaucratic character. It uses the state bureaucratic apparatus to derive super-profits. Just as in China, amongst the bourgeoisie, it was the comprador capitalists who were the targets of the revolution, so also in India it has to be the comprador-bureaucratic capitalists. There is just no question of their being the motive force of the revolution.

It is true that the Indian bourgeoisie was and is the most developed bourgeoisie among the colonial and semi-colonial countries. But does this bourgeoisie, which developed as a direct result of the imperialist wars and as an appendage of the imperialist world economy, change its essential character from being a comprador-bureaucratic capitalist to that of an independent industrial capitalist? To characterise the mas industrial big bourgeoisie is to characterise India not as a semi-feudal, semi-colonial country, but to place India on a par with the imperialist countries like Britain, France, Japan or Italy. There is no other possible classification for such a bourgeois state. Either a country is a colony or a semi-colony or it is an independent country. You

define the position as follows: "The fact to be noted here is that it is the industrial big bourgeoisie which, today, has emerged as a powerful force holding the leading position in the new state and government and not the comprador-element." And again, "though certain tendencies of the nature (comprador) are present in the Indian situation too, it is by no means the principal characteristic of the Indian big bourgeoisie which is heading the state and government." By an indirect reference you attribute the principal characteristic of the Indian big bourgeoisie as "interesting itself in the expansion of industries and the development of the national economy." (Madurai Resolution, p. 5.). To have the cheek to attribute such qualities to the Indian big bourgeoisie during this third stage of the general crisis of capitalism is nothing but counter-revolutionary. The Appendix to para 33 (page 64) of your Party Programme has this foot-note below the figures: "The proportion of industrial production and commerce is not materially changed during the entire period (1948-63), despite rise in new industries," and still you have the cheek to say (indirectly of course) that: "expansion of industries and development of national economy" is the principal characteristic of the Indian big bourgeoisie. How then are you different from the Dange clique?

Again, from the Appendix given to para 29 of the programme (page 60), can't you see that from 1959 onwards there was a tremendous spurt in foreign collaborationist agreements which rose from 150 in 1959 to 302 in 1964, and again from the Appendix to para 24 (page 58) India's foreign liabilities rose from 493 crores to 761 crores in the private sector and from 225 crores to 1470 crores in the official or public sector. In the Appendix to para 30 (page 62) dealing with the utilization of external Assistance upto 31st Dec., 1963, the respective figures for the U. S. A., the U.K., West Germany etc., and the U. S. S. R. and other Socialist countries are 2034.9 crores, 194.5 crores, 245.5

crores and 166.2 crores. Do these figures show that the Indian big bourgeoisie is an industrial big bourgeoisie "interested in the expansion of industries and development of national economy" or that they are a comprador-bureaucratic bourgeoisie who have sold out the nation's interest to the imperialists, primarily U. S. imperialists for their crumbs in the super-profits. Do not these figures (and mind you, these are not the C. P. C's) indicate that there was a definite shift around 1959 from leaning on British imperialism as of old to selling out to American imperialism?

Your new analysis of the Indian big bourgeoisie and the character of the Indian state is so ridiculous that it is no wonder that it does not fit into any of the categories so far defined about the bourgeoisie in the world's hinterland. Hence your slogan of an independent path for India's Revolution. In effect it is meant only to isolate the Indian Revolution from its Asian, African and Latin American context and hand it over to counter-revolution, lock, stock and barrel.

STABBING VIETNAM IN THE BACK

There is just one sector where you feel you can still play havoc: that is on the Vietnam question. But there again you are thoroughly mistaken. It is indeed surprising to find a group of people today who call themselves communists, championing, even after the West Asia crisis, the slogan of unity in action with the revisionists. You say, "A serious debate is on in the world communist movement as to the correctness or otherwise of the stand taken by the C. P. C. on this issue of proposed united action." Gentlemen, you will be right if you had said that the serious debate was taking place in the world Revisionist movement. The world communist movement with China as its leading centre has nothing to debate on

this issue. Their stand is unambiguous. They are out to wipe out revisionism and not to unite with it in action. As for Vietnam, don't you, revisionists, shed crocodile tears over their so-called suffering. You see only "the small socialist republic of North Vietnam together with its patriotic fighters in South Vietnam fighting alone against U. S. aggression" and "making unheard of sacrifices." This according to you is the stark reality. Quite a dismal, depressing picture indeed—looks like you are in the pay of Johnson, MacNamara & Co. For it can only be the American imperialists who would like the people of the world to see in Vietnam such a dismal "stark reality." You too want to stab Vietnam in the back by advocating induction of revisionism into their fighting ranks.

Gentlemen Revisionists, do you accept that the Vietnamese people are fighting a People's War and that in this era, imperialism can only be fought and defeated by waging a protracted People's War? The Vietnamese people learned the great lessons of the Chinese Revolution and took the tortuous path of People's War for their liberation, the only path by which peoples of Asia, Africa and Latin America can defeat imperialism and their running dogs. You shed so much tears for Vietnam but have you ever tried to learn about the essential difference between a People's War waged by relying on highly conscious revolutionary people and an imperialist war, which can only be waged by relying on modern weapons and hired soldiers. In the words of Com. Lin Piao :

"Comrade Mao Tse-tung has provided a masterly summary of the strategy and tactics of People's War. You fight in your way and we fight in ours : we fight when we can and move away when we can't.

"In other words, you rely on modern weapons and we rely on highly conscious revolutionary people : you give full play to your superiority and we give full play to ours ;

you have your way of fighting and we have ours..... This strategy and these tactics can be applied only when one relies on the broad masses of the people, and such application brings the superiority of People's War into full play."

Since you refuse to understand this essential difference between the two wars, and the specific nature of the People's War waged by the Vietnamese people, you are not able to render any effective help to the valiant Vietnamese people, except by passing some resolutions, and once a while calling a public meeting. The job of an honest communist is not to bemoan the fate that has overtaken the Vietnamese people but drawing inspiration from the way the brave Vietnamese people are fighting the U. S. imperialists and winning victory after victory, to rouse the revolutionary consciousness of the broad masses of our own people against the common enemy and engage him in battles wherever possible. This cannot be done in 'unity' with revisionism, because the revisionists "try to exorcise the revolutionary spirit of Marxism, to undermine faith in socialism among the working class and working people in general. They deny the historical necessity for a proletarian revolution and the dictatorship of the proletariat during the period of transition from capitalism to socialism, deny the leading role of the Marxist-Leninist party, reject the principles of proletarian internationalism and call for rejection of the Leninist principles of party organisation and above all, of democratic centralism for transforming the communist party from a militant revolutionary organisation into some kind of debating society."

(The Twelve Parties' Declaration, 1957)

It is an every day experience for our working class and our communists that wherever revisionism penetrates, the first casualty is the revolutionary spirit. One can understand the Soviet revisionist leaders and their henchmen

all over the world clamouring for 'unity in action' in Vietnam. But you are advocating it in a new guise for the so-called purpose of "singling out and isolating the most immediate and hated enemy." Here you are advocating only your own rotten idea of a united front against the Congress in Kerala and in W. Bengal, which has in effect only rejuvenated revisionism on our soil to an alarming scale. Very rightly the C. P. C. believes that unity in action with revisionists will only bring disaster to the Vietnamese people. To talk about unity in action even after the West Asian crisis where the Arabs were betrayed so blatantly by the C. P. S. U. leaders only exposes your real face—the ugly face of modern revisionism with the C. P. S. U. as its world Centre.

THE INDIAN PEOPLE AND THE CHINESE PEOPLE ARE ONE

Our country is a great country. Its 510 million people are a great people. Being the world's second in terms of population its responsibilities to the world and to itself are tremendous. China, only a slumbering giant in the beginning of the century, with a population of 750 million, has shaken itself up from the age-old stupor and swept away all imperialist and feudal vermin from its sacred soil. And today it is wiping away capitalism too. There it is standing by our side shedding the brilliance of her achievements. The Indian people too are as inevitably rising up against their age-old enemies, feudalism and imperialism. Imperialism is now in its death-throes. As always it is relying, as a last resort, more and more on its agents within the camp of the working class and its party to come to its succour. The ruling circles of the Indian reactionaries who are its open agents are more hopeful of the modern revisionists, whether of the Dange clique or the Nambudiripad-Ranadive gang of double-dealers to hoodwink the

people and continue their inhuman exploitation. The Indian communists will always be on the side of the people fighting the age-old evils of feudalism and imperialism represented by Indian reactionary ruling circles and modern revisionists. Armed with Mao Tse-tung's Thought, the most advanced world outlook of the proletariat, they are certain to win, though the path will be tortuous and long. The day is not far off when we, the Indian people and our neighbour, the Great Chinese people will both stand up arm in arm and together with the other anti-imperialist peoples of the world will bury imperialism and feudalism and all other forms of exploitation, once and for all.

MADURAI DOCUMENT BETRAYSREVISIONIST UNDERSTANDING OF THE
NATURE OF CONTRADICTIONS*Editorial Board, Deshabrati*

[This is an English rendering of one of the articles analysing the revisionist character of the Madurai ideological document, which are appearing in the Bengali Weekly, Deshabrati. This article, originally in Bengali, was published on October 5, 1967.

—Editor, LIBERATION]

What is the essence of the General Line of the International Communist Movement as presented by the Central Committee of the great Chinese Communist Party?

“Workers of all countries, unite; workers of the world, unite with the oppressed peoples and oppressed nations; oppose imperialism and reaction in all countries; strive for world peace, national liberation, people’s democracy and socialism; consolidate and expand the Socialist camp; bring the proletarian world revolution step by step to complete victory; and establish a new world without imperialism, without capitalism and without the exploitation of man by man.”

[Letter of the C. P. C. Central Committee dated June 14, 1963 in reply to the letter of the CPSU Central Committee dated March 30, 1963]

What is the real nature of the profound significance underlying the General Line of the International Communist Movement presented by the CC of the CPC? This is the General Line which calls for carrying forward the resolute revolutionary struggles of the peoples of the world and

the proletarian world revolution step by step to complete victory by united revolutionary struggle; imperialism can be fought effectively and world peace defended only if the peoples of all countries wage a resolute united revolutionary struggle.

On the other hand (and as opposed to the Chinese Party), the leadership of the CPSU lays down and pursues a General Line which is devoid of revolutionary content and finds expression in “peaceful co-existence” and “peaceful competition” between the two social systems and “peaceful transition from capitalism to socialism.” By adopting this international line they have entered into an unholy alliance with US imperialism, created disruption in the world communist movement and have taken to the path of restoring capitalism in their own country.

Why is this so?

A concrete class analysis of world politics and economics and of actual world conditions as a whole, that is to say, a concrete class analysis of the fundamental contradictions in the contemporary world, constitutes the starting point from which the Communist Parties proceed to define the General Line of the international communist movement. Differences in the class analysis of the contradictions in the contemporary world and in regard to a correct understanding of their inter-connection as well as differences in correctly understanding the inter-connection of the struggles that grow out of those contradictions in the contemporary world—lie at the root of the ideological struggle between the CC of the CPC and the leadership of the CPSU. The CPSU leadership has completely rejected dialectical materialism and the dialectical materialist theory of knowledge and has had recourse to idealism, and their approach to the whole thing is purely subjective. The dialectical materialist theory of knowledge has been fully upheld in the assessment and analysis made by the Chinese Party leaders.

To anyone who has gone through the sections, namely, "New Epoch" and "On the Issue of Contradictions," of the Madurai document produced by the neo-revisionist leadership of our party, it would appear that they are, on the face of it, expressing their agreement with the Chinese Party and criticising the modern revisionists. And it is precisely here that the hateful deception of the neo-revisionist leadership of our party has revealed its worst features, or, it might be said, the full depth of their ignorance about the dialectical materialist theory and the dialectical materialist theory of knowledge. That explains why they are so anxious not to allow comrades to examine critically how far the Programme adopted at our Seventh Party Congress has succeeded in defining many strategic and tactical tasks of the international communist movement which arise out of the characteristic features of this era of ours.

Let us examine their deceptions. The Eighty-one Party Document formulated the specific features of our era in the following manner :

"Our time, whose main content is the transition from capitalism to socialism initiated by the Great October Socialist Revolution, is a time of struggle between the two opposing social systems, a time of socialist revolutions and national-liberation revolutions, a time of the breakdown of imperialism, of the abolition of the colonial system, a time of transition of more peoples to the socialist path, of the triumph of socialism and communism on a world-wide scale."

But how does the Madurai document present the characteristic features of the contemporary world in its "New Epoch" section? The Madurai document states :

"Ours is certainly a new epoch, an epoch of transition from capitalism, an epoch when the international socialist system is becoming the decisive factor determining

the course of world development, an epoch of rapid decay and disintegration of colonialism, an epoch of titanic class battles between the forces of moribund capitalism and of socialism and national liberation revolutions, and an epoch of the collapse of imperialism and the final victory of socialism and communism on a world scale."

[Madurai document, *People's Democracy* supplement of Sept. 3, 1967 ; p. 7.]

How did the formulation—"an epoch when the international socialist system is becoming the decisive factor determining the course of world development"—creep into the Madurai document in connection with the definition of the characteristics of the contemporary era? Readers can see for themselves that the Moscow statement of 1960 referred to this aspect like this—"a time of struggle between the two opposing social systems."

Can this difference be fortuitous? Does not this small difference signify a difference in understanding the role of the most important and new factors in the contemporary world as stated in the 1960 Moscow Statement? Of course, it does and the difference is quite important. It is absolutely necessary to understand properly these new factors in order to resolve correctly the basic issues of the contemporary world in a manner commensurate with the interests of peace, national independence, democracy and socialism.

How can the transition from capitalism to socialism constitute the main content, dominant trend and principal characteristic of the historical development of society? To formulate this as a characteristic of the contemporary world as has been done in the Madurai document, viz.—that this is "an epoch when the international socialist system is becoming the decisive factor determining the course of world development"—is to relegate all other factors to a secondary place. Not only that, the very significance of the

profound and comprehensive definition of the characteristics of the contemporary era as contained in the 1960 Statement, is thereby reduced to a meaningless thing. While analysing the new factors, the Statement not only referred to the transition from capitalism to socialism as the main content of our era, but also elucidated the method of its development and the content of this transition.

What then is that method and that content? In this new epoch, transition from capitalism to socialism will take place as a result of the struggle between the two systems, as a result of the socialist and national revolutions and as a result of the overthrow of imperialism and liquidation of the colonial system! That is why, the process of transition from capitalism to socialism is the result of revolutionary class-struggles both in the national and in the international sphere.

The world socialist system has become a decisive factor in the development of human society. But the main content, dominant trend and the principal characteristics of the historical development of human society are being determined by the sum total of the revolutionary struggles waged by the revolutionary forces for socialist transformation of society and against imperialism. This meaningful concept is clearly reflected in the understanding of the C. C. of the great Chinese Communist Party. The C. C. of the C.P.C. defines the line in these words: "This general line is one of resolute revolutionary struggle by the people of all countries and of carrying the proletarian world revolution forward to the end." [Ibid]

The "New Epoch" section of the Madurai document talks of the united action by the world socialist system, by the working class movements in the advanced capitalist countries and the national liberation struggles, by the broad popular movements against war and for world peace, and calls upon them to inflict defeat after defeat on imperialism. This section also refers to the fact that the modern

revisionists are disrupting the solidarity of the world socialist system and the unity of the international Communist movement, and undermining the national liberation struggles and the movements of the revolutionary working class. But while defining the characteristics of the epoch, it points to the socialist system as the "decisive" factor determining the course of world development and thus keeps the door open for an eventual compromise with revisionism.

DEVIATION FROM MATERIALIST DIALECTICS IN ASSESSING THE CONTRADICTIONS

The four fundamental contradictions in the contemporary world are :

- (i) the contradiction between the socialist camp and the imperialist camp ;
- (ii) the contradiction between the proletariat and the bourgeoisie in the capitalist countries ;
- (iii) the contradiction between the oppressed nations and imperialism ; and
- (iv) the contradiction among imperialist countries and among monopoly capitalist groups.

Of these, the contradiction between the socialist camp and the imperialist camp is a contradiction between two fundamentally different social systems, and from the class point of view this contradiction is a contradiction between the states under the proletarian dictatorship and the states under the dictatorship of monopoly capitalists.

These four kinds of contradictions are inter-related and influence each other. From the point of view of dialectical materialism, it is of utmost importance to find out the inter-connection between these contradictions and the concrete form in which they influence each other, that is to say, to find out properly their individual role. Further, according to the dialectical materialist viewpoint, it is the contradiction inherent in a thing or a phenomenon that acts as the motive force behind any change in the thing or

phenomenon while the external contradictions provide the circumstances for this change. The external contradictions create favourable or unfavourable circumstances and thereby encourage or discourage the internal contradiction—this sums up their role.

Three among the four fundamental contradictions in the contemporary world, the contradiction between the proletariat and the bourgeoisie in the capitalist countries, the contradiction between the oppressed nations and imperialism, and the contradiction among imperialist countries and among monopoly capitalist groups—are contradictions within the imperialist camp. According to the dialectical method, further collapse of imperialist camp and further development of the socialist camp, that is, transition from capitalism to socialism can take place only as the result of the actions of the internal contradictions of the imperialist camp.

The Soviet leaders reject this dialectical method. They hold that the contradiction between the socialist camp and the imperialist camp—which is only an external contradiction so far as the collapse of the imperialist camp is concerned—is the principal contradiction that will determine the collapse of the imperialist camp. Moreover, they look at it as a contradiction devoid of any revolutionary content. They refuse to see that it is basically a contradiction between states under the dictatorship of the proletariat and states under the dictatorship of the monopoly capitalists.

While speaking of the four contemporary contradictions the Madurai document has indulged in much learned discussion about the roles of contradictions—the central contradiction, the main contradiction etc. What is totally absent, however, is the inter-connection between and an analysis of the roles of contradictions, the chief thing in dialectical materialist assessment. This has led them to

make the following statement while defining the characteristics of the contemporary era: "This is an epoch when the international socialist system is becoming the decisive factor determining the course of world development." And while discussing the contradictions it has stated: "Notwithstanding the fact that" "the contradiction between the camp of socialism and the camp of imperialism remains as the central one among the fundamental contradictions of our time," "the one between the imperialists and oppressed nations has got accentuated and assumed the acutest form... and the intensification of this contradiction is, of course, influencing the course of all other contradictions, their growth and development." [Madurai document, p. 12]

That is, the socialist system is becoming "the decisive" factor determining the main content of the present epoch while the contradiction between the oppressed nations and imperialism, that is to say, the role of the national liberation struggles consists only in "influencing" the growth and development of all other contradictions. In other words, the course of development of the content, the path of transition from capitalism to socialism, will be determined not by the maturing of the internal contradictions but by the external contradiction, namely, the role of the socialist camp. It is only natural that the neo-revisionist leadership was so anxious to push the programme, full of the seeds of revisionism, through the Seventh Congress of our Party in a hurry and to forbid any discussion of the Party Programme and resolutions while circulating the document on the international ideological controversy for discussion.

There is no doubt that referring to the Socialist camp the Moscow Statement of 1960 said:

"It is the principal characteristic of our time that the world socialist system is becoming the decisive factor in the development of society."

How should we understand this profound concept? The contradiction between the two systems is one of the four fundamental contradictions which are working towards the collapse of the imperialist camp and its role must be appreciated in a dialectical materialist manner.

The world socialist system is a firm mainstay for the national liberation struggles and the working class movements in the capitalist countries. The successes achieved in the building of socialism and communism have transformed the socialist camp into a powerful international force. The emergence and development of the socialist camp not only influence the course of development of the contradictions but also exert a big influence towards the resolution of the contradictions. How? It is creating extremely favourable conditions for the people of different countries and for the revolutionary struggles for national liberation, democracy and socialism. Secondly, the socialist camp presents a real possibility for the prevention of a new world war, and this makes it possible to advance towards national liberation, democracy and socialism without a new world war. But this advance itself will be made as a result of the maturing of the internal contradictions of the world imperialist camp, by the people's revolutions to which it leads, by the smashing of the weak links of the world imperialist front. A united front of the revolutionary struggles of all countries is of utmost importance in order to break these weak links.

There can be no doubt that the vast areas of Asia, Africa and Latin America are the storm-centres of the revolutionary movements. It is here that the imperialist front must be broken and the revolutionary national liberation struggles are the means of doing this. But what makes these areas the storm-centres? The Madurai document has totally failed to grasp it.

With the shrinking of the world imperialist system various types of contradictions in the world are concentrated

in these areas (Asia, Africa and Latin America). Contradiction between the oppressed people on the one hand and imperialists and new and old colonialists on the other, contradiction between the peasantry and the feudalists, contradiction between the proletariat and the bourgeoisie, contradiction among different imperialists and contradiction between the socialist camp and the imperialist camp—all these are concentrated in these areas. And again, it is here that a powerful revolutionary force—people's movement for national liberation—has emerged with the force of a tremendous tidal wave, and the ruling bourgeoisie in various countries in these areas have not yet succeeded in building up a powerful state machinery comparable to that built up by the ruling classes in the Western countries. It is abundantly clear that these are the most valuable areas in the imperialist capitalist camp.

The Madurai document produced by the neo-revisionist leadership contains everything but a complete revolutionary theory—in point of fact, it is nothing but a patchwork of pieces of self-contradictory theoretical ventures. For a complete theory they would have to accept unequivocally either the general line of the CPC or that of the CPSU.

They do not dare come out openly against the general line of the CPC or go over to the modern revisionists directly since they are perfectly aware of the revolutionary consciousness of the toiling people of India and the Party ranks. But their cleverness cannot save them. However much they may criticise the Soviet revisionists, they are, in practice, pursuing the CPSU political line and that explains why, despite their revolutionary braggadocio, they have willingly tied themselves to the chariot-wheels of the state of the counter-revolutionary Indian ruling classes.

U. P. COMRADES REVOLT AGAINST THE NEO-REVISIONIST LEADING CLIQUE

[We reproduce the following documents which reveal how the revisionist chieftains of the Party insist on a mechanical observance of Party forms and Party discipline in order to suppress genuine revolutionaries within the Party and foist on it a revisionist line—a line of utter surrender to the reactionaries—and, at the same time, cynically trample Party forms and discipline underfoot when it suits their sordid ends.]

These documents also show that as an inevitable consequence of the neo-revisionist activities a revolt against the leading clique is fast developing among the Party ranks.

The first of the three documents we are printing is the English rendering of a circular in Hindi, issued on 27. 9. 1967 by Comrade Shiva Kumar Misra, Secretary of the U. P. State Committee and Member of the Central Committee, C. P. I. (Marxist), to all Party units in his state.

The second one forms the concluding portion of the letter of Comrade Shiva Kumar Misra to the General Secretary, C. P. I. (Marxist) protesting against the revisionist policies and vile disruptive activities of the neo-revisionist leaders and their stooges in U. P.

The last document is the letter of resignation submitted by Comrade S. N. Tewari, member, U. P. State Committee and a founder-member of the Party in U. P. Comrade Tewari led the revolt against the Dangeites in his state and is now leading the revolt against the neo-revisionists. Nine out of twenty-seven members, who attended a meeting of the State Committee which was convened unconstitutionally at the instruction of P. Sundarayya, and H. S. Surjeet, declared Com. Tewari as expelled from the Party.

—Editor, LIBERATION].

I

COMRADE S. K. MISRA'S CIRCULAR

“A circular was previously sent to you on 8. 9. 67 urging you to mobilise and organise the revolutionary people of U. P. in support of the Krishak Vidroh [peasant revolt] in Naxalbari. Hope you are carrying on accordingly.

“A small revisionist clique in power in the C.C. and a handful of their stooges in the U. P. State Committee have gone mad with rage against this circular. It is out of this madness that they had a counter-circular issued in the name of Shankar Dayal Tiwari and thus violated all the norms and forms of the Party.

“The Krishak Vidroh in Naxalbari has to-day become the demarcating line between the revisionists on the one hand and Marxist-Leninists on the other. The revisionist leading clique of the C.C. is on the one hand busy in lending its helping hand to the ruling classes by its capitulationist and class-collaborationist line, and on the other hand, is adopting organisational methods against the Marxist-Leninist cadre of the Party, who are supporting the Krishak Vidroh whole-heartedly.

“The revisionist clique on the one hand rends the sky with cries of Party Constitution and discipline in order to hide its counter-revolutionary character, and on the other, tramples underfoot the same in order to serve the narrow interests of their coterie.

“P. Sundarayya and Harkishen Singh Surjeet, the two chieftains of this revisionist leading clique, recently had a so-called P. C. meeting convened by a handful of their stooges without any consultation with the Secretariat of the State Committee. At this meeting which was wholly irregular and unconstitutional, they arbitrarily removed the Secretary of the State Committee from his office, disbanded the Secretariat, set up a new puppet-secretariat, dissolved all the Regional Committies and expelled the aged veteran

Marxist-Leninist Party leader, Com. Shri Narain Tewari from the Party-membership. All this was done quite undemocratically. All the Party forms were thrown to the winds by these actions.

"This act of replacing the State and the Regional leadership duly elected in Party conferences or afterwards has no precedent in the entire history of the Party.

"Marxist-Leninists enjoy a clear majority in the State Committee of the Party and the number of the supporters of the revisionist leadership of the C. C. is quite insignificant. I command the confidence of the majority in the P. C. This has been made clear during discussions on ideological differences in the world Communist movement, on questions of tactics, and on the peasant revolt in Naxalbari, and the revisionist leading clique fully realizes this. The big majority within the U. P. State Committee has spurred the anti-Marxist-Leninist counter-revolutionary politics and tactical line adopted by the revisionist C.C.

"The neo-revisionists failed to achieve their object in U. P. just as the old-revisionists had failed. That is why, they stooped to take extra-ordinary measures to reduce the majority in the State Committee into a minority, to capture the H. Q. of the State Committee conspiratorially and to foist their revisionist politics and tactical line on the Party.

"Some of our comrades who were present in the meeting vehemently opposed the revisionist politics, tactical line and unconstitutional measures, exposed their ugly revisionist faces thoroughly and in the end walked out of the meeting.

"The great majority of the Marxist-Leninist cadre of the party heartily greets these revolutionary comrades.

"The revolutionary movement of the people can be guided in the right direction only in the beacon-light of Marxism-Leninism and Thought of Mao Tse-tung, which is the summit of Marxism-Leninism in the present epoch. People's Democracy can be established only through a successful peasant revolution under the leadership of the working class.

"The revisionist clique of the C. C. after taking the reins of the Party in the 7th Party Congress has been trying to put our Party in opposition to Marxism-Leninism, Thought of Mao Tse-tung and the Chinese Communist Party most cunningly and step by step. Now its face is exposed and there is revolt against the revisionist clique in power at every level of the Party. The revolt is justified, it cannot be suppressed by wielding the sword of discipline.

"The majority in the State Committee, duly elected by the State Conference is with me and I am the Secretary of the State Committee. Shankar Dayal Tiwari, who has been appointed Secretary by the revisionist leading clique, has no right to function as such. In case he functions as Secretary, his action will amount to be an anti-party one. The party units should not accept any instructions, circulars or literature etc., from the revisionist H. Q. The Regional Committees of the Party are there as before, they will function as usual. We are trying to establish a revolutionary H. Q. of the Party at the earliest as the H. Q. of the Party has been captured by the revisionists. You will be receiving necessary instructions from there from time to time. We appeal to the District Committees not to maintain any connection with the revisionist H. Q."

II

CONCLUDING PORTION OF COMRADE S. K. MISRA'S LETTER TO THE GENERAL SECRETARY, C. P. I. (M)

"Disciplinary measures against me and several others are in the air. A party which is not true to the revolutionary principles of Marxism-Leninism, whose policy is not correct and which is not merged with the masses, cannot impose its discipline. According to Comrade Lenin, any attempt to impose such discipline is bound to end in grimacing. However, you may try it if you so desire. I have only to say this that no one on earth will be able to

withhold reorganization of our Party on correct revolutionary lines, the clouds of revisionism are bound to be scattered, the revolutionary cadre will arise and fight against the wrong policies and methods adopted by the PB and the CC, they will not allow revisionism to flourish in our Party, the revolutionary line is bound to win in the end. With greetings.

Yours

Sd. S. K. Misra

Secretary, State Committee
C. P. I. (M)

Dated 23. 9. 67

III

COPY OF RESIGNATION LETTER OF COM. S. N. TEWARI

The Gen. Secty.,
CPI (M).

Mahodaya,

We gave the reins of leadership of our Party in your hands and those of the present CC with great enthusiasm in the year 1964 at the time of the Calcutta Party Congress. Several comrades amongst us even at that time were aware of the fact that this leadership like Dangeites had several times exhibited its petty-bourgeois character. It simply criticised the Dangeites in the Party Congress and has tried to justify all its steps including those which were clearly of a revisionist nature. Party while feeling perturbed over this state of affairs, still hoped that this leadership would build a Marxist-Leninist Party and would prepare the path for People's Democratic Revolution.

But this leadership practising fraudulent methods stooped to such a low level as it permitted march of police force against a peasant revolution in the name of opposition to Naxalbari and so-called left adventurism. The Kerala and Bengal Govts. which have been formed under the leadership of our Party are now working as the defenders of the big bourgeois-landlord State. Even Dange could not deceive the militant ranks of our Party as successfully as this leadership has done.

In this situation, after very careful consideration I have come to the conclusion that this Party, which takes elections as its main instrument of struggle, the organizational

structure of which is such as is suited only to elections and to keep restricted the movement to partial struggles to achieve electoral successes, which adopts the policy of appeasement of the bourgeois leadership, which has urban areas as its base, cannot fulfil its jobs.

I find that it is adopting worse methods than the Dangeites to suppress the revolt of the cadre that has come up against its revisionist line. Dange required at least to enact a drama of setting up a Commission to enquire into the 'Left activities', this leadership did not even require a Commission, a list of so called 'extremists' is ready and the propaganda is on to serve the Confidential Department. The leadership has beaten the Dangeites in waving its sword of disciplinary action.

Thus this Party has lost the necessity of its existence.

It is good that a revolt is awakened in the ranks against the treacherous revisionist line of this leadership. The ordinary ranks of our Party are conscious revolutionaries. They joined our Party with the ardent desire for revolution, they do not adopt servile attitude towards any leaders or any so-called higher committees. The revolt of cadre against this leadership is at present in different stages at different places, it is bound to reach one common stage very early. I have full confidence that this revolt will give birth to a real Communist Party, which will have rural areas as its base, which will not adopt attitude of blind support towards the bourgeois leadership, which will remain away from the mire of Parliamentarianism, and which will carry forward the People's democratic revolution by adopting the policy of building revolutionary base areas of agrarian revolts. Despite my old age of 73 years I will exert all my energies in building such a Party.

It is with this feeling that I resign from my Party, the CPI Marxist. My greetings to those militant cadre, who are marching forward on the path of building a real revolutionary organization with the flag of revolt against revisionist leadership.

Though they might be weak today, yet they will become strong and victorious tomorrow.

23. 9. 67

Sd. Shri Narain Tewari
Member, State Committee,
C. P. I. Marxist

RANADIVE TRIES TO DECEIVE

Sushital Roy Chowdhuri

[This is an English rendering of an article by Comrade Sushital Roy Chowdhuri, which appeared in the Bengali Weekly DESHABRATI of August 10, 1967, in answer to Ranadive's article, "Ultras' Thesis: Inverted advocacy of Congress Rule," in PEOPLE'S DEMOCRACY of July 16, 1967.

—Editor, LIBERATION]

The leaders of our Party have abandoned the revolutionary path of Marxism-Leninism and taken to the road of revisionism. As a logical consequence they have to resort to dishonesty in polemics. It has been a well-known practice of the revisionists since the time of Marx conveniently to pare and prune the statements of their opponents and to quote them in a distorted manner.

Let us examine the long article by Ranadive in *People's Democracy* dated 16th July, 1967, captioned: "Ultras' thesis: Inverted advocacy of Congress rule."

In our previous article we referred to the existence of a very feeble trend inside the Party which favoured boycotting of the 4th General Elections. We have also shown how the basketfuls of quotations which Ranadive has produced from Lenin to refute this trend and to establish the justifiability of their own stand in regard to the 4th General Elections, may be likened to cannon-salvoes to kill mosquitoes and how this cannonade served only to betray his own clumsiness.

Now, before we enter into an elaborate discussion of his callowness and of the revisionist character of the party leadership, let us probe a little into the nature of Ranadive's dishonesty.

In the very beginning of his article under discussion, Ranadive, the 'theoretician', quotes from a pamphlet of the 'adventurists' in an attempt to show up those who were in favour of boycott. It reads as follows:

[It was possible] "to persuade the masses to boycott the elections, if conscious efforts were made to bring to its natural culmination the form which the mass movements displayed in the different states, especially in West Bengal and to raise the movements to a higher stage. But without making any attempts towards this the movement was terminated—under the slogan of a bigger movement—in the 48-hour strike and hartal and now that the elections are due all thinking has been concentrated on elections, on the pretext of the election-mindedness of the people. This is dangerous opportunism."

[*People's Democracy*, July 16, 1967]

True to their 'tradition', Ranadive does not reveal the identity of the leaflet and suppresses its source. Nevertheless, the leaflet has reached us too. The leaflet has been identified as Bulletin No. 1 bearing the caption "*Present Situation and our Tasks*," circulated by the "Inner-Party Committee to fight against Revisionism." In the past also we had had occasion to refer to this bulletin since it appears that for some mysterious reason, Ranadive is much too eager to suppress its identity.

The last chapter of this draft is captioned "*The role of Parliamentary Activities*." But the central theme of the bulletin, which was circulated among comrades for discussion, is a line of thought in regard to the situation in India in 1965-66 and the perspective of Indian Revolution.

However, Ranadive has quoted only a portion from the chapter, "The Role of Parliamentary Activities". For the information of the readers we reproduce below this portion as it stands in the original document:

"We have discussed above about the mass movements in India and about the character and development of the

Indian Revolution. We have to judge all things in that perspective. It can be said that if conscious efforts were made to advance the mass movements—the form it took in different states, especially in West Bengal—to their natural culmination and if the movements advanced to a higher stage, it is doubtful whether the Elections would have been held at all and it is a matter for serious consideration whether the masses could not have been persuaded to boycott the Elections at that time. But having done nothing in this respect and having terminated the movement with a 48-hour peaceful general strike and hartal in the name of intensifying the movement, it is the worst kind of opportunism to raise now pretexts of people's present attitude towards elections and consequently, to concentrate all thoughts on elections. The truth is, our leaders have gone bankrupt, they are unable or deliberately refuse to discover the new content which has recently been growing in the democratic movements; as a result, their outlook has become one of electioneering and their political tactics have been reduced to electoral tactics. Yet what else could be the main task before us, if not to enrich the new forms of the mass movements and to undertake political and organisational measures to this end? Elections must be subordinated and made complementary to this task. The responsibility to acquaint the people with basic facts and questions rests primarily on us. The people will have to be made conscious of the power-frenzied offensive that may be launched by the reactionaries after the elections are over and of the need for appropriate preparedness. Once again the present party leadership is confining a major section of the leading cadres within the four walls of Parliament and Assemblies, and is reinforcing this pattern in the party's organisational set-up. This is the natural culmination of their political thinking and

attitude. This is why, they brand as 'adventurist' and 'sectarian' anyone who dares to oppose their policy and line. This has given rise to an ideological conflict inside the Party."

Readers who compare the two excerpts, one quoted by Ranadive and the other by us, from the same portion of the original text, can clearly find out for themselves how great is the difference between the two.

There is not only difference in the choice and composition of words, but the idea expressed is also faulty. For instance, the original text reads: "...if conscious efforts were made to advance the mass movements—the form it took in different states, especially in West Bengal—to their natural culmination and if the movements advanced to a higher stage, it is doubtful whether the elections would have been held at all and it is a matter for serious consideration whether the masses could not have been persuaded to boycott the elections at that time." Ranadive renders it thus: "[They say it was possible] 'to persuade the masses to boycott the elections, if conscious efforts were made to bring to its natural culmination the form which the mass movements displayed in the different states, especially in West Bengal, and to raise the movements to a higher stage.'" Clearly, a part of the original text, viz "... it is doubtful whether the elections would have been held at all" has been dropped by Ranadive from his quotation.

Anyway, let us now consider the more original aspects of Ranadive's dishonesty.

Ranadive has left out the first two sentences and the concluding portion of that paragraph in the original text and quotes only the portion in between. The first two sentences clearly testify that the author of the original document at first stressed the importance of taking into account the nature and characteristics of the mass struggles in India during 1965-66 and those of the Indian Revolution and considering every aspect of the 4th General Elections

in this context and only then proceeded to make his own observations on what was actually done. And in the concluding portion the author, while reviewing the mass struggles of 1965-66, speaks about the emergence of a "new content" in the mass struggles of the recent period and accuses the leaders for their failure to perceive the same. It is further noticed that it is in the context of the emergence of the new in the mass struggles that the author observed in the concluding portion: "What else could be the main task before us, if not to enrich the new forms of the mass movements and to undertake political and organisational measures to this end?" and "Elections must be subordinated and made complementary to this task." [Ranadive, for all your penchant for theorising, you can hardly succeed in making these words appear as a recommendation for boycotting the elections !] The concluding portion exposes the character of the leadership which believes in parliamentarianism, and says, "Once again the present Party leadership is confining the major section of leading cadres within the four walls of Parliament and Assemblies, and is reinforcing this pattern in the party's organisational set-up. This is the natural culmination of their political thinking and attitude." [Can this accusation be called unjustified in any way? How many among the members of the provincial Secretariat and of the provincial committee were nominated to contest the elections? How many among the members of the district committees and how many district secretaries were candidates for the election? Comrade Ranadive! Do you happen to remember your address inaugurating the election campaign at the Monument maidan in Calcutta? These were your words: "This may well be the last election we are having." This statement of yours conveyed a certain understanding of the situation, didn't it? Do you claim that the correct path for a revolutionary Party to prepare itself to meet the situation adequately was to send so many of its leaders

to contest the elections? And have you considered how far your circular setting down the criteria for the selection of candidates—which was not circulated among Party committees below the provincial committee level—was adhered to in this State of West Bengal? Did this issue figure in the election review made by the State Committee? Has any higher committee had occasion to check this?]

However, anyone who glances through the portion quoted by Ranadive can find for himself that it is impossible even by the utmost stretching of imagination to extract the meaning from it that the author of the original document was an extreme "boycottist." But that matters little to Ranadive! This is how he follows up his quotation: "It is no use telling these people that through the elections the Party could approach vaster sections of the population than it could do otherwise; [*People's Democracy*, July 16, 1967, p. 5]

He who has once started to glide down the slippery path of revisionism and yet tries his utmost to cover it up from the eyes of revolutionaries, has inevitably to resort to worse and still worse dishonesty. Ranadive has not proved an exception to this.

In course of his distorted interpretation of the above excerpt, Ranadive quotes another excerpt from a different document (*Ibid*; col. 2). In this case, however, the identity of the document has been revealed by him which is, "Anonymous letter to P. B. & C. C." The portion which has been quoted without context may, of course, convey the idea that the author was absolutely against our participation in elections. We have already discussed in our previous article that there was a feeble trend which favoured boycotting the elections. The document may well be by one of them. But the interesting thing to note is how skilfully Ranadive builds up his case so as to make the two different documents appear at least to the casual readers, as one and the same. Ranadive begins his first quotation

with the words, "They say," and continuing the thread of his discussion prefaces his quotation from the second document with these words, "at one place they say...." The identity of the latter has been revealed while that of the former has been suppressed, and this whole manner of presentation can only lead people to conclude that the authors of the two documents, whom Ranadive calls "they" are the same person. Bravo, Ranadive!

Ranadive chose to suppress completely the fact that the Bulletin issued by the 'Inner-Party Committee for Struggle against Revisionism' discussed the characteristics and nature of the mass struggles in India during 1965-66 and of the Indian Revolution and considered the entire matter relating to the 4th General Elections in this context.

We reproduce below the full text of that portion of the Bulletin which relates to the issue we have presently discussed, so as to enable the comrades to judge properly the whole thing for themselves. The text reads:

PRESENT SITUATION AND OUR TASKS

Now, let us come straight to the main aspect of our Document. Our understanding of the present situation, the nature of the activities of our Party in this situation and our general understanding of the perspective or the path of Indian Revolution—all these we are placing for the consideration of the comrades. This is something fundamental. A clear understanding in this regard and a policy based on it are absolutely essential for a revolutionary Party.

The mass struggles of the recent times clearly show that our country has entered into a phase that marks the beginning of a revolutionary upsurge. The mood of the people of our country is day by day becoming revolutionary. The atmosphere is growing tense as a result of huge social upheavals taking place again and again. The causes of these eruptions happen to be different but it was

inconceivable before that they could lead to such eruptions. It is also observed that there was no preconceived plan behind these eruptions; that is to say, they occur quite spontaneously. Again, such outbursts are occurring more and more frequently. In the current year [1966] not a single month passed without the news being published of some section of the people coming into clash with the police in some part of the country or other. No doubt, the nature of these explosions is rather crude, yet their frequent recurrence unmistakably shows that they are nothing but the rumble of the approaching revolutionary tide.

Moreover, the following special characteristics can be traced in the mass struggles of this time:

- (1) Even the movements for partial demands or for certain rights have to face the hard, unyielding attitude of the ruling classes. To fulfil even ordinary demands people have to wage stubborn struggles. In most of the cases these movements are being confronted with the organised might of the ruling classes.
- (2) The consciousness that it is necessary to struggle against the whole system is fast growing. A feeling for change, if not class consciousness, is developing even among backward sections of the people, whose participation determines the sweep and intensity of any movement.
- (3) The traditional weapon of the working class—the general strike—as a means of fighting for demands, as a means of rousing the consciousness of the people, uniting them and drawing them into the struggle—is growing popular.
- (4) At the time when people wage united struggles—at the time when democratic mass movements spread, specially during general strikes and *hartals*—hundreds of hitherto unknown agitators emerge; these agitators, in reality, turn out to be very influential because they have the closest ties with the vast masses.

(5) We have already referred to the clashes between the people and the police at the time of struggles. A very significant feature noticeable during these struggles or clashes is that the masses show a firm determination to carry forward the movements in the teeth of fierce police onslaught. People do not surrender easily. During these confrontations with the police, the people display ingenuity in devising various methods to weaken the enemy by returning every blow they receive.

This is deeply significant from the point of view of mass struggles. No doubt, such actions are at present crude in nature, but their manifestation is a reality. Their second important characteristic is that in many cases they bear unmistakable signs resembling a civil war. This is specially observed in West Bengal where the ruling class, in order to suppress the democratic movements, depend mainly on the police force on the one hand, and on the other, try to unite all the reactionary forces of their own class for violent attacks on the people.

The fundamental question in the context of the above situation is whether the tremendous social upheaval taking place now throughout the country will develop into an increasingly powerful tidal wave. The only way to have a definite answer to this question is to study carefully the social contradictions behind the present situation and to understand correctly the principal aspects of the contradictions. It is as a result of the sharpening of these contradictions that objective conditions are created for this social upheaval to grow into a tidal wave.

During the post-Second World War period, the contradiction between the imperialist powers within the shrinking and crisis-ridden capitalist system and the contradiction between the imperialists and the working class within every imperialist country began to grow sharp. On the other hand, national liberation struggles, too, against imperialist forces became irresistible. The imperialist

powers, in a bid to resolve these contradictions, resorted to the policy of preserving and intensifying their colonial exploitation through neo-colonialism. As a result, the contradiction between national liberation movements and imperialist powers has grown more acute and this has proved to be the principal contradiction among all the contradictions of the present-day world. In our country the period 1945-46 was the time when the contradiction and conflict between imperialism and the people became the sharpest. In such a situation the big bourgeoisie (representatives of the monopolists and big capitalists) grew afraid of a popular revolution and established in 1947 the Congress rule on the basis of its collaboration with imperialism in order to preserve intact the imperialist interests and to exploit India's labour power and resources jointly with them.

Since then they have adopted the policy of attempting to resolve the contradiction between imperialism and Indian national-liberation movement at the cost of the people. The phenomenal increase in the tax-load on the Indian people reflects the increasing intensity of the joint exploitation by imperialism and Indian finance capital and their attempt to resolve this contradiction at the cost of the Indian masses. It is also reflected in the perpetuation of black-marketing and inflation, which has brought about a disproportionate difference between the price of the agricultural commodities produced by the peasantry and that of other commodities. To this is added the contradiction arising out of their failure to release the productive forces in the countryside through a radical reform of the feudal land tenure system and thus to reform the land relations in favour of the peasantry. In addition, there is the contradiction due to the unresolved issue of the right to self-determination of various nationalities in a multinational country like India.

As an outcome of the whole process the economy

of the country was plunged into an unprecedented crisis in 1962 and the ruling class resorted to turning the economy of the country into a war-economy at the cost of the people. Thus they intensified the exploitation of the people under cover of rabidly chauvinist slogans.

This orientation towards war-economy put India's backward economy under very a great strain and all kinds of contradictions entered into a new phase of intensification. India's economy and political conditions entered a qualitatively new phase since the time of the Sino-Indian border clashes. The situation is like this: The miseries of the vast peasant masses and the poor urban people are beyond endurance; the exploitation of the working class has been intensified to the utmost limit; the plight of the middle class working people is extremely miserable; there is uncertainty and insecurity in different spheres of the social life, crisis in the sphere of education owing to the cut in education expenditure, shrinkage in scope of employment and ever-increasing unemployment and above all, there is growing lack of confidence in and hatred against the government in the minds of the people. An understanding of this situation and of the true nature of the aforesaid contradictions should make it easy for one to visualise that all the contradictions will inevitably grow increasingly sharper and will certainly make the social upheaval irresistible. The objective conditions for this are growing. This is the main thing. To explain the idea: "Revolutionary flood-tide is inevitable"—we may say in the words of Comrade Mao Tse-tung—"A Marxist is not an astrologer; he can merely indicate the general direction as to the future development and change; he can do that much and nothing more. He cannot mechanically foretell the date and hour and never should he do that." [Retranslated from Bengali—Ed.] But to say that "revolutionary flood-tides will soon come" certainly does not mean that it has no significance for our way of functioning. In

other words, the analysis and realisation that revolutionary flood-tides will soon come underline the necessity for a completely new outlook regarding the whole situation and a new programme of action.

But it is not enough to consider the issue of revolutionary flood-tide in isolation; suitable organisational measures to meet the needs of such a situation must also be considered. This is so, because, political activities and organisational measures are inseparably connected. The present stage of our revolution is People's Democratic in nature; this is not a socialist revolution. At the present stage this revolution is directed towards overthrowing imperialism, big and monopoly native finance-capital and feudalism and towards establishing a People's Democratic State. The immediate task to achieve this goal is to end the Congress rule by means of a genuine democratic revolution through militant people's struggles waged under the working class leadership. The main basis for the establishing of the People's Democratic State is the firm alliance of the working class and the peasantry. So it is necessary for us to orientate and organise all our activities accordingly. To realise this objective, our immediate aim should be to win over the people as rapidly as possible both in the rural and in the urban areas—to the side of revolution through systematic revolutionary activities; but the key to the victory of the revolution is the leadership of the proletariat. For this it is necessary to establish the base of the party in all principal industrial areas as well as in the workers' organisations of Transport, Post and Telegraph etc. and to make the Party genuinely proletarian both in its appearance and in its roots, by bringing in truly militant and tested working class cadres. Along with this, powerful working class movements and organisations will have to be built up.

But at the same time the basic orientation of the movement has to be kept in sight. It must not be forgotten that the main condition for helping the struggle in the

urban areas and for hastening the nation-wide revolutionary flood-tide is to develop the struggle for land, which is the basic struggle of the peasantry in the rural areas. So, we must give serious attention to this matter. But, this does not mean giving up the struggles in the urban areas or minimising their importance. Again, to neglect, in any way, the task of developing basic struggles and building up militant bases in the rural areas, will be a fatal mistake. Hence the necessity for building up powerful broad-based peasant organisations, especially, mass organisations of agricultural labourers, of poor share-croppers and of poor peasants, which will create objective conditions for establishing militant bases. It is our conviction that with the resources which our Party has at present, and provided a genuine class-consciousness is there, it should not prove difficult for the Party to tackle the problem of these two types of organisational activities. But that requires a conscious effort, a revolutionary initiative and efficient leadership.

THE EMERGENCE OF THE NEW IN INDIAN MASS STRUGGLES

While we should, under the sustaining inspiration of this understanding, ceaselessly strive to develop the organisational and militant activities of the above two types, serious attention must be given at the same time to the new—which, from time to time appears like a flash of lightning and electrifies the whole atmosphere during its brief spell of existence. We must realise its significance, realise its revolutionary potentiality in the context of the programme of action discussed before. In fact, this 'new' urges us to free our thoughts and outlook from the stereotyped grooves of activities. We are speaking of those clashes which are taking place between the people and the organised forces of the ruling class in time of mass struggles—and in some cases features of a

civil war are witnessed even if in flashes. A politically conscious revolutionary must recognise the essence of the aspirations of the people which find expression during such clashes, of the preparations for resistance which in many cases they organise spontaneously. There can be no doubt that these are, though in an embryonic form, the highest form of struggle aspired to by revolutionaries. In the past also a good many struggles were fought, but, in the recent years, their frequent occurrences and the activities of the people during these occurrences clearly make them qualitatively different from those of the past. These are plainly an embryonic form of what are required to bring about revolutionary changes in the society. So, the bounden duty of this moment is to give all attention to ensure proper nurturing of this embryo, so that it can grow and develop as a well-nourished entity within the womb of mass struggles to its full maturity. This will pave the way for the victory of the People's Democratic Revolution. Therefore, to continue to neglect the task of generalising this 'new' will mean gross failure to carry out our Marxist revolutionary duty. Failure to do this will mean reducing the struggles to reformist movements totally devoid of revolutionary content. So, it is necessary to be vigilant in this regard. On the whole, what we need is a new outlook, a new strategy and new tactics in regard to struggles and organisations and a truly revolutionary way of functioning.

THE MILITARY GOVERNMENT OF NE WIN.

THE CHIANG KAI-SHEK OF BURMA, IS
BOUND TO FAIL : THE PEOPLE ARE
BOUND TO WIN

[*Speech by Thakin Ba Thein Tin, First Vice-Chairman of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Burma, at the July 5 Peking memorial rally for martyr Liu Yi.*]

Comrades, Comrades-in-arms and Friends :

On behalf of the Burmese people, the Communist Party of Burma and Comrade Thakin Than Tun, the Chairman of our Party, I speak at the memorial rally for Comrade Liu Yi today.

I want first of all to say that Comrade Liu Yi was an expert sent to Burma to work for Burmese economic construction in accordance with the Sino-Burmese Economic Aid Agreement.

He served the Burmese people with a high degree of proletarian internationalist spirit. He was killed by thugs instigated by the reactionary Ne Win military government while performing the tasks assigned to him by his country, and died a heroic death.

His death and bloodshed contributed to the establishment of Chinese-Burmese friendship. The Burmese people will never forget this. They will always remember him.

The Burmese people and the Communist Party of Burma feel great sorrow at Comrade Liu Yi's heroic death. We express our sympathy with the Chinese people and the relatives of Comrade Liu Yi.

Now, I want to say that the struggle waged by the young overseas Chinese students and the overseas Chinese brothers in Burma is entirely just and correct.

Their just struggle is bound to win.

The reactionary Ne Win military government can never crush their just struggle.

The combined pressure of Ne Win's masters—U. S. imperialism and the Soviet revisionist leading clique—cannot crush their just struggle either.

Why ?

Because they have grasped the thought of Chairman Mao, the great leader of the world, and their struggle is just ; the glorious 700 million Chinese people are with them, the broad masses of the Burmese people are with them.

I want to reiterate at this rally that our Communist Party of Burma wholeheartedly supports the just struggle of the overseas Chinese, and vehemently protest against the fascist atrocities of the Ne Win military government in massacring the overseas Chinese.

We fully support the June 29 statement of the Government of the Chinese People's Republic protesting against the Ne Win military government.

Martyr Liu Yi, overseas Chinese student martyrs and overseas Chinese martyrs gave their lives and shed their blood for this struggle.

Many more were wounded, arrested and persecuted. It has been learnt that, up to the present, in Rangoon alone overseas Chinese have been killed by the hundreds and overseas Chinese students and overseas Chinese have been arrested by the thousands.

This is an outrageous crime that can never be erased from the history of Burma ! The blood debt incurred by the Ne Win military government, including that owed Comrade Liu Yi and other martyrs, must be paid in blood. We declare here that our Party and the people of Burma, together with the Chinese people must demand payment for it.

Next, I want to talk about why the Ne Win military government carried out this massacre.

It was by no means accidental that the reactionary Ne Win military government opposed China.

Burma's anti-China incident is not divorced from the anti-China drive in Indonesia, India, Hongkong and in other countries and areas; it is part of the adverse current of opposition to the Communist parties, the people, the revolution and China. All this shows that class struggle throughout the whole world is very sharp and that the world revolutionary movement has entered a new stage and reached a new height.

This incident was planned beforehand, arranged and carried out in collusion with the U. S. imperialists, Soviet revisionists, reactionaries of all countries and the Kuomintang gang.

The anti-China outrage instigated by the Ne Win military government is an outcome of the anti-communist, anti-popular policy of civil war which it has followed for a long time, and an outcome of its reactionary foreign policy of further dependence on and collusion with imperialism, revisionism and the reactionaries in all countries, and has been decided by its class nature.

The Ne Win military government has carried out this massacre at a time when it is facing total bankruptcy, militarily, politically and economically.

I would like first to talk about its military bankruptcy.

The armed struggle under the leadership of the Communist Party of Burma headed by Chairman Thakin Than Tun has been going on for 19 to almost 20 years.

Ne Win and his gang are the chief culprits who started reactionary civil war.

They set off the unjust war, and burnt down thousands of villages.

They have turned a large number of villages into concentration camps like those in south Vietnam.

Tens of thousands of peasants have been killed and

arrested, many women raped and many Communists massacred.

Aided by U. S. imperialism and assisted by Britain, Israel, West Germany, Japan, India and other imperialists and reactionaries, the Ne Win military government has launched wild attacks on the Burmese people's democratic revolution.

It has received much aid from Khrushchov, Kosygin, Brezhnev, Tito and other modern revisionists.

Ne Win also received great help from China's Khrushchov.

Nevertheless, the Burmese armed struggle has not collapsed. At present, we are dealing the Ne Win military government harsh blows. Under the banner of the national democratic united front, the armed units have scored victory after victory. The people of the Shan, Kachin, Karen, Kayah, Mon and Pa-o nationalities are also engaged in armed struggle against the Ne Win military government. The revolutionary armed forces have now grown so strong that they are capable of taking medium-sized and small towns and have occupied them for a time. According to incomplete statistics, more than 400 battles were fought in 1966. Our Party's armed forces have increased by half. Our guerrilla bases have been expanded and consolidated. The area in which we are fighting accounts for more than 60 per cent of the country's total area.

Last October, our armed units attacked a position only two miles from Ne Win's mansion. In November, they captured the goods of a co-operative shop on the outskirts of Rangoon. These battles gave the Ne Win government a shock. The U. S. and British press sum up our present military situation as follows: The revolutionary armed forces are forming a crescent around Rangoon and although the Burmese Government can control two-thirds of the country by day it can only control one-half at night. U. S.

imperialism is worried that Burma may become a second Vietnam within two or three years.

The Ne Win military government has fired the first shot against Chinese nationals. Since it has fired the first shot, it is with good reason that we should hit back.

Now that Ne Win has fired the first shot in opposing China, the armed struggle in Burma will certainly develop by leaps and bounds and reach a still higher stage. This is because the present situation is that the Burmese armed struggle is enjoying the full sympathy and support of the 700 million Chinese people and the overwhelming majority of the Burmese people, who are against Ne Win, and will unite still more closely.

The situation to be looked forward to is that the Burmese armed struggle will display greater might and spread further, and more troops of the Ne Win government will be wiped out. This is how Ne Win is digging his own grave.

It is because we have taken Marxism-Leninism, Mao Tse-tung's thought as our guide that we have been able to persevere in carrying on armed struggle for nearly 20 years. The brilliant victories we have won in the military field are a victory of the invincible thought of Mao Tse-tung.

It is because we have established in our minds Chairman Mao's idea that "political power grows out of the barrel of a gun" that we have been able to persevere in struggle. We have been able to do so because we have used guns and opposed the ideas and programme of China's Khrushchov and of the Soviet revisionist leading clique which urge us to co-operate with Ne Win and be his disciples.

Our armed struggle arose out of our mastery of Chairman Mao's thought. As already mentioned, we have not only accepted the guidance of the completely correct idea, namely, "political power goes out of the barrel of a gun," but we also carry on our fight in accordance with

Chairman Mao's theory on protracted war, relying on the countryside as our base area and encircling the cities from the countryside. Our practice has proved that, given a Party armed with the thought of Chairman Mao, and given that this Party is able to rely first of all on the peasants, protracted war can be carried on even in a small country like Burma.

However, as a result of the disruptive activities of China's Khrushchov, the Burmese revolution and the Chinese people have been turned from close friends into distant relatives.

China's Khrushchov has a soft spot for Ne Win, but harbours no such good intention towards the Communist Party of Burma. This is not fortuitous; there is a reason. As far back as 20 years ago, our Party was a Party loyal to Marxism-Leninism, Mao-Tse-tung's thought. It is only natural that China's Khrushchov, who is opposed to Marxism-Leninism, Mao Tse-tung's thought, should treat us badly.

In spite of the fact that China's Khrushchov has not liked us, we have followed Chairman Mao's teachings, persevered in self-reliance and carried on struggle for more than 19 years.

Burma's revolution has proved that as long as the people of various countries really act according to Chairman Mao's teachings on self-reliance, then the oppressed people of these countries can decide their own destiny in the spirit of self-reliance. Our Party is now undertaking a vigorous study of Chairman Mao's works. It has also been stressed that everyone undertake a creative study and application, in the course of struggle, of "Long Live the Victory of People's War!", written by our respected and beloved Vice-Chairman Lin Piao.

We regard Chairman Mao's works as an invaluable treasure.

Ne Win and his like also study Chairman Mao's works according to their understanding. But the purpose of

their study is to discredit Chairman Mao and the Chinese people, to discredit the Burmese people and oppose the Burmese Communist Party.

The enemy is afraid of Mao Tse-tung's thought. Ne Win, the revisionists of all countries and China's Khrushchov are all in mortal fear of Mao Tse-tung's thought. That is why we must double our efforts to study Mao Tse-tung's thought which the enemy fears.

As I have already said, because of the rapid development of the armed struggle in Burma, the military crisis of the Ne Win military government has become more serious.

Class struggle is very acute in Burma. The reactionary Ne Win military government is facing crisis all along the line. This crisis is a bomb that is about to explode.

In these circumstances, the Ne Win military government directs its spearhead at the Communist Party of Burma. It has decided to launch another wild military offensive against the Party.

Externally, it still regards the People's Republic of China as the main danger. It made a public statement to this effect at the Burma Socialist Programme Party Conference convened last November.

From these facts people can clearly see that the Ne Win military government is the enemy of the Burmese people and the enemy of the Chinese people as well.

This Ne Win military government has worked more flagrantly than ever in collusion with U. S. imperialism, Israel, Thailand and the "Malaysian" reactionaries.

Prior to the massacre of the overseas Chinese, it held talks with Adam Malik, representative of the Indonesian fascist government.

I would now like to say something about the political crisis of the Ne Win military government.

Ne Win openly declared that his political line was one

of non-acceptance of Marxism-Leninism, Mao Tse-tung's thought, and of non-acceptance of the leadership of the proletariat.

He said his government would give the peasants privileges, but in reality its foundation is the landlords and rich peasants.

It virtually transferred the right to resolve the peasant problem to the reactionary village heads, bureaucrats and military officers.

What it preached about the "labouring people" in effect refers to the bureaucratic exploiting class and reactionary military officers who are slaughtering the peasants. The real workers serve only as the object of their exploitation and oppression.

As in the case of Yugoslavia, Ne Win accepts aid from all imperialist and revisionist countries.

He suppresses the Communist Party by means of unjust war.

This is what the "Burmese programme for socialism" has meant.

Even now the Soviet modern revisionists still proclaim that the road Ne Win takes is a non-capitalist one.

China's Khrushchov also directly told Ne Win that it was necessary to learn from Ne Win's programme for socialism.

But the Burmese people have a real understanding of their own. They see with their own eyes that Ne Win's "Burmese programme for socialism," has brought about the massacre of tens of thousands of people.

Under the Ne Win military government rule, even bourgeois democracy was got rid of. Four months after the military government came to power, more than 100 university students were killed and over 300 students injured on July 7, in Rangoon, the capital of Burma.

In November, 1963, after shamelessly sabotaging peaceful negotiations, the Ne Win military government abolished all

legitimate parties and arrested more than 1000 well-known progressive people. From that time till now, it has continued to arrest workers, peasants, students, writers and owners of enterprises. What do all these facts show? They show that Ne Win, who is carrying out military dictatorship in the country, is Burma's Chiang Kai-shek.

The people have clearly realized that the Ne Win military government is incapable of resolving any problem, no matter whether it concerns culture, public health, or the economy. Things are going from bad to worse.

Therefore, the people have seen that Ne Win's "Burmese programme for socialism" is false. Ne Win cannot deceive anyone! And, therefore, Ne Win has exposed his true features to the Burmese people, as did Khrushchov, Kosygin and Brezhnev. China's Khrushchov has also shown his true countenance.

Comrades, this is perfectly clear to us.

We never thought that socialism could be established by relying on "aid" from U. S. imperialism. However, the group of people like Ne Win, Khrushchov and China's Khrushchov said it was possible and experimented in Burma.

I would also like to say a few words about the economic crisis of the Ne Win military government.

Ne Win's "programme for socialism" in Burma long ago plunged the whole country into a serious economic crisis. At present, there is an extreme lack of food and medicine, the price of commodities is very high and speculating merchant cliques and black-markets are so numerous that Ne Win has been helpless in dealing with them. The reason is that his officers and officials have all taken part in black-market activities.

With regard to the situation of the material shortages, I would like to cite a few examples to explain it.

At present, Burma is extremely short of cooking oil and there has been none for use in preparing dishes. The ordinary people call those dishes with no cooking oil, or very little, "Ne Win dishes."

Famine in Burma is now extremely serious.

Burma is one of the world's biggest rice-producing countries. Even during World War II, when the whole country had been turned into a battlefield, there was no famine in Burma because of the self-reliant efforts of the Burmese people.

In pre-war days, apart from domestic consumption, three million tons of rice were exported annually. But now the amount exported has been only six hundred thousand tons, and the sale of rice domestically has to be measured by the milk bottle.

Famine has been brought on under Ne Win's rule. The Government has declared that Burma will possibly be without grain before November and December of this year. It therefore asks the people to practise economy in grain consumption. However, famine has already begun. Workers have left the factories because they have nothing to eat; peasants are unable to work in the fields because they have insufficient food. People are eating roots and bark. Diseases are spreading because of malnutrition.

Demonstrations and struggles have occurred aimed at securing a solution to the grain problem. In some places the seizure of rice has taken place. In Rangoon, it is only possible for a person to buy one milk bottleful of rice daily. Over 1000 residents in the Thaketa quarter held a demonstration in front of a grain shop because they had no rice for their evening meal. In Rangoon some restaurants have no rice to serve.

The people of the whole country are highly indignant at the Ne Win military government.

In order to shake itself free of political, military and economic crisis and consolidate its rule, the Ne Win military government has adopted despicable measures. It has stirred up a conflict between China and Burma in an attempt to divert into a national conflict the fierce anger of the Burmese people that has burst forth like a volcano.

It is well-known that the Ne Win military government started by ruthlessly massacring overseas Chinese students and other overseas Chinese. At first, it manufactured rumours and incited national hatred, and then provoked national conflict. Its despicable schemes may succeed perhaps for the time being. However, the friendship between China and Burma that has been formed for such a long time is firm and nobody can undermine it. No force on earth is capable of sabotaging this friendship. Whoever attempts to do so is a madman, just banging his head against a brick wall.

Chairman Mao teaches us: "Lifting a rock only to drop it on one's own feet" is a Chinese folk saying to describe the behaviour of certain fools. The reactionaries in all countries are fools of this kind. In the final analysis, their persecution of the revolutionary people only serves to accelerate the people's revolutions on a broader and more intense scale." By his opposition to China, Ne Win is lifting a rock only to drop it on his own feet.

Before World War II, the British imperialists provoked a conflict between China and Burma. Apart from this, China-Burma friendship has been firm. It is a flesh and blood friendship. The Burmese call the Chinese *paukphaw* meaning kinsmen. Of course, Ne Win also calls China's Khrushchov *paukphaw*. The latter is a *paukphaw* of partners-in-crime, and not that between the people. It is merely *paukphaw* of a supreme master and a disciple.

Therefore, we are convinced that, guided by the spirit of genuinely consolidated friendship between China and Burma, and not by the hypocritical rubbish of Ne Win and China's Khrushchov, the overseas Chinese in Burma will certainly win victory.

There is another matter I would like to refer to.

The reactionaries of all countries say that there are two kinds of Communist Parties. They say that they do not fear the Communist Parties of Khrushchov, Kosygin and

Brezhnev and that they can make friends with such Communist Parties. They take the same attitude towards Communists like China's Khrushchov. But they are frightened out of their wits by the Communist Party of Mao Tse-tung.

This analysis of the enemy is very important. We should all be Communist Parties of Mao Tse-tung.

The overseas Chinese in Burma, who are struggling by holding aloft Chairman Mao's teaching "a great life, a glorious death," will certainly win.

The Burmese people will surely end this massacre soon and unite as one in opposition to Ne Win.

The Ne Win military government which is opposing the Chinese and Burmese peoples will certainly be defeated.

China's Khrushchov, who has suppressed the great proletarian cultural revolution and the Red Guards in China, has been discredited among the masses. The Ne Win military government, which is suppressing overseas Chinese for fear both of the influence of China's great proletarian cultural revolution and of the revolutionary forces in Burma, is bound to fail.

China's Khrushchov, who opposed the thought of Chairman Mao, has bitten the dust; the Ne Win military government which has insulted Chairman Mao, will also certainly be defeated.

Together with the Chinese people, we will certainly carry the struggle against the Ne Win military government, the struggle against revisionism and the struggle against the reactionaries of all countries through to the very end.

We will definitely strengthen the struggle against the Ne Win military government in our practical work.

Let the U. S. imperialists and the Soviet revisionists give more aid to the Ne Win military government!

However great the sacrifice we have to suffer, no matter how long the struggle continues, we will certainly carry on our fight.

We have waged a military struggle over a period of nearly 20 years. We say that we are not afraid of any kind of enemy, because we have Chairman Mao's thought as our guide.

We will overthrow the Ne Win military government and bring about a lasting peace, a happy and completely independent Burma and set up a people's democratic united front government conforming to the people's wishes.

Let us unite, fight and triumph together under the banner of Chairman Mao's thought!

We fully support the fraternal overseas Chinese in Burma in their revolutionary, valiant and just struggle! No one can destroy the friendship between China and Burma!

The reactionary Ne Win military government is bound to fail!

The people's democratic revolution is bound to triumph!

Long live the unity of the Burmese and Chinese peoples!

Long live the unity of the Communist Parties of Burma and China!

Long live proletarian internationalism!

Long live China's great proletarian cultural revolution personally led by Chairman Mao!

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

U. S. imperialism is bound to fail!

Modern revisionism headed by the leadership of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union is bound to fail!

To the good health of Comrade Thakin Than Tun, Chairman of the Communist Party of Burma!

Long live Chairman Mao, the great leader of the world's people! Long, long life to him!

NOVEMBER REVOLUTION AND THE CPI

[From P. 32]

following these lessons Mao also successfully carried out the biggest colonial revolution that ever took place in history. As early as 1928, Mao Tse-tung had summarised the task of the Communist Party of China as follows:

"We fully agree with the Communist International's resolution concerning China. At present China certainly remains in the stage of the bourgeois-democratic revolution. A programme for a thorough democratic revolution in China includes, externally, the overthrow of imperialism so as to achieve complete national liberation, and, internally, the clean-up of the influence of the comprador class in the cities, the completion of the agrarian revolution, the elimination of feudal relations in the villages and the overthrow of the government of the war-lords. We must go through such a democratic revolution before we can lay a real foundation for passing on to socialism." (*Selected Works of Mao Tse-tung*, I, p. 99). It is on this basis that Mao Tse-tung developed the theory of New Democracy, of People's Democratic Revolution—a theory that has been accepted by the international communist movement. The main force of the People's Democratic Revolution is the peasantry guided by the proletariat.

Another great contribution of Mao Tse-tung is his uncompromising fight against modern Revisionism which was about to paralyse the revolutionary movement of the world proletariat. Just as Lenin had previously rescued Marxism after the death of Engels from the hands of Bernstein-Kautskyite revisionism so did Mao Tse-tung save Marxism-Leninism after the death of Stalin from the clutches of Khrushchevite modern revisionism.

Of all the Communist Parties that refused to learn and apply the lessons of the November Revolution the Indian Party occupies the foremost place. From its very inception the leadership of the Party in India failed to study

Marxism-Leninism seriously and apply it under Indian conditions. In course of its 40 years' existence, the leaders of the Party, whether of the CPIR or CPIM, have made hardly any significant contribution to Marxist theory and practice. Hardly any one of them has studied and analysed from the Marxian point of view, from the point of view of class struggle and Dialectical Materialism, the rich cultural and historical inheritance of the Indian people or the present Indian social and economic conditions.

November Revolution betrayed—that epitomises the history of the Indian party leadership. From the very beginning of its history the Indian Party was led by Revisionists, sometimes of the Right, sometimes of the Left. The role of these leaders all throughout has been a role of repeated betrayal. Party leaders indulged themselves mostly in factional quarrels; there was hardly any ideological struggle within the party. Party cadres were mainly drawn from petty bourgeois sections which contained good revolutionary elements but their training in Marxist theory and practice was persistently and deliberately neglected by the party leadership. Hence many of these revolutionary elements that came into the party could not get rid of their petty bourgeois vices and could not become revolutionary Marxists. Even those few excellent militant working class and peasant cadres who came into the party got contaminated with these vices and they soon lost their revolutionary character.

The most glorious chance for applying the lessons of the November Revolution in India came just after the end of the Second World War when the heroic sailors of the Royal Indian Navy rose in open revolt, when the entire Indian army was on the verge of mutiny and when the masses of the Indian people were in a revolutionary mood. That was a most wonderful revolutionary situation, only the leadership was lacking.

It was the Party leaders, both of the Right and of the Left, who betrayed that revolution. During the war, although the Party adopted the correct slogan "People's

War", its leadership did not prepare the party cadres and the masses for that eventuality. During the war the Party got a chance to build itself on a strong mass base and as a strong independent party of workers and peasants. But instead of doing that it converted itself into a tail of the reactionary Indian National Congress. Then out of sheer opportunism it accepted the Two-Nation theory and the slogan of Pakistan of the Muslim League reactionaries, thinking that thereby it could win over the Muslim masses. Naturally, because of such opportunism and anti-Marxist policies, the Party got isolated from the "People", thereby knocking off the basis of a "People's War". Then, in spite of all these blunders of the Party, when the masses, soldiers and sailors themselves spontaneously took to the path of "war", a really "People's War", the Party leaders got frightened and handed over the revolutionary sailors to British imperialism through the Congress and League leaders. In the whole history of the international proletarian movement this betrayal of the Indian party leaders is the most shameful example.

As a result of this betrayal, some leaders at the top were removed and a set of new leaders took their place. But this was only meant to hood-wink the discontented Party rank and file. There was no real change in the character of leadership, no real Marxist-Leninist leadership was formed—only the Right Revisionist leaders were replaced by the Left Revisionist leaders. To the spontaneous mass movements that developed in Telengana, Kakdwip, Susong and many other places, the Party leadership again gave wrong slogans and followed wrong tactics. Due to the pressure of the rank and file, the Party for the first time adopted a revolutionary Marxist Programme in 1951. But it took no time for the opportunist leaders to scuttle that programme. It did not take long for these leaders to convert the party into a parliamentary electioneering party. Whatever chance there was to build a revolutionary party on the basis of the 1951 Programme and on the slogan of People's Democratic

Revolution was destroyed by parliamentarism that engulfed the whole party.

The most surprising thing is that after all these years of ignominious betrayals, those very treacherous leaders are the dominating factors in both the CPIR and CPIM! Therefore it is not at all surprising that the leadership of both the Parties are denouncing with equal vehemence the revolutionary movement initiated by the Naxalbari peasants under the guidance of revolutionary Marxists.

Naxalbari, within such a short time, has already become a symbolic term for people's revolution. It has already caught the imagination of the struggling workers and peasants all over India. It has opened up a completely new chapter in the history of the Communist movement in India and has laid the foundation for building a real Communist Party based on Marxism-Leninism and on the lessons of the November Revolution.

"An erroneous leadership that endangers the revolution should not be accepted unconditionally but should be resisted resolutely.

—Mao Tse-Tung