

Charu Mazumdar on the Naxalbari Road

Fully one year has passed since the peasant struggle in Naxalbari began. This struggle is different from all other peasant struggles. What is the difference? Peasants have always struggled against various injustices and oppressions. This is the first time that the peasants have struggled not for their partial demands but for the seizure of state power. If the Naxalbari peasant struggle has any lesson for us it is this: militant struggles must be carried on not for land, crops etc., but for the seizure of state power. It is precisely this that gives the Naxalbari struggle its uniqueness. Peasants in different areas must prepare themselves in a manner so as to be able to render ineffective the state apparatus in their respective areas. It is in Naxalbari that this path has been adopted for the first time in the history of the peasant struggles in India. In other words, the revolutionary era has been ushered in, and this is the first year of that era. It is for this reason that the revolutionaries of all countries are heartily welcoming the Naxalbari struggle.

India has been turned into a base of imperialism and revisionism and is acting today as a base of reactionary forces against the people struggling for liberation. That is why the Naxalbari struggle is not merely a national struggle, it is also an international struggle. This struggle and the path we have chosen is in no way easy or smooth. The path of revolution is difficult, not smooth or easy, and difficulties, dangers and even retreats will be there. But the peasants, who are fired in the spirit of internationalism, have defied all this and refuse to submit. They persist in following their path of struggle.

June 1968

— from "One Year of Naxalbari Struggle"

We want to introduce a system under which the administration will be carried out by revolutionary committees at all levels. Previously this did not form a part of the programme of democratic revolution. This is a contribution of China's Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution. We are adopting it because we believe that China's Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution is the

third revolution that has influenced the world system. After the first revolution — the Great October Revolution — the democratic revolution of every country became part of the world socialist revolution. After the second revolution — the Great Chinese Revolution — the revolution in every country can be victorious only by taking the path of people's war. Exactly, in the same way, today, after the third revolution — the Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution — the democratic revolution of every country has become a part and parcel of this Cultural Revolution. This is because no revolution in any country in the present era can win victory without fighting revisionism.

Today revisionism is the enemy of the revolution of every country, and its weapon is bourgeois democracy. So the democratic revolution will have to move forward by fighting necessarily against bourgeois democracy, that is, against institutions like elections and parliament. Therefore, we can never make use of these institutions in carrying forward the democratic revolution today. We must carry on administration by forming revolutionary committees with the cooperation of the masses and with their leaders as members.

We cannot say just now what the character of the revolutionary committees will be like. It would simply be bookish to talk of implementing in toto the "three-in-one" alliance which grew out of the experience of the Cultural Revolution of China. Our revolutionary committees will grow out of the experience of our struggle and we shall have to work out their form on the basis of that experience.

None of the three revolutions — the Great October Revolution, the Great Chinese Revolution and the Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution — is a revolution of a particular country, on the contrary, each of them is a column on which rests the edifice of the world victory of the international working class. So each of these revolutions has worldwide influence and its experience has enriched the arsenal of the international working class. After the October Revolution no revolution was possible under the leadership of the bourgeoisie because the October Revolution made the bourgeoisie panic-stricken. So it was the working class which had to lead every revolution after the October Revolution. The victory of the Great Chinese Revolution has caused panic to world imperialism. As a result intervention by the world imperialist system has become a reality confronting every revolution in every country. That is why the revolution in every country must learn the lessons of the Chinese Revolution and can be victorious only by taking the path of people's war. Similarly, today, after the Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution, revisionism, which has assumed the form of social-imperialism, has turned into an enemy of every revolution. That is why no revolution in any country can win victory without fighting revisionism.

December, 1969.

— **"March Forward Summing Up the Experiences of the Revolutionary Peasant Struggle of India"**

We shall have to carry on daily the struggle against revisionism, adopting the tactics of area-wise seizure of power. Certain revisionist ideas are firmly rooted inside the party. We shall have to carry on the struggle against them. We are discussing some questions here.

1) The question that has assumed importance today in the struggle against revisionism is the complete support given by the Soviet leadership to the reactionary ruling class of India. They have announced that they will give India

an aid of Rs. 600 crores* during the Fourth Five Year Plan. The idea that Soviet aid is strengthening India's independence is extremely wrong. For there is no class analysis behind this. We shall have to place clearly before the people our views against this support. If support is given to the government of India which is following the path of cooperation with imperialism and feudalism, it is the reactionary class which is strengthened. So Soviet aid is not strengthening the democratic movement of India, but is increasing the strength of the reactionary forces in cooperation with U.S.-led imperialism and the Soviet. It is the Soviet-U.S. cooperation of modern revisionism that we are observing in India — a satanic association against the people's liberation struggles in the future. We are seeing from our experience in India that the dominance of the big monopolists exists on the production of the big industries that have grown in the public sector with Soviet aid. So the State will not be able to control the power of the monopolist employers through public sector industries, it is the monopolist employers who are controlling the production of the public sector industries. Our experience is the same in both the cases of steel and petroleum.

2) The question that has become important to us today is bourgeois nationalism. This nationalism is extremely narrow and it is narrow nationalism that is today the biggest weapon of the ruling class. This weapon they are using not only in the case of China, but also on any question like Pakistan, etc. By raising the slogan of national unity and other slogans, they want to preserve the exploitation of monopoly capital. We should remember that the sense of unity of India has risen as a result of the anti-imperialist movement. As the Indian Government is carrying on compromising with imperialism, that sense of unity is being struck at its root. There is only one aim at the root of the slogan of unity given by the present ruling class, and that is unity for the exploitation by monopoly capital. So this slogan of unity is reactionary and Marxists must oppose this slogan. The slogan — "Kashmir is an inalienable part of India" — is given by the ruling class in the interest of plundering. No Marxist can support this slogan. It is an essential duty of the Marxists to accept the right of self-determination by every nationality. On the questions of Kashmir, Nagas, etc., the Marxists should express their support in favour of the fighters. The consciousness of a new unity will come in the course of the very struggle against this government of India of imperialism, feudalism, and big monopolists, and it is in the interest of the revolution that it will be necessary to keep India united then. That unity will be a firm unity. It is from this consciousness of nationality that there have been struggles in South India against the imposition of Hindi and 60 people have lost their lives in this year of '65. So if the significance of this struggle is belittled, the working class will isolate itself from the struggles of the broader masses. It is in the interest of the working class that the efforts for development of these nationalities should be supported.

3) "Establishing class analysis in the peasants' movement." At the present stage of the revolution the entire peasantry is the ally of the working class, and this peasantry is the biggest force of the People's Democratic Revolution of India and it is by keeping this in mind, we shall have to march forward in the movement of the peasantry. But all peasants do not belong to the same class. There are mainly four classes among the peasant — rich, middle, poor and landless — and there is the rural artisan class. There are differences in their revolutionary consciousness and ability to work according to the conditions. So Marxists must always try to establish the leadership of the poor and landless peasants over the entire peasant movement. The mistake that is often made while analysing the class of the peasants is to determine it on the basis

* crore - 10 million

of the title deeds of land. This is a dangerous mistake. It has to be analysed on the basis of their earning and level of living. The peasant movement will become militant to the extent we establish the leadership of the poor and landless peasants over the entire peasant movement. It should be remembered that whatever fighting tactics are accepted on the basis of the support of the broad peasantry can never be in any sense adventurism.

It should be remembered that all these years, basing ourselves on the support of the non-peasantry, we have looked for the narrowness of the peasant movement, and whenever repression came we thought that there must have been some adventurism. It should be remembered that no movement of the peasants on basic demands will follow a peaceful path. For a class analysis of the peasant organisation and to establish the leadership of the poor and landless peasants, the peasantry should be told in clear terms that no fundamental problem of theirs can be solved with the help of any law of this reactionary government. But this does not mean that we shall not take advantage of any legal movement. The work of open peasant associations will mainly be to organise movements for gaining legal benefits and for legal changes. So among the peasant masses the most urgent and the main task of the party will be to form party groups and explain the programme of the agrarian revolution and the tactics of area-wise seizure of power. Through this programme, the poor and landless peasants will be established in the leadership of the peasant movement.

4) From 1959, on every democratic movement of India, the government has been increasingly launching violent attacks. We have not given leadership to any active resistance movement against these violent attacks. We gave the call for passive resistance in the face of these attacks, like the mourning procession after the food movement, among such instances. We shall have to remember Comrade Mao Tsetung's teaching: "Mere passive resistance against repression drives a wedge in the fighting unity of the masses and invariably leads to the path of surrender." So, in the present era during any mass movement, an active resistance movement will have to be organised. The programme of active resistance has become an absolute necessity before any mass movement. Without this programme, to organise any mass movement today means to plunge the masses in despondency. As a result of the passive resistance of 1959, it was not possible to organise any mass rally on the demand for food in Calcutta in the years 1960-61. This organisation of active resistance will arouse a new confidence in the minds of the masses and the tide of struggle will arise. What do we mean by active resistance? First, preservation of cadres. For this preservation of cadres, proper shelters and a communication system are necessary. Secondly, teaching the common people the techniques of resistance, like lying down in the face of firings, or taking the help of some strong barrier, forming barricades, etc. Thirdly, efforts to avenge every attack with the help of groups of active cadres, which has been described by Comrade Mao Tsetung as "tit for tat struggle." At the initial stage, in proportion to their attacks, we shall be able to avenge a few attacks only. But if even a little success is gained in one case, extensive propaganda will create new enthusiasm among the masses. These active resistance struggles are possible in cities and in the countryside, everywhere. This truth has been tested in the Negro resistance movement in America.

5) There is no clear-cut idea in the Party about underground organisation. A secret organisation does not grow merely if a few leaders stay underground. On the contrary, these very leaders face the danger of getting isolated from the Party ranks. If party leaders go underground and work as leaders of open mass organisations, they will invariably get arrested. So the underground leadership will have to go forward with the work of building a secret party. So it is not a fact that the task of forming a secret party is solely that of the underground leaders; every party member should work for the secret organisa-

tion and through those new party cadres the party's links with the masses will be established. Only then the underground leaders will be able to work as leaders. So in this era the main call before the party is — every party member will have to form a party activist group. These activist groups will have to be enthused with revolutionary politics. This task of forming activist groups will be the main task for all party members of all fronts. How soon we can raise these activists to party membership will depend on how many new activists these activists will be able to collect. Only then can we get a large number of party cadres unknown to the police and all the difficulties of underground leaders in maintaining links with the party ranks will disappear. Some revisionist ideas among us about political and organizational matters and mass organizations etc. have been pointed out here. Today party members will have to think anew about every mass movement. In the style of our movement, in our organisational thinking, in other words in almost every sphere of our lives, revisionism has built its nest. As long as we cannot uproot it, the new revolutionary party cannot be built, India's revolutionary possibilities will be hindered. History will not forgive us.

Carry on the Struggle Against Modern Revisionism

— from *Eight Documents (1965-67)*

In the post-election period, the party leadership has girded up their loins to prove our anticipations true. The Politburo has indicated our tasks: "Struggles should be carried on to save the non-congress ministries from the hands of reaction," that is, it is not the intensification of class struggle, but the main work of the Marxists should be to plead for the ministries. So to firmly establish economism in the working class, a convention of party workers was called. And immediately after that, under the leadership of the ministry, an agreement for peace in the industry was signed. The workers were forbidden to "gherao"*. What else could be a more naked expression of class collaboration? The employers are being given full rights to exploit and the workers are being told not to fight. The moment the Communist Party joined the government which came into office as a result of a big mass movement, they chose the path of class collaboration. The Chinese leaders predicted long ago that those who are following a neutral policy regarding the international ideological differences will very soon choose the path of opportunism. And now the Chinese leaders are saying that these neutralists are actually revisionists, and they will soon go over to the counter-revolutionary camp. We have witnessed this truth in our country. We have seen before our eyes how the working class has been betrayed. Take along with this the statement of the Communist Party leader Hare Krishna Konar. He first promised that he would distribute all the vested lands among the landless peasants. Then the amount of land came down. Finally, he announced that this year things would remain as they were. The question of foregoing all land revenue was left at the mercy of the J.L.R.O.'s. The peasants were asked to submit applications. And it was said that the peasants must not forcibly occupy land. Hare Krishna Babu is not only a member of the Central Committee of the Communist Party, he is also the secretary of the *krishak sabha*** of Bengal. It was at the call of his *krishak sabha* that in 1959 the peasants carried on a movement to occupy vested lands and illegally transferred lands. The government unleashed repression in the interest of the landlords. The judgement was given for evic-

*gherao- group form of pacifist action

***Krishak sabha* - peasant organisation (Bengali)

tion. Still the peasants in many cases did not give up the land — they kept them occupied by the strength of the unity of the village.

Did the leader of the *krishak sabha* support their movement after he became a minister? No, what he said meant that vested land would be redistributed. Who will get it? The J.L.R.O. would consult the *krishak sabha* in that matter. But will the opinion given be acted upon? Hare Krishna Babu has not made any commitment in this regard. But if the J.L.R.O. rejects the views of the *krishak sabha*, the peasants by no means will be able to occupy the land. In this respect Hare Krishna Babu did not take time to come out clearly. What will you say about this? Is this not acting like the lackey of the government and the jotedar? Even congressmen did not dare to hold brief so shamelessly for the feudal classes. So to abide by the directives of the Party leaders means to accept without any judgement the exploitation and rule of the feudal classes. So it will be the responsibility of the Communists to expose before the Party members and the masses the anti-class reactionary role of this leadership and move forward following the policy of intensifying class struggle.

Then again, suppose the landless and poor peasants accept Hare Krishna Babu's proposal and submit applications, what happens then? It is true that there is some uncultivated land in the vested land, but the amount of cultivated land is more. There are peasants working on these cultivated lands; today they are either enjoying it under licence, or giving a share to the jotedar. When this land is redistributed invariably conflicts will develop among the poor and landless peasants, and as a result of that, over the entire peasant movement the leadership of the rich peasant would be established. For the rich peasant has the opportunity of pulling strings, he is also a partner in feudal influence. So Hare Krishna Babu is not only refusing to launch struggles today, he is also making arrangements so that in the future also the peasant movement does not move along the militant path.

Yet, we have taken the programme of People's Democratic Revolution and the task of that revolution is land reforms in the interests of the peasants. Land reforms in the interest of the peasants are possible only when we are able to annihilate the authority of the feudal classes in the countryside. To do this we shall have to take away the land from the feudal classes, and will have to distribute it among the landless and poor peasants. We shall never be able to do that if our movement remains confined within the bounds of economism. We have seen in every area where there has been movements on vested land, the peasant who has got the occupation of vested land and managed to get licence, ceases to be active in the peasant movement. What is its reason? Because, in a year the class character of that poor peasant has changed and he has now become a middle peasant. So the economic demand of the poor and landless peasant is no longer his demand. So economism drives a wedge in the unity of the fighting peasants and plunges the landless and poor peasants in despondency. Those who uphold economism judge every struggle by the number of *maunds* of paddy seized or the number of *bighas* of land the peasant received. They never judge by the yardstick whether the fighting consciousness of the peasants has increased. So they do not make any effort to increase the class consciousness of the peasant. Yet, we know no struggle can be waged without sacrifice. Chairman Mao has taught us, wherever there is struggle there is sacrifice. At the initial stage of the struggle the power of reaction will naturally be greater than that of the masses. So the struggle will be long-drawn. Since the masses are a progressive force, its power will increase day by day, and since the reactionary force is dying, its power will decrease day by day. So unless the masses are inspired to make sacrifice, no revolutionary struggle can succeed. Economism takes away from this basic revolutionary outlook into the dark alley of bourgeois outlook. The Party leaders are doing exactly this by all their activities. If we review all our

peasant movements of the past, we shall see that the Party leaders imposed compromises on the peasants from above. Yet it was the responsibility of the Party leadership to establish the fighting leadership of the working class over the peasant movement. They did not do this before, nor are they doing it now. Now they are asking us to depend on law and bureaucracy. Lenin has written that even if a progressive law is passed, if the responsibility of implementing it is given to the bureaucracy, the peasants will not get anything. So our leaders have departed far from Lenin and the revolutionary path.

Agrarian revolution is the task of this moment today; this task cannot be left unimplemented. And without doing this, no benefit can be done to the peasant. But before the agrarian revolution, it is necessary to destroy state power. To carry out the agrarian revolution without destroying the state machinery means revisionism straight-away. So the first and main task of the peasant movement today is to destroy the state machinery. If this cannot be done all over the country, all over the state, will the peasant rest quietly? No, Marxism-Leninism-Mao Tsetung Thought has taught us that if the peasant of any area can be enthused with political thought, the work of destroying the state machinery in that area should be carried forward. It is this which is known as a peasants' liberated area. The struggle to create this liberated area is today the most urgent and immediate task of the peasant movement.

What, according to us, is a liberated area? We shall call that peasant area a liberated area one from which we have been able to oust the class enemies. To build this liberated area, the peasants' armed force is necessary. By this armed force, as we mean the hand-made weapons of the peasants, so also guns are needed. We shall understand whether the peasants have moved forward to collect guns. Where will the peasants get guns? Class enemies have guns with them, and they stay inside the villages. Guns have to be snatched away from them. They will not give us guns on their own. So we shall have to seize those guns by force. For this the peasant militants will have to be taught all tactics beginning from setting fire to the houses of class enemies. Apart from this, we shall get guns from the armed forces through sudden attacks on them. The area where we shall be able to organise this gun-snatching campaign will fast be transformed into a liberated area. So to do this, it is necessary to propagate the politics of building up armed struggles extensively among the peasantry. It is further necessary to organise small secret militant groups to carry on the campaign of collecting guns. As members of these groups will propagate the politics of armed struggle, so also they shall simultaneously try to successfully implement the concrete programme of collecting guns. The appearance of the struggle does not change merely with the collection of guns — the collected guns will have to be used. Only then will the creative powers of the peasant develop and a qualitative change in the struggle take place.

This can be done only by the poor and landless peasants — the firm ally of the working class. The middle peasant is also an ally, but his fighting spirit is not as intense as that of the landless and poor peasants. So he cannot become a participant in the struggle at the same time — he needs some time. It is for this that class analysis is a must for the Communist Party. So the great leader of China, Chairman Mao Tsetung, at the very first did this work and was able to correctly give the guideline for revolutionary struggle. So the main thing in our organisational work is to establish the leadership of the poor and landless peasants in the peasant movement. The leadership of the poor and landless peasants will be established in the process of organising the peasant movement with the politics of armed struggle. Because they alone are the most revolutionary force among the peasant classes. A separate organisation of agricultural labourers will not help this work. On the contrary, a separate agricultural labourers' organisation increases the trend towards a trade union movement based on economism and aggravates differences within the peasants.

It does not enhance the unity of the allied classes because in our agrarian system it is the exploitation of the feudal class that is the main feature.

In this connection another question crops up — the question of compromise with the small owner. What will be the attitude of the Communists in this case? In the case of compromise, we shall have to judge on whose side we are. So we cannot support any other class against them. All along in the peasant movement the Communists had forced the poor and landless peasants to give up their interests in the interests of the petite bourgeoisie. As a result of this, the poor and landless peasants lose their fighting spirit. We should also have separate attitudes regarding the middle and rich peasants. If we regard the rich peasant as a middle peasant, the poor and landless peasants will feel despondent. Again, if we judge the middle peasant as a rich peasant, the fighting enthusiasm of the middle peasant lessens. So Communists must learn according to Chairman Mao's directives and make class analysis of the peasants in every area.

The peasants of India have exploded again and again into revolts. Again and again they have sought guidance from the Communist Party. We did not say that the politics of armed struggle and the campaign for collecting guns is the only way. This way is the path of the working class, the path of liberation, the path of establishing a society free from exploitation. In every state all over India, the peasant today is discontented, the Communists will have to show them the way. That way is the politics of armed struggle and the campaign of collecting guns. We must hold aloft this only path to liberation. The Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution of China has declared war on all types of selfishness, groupism, revisionism, tailism of the bourgeoisie, praise of bourgeois ideology — the burning influence of that revolution has reached India also. The call of that revolution is — *“Be ready firmly to make all sorts of sacrifices, remove one by one the obstacles on the road, victory will surely be ours.”* In however frightful form imperialism might come, however ugly the net might be which modern revisionism would spread to help them, the days of the reactionary forces are numbered, the sunlight bright with Marxism-Leninism-Mao Tsetung Thought will wipe out and banish all darkness.

Naturally, the question crops up — in that case is there no need for the peasants to organise mass movements in this age on the basis of partial demands? Certainly the need is there and will remain there in the future. For India is a vast country and the peasants also are divided into many classes. So the standard of political consciousness cannot remain at the same level in all the areas and among all the classes. So the opportunity and possibility of peasants' mass movements on the basis of partial demands will always be there and Communists must take full advantage of that opportunity at all times.

By what tactics shall we lead the movements on partial demands, and what will be their aim? The main point of our tactics will be to see whether there is the mobilisation of the broad peasantry and our main aim will be to see whether the class consciousness of the peasant has increased — whether they have moved forward towards widespread armed struggle. Movements on partial demands will intensify class struggle, will increase political consciousness among the broad masses, the broad peasant masses will be inspired to make sacrifices, the struggle will spread to newer and newer areas. Movements on partial demands can take any form, but the Communists should always propagate among the peasantry the need for higher forms of struggles. Under no circumstances should there be any attempt to pass off as the best whatever form the peasants have accepted. In fact, Communists should always propagate among peasants revolutionary politics, that is, the politics of armed struggle and the campaign of collecting arms. In spite of carrying on this propaganda, the peasants might decide on mass-deputation and we shall have to lead that movement. In the period of white terror, the effectiveness of mass deputation should never be belittled, for it is these mass deputations that will

increasingly draw the peasant into the struggles. Movements on economic demands are never wrong, but to lead these struggles in the manner of economism is a crime. And it is also a crime to propagate that movements on economic demands will on their own take the form of political struggles, because this itself is worshipping spontaneity. None of these can show the way to the masses, can bring clarity of attitude, or give inspiration for making sacrifices in struggles. There is only one task at one stage of the struggle. Unless this is done, the struggle cannot reach a higher stage.

Today, that particular task is the politics of armed struggle and the campaign of collecting arms. Whatever work we might do leaving aside this task, the struggle will not reach a higher stage, the struggle will collapse, the organisation will not grow. In the same way there is only one way for the Indian revolution — the way shown by Lenin — the people's armed force and the formation of a republic. Lenin said in 1905 that even if it is not possible all over Russia, build up these two where it is possible. Chairman Mao Tsetung has enriched further this path indicated by Lenin. He has taught the tactics of people's war, and the liberation of China has been achieved through this path. Today that path is followed in Vietnam, Thailand, Malaya, Philippines, Burma, Indonesia, Yemen, Congo-Leopoldville and different countries of Africa and Latin America. In India also that path has been adopted by the Nagas, Mizos, the people of the Kashmir area — the path of armed forces and administration by the liberation front. So today the working class will have to be called upon and told that the working class will have to give leadership to the democratic revolution in India, and this task will have to be done by the working class through its providing leadership in struggles to its main ally, the peasantry. So it is their responsibility to organise the peasant movement and to elevate that struggle to the stage of armed struggle. The advanced section of the working class will have to go to the countryside to participate in the armed struggle. This is the main task of the working class. "*Collection of arms and forming bases of struggle in the countryside*" — this is what is called the politics of the working class, the politics of the seizure of power; we shall have to enthuse the working class with this politics. Organise all the workers in trade unions — this slogan does not enhance the political consciousness of the working class. This of course does not mean that we shall no longer form trade unions. This means that we shall not confine the revolutionary cadres of the party in trade unions — their task will be to carry on propaganda campaigns among the working class, that is to propagate the politics of armed struggle and the politics of gun-snatching campaigns and build up the party organisation. Among the petite bourgeoisie also our main task is to carry on our political propaganda and explain the significance of the peasant struggle. In other words, in every front of the party the task is to explain the importance of peasant struggles and to give the call for participation in those struggles. The extent to which we can do this work, to that extent we shall reach the stage of conscious leadership in the democratic revolution. Opposition to this basic Marxist-Leninist path of the party is not only coming from the revisionists. The revisionists are taking to the path of class collaboration straight away, so it is easy to take their mask off. But there is another form of opposition within the party which is called dogmatism. They accept the necessity of revolution, accept that revolution can be possible only through armed struggle. But they dream that it is possible to take to the path of armed revolution only by extending mass movements all over India. Before that there might be small, or even big clashes, but seizure of power would not be possible. About seizure of power, they hope that a version of the October Revolution would be enacted in India. They apply to India in the same way their bookish knowledge as to how the October Revolution became successful. They forget that before the October Revolution there occurred the February Revolution and the bourgeois parties came to power and power was also in the hands

of the Soviets of workers, peasants and soldiers. As a result of this dual power, the leadership of the working class was effective in the Soviets. And when the petit-bourgeois parties in these Soviets handed over power to the bourgeoisie, only then was it possible for the working class to make the October Revolution.

They do not analyse the concrete conditions of India. They do not take lessons from the struggles that are taking place in India. The main reason for the success of the Russian revolution lay in the correct application of the united front tactics. In the case of India also the question of united front tactics is equally important. But the form of democratic revolution in India will be different from this. In India, also in Naga, Mizo, Kashmir and other areas, struggles are taking place under petit-bourgeois leadership. So in the democratic revolution, the working class will have to advance by forming united fronts with them. And in newer and newer places struggles will begin under the leadership of bourgeois or petit-bourgeois parties. The working class will certainly forge alliances with them also and the main basis of this alliance will be anti-imperialist struggle and the right of self-determination. The working class certainly accepts this right, along with the right of secession.

Those who dream of revolution in India along the path of the October Revolution, although they are revolutionaries, they cannot boldly give leadership because of their doctrinaire attitude. They do not understand the significance of peasant struggles and as a result unwittingly they become propagandists of economism among the workers. They cannot take lessons from Chairman Mao's teaching. They cannot imbibe the experience of the revolutionary struggles of the masses of Africa, Asia and Latin America. One section among them become worshippers of Che Guevara and do not stress the work of organising the peasantry, which is the main force of the democratic revolution of India. As a result, they invariably become victims of Leftist deviations. So we shall have to give particular attention to them and must gradually educate them through experience. On no account should we become impatient with them. Apart from them, there is also another group of revolutionary comrades among us, who accept the Chinese Party and Mao Tsetung Thought and also accept that that path is the only path. But they take the book "How to Become a Good Communist" as the only way to self-cultivation; as a result they fall into a dangerous deviation.

The only Marxist way of self-cultivation that Lenin and Chairman Mao have taught us is that of class struggle. Only by burning himself in the fire of class struggle can a Communist become genuine gold. Class struggle alone is the real school for the Communists, and the experience of class struggle will have to be assessed in the light of Marxism-Leninism-Mao Tsetung Thought, and lessons will have to be drawn from it. So the main point of party education is to apply the lessons of Marxism-Leninism in the field of class struggle, to come to general principles from that experience, and to take again to the masses those principles gained from that experience. This is known as "*From the People, To the People.*" This is the main point of Party education. These revolutionary comrades fail to realise this main truth of Party education. As a result, they commit idealist deviations about Party education. Chairman Mao Tsetung has taught us that there can be no education without practice. In his words, "*doing is learning.*" Self-cultivation is only possible through changing the situation by revolutionary practice alone.

REVOLUTIONARIES OF THE WORLD UNITE!

LONG LIVE THE REVOLUTIONARY UNITY OF WORKERS AND PEASANTS!

LONG LIVE CHAIRMAN MAO TSETUNG! □

It Is by Fighting Against Revisionism that the Peasant Struggle Will Have to Be Taken Forward

— from *Eight Documents (1965-67)*