

Liberation

February, 1968

'I Will Unmask Myself'

History of the CPI

*Revolutionary Situation :
Has It Matured ?*

*'Revisionists of the World,
Unite !*

Marxism-Leninism vs.

Castroism

LIBERATION

.....	3
<i>Revisionists of the World, Unite !'</i>	
<i>The Language Question</i>	
<i>The Paper Tiger of Kashmir</i>	
<i>olutionary Situation : Has It Matured ? —Asit Sen</i>	17
<i>erism-Leninism vs. 'Castroism'</i>	35
<i>ssessment of the History CPI—Bande Ali Khan</i>	50
<i>-ordination Committee's Appeal</i>	74
<i>olutionary Comrades on the March</i>	77
<i>'Till Unmask Myself"—Ranadive —Partha Choudhuri</i>	83

Editor-in-chief :

Sushital Ray Choudhury

QUOTATION FROM COMRADE MAO TSE-TUNG

Revisionism, or Right opportunism, is a bourgeois trend of thought that is even more dangerous than dogmatism. The revisionists, the Right opportunists, pay lip service to Marxism; they too attack "dogmatism." But what they are really attacking is the quintessence of Marxism.

(On the Correct Handling of Contradictions
Among the People)

AN APPEAL

Liberation appeals to you, comrades and sympathisers, to have the cause of the Indian Revolution at heart, for your contributions to the Liberation Fund.

Liberation needs your donations as well as your suggestions, criticisms and guidance. With more money we intend to bring out booklets and pamphlets in order to wage a successful struggle against all reactionary ideology, including revisionism and right opportunism. Your suggestions and help in this regard will be most welcome.

We also invite you to send us articles and reports of struggles in your areas for publication in Liberation.

Liberation is in urgent need of all the help and support you can offer.

Calcutta
January 1, 1968

Editorial Board
Liberation

NOTES

'REVISIONISTS OF THE WORLD, UNITE!'

The heirs to Khrushchev's mantle are holding a conference of world revisionists in Budapest, capital of Hungary, in February this year. But they have failed to knock up any delegation from East and South-east Asia—China, Japan, Korea, Vietnam, Indonesia, Burma, Malaysia etc. India will be represented by the Dange clique, the social chauvinists who have abandoned Marxism. Though two PB members of the Marxist Party went recently on pilgrimage to Bulgaria and London, the "Marxist" leaders are, unfortunately for them, being left out, perhaps on account of factional fights with the Dangeites. Besides Albania, Rumania, Cuba and several other countries have refused the invitation to join the Budapest meet which was, in spite of the Chinese Party's objections, planned more than three years ago by Khrushchev. His successors, more wily and crafty than him, have taken quite a long time to prepare for the meet, yet they have failed to rally the entire herd for, despite their appearance of strength, the revisionists are really in disarray, especially after the staggering blow they have received from the great Proletarian Cultural Revolution in China.

What is the declared object of the so-called 'world conference of Communists'? When the bourgeois press says that the purpose is to 'ostracise' the Chinese Party, the *Pravda* has declared that the object is to consolidate and intensify the struggle against US imperialism, especially, against its aggression in Vietnam.

The bourgeois propaganda points to the fact that the imperialists and other reactionaries are pinning their faith on this gathering of the revisionist chiefs in Budapest. An AFP message from Williamstown, Massachusetts, dated January 21, says that in a speech to Williams University students on the previous day U. S. Senator Wayne Morse accused the American military leaders of preparing for a war against China. The U. S. imperialists, who despair of early victory in Vietnam, have

already spread the flames of war to Laos and Thailand and threaten Cambodia. They have set up almost a ring of bases, both nuclear and conventional, around China and expect their revisionist friends, Kosygin and Breznev, to come to their aid and 'ostracize' China. But the imperialists seem too optimistic. The question is, who will 'ostracize' whom?

Those who try to 'ostracize' the Chinese Party led by Mao Tse-tung are more likely to be 'ostracized' themselves by the peoples fighting for national liberation and socialism all the world over. Mao Tse-tung's thought, the Marxism-Leninism of our era, is the source of inspiration to the revolutionary comrades and masses throughout the world who recognize in the Chinese Party their friend, guide and leader. As most of the established socialist parties of Europe and their "esteemed" leaders renounced socialism and proletarian internationalism and rallied round the bourgeoisie of their respective countries after the outbreak of World War I, so the traditional communist parties of Europe, which, like the parties of the Second International, represent the labour aristocracy and the petty bourgeoisie, have today betrayed Marxism-Leninism and the cause of world revolution and have, while mouthing Marxist phraseology, proved to be the lackeys of the western imperialists. No doubt, they too, like the parties of the Second International, will be rejected and 'ostracized' by the toiling people of their own countries.

The revisionist leaders claim that their purpose is to consolidate and intensify the struggle against U.S. imperialism. They are indeed anti-imperialist *in words*; but are they also anti-imperialist *in deeds*? Engels said that an individual must be judged 'not by his professions, but by his actions; not by what he pretends to be, but by what he does, and what he really is'. A political party too should be judged in the same way. To quote Marx, 'In historical struggles one must distinguish still more the phrases and fancies of parties from their real organism and their real interests, their conception of themselves from their reality.' Only those who refuse to see fail to see that the revisionists are steadfastly pursuing the line of

rapprochement and multilateral collaboration with imperialism, particularly, U. S. imperialism, the line of disrupting the people's struggles against the imperialists and other reactionaries, the line of sabotaging the revolution. The Khrushchev revisionists have proclaimed an interesting discovery of theirs—the discovery that the imperialists are split into a 'warlike section' and a 'peaceful coexistence section'. To them Kennedys and Johnsons and, sometimes, Eisenhowers are the representatives of this 'peaceful coexistence section' and so they treat them as their friends and try to arrive at compromises with them. This discovery leads them to conclude that a non-imperialist peaceful policy is not incompatible with the economic basis of monopoly capitalism and that a world without wars and weapons is possible even when imperialism remains. It is with the help of this anti-Marxist, pernicious theory that they seek to justify their close collaboration with the US imperialists, their efforts to subordinate all revolutionary movements and national liberation struggles to the policy of 'U. S.-Soviet co-operation', and their insistence that the fate of the world revolution is to be determined by the outcome of the economic competition between the Soviet Union and the U. S. A. So they are unsparing in their efforts to cultivate the best possible relations with U. S. imperialism, 'the chief gendarme of world reaction', 'the most ferocious enemy of all mankind', and concludes all kinds of pacts and agreements with it (the latest in the series is the draft nuclear non-proliferation agreement) even when the U. S. imperialists are committing appalling crimes against brave Vietnam, neighbouring countries and other peoples. That is why Kosygin runs to Glassboro for a friendly meeting with Hitler's successor when Israel, egged on by the Hitlerites of today, has invaded and occupied large parts of Egypt, Syria and Jordan. That is why the Soviet revisionists are treating all stooges of the U. S. imperialists everywhere as their friends and take pains to cultivate their friendship. That is why they are prompt in extending their hand of friendship to the murderers of the Iraqi communists, ^{to} the Suharto-Nasution clique which has massacred five hundred thousand or more Indonesian

communists and other progressives, ^{to} the treacherous rulers of Malaysia etc. They are even establishing friendly relations with U. S. stooges in Latin America. While shouting the slogans of 'complete disarmament' and 'a world without arms' they feverishly rearm the reactionary ruling classes everywhere. They are today the second biggest merchants of death, second only to the U.S.A. They are the biggest suppliers of military hardware to India, Indonesia, Iraq and various other countries. Against whom are they arming the Indian reactionaries? The possible targets are Pakistan, China and the Indian people. But Soviet arms are not certainly intended against Pakistan because the revisionists, like the U.S. imperialists, are trying to unite the reactionary ruling classes of India and Pakistan in a front against China. The Soviet weapons of death are, therefore, meant to be used against China and the toiling people of India who may try to throw off the yoke imposed by imperialism, feudalism and comprador capital. This is one side of the picture—this close collaboration and friendship between the revisionists and the U.S. imperialists and all other reactionaries, both in theory and in practice. What does the other side reveal? It reveals that together with the U.S. imperialists the revisionists are frantically trying to retard the progress of China and to put out the flame of national liberation war in different countries. In 1960, when China was faced with difficulties caused by natural disasters, they trampled underfoot all treaties and agreements and withdrew all technicians and all other aid and removed even the blueprints of factories then being built up in China in collaboration with them. They have flagrantly violated their agreement with China and have tried their hardest to see that China does not obtain nuclear weapons when they and the U.S. imperialists remain armed to the teeth with these weapons of mass destruction. Their policy is the policy of disarming China while rearming all reactionaries. They can also hardly conceal their hostility to national liberation struggles. While the revisionists preach to the working class and other toiling people the virtues of peaceful transition to socialism, the Soviet revisionist rulers act together with US imperialism as the main prop—economy-

cally, militarily and politically—of the reactionary regimes in India and elsewhere. Recently they have extolled the merits of the reactionary Ne Win regime in Burma and fiercely attacked the Burmese Communist Party which has already liberated a large part of the country.

As the Chinese comrades said some time ago:

"Numerous facts show that the clamour of the new leaders of the C. P. S. U. against U.S. imperialism is a sham while their capitulation to U.S. imperialism is the essence, that their issuing of the statement against U.S. imperialism is a sham while their suppression of the masses struggling against U.S. imperialism is the essence, that their support for revolution is a sham while their disruption of revolution is the essence, that their statements such as 'unity against the enemy' and 'concerted action' are a sham while their actions to undermine unity and create splits everywhere,....are the essence.

"To sum up, what the new leaders of the C.P.S.U. have been doing can be described as 'three shams and three realities': sham anti-imperialism but real capitulation, sham revolution but real betrayal, sham unity but a real split."

The most urgent task facing the Marxist-Leninists is to unite with all the forces that can be united in order to oppose U.S. imperialism and its lackeys, to oppose the reactionaries of all countries, and to lead the struggle for world peace, national liberation, people's democracy and socialism to victory. But any unity with the revisionists, who act as the accomplices of imperialism and reaction, is no better than a pipe dream. Lashing at the leaders of the Second International, Lenin declared in 1915 that "unity with the opportunists can be defended *at present* only by the enemies of the proletariat or by hoodwinked *traditionalists* of a bygone period. To-day, following 1914, unity of the proletarian struggle for the socialist revolution demands that the workers' parties separate themselves completely from the parties of the opportunists." (*What Next?*)

In order to wage the struggle against imperialism and reaction successfully and to strengthen further the unity of the toiling people of the world, it is imperative to expose the true

features of the modern revisionists, the fifth column within the communist movement, and to lay bare the real meaning of their deceptive slogan of "unity in action" against imperialism.

It seems that the revisionist chiefs have chosen this moment to gather in Budapest and to devise new tactics for intensifying their struggle against the forces of socialism and national liberation because of the blow they are daily receiving from the revolutionary people of the world, especially, the stunning blow from the Proletarian Cultural Revolution in China and because of demands from the U. S. imperialists. The Marxist-Leninist parties and groups in the different countries of the world will also redouble their efforts to frustrate all revisionist conspiracies and to defeat imperialism, particularly U. S. imperialism, and all reaction. All the machinations of the revisionists are bound to fail: the Revisionist International is doomed.

THE LANGUAGE QUESTION

Language is an essential component of a nation or nationality. It is therefore, quite natural that the question of state language in a multi-national country should stir up people's emotions. The bourgeoisie in every country resorts to their favourite tactic of keeping various sections of the people divided against themselves. In a multi-national country the dominant section of the bourgeoisie uses the language question to this end. This section tries to make their own language the state language and thus to impose it on the other nationalities having different languages, and thus rouses their suspicion and animosity. In our country also, the leaders of the Congress government, the mouthpiece of the imperialist-big bourgeois-feudal interests, have all along been playing that same nefarious game. They managed, by virtue of the precarious majority they were able to rally over the question of state language in the so-called Constituent Assembly, to get Hindi, which is the language of only one nationality, recognised as the state language of India. By the same majority they had it incorporated in the Constitution also. Having thus secured their objective they have, time and again, used the issue of the so-called Language Bill as a weapon to rouse mutual

distrust and animosity among the peoples of different nationalities.

Quite recently the reactionary Congress ruling clique introduced an Amendment to the Official Languages Bill in Parliament, thus fanning once more the dark flames of rancour and animosity among the people, the evil effects of which spread far beyond the confines of the Parliament Bhavan, even to the farthest corners of our country. The violent turn that the *Angrezi Hatao* (Banish English) movement took in certain parts of Northern India, particularly in places like the U. P. and Bihar, triggered off a more violent anti-Hindi movement in some states of Southern India. The emotions and passions have since subsided somewhat but the factors which brought about such upheavals remain and can at any time cause similar explosions. One cannot overlook the fact that the Official Languages Amendment Bill and the form in which it was approved by Parliament, was unable to satisfy completely the aspirations of even a single nationality; on the other hand, it earned the hostility of all the nationalities, though in widely varying degrees and for different reasons. Thus, the existence of the Bill itself, not to speak of its eventual implementation, has embittered our people and tends to deepen and perpetuate mutual distrust and hostility among the various nationalities. With the prospect of Hindi becoming the sole All-India official language, *i.e.*, a language dominating the others a few years hence, the sop cynically doled out by the Congress chieftains in the form of a concession, namely, to allow English to continue as an alternate link language while raising Hindi to the status of the all-India link language, can in no way allay the fears and suspicions of other nationalities but can only deepen them.

Only the reactionary imperialist-big bourgeois-feudal combine, which rules India today, stands to gain by the perpetuation of the division and mutual distrust and animosity among various nationalities of our country. Such division, mutual distrust and animosity constitute a powerful force working against the successful development of India's democratic revolution. Yet

no radical transformation of Indian society can be brought about unless the domination of the imperialist-big bourgeois-feudal reactionary combination is thoroughly eliminated by carrying the democratic revolution to a victorious end. Such a victory is possible only through the united efforts of the Indian people, particularly through the united efforts of the basic classes, *i.e.*, the workers and peasants of all the nationalities inhabiting India. That is why, we, the Marxist-Leninists of India, can never afford to be indifferent towards the language question. Therefore, it is imperative for us immediately to take up in right earnest the work of educating the peoples of all nationalities about how the language problem can never be solved by the reactionary ruling classes and how they are trying to bolster up their rule of exploitation and oppression by subjugating and subduing various nationalities, their culture and languages—and finally, how a just, lasting and truly democratic solution of the language problem is possible only by carrying the democratic revolution to a victorious end through the conscious and united efforts of the workers and peasants and other toiling people of the various nationalities. We must devote ourselves wholeheartedly to this task.

How the Marxist-Leninists look at the question of nationalities and the question of language is well-known and how they have been able to provide in practice the only just and lasting solution to these questions and thus proved the scientific truth inherent in their theory, have been clearly and convincingly demonstrated.

Marxist-Leninists always and unwaveringly uphold the view that in a multi-national country, every nationality, big or small, must enjoy the right of self-determination and every language must have equal status. This is an inviolable principle of Marxism-Leninism. It is this that divides the Marxist-Leninists from the revisionists, bourgeois reformists and social-chauvinists of all hues. Starting from this viewpoint, Marxism-Leninism considers that in a multi-national country it is neither necessary nor just to upgrade one particular language to the status of the official language for the whole country. Provided we earnestly

and steadfastly uphold the principle of equal rights and status for all the different nationalities inhabiting this country, it is not at all impossible in practice to give equal status to all the languages and to carry on the work of the central government on this basis.

In our country, however, the leaders of the renegade Dange clique and of the CPI(M), who for forty or more years have usurped and shared among themselves the leading positions in the Marxist movement in India, never cared to uphold this universal principle of Marxism-Leninism, a principle that alone can guarantee a just and lasting solution of the national question in our country. The Seventh Congress of the CPI(M) also failed to uphold boldly, rather betrayed, this proletarian scientific principle for the solution of the national question. These leaders never dared to cross the limits set by the Nehru policy in respect of the national question. No wonder that they failed to pursue boldly an independent programme in Parliament on the language question. They have proved unable to unite the people, especially the basic classes, *i.e.* the workers and the peasants, by dispelling from their minds the suspicion and mistrust sown by the reactionaries and to chart an independent course of action to be followed by the united workers and peasants in order to defeat the reactionary game of sowing disruption among the people. As a result, the entire revolutionary movement and the unity of the basic classes are seriously endangered by the frequent outbursts of rabid chauvinism, provincialism, etc.

The revolutionary Marxist-Leninists must now firmly and earnestly take up the task of educating the people, especially the workers and the peasants about the Marxist-Leninist principles for a just and lasting solution of the national and language questions in our country.

THE PAPER TIGER OF KASHMIR

In early January the restrictive orders on Sheikh Abdullah were withdrawn by the Government of India and he was released after about fourteen years in prison or detention with only two brief spells of freedom in 1958 and 1964. In 1953, when he was

Prime Minister of the State of Jammu and Kashmir, he met Adlai Stevenson of the United States and got himself involved in U. S. imperialism's intrigues to grab Kashmir. That landed him in prison a little over fourteen years ago.

After his release Sheikh Abdullah has reiterated his demand for the right of self-determination of the Kashmiri people. At a reception held in Delhi, he declared :

"The people of Kashmir will not allow India, Pakistan or any other power to grab their birthright to decide the future of the state by their free will."

He pointed out that Kashmir had acceded to India on the condition that its fate would be finally decided by its people. He would not, he added, resile from his pledge that the people of "Kashmir alone are masters of their fate."

How does he propose to realize this demand ? As, according to a PTI message, Jaya Prakash Narayan, one of his confidants, said in Monghyr on January 15, the Sheikh was anxious to seek a peaceful solution to the Kashmir issue. In his report dated January 10, the staff correspondent of the *Statesman*, wrote : "The final solution of the Kashmir problem depended on normalization of ties between the two countries [India and Kashmir], they [Sheikh Abdullah and Narayan] felt." (*The Statesman*, 11.1. 68). In his reply to a questioner during a public meeting at Vithalbhai Patel House in Delhi he regretted that "the period since independence had been full of hatred and strife between India and Pakistan and both of them had become satellites of big powers."

What is the nature of the solution of the Kashmir problem the Sheikh is seeking ? At his press conference on January 4, he "pledged" to devote the rest of his life to promoting friendship and amity between India and Pakistan by working out a solution of the "Kashmir dispute" which would be acceptable to India, Pakistan and the people of Kashmir. Elaborating this he referred to his discussions with Jawaharlal Nehru in 1964 and said that there had been agreement that **the formula for solution should be such that all the parties could sell it to their constituents**, and that would not create more

difficulties. Asked whether he thought President Ayub Khan would be able to sell to his people a solution acceptable to India, **the Sheikh said that if the solution was considered fair by the world he (Ayub) must accept it.** At the same press conference, he endorsed the Tashkent Declaration and said :

"No tribute can be more meaningful to Gandhiji's memory than a nation-wide effort to infuse life and reality into the Tashkent Declaration."

When the State of Jammu and Kashmir acceded to India in October 1947, it was agreed by both India and Kashmir that "the question of the state's accession should be settled by reference to the people." In a broadcast from Delhi on November 2, 1947, Pandit Nehru reiterated that India, when accepting the accession of Kashmir, accepted at the same time the position that the ultimate future of the State should be decided by the Kashmiri people. He said, "We have no intention of using our troops in Kashmir when the danger of invasion is past. We have declared that the fate of Kashmir is ultimately to be decided by the people. That pledge we have given. The Maharajah has supported it, and we wish to give it again not only to the people of Kashmir but to the whole world." Though repeated many times, this pledge was never redeemed and Kashmir remains divided by an artificial cease-fire line with a little over one-third of the area being ruled by the Pakistani authorities through a so-called Azad [Free] Kashmir Government and the rest forming part of India. Even the special status that the Indian portion enjoyed under the Constitution of India for some years has now been ended. Gilgit in the north, one of the most important strategic areas of the world, as it borders on China, the Soviet Union, India and Pakistan, has been presented by the Pakistani ruling class to the U.S. imperialists to serve as one of their bases.

The Sheikh rightly demands for the Kashmiri people their inalienable right to determine their own fate. But he expects (particularly, after all that has happened) that this very revolutionary demand will be conceded to them by the reactionary ruling classes of India and Pakistan ! And his game seems

fully exposed when he endorses the Tashkent Declaration and says that "if the solution was considered fair by the world he (Ayub) must accept it". At present there are two worlds in mortal conflict with each other—one dominated by the U. S. imperialists with whom the Soviet revisionists are collaborating, the other led by Socialist China and the Marxist-Leninists of various other countries. When the Sheikh speaks of "the world", he must be referring to the former which, in its frantic attempt to unite India and Pakistan in a front against China, imposed the Tashkent Declaration—a Declaration that solved none of the outstanding problems between India and Pakistan and led not to any improvement but to the deterioration of the relations between them. **It is not difficult to understand that no solution considered "fair" by the U. S. imperialists, 'the chief bulwark of world reaction', and their Soviet collaborators can really be fair to the people of Kashmir, India or Pakistan or serve their interests. For quite a long, long time the British and U. S. imperialists have used the Kashmiri people as a pawn in their game, a game that has brought indescribable misery and suffering to the people of Kashmir, India and Pakistan. The Sheikh must be playing their game when he looks up to them for a peaceful and "fair" solution of the Kashmir problem. He has justly accused India and Pakistan of being satellites of big powers but the status that he is himself seeking for Kashmir is no better than that of a neo-colony of the U. S. imperialists and Soviet revisionists—a hot-bed of war and aggression against Socialist China and the people of India and Pakistan. He has used many hackneyed, hollow and moth-eaten phrases about Indo-Pak friendship and the will of the Kashmiri people but those honeyed phrases cannot hide the real design. The Sheikh is striving for a reactionary solution which he wants the U. S. imperialists to impose on the reactionary governments of India and Pakistan.**

Marxist-Leninists should support the right of the Kashmiris on both sides of the cease-fire line to determine

their own fate. If the toiling people of India refuse to support this very just demand, to adopt a revolutionary programme on the national question, and continue to rally behind their common enemy, the imperialist-feudal-comprador combine, that oppresses both the toiling people of Kashmir, and themselves, they can never be free. **In their own interest they must link the revolutionary struggle for People's Democracy with a revolutionary programme on the national question.** While fighting for the overthrow of the rule of the imperialists, the big landlords and the big bourgeoisie, they should uphold the right of self-determination of Kashmiri and other peoples. Lenin said :

"Never in favour of petty states, or the splitting up of states in general, or the principle of federation, Marx considered the separation of an oppressed nation to be a step towards federation, and consequently, not towards a split, but towards concentration, both political and economic, **but concentration on the basis of democracy**". ("Proletariat and Right to Self-Determination", *Collected works*, Vol. 21).

To quote Lenin again,

"We demand freedom of self-determination.....for the oppressed nations, not because we have dreamt of splitting up the country economically, or of the ideal of small states, but on the contrary, because we want large states and the closer unity and even fusion of nations, only on a truly democratic, truly internationalist basis, which is *inconceivable* without the freedom to secede". (Ibid)

On the national question the Dangeites and the neo-revisionist leaders of the CPI (M) have completely surrendered to the reactionary classes and serve as their lackeys. Of course, they try hard to cover up their shameful betrayal of Marxism-Leninism with anti-imperialist phraseology but their stand on this issue is essentially no different from that of the rabid Hindu chauvinists. While the Dangeites, like the Congress rulers, claim that the will of the Kashmiris has already been expressed

in favour of accession to India and that no change in the status quo can be permitted, the neo-revisionists hold that though the will of the Kashmiri people has not yet been ascertained, the status quo must continue. (Cf. Communist Party Statement issued by E. M. S. Namboodiripad, *People's Democracy*, November 7, 1965). In other words, both support the present stand of their masters—the ruling classes of India—that the portion of Kashmir they have grabbed, must remain theirs while the other portion may go to Pakistan. The people of Kashmir on both sides of the cease-fire line are mere chattels to be disposed of as the imperialists and their lackeys decide! This is Marxism-Leninism, indeed!

The right of self-determination can never be obtained by a nation as a gift from its oppressors. It is by waging an uncompromising struggle against them that a people can achieve this right. The toiling people of Kashmir who during the British rule led the people's struggles in princely states against feudal and imperialist oppression, will have to take to the same path again. **Our struggle and theirs will be directed against the same enemy—imperialists and their lackeys, the big landlords and the big bourgeoisie.**

Sheikh Abdullah, instead of relying on the people of Kashmir, is depending on the imperialists, especially, U.S. imperialists, and the reactionary ruling classes of India and Pakistan to achieve his goal. He is thus playing a very reactionary role, which may prove extremely harmful to the interests of the Kashmiri people, whom he claims to represent. As the people of Kashmir become more and more conscious of the sinister designs of U. S. imperialism and its ally Soviet revisionism, and of the reactionaries of India and Pakistan, they will also see through his game, rid themselves of his influence, and choose the correct path—and the Sher-e-Kashmir (the Lion of Kashmir) will prove to be a mere paper tiger.

The Revolutionary Situation: Has It Matured?

—Asit Sen

[This is an English version of an article which appeared in the October (1967) issue of KATHA O KALAM, a Bengali periodical published from Siliguri, Darjeeling district. The neo-revisionist leading clique of the CPI(M) fretted and fumed when the revolutionary comrades and the peasant revolutionaries of Nawalbari dared rise up in revolt against feudal oppression and exploitation and challenged the might of the big bourgeois-landlord state in defiance of the class-collaborationist line vigorously pursued by the clique. The neo-revisionists had already joined hands with the political representatives of the jotedars (the rich landowners who do not themselves cultivate the land) and the bourgeoisie in forming the so-called United Front Ministry in West Bengal and pretended that the police and the military had become friends of the people. Besides showering all kinds of abuse on the revolutionary comrades, these renegades openly condemned the Nawalbari struggle as being 'adventurist', 'premature', etc. In order to confuse the Party ranks and the people, they contended that the revolutionary situation in India was yet to mature. This article was written to refute this false 'theory' which the renegades put forward to serve their masters.]

The neo-revisionist cacophony has begun its command performance, conducted by our "Marxist" theoretician B.T. Ranadive, who is ably assisted by Promode Dasgupta—a man whose innocence of Marxism is as genuine as the former's skill in perverting it. The burden of their song is: 'Has the revolutionary situation matured?' Had they stopped at this, the rank and file, who uphold Marxism-Leninism, would at least have had the occasion to study more closely the Marxist teachings on revolution and find out the answer by applying the Marxist criteria. But that was not to be and the "Marxist" leaders have, in their bloated wisdom, preferred to provide a reply also

—a cryptic reply : the time is not yet ripe. In their zealous implementation of this view, they have undertaken two-pronged tactics. On the one hand, they are trumpeting the discovery and adoption of a 'grand strategy' and on the other, they have mounted a vicious attack against comrades who dare talk of revolution labelling them as adventurists, sectarian, pseudo-leftists and even agents of the CIA. What, after all, is that much-publicised 'grand strategy'? The argument essentially runs on these lines : the time is not ripe for revolution and it is so because the organisation is not strong enough ; now that a golden opportunity for building up organisations has come with the establishment of the 'progressive' United Front government, every effort should be made to strengthen the organisations by directing all the mass movements towards a central goal—the goal of protecting the U. F. government. As a result of this struggle to keep the United Front government in power, the revolutionary organisations will march from strength to strength—and then the revolution will be accomplished.

Life has its own logic. That is, once you decide upon a line of action, it develops according to its own logic and you are perforce carried along with it. The same is the case with our "Marxist" exponents of that famed 'grand strategy', who have been driven by the working of their own logic to a position where they see the ghost of reaction behind every mass struggle that is bursting forth every now and then on demands of food and job and against cruel exploitation and oppression by the exploiting classes. Whenever they find the masses showing initiative and political consciousness during the struggles, they immediately dub them as the machinations of anti-social reactionary elements. The plain truth is, they are determined to throttle any and every action that tends to strike at the root of the existing social system based on the exploitation and oppression of the people. In other words, they have turned into direct agents of reaction and have taken upon themselves the task of preserving the existing social system as best as they can at a time when historically that system has long since become reactionary to the core and is inexorably proceeding towards its doom.

If it were only the case with men like Promode Dasgupta, who are blissfully innocent of even the A. B. C. of Marxism and whose capacity is strictly limited to the things they are taught and asked to reproduce in public, it could be safely and contemptuously ignored. But the fact is that compulsions of reactionary class interests have drawn in even our "Marxist" theoretician B. T. Ranadive into the fray, and that he is putting all his past experience and craftiness at the service of his masters to present a reactionary line in the garb of a Marxist theory—as a revolutionary one. This should make a difference.

To distract people's attention from the real nature of the reactionary line they are trying to push through, these people are calculatedly making much noise over the question artificially posed by them, namely, 'Has the revolutionary situation matured?' That this is so becomes evident if we note how Ranadive in the course of his theoretical jargoning, supposedly to substantiate the contention that the time is not yet ripe, has brought in issues like participation in the bourgeois democratic elections, participation in a coalition government within the framework of the bourgeois state, the class nature of the state etc., but has significantly overlooked the issues which are indispensable for any discussion on the question of revolutionary maturity. We should, therefore, lay stress upon this aspect in the present article. Naturally we shall have to leave out any discussion on the serious distortions and twists made by Ranadive in the course of his exercise in theorising about the question under discussion. I may, however, draw the attention of Marxist-Leninist comrades to one instance to show why Ranadive cannot help distorting Marxism-Leninism in course of his discussion.

How Ranadive Distorts Lenin

Take, for example, the fact that Ranadive, in discussing the question of elections, has chosen to quote lengthy extracts from Lenin's "*Left-wing Communism*". But why, then, did Lenin write this book? After the October Revolution in Russia, the communists in Germany, Holland and Great Britain were waging a struggle against parliamentary opportunism inside the communist movement in those countries. However, certain

sections of the communists in those countries were trying to give currency to a theory—the theory that the era of bourgeois parliamentarism had come to an end with the October Revolution and so, to participate in bourgeois elections any more was tantamount to pushing history back. Thus some sections of the communists in Germany, Holland and Great Britain raised the slogan of boycotting bourgeois democratic elections as the only acceptable general policy for an entire historical period. Lenin wrote the above book to criticise these communists. Naturally, the central theme of Lenin's whole discussion was to point out that although historically the era of bourgeois democracy, i.e., bourgeois parliamentarism had already come to an end, it still had a role to play in practical politics. And so, there was no reason to adopt the boycotting of elections as a general policy applicable to all countries and at all times. In the course of this discussion Lenin demonstrated through analysis how and under what concrete conditions bourgeois elections could be used to serve the cause of revolution. He also formulated therein certain general rules for distinguishing the features of revolutionary conditions and explained what is meant by preparing for a revolution. He taught us in this book to take into account the concrete conditions existing in a particular country at the given time regarding the development of revolution and the state of preparedness and to decide accordingly whether to participate in or to boycott the elections.

We are not aware of any Marxist in this country who claims that the role of bourgeois parliamentarism as a political weapon has outlived its usefulness. Nor has Ranadive been able to enlighten us about any such thing during his attacks on the Marxist-Leninists whom he, in his wisdom, has branded as "ultras." But evidently this 'trifle' has not deterred Ranadive. It would, however, be unjust for us to conclude from this that he is a man lacking in intelligence. We must pay the devil his due, and as such, must need credit Ranadive with the qualities he really possesses, for instance, an abundance of cunning tempered with decades of practice in systematically perverting Marxism-Leninism. In the present case he has made full use

of these qualities of his. While the so-called 'ultras' have persistently tried to concentrate all discussion around the issue whether the time is ripe for revolution, Ranadive has been striving to distract attention from this basic issue and has artificially brought in the question, namely, whether participation in bourgeois elections conforms to Marxism or not. This explains why he had to fall back upon Lenin's "*Left-wing Communism*"; because he had to stir up a controversy over a thing which, to our knowledge, does not exist in reality and Ranadive also knows it only too well.

So, while considering the question whether or not the time for revolution has come, we must avoid falling into the trap so carefully laid by our "Marxist" theoretician Ranadive. To do this we must find an answer to the question solely by an analysis of the social system and should not be distracted by such questions whether or not Marxism approves participation in bourgeois elections, what classes control the state power, and the like—questions which are of secondary importance in considering the matter under discussion.

What Is The Meaning Of Revolution ?

It is necessary to understand clearly the meaning of the term 'revolution' in order to ascertain whether the time for revolution has really come. When we say that Darwin revolutionised the zoological science or that Marx ushered in a revolution in the interpretation of human history, the word 'revolution' is used in a certain sense, and signifies that Darwin and Marx brought about fundamental qualitative changes in the realms of zoology and history respectively. In both these subjects all existing theories sprang from an idealist or mechanical materialist world outlook and it was Darwin and Marx who substituted a scientific materialist outlook for the existing idealist and mechanical materialist outlook in their respective fields. Thus the word 'revolution' denotes a fundamental, qualitative change. This, in general, is the meaning of revolution.

What Is Social Revolution ?

In politics we are concerned with social revolution—that is, a qualitative change in the existing social system. In nature

everything changes. But it does not happen that a certain thing or phenomenon remains unchanged for a certain period of time and then all of a sudden undergoes a qualitative change. In reality, the changes in things or phenomena take place according to a law, which is that an unceasing process of quantitative changes brings about a qualitative change in them. The development of human society is also guided by this law. But the sphere of social development is a complex thing and so, the processes of change, both quantitative and qualitative, in this sphere are also complex. However, complex as they are, they are guided without exception by the basic law of change mentioned above. In other words, a particular social system undergoes a qualitative change only after and as a result of a long process of unceasing quantitative changes. Thus, social revolution is, like any other revolution, the end-result of an unceasing process of changes. That is, the leap of a given social system to a qualitatively higher social system through a victorious social revolution takes place only as a result of a process of quantitative changes which goes on for an entire historical period.

What Are The Forces Of Social Revolution ?

The change in the social system does not, however, occur as a result of 'divine' forces, nor by any directives of human thought. The causes of the change are inherent in the society itself. Every change is the result of the conflict of two opposing forces. Every change in the social system is also the result of the conflict of two opposing forces. In human society, productive forces and production relations are the two opposing forces.

By productive forces are meant the human labour power and the material implements of labour, i.e., the things by which human labour power is applied profitably. Productive forces are the things that men use to exploit nature in order to satisfy their material and cultural needs.

In struggling against nature, which they must do to satisfy their needs, men inevitably enter into certain relations with one another—and these relations are called production relations, which do not depend on the likes or dislikes of men for their

existence. Production relations constitute the real foundation of human society on which is erected a superstructure consisting of such things as politics, social justice, art and literature, philosophy, religion, law etc. Although these things of the superstructure depend, in the final analysis, on the basis, i.e., production relations and cannot have any existence independent of or separate from that of the basis—yet they can, within limits, act independently and sometimes exert some influence on the basis. Anyway, it is the basis that invariably determines the nature of the superstructure and never the other way round.

As stated before, men enter into certain production relations with one another, that is, live a social life. And these production relations in their turn go on developing the productive forces. But it so happens that a particular form of production relations can help develop the forces of production only upto a certain stage and the reverse process begins after this stage has been reached. In such cases production relations cease to develop the forces of production and gradually begin to impede the process of development of the productive forces. Once that stage is reached no further development of productive forces is possible without bringing about a fundamental change in the production relations, i.e., social structure. When the conflict between the production relations and productive forces in the old social system is thus aggravated, there begins an era of social revolution. In this way the old production relations gradually advance towards their own destruction over an entire period of time and after a certain stage is reached these old relations undergo a qualitative change giving birth to a new social system. Consequent to this revolutionary change in the basis, there begins a revolutionary change in the superstructure. But this change in the superstructure is effected over a much longer period.

It is this basic conflict inside a social system that caused the primitive human society to break up and laid the foundations for a higher social system, namely, the slave society. Later, the same process gave birth to the feudal society, the capitalist society and the socialist society one after the other. While this

basic conflict between the production relations and productive forces constitutes the real and root cause that brings about change in social systems, its developments do not always proceed freely and unobstructed.

When this conflict grew acute in primitive society, the existing social order began to break up but it so happened that no element of the superstructure exerted force from above to resist this breaking up. Therefore, there was no necessity for any force to be applied to free the forces of production. In all later forms of society, however, an additional conflict—the class conflict between the exploiters and the exploited—appeared. This happened because the means of production in such societies were owned and controlled by a handful of people. As a result, the unfettered development of the conflict between production relations and the forces of production was weighed down and influenced by the conflict between the classes. This class struggle intruded into the field of social development and got itself imposed upon the basic conflict. And so it became impossible for basic conflict in society to develop freely unless the contradictions between classes were resolved through class struggle. Marx and Engels were expressing this truth when they declared in the beginning of their *Communist Manifesto*: "The history of all hitherto existing society [excepting the primitive Communistic society] is the history of class struggles."

But Marx and Engels did not restrict the real nature and intensity of class conflicts to the statement alone that human history is the history of class struggles. By concretely analysing history they demonstrated how society gets differentiated into two parts—urban and rural, how the necessity of the exploiting classes to preserve the existing social order gives rise to the state power and how the state power is used to forcibly suppress class struggles. They discovered through an incisive analysis the real role of the state power in a class society and its relation to the entire society and exploded the myths and mystifications created by bourgeois historians around the question of the state. Marx announced this discovery during the lengthy debate at the Second Congress of the Communist League in 1847.

From what has been said above some conclusions can be drawn: (1) social revolution means a qualitative change in the social relations; (2) this qualitative change is nothing but a qualitative change in the relations between classes, that is, the exploiting class is overthrown and its domination is replaced by the domination by the exploited class, which aims ultimately at setting up a classless society; (3) no class can overthrow another class except through intense class struggle; (4) as the state is the organ of maintaining the old class relations by forcible suppression of the class struggle, no social revolution is possible without smashing the old state machinery in the final phase of the class struggle; (5) in order to protect and preserve the fruits of social revolution the exploited class must needs establish its own state power; (6) the class society determines the nature of state power and not *vice versa*; so, a new state power can be established only through class struggle. The conflicts between classes can never be abolished by capturing state power from above and by avoiding class struggle.

If we consider the question of social revolution in this broad context, two aspects of the question whether the time for revolution has come, will come up before us. First, we shall be faced with the question whether the basic contradiction in social development, namely, the contradiction between the forces of production and production relations, has ripened to the stage of an antagonistic contradiction or not; in other words, whether the existing relations of production are able to develop the forces of production any longer. If the relations of production have already reached a stage when they act as an impediment instead of as a promoter of the productive forces, then it becomes clear beyond any shadow of doubt that we have arrived at the era of a social revolution. Secondly, the question arises as to whether the time has come to direct the class struggles with the object of quickening the pace of the social revolution, that is, of hastening to bring about a revolutionary change in class relations. If this be so, we shall have to try to turn the economic struggles into political class struggles

as quickly as possible. In other words, the exploited classes must march forward quickly and resolutely to overthrow the exploiting classes by smashing all the legal and political trappings that protect the interests of the exploiters and establish their own political power. Again, as the law and order of the exploiting classes depend, in the final analysis, on the power of the armed forces for their preservation and protection, the exploited classes must, in their march towards establishment of political power through class struggle, build up their own armed forces step by step.

Has The Time Come For Social Revolution In Our Country ?

Now let us see if we in India have entered the phase of revolution in the light of what Marx said. Lenin once remarked, in the course of his criticism of Kautsky, that broadly speaking, the era of competitive capitalism ended and the monopolist phase began by 1870. Lenin demonstrated through his analysis that this monopoly capital was the economic base of imperialism. That is, capitalism entered the era of imperialism after 1870, which transformed itself gradually into a world system. Lenin established further that imperialism is the highest stage of capitalism and is also the stage of the decay of capitalism, when no further sustained development of the forces of production is possible. Extending this argument further and taking the world as a whole, i.e., as a unit of social system, we may say that the whole world has entered the era of social revolution. This is not to say, however, that revolution will take place simultaneously at all places on the earth, and a qualitatively new higher social system will be established in the world at once. This cannot be. Lenin explained why it can never happen like this. Lenin pointed out that owing to the uneven development of capitalism, social revolution will take place in different countries at different times and in different ways. Judged from this point of view it becomes clear that India was already ripe for a social revolution even at the time when she was ruled by the British imperialists. This social revolution had as its objective—the overthrow of foreign imperialism and of native feudalism,

which was preserved and protected by the former. But due to the lack of far-sightedness on the part of the exploited classes, that revolution could not succeed and a section of the native bourgeoisie managed in active collaboration with the imperialists to make certain changes in the political superstructure and trumpeted these changes as a great social revolution. It must be admitted that this trick of theirs succeeded in confusing the people for quite a long time.

So, we find that India was already ripe for a social revolution even at the time of British rule. We also find that this revolution did not take place. It means that we are still in that period of social revolution and will continue to be so till we are able to carry the revolution through successfully. Judged from this point of view, the raising of such questions as to whether the time is ripe for revolution or not must appear to be what it is—the antics of a madman or the cunning deception of a trained agent of reaction.

Real Nature Of Ranadive's Deception

It seems, however, that the depth of Ranadive's cunning deception cannot be fully gauged if we restrict ourselves only to this point. This is so because Ranadive & Co. have taken good care to talk about completing the unfinished social revolution by overthrowing imperialism, feudalism and the collaborating bourgeoisie. The real depth of their deception is revealed on another question, namely, what is the objective, the goal, towards which we must direct, in the main, the class struggles in this era of social revolution ?

Let us examine, therefore, whether the present time is favourable for us to advance towards the objective, namely, the overthrow of the existing regime of the exploiting classes. The Programme which was adopted at the Party's Seventh Congress repeatedly says that the miseries of the toiling people cannot be lessened but can only grow more intense under the existing social system. So, the Programme states that the main and primary task of the toiling people is to break up the existing social system and establish a people's democratic social system in its place. The axis of this people's democratic revolution is the agrarian

revolution. Once we analyse the trickeries of Ranadive & Co. in the context of this agrarian revolution, which is, in the words of the Programme, the axis of the social revolution, we can at once get an answer to the question whether the time has come for revolution, and also expose the deception underlying the slogan "the time is not yet ripe" raised by Ranadive & Co.

From what Lenin taught, every communist knows that the objective conditions for revolution and the necessity to carry it forward quickly to its full consummation are there when both the exploiting and the exploited classes are enmeshed in a nation-wide crisis. At a time of such crisis the exploited classes deeply realise from their own living conditions that it is impossible to go on living in the old way. Similarly, the exploiting classes also realise the futility of maintaining their regime of oppression and exploitation in the old way and try to devise ever new methods to maintain the same. To these factors Lenin added one thing more—a revolutionary consciousness which favours the carrying forward of the revolution quickly to complete success. Does this mean, therefore, that the entire toiling people will realise the inevitability of revolution and will begin to act consciously to that end? To this, Lenin replied that what is necessary is that the majority of the working class, at least the majority of the class conscious and politically active sections of the working class, must come to realise that a revolution is inevitable. When such a consciousness combines with the other objective factors of a revolutionary condition, it becomes necessary to orientate the class struggles quickly towards the objective of bringing about revolutionary changes. All this Lenin said in his *"Left"-wing Communism* which Ranadive in his usual hypocritical manner pretends to swear by.

It goes without saying that communists will continue to participate in bourgeois elections, if they are allowed to, till such a revolutionary situation matures. But then, they participate in it only to use it as a means of propagating the necessity of a revolution among the broad masses of the toiling people through their election campaigns, and certainly not to sing the

glory of the bourgeois parliamentarism by sending in hundreds of choir-boys. In the above book Lenin clearly stated that communists never fight the elections to win more seats. Ranadive, who quotes so liberally from *"Left"-wing Communism* is however shrewd enough to skip over precisely those portions in the book which have a direct bearing on the discussion of the question of whether the time for revolution has come or not. What else could he do? These are precisely the portions which clearly show the inter-connection between the bourgeois elections on the one hand and the forces of revolution on the other, and clearly point out that the primary task before the communists is to make the revolution a success and if they have to participate in the bourgeois elections under special conditions, it is only to facilitate and quicken the achievement of their primary objective. In this alone lies the significance of their participation in bourgeois elections. And so, how could we expect our 'Leninist' Ranadive to make use of these portions which speak so clearly about the necessity of bringing about revolution and even point it out to be our primary task—the very thing that Ranadive tries to push back to a secondary place?

Is India Ripe For Revolution?

Let us now see how we can gauge the situation in our country according to the criteria set by Lenin regarding a revolutionary situation. First, that there is a nation-wide crisis today requires no Marxism-Leninism to realise. The toiling people realise from their own experiences how cruel and deep is this crisis. The ruling classes are also sensing the depth of the crisis with their own class consciousness and as such are resorting to ever new methods to maintain their regime of exploitation. This is finding expression in such things as, exploiting peasants through the new agrarian laws, retrenchment of workers in the name of automation and rationalization and attempts to subdue the forces of revolution by opening the flood-gates of rabid chauvinism. To all this let us add the factor of revolutionary consciousness, and see what we get. The class conscious and politically active workers are the vanguard of the working

class. Marx and Engels defined these advanced elements as communists. Lenin defined the Communist Party as the highest class organisation of the toiling people. Did not this vanguard and its highest class organisation in this country openly admit in its Programme adopted at its well-attended Congress that the revolution is both inevitable and necessary? The one thing more that, according to Lenin's "*Left*"-wing *Communism*, is necessary, is—crisis in the government and the increasing participation by the backward sections of the people in political activities. Had there been no governmental crisis, no participation by the backward sections increasingly in political activities, how else can the fact be explained that eight of the existing state governments were dislodged from power? In other words, the time for revolution has ripened to such an extent that not only the vanguard of the working class, but even the backward sections of the people also realise the necessity to break up the existing social order. And it was because of this that all through 1966 even the backward sections of the people repeatedly took part in death-defying struggles on various demands and the struggles for economic demands began to be quickly transformed into political battles. But the backward sections cannot realise on their own the real way in which they should advance in order to seize political power, and carry the social revolution through to the victorious end. It is the duty of the Communist Party, the highest class organisation of the vanguard of the working class, to enlighten them on the way, the manner, in which they should advance to achieve their goal. The neo-revisionist leadership of the Communist Party (Marxist) precisely shirked this duty and for this purpose has artificially raised the bogey that the time for revolution has not yet come. Thus they have tried to push the question of revolution back to a position of secondary importance and to raise the question of elections to the position of primary importance. Instead of clarifying people's minds about the real connection that exists between the social order and the state machinery, they have shamelessly tried to capitalise on people's ignorance about it and have assiduously tried to raise false hopes in their minds, by sugar-coated talks and assurances that their living conditions

can be bettered, even if to a small degree, by replacing the Congress ministers by the so-called progressive ministers. In this way, this neo-revisionist leadership has been trying their utmost to reverse the process of revolutionary mass awakening. Why should they try to do this now? Precisely because a revolutionary situation exists in our country and the masses are waking up to the necessity of making a revolution, these neo-revisionist leaders are so keen on distracting people's attention from revolution and diverting it to the 'blessings' of bourgeois parliamentarism and the game of cabinet-making.

There is further proof to show that these people are shouting 'the time for revolution has not come' precisely for the purpose of hiding from the people the fact that the time for revolution is ripe. Let us remember that on many a previous occasion the people clashed with the police and many a precious life was sacrificed but never before were these people heard raising the bogey of untimeliness. On the contrary, they applauded those clashes in order to strengthen their own positions in the Party and the mass organisations. The reason for this is of course not far to seek. They are fully aware of the fact that in order to make the social revolution thoroughgoing, the basis of the social order must be smashed and that sporadic clashes with the state power, however valiant, can never achieve that. That is why, these agents of the bourgeoisie found nothing to worry over struggles so long as these remained sporadic, and did not think of raising the bogey of untimeliness nor did they care to direct this fighting consciousness towards the main objective of social revolution.

But unfortunately for these men, history is created by the people themselves and not by leaders, however crafty and deceptive they may be. The true representatives of the people, taking lessons from the experience and consciousness of the struggling masses, have today revealed before millions of toiling people the path to be taken to make the social revolution completely successful. In the fields and forests of the Terai region they have ushered in a glorious peasant revolution which is the axis of the people's democratic revolution. They have

refused to fritter away their revolutionary fighting strength by engaging in sporadic and futile clashes with the state power. Instead, they have started a peasant revolution on correct lines whose main objective is to overthrow the forces of feudalism in the countryside. Their struggle is thus a struggle for land, which, they realise well, can only be successful by using force and never through resort to the legalities or documents of the existing regime. The revolutionary peasants of Terai also realise that what they are up against is not merely the feudal landlords of the countryside, but also the armed might of the state, which protects the interests of the exploiting classes. For this reason, the revolutionary peasants there are getting prepared for an armed struggle and are developing their own armed might in the course of struggles. The essence of seizure of state power is to develop people's own armed power so as to provide an all-round protection for the rights of the people and to maintain decisive control over all matters involving such rights.

It can be seen clearly that the main task of the Indian social revolution at the present stage has for the first time been undertaken at the foot of the Himalayas. It is happening at a time when the time is ripe for revolution in our country. That is why this spark kindled in Terai cannot remain and is not remaining confined to that region alone and is about to kindle a flame that will engulf the entire stretch of West Bengal—the saline alluvial soil in the southern reaches also. As soon as the actual process of revolution started, the neo-revisionists raised the bogey of "untimeliness". One might ask these gentlemen—if the revolution now going on in Terai is, according to you, untimely, how comes it that the 'struggle' you have begun in the district of 24-Parganas with such fanfare and trumpeting is, as claimed by you, timely? In your enthusiasm you even bragged that you were not only not against the peasants' struggle for land, you yourselves were 'fighting' in the 24 Parganas exactly for this—for land. You claimed that your objection to the Naxalbari type of struggle was not because you were opposed to the interests of the peasants but because the way, the manner, of the struggle in Naxalbari was not the correct one.

Well, this is very enlightening indeed, Messrs Neo-revisionists! So, this is the real reason for your notorious opposition to the Naxalbari struggle—you are opposed to it **not** because it is premature or untimely (yet you have worked overtime to make people believe this cooked-up lie of yours!) but your **real** reason for opposition to Naxalbari is its method, the *revolutionary method*, of struggle. So, it becomes clear that your bogey of 'untimeliness' is merely a smoke-screen, a concocted lie, to hide your **real** opposition to the peasants' revolutionary struggle against feudalism—the only struggle that can overthrow the feudal exploiters in the countryside.

What is the path of Naxalbari which our neo-revisionists dread so much? This is the path of social revolution, of the overthrow of the exploiting classes. The revolutionary peasants of Naxalbari realise very well that this is the only path to lead the revolution to victory, which can never be achieved within the four walls of bourgeois laws. They have sternly refused to be duped by the sweet day-dreams of solving their problems peacefully by coming to terms with their feudal oppressors—a path persistently peddled by the neo-revisionists. Instead, they have firmly taken to the path of sharp class struggle.

What again is the so-called path of the 24 Parganas which our neo-revisionists laud sky-high and hold up as a "model" for peasant struggles? This is the path of class collaboration, the path to obstruct social revolution—the path of counter-revolution. The neo-revisionists succeeded, though temporarily, in smothering the revolutionary spark as soon as it reached Sonarpur in the 24 Parganas from Naxalbari in the north. They did it with the help of illusions about solving problems through and within the bounds of the bourgeois laws. Since they were able to canalise the struggle in Sonarpur into the safe channel of peaceable bourgeois reformism, they jumped with joy and with good backing from the bourgeois press held it up as the 'model' for peasant struggles.

But the spark of the peasant revolution in Naxalbari will certainly start a forest-fire in India and no traitors, no revisionists—new or old—can succeed in smothering this tiny

spark. The betrayal of revolution perpetrated by the new-time revisionists in close cooperation with the traitorous Dange clique in the 24 Parganas will not be able to stem the revolutionary tide for long. The revolutionary path of Naxalbari, according to the inexorable law of historical development, is the only path for the emancipation of the Indian peasants and revolutionary people.

History teaches us that counter-revolutionaries shout about 'untimeliness' precisely at a time when revolution becomes imminent. Our neo-revisionists of the Ranadive brand are frantically shouting and whining and crooning against the Naxalbari struggle on the plea that the time for revolution has not yet come. But they can scarcely hide their counter-revolutionary faces. The time has indeed not come yet—the time for the trial of counter-revolutionaries like Ranadive in the stern court of the revolutionary Indian people.

If there is to be revolution, there must be a revolutionary party. Without a revolutionary party, without a party built on the Marxist-Leninist revolutionary theory and in the Marxist-Leninist revolutionary style, it is impossible to lead the working class and the broad masses of the people in defeating imperialism and its running dogs.

—MAO TSE-TUNG

MARXISM-LENINISM Vs. 'CASTROISM'

The international communist movement is being assailed today, as it has always been since its first stirrings, from both within and without. The latest to join the attack is the leadership of the Cuban revolution—Fidel Castro and his associates.

After the victory of the Cuban revolution and the fall of hated Batista on New Year's Day, 1959, Fidel Castro, who declared (on April 21, 1959) that he would "oppose all dictatorships including communism" and who tried his best to cultivate "the best relations" with the US Government, found that all his attempts to do so were repulsed by the arrogant imperialists who considered all Latin America to be their "backyard". The North American imperialists who refrained from intervening during the progress of the revolution, who were at first 'cautiously optimistic about the new Cuban Government's future economic and political policies', and who were among the first to recognize the new Cuban Government, would not be satisfied with any thing less than total subservience. As 'Che' Guevara said in November 1960 to an American journalist, "With the exception of our Agrarian Reform, which the people of Cuba desired and initiated themselves, all of our radical measures have been a direct response to direct aggressions by powerful monopolists of which your country is chief exponent. U. S. pressure on Cuba made necessary the 'radicalization' of the Revolution." So, to withstand this pressure Fidel Castro and his friends leaned more and more on the Soviet Union and gradually drifted into 'communism'.

The Cuban leaders have built up the OLAS—the Latin American Solidarity Organization—which is affectionately called by Castro's admirers the Havana international—a new international centre of Communist movement. Castro, the leader of this organization, preaches socialist revolution and armed struggle in the Latin American countries and holds that proletarian revolution in a backward semi-colonial Latin American

country can be accomplished without a revolutionary theory—Marxism-Leninism—and without a revolutionary party equipped with it. It is, therefore, necessary to analyse the class roots of 'Castroism' and the kind of strategy and tactics he recommends.

In this issue of *Liberation* we are reproducing extracts from a speech by George Diaz of the Revolutionary Communist Party of Chile and two articles by the Chilean Party. More on 'Castroism' will appear in subsequent issues. —Ed. *Liberation*

CHILEAN REVOLUTIONARIES FIGHT REVISIONISM AND 'CASTROISM'

GEORGE DIAZ

REVOLUTIONARY COMMUNIST PARTY OF CHILE

[*Excerpts from a speech to the Fifth Congress of the Albanian Party of Labour (Tirana, PRA) November, 1966. The title and sub-titles are ours.*]

The situation which we, revolutionaries, are coping with at present is a complicated but a very favourable one for our struggle. While people in all corners of our planet are rising up in arms against Yankee imperialism, reactionaries and revisionists, headed by the leadership of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, unite making desperate efforts to bring these wars to a standstill, dealing hard blows at the Marxist-Leninists and trying to disrupt their organizations. The Marxist-Leninists of the whole world should deal a counter blow at this reactionary "Holy Alliance", counterbalancing it with a grand revolutionary, anti-Yankee and anti-revisionist alliance. It is precisely for this reason that this unity of Marxist-Leninists and the unity of all the people of the world is a fact which reality as well as our enemies impose upon us. For our Party the problem of unity is, in essence, a problem of principle.

It is these principles that determine and condition unity. Our Party adheres only to unity based on the fundamental principles of Marxism-Leninism and of the war against the Yankee imperialists, reactionaries and revisionists.

Like all other reactionaries, the modern revisionists in their attempts to achieve their goal and waylay the people, resort to two-fold tactics. On the one hand, they launch delirious attacks against Albania, the People's Republic of China and other Parties, they try to isolate and liquidate Marxist-Leninist Parties and to conspire against the revolutionary struggle of the people of the world, while, on the other hand, they resort to the tactics of "joint action" toward Vietnam and cessation of the ideological struggle embodied in international polemics. These are two sides of the same coin and constitute direct support for Yankee imperialism and betrayal of world revolution.

Why revolutionaries oppose "united action" with Soviet revisionists

As a means to avert its complete isolation, to cover up its true features and to penetrate into revolutionary ranks, Soviet revisionism proposes "joint actions" in support of the war of the Vietnamese people. But can there be joint actions with those who facilitate the withdrawal of Yankee troops from Europe in order to concentrate them in Vietnam, with those joining the anti-Chinese chorus conducted by Yankee imperialists, with those who try to draw the heroic battle of the Vietnamese people for independence and national reunification into the sphere of the Soviet-U. S. alliance to share the world between them? Can there be united action in support of people who resist the ruthless aggression of the Yankee imperialists with those who do nothing to isolate and oppose these imperialists but who keep strengthening their relations, who conduct warm telephone talks and conclude pacts of collaboration with them? Can there be joint actions with those who have raised the corrupt life of imperialism and its decadence into an ideal and pattern for the life of the Soviet youth? Can there be united action with those who are not satisfied with sharing the world

with Yankee imperialists but pretend to share also outer space as far away as the moon? We are of the opinion that there can be no united action with those who behave this way, with those who have nothing in common with us, from whom everything divides us. Our Party, while opposing the betrayal of the Chilean revisionists, will keep doing everything which leads to, inspires and helps the triumph of the grand cause of the Vietnamese people and which leads to the isolation and destruction of Yankee imperialism.

Revolutionaries must reject 'centrism' and work out a common international general line

While refusing adherence to united actions with revisionists, we at the same time reject adherence to centrism for we believe there exist no converging points or parallel lines between the two attitudes which are different in their nature and mutually exclusive. The struggle of the Chilean people has shown that Yankee imperialism and modern revisionism in our country are, likewise, united and have a common general line which they follow with persistence. There are people who, basing their views on differences of conditions in various countries or in given situations, deny in practice the need for Marxist-Leninists to unite, formulating a common international line of action. We think this stand is erroneous because it not only favours Yankee imperialism and modern revisionism but is also contrary to the international nature of proletarian revolution. Our Party considers it necessary for Marxist-Leninists of the world not merely to seek formal unity but also to work out a common general line emanating from their revolutionary experiences in the struggle against Yankee imperialism, reaction and modern revisionism.

Struggle against revisionism in Latin America

At present, the Marxist-Leninists in Latin America are faced with a peculiar situation, the collaboration of certain individuals who pose as "revolutionaries" with Latin American revisionists and with the leading clique of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union. When the tides of revisionism were at their

lowest ebb in Latin America, when the revisionists were ideologically and politically discredited and their organizations disintegrating, when the Caribbean crisis had laid bare the capitulating and treacherous features of the Soviet revisionists and Khrushchev himself had fallen, those so-called "revolutionary" individuals, responding to the call of the Khrushchevite revisionists, ran to their assistance. This is precisely the character of the meeting of the revisionist parties of Latin America which was held in Havana in December 1964. Coming in a special plane by way of Moscow, there gathered all the opportunist dregs, renegades, traitors and discredited elements, those held in contempt and consigned to oblivion by the Latin American masses, who formulated their nefarious line of cessation of polemics and attacks against the left-wing revolutionaries. They tried to isolate the Marxist-Leninists and neutralize the revolution, to misconstrue Marxist-Leninist ideas and principles and to substitute class collaboration for class struggle. They tried to check the spread of revolutionary ideas and to suppress them. We think we have acted right in denouncing this gathering as a meeting of traitors. We consider these individuals as collaborators with opportunists whose true identities they try to cover up and disguise as "revolutionary", but they will not succeed in deceiving the masses, for these opportunists have already exposed their revisionist nature.

Neo-revisionists must be exposed

In our struggle against our principal foe, Yankee imperialism, we cannot seriously speak of revolution without first exposing the revisionists, just as we cannot seriously speak of an armed uprising without opposing revisionist treason and their "peaceful transition" and "revisionist peaceful coexistence." With a view to averting their disgrace and total isolation, those self-styled "revolutionaries" raise a hue and cry about resorting to armed struggle but, at the same time, they follow a two-fold tactic in order to oppose it. First, they support the revisionists, saying that no armed struggle should be resorted to; secondly, they support the military venture of petty bourgeois groups behind the backs of the masses, as a means after all of lowering

the prestige of an armed uprising and forcing the sacrifice of many patriots. They set themselves the task also of attacking and dealing blows at Marxist-Leninist Parties. Just like the revisionists and imperialists, they have resorted to intrigues, slanders, denunciations and sabotage against these Parties.

They also try to liquidate Marxist-Leninist Parties or deny the necessity for a proletarian vanguard to guide the revolution. They, therefore, state that it is enough to set up a hotbed of uprising of the petty bourgeoisie sent from the city to the countryside to seize state power and that the basic task of creating an ideologically, politically and organizationally Marxist-Leninist Party can be left aside. They also claim that the union of the peasants and workers, the United Front and the creation of the armed forces of the people emerging from the armed struggle of the masses under the guidance of the Party can also be left aside.

These neo-revisionists in the attack on us try to justify themselves by saying that in order to live it is necessary to make concessions and submit to the strategy of the revisionists. To accept revisionist blackmail is, after all, the same as to accept imperialist blackmail. In sharp contrast with this opportunist attitude, the Party of Labour of Albania has set for us a great internationally significant example, unwaveringly uncompromisingly resisting both the aggressions and blockades by the imperialists as well as those by the revisionists. The guarantee of independence should be sought in the Marxist-Leninist Party, in the people, the army and in independent economy, not in the disgraceful compromise or capitulation of the revisionists to imperialism.

2

FOQUISMO' : URBAN TERROR OR POPULAR WAR ?

(A Petty-bourgeois and a Proletarian Line in
the Chilean Revolution)

Revolutionary Communist Party of Chile

The leaders of MIR^a claim to combine in their ranks all groups of the petty-bourgeoisie who hope to establish "socialism" in our country through armed insurrection. Since those who have heeded its call are, for the most part, small groups of intellectuals with Trotskyite or old "left" (revisionist Communist Party) backgrounds along with youths deluded by "Castroism", anarchism, etc., their difficulties in formulating a program continue to be insuperable. The existing ideological mosaic permits everyone to think what he wants to about this armed insurrection, about the strategy and tactics of establishing socialism. Despite this lack of ideological clarity, they hope to lead the working class in a frontal attack against all of its class enemies.

To speak of "armed insurrection" without explaining what is meant by this, without indicating clearly the strategy and tactics to be used in this struggle, without indicating with precision the contradictions inherent therein, without identifying the principal enemy and the secondary enemies, to dream of defeating them all at once, can only be called demagoguery and irresponsibility.

The form in which the armed struggle is organized and undertaken always represents the interests of the class that directs it. The MIR and other small petty-bourgeois groups identify very closely with the methods of insurrectional struggle which triumphed in Cuba—that is, the guerrilla "foco" and urban terrorism. This is one of the few things that are clearly set forth in their writings. As one would expect, this insurrec-

tionist theory—urged on the whole of America by the Havana leaders—is an obvious expression of the moods, inclinations and thinking of petty-bourgeois elements. Urban terrorism does not involve the masses, is based on isolated actions which can be carried out by a very few individuals, does not need popular support and can cause enemy losses without enlisting the proletarian masses. This is the petty-bourgeoisie's favourite type of struggle, reflecting its individualism and its misgivings about joining the proletariat. Many of these people are capable of throwing a bomb, but very few of them are disposed to go out and share the hardships of the workers and peasants, to learn about class consciousness from the workers and peasants.

The theory of the "guerrilla foco" also has its class roots. It is based on the assumption that a group of petty-bourgeois revolutionaries grafted onto the countryside (or, better yet, onto the mountains if there are any) can carry out armed assaults capable of rallying the peasant masses to its ranks, of arousing the revolutionary conscience of the whole country and, finally, of taking power.

It is not a question of winning support of the masses in order that they will wage their own war of liberation but, on the contrary, of waging the war so as to win the support of the masses.

It is not a question of raising the level of the mass struggle to the point where the people will be able to form their own army, led by the ideology and the party of the proletariat, but of winning the support and admiration of the masses by heroic actions while leaving them on a secondary plane, disposed to take what the military group chooses to offer them when it takes power, deprived of the possibility of determining the future of the society which generated the struggle and of establishing a real dictatorship of the proletariat. The guerrilla group without the direction of a proletarian party may be able to realize some military successes and even, in some cases, do away with an unpopular government, but if it is not controlled by the proletariat it inevitably transforms itself into a new oppressor.

The political tendency of Castroism is characterized by an "elemental revolutionary pragmatism which precludes a commitment to a completely systematized ideology" (so states S. Condoruna in his book titled *La Revolucion* published by MIR itself). This tendency has been manifested in all Latin America under the influence of the Cuban Revolution, and the MIR of Chile is simply one of its expressions. The alleged attempt, urged from time to time, of "searching for a revolutionary road to socialism based on the history of the country and of forging a program to meet the specific national conditions" is a cover-up for the desire to exempt the revolutionary struggle from the need to conform to the revolutionary ideology of the proletariat, that is, Marxism-Leninism. Under the pretext of a nationalist formulation, it tries to avoid any commitment to a clearly defined ideology. It tries to ignore the international experiences of the proletariat because from these one can only deduce the necessity of creating a working class party, armed with Marxism-Leninism, capable of mobilizing the masses in a revolutionary manner, of guiding them to form their own army and of leading them in an extensive popular war which can destroy the enemies of our people one by one. This approach is intolerable for the Trotskyites and not much more attractive to the other petty-bourgeois elements of MIR.

The theory of "foquismo guerrillero" has been tried in the Latin American revolution with disastrous results. The hope that the Cuban example can be repeated is an illusion. No armed group can hope to reduce the struggle to a simple confrontation with the bourgeois army of a single country. The brutal intervention of the Yankee army in the Dominican Republic should have disabused everyone of any illusions about a short struggle and an easy success.

Yankee imperialism is the principal enemy of all the Latin American peoples. Hence we must confront it with all the pro-revolutionary forces in every one of our countries in a concerted manner. It is a powerful enemy and the only way to defeat it is by means of a popular war, coordinated with all the liberation struggles of the oppressed peoples, with all the

revolutionary struggles of our America, in which the popular masses have the fullest opportunity of developing their enormous forces and of applying the methods of struggle developed by the great revolutionaries of our era and applied to the concrete realities of their own countries.

People's war is based on the revolutionary mobilization of large masses, led by the party of the proletariat, in a struggle for their concrete interests and with the clear objective of the conquest of power. It teaches the masses to take advantage of their own forces and awakens their creative genius to solve the problems encountered in the course of the struggle. It teaches them to systematize their experiences so that these can serve as an orientation and guide and help them to raise the level of their many forms of struggle. It teaches the masses to dare to struggle against an enemy that is initially more powerful and to develop their own forces, concentrating them to annihilate the enemy piece by piece until they gain the superiority which makes it possible to crush him decisively.

People's war is the most advanced type of struggle against a powerful enemy. It is the fruit of a long international experience in the application of Marxism-Leninism. The principles of people's war, formulated by Mao Tse-tung, are the logical consequence of the correct application of Marxism-Leninism to the struggle of the people against an enemy of superior military force. These principles proved to be correct in the Anti-Japanese war, in the long war of liberation of the Chinese people, in the Korean war and in the anti-fascist war waged by the Soviet people. Today they are receiving their most definitive substantiation in the Vietnamese War. The heroic struggles of the Vietnamese people are a treasury of the proletariat, and only irresponsible people or those who have never seriously thought of revolution can ignore or underestimate the importance of their great contribution.

People's war is an expression of proletarian ideology in the same way that "foquismo" and urban terrorism are the expression of petty-bourgeois ideology. Our differences with MIR are not, as they claim, those of following or sympathizing with this and

that country, but very profound ones reflecting the different classes which we represent.....

NOTES

1. *FOCO*—although related to the English word *focus*, the Spanish word *foco*, when used in the context of military science, has no exact equivalent in English. It generally refers to a centre of guerrilla activity rather than a definite geographic location or specific military base. Occasionally, it is used to mean a single guerrilla band. *Foquismo*, then, is a term which has come to be synonymous in Latin America with the Cuban "theory" of revolutionary warfare and can be briefly summarized as follows: the guerrilla *foco*, multiplied many times over throughout the countryside, in much the same way as cells divide, can develop into a strong revolutionary army capable of defeating the enemy and taking power, at which time the military leaders then become the leaders of a new vanguard party and the national government.

2. *MIR*—a left-wing group in Chile which espouses the Cuban "foquismo" form of armed struggle. Unlike most of the Mirista (*MIR*) parties of Latin America which had their origins in bourgeois reformist parties, the *MIR* of Chile was formed in August 1965 by various dissident militants in the old Socialist and Communist Parties together with some of the top leaders of the Trotskyite groupings.

3

THE POSITION ON CUBA

Despite its repeated affirmations of independence, *MIR* numbers itself among the semi-official representatives of the Cuban line. They cannot hope for more because the official representation and direct contacts with Cuba's Communist Party

are in the hands of the leadership of the revisionist Communist Party in Chile. MIR's relations with the Cuban leaders have to be carried out under the stigma of an illicit love affair. They even have to share a sort of concubinage with the Socialist Party and other groups previously mentioned, including the group of orators who direct the Chilean revolution from Radio Havana. But MIR's ideological devotion is total. In its declaration of principles, it says, "MIR proclaims its support to the Cuban revolution because its *methods of insurrectional struggle*, its policy of liquidation of the oligarchy and national bourgeoisie, its anti-imperialist posture, and its *plans for building socialism*, including its proposals of not permitting sectarianism or bureaucratism constitute an example for the guidance of the revolutionists of the continent." [Emphasis added]

The Cuban revolution has had an enormous influence on the development of the struggle by our people. For the first time, in Latin America, armed forces supported by the people were able to overthrow and destroy a professional army and a corrupt regime supported by Yankee imperialism. For the first time, a Latin American government was capable of confronting imperialist fury, defeating it at the Bay of Pigs, and of synthesizing its revolutionary practice in a remarkable document valid for the Latin American revolution—the Second Declaration of Havana. Because of this and because of the affection and admiration which the Cuban Revolution has earned among the proletarian masses of the entire continent, the actions and statements of its leaders, and the road that they have chosen for the building of socialism, must be carefully analyzed by the Latin American revolutionaries. Successful revolutions should be studied with great care by those who aspire to lead the struggle of their peoples. We have to learn from the successes and errors, and every revolution has both. A blind and uncritical admiration lends no service to the proletariat and offers it no guidance in the complicated struggle with its class enemies. But the followers of Havana, including the leadership of MIR, deny even the right to discuss the position of the Cuban leaders or their direct action in the politics of our country. Their favourite

argument is that we have no right to criticize the heroes of the Sierra Maestra since we have never made a revolution ourselves. This is ridiculous and infantile. It is a typically dogmatic argument which would exempt heroes and successful leaders from all dialectic process, all possibility of change or of error. Lenin would have no right to criticize Kautsky, a brilliant Marxist leader who made important contributions to revolutionary theory before becoming a renegade. Nor would we be able to judge Tito of Yugoslavia, a hero of the anti-fascist war who later became a traitor to the proletarian cause and an ally of imperialism. One could go on indefinitely citing similar historical examples. The greater the merits of a revolutionary leader, the greater his responsibility and the greater the damage that can result from his mistakes.

We have serious criticisms of the Cuban leaders and consider it a duty and a responsibility to formulate them clearly. But it seems to us to be the most detestable petty-bourgeois opportunism to keep silent in order not to detract from the prestige which the Cuban Revolution rightfully deserved, and especially during that period when Yankee imperialism considered Cuba its greatest enemy.

We criticize the present Cuban leaders for the following things:

(1) For having departed from the correct and independent line maintained until the Caribbean crisis and giving in to the pressures of Soviet revisionism. This departure became increasingly apparent when Cuba lent itself as the seat of the meeting of the 22 revisionist parties of Latin America in 1964, thereby joining ranks with the corrupt, double-dealing opportunists of Latin American revisionism and even signing a pact of unity with them against revolutionaries. Later, in 1965, the Cuban leaders attended the Moscow meeting. Finally, on the last night of the Tri-Continental Conference, they unjustifiably launched a surprise attack, a slanderous assault against the Communist Party of China.

(2) For having ordered the cessation of public polemics between Marxist-Leninists and revisionists on the grounds

that the ideological struggle "could wait ten years" and that the defence of principle was "Byzantinism". This thesis, an extreme form of opportunism, was in open contradiction to the Second Declaration of Havana. A fundamental duty of revolutionaries is to spread revolutionary ideas, and the cessation of public polemics was designed to muzzle these ideas in order to preserve revisionism and gain the approval of the reactionaries, revisionists and imperialists.

(3) For spreading throughout all Latin America a line of adventurist armed struggle based on a petty-bourgeois guerrilla "foco" transplanted from the city to the country, isolated from and acting in place of the masses, who are left under the ideological leadership of the revisionists.

(4) For having its leader, Fidel Castro, sign a joint declaration with Luis Corvalan, head of the clique of renegades who direct Latin American revisionism, indicating a unanimity in point of view. This was a cowardly blow at Chilean revolutionaries but more fundamentally, at the prestige of the Cuban Revolution and the Second Declaration of Havana. Revolutionaries must draw the conclusion that, if the Cuban leadership has an identity of views with Corvalan, it has nothing in common with us nor with the interests of the proletariat and the Cuban revolution.

(5) For having imposed on the Tri-Continental Conference an opportunist line for Latin America, excluding revolutionary parties and organizations but always including the revisionists. As a matter of fact, the Cuban leadership thereby did a great service for international revisionism, helping it in its efforts to split the Afro-Asian movement, and did no service to the Latin American revolution. But Yankee imperialism can be thanked to them. The revolutionary proposals approved at the conference will only serve to camouflage the enemies. The Latin American Organization of Solidarity (OLAS), the ideal organ for propagating those proposals, will become, in the final analysis, centre for Latin American revisionism.

(6) For having systematically opposed the Marxist-Leninist parties of Latin America to the point of direct attack on the

and resorting to intrigue, conspiracy and bribes to break them up and organize factionalism against their directives. Our Colombian, Dominican, Guatemalan, Peruvian, Brazilian, Argentinian comrades, as well as we ourselves, can testify to this.

The petty-bourgeois class origins of the MIR leadership and, to a great extent, its "super-militants" explain its devotion to the Cuban leaders, its line and methods. In Cuba, all its dreams are realized. The Trotskyite group of MIR applauds because Cuba proclaimed socialism "by decree", all at once. These people are not interested in objectively analyzing what kind of socialism has been instituted there. They do not seem to take notice that the greater part of Cuba's land is in the hands of small owners who exploit the manual labour of others, that capitalist, not socialist, forms of agricultural production have developed, that the bourgeoisie has not been relieved of its positions of leadership in the bureaucratic apparatus and in the cultural institutions but that, on the contrary, the bourgeoisie is becoming more secure and gaining new positions of power. They consider exemplary the Cuban line of building socialism and do not stop to ask whether it corresponds to the interests of the revolutionary people of Cuba—an economic policy based on the "international division of labour" and directed by Moscow, which relegates to Cuba the role of a one-crop, sugar producer, totally dependent on the Soviet revisionist leadership, instead of encouraging the Cuban people to build a diversified, self-sustaining economy. Nor do they question whether it is prudent to depend on external "help" and foreign markets when they are in constant danger of a total blockade by Yankee imperialism. It seems never to have occurred to them that the whole present-day set-up in Cuba is predicated on the illusory assumption that there will be a very long period of peaceful coexistence with imperialism.

A NEW ASSESSMENT OF THE HISTORY OF THE C.P.I. : I. 1919-1928

—Bande Ali Khan

(It is true, though strange, that the history of our Party—which is more than forty years old—is little known to our comrades and no attempt, except some reminiscences, has been made to record and analyse it. The reasons are understandable. Any such attempt would have exposed the roots of right and left opportunism, the maladies which have stunted the growth of the Party and disorganised and disrupted the forces of the Indian revolution; any such attempt would have brought to light the dark deeds of the leaders—the Ranadives, Danges, Joshis, Muzaffar Ahmeds etc., who have been at the helm of the Party since almost its birth. So, many important Party documents especially, the Communist International documents, have been carefully withheld from rank and file comrades and are almost unavailable to prevent them from making the attempt themselves. As the study of the history of the Party can alone help us to draw lessons from the experiences of the past and contribute to our understanding of the present problems, we are initiating discussion on the history of the Party. A New Assessment of the History of the C. P. I. will be published serially in *Liberation* and we invite all comrades to join in the discussion so that an authentic history of the C. P. I. may be prepared.

—Ed. *Liberation*.

I. Revolution Long Overdue :

An Indian revolution is long overdue. Most of the major countries in the world have gone through their revolutions and brought about fundamental changes in their social order, thereby accelerating human progress. India is the only major country in the world which has not as yet brought about a fundamental change in her society through a revolution. As a result, she is condemned to maintain an archaic social system which compels

her vast population to live in perpetual misery, starvation and backwardness, with no hope of progress and enlightenment in any direction. Only a revolution bringing about fundamental changes in her social structure can save the Indian people from the inevitable doom.

All the international revolutionary leaders from Marx and Engels to Lenin, Stalin and Mao Tse-tung understood the importance of a revolution in India and eagerly looked forward to it. During 1857-58, the only occasion when the Indian people made a serious attempt to bring about a revolution, Marx closely followed its development. He saw its significance as a part of the world revolution and as allied to the European proletarian revolution. In one of his letters to Engels Marx wrote: "India is now our best ally." (Marx-Engels: *On Colonialism*, Moscow, p. 285). It should be noted that some of the revolutionary Chartist leaders of England like Earnst Jones who came under the influence of Marx and Engels also considered the Great Indian Rebellion as an ally of their own struggle against British capitalism.

Marx and Engels were keenly alert to the revolutionary beginnings then taking place in Asia, particularly in India and China. They paid special attention to the Great Indian Rebellion as they did to the Chinese Taiping Rebellion. These rebellions, they held, were part and parcel of the general anti-colonial liberation struggle of the oppressed nations, and with great enthusiasm they wrote about these events in the *New York Daily Tribune*¹. Those writings show what tremendous faith

¹These articles have been brought out in one volume under the title of *The First Indian War of Independence: 1857-1859*, Moscow, 1959; then again in collection of articles by Marx and Engels named *Colonialism*. It is to be observed that while Marx and Engels considered the Great Rebellion as the anti-colonial liberation struggle of all classes of the Indian people and, as such, acclaimed it, R. P. Dutt wrote only a few lines about it and that was just a repudiation of Marx's assessment. "The rising of 1857" wrote Dutt, "was in its

Marx and Engels had in the revolutionary potential of the Chinese and Indian peoples. Again, in 1882, Marx wrote to Kautsky: "India will perhaps, indeed very probably, make a revolution." (*On Colonialism*, p. 366)

In the dark days after the defeat of the Russian Revolution of 1905-6, when Czarist reaction was triumphant over the revolutionary forces in Russia, Lenin saw a new light in the awakening of the peoples of Asia—in India, China, Turkey, Persia, Indo-China—countries which only yesterday were in a state of deep slumber. Lenin wrote at that time: "In India, too, the proletariat has already developed to conscious political mass struggle and, that being the case, the Russian-style British regime in India is doomed!" Lenin saw that such struggles "steel millions upon hundreds of millions of proletarians throughout Asia..."

"The Russian proletariat should not seek its allies among the liberals. It must follow its own independent path to the complete victory of the revolution, basing itself on the need for a forcible solution of the agrarian problem in Russia by the peasant masses themselves. It must help them overthrow the rule of the Black Hundred landlords and Black Hundred autocracy, making its goal the establishment of a democratic dictatorship of the proletariat and peasantry, and remembering that its own struggle and victory are inseparable from the international revolutionary movement. Let us have less *illusions* about the liberalism of the counter-revolutionary bourgeoisie (both in Russia and in the world). And let us pay more attention to the growth of the international revolutionary proletariat." (Lenin: *Inflammable Material in World Politics*, 1908)

Already in 1908 Lenin saw that the objective conditions in Asian countries were fast maturing for the liberation movement. Immediately after the November Revolution, Lenin, Stalin and other Bolshevik leaders appealed again and again to the Eastern essential character and dominant leadership the revolt of the old conservative and feudal forces and dethroned potentates for their rights and privileges which they saw in process of destruction. This reactionary character of the rising prevented any measure of popular support and doomed it to failure." (*India Today*, 1947, p. 253). Revisionism in India is deep-rooted.

peoples to overthrow foreign imperialism and complete their democratic revolutions. And how hopefully Lenin was expecting the emancipation of the peoples of China and India when he wrote in his last article in March 1923:

"In the last analysis, the upshot of the struggle will be determined by the fact that Russia, India, China etc. account for the majority of the population of the globe. And it is precisely this majority that, during the past few years, has been drawn into the struggle for emancipation with extraordinary rapidity, so that in this respect there cannot be the slightest doubt what the final outcome of the world struggle will be. In this sense the complete victory of socialism is fully and absolutely assured." (*Selected Works*, II, p. 854)

The expectations of Marx, Engels, Lenin and Stalin have been gloriously fulfilled by China. India has miserably failed. The reason for this failure lies hidden in the last 40 years' history of the CPI.

II. *Second Comintern Congress: Lenin's Theses on the National and Colonial questions.*

The First International (1864-67), under the guidance of Marx, had laid the foundation of the international organization of the workers in order to prepare for their revolutionary onslaught on capital and for socialism. The Second International (1889-1914) marked the epoch in which the soil was prepared for a broad, mass, widespread socialist movement in many countries. The Second International also led to a temporary increase in the strength of opportunism, revisionism and reformism, culminating in its disgraceful treachery and collapse during the First World War.

The World War opened a new epoch in human history—the epoch of the Socialist Revolution under the dictatorship of the proletariat. As a result of the war the whole capitalist world was tottering. Under the guidance of Lenin the first Socialist Republic was successfully established in Russia and waves of popular revolution engulfed the whole of Europe and Asia.

It was in this background of revolution and counter-revolution that the corpse of the Second International was disinterred and galvanized into life at a conference at Berne in February, 1919. Its resolution repudiated in principle the dictatorship of the proletariat and declared in substance for bourgeois Parliamentary democracy. From then onwards the main target of attack of the socialists was Communism and Soviet Russia than rather capitalism.

Under these circumstances, the formation of a revolutionary international, for which Marx and Engels had worked and Lenin had fought for so long, had become an urgent necessity for organizing the proletariat under the revolutionary banner and for guiding them towards their revolutionary goal. Even though the foreign intervention and civil war demanded the entire attention of Lenin, the formation of a revolutionary international could not be postponed any longer. The Third International (or Communist International, in brief, Comintern or CI) was founded in Moscow in March 1919. Its programme was formulated by Lenin. It was a programme for the seizure of power, destruction of the old administrative and governmental machine and the establishment of proletarian democracy through the dictatorship of the proletariat.

After the first successful socialist revolution Moscow naturally became the centre of revolutionary activities. Revolutionaries from all over the world flocked to Moscow. Indian revolutionaries who were then living abroad—in Germany, France, England, America—also acted similarly. Among those who went to Moscow, the most prominent were M. N. Roy and his American wife Evelyn Roy, Dr. Bhupendranath Dutta, Virendra Chattopadhyaya, Abani Mukherji, Nalini Gupta, Luhani, Khankoji, etc. None of these Indian revolutionaries knew much about Marxism at that time. They were all welcomed in Moscow by the Bolshevik leaders and Lenin himself had long talks with many of them. Among them, Roy was the most active and most promising and for many years he played a very important role in the Communist International on behalf of the Indian people.

The Second Congress of the Communist International, held

in Moscow from July 18 to August 7, 1920, was an important session. Among the questions that were discussed were the major aspects of proletarian dictatorship, of the treacherous nature of Social-Democracy, important tactical problems regarding parliamentarism and political question, the relation of the proletariat with the peasantry, trade union, youth, women questions etc. Particularly, the *Theses on the National and Colonial Questions* submitted by Lenin at this formative period of the CI ranks among the great writings produced by the world Marxist movement. Another important document of the Second Congress was the 21 "Conditions of Admission to the Communist International." Lenin personally attended the Congress and took great interest in it, particularly in the colonial thesis. Roy participated in the Congress as a delegate from Mexico, while Abani Mukherji and P. T. Acharya represented India.

In his report Lenin singled out the greatest barrier standing in the way of a broad proletarian revolution in Europe, the opportunist Social-Democracy. "Practice", Lenin said, "has shown that the active people in the working class movement who adhere to the opportunist trend are better defenders of the bourgeoisie, than the bourgeoisie itself. Without their leadership of the workers, the bourgeoisie could not have remained in power." (*Selected Works*, vol. 10, p. 196.) This was true not only of the Social-Democratic revisionists of Lenin's days, but also true of the "Communist" revisionists of our day.

Marx and Engels left a rich heritage of revolutionary principles regarding the national and colonial question from the First International for the coming generations of workers, but the revisionist treacherous leaders of the Second International tried to bury them. These reformist and revisionist socialist leaders defended their own imperialist colonial exploitation and finally ended up by supporting their respective imperialists responsible for the holocaust of World War I. The gateway to the great colonial field of revolutionary struggle that was opened by the First International was closed by the Second International, but opened up again by the Communist International.

Lenin, from the very beginning laid great stress upon the question of self-determination of the oppressed peoples and resurrected and redeveloped the revolutionary principles of Marx and Engels on the national and colonial questions. Stalin followed the same course. After the victory of the November Revolution Lenin and Stalin at once granted to the peoples who were oppressed by Czarism the right of self-determination including the right of secession. The Russian Revolution, that freed its own colonial peoples, naturally tremendously influenced the subsequent revolutionary movements in China, Turkey, India, Korea, Persia, Afganistan and Egypt.

In the post-war period the Colonial question came to the forefront. Lenin was the Chairman of the Colonial Commission of the Comintern. He placed the resolution on the National and Colonial question at the top of the agenda. But for many of the delegates the problem was new and the major European delegations, who were still under the influence of the Social-Democratic tradition of ignoring the problems of the world outside Europe and America, took little interest in the National and Colonial question. Lenin wanted to break completely with that reformist tradition and embrace the whole world—which is the real Marxist outlook.

Among the delegates there was a lack of knowledge of Marxism. Moreover, they were divided into rival groups with discordant ideas—there were moderates, centrists as well as extreme anarchists. Hardly any Communist Party had come into existence in any country except Russia. None of the delegates could take the initiative and draft a resolution on the colonial question for the Second Comintern Congress. Lenin's was the only thesis and it was circulated among the delegates for preliminary discussions.

Lenin had already shown in his *Imperialism* that the exploitation of the colonial masses yielded a super-profit; capital exported to colonial countries where labour could be bought cheaply earned a much higher profit than at home. A part of this super-profit is conceded to a thin upper stratum of the metropolitan working class to secure their support for colonial

ism. From this analysis Lenin drew the conclusion that successful revolution in colonial countries was a condition for the overthrow of capitalism in Europe and for world revolution. Lenin's Colonial Thesis was based on this analysis.

The eleventh section of Lenin's *Draft Theses on the National and Colonial Questions* was as follows :—

"With regard to the more backward states and nations, in which feudal or patriarchal and patriarchal-peasant relations predominate, it is particularly important to bear in mind :

"First, that all Communist Parties must assist the bourgeois-democratic liberation movement in these countries and that the duty of rendering the most active assistance rests primarily upon the workers of the country upon which the backward nation is dependent colonially or financially ;

"Second, that it is necessary to wage a fight against the clergy and other influential reactionary and mediaeval elements in backward countries ;

"Third, that it is necessary to combat Pan-Islamism and similar trends which strive to combine the liberation movements against European and American imperialism with the attempt to strengthen the positions of the Khans, landlords, Mullahs etc ;

"Fourth, that it is necessary in the backward countries to give special support to the peasant movement against the landlords, against large landownership, and against all manifestations or survivals of feudalism, and to strive to lend the peasant movement the most revolutionary character and establish the closest alliance between the West European Communist proletariat and the revolutionary peasant movement in the East, in the colonies, and in the backward countries generally ;

"Fifth, that it is necessary to wage a determined struggle against the attempt to paint bourgeois-democratic liberation trends in the backward countries in Communist colours ; the Communist International must support the bourgeois-democratic national movements in colonial and backward countries only on condition that, in all backward countries, the elements of future proletarian parties which are Communist not only in name shall be grouped together and trained to appreciate their special

tasks, viz, to fight the bourgeois-democratic movements within their nations; the Communist International must enter into a temporary alliance with bourgeois democracy in colonial and backward countries, but must not merge with it and must under all circumstances preserve the independence of the proletarian movement even if in the most rudimentary form;

"Sixth, that it is necessary constantly to explain and expose among the broadest masses of the toilers of all countries, the deception systematically practised by the imperialist powers in creating, under the guise of politically independent states, states which are wholly dependent upon them economically, financially and militarily; under modern international conditions there is no salvation for dependent and weak nations except in a union of Soviet republics." (Lenin: *Selected Works*, Vol. II, pp. 657-58).

Thus we see that Lenin in his Colonial Thesis emphasised that (1) the stage of the revolution in India was bourgeois-democratic and the Communist Party and the proletariat must support it; (2) the Communists must fight against all kinds of religious obscurantism and prejudices, against the influence of the clergy, priests and mullahs and against Pan-Islamism; (3) the peasant movement against feudalism has a revolutionary character and it must be specially supported; (4) while participating in the bourgeois-democratic liberation movement the Communists must under all circumstances preserve the independence of the proletarian movement and the Communists must organize the Communist Party; (5) the Communists must systematically expose the imperialist plan of creating so-called independent states which are in reality dependent on imperialism economically and militarily. Knowing the character of imperialism and of the colonial bourgeoisie, Lenin could foresee the creation of an "independent" India.

There was a long discussion over two drafts. While Lenin demanded that the main task of the Communists was to assist any bourgeois-democratic liberation movement in Eastern countries, *M. N. Roy asserted that the Comintern should assist exclusively Communist movement in India and that the CPI

should devote itself exclusively to the organisation of the masses for the struggle for their class interests.

Further explaining his viewpoint Roy said that in the dependent countries like India there were "two distinct movements" which were growing further apart each day—(a) "the bourgeois-democratic nationalist movement, with a programme of political independence under the bourgeois order," and (b) "the mass action of the poor and ignorant peasants and workers for their liberation from all sorts of exploitation."

Roy's thesis was thus tantamount to a call for "socialist" revolution; he wanted to skip the first stage of the revolution in a colonial country—the bourgeois-democratic stage, about which Lenin was so explicit in his draft. Roy was wrong in respect of both strategy and tactics. His differences were fundamental and had their logical consequences in the future.

What would be the role of the (C)I in the colonial countries? Roy argued that in the advanced countries the class-conscious proletariat could form Communist Parties. "But in the colonial countries similar instruments for revolution were absent. How then the CI develop the national liberation movement there as part of the World Proletarian Revolution?"¹ To this question, says Roy, Lenin's answer was "based on ignorance of the relation of social forces in the colonial countries."

For Lenin, historically, the national liberation movement had the significance of the bourgeois-democratic revolution; this stage had to be passed through before it could enter the stage of the proletarian revolution. The only question was—who is to lead?

Roy asserts that, according to Lenin, "The Communists must help the colonial liberation movement under the leadership of the nationalist bourgeoisie, regarding the latter as the objectively revolutionary force." (*Memoirs*, p. 379).

¹M. N. Roy: *Memoirs*, p. 379. About two years after this Roy in an interview with Stalin raised the same question. Roy himself says that he heard Stalin "meekly", then asked him "timidly": then how the cause of Communism and of the liberation of the proletariat be helped if the capitalist and feudal

Roy deliberately misrepresents Lenin's views. All that Lenin said was that at that time (in 1920) there was no proletarian party in India (Lenin talks of "future" proletarian parties), but the proletariat as well as the peasantry were actively taking part in national democratic movements and therefore the elements for building a Communist Party in India existed; so the Communists must do everything to build up a CP quickly while, for the time being, they must support the national movement under the bourgeois leadership. In the *Theses on the National and Colonial Questions*, Lenin clearly pointed out that "the Communist International must enter into a temporary alliance with bourgeois democracy in colonial and backward countries, but must not merge with it and must under all circumstances preserve the independence of the proletarian movement even if in the most rudimentary form". In the *Theses* Lenin also asked the Communists to give special importance to the peasant movement in the colonies as a revolutionary force. Roy never recognized the revolutionary character of the peasant movement.

Roy's colonial thesis was not meant as an alternative, but as supplementary to Lenin's, though it was radically different from that of Lenin and offered an entirely different evaluation of the revolutionary potential of the Indian middle class. Roy says that in private conversations Lenin was much impressed by Roy's arguments and he asked Roy to draft a thesis of his own. (Roy: *Memoirs*, p. 43. Roy says that Lenin suggested this because he was open-minded and because he was breaking new grounds and final judgement should await more practical experience).

Roy's original thesis is not available, nor in his *Memoirs* does it ask the question: "The modern Machiavelli [Stalin] laid his card on the table: That should not be allowed; the proletariat in alliance with the peasantry should become the driving force of the national liberation movement, so that, at the proper moment, the revolutionary cadre, organised in the Communist Party, might lead to transform the national liberation movement into a civil war for the social emancipation of the toiling masses." (*Memoirs*, p. 538).

he give it, but this is what was described by a contemporary Russian newspaper:

"Comrade Roy arrives at the conclusion that it is necessary to eliminate from point 11 of the thesis on the national problem the paragraph according to which Communist Parties must assist any bourgeois democratic liberation movement in Eastern countries. The Communist International should assist exclusively the institution and development of the Communist movement in India, and the Communist Party of India must devote itself exclusively to the organisation of the broad popular masses for the struggle for the class interests of the latter."

(Quoted by Overstreet and Windmiller: *Communism in India*, p. 28).

With great patience Lenin tried to persuade Roy. According to a French Communist who was present at this Congress:

"Patiently Lenin replied to him [Roy] explaining that for a longer or shorter period of time the Indian Communist Party would be a small party with but few members, having only weak resources, incapable of reaching, on the basis of its programme and by means of its own activity, a substantial number of peasants and workers. On the other hand, on the basis of demands for national independence it would become possible to mobilize large masses—experience has already demonstrated that amply—and it was only in the course of this struggle that the Indian Communist Party would forge and develop its organisation to the point where it would be in a position, once the national demands were satisfied, to attack the Indian bourgeoisie." (Alfred Rosmer, "In Moscow in Lenin's Days: 1920-21", *The New Internationalist*, Summer, 1955).

Roy's views were as follows:

"The real strength of the liberation movements in the colonies is no longer confined to the narrow circle of bourgeois democratic nationalists. In most of the colonies there already exists organised revolutionary parties which strive to be in close connection with the working masses. (The relation of the CI with the revolutionary movement in the colonies should be realised through the mediums of these parties and groups, because

they were the vanguard of the working class in their respective countries). They are not very large today, but they reflect the aspirations of the masses and the latter will follow them to the revolution. The Communist parties of the different imperialist countries must work in conjunction with these proletarian parties of the colonies, and through them give all moral and material support to the revolutionary movement in general.

"The revolution in the colonies is not going to be a Communist revolution in the first stages. But if from the outset the leadership is in the hands of a Communist vanguard, the revolutionary masses will not be led astray." (Second Congress of the Comintern, Proceedings, p. 578).

During the debate Lenin pointed out that the bourgeois nationalist movements in the colonies were revolutionary and that the Communists should support them. Roy, on the other hand, said that they were not revolutionary and therefore unworthy of support, that the Communists must not enter even into "a temporary alliance with them". Lenin insisted that the Communists in India must work in bourgeois nationalist organisations for some time because they were anti-imperialist and because there were no proletarian organisations in India, and to form a Communist Party would take some time. Lenin's thesis had referred to "future proletarian parties" in the colonies and to the fact that there the proletarian movement was "still in the embryonic state". (Ibid, p. 574).

As opposed to Lenin, Roy argued that the first and foremost task was to form the Communist Party of India that would organise the peasants and workers and lead them to revolution and to the establishment of Soviet Republics. Roy insisted that there were important revolutionary parties in India (apparently Roy meant the terrorist groups with which he was acquainted and that the Communists should work in them in preference to bourgeois organisations. (It did not take Roy long to get disillusioned with his "revolutionaries" on whom he counted to build up the C.P.I. Roy admits: "The Moscow visit of the Indian revolutionaries from Berlin was an unpleasant interlude,.....")

[did] destroy my illusions about the famous revolutionaries to a large extent."—(Memoirs, p. 495).

After a prolonged debate the resolution that was finally adopted was as follows: "With regard to those states and nationalities where a backward, mainly feudal, patriarchal, or patriarchal-agrarian regime prevails, the following must be borne in mind: 1) All Communist Parties must give active support to the revolutionary movements of liberation, the form of support to be determined by a study of the existing conditions, carried on by the party wherever there is such." (The Second Congress of the Comintern, Proceedings, p. 174).

Thus it can be seen that Roy succeeded in slightly modifying Lenin's formulation. The change from "bourgeois democratic liberation movement" to "revolutionary movements of liberation" was more apparent than real; it was not fundamental. As Lenin asserted in the debate, "there is no doubt that every nationalist movement can be only a bourgeois democratic movement." (Ibid, p. 109). But the changed wordings led to different interpretations.

III. Roy's "India in Transition"

Roy was not content with the decisions of the Second Congress. He proceeded to elaborate his theory in a book called *India in Transition*, which he wrote in collaboration with Abani Mukherji and which was published towards the end of 1922. It was a stimulating work, being the first attempt to analyse and assess Indian conditions from a Marxist point of view and as such exerted a good deal of influence in those days on the Communists and progressives, especially in India. But unfortunately the basic theories propounded by Roy in that book were un-Marxist and, in the long run, did a lot of harm to the Indian Communist movement.

In this book, Roy just as seriously overestimated the role and potential of the Indian bourgeoisie as he underestimated the strength of Gandhism and feudalism. There he says: "The impending wane of Gandhism [Gandhi had then suspended the non-co-operation movement after the Chauri Chaura incident in February 1923] and for that he had to face a lot of criticism at

that time] signifies the collapse of the reactionary forces and their total elimination from the political movement." (*India in Transition*, p. 205). In reality, Roy was just indulging in wishful thinking. How wrong Roy was in his analysis the next 25 years of the history of the Indian national movement was to prove. That feudalism can vanish by itself, without a serious battle against it by peasants and workers, i.e., without a bourgeois-democratic revolution, was, to say the least, an infantile illusion. Roy's politics was based on such illusions and not on the reality of the situation.

The book begins by denying the accepted fact that the basic feature of India's economic and social life was feudal. "Contrary to the general notion", says Roy, "India is not under the feudal system." (*India in Transition*: p. 17. Roy emphatically repeats the same statement in his *Memoirs* (p. 552); "Contrary to the prevailing notion among the Bolsheviks, the predominating social factor in contemporary India was not feudalism)." The rising bourgeoisie, which was already well-established, was the dominant political factor in India. But it was being hampered by British rulers from fully exploiting the economic opportunities offered by increasing industrialization of India. So it comes to a political clash with British imperialism. But side by side mass impoverishment has also grown, which has roused the political consciousness of the people. If the bourgeoisie unite with the masses British rule in India will be endangered. In order to prevent such a union, the British make some political and economic concessions to the bourgeoisie. Due to these concessions, the Indian bourgeoisie vacillate. But it wants more and to get more concessions from the British, it must show its ability to speak for the growing mass revolutionary movement. But, just like the imperialists, the Indian bourgeoisie is also haunted by the fear that these revolutionary masses might eventually threaten its own existence. Thus a time comes when it strikes a bargain with imperialism and relinquishes all revolutionary role.

India in Transition also revealed Roy's utter contempt for the masses, particularly of the peasantry, when he dealt with the

'Sepoy Mutiny'. We have seen before how Marx and Engels keenly followed the Great Rebellion of 1857 and how they acclaimed it from the first as a national revolt—a revolutionary uprising of the Indian people of all classes against British rule and how they stressed the revolutionary role of the peasantry—their active participation in the war, their guerrilla tactics and their efforts to cut off British communications and supply lines. They ardently hoped that the revolt would triumph.

How does Roy look at 1857? "The last vestiges", says Roy, "of feudal power were shattered by the failure of the revolution of 1857, which is known as the Sepoy Mutiny. The revolution of 1857 was nothing but the last effort of the dethroned feudal potentates to regain the worn-out feudal system and the newly introduced [British] commercial capitalism for political supremacy." (*India in Transition*, p. 17.)

Let us now see how Marx saw 1857? "It is for the first time", wrote Marx, "that sepoy regiments have murdered their European officers, that Mussulmans and Hindus, renouncing their mutual antipathies, have combined against their common masters, that 'disturbances beginning with the Hindus, have actually ended in placing on the throne of Delhi a Mohammedan Emperor [Bahadur Shah]'; that the mutiny has not been confined to a few localities; and lastly, that the revolt of the Anglo-Indian army has coincided with a general disaffection exhibited against English supremacy on the part of the Great Asiatic nations, the revolt of the Bengal army being, beyond doubt, intimately connected with the Persian and Chinese wars." (Marx-Engels: *The First Indian War of Independence*, p. 40.)

Thus it is quite clear that Roy's views were quite opposite to those of Marx and Engels. Pursuing the same wrong line Roy further stated:

"... by no means could it be looked upon as a national movement. It was nothing more than the last spasm of dying feudalism. In so far as it aimed at the overthrow of foreign domination, which had obstructed the social growth of the people, the revolt of 1857 was revolutionary, but socially it was a reactionary movement because it wanted to replace British

rule by revived feudal imperialism, either of the Moghals or the Marhattas." (*India in Transition*, p. 61. It is to be observed how R. P. Dutt repeated this theory of Roy almost word for word.)

Again, "The objectively reactionary character was the reason of its failure. It could not have been suppressed had it been a progressive national movement, led by native bourgeoisie with advanced social ideals and political programme. But such a movement was impossible in that epoch. The necessary social elements were absent." (*India in Transition*, p. 161)

The most important fact about the Great Rebellion of 1857 was that it was basically a peasant rebellion. Just because the peasants in their thousands and tens of thousands actively participated in various ways and fought with arms in hand over a wide area, it took the British more than two years to suppress it by employing its maximum power. (Suprakash Roy in his *Bharater Krishak Bidroha O Ganatantrik Sangram* and Promode Sengupta in his *Bharatiya Maha-Bidroha : 1857* have dealt with the peasant character of the Rebellion of 1857.)

Yes, the Great Rebellion was led by the feudal class. So what? At that time, in mid-nineteenth century India, the bourgeoisie or the proletariat was in infancy, so the question of bourgeois or proletarian leadership could not arise in 1857. Only the anti-British elements of the feudal class came forward to give the leadership to the peasant rebellion. Actually, the bulk of the feudal class, particularly all the ruling feudal princes, helped the British.

The main question in 1857 was not its leadership, but the liberation of the Indian people from colonial slavery even if it was under the leadership of the feudal class. That is why, Marx was glad to see Bahadur Shah on the throne of Delhi and called Sindhia, Jang Bahadur of Nepal, etc. who fought for the British "running dogs of the British," "English dog-man." As early as 1853 Marx realised the importance of Indian independence and wrote: "The Indians will not reap the fruits of the new elements of society scattered among them by the British bourgeoisie, till in Great Britain itself the new ruling class shall have been supplanted by the industrial proletariat, or till the Hindu

themselves shall have grown strong enough to throw off the English yoke altogether." (Marx-Engels: *The First Indian War of Independence*, p. 37.)

Dealing with the present stage of world proletarian revolution Mao Tse-tung says: "No matter what class, parties or individuals in the oppressed nations join the revolution, and no matter whether or not they are conscious of the point mentioned above [the significance of the proletarian revolution] or subjectively understand it, so long as they oppose imperialism, their revolution becomes part of the proletarian socialist world revolution and they themselves become its allies." (Mao Tse-tung: *On New Democracy, Collected Works*, Vol. III, pp. 114-15.)

Instead of adopting an anti-imperialist revolutionary attitude and as opposed to Marx-Lenin-Stalin-Mao's people-oriented outlook, Roy advocated a philosophy of petty-bourgeois philistines. Instead of 'having faith in the masses' ("We must have faith in the masses and we must have faith in the Party. These are two cardinal principles. If we doubt these we shall accomplish nothing."—Mao Tse-tung: *On the Question of Agricultural Co-operation*) he idealised the slavish psychology of the highbrow petty bourgeois intellectuals, as is revealed in the following passage:

"It [the rebellion of 1857] was provoked by a fierce spirit of social reaction, being a revolt not against the British Government in particular, but against the advanced social and political ideas it embodied,—the ideas which were hailed by the intellectual middle-class of India, because the latter was materially prepared for them, and would itself have evolved them, had they not been brought into the country through the agency of a foreign conqueror...."

"Inadvertently, it [Western education] let loose that dynamic social force which was destined to prove eventually mortal to the British, and in order to be able to fulfil its historic mission, had to prove itself an enemy of the native reactionary elements which stood in the way of progress in the name of national culture and tradition. As a result of this policy of introducing Western education, a class of intellectuals with

modern thought and progressive tendencies had come into existence already in the 30's of the 19th century. Still, in its infancy, this progressive element showed signs of vigour in social and religious reformism..... The social significance of the Revolt of 1857 was the reaction it embodied against this revolutionary force, which had not appeared as such till then, but which was the harbinger of a new India to be dominated neither by a foreign imperialism however liberal, nor by the native conservatism however glorified." (*India in Transition*, pp. 126-64.)

Roy's contempt for the peasantry and the working class and his faith in the enlightened petty bourgeois intellectuals was the result of his Trotskyite sympathy. When Roy was writing his *India in Transition*, the question of NEP (New Economic Policy) was the most burning problem in Russia. Although the Civil War had ended, famine was raging in the country. War Communism (forcible collection of grains etc.) which was a necessary measure during the war of intervention and the Civil War, was now being resented; people wanted relaxation. There was terrible food shortage in the towns and cities and shortage of necessities in the villages. The kulaks, who had surplus, refused to give grains to the state, and destroyed their live-stock instead of giving it to the Government.

Lenin and Stalin advocated NEP as a remedy. Trotsky, head of the Red Army, and at that time a very popular figure in Russia, in opposition to NEP, advocated military dictatorship. As the organizer of the Red Army, he had obtained increasing control over all available man-power; gradually all trade unions were brought under military control. After the Civil War the soldiers demanded demobilization, but when they went home there was no job for them. Trotsky wanted to form labour battalions with them. He declared that like soldiers, workers also must be forced to do their duty. Obviously, Trotsky was heading towards Bonapartist adventure. (He himself admitted that he had taken 30,000 Czarist officers into the Red Army. (Roy : *Memoirs*, p. 496). But the Kronstadt revolt in March 1921 came as a serious warning. The very existence of the Soviet regime was in danger. One week after this revolt the Tenth Congress of

the CPSU was held which accepted the NEP. Trotsky with his theory of Permanent Revolution vehemently fought against the NEP. Lenin and Stalin had to fight hard against him for its acceptance. The NEP, which allowed free trade in grains and allowed some concessions to capitalism, was undoubtedly a retreat from socialism. But this retreat was necessitated by the prevailing conditions and it saved the Soviet Union. At the root of all this was the question of the peasantry. Trotsky regarded the peasantry as a reactionary block; in Russia the peasants formed the overwhelming majority, while the proletariat was only a small minority. Ignoring the fact that the proletariat captured power in Russia with the help of the peasantry and could also retain it with its help, Trotsky held that to save the Russian revolution it was absolutely essential to have proletarian revolution in the advanced industrialized countries. This, in short, was Trotsky's theory of Permanent Revolution, which only boiled down to military adventurism.

Where did Roy stand in these controversies? He himself says: "...in the discussions in the higher circles of the Bolshevik Party, I supported the opposition to the NEP. ...[I] came to be known as one of his [Trotsky's] ardent admirers and staunch supporters." (M. N. Roy : *Memoirs*, p. 503.)

Royism has much similarity with Trotskyism. The main characteristics of Royism are : (1) his theory of Indian revolution is anti-Marxist and anti-Leninist; (2) he is contemptuous and distrustful of the peasantry, and denies its revolutionary role; (3) his reliance on the so-called revolutionary role of the petty-bourgeois intelligentsia as the main force of Indian revolution.

So long Roy was in the Comintern he exerted tremendous influence on the Indian Communists. Even after his expulsion his ideas continued to be propagated by R. P. Dutt, and sometimes through him and sometimes directly the CPI leaders like Dange, P.C. Joshi, Ranadive, Ajoy Ghosh, Muzaffar Ahmad, Namboodiripad, Sundarayya—all inherited Roy's theories which have dominated the Party for the last forty years—sometimes and sometimes surreptitiously,—sometimes as revisionism

and opportunism and sometimes as ultra-leftism. The Party leadership could never get rid of its anti-Marxist, anti-Leninist inheritance of Roy.

IV. Formation of CPI At Tashkent

Early in 1920 many Indian Muslims protesting against the ill-treatment of the Sultan and Caliph of Turkey by the British left India for Afghanistan. They numbered nearly 20,000. They were called *Muhajirs* (emigres). Most of these *Muhajirs* were fanatical Khilafatists and Pan-Islamists and wanted to go to Turkey to fight for the Sultan. They were soon to be disillusioned when they found that it was the Turks themselves under the revolutionary leadership of Kemal Pasha who abolished the Caliphate as well as the Sultanate and declared Turkey a secular republic.

However, after many vicissitudes some of the *Muhajirs* reached Tashkent. To Tashkent also came many Indian deserters from the British Army. They were all good materials—militant and daring—only requiring ideological training. A school was started for them. Some of them would not change much and remained religious bigots as before, but others became as enthusiastically devoted to Communism as they had previously been to the cause of the Caliphate. It was they who insisted on the immediate formation of the Communist Party of India.¹

¹Muzaffar Ahmad is very angry with Roy because he says in his *Memoirs* that the *Muhajirs*, though very anti-British had no conception of democracy. Ahmad says: "This is a worthless statement" and suggests an ideological similarity between Islam and Communism. It is not unlikely that Ahmad is very much influenced by Sheikh Musher Hosain Kidwai's *Pan-Islamism and Bolshevism* (London, 1937). Kidwai enunciates some strong similarities between Islam and Communism: (1) both sought to establish human equality and brotherhood; (2) both advocated internationalism; (3) neither permitted any race or colour inequality; (4) both were opposed to capitalism or landlordism; (5) both encouraged work and labour. As a matter of fact, all religions—not Islam alone, but also Chris-

The Second Congress had set up a Central Asiatic Bureau with the Red Army Chief of the Eastern Section, Sokolnikov, as its chairman and Bukharin, Roy and Safaroy as members. This Bureau was also called the "Turk" Bureau because Turkistan became its centre of activity. At that time all the Central and Middle Eastern countries as well as China and India were passing through a turmoil. The purpose of the Bureau was to spread Communist ideas in all these countries and also to set up

tianity, Buddhism, Judaism, Confucianism, even the caste-ridden Hinduism—can more or less claim all these features. This kind of approach is an attempt to interpret history without class struggle and is therefore out and out anti-Marxist. That is what Ahmad does. He goes so far as to idealize the reactionary Khilafat movement in India as well as the institution of Caliphate which for centuries kept down the masses in feudal slavery and medieval darkness. Ahmad says: "It was out of the Khilafat movement that, indeed, the non-cooperation struggle emerged [Sic]. Hindus had joined the Khilafat agitation.....Roy had acquainted himself with Islamic literature. He had also read the Quran. How can it be that inspite of having made such study he could not realise that Islam was based on a brand of democracy? Didn't the young *muhajirs* have any conception of Muslim democracy, if of nothing else? There was, and perhaps still is, in the Muslim mind something like a feeling of international fraternity, and its symbol was the *Khilafat*." (*The C.P.I. and its Formation Abroad*, pp. 73-74). It seems that Ahmad, the founder-member of the CPI, has thrown overboard all Marxist-Leninist teachings on religion. Just as Ahmad is proud of Muslim democracy and Muslim international fraternity, in the same way the Danges and Namboodiripads are proud of their Brahminism under their skin. What wonder that after 40 years of efforts there is no Marxist-Leninist Communist Party in India yet? However, in order to fight religious fanaticism, Lenin had to put a strong clause against Pan-Islamism in his draft colonial thesis for the Second Comintern Congress in 1922. Does Ahmad know it?

military organisations of these peoples to bring about revolutions wherever possible. The Bureau called a Congress of the Peoples of the East in September 1920 at Baku where 32 countries were represented. The Indian delegation consisted of 14 members under the leadership of Abani Mukherji. This was the time when the Muslims, like all oppressed peoples, were being attracted to Bolshevism because it had destroyed the Czarist regime which had enslaved many Muslims and because the Bolsheviks had declared equality of races and nationalities and were offering active assistance to their liberation struggles.

It was as a member of this Bureau that Roy came to Tashkent. He was anxious to recruit from the *Muhajirs*, deserters and others an army which would invade India. (All these activities became so menacing that Lord Curzon, the then British Foreign Minister, protested to the Soviet Government against the Indian Military school at Tashkent.) At that time Raja Mahendra Pratap and Barkatullah had set up a "Provisional Government of Free India" at Kabul and they also started negotiating with Moscow with a view to organizing an Indian Army for fighting the British in India. All these military plans did not materialise—the Indian army could not be formed.

At Tashkent Roy, with the help of his wife Evelyn, concentrated on the political training of the Indians there. Shaukat Usmani, and Mohammed Shafik were very enthusiastic about forming the CPI immediately. Abdur Rab and Tirumal Acharya, who came from Afghanistan, also insisted that the CPI should be formed at once at Tashkent. Roy says in his *Memoirs* that he was opposed to the idea but at the end he had to yield. Thus the Communist Party of India was first formed at Tashkent in November 1920. But there is some dispute about the exact date and year; some say that the CPI was formed in the beginning of 1921.¹

¹Characteristically Muzaffar Ahmad has picked up a quarrel with Roy—why has not Roy given the exact date and year about the formation of the emigre CPI?—and writes pages after pages chastising Roy for his indifference, although Ahmad himself says that Roy "wrote his memoirs long after the event

In April 1921 the CPI and the school were transferred from Tashkent to Moscow and a Communist University of the Toilers of the East was established. At the Tashkent school, there were about 100 Indians; only 22 of them were taken to Moscow, joined the Red Army, the rest went back to India. The CPI was affiliated to the Communist International.

and perhaps he could not exactly recall the time". (*The Communist Party of India and its Formation Abroad*, p. 58). But how is it that after Ahmad has raised such 'important' polemics he himself makes contradictory statements? In one place he says: "It was in Tashkent that the first foundations were laid of the emigre Communist Party of India". (Ibid, p. 74). Again, "the date of the Party's foundation, if it was not 1920, could not have been later than early 1921". (Ibid, p. 83). In another place Ahmad says: "After getting their education for sometime here [at the University of the Toilers of the East, Moscow], when they [the Indian Communists who came from Tashkent] accepted Marxist ideology, they formed the Communist Party of India in Moscow (1921)". (*Bharater Communist Party garar prathama jug* (Bengali), p. 14). Mohammed Shafik became the first Secretary of the CPI.

BIHAR STATE CO-ORDINATION COMMITTEE'S CALL

On behalf of the Bihar State Co-ordination Committee, Revolutionary Section of C.P.I. (M), Comrade Satyanarain Singh has issued the following statement :

With the toppling of yet another non-Congress Ministry, this time in Bihar, the most popular query addressed to political leaders is—"What next ?"

The ex-ministers of the toppled united front ministry, including those calling themselves communists, have a ready-made answer to the query which they have been blaring out to the people through all media of propaganda and other conceivable methods. Their answer is that the people should lay down their lives for installing the U. F. regimes back again in power. However, we, the revolutionary section of the C.P.I. (M), most sharply differ with this answer as, in our opinion, the U. F. coalitions do not represent an advance for the Indian people in their struggle against imperialism, feudalism and bureaucratic capitalism.

The people have learnt through bitter experience that non-Congressism is another name for the careerist politics being frantically pursued by the renegades of the Indian communist movement in league with other agents of the ruling classes.

The last ten months have proved beyond a shadow of doubt that coalition ministries are no alternatives to the capitalist-landlord rule, on the contrary, they are a variety of the same. Further, they are useful to the ruling classes in as much as they serve to instil illusions among the toiling people about parliamentary democracy and divert their attention from revolutionary struggles to establish a People's Democratic State in India.

The people have found their hopes for a better life under a non-Congress coalition shattered which no amount of demagogy

is going to revive. They have learnt that so long as the state machinery retained its present character and so long as it is not smashed and replaced by a People's Democratic state machinery, change of ministers and ministries would not be of any value for the toiling people. Is it not a fact that those who promised relief to the toilers have practically done nothing during the last ten months to lessen their burden? The soaring prices, growing scarcity of food and other consumer articles, the growing number of lay-offs, lock-outs, retrenchment and closures rendering thousands of workers jobless, the feverish drive of the landlords towards evicting the tillers from the land and growing impoverishment of the peasantry and the urban middle class leave no room for the theory of "providing relief through the coalitions", which is a mere deception being practised by the careerists.

The black-marketeers have had a free run, hoarders and profiteers have had a good time and the landlords usurped a rich harvest during the coalition regimes. In Bihar, the minorities were butchered while the Jana Sangh basked in the sunshine of the glory that was the non-Congress coalition. P.D. Acts continued and were used against communists and others for voicing people's demands. Those who had promised to use the coalition as a "weapon of mass struggles" soon changed colours and unleashed brutal repression on workers and peasants, students and youths. The Mugma firing and the Naxalbari repression are living monuments depicting the treachery of the Dangeites and Ranadiveites to the toiling people of our country.

Therefore, while we continue to offer all-out opposition against the Congress regimes, whether in the Centre or in the Provinces, we cannot ask people to lay down their lives for installing traitors to the cause of the toiling people in power. We shall urge the people not to pin their faith on any of the constituents of the United Front as there is no difference between tweedledum and tweedledee. We shall exhort the people not to waste their energy in futile exercises of ministry-making but to unleash struggles to dislodge the reactionary state step by step, from the rural areas and establish real people's power.

Experiences of the last 20 years in India and also of other Asian countries of similar status and character have shown that only an agrarian revolution with worker-peasant unity as its base could throw out the reactionary regime of the big landlords and big capitalists and establish PEOPLES' DEMOCRACY. Considered from this angle, the slogans of mid-term poll and non-Congress coalitions are nothing but a ruse to hoodwink the people. What is necessary is the unfolding of revolutionary peasant struggles of the Naxalbari type on a wide scale and not opportunist exercises in ministry-making. It is time that revolutionary struggle for smashing the state machine began.

26. 1. 1968

To Appear In LIBERATION

MARCH 1968

1. Important Questions During Agrarian Reform by Jen. Pi-shi
2. A New Assessment of the History of the CPI
3. Towards Victory in Vietnam
4. British Rule Totters in Hongkong
5. Take up the Task of Building a Revolutionary Party and other Articles and Notes

Revolutionary Comrades On The March

We were very pleasantly surprised to read a brief review of *Liberation*, entitled "On the Road to Revolution", in the January issue of *People's Path*, Monthly Organ of the Desh Bhagat Yadgar Committee, Jullundar. This journal, which supported the Naxalbari struggle from the very beginning and has been waging a determined fight against revisionism and neo-revisionism has made the following comment:

"In *Liberation*, for the first time in India, we meet with an English journal which attempts to assess Indian reality and to chalk out the road for future progress of India by applying the great heritage of the science of marxism-leninism as it has been developed since its birth by Lenin, Stalin, and most important of all for our time, Comrade Mao Tse-tung. Marxism-Leninism of today, shorn of all revisionist and national chauvinist pretensions, is the thought of Mao Tse-tung. The universal applicability of the idea of the agrarian revolution and people's war developed by Mao Tse-tung has been accepted by all seriously inclined Marxist-Leninists as far as the underdeveloped countries of Asia, Africa and Latin America are concerned."

Our contemporary has been very generous in appreciating *Liberation*; we, on our behalf, while conscious of our limitations, will earnestly try to prove worthy of this praise. The truth is, after a long period of right opportunism, which has prevented the growth of the Party and betrayed the revolution, the rank and file comrades everywhere are beginning to acquire a class outlook and considering the problems of the Indian Revolution in the light of Marxism-Leninism, in the light of Mao Tse-tung's thought. The idea of the agrarian revolution and people's war is today gripping the minds and imagination of political workers belonging to the CPI (M) as well as to other so-called socialist and communist parties. A ferment is going on within various such parties and we are on the threshold of a new era in

the history of our Party and people. The old with its opportunism, factionalism and non-class outlook is dying, the new with its love of and faith in the toiling people and loyalty to Marxism-Leninism, Mao Tse-tung's thought, is emerging. Revolutionary comrades are on the march throughout India.

TAMILNAD

Our comrades in Tamilnad have been bringing out from this New Year's Day a weekly in Tamil—*Puratchikanal* (*Revolutionary Flame*). The *Flame*, we are sure, will burn brighter and brighter with the passing of days and kindle another flame that will engulf the whole of Tamilnad, the whole of India.

Our comrades there are also taking steps to co-ordinate their activities and set up the Tamilnad State Organising Committee of revolutionary comrades.

PUNJAB

A meeting was held by the representatives of Punjab revolutionaries of the Indian Communist Party (Marxist). After forming their Co-ordination Committee they have released the following statement to the press :

A meeting of the revolutionaries of the Communist Party of India (Marxist), representing the different districts of Punjab, was held and it welcomed the Naxalbari Kisan Revolt. In the light of the declaration of the all-India Co-ordination Committee, the meeting strongly condemned the betrayal of the great peasant revolt of Naxalbari by the treacherous leaders of the CPI (M).

In the view of the Punjab revolutionaries the neo revisionists have betrayed Marxism-Leninism and Mao's thought and given up the class struggle and have entered into the mire of parliamentarism. They have joined the counter-revolutionary camp and have unmasked their dual face by passing the notorious Madurai resolutions. Supporting whole-heartedly the declaration of the All-India Co-ordination Committee of the Revolutionaries of the Indian Communist Party (Marxist), the meeting called upon the revolutionaries of Punjab to carry forward the peasant struggles on the line of Naxalbari by openly revolting against the traitor clique of Loyalpuri and Surjeet and organise

a genuine Communist Party on the basis of Marxism-Leninism and Mao's thought.

BIHAR

Revolutionary comrades of C. P. I. (M) of Bihar met on 9th & 10th December, 1967 and adopted the following appeal :

Appeal to Revolutionary comrades in C.P.I. (M). Bihar State

With the revolutionary struggle of the peasants in Naxalbari, the struggle of Marxist-Leninists against revisionism in the Indian Communist movement has reached a new stage. The neo-revisionist face of the leadership of the C. P. I. (M) is exposed once for all, and it has been proved beyond a shadow of doubt that their professed loyalty to Marxism-Leninism is nothing but pretension.

The struggle in Naxalbari and many struggles that have subsequently burst forth in several parts of our country prove the contention of the revolutionary section of the C.P.I.(M) that an excellent revolutionary situation obtains in our country with all the characteristics pointed out by Lenin, and the utter bankruptcy of the contrary preachings of the neo-revisionist leadership is quite apparent. It is absolutely clear for all who care to see that the leadership of the C.P.I.(M) has finally abandoned the path of seizure of state power by revolutionary means and instead has taken to the path of corrupt Parliamentarism and class collaboration. Never before in history has any leadership claiming to be loyal to Marxism-Leninism collaborated with the reactionaries in unleashing brutal police repression on a people's struggle as has been done by the leadership of the party in Naxalbari. Repression on the fighting peasantry, militant working class and brave students, and expulsions of revolutionary cadres of the party supporting and conducting these struggles denote that the leadership is determined to transform our party into an appendage of imperialism, feudalism and bureaucratic capitalism.

However, there is nothing fortuitous in the disastrous course being followed presently by the party leadership. As a matter

of fact, their conspiracy to subvert the struggle against revisionism had begun even before our organisational split with the renegade Dange clique. The split was artificially engineered mainly on the issue of the Dange letters and the party was formed without the full maturing of the ideological polarisation in the party, which is necessary for the formation of a revolutionary organisation. The leadership surreptitiously smuggled formulations into the party programme which run counter to Marxism-Leninism and the thought of Mao Tse-tung. In the name of applying the general principles of Marxism-Leninism in a concrete manner, the leadership sought to conceal the neo-colonialist nature and the semi-colonial and semi-feudal character of our economy and thereby refused to accept the strategic and tactical tasks emanating therefrom for the Indian revolution. They sought to hide the naked reality that the Indian big bourgeoisie has no fundamental contradiction with Imperialism and is compradore and bureaucratic in nature. In essence, they made painstaking efforts indirectly to prove that what we have in India is some sort of an independent capitalist economy and that the anti-imperialist role of the Indian big bourgeoisie has not been exhausted. In this way, they sought to refute the teachings of Comrade Mao Tse-tung on world revolution in general and the revolutions in Asia, Africa and Latin America in particular. Their claim that neither the lessons of the Russian Revolution nor those of the Chinese Revolution apply in the case of India is nothing but a demagogic ruse to hide the real intention which is that there should be no revolution in India. Similarly, the seemingly innocent posture of neutrality between the C. P. S. U. and C. P. C. on issues of ideological controversy is nothing but a shameless attempt to aid Khrushchev revisionism and disrupt the international front of Marxist-Leninists.

There is absolutely no doubt that the leadership has taken advantage of the deep anger in the party ranks against the renegade Dange clique and utilized it to further their own factional interests in the name of struggle against revisionism.

The Naxalbari struggle proved in practice that the situation in India is ripe for unleashing revolutionary political struggles and

developing rural base areas. It proved that the time has come when revolutionaries in the C.P.I.(M) should unite and co-ordinate their efforts for rebuilding the Communist Party so as to give proper leadership to these struggles. This task could not be fulfilled without uncompromising struggle against revisionism and giving it a speedy burial.

It is therefore a matter of great jubilation for the Marxist-Leninists that revolutionary representatives of the party met at Calcutta and decided to unite and co-ordinate their activities. We warmly support the Declaration issued by the Central Co-ordination Committee and call upon all the revolutionary comrades of Bihar and the C.P.I.(M) to rise and take up arms against the neo-revisionist politics of the leadership of the party and fulfil the sacred tasks entrusted by history. We call upon all the revolutionary comrades inside the party to unite with those outside it in implementing the following tasks set by the Central Co-ordination Committee :

- (1) To develop and co-ordinate militant, revolutionary struggles at all levels, specially, peasant struggles of the Naxalbari type under the leadership of the working class ;
- (2) To develop militant, revolutionary struggles of the working class and other toiling people, to combat economism and to orient these struggles towards agrarian revolution ;
- (3) To wage an uncompromising ideological struggle against revisionism and neo-revisionism and to popularise the Thought of Comrade Mao Tse-tung, which is Marxism-Leninism of the present era and to unite on this basis all revolutionary elements within and outside the Party ;
- (4) To undertake preparations of a revolutionary programme and tactical line based on concrete analysis of the Indian situation in the light of Comrade Mao Tse-tung's Thought.

We also decide to form a State Co-ordination Committee to co-ordinate the efforts of all the revolutionaries for fulfilling the above tasks.

Let every Communist join in this historic task.

ALLAHABAD

Comrade Ambika Prasad Mishra, Secretary, Allahabad District Committee, C.P.I. (Marxist), has issued the following statement :
Our attention has been drawn towards a news item appearing in the press saying that the District Committee of the Party has been dissolved by the State Committee at its meeting on 15, 16 and 17 December at Varanasi. It an unprecedented step in the history of the party that a District Committee has been dissolved without even going through the formalities of giving a charge-sheet and holding an inquiry into the alleged charge. The District Committee neither received any commu-

nication about the charges nor did any member of the State Committee ask for any meeting of the Committee. It has been alleged that in the opinion of the State Committee the District Committee was incapable of carrying out the policy and programme of the party. How the distinguished State Committee came to this conclusion is not known. It has also been alleged that the State Committee had information to the effect that the responsible members of the District Committee were propagating extreme Leftist opinion associating themselves with anti-party activities. If that was so, the State Committee ought to have expelled them instead of dissolving the District Committee.

As far as the Organising Committee announced by Sri Satya Narain Tiwari is concerned, two of its members had been charge-sheeted, another member had been expelled, another's application for membership was rejected and the fifth one was only a candidate member. The meeting in which the decision was announced and the organising committee formed consisted of 15 persons among whom there were only two party members. How much support in the party exists for this action is evident from these facts. There is no question of carrying out the directives of this so-called Organising Committee. The District Committee of the party is functioning as it alone is the sole authority of the party having been elected by the District Conference. I condemn this anti-party action of the State Committee and appeal to the party members and sympathisers not to have relation with this so-called Organising Committee at the party level.

KERALA

We publish an extract from a letter addressed to us by a comrade from Trivandrum :

"At the outset let me greet the Revolutionary comrades of the C.P.I. (M.) and the revolutionary peasants of Darjeeling for their heroic revolutionary armed struggle and establishment of a red area in Naxalbari. The spark in Darjeeling has strengthened and invigorated the revolutionaries in the Party and the revolutionary people of Kerala. The process of struggle for building a genuinely revolutionary Party of Marxism-Leninism, Mao Tse-tung's Thought, is in the offing in Kerala too as in other parts of India.

"With much enthusiasm we from this part of India look up to *Liberation* for guidance and the articles like "Spring Thunder Over India", "Indian Revolution", "Time to Build up a Revolutionary Party", etc., in the first issue of *Liberation* and "Declaration of the Revolutionaries in the C. P. I. (M.)", etc., in the second issue of *Liberation* have very much impressed the revolutionary comrades of the Party as well the revolutionary people of Kerala."

"I WILL UNMASK MYSELF"

—RANADIVE

—Partha Choudhuri

In the January issue, *Liberation* reproduced some Pages from *Party History* which our readers may have found quite illuminating. In the following very interesting extracts from the Self-Critical Report (too lengthy to be reproduced in its entirety) dated May 20, 1950, and from the report of his Self-Critical Speeches made on May 28, 29 and 31, 1950, by B. T. Ranadive, then General Secretary of the C. P. I. and now the chief 'theoretician' of the C.P.I. (M), member of its Polit Bureau and editor of its central organ, *People's Democracy*, Ranadive accuses himself of various crimes against the Party. Let him first unburden his soul :

"It is difficult to write an adequate criticism of one's own mistakes when one has piled up a record of mistakes and crimes in a short period [1948-50]."

* * *

"In the past also I had been guilty of worst kind of left-sectarian error—left sect-arianism was natural to me."

* * *

"On the basis of this understanding there was an opportunist underestimation of the necessity and prospect of armed struggle in the rural areas and under the guise of developing a General Political Strike—the supremacy of the weapon of economic strike was practically asserted. The talk of political general strike in the cities led to adventurist practice only.

"Thus the special and specific form of the armed revolution in the colonies was totally missed as was the national liberation character of the struggle itself."

* * *

"This left-sectarianism was reinforced prior to the Party Congress [the Second Congress in 1948] by writings of Kardelj [the chief theoretician of the treacherous Tito clique] and others which were at one time in vogue with us. Partly at least, the economic analysis made in the Political Thesis [adopted at the Second Party Congress], formulations like 'The Government is relying on the national bourgeoisie', etc. are to be found in Kardelj's book—[*Problems of International Development*] and were fully utilised and

expounded by me to prove that the national bourgeoisie have gone over to the opposite camp."

"I am writing all this to show that I represent the most hardened left-sectarian trend and unless this is understood many subsequent things could not be understood...."

* * *

"How little this article [Comrade Alexeyev's article in the *Bolshevik*, central theoretical organ of the CPSU (B) led by Stalin, of September or October, 1948] affected my consciousness, how blind I had become could be seen from the fact that the documents which formally bade goodbye to anti-feudal, anti-imperialist character of our revolution—People's Democracy, Agrarian Question, Tactical Line—were written by me either immediately after reading this article or just before it. In any case it is a damning indictment of my understanding and power of grasping, my respect for the product of highest ideological authorities, that just when they were asserting for the benefit of our Party, the national liberationist, and anti-imperialist, anti-feudal character of our revolution, I was producing documents to prove exactly the opposite—decolonisation [the notorious anti-Leninist theory fathered by M. N. Roy], ignoring existence of imperialism, forgetting feudalism in agriculture etc.

"There can be no greater indictment than that in spite of this article I could not see the essentially sound revolutionary character of the tactical line put forward [in 1948 after the Second Party Congress] by the Andhra Secretariat [the only member of the Andhra Secretariat who opposed this tactical line and, like Ranadive, repudiated the anti-imperialist, anti-feudal character of the Indian Revolution, shielded imperialism and feudalism and preached the Titoite theory—the roots of which go back to M. N. Roy—of one-stage revolution—socialist revolution—was P. Sundarayya, now General Secretary of the CPI (M)] and attacked it from a rabid left-sectarian, semi-Trotskyist outlook.

"Neither the voice of colleagues, neither [nor] the voice from abroad could change my consciousness."

"To treat these articles [by Alexeyev, Zhukov etc.] lightly, not to have discussed them seriously in a PB meeting, not to have drawn the attention of the CCs to them and asked them to study them was nothing but unexampled conceit and arrogance and lack of political seriousness. To have failed to do all this, to have failed to understand the correctness given in the article showed my abysmal political ignorance, and extreme subjectiveness and

self-complacence. It is now difficult to tell with what mental gymnastics, what logical acrobatics I squared these articles with what I had written in the Political Thesis and what I subsequently wrote in the Tactical Line and other documents."

* * *

"This correct revolutionary lead [this refers to Mao Tse-tung's article on Chinese Revolution and the Communist Party of China, published in *China Digest* of March 1949], this warning against adventurism in the cities, this emphasis on the supreme importance of armed struggle in rural areas, and building of bases there—as the specific form of revolutionary struggle was all lost on me. It failed even to rouse me to the point of reconsidering my rejection of the Andhra Sectt.'s plea for Chinese way. **Blind egoism, self-complacence and refusal to learn cannot go further.**"

* * *

"Such is the story of refusal to learn; of blind left-sectarianism gone mad; of failure to respond to the authoritative voice of Marxism reaching from all directions. The unfathomable depths of political bankruptcy exhibited in this story, the entirely warped outlook, and the distorted understanding of politics which has become a second nature [mark the words]—all [is] seen in this story in its naked and unashamed form. No epithets, adjectives and political characterisation can adequately describe these crimes and failings."

* * *

"But if I had started travelling down the road of left-sectarianism before and after the Party Congress (in 1948), it should not be imagined that I was free from right-opportunist mistakes at that time. On the other hand I piled up a number of right opportunist mistakes at this time.

"Almost immediately after illegality I met EMS and discussed with him the Malabar situation. Malabar had seen a huge peasant upsurge accompanied by terror and brutalities at the hands of the Madras Government. It was an upsurge that had started before the Party Congress. It was an upsurge out of which was developing the armed struggle of the peasantry.

"And yet what did my advice and suggestions amount to? I of course did not say that armed resistance should not be there. But my cautions and warnings about our comrades only running with arms and forgetting to mobilise the people—all amounted to cautions against armed struggle and overstressing the possibility of peaceful mobilisation. Thus when Diwakar

suggested formation of squads for military training, I more or less discouraged it under the plea that the people must firstly be won over. I was totally underestimating the depth of the agrarian crisis and the forms of struggle that had to be developed. **In reality I who thundered against the old reformist conception of not allowing mass struggles to reach higher forms—was advocating the same line in relation to the peasant struggles.** The perspective of armed struggle in rural areas as a widely developing phenomenon, as the growing reality was not at all clear to me.

"This was equally seen in my articles on Hyderabad when I wrote about everything but failed to make Telengana and the attack against it as the central point. The underestimation of the importance of Telengana in the developments over accession was not accidental. **It was an underestimation of the armed struggle of the peasantry; the lack of faith that this struggle is not accidental, but has come to stay; lack of faith that it must spread and win.**

".....Thus with regard to the revolutionary form of struggle in the rural areas I was taking a right reformist attitude.

"Again the one or two documents on TU that I wrote in this period tended to become **adventurist** for they did not take into consideration the change that had come over in the cities vis-a-vis in the recent months, especially in the province of Madras. The review of Coimbatore strike, though it advises the comrades not to boycott works committees etc., yet misses the main point—which had already become clear by then; and that was the widespread political terror that was reigning supreme in the villages of Andhra and towns of Tamilnad. What was immediately required was to map out tactics of trade union struggle and organisation when in one part we are carrying on armed struggle in the rural areas and in another—the cities—white terror is raging. There is no mention of this central point in the document; on the other hand there is encouragement to militant forms of struggle—which is bound to lead to adventurist practice.

"Here the adventurist practice does not come from a conception of a General Strike in the cities leading directly to insurrection; but from a crude trade union economic point of view which does not understand the tactics of the daily struggles of the working class from the stage of the general political struggle; which does not relate these tactics to the stage of the armed struggle of the peasantry in the rural areas; which does not see the unity of the two struggles and their common aim, which therefore does not see that our

common enemy is wild with us because of our partisan action and is out to wreak vengeance on us in the cities.

"It is very necessary to understand this particular aspect of adventurism in the cities and trade union movement. Any tendency to lay down that in all provinces this adventurism arose out of 'General Strike—armed insurrection in the cities' conception will not be correct. Unless it is realised that the economist past of our trade union centres is also one of the contributory causes, in many cases, to adventurist practice in the cities and trade unions—it will not be easy to fight the trend which does not relate the tactics of the stage of trade union struggle to the stage reached by the political struggle in the country-side and to the fact that in cities the enemy finds it easy to direct the full force of its terror."

* * *

"The idea of the interlacing of the two revolutions, of reducing the liberation struggle virtually to a socialist revolution, which was dominant in my mind under the impact of Yugoslav Titoite ideology, and which found some veiled expression in the Political Thesis, which was given full and blatant expression in my speech to the Congress—now was made the basis of the tactical line. Thus the strategy outlined in these documents, the stage of the revolution given, the class composition given—all were departures and unpardonable departures from the Political Thesis. **The Political Thesis with all its faults did not base itself on the Titoite conception of People's Democratic Revolution whereas the Tactical Line and other documents did.** This is the basic difference between the Political Thesis and the PB documents."

* * *

"Along with this [the blatant repudiation of the Chinese path—"the special path of colonial revolution"] was the anti-Marxist conception of the so-called upsurge which was nothing but a veiled conception of spontaneously developing revolution with the Party only playing the role of intervention. **Under the guise of fighting reformism, under the pretext of fighting the tendency to run away from mass struggles, what was in essence advocated by me in my writings was tailing behind events without attempts to organise and lead the developing upsurge.** The experience of leading the movements in the old way, was leading to certain disastrous consequences, the new terror offensive of the Government required new ways and methods of revolutionary struggle; the growing attack against the Party required careful plans to protect the Party, expand it and develop it as the vanguard.

But all these were brushed aside. Whenever people raised these problems in their own way—they were brushed aside. **My line amounted to organisational liquidationism and reckless throwing away of cadres in the partial struggles without regard to the consequences.**"

"Just as under the guise of [mark the expression] attacking the Indian bourgeoisie I forgot imperialism and the national liberation struggle itself, so under the guise of protecting the unity of the masses, and revolutionary struggle, of fighting the machinations of the bourgeoisie of their nationalities, fighting their compromising policies, I threw out the very essence of the right of self-determination, the very struggle of the nationalities for self-determination."

"This attack on guerilla warfare and partisan action unmasked my bankruptcy. It became still more clear when we consider the way in which I attacked it. More or less in opposition to partisan action I put the idea of democratic front and wrongly criticised the Andhra comrades for forgetting the democratic front....In reality this criticism showed that I myself was living in the peace-period when it was thought that democratic front could be built peacefully by means of agitation, mobilisation and at most satyagraha-like struggle, when the role of partisan warfare as a unifying factor in rural areas was not seen. What I [was] practically advocating was—'build a democratic front first peacefully, i.e., without armed struggle and then think of partisan warfare.' This was nothing but a rejection of partisan armed warfare in the immediate present, leaving it to some distant date; thus underestimating both the depth of the crisis in agrarian areas and the undermining [of] faith in armed actions."

"The rejection of the Chinese path was thus not merely a question of forms of struggle etc., but a hopeless underestimation of the peasant question, of the force of agrarian revolution under colonial conditions; it is besides a failure to take the colonial character of India. The following constitute some of the major blunders that arose out of my deep-rooted left-sectarianism which dated back to 1929-30."

"Left-sectarianism in the final analysis is a bourgeois nationalist trend alien to Marxism, alien to proletarian internationalism. It repudiates the international experience of Marxism in a subtle way, without formally declaring its rupture with

it. The days when international Marxism-Leninism could be openly repudiated are gone. **The arrogant and conceited attack on Mao was part of this repudiation of Marxism-Leninism.** Even before the October Revolution the anti-Marxists dared not openly repudiate Marxism; they wanted to make Marxism more 'up-to-date'. After the revolution, the anti-Marxists said they accepted Marxism-Leninism but not Stalin. **My pose to accept Stalin and C.P.S.U. (B) only and at the same time attack on Mao was nothing but a subtle [mark the word 'subtle'] repudiation of Marxism-Leninism—for I was rejecting the concrete application of the teachings of Stalin on the colonial question. And this has been the essence of all bourgeois trends which masquerade as Marxism—accept in the abstract to repudiate, amend, ignore, revise in the concrete."**

"But little I learnt from the writings in *Bolshevik* and from writings of Stalin in spite of my vaunted boast, I have already shown. And it was natural. I could not learn a jot from these so long as I repudiated their concrete application which had led to the world-shaking event—of liberation of China. It is then no wonder that I refuse to learn from the many articles coming from China. **This refusal to learn together with the insolent article on Revisionism—in essence amounted to a theory and outlook of Indian exceptionalism, to the Titoite method of finding fault with other parties, repudiating the international experience in order to cover your own opportunist and anti-revolutionary practice.** The pose that we only learn from Marx, Engels etc.—was an attempt to demand freedom to interpret the teachings of Marx, Lenin, Stalin, to distort them to suit the left-sectarian [line]—under the guise of applying them to special Indian conditions."

"Both my political outlook, my methods of functioning, led to understanding [undermining?] and sabotage of collective functioning in the PB, CC and the party as a whole. It led to strengthen of [sic] the bureaucratic tendencies from top to bottom; a callous attitude to the ranks, to the lower committees, members of the Provincial Committees and members of the CC, it led to bureaucratising, snuffing [snuffing?] of criticism and self-criticism, inefficiency, incapacity, procrastination and failure to do jobs. Here again the key task of the General Secretary was not only not discharged, but my occupation of the post became a positive hindrance in the way of Party correcting its mistakes, in the way of the PBMs and CCMs

learning from events, ranks, situation, discussions and international directives and experience."

"This formal consultation with CCMs who were here etc. continued afterwards also. For instance, the 13th March Letter on Railway strike was circulated to the CCMs but no formal meeting or discussion was held. But the fact that no formal meeting of the PBMs or CCMs was held to discuss the failure of the Railway strike, no opportunity was taken of the CCMs being heard, to get them together and hold a proper meeting—some of them were in my den—speaks of the hardened bureaucratic attitude, which I had so swiftly developed towards Party forms and functioning. There could not be a more glaring instance of the individual substituting himself for the Unit, individualist way of functioning."

"Mechanical and bureaucratic way of functioning led to disastrous results, and further sabotage of collective functioning. Provincial documents were circulated only when the question of the Province was taken; otherwise they lay there. Things were happening in Tamilnad—Jail struggles, defections, repressions, expulsions—all of which should have been immediately attended to though the PBM concerned was not here. The entire T. N. situation should have been put before the PBMs, CCMs, decisions or suggestions taken.

"So also with regard to many other issues. Strike-calls were failing in Bombay; strikes were failing in Calcutta. Immediate intervention of the P.B. was necessary and proper guidance had to be given. No reports were called for. PB meeting was not held, consultations not held to study the situation.

"Things were happening in Calcutta—processions, hunger-strikes, bomb-throwings, arrests—a detailed study was necessary. In the whole year that I was here the P.B. formally even did not discuss the Bengal situation.

"The peasant struggle in Midnapore and Kakdwip—similarly was not discussed by the P.B."

"This bureaucratic attitude was applied to P.B.Ms also. Ram's letters and documents were placed before P.B.Ms months after they had been received, when it was decided to take up the entire Andhra dak. These documents contained important points about the big bourgeoisie etc. Ram's criticism of 9th March railway strike—letter which was received in June or July—and other things—yet they were not circulated immediately. Thus there was sabotage of collective thinking, functioning, even on the limited plane of circulation of documents".

"The failure to call a meeting of the C.C. in these two years is another big crime".

"From all this it should be clear how correct Ram was when he said about me; 'Joshi [P.C. Joshi, General Secretary of the C. P. I. from 1935 to 1948] is gone but Joshi's methods remained.'"

"At the Party Congress I myself had given a warning against bureaucratism, and condemned the bureaucratism of the old C.C. and P.B., its refusal to learn from the ranks, from the Provincial Committees, from each other. I commit, repeat, and multiply all these mistakes and inflict incalculable harm on the Party.

"All this led to nothing but the strangulating of the collective mind of the leadership which, had it functioned, would have saved the Party from the mistakes and disasters that have overtaken it.

"In tune with this bureaucratic and dictatorial functioning were the actions taken against C.C.Ms and P.C.Ms and the words used against them. The words used against the Jail comrades, against Bihar, T. N. [Tamilnad], Assam C. C. Ms and P.C Ms, against Jatin, Samsher, Kamat, Pandit, against Andhra C.C.Ms, Professor etc.—all unmask the extremely arrogant and bureaucratic attitude of mine. Further the actions taken against the P.C.s were disruptive of Party unity, and should be remedied immediately. Especially, the removal of T.N. P.C.M.s and C.C.Ms from the province.

"All these should be sufficient to show the great harm I have done through my left-sectarian mistakes and the organisational bureaucracy. The political mistakes date back to a much earlier period when I was guilty of sectarian mistakes and line. This means that this [is] a hardened trend which has not learnt from the growth of the party and the movement."

(All the above extracts are taken from Ranadive's self-critical report dated 20.5.50 and the following are portions from the report of his self-critical speeches made on 28th and 29th May, 1950).

"Cominform article [the article published in the organ *For a Lasting Peace, For a People's Democracy* of January 1950] looked upon as only a tactical change.

"First I justified old line completely. Then shifted partly, as is known."

"So far as CPC [Communist Party of China] was concerned, I could never understand it. There the disease in me went deepest.

"I did remark that we came to new line on our own. Gave sermons to other parties, scurrilously slandered them. Main propounder of such slander on PHQ.

"A few days ago I would not have characterised this a Titoite trend. All my slips taken together do become a trend.

"This crime of mine not nailed down in my self-critical report. Each of my crimes on this issue deserves drastic punishment e.g. anti-Mao writing, article on Revisionism etc.

"This trend of mine was an anti-international bourgeois-nationalist trend which cut off the Party from the broad international movement."

"Liquidation of PCs etc. was the worst thing done."

"My polemics was intimidation. And it was connected with wrong political guidance and organisational methods. Result: organisational liquidation, everyone struck with fear.

"Correct to call these methods Turkish, Titoist. Last UP Letter said that many comrades thought that being in jail was better than remaining outside and being thrown out as cowards and reformists."

* * *

"Everyone opposing was hit right and left. I never thought that if I had to criticise everybody, something must have been wrong with me. That was ego. The worst condemnation was three of us condemning as many CCMs and PBMs, on issue of Yerwada, Nasik Hunger-strike."

* * *

"My 'Marxism' is all wrong. It has to be straightened out and [this] is very difficult. And I thought that I knew it best.

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

On 31st May 1950, Ranadive said:

"Both in my report and in my speech I could not really and properly criticise myself. My criticism on organisational part has been criticised as insincere. I accept it..... I have stabbed the Party in the back. It is an enormous guilt which only those who are guilty of [it] realise but on lines given by Vanu I will unmask myself."

With this promise "I will unmask myself" ended Ranadive's self-criticism. His self-criticism had already revealed quite a

hideous face, what more hideous crimes of his he had yet to unmask we do not know. We are not also aware if he fulfilled this promise afterwards. In the Seventh Congress of the Party held in Calcutta, Ranadive's colleagues promised to submit their self-critical reports. These reports, we are afraid, will never be submitted, for most of them have a past which they prefer to hide.

What are the principal crimes of which Ranadive accuses himself?

First, Ranadive admitted that, under the influence of Kardelj and other Titoite agents he wrongly characterised the stage of the Indian revolution as one interlacing the two stages—democratic and socialist—screened imperialism and feudalism in the name of fighting capitalism, and ignored the anti-imperialist, anti-feudal character of the revolution. This led to left adventurist practice in the urban areas, which cost the Party very dearly. At the same time this led to right opportunist practice in the countryside and sabotaged the agrarian struggles, like that of Telengana, which had already started. Today also, though Ranadive, Sundarayya, Basavapuniah, Namboodiripad and Co. have described the present stage of revolution as People's Democratic, they are in practice ignoring its anti-imperialist, anti-feudal character by describing the Indian big bourgeoisie as independent and the Indian state as sovereign, and sabotaging the agrarian revolution the rumblings of which can be heard. e/

Secondly, Ranadive admitted that he could never understand the CPC (the Communist Party of China) and had slandered it. Only a fool or a knave could claim that without assimilating the rich experience of the CPC and without understanding Comrade Mao Tse-tung's Thought, a party of the working class could accomplish a successful revolution in any country of the Third World. The same failure to understand the CPC, the same hostility towards this great Party, characterises the present attitude of the "Marxist" leaders.

Thirdly, Ranadive admitted that he represented a Titoite trend, both politically and organisationally. Titoism, which the B1-Party Statement of 1960 described as a "variety of international opportunism" and as a betrayal of Marxism-Leninism, was the first bourgeois-nationalist revolt from within a Communist Party against the international Communist movement. Titoite agents were then active and Ranadive became such an active exponent of Titoism that he maligned Mao Tse-tung and the great Chinese Revolution. He went so far as to suppress all international documents which warned the Indian Party against the disastrous line it was pursuing under Ranadive. (In

his Self-Critical report dated 16.5.50, Bhowani Sen, the principal accomplice of Ranadive, wrote :

"From September 1948 to February 1950 the PB was pursuing a policy of hostility to the International Communist movement. This hostility is expressed through such actions as open attack against the leading Communist Parties of the world (article on Revisionism, article on Mao Tse-tung and China way), suppression from the Party press of authoritative political documents of the Cominform, TUCAA (Trade Union Conference of Asian and Australasian countries in November 1949) held at Peking and Liu Shao-chi's article on National Bourgeoisie etc., while at the same time Tito clique's slander against the Cominform is circulated to all units of the Party. These reveal that the PB under the leadership of the G. S. was pursuing a policy of bourgeois nationalism and hostility towards the International Communist movement. Thus Trotskyist-Titoist line was being pursued in all its aspects—from Left opportunist strategy and tactics on the question of Indian revolution to open hostility to the International Communist movement."

At another place Bhowani Sen said :

"Even after the Titoite fascists were expelled from the Cominform, a sympathiser, with the knowledge of the G. S., continued to maintain the agency of Tanjug—the organ of the Titoite fascists.....Now I come to learn that Tito gang's answer to Cominform charges, received through the same agency, was cyclostyled and circulated to all P. (Party) ranks as an Information Document".

What does this reveal—the deliberate suppression of important communist documents and endorsement and circulation of the documents of the Titoites ?

To day, the "Marxist" press lauds to the skies the "achievements" of the Soviet Union and the East European "socialist" states, and idealises Castro, and the "Marxist" bookshops are the main centres selling revisionist literature while documents of the international communist movement are mostly suppressed. Today, also, they are maligning the CPC, the leader of the international communist movement.

Fourthly, Ranadive admitted that he had not only suppressed authoritative international documents but had also suppressed by every conceivable means all criticism of his treacherous policy made by Party Committees and individual comrades here. No meeting of the Central Committee was convened; only Ranadive and one or two PB members arrogated to themselves the right of dissolving even elected Provincial Committees.

(Bhowani Sen said :

"This led to a whole series of bureaucratic action inside

the Party. Democratic centralism was thrown overboard. Members of the Central Committee were being expelled, suspended and censured. Every criticism of the Party policy was being suppressed. Left-adventurism was being forced upon the entire Party. The Central Committee was never functioned as the Central Committee. Every opposition was muzzled by raising the scare of reformism".))

Thus the enemies of the Party were successful in liquidating the Party almost completely.

Today also, elected Party Committees, local and district, even State Committees like that of the UP are being disbanded without even the formality of a charge-sheet against them, and innumerable militant comrades are being hounded out of the Party in order to pursue an utterly opportunist political line. The scare of left adventurism is also being raised for the same purpose. The organisational methods are not essentially different from those of 1948-49. ♪

One may ask, "How was it possible for one, two or three men to derail the Party despite elaboration of a correct political-tactical line by the Secretariat of the Andhra Provincial Committee, experience of a large majority of comrades including members of the CC and PCs, criticism by many of them of disastrous strategy and tactics pursued by Ranadive and accomplices, and despite the repeated advice from the international communist movement? How could this Ranadive phenomenon arise at all?" We think that it was the utterly wrong conception of party discipline which gave enormous power to a few individuals at the top. It may be an extreme manifestation, but, usually, in the name of democratic centralism, the worst kind of authoritarianism is practised and democracy stifled within the Party. This negative example should teach us that revolt against wrong politics and bureaucratic organisational methods of the leadership is not only justified but also the duty of a communist. As Mao Tse-tung said, "An erroneous leadership that endangers the revolution should not be accepted unconditionally but should be resisted resolutely". He has pointed out that even within a Communist Party there exist contradictions between proletarian trends and bourgeois and other reactionary trends. In India, since the birth of the Party, the representatives of the reactionary trends, besides agents planted by the enemy, have tried successfully to derail the Party from the correct Marxist-Leninist line and hampered the growth of the Party. Today, the conflict between the two trends within the Party has become acute, especially, after the Naxalbari struggle. In the name of democratic centralism, the lackeys of the big landlords and the big bourgeoisie, who adorn the positions of authority in the Party, will no longer

be able to impose their counter-revolutionary line on the Party comrades. "Communists", Comrade Mao Tse-tung said, "must always go into the whys and wherefores of anything, use their own heads and carefully think over whether or not it corresponds to reality and is really well founded; on no account should they follow blindly and encourage slavishness."

It does not seem that Ranadive's self-criticism was sincere. In record time, in two years, he was able virtually to liquidate the Party and class organizations trampling underfoot all advice or criticism from abroad and from within. Even when a Cominform article came, he tried to justify his policy and published in *Communist* of February-March, 1950, a statement justifying it. Only when his chief comrade-in-principle accomplice—Bhowani Sen—also discreetly rebuked him and submitted a very damaging self-critical report, Ranadive admitted his crimes against the Party. His self-critical report and speeches remind one of a criminal caught red-handed, trying to wriggle himself out of a very uncomfortable situation by debasing himself as much as possible in the hope of worming his way into the Party hierarchy at a more suitable moment.

Our quarrel is not with Ranadive but with the Ranadives, the Danges, the Namboodiripads and so on. They are not merely individuals but also types. Just as there are a number of Danges within the Party who shield one another (otherwise, Sripad Amrit Dange would have been found long ago), so there are several Ranadives and Joshis holding top positions in the Party. Ranadive and Joshi are not the only criminals who, to use the apt words of Ranadive himself, "stabbed the Party in the back". It is time that these enemies and the true features of their counter-revolutionary politics were unmasked. □

(The ^{words} ~~phrases~~ in the extracts quoted are ours.—Editor)

ATION

Price 1-00

—Read—

KALPURUSH

Political and Literary Monthly in Bengali]



KALPURUSH KARYALAYA

6 Bankim Chatterji Street, Calcutta-12

Published in Bengali

Peasant Movement in Hunan

—Mao Tse-tung 50 P

Chen Po-ta and Peasant Movement

—Chen Po-ta 85 P

Principles of Communism

—F. Engels 60 P

In English

Stalinism & Problem of Linguistics

—J. V. Stalin 1'30 P

Principles of Communism &

History of Communist League 1 32 P

RADICAL BOOK CLUB

6 Bankim Chatterji Street, Calcutta-12

and Published by Nimai Ghose from 60A, Keshab
Chandra Sen Street, Cal-9 and Printed by him from
Sathamala Press, 59A Bechu Chatterjee Street, Cal-9