

the Comrade

Vol. II, No. 2

Rs. 30

Centenary Year of October Revolution

Naxalbari Legacy in its Fifties

Sept. 9: Mao Tse Tung Thought

*Shaheed Bhagat Singh: Ideological
Development*

*Fascist Reaction: How to View and
Respond*

ORGAN OF THE C.P.R.C.I. (ML)

Issued in Sept. 2016

• October Revolution	
- Hold High the Banner of Ideological Legacy	1
- Cherish the Legacy	2
- The International Character	17
- How the Dream Came True, From Paris	
Commune to the Great October Revolution	25
• Our Legacy: As Steady as Mount Tai	34
• Naxalbari Uprising	
- The Legacy Enters its Fifties	38
- 50 Years of Distinct Ideological Phase	38
- Spring Thunder Over India	45
- The Darjeeling Peasant Armed Struggle	49
• Mao Tse Tung Thought	
- Grasp and Defend as an Integral Whole	54
- On Salient Components	57
• Ideological Development of Bhagat Singh	63
• The Question of Response to Fascist Reaction	
- A Policy Decision	73
- Let the Revolution Overtake	75
- On Chinese Fascism: The New Autocracy	84

The October Centenary:

Hold High the Banner of Ideological Legacy

We are close to the centenary of Great October Revolution. In spite of the temporary restoration of capitalism in the socialist world, the international phenomenon of October revolution has not become a thing of the past. Rather, its legacy is very much living in the present, as a material force, illuminating and inspiring the minds of world people and pointing to a bright future of mankind, free of all exploitation and discrimination.

The world is going to enter the centenary year of October revolution when the crisis ridden world imperialist system is at the advanced stage of its decadence. The cherished dream of the international bourgeoisie continues to elude them i.e. the dream of a new period of economic recovery and political stability of the world imperialist order. Its decline is now marked with inability even to reform. It has been already compelled to throw away the banner of so called welfare state and has dismantled its own pillars of 'social peace'. It has now much reduced capacity to nurture revisionism.

On the other side deepened urge among the people of the world to resist all oppression is a real phenomenon. It is because they have seen the vulnerability of imperialism and the uplifting actual glimpses of a new world beyond imperialism. They are longing for a new world and are in search for a road to it. There is turbulence in the world. At the same time there is an unusual gap between the demands of the objective revolutionary situation and the state of the subjective forces. The most crucial for addressing this gap is the re-organization of communist parties to transform the turbulence into a mighty force for world revolution.

Various quarters are busy in planning the celebrations in the coming centenary year of October revolution. There may be initiatives for joint campaigns from a variety of forces. For communist revolutionaries the *distinct ideological legacy* of Great October Revolution should be the prime running thread of all activity regarding the centenary celebrations. It is because the enemies continue to

attack this legacy in panic. It is also because even sections of friends tend to question this or that aspect of this legacy in confusion. The prime concern for some remain to 'explore' the causes of, "defeat of socialism" even when advanced stage of crisis of imperialism provides opportunity to go on offensive against bourgeois-revisionist ideology. Our activity regarding October centenary year should take care to guard against and clear such a fog.

The following writing from the old files of "The Comrade" of CCRI period is being published because of its utter relevance in the above context.

From Old Files :

Cherish the Legacy of the Great October Revolution

Part I - Revolution is the festival of the oppressed masses. The month of October has got the distinctive honor of being the occasion when two such grand festivals of the masses occurred. The Great October Revolution, in the year 1917, overtook Czarist Russia and shook the old world by establishing the first successful dictatorship of the proletariat. Thirty two years later, in October 1949, the great Chinese people's democratic revolution triumphed in establishing the People's Republic of China, and delivered a hammer-blow to the whole imperialist colonial and neo-colonial order in the East.

Thus the month of October has got associated with the irresistible march of the world proletarian revolution, with the revolutionary initiative and striking power of the proletariat. Ever since then, October has been and shall remain, for the communist revolutionaries and the politically conscious workers and oppressed peoples of the world, the month of revolutionary celebration, the occasion for celebrating the great human-emancipatory performance and potential of the proletariat and that of the broad masses of the oppressed people led by the proletariat in revolutionary action.

The Great October Revolution was an occurrence of world-historic significance. It signified a radical turn in the movement of world history, in the progressive motion of human social development. It marked the first actual leap of human society, under the leadership of the proletariat, into the process of emancipation from, all kinds of exploitation and oppression of man by man. So, as a political phenomenon, it acted as a beacon, a path-breaker and a mighty booster to the emancipatory struggles of all the socially oppressed classes and nationally oppressed S peoples the world over, drawing all these struggles into the ambit of world proletarian revolution.

Along with its tremendous political impact on contemporary history, the Great October Revolution left a profound ideological imprint on the whole historical epoch, the epoch of imperialism and proletarian revolution. It confirmed the basic tenets of the Marxist-Leninist theory of proletarian revolution and proletarian State (dictatorship of the proletariat) in the revolutionary practice of millions of masses of the working people. And, through this corroboration by social practice, it transformed these scientific theoretical propositions into, ideological-political axioms, ideological-political truths of our age.

In particular, the Great October Revolution presented the most telling practical critique of the ideological-political categories of democracy and nationalism, the ideological talismans that the bourgeoisie desperately clutches at in order to mystify and legitimize its own class domination and exploitation. It demonstrated the extremely limited and formal nature of bourgeois democracy, the exclusivist and chauvinistic nature of bourgeois nationalism, and their historically obsolete character as instruments of human emancipation (under conditions of the world-system of imperialism) by actually counter-posing to these such qualitatively new and effective instruments as proletarian democracy and proletarian internationalism.

The Great October Revolution shattered the

bourgeois myth that under the bourgeois order all citizens enjoy equal democratic rights and all nations enjoy equal national rights, by concretely highlighting and solving the vital question of the material conditions necessary for the masses of toiling people to be able really to exercise these rights, and the question of the social objective of exercising these rights. It showed how the exploited and oppressed majority, the toiling people, can have those material conditions only by overthrowing the rule of the exploiter and oppressor minority, the capitalists and the, landlords; by smashing the bourgeois State apparatus which is the bulwark of that rule, by breaking the stranglehold of this exploiter minority on the ownership of the social means of production which is the economic foundation of that rule and, instead, establishing their own socialist ownership of these means; by establishing the proletarian system of State, the dictatorship of the proletariat, which is based on the revolutionary alliance of the broad masses of working people of town and countryside led by the proletariat and which has the most democratic possible organs of State power in the form of the all-embracing mass political representative organizations of the working people the soviets of workers' deputies, soldiers' deputies, and peasants' deputies. It showed how, given those material conditions, the broad masses of working people can really exercise their democratic rights for determining the arrangement of their social labor and life on just and rational lines; for enjoying the full fruits of their social labor; for giving free play to their creative urge and energy in the material and spiritual domains; and for depriving the bourgeoisie of its democratic right to restore the old exploitative order, i.e., for exercising all-round dictatorship over the bourgeoisie.

Thus, it sealed the historical fate of bourgeois parliamentarianism by counter-posing to it the soviet power as a new and higher form of democratic State power that combines the parliamentary elective principle with the immediate and direct democracy of the laboring

masses, their direct participation in and constant check over the State administration.

Similarly, it indisputably proved that the proletariat is, indeed, the most staunch opponent of any kind of national privilege, discrimination, persecution and oppression; that the proletariat upholds as a matter of principle every nation's right of self determination, i.e., its right of secession (from any imposed integral frame of a colonial or multinational State) or its right of voluntary union with other nations (on the basis of mutual trust and fraternal collaboration). Further, it proved that, in their striving for national emancipation and progress, the toiling masses of oppressed peoples can dispense with the rusted weapon of bourgeois nationalism that enhances national mistrust, disunity and enmity, and seek fraternal union of the workers and peasants of diverse, nations based on the principles of voluntariness and internationalism. Finally, it proved that only under the leadership of the proletariat and as a part of international revolutionary struggle against the world-imperialist system of financial enslavement and colonial domination can the struggle of the oppressed peoples for national liberation and national equality be carried through to its end, enabling them to realize national self-determination whereby they can transcend nation-statehood and acquire international statehood the union of soviet socialist republics and pursue a common progressive social destiny while retaining their specific national-cultural features.

Although the Great October Revolution, as a political phenomenon, has passed for once into history, its ideological verdict on the historical obsolescence of bourgeois democracy and bourgeois nationalism (the ultimate ideological-political disguises of the exploiters' class-domination) and on the superiority and relevance of proletarian democracy and proletarian internationalism holds good and shall go on resounding throughout the span of the present epoch. The episodic twists and turns of history in its progressive course of development may, for a short

while, blur or obscure this ideological verdict; nevertheless, its stamp on modern history is indelible. This ideological legacy of the Great October Revolution is a great source for revitalizing the self-confidence and revolutionary spirit of the proletariat, the faith of the proletariat in its tremendous revolutionary strength and inevitable victory.

The chief endeavor of the bourgeoisie of all countries and of its reformist hangers-on is to kill the working class faith in its own strength, faith in the possibility and inevitability of its victory, and thus to perpetuate capitalist slavery. For the bourgeoisie knows that- if capitalism has not yet been overthrown and still continues to exist, it owes this not to its own merits but to the fact that the proletariat still has not enough faith in the possibility of victory . (Stalin: Report to the Eighteenth Congress of the C.P.S.U. (B) On the Work of the Central Committee). These days that chief endeavor of the bourgeoisie of all countries and its reformist hangers-on has acquired an unprecedented vehemence, under conditions of the accentuated general crisis of the world capitalist system. Focusing on the political commotions which the crisis-ridden revisionist-capitalist countries particularly the East-European countries are presently experiencing, they are crowing and feverishly gesticulating: Look, socialism has failed, the soviet system has failed, proletarian internationalism has failed! Communism is dead!! But, alas! For greeting the death of communism they have nothing new to wave except the old tattered flags of bourgeois democracy and bourgeois nationalism; the same old flags which have got crumpled and faded under the deadweight of their own god Finance Capital and got quite debunked by the enlightening experience of the Great October Revolution! They are doing all this with a view to sowing doubt and confusion in the minds of workers and the oppressed peoples about the prospects of world proletarian revolution; with a view to discouraging the toiling people from venturing into the undependable arena of mastering their own destiny;

and with a view to reconciling them to wage-slavery and national dependence. In doing so, the bourgeoisie of all countries and its reformist hangers-on are banking on their capacity for concealing from the common people the essential reality of what is happening in these so-called socialist countries.

In their propaganda blitzkrieg, they are concealing the fact, very well known to themselves, that these countries ceased to be under proletarian rule long ago; that the bourgeoisie succeeded in seizing the State power, through the medium of revisionist to the communist party and social-revolution, and in restoring the capitalist order in these countries while retaining the garb of socialism; and that the economic and political bankruptcy of these regimes that they are so exultantly advertising denotes, not at all the failure of socialism but that of social-capitalism (socialism in appearance, capitalism in essence) not at all the failure of the soviet system of dictatorship of the proletariat but that of a peculiar bureaucratic system of dictatorship of the bourgeoisie, not at all the failure of proletarian internationalism but that of recrudescent bourgeois nationalism based on bourgeois social relations which undermined the mutual trust and fraternal collaboration of various national groups, and not at all the fiasco of communism. It can be easily, seen that their malicious attempt at concealing this fact from the toiling masses has been considerably facilitated by the opportunist practice of those sections of the communist revolutionary movement who unduly dragged their feet on, or defaulted on, the question of exposing the reality of revisionist take-over in the erstwhile socialist countries.

They are concealing the fact that the economic-political crisis, that is bringing the revisionist countries down to their knees, differs only in form and extent rather than its essential nature from the one confronted by the other capitalist countries: It is the aggravated general crisis of world capitalism that is finding its specific expression all over the world in an uneven manner. The bourgeois rulers of the Western

imperialist countries (along with the Japanese bourgeoisie) can somewhat afford to gloat, at the moment, over the sorry plight of the revisionist regimes because of the fact that the former are relatively well-placed in the hierarchy of the world imperialist system than their East European counterparts. They have access to the shock-absorbing cushion of super-exploitation of the dependent countries of Asia, Africa and Latin America that mitigates the tremors of the economic crisis and, hence, postpones for some time the impending internal explosions within these countries. This imperialist privilege is by and large denied to the East European revisionist rulers. That is why, of all the advanced capitalist countries, the East European revisionist countries constitute the foremost arena of economic and political instability that may thus bear the brunt of the impending strokes of proletarian socialist revolutionary movement.

But then, the West European bourgeoisie is only relatively secure from the knock of its historical destiny, for the cushion of neo-colonial super-exploitation is tending to slip out of its hands in the whirlwind of anti-imperialist struggles raging and gathering momentum in the vast expanses of the Third World. That is to say, the protective financial umbrella of the World Bank and parliamentary governance can no more bail out the East European bourgeoisie from the fundamental crisis of capitalist economy and the political trappings of bourgeois social order than they have done in the case of the West European bourgeoisie. This inextricable crisis of world capitalism is driving the toilers of all lands, howsoever stumblingly but inexorably, into the arms of that very communism that has been pronounced dead by the wishful bourgeoisie.

The bourgeoisie of all countries and its reformist hangers-on are obscuring the elementary political truth that State power, of whatever kind, is never changed, nor even seriously affected, by peaceful processions of some hundred thousand persons whose political earnestness and stamina are not tested in any confrontation with even a fraction of the armed might

of the State. They are concealing the fact that the current political developments in the East European revisionist countries (where governments are falling like nine-pills apparently under the noise-impact of massive peaceful processions!) do not involve changes in the existing class rule of the concerned bourgeoisie in each case; that the changes taking place, or being contemplated, in the composition of governments or the form of governments are in accordance with the general class interests and will of their respective ruling bourgeois classes notwithstanding the reservations or contrary wishes of particular sets of individuals or small sections of the ruling classes; that this policy of readjustment of the polity sprang up from the revisionist rulers foreboding of violent eruptions of the accumulated resentment of the toiling masses due to mounting economic hardships and bureaucratic oppression, and is an attempt at defusing that resentment and encouraging its absorption by the peaceful bourgeois movement for reforms; that, apart from the just-mentioned basic political consideration, this readjustment policy is dictated by the pressing consideration of bourgeois movement for reforms; that, apart from the just mentioned basic political consideration, this readjustment policy is dictated by the pressing consideration of seducing Western monopoly capital and, to that end, offering some political concessions, chiefly in the form of politically accommodating the local pro-Western bourgeois elements; and that precisely because it does not clash with, but is compatible with, the general class interests, political power and political perspectives of powers-that-be, because it signifies no gains to the political strength and say of the exploited majority of these peoples, the democracy wave having unhindered sway in one country of Eastern Europe after the other, and is being smiled upon alike by Gorbochev, Bush, Kohl, the Church, et all.

While they are fully advertising the massive mobilizations for the democracy are concealing the fact that mostly the marches in the East-European capitals, they participants belong to various strata

of the bourgeoisie and the upper stratum of the working class, and are invariably led by bourgeois academicians, clerks and even the revisionists themselves. They are obscuring the fact that, over the long years of bourgeois-revisionist rule, the working class masses of these countries have been subjected by revisionist rulers to a systematic, persistent, and all-round campaign ideological disorientation; that the revisionist rulers, through a protracted process of theoretical distortion of Marxism and practical prostitution of socialism, have been able to cause a lot of blunting of the political consciousness of the working masses and a blurring of their political vision; and that if, owing to this ideological-political vulnerability, some sections of the working people are momentarily manipulated to join the chorus of bourgeois parliamentarianism, it would be more a reflection of their strong urge to get rid of the existing state of affairs than their fondness of bourgeois parliamentarianism.

Lastly, they are concealing, or perhaps themselves ignoring, an important political implication (other than the immediate ones) of the recent developments in East European countries. The exposure of the laboring masses of these countries to bourgeois democracy, the direct experience of which the East-European peoples had fortunately skipped earlier, and to monopoly capital's intensified squeeze on them as an accompaniment of bourgeois democracy, will certainly and quickly make them recoil from bourgeois democracy. Then, these laboring masses, already freed from the political ambiguity that was due to the camouflaged class exploitation and oppression of bourgeois revisionist order, getting aroused and politically enlightened by the transparent and escalating class exploitation and oppression of bourgeois democratic order, and eagerly seeking the way out of the capitalist wage-slavery, shall invoke, from the deep recesses of their collective memory, the glorious legacy of Great October Revolution that may get dimmed for a while for some sections of the international proletariat but can never get erased from its

historical memory.

The specter of communism shall go on haunting the bourgeois world. It cannot be laid to rest so long as the international proletariat lives and until the international bourgeoisie is laid to rest.

Long live World Proletarian Revolution!

Long live the spirit of the Great October Revolution!!

Part II - The bourgeoisie of all lands and its reformist hangers-on ardently wish to wipe out the ideological legacy of the Great October Revolution from the minds of the exploited and oppressed people of the world. The collapse of the crisis-ridden, abnormal capitalist models of economy and State, which were being pursued in the U. S. S. R and the East European countries under bourgeois-revisionist rule, and the reverting of these countries to the typical Western capitalist model, have provided a prize-pretext for bourgeois reactionaries the world over to give vent to their class hatred for proletarian rule and socialist society. In their propaganda blitzkrieg, they are presenting the Gorbachovite renegades as approvers against the dictatorship of the proletariat, socialism, and Marxism-Leninism, in order to lend a semblance of credibility to their revilement of the glorious accomplishments of victorious proletarian revolutions.

Marxist-Leninists everywhere must rebut this bourgeois propaganda campaign. Expectedly, the anti-socialist propaganda deluge, let loose through all the channels of mass communication under bourgeois control, failed to make any noticeable dent in the ideological-political commitment of the communist revolutionary forces of India. It could not be otherwise, because the massiveness of the scale of this bourgeois propaganda is matched by the paltriness of its theoretical-ideological substance. As to its logic (if one is to search that rare element in the current bourgeois propaganda offensive which is more on the lines of a modern commercial advertisement campaign rather than of an

argumentative construction against socialism), the whole campaign rests on the presupposition that, till recently, socialism held sway in the COMECON/Warsaw Pact countries and that the system collapsed under the strain of severe economic crises and popular revolts. That is, that socialist economy and planning led to the economic collapse and that the dictatorship of the proletariat led to popular disenchantment and revolts. On the false foundation of that presupposition are then piled together such trite lies and slanders against proletarian rule and outstanding communist leaders as have cropped up and gotten debunked umpteen times since the Great October Revolution.

One would think that communist revolutionaries of India, while rejecting this bourgeois propaganda trash with the contempt it deserves, would counter it, at the popular level, chiefly by exposing and demolishing with concrete facts and figures its false foundation viz the presupposition. Because, once its basic premise is affectively refuted, once this simple truth is affectively projected that the recent East European developments have nothing to do with socialism, have no relevance to any appraisal whatsoever of the earlier socialist praxis under proletarian rule in these countries, the whole bourgeois propaganda gets reduced to the conventional counter-revolutionary howling of bourgeois jackals.

But, strangely, a section of communist revolutionary forces of India is getting engaged professedly for defending socialism and Marxism-Leninism against the current bourgeois propaganda offensive - in analysing and debating the historical experience of the dictatorship of the proletariat and the causes of capitalist restoration in the erstwhile socialist countries, and is ending up with verdicts of the alleged mistakes of Comrades Stalin and Mao. That is tantamount to affirming, in practice, the very link between the recent developments in revisionist countries and the post practices of socialism which needs to be refuted,

and so lends credibility to the propaganda plank of the bourgeois.

It is unpleasant to opine that the comrades who are engaged in such an exercise have not thought over the question as to what the alleged shortcomings/mistakes of Stalin or Mao have to do with the recent turmoil in the revisionist countries and what is the relevance of their reviews of the available theory and practice of socialism to their professed task of countering the current bourgeois propaganda offensive and defending socialism and Marxism-Leninism. Yet that seems the only generous interpretation of the way they have chosen to respond to the challenge of the bourgeois propaganda. (emphasis added - the Editor)

Further, it is not clear as to which target-group they have in mind, whom they wish to brace with their analyses and debates against the anti-socialist propaganda offensive of the bourgeoisie. That target-group can hardly be the masses of common people who, being subjected to the bourgeois disinformation campaign and deprived of access to information about the actual course of events and state of affairs in those distant lands, need most of all accurate, relevant, adequate information and unequivocal comments from communist revolutionaries. Should these analyses and debates be meant for developing clarity of understanding and unanimity of views concerning the theory and practice of socialism among communist revolutionary forces, **the exercise is unexceptionable but for its ill-timing.** (e.a.) It may, however, be observed that open debate is not the proper means even to the said end, because, the communist practice of open debate is meant for refuting ideological deviations and not for seeking unanimity of views between the contending sides. Any so-called friendly public debate, when communist revolutionaries allow themselves to become a party to it, on vital questions concerning theory and practice of socialism (that too under the conditions of a raging enemy propaganda offensive against socialism),

serves only to add to the confusion in the minds of the common people, and in some cases, to transport the doubts and confusions of political individuals over to the revolutionary masses who are otherwise capable of sounder responses to the enemy propaganda. Because, first, it conceals the actual character of the conflict of views behind its 'friendly' signboard, thus lowering the guard of revolutionary masses against hostile ideological tendencies; second it invariably projects a lot of loud-thinking and tentative stands of the participants on grave matters. **Therefore, organized Marxist-Leninists who, as political representatives of the proletariat of India, are expected to provide reliable leadership to the democratic revolutionary movement of the Indian people can ill afford to present themselves as partners in such a joint-venture.** (e.a.)

Then, as the analyses and debates under reference cater neither to the specific needs of the common people, nor to that of communist revolutionaries (due to the given context and the manner in which these are being carried out), there is obviously some other beneficiary whose demand and appreciation for such endeavors prompt the comrades to undertake these. One such beneficiary, for certain, is a fickle-minded section of intelligentsia, professing to be Marxist-Leninist or supporters of Marxist-Leninist movement, who, like slender reeds start swaying with every whiff of a cross-wind. Of course, the communist revolutionary movement should show due considerateness and helpful attitude towards those of them who strive to fit their own ideological drift. **Nevertheless, the curiosities and anxieties of this section cannot be allowed to distort the sense of proportion and priority of concerns of the organized movement.** (e.a.)

Should the current bourgeois propaganda offensive at all induce the revolutionaries to draw lessons, let them draw these lessons rather from the line of attack of this bourgeois campaign than from

the handling of concrete problems by the dictatorship of the proletariat in erstwhile socialist countries. The bourgeoisie is not attacking Stalin and Mao for their shortcomings or mistakes whatsoever but for their staunchness as proletarian revolutionaries and their excellent helmsmanship of the proletarian class rule that had made them the symbols of vigor of socialist revolution and the discomfiture of the bourgeoisie. The bourgeoisie is not attacking socialism for the deficiencies in its implemented models **but for the terrific effectiveness of its cardinal element the dictatorship of the proletariat and the solidity of its principal guiding force the Party of the proletariat. And, that is how it should be.** (e.a.)

The class enemy would naturally train its propaganda guns especially at what it most dreads, and hence most hates, in the world proletarian revolutionary movement, i.e., the crucial strengths, the vital sinews of the Revolution the dictatorship of the proletariat, the Party, and the great revolutionary leaders. **The class enemy's frenzied tirade should make the communist revolutionaries better appreciate these precious assets and prompt them to grasp, defend and promote the same ever more firmly.** (emphasis original) That should never become the cause or occasion for their looking back and reappraisal of their positions and practices. Only the criticism from the revolutionary masses, and from the persons having genuine concern for the advancement of the revolutionary cause, should prompt communist revolutionaries to stop and ponder as to whether there has been a fault on their part and where it lies.

Today when the dictatorship of the proletariat nowhere materially exists, the international bourgeoisie and its reformist hangers-on are still letting no stone unturned to heap dirt upon it. They are not foolish enough to believe their own propaganda about the demise of Socialism and not to be apprehensive about the impending re-emergence of

the dictatorship of the proletariat. They are attacking the very concept and prospect of the dictatorship of the proletariat. In that sense, this issue belongs solely to the ideological warfare between the bourgeoisie and the proletariat, at the present moment.

However, the bourgeois tirade against the Party has both ideological and immediate political implications. The bourgeoisie of all lands seems to have drawn its own lesson, from historical experience, about the crucial significance of the Party (of Leninist mould) for the fate of the proletarian revolutionary movement, both in the context of attaining and consolidating the proletarian State power as an instrument of socialist transformation of the old world and in the context of losing out to and confronting the counterrevolutionary bourgeois restoration. Hence its accentuated attack, in virulent as well as sly tones, on the concept of the Leninist Party; and the intensification of its direct and indirect encouragement to such opportunist tendencies all over the world as corrode the cutting edges of the communist Party, especially the class-distinctive politics and the democratic-centralist organization of the Party. **That should prompt the communist revolutionaries of India in particular, not only to come out in spirited defense of the Party concept but also to make them more attentive towards fostering these very Party attributes in their concrete practice of building up the Party. Their doing so would be the most fitting response to the current bourgeois propaganda, offensive. That would be, on their part, a situation-specific and concrete, way of cherishing the legacy of the Great October Revolution. (e.a.)**

[The Comrade (CCRI period) no. 5 and no. 8]



J. V. Stalin

The International Character of the October Revolution

(Works, Vol. 10, August - December, 1927)

The October Revolution cannot be regarded merely as a revolution "within national bounds." It is, primarily, a revolution of an international, world order, for it signifies a radical turn in the world history of mankind, a turn from the old, capitalist world to the new, socialist world.

Revolutions in the past usually ended by one group of exploiters at the helm of government being replaced by another group of exploiters. The exploiters changed, exploitation remained. Such was the case during the liberation movements of the slaves. Such was the case during the period of the uprisings of the serfs. Such was the case during the period of the well-known "great" revolutions in England, France and Germany. I am not speaking of the Paris Commune, which was the first glorious, heroic, yet unsuccessful attempt on the part of the proletariat to turn history against capitalism.

The October Revolution differs from these revolutions in principle. Its aim is not to replace one form of exploitation by another form of exploitation, one group of exploiters by another group of exploiters, but to abolish all exploitation of man by man, to abolish all groups of exploiters, to establish the dictatorship of the proletariat, to establish the power of the most revolutionary class of all the oppressed classes that have ever existed, to organise a new, classless, socialist society.

It is precisely for this reason that the victory of the October Revolution signifies a radical change in the history of mankind, a radical change in the historical destiny of world capitalism, a radical change in the liberation movement of the world proletariat, a radical change in the methods of struggle and the forms of organisation, in the manner of life and traditions, in the culture and ideology of the exploited masses throughout the world.

That is the basic reason why the October Revolution is a revolution of an international, world order.

That also is the source of the profound sympathy which the oppressed classes in all countries entertain for the October Revolution, which they regard as a pledge of their own emancipation.

A number of fundamental issues could be noted on which the October Revolution influences the development of the revolutionary movement throughout the world.

1. The October Revolution is noteworthy primarily for having breached the front of world imperialism, for having overthrown the imperialist bourgeoisie in one of the biggest capitalist countries and put the socialist proletariat in power.

The class of wage-workers, the class of the persecuted, the class of the oppressed and exploited has for the first time in the history of mankind risen to the position of the ruling class, setting a contagious example to the proletarians of all countries.

This means that the October Revolution has ushered in a new era, the era of proletarian revolutions in the countries of imperialism.

It took the instruments and means of production from the landlords and capitalists and converted them into public property, thus counterposing socialist property to bourgeois property. It thereby exposed the lie of the capitalists that bourgeois property is inviolable, sacred, eternal.

It wrested power from the bourgeoisie, deprived the bourgeoisie of political rights, destroyed the bourgeois state apparatus and transferred power to the Soviets, thus counter-posing the socialist rule of the Soviets, as proletarian democracy, to bourgeois parliamentarism, as capitalist democracy. Lafargue was right when he said, as far back as 1887, that on the morrow of the revolution "all former capitalists will be disfranchised."¹

The October Revolution thereby exposed the lie of the Social-Democrats that at the present time a peaceful transition to socialism is possible through bourgeois parliamentarism.

But the October Revolution did not and could not stop there. Having destroyed the old, bourgeois order, it began to build the new, socialist order. The 10 years of the October Revolution have been 10 years of building the Party, trade unions, Soviets, co-operatives, cultural organisations, transport, industry, the Red Army. The indubitable successes of socialism in the U.S.S.R. on the front of construction have clearly shown that the proletariat can successfully govern the country without the bourgeoisie and against the bourgeoisie, that it can successfully build industry without the bourgeoisie and against the bourgeoisie, that it can successfully direct the whole of the national economy without the bourgeoisie and

against the bourgeoisie, that it can successfully build socialism in spite of the capitalist encirclement.

Menenius Agrippa, the famous Roman senator of ancient times, was not the only one to uphold the old "theory" that the exploited cannot do without the exploiters any more than the head and other parts of the body can do without the stomach. This "theory" is now the corner-stone of the political "philosophy" of Social-Democracy in general, and of the Social-Democratic policy of coalition with the imperialist bourgeoisie in particular. This "theory," which has acquired the character of a prejudice, is now one of the most serious obstacles in the path towards the revolutionisation of the proletariat in the capitalist countries. One of the most important results of the October Revolution is that it dealt this false "theory" a mortal blow.

Is there any further need to prove that these and similar results of the October Revolution could not and cannot fail to exert an important influence on the revolutionary movement of the working class in the capitalist countries?

Such generally known facts as the progressive growth of communism in the capitalist countries, the growing sympathy of the proletarians of all countries for the working class of the U.S.S.R. and, finally, the many workers' delegations that come to the Land of Soviets, prove beyond doubt that the seeds sown by the October Revolution are already beginning to bear fruit.

2. The October Revolution has shaken imperialism not only in the centres of its domination, not only in the "metropolises." It has also struck at the rear of imperialism, its periphery, having undermined the rule of imperialism in the colonial and dependent countries.

Having overthrown the landlords and the capitalists, the October Revolution broke the chains of national and colonial oppression and freed from it, without exception, all the oppressed peoples of a vast state. The proletariat cannot emancipate itself unless it emancipates the oppressed peoples. It is a characteristic feature of the October Revolution that it accomplished these national-colonial revolutions in the U.S.S.R. not under the flag of national enmity and conflicts among nations, but under the flag of mutual confidence and fraternal rapprochement of the workers and peasants of the various peoples in the U.S.S.R., not in the name of nationalism, but in the name of internationalism.

It is precisely because the national-colonial revolutions took

place in our country under the leadership of the proletariat and under the banner of internationalism that pariah peoples, slave peoples, have for the first time in the history of mankind risen to the position of peoples that are really free and really equal, thereby setting a contagious example to the oppressed nations of the whole world.

This means that the October Revolution has ushered in new era, the era of colonial revolutions which are being carried out in the oppressed countries of the world in alliance with the proletariat and under the leadership of the proletariat.

It was formerly the "accepted" idea that the world has been divided from time immemorial into inferior and superior races, into blacks and whites, of whom the former are unfit for civilisation and are doomed to be objects of exploitation, while the latter are the only bearers of civilisation, whose mission it is to exploit the former.

That legend must now be regarded as shattered and discarded. One of the most important results of the October Revolution is that it dealt that legend a mortal blow, by demonstrating in practice that the liberated non-European peoples, drawn into the channel of Soviet development, are not one whit less capable of promoting a really progressive culture and a really progressive civilisation than are the European peoples.

It was formerly the "accepted" idea that the only method of liberating the oppressed peoples is the method of bourgeois nationalism, the method of nations drawing apart from one another, the method of disuniting nations, the method of intensifying national enmity among the labouring masses of the various nations.

That legend must now be regarded as refuted. One of the most important results of the October Revolution is that it dealt that legend a mortal blow, by demonstrating in practice the possibility and expediency of the proletarian, internationalist method of liberating the oppressed peoples, as the only correct method; by demonstrating in practice the possibility and expediency of a fraternal union of the workers and peasants of the most diverse nations based on the principles of voluntariness and internationalism. The existence of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, which is the prototype of the future integration of the working people of all countries into a single world economic system, cannot but serve as direct proof of this.

It need hardly be said that these and similar results of the October Revolution could not and cannot fail to exert an important

influence on the revolutionary movement in the colonial and dependent countries. Such facts as the growth of the revolutionary movement of the oppressed peoples in China, Indonesia, India, etc., and the growing sympathy of these peoples for the U.S.S.R., unquestionably bear this out.

The era of tranquil exploitation and oppression of the colonies and dependent countries has passed away.

The era of liberating revolutions in the colonies and dependent countries, the era of the awakening of the proletariat in those countries, the era of its hegemony in the revolution, has begun.

3. Having sown the seeds of revolution both in the centres of imperialism and in its rear, having weakened the might of imperialism in the "metropolises" and having shaken its domination in the colonies, the October Revolution has thereby put in jeopardy the very existence of world capitalism as a whole.

While the spontaneous development of capitalism in the conditions of imperialism has passed owing to its unevenness, owing to the inevitability of conflicts and armed collisions, owing, finally, to the unprecedented imperialist slaughter into the process of the decay and the dying of capitalism, the October Revolution and the resultant dropping out of a vast country from the world system of capitalism could not but accelerate this process, undermining, bit by bit, the very foundations of world imperialism.

More than that. While shaking imperialism, the October Revolution has at the same time created in the shape of the first proletarian dictatorship a powerful and open base for the world revolutionary movement, a base such as the latter never possessed before and on which it now can rely for support. It has created a powerful and open centre of the world revolutionary movement, such as the latter never possessed before and around which it can now rally, organising a united revolutionary front of the proletarians and of the oppressed peoples of all countries against imperialism.

This means, firstly, that the October Revolution inflicted a mortal wound on world capitalism from which the latter will never recover. For that very reason capitalism will never recover the "equilibrium" and "stability" that it possessed before October.

Capitalism may become partly stabilised, it may rationalise its production, turn over the administration of the country to fascism, temporarily hold down the working class; but it will never recover the

"tranquillity," the "assurance," the "equilibrium" and the "stability" that it flaunted before; for the crisis of world capitalism has reached the stage of development when the flames of revolution must inevitably break out, now in the centres of imperialism, now in the periphery, reducing to naught the capitalist patch-work and daily bringing nearer the fall of capitalism. Exactly as in the well-known fable, "when it pulled its tail out of the mud, its beak got stuck; when it pulled its beak out, its tail got stuck."

This means, secondly, that the October Revolution has raised to such a height the strength and importance, the courage and the fighting preparedness of the oppressed classes of the whole world as to compel the ruling classes to reckon with them as a new, important factor. Now the labouring masses of the world can no longer be regarded as a "blind mob," groping in the dark and devoid of prospects; for the October Revolution has created a beacon which illumines their path and opens up prospects for them. Whereas formerly there was no world-wide open forum from which the aspirations and strivings of the oppressed classes could be expounded and formulated, now such a forum exists in the shape of the first proletarian dictatorship.

There is hardly room for doubt that the destruction of this forum would for a long time cast the gloom of unbridled, black reaction over the social and political life of the "advanced countries." It cannot be denied that the very existence of a "Bolshevik state" puts a curb upon the dark forces of reaction, thus helping the oppressed classes in their struggle for liberation. It is this that explains the savage hatred which the exploiters of all countries entertain for the Bolsheviks.

History repeats itself, though on a new basis. Just as formerly, during the period of the downfall of feudalism, the word "Jacobin" evoked dread and abhorrence among the aristocrats of all countries, so now, in the period of the down fall of capitalism, the word "Bolshevik" evokes dread and abhorrence among the bourgeois in all countries. And conversely, just as formerly Paris was the refuge and school for the revolutionary representatives of the rising bourgeoisie, so now Moscow is the refuge and school for the revolutionary representatives of the rising proletariat. Hatred of the Jacobins did not save feudalism from collapse. Can there be any doubt that hatred of the Bolsheviks will not save capitalism from its inevitable downfall?

The era of the "stability" of capitalism has passed away, carrying

away with it the legend of the indestructibility of the bourgeois order.

The era of the collapse of capitalism has begun.

4. The October Revolution cannot be regarded merely as a revolution in the sphere of economic and social-political relations. It is at the same time a revolution in the minds, a revolution in the ideology, of the working class. The October Revolution was born and gained strength under the banner of Marxism, under the banner of the idea of the dictatorship of the proletariat, under the banner of Leninism, which is Marxism of the era of imperialism and proletarian revolutions. Hence it marks the victory of Marxism over reformism, the victory of Leninism over Social-Democratism, the victory of the Third International over the Second International.

The October Revolution has brought into being an impassable chasm between Marxism and Social-Democratism, between the policy of Leninism and the policy of Social-Democratism.

Formerly, before the victory of the dictatorship of the proletariat, Social-Democracy, while refraining from openly repudiating the idea of the dictatorship of the proletariat but doing nothing, absolutely nothing, to bring nearer the realisation of this idea, could flaunt the banner of Marxism, and it is obvious that this behaviour of Social-Democracy created no danger whatever for capitalism. Then, in that period, Social-Democracy was formally identified, or almost completely identified, with Marxism.

Now, after the victory of the dictatorship of the proletariat, when everybody has seen for himself to what Marxism leads and what its victory may signify, Social-Democracy is no longer able to flaunt the banner of Marxism, can no longer coquet with the idea of the dictatorship of the proletariat without creating a certain danger for capitalism. Having long ago broken with the spirit of Marxism, it has found itself compelled to discard also the banner of Marxism; it has openly and unambiguously taken a stand against the offspring of Marxism, against the October Revolution, against the first dictatorship of the proletariat in the world.

Now it has had to dissociate itself from Marxism, and has actually done so; for under present conditions one cannot call oneself a Marxist unless one openly and devotedly supports the first proletarian dictatorship in the world, unless one wages a revolutionary struggle against one's own bourgeoisie, unless one creates the conditions for the victory of the dictatorship of the

proletariat in one's own country.

A chasm has opened between Social-Democracy and Marxism. Henceforth, the only bearer and bulwark of Marxism is Leninism, communism.

But matters did not end there. The October Revolution went further than drawing a demarcation line between Social Democracy and Marxism; it relegated Social-Democracy to the camp of the direct defenders of capitalism against the first proletarian dictatorship in the world. When Messieurs the Adlers and Bauers, the Welses and Levis, the Longuets and Blums abuse the "Soviet regime" and extol parliamentary "democracy," these gentlemen mean that they are fighting and will continue to fight for the restoration of the capitalist order in the U.S.S.R., for the preservation of capitalist slavery in the "civilised" states.

Present-day Social-Democratism is an ideological support of capitalism. Lenin was a thousand times right when he said that the present-day Social-Democratic politicians are "real agents of the bourgeoisie in the working-class movement, the labour lieutenants of the capitalist class," that in the "civil war between the proletariat and the bourgeoisie" they would inevitably range themselves "on the side of the 'Versaillese' against the 'Communards.'" ²

It is impossible to put an end to capitalism without putting an end to Social-Democratism in the labour movement. That is why the era of dying capitalism is also the era of dying Social-Democratism in the labour movement.

The great significance of the October Revolution consists, among other things, in the fact that it marks the inevitable victory of Leninism over Social-Democratism in the world labour movement.

The era of the domination of the Second International and of Social-Democratism in the labour movement has ended.

The era of the domination of Leninism and of the Third International has begun.

*(Originally published in Pravda, No. 255,
November 6-7, 1927)*

Notes

1. Paul Lafargue, On the Morrow of the Revolution (see Works, Russ. ed., Vol. I, 1925, pp. 329-30).

2. V. I. Lenin, Imperialism, the Highest Stage of Capitalism (see Works, 4th Russ. ed., Vol. 22, p. 182).

How the Dream Came True

From Paris Commune to the Great October Revolution

17 years before the end of 19th century, Marx breathed his last.

17 years after the end of 19th century, his dream became true.

In October 1917, under the leadership of comrade Lenin and the Bolshevik communists, the working class in Russia overthrew the Tsarist regime and established its dictatorship; hence, laid the foundation for building a socialist system in one sixth of the globe.

Before Marx, many of the thinkers, philosophers and other revolutionary fighters had envisioned such a society, wherein there is no class difference between the exploiter and the exploited, the oppressor and the oppressed, the hunter and the hunted. Wherein there is no exploitation of man by man, no oppression of man by man. Wherein all humans stand equal, and together they enjoy the boons of nature, distributed equally among the community. Wherein there are no social disparities of rich and poor, class and caste. Many warriors for all their lives struggled hard and sacrificed for such an ideal, but it was not realized and neither it could be. Because, at that time, the society had not reached the stage of capitalist development i.e. the stage at which the objective conditions, science and philosophy required for building a social system based on human equality were to come into existence. Nevertheless the struggle by these thinkers, philosophers and revolutionary fighters was not in vain. Their vision was actually a reflection of desires and aspirations of the slaves, the tenants and the people tormented by the oppression and the exploitation. Their struggle was a reflection of the class struggle in those times of history. In this way, they played an important role in keeping ablaze and aglow, the urge for equality, fraternity and freedom of humans living in a society of class divisions and in carrying forward the class struggle. Their struggle and their dedication towards this idealist vision of theirs, truly deserves a salute.

When, as a result of process of development of capitalism, the working class came into existence and took to the path of struggles; when the knowledge and the exploration of nature and society moved beyond the boundaries of religious myths and got transformed into

social and natural sciences, through grinding against the whetstone of examination and analysis; the philosophy, too, broke out of the rusted chains of idealism and got placed on the sound basis of materialism. It was the time, when the task of carrying forward the economics, politics and philosophy of society to the next logical stage of its development, and beyond the narrow boundaries of class interests of capitalists, was bestowed upon the great genius of Marx. Marx, with the help of his friend Engels, minutely scrutinized, investigated and systematized the laws of development of society, especially the economic relations and laws of development of the capitalist regime. He deeply scrutinized and analyzed the class-struggles, the state and the politics, and located and theorized the laws of development of these. He deeply studied various philosophical thoughts, explored the relation of philosophy with economic and class relations and phenomena, and evolved the finest scientific and rationalistic philosophy.

In this way Marx created an ideology, which is scientific as well as practical and which solves the problems of the past as well as depicts the future direction; an ideology which provides new horizons to human thinking and guides practice as well. This is an ideology of revolutions. Presently, it is an ideology of the working class.

On the basis of this ideology Marx envisioned that the time had come when the exploitation of man by man would be abolished. A force had come into existence which would eliminate all class-divisions and oppression i.e. the force of modern industrial worker. Capitalism itself would keep on creating an army of the workers, it would itself dig its grave and one day the workers' army would bury capitalism in this grave. That would be the beginning of the age which would guarantee equality, freedom and prosperity to all the people. Although, the path of society's development would be long, full of vicissitudes and sacrifices, yet it would not be dependent on the individual intentions. Rather, the economic and political phenomena of society would keep on motivating the human intentions and thoughts in this direction of development.

Even before Marx, ever since the birth of capitalism, kind of disarrayed and unrefined ideas of communism were in air. Capitalists were leaving no stone unturned to bury such ideas. They were attempting, rather feverishly, to establish the capitalist system itself as a golden era of human civilization, an everlasting form of equality,

freedom and fraternity. When the conclusions reached upon by Marx on the basis of analysis and his theory of communism based upon the scientific viewpoint, deflated all these attempts, then, in order to fight against this theory, the capitalists first of all took a stance of avoiding and ignoring it. For twenty long years, braving the odds of impoverishment, destitution and obscurity, Marx resolutely remained engaged in uniting the supporters of communism and in propagating the communist principles.

Then, in 1871 appeared a whirlwind in Paris, the capital city of France. People, including large numbers of semi-workers and peasants, apart from workers, captured the state power, dismantled the royal army and organized a people's army, abolished all the special privileges and established a government of elected representatives of the people. The control of factories and estates was taken over by the people and thus the banner of Paris Commune was unfurled. The development sent the chills down the spine of the capitalists of entire Europe. It came forward in support of the French capitalists. Although the Paris Commune was crushed after 72 days, but Communism and the Marxist theory became a popular talk as a result.

Though, owing to his scientific thinking, Marx was already apprehensive about the victory of the people of Paris, yet he took deep interest in the rebellion. He gave concrete suggestions to his supporters and adherents of First International in France. He made attempts to provide guidance. He analyzed the rebellion painstakingly and enriched the revolutionary theory invaluabley. It is the experience of Paris Commune from which Marx drew the lessons and conclusions that working class could not capture the state power anywhere through non-violent means, and neither could it build socialism through capturing the readymade state machinery of a capitalist system. To build socialism, the working class must establish its dictatorship and dispossess the capitalist class of its economic resources and armed might. These were the lessons of Paris Commune which later became the foundation-stone for the October revolution.

Despite being an unsuccessful endeavor, the Paris Commune was proved to be a milestone in establishing the superiority of the Marxist theory and in popularizing it among the worker masses, intellectuals and worshippers of human equality. After this, on the

basis of this theory, the organizations devoted to the Marxist theory started coming up right in the midst of the capitalist citadels in the form of Social Democratic parties. The discussion and debates over the issue of bourgeois theories vis-a-vis Marxist theories became a fashion in intellectual circles. "Communist Manifesto" and "Capital" became a subject of discussion even outside the Europe.

But it was not the time of intense class struggles in Europe. The capitalism was developing relatively fast. It was advancing towards the monopoly phase, leaving behind the phase of free competition. The European countries were competing against each other to establish their colonies in Africa and Asia. It was the time, 17 years before the 19th century ends, when Marx closed his eyes forever with a dream of scientific socialism in them.

17 years after the end of 19th century, Marx's dream was realized in Russia. At the end of 19th century, Russia, wailing under the yoke of Tsarism, was such a citadel of reactionary forces, where peasants were suffering under the feudal exploitation and oppression. Several nationalities were suffering under the Tsar-imposed-servitude. Although the capitalist development started rather late it was speedily engulfing the entire economic structure, yet the capitalist class was politically weak and following the policy of conciliation rather than taking Tsarism head-on. Civil liberties were very limited and trade union and revolutionary activities were completely banned. Press was under the total control of the Tsarist regime.

With the rising levels of production in factories, the working class trade union consciousness also developed. At the same time, Marxism was transmitted to the Russian intellectuals through Europe. Earlier, intellectuals only propagated Marxism, but then out of its natural fusion with trade union activity, dozens of Marxist groups came into existence.

Although, these groups were engaged themselves in some activity, yet this activity was neither integrated nor planned. The severe oppression and restrictions by the Tsarist regime was either resulting in swift arrests of activists or forcing them out on exile. At such a time Plekhanov and Lenin took upon themselves the task of stringing together these activities. As a result of this a loose kind of social democratic party on the basis of a broad programme came into existence.

But, Lenin put in rigorous efforts in developing and establishing the party principles so as to build a new kind of party, with an iron discipline emanating from the principle of democratic centralism and committed to a concrete revolutionary programme and path; along with it started a resolute theoretical struggle against the economistic and legalistic trends of traditional Marxists. As a result of this struggle, Lenin had to part himself away remorselessly from his earlier comrades such as Plekhanov, Axelrod and Martov. But it is out of such a resolute theoretical, political and organizational struggle that a new kind of working class party the Bolshevik Party came into existence and developed.

It is during this struggle that Lenin, while firmly upholding the revolutionary spirit of Marxism and developing it, clarified the concepts of the leadership role of the proletariat, significance of peasantry and vacillation of bourgeoisie in democratic revolution. He pointed out the indispensable process of development of economic struggles into political struggles during trade union activity and determined the role and forms of Party leadership in accelerating this process.

This theoretical and ideological struggle with the reformists was yet getting intensified that signs of revolutionary uprising began to appear in workers, peasants and students. Lenin took up the task of preparing the party and the working class to play the vanguard role during the uprising, but the reformists were dragging their feet. Eventually, the rebellion broke out in 1905. Workers and peasants dealt heavy blows to Tsarism and feudal lords, armed clashes took place. Though in urban areas, the rebellion was crushed in few months but in backward rural areas it continued, in a scattered manner, even up to the year of 1907. This rebellion is known in history as the revolution of 1905. Though failed, the rebellion shook the ground under the Tsarist regime and brought sharp political awareness among the people. The features and characteristics of different class political forces appeared clearly. Reformism of the Russian revisionists known as Mensheviks and their love for the bourgeoisie became apparent. The counter-revolutionary role of the Russian liberal bourgeoisie and its collaboration with Tsarism got exposed. The approach of the Bolsheviks to confront Tsarism and the bourgeoisie with firmness got accepted by the people and established among them. The class character of the Bolsheviks and

the Menshevik revisionists was made known to the world as a result of this revolutionary uprising and its failure. These were the Bolsheviks who resolutely and courageously plunged into this revolutionary upsurge and called for completely abolishing the Tsarist regime and establishing democratic state of workers and peasants instead. These were the Mensheviks who, at the time of the revolutionary upsurge, were vacillating, stood by the side of the bourgeoisie and gave the slogan of establishing a parliamentary regime in the leadership of the bourgeoisie. These were the Bolsheviks who were not disheartened by the failure of the revolution; instead acknowledged it as a peoples' rehearsal for a victorious revolution. They drew lessons from it and started preparation for the next round of the revolution. These were the Mensheviks who were disheartened by the failure of the revolution and drew a lesson that workers "should not have picked up the arms." Lenin correctly concluded at this time that it was not the working class but the petty-bourgeoisie which vacillates and goes for calculating the chances of success and failure in face of a rising revolutionary upsurge. When the revolutionary tide is on the upswing, it becomes most excited and plunges into it. When the upsurge recedes and revolution fails, it becomes remorseful and dismayed. But the working class, on the other hand, with its firm conviction in its inevitable victory, gathers achievements of the revolutionary practice and learns lessons from it. Rather than being remorseful and dismayed, the splendor of peoples' revolutionary potential inspires it to draw its future plans and decide its tasks.

In the next few years, this conviction of the Bolsheviks was put to test while confronting extremely severe and brutal reactionary offensive of the Tsarist regime. The period is known as the Stolypin reaction in history. Every kind of revolutionary activities, including trade union activities, came under severe repression during this period. It was an order of the day for the Tsarist police to put the activists under house arrest, or resort to severe torture, or send them to exile or simply execute the activist even on a slight instance of suspicion. In face of such a severe repression, petty-bourgeois revolutionary elements lost the courage and became passive. Many intellectuals deserted Marxism and reverted back to metaphysics. Revisionists even abandoned the formal positions of opposing Tsarist regime and making a revolution. But the Bolsheviks under the

leadership of Lenin and other resolute fighters of the working class remained steadfast. Thousands of them were sent to jails and exiled where they faced extremely tortuous conditions, immense economic hardships, problems of underground life. Yet their conviction and their belief in the Marxist theory, inevitability of revolution, potential of the working class and most of all in party's line, had steeled their determination. It had encouraged them manifold to confront the difficulties and problems. It had infused in them the spirit of sacrificing at the altar of the revolution. That is why, despite the severe repression during those years when even the trade unions as well as the party were scattered, when the non-class supporters and sympathizers of the revolution were in dismay, they did not only keep the party core secure, but were able to make it more trained, steeled and consolidated.

As a result of this ideological political consolidation, it was the Bolshevik party, which, during the First World War, under the leadership of Lenin, stood steadfast against the national-chauvinistic storm of imperialists, while all the other social democratic parties and the leaders swayed along. It was a result of this consolidation alone that the Bolshevik party was altogether ready to lead from the front when the movement of workers and peasants again turned its side.

In February 1917, as a result of deepening economic-political crisis, the Russian working class and the soldiers opposed the imperialist war and raised the demand for bread, peace and freedom. The Bolshevik party, at this occasion, raised the slogans of abolishing the Tsarist regime and the slogan of "all power to the Soviets". The general uprising of the working class, the soldiers and the peasants overthrew the Tsarist regime. But some factors were causing limitations such as the main Bolshevik leaders were outside the country at the time, the prominent leadership present in the country was busy with the tasks pertaining to the rebellion and thousands of novice activists had entered the Soviets. Taking advantage of such factors the Menshevik revisionists and the Socialist revolutionaries had acquired the dominant position in Soviets. They compromised with the bourgeoisie and handed over the power to it. The government of the bourgeoisie thus established, replacing the monarchy.

Situation was rather unique in this transitional period. If the bourgeoisie was holding the power on the one hand, the Soviets held

sway among the people. The Soviets of workers and soldiers were still autonomous to a large extent.

People were expecting that their demand for bread, peace and freedom would be met by the government; would come out of the war; would provide better wages and civil liberties to workers; would distribute land among the peasants. But the bourgeois government kept its preferences for its imperialist interests and declared to continue the war. Serving the interests of bourgeois landlords, it refrained from providing land to the farmers.

Nevertheless, within the next eight months, the Bolsheviks performed a miracle. But this miracle was not that easy. They worked round the clock and carried out an intense political campaign to gain majority in the Soviets. Traditional Marxists were not acknowledging the concept of the proletarian revolution immediately after this bourgeois revolution. Many among them were Trotskyites and the well known intellectuals like Zinovev and Bukharin, who were part of the Bolshevik Party. They did not have faith in the ability of the working class to seize and control the power and build socialism. But the people having faith in Marxism and in the creative potential of the working class, under Lenin's leadership, put forth a resolute struggle against these wrong conceptions. In form of the Soviets, an alliance of the workers, soldiers and the peasants was set-up and on October 25th of 1917 (November 7th as per the New Calendar) the bourgeois rule was overthrown and the rule of the working class was established. Entire property of the capitalists and the landlords was confiscated and brought under the ownership of the State of the working class. Land was distributed to the tillers. Workers committees were created to control the management of the factories. Soviet Russia called back her army from the war fronts and declared peace. Peoples' demand for bread, peace and freedom was met. Entire power was handed over to the Soviet heads. Thus, October revolution was an advent of a new era, a beginning of a new chapter, not only for Russia, but for the world as a whole. This was a beginning of a new era, the era of socialist building.

It was, of course, not that easy and straightforward a task to destroy the power of the exploiting ruling classes and demolish the old system. It required tons of patience, firmness and wisdom. It was a task full of sacrifices. But to build a new system replacing the old one, was far difficult than this. Not only the dethroned classes were frantically fighting their last battle, but the imperialists and the

reactionaries all over the world were hell bent on strangulating the newly born system. Moreover, the older economic and administrative system had been destroyed and the newer system was yet to be built. Neither was there any earlier experience of building such a system. Such a situation was crying for a peaceful span of time. But the imperialist were not ready at all to let this happen. So, right after it came into existence, the Soviet government had had to pay compensation to one faction of the imperialists (Germany) and had to thwart back the joint intervention by the alliance partners of the other faction. Thus, under the leadership of Lenin and Stalin, the Soviet regime performed another miracle just in the days of its beginning. Next, it liberated the nationalities enslaved by the Tsarist regime and put these on to the path of prosperity. It adopted the path of reducing the economic and class differences by eliminating the poverty as well as the affluence. Through the active participation of the people, it started building such a planned economic system in which collective and socialist production began to replace the private production. There was work for everyone, and everyone was paid according to the work. Unemployment, inflation and starvation just vanished away. An atmosphere of equality, fraternity, freedom, prosperity, education, culture, development of new kind of democratic values and thus an atmosphere of development of a new kind of human beings had been established and began to develop which had become an ideal for the entire world.

The October revolution marked an advent of a new era of the proletarian revolutions, and thus established Marxism at the next level of its development as Marxism-Leninism. Along with it Marxism became a world phenomenon instead of being a European phenomenon. The October revolution spread the message of liberation and revolution even to the far away and isolated regions of the oppressed colonies of imperialism. This rang the death knell and sent shivers down the spine of imperialist system of exploitation and oppression.

Thus, the October revolution realized the dream for socialism of the great Marx.

Before the October revolution, the fanatic advocates of bourgeoisie used to call Marx a day dreamer. Their mouths were shut, once and for all, after the October revolution. The socialist system that was being built in the Soviet Union left those at a loss for words who questioned Marx's dream or his theory.



Our Legacy

As Steady as Mount Tai

On the top of the mountain was a small village called Pailungmiao. On such a commanding height, it held strategical importance. Vice-Chairman Chou thought the Chairman was too tired, and he wanted to camp in this place.

"This is an advantageous spot for us," he said. "Headquarters can set up here."

"Right," said the Chairman. "We'll stop here. Deploy the security guards well. If the enemy comes up the mountain, we can fight them off for more than three hours. There'll still be time for us to go, then."

After dark, the enemy lit a big fire in the sector west of Chiahsien County. Its flames leaped high, turning the mountains and fields crimson. We could see very clearly from the mountain, as if the fire was right before us. Comrade Wang Tung-hsing hurried to report it to Vice-Chairman Chou, who came out for a look.

"Have the security guards take good positions," he said. "Don't tell the Chairman. Let him have a good sleep. He's too tired!"

Who would have guessed that the Chairman, in his room, would overhear him? "Wang Tung-hsing!" the Chairman called in a loud voice, "Don't worry. Today, the world isn't theirs, it's ours!"

Smiling, Comrade Wang Tung-hsing left.

During the latter half of the night there was a big rain. Water pelted the enemy at the foot of the mountain, making them howl and cry. They fired their rifles and their artillery to give themselves courage. We slept well all night.

In the morning it was raining harder than ever. The whole mountain was white and misty, like a waterfall. As we went down the mountain, the water simply pushed us along. It was impossible to stand still. The horses could not be ridden. The Chairman walked with us, hand in hand.

In the valley we went north, towards the upper reaches of the Chialu River. The torrents had overflowed the river bed. There was no telling how wide it was. Our advance guard found the narrowest part of the river, and started to build a bridge. There were two big boulders on either side of the river which seemed usable as foundations for the bridge. But the torrent was too strong. You got dizzy just looking at it. When the Chairman arrived, Comrade Wang Tung-hsing hurried up

to him and reported: "The flow's too rapid. It is going to be difficult to build a bridge. A few comrades have already swum across to find some of the local people on the other side."

The Chairman walked to the river's edge and examined the situation carefully. Then he put the end of a branch in to test the speed of the flow. Vice-Chairman Chou and Comrade Jen Pi-shih had long since been busy supervising the construction of the bridge.

Suddenly rifle and artillery fire sounded from the direction of Pailungmiao. The thunder of the exploding shells sounded directly overhead. Our guards detachment was exchanging fire with the enemy. The place seemed about to become a battlefield! The Chairman turned and looked at the mountain top, then, quite unruffled, paced back and forth along the river bank. The fighters building the bridge had stripped, and were straining with all their might to fling ropes and spars to the opposite bank so as to set up a framework on which boards could be laid. But the river was wide and the water fast. Some of the spars fell in the middle of the river and were washed away. Though the situation was very tense, the bridge could not be built immediately. Comrade Wang Tung-hsing grew quite upset, and he hurriedly asked the Chairman's permission to find some way of getting him over to the other side first. The Chairman shook his head:

"No. I'll stay here. Find a way to get the secretaries, the radio men and the documents across the river first!"

More than once the Chairman had taught us that we must pay attention to preserving our documents under all circumstances, because they affected the lives and future of the people of the whole country. Many times he had instructed us: "In a crisis you needn't worry about me. Save the secretaries and the documents first." At all times, he placed the country and the fate of the people first, never giving a thought to his personal safety. That was the noble way of our leader!

Soon, in accordance with the Chairman's instructions, the men in charge of documents and communications, holding onto unsaddled horses, swam with the current to the opposite shore.

The fighting grew hotter, but the bridge building still progressed very slowly. On both banks, men pulled the ropes tight and lashed them around boulders, then laid some doors upon the ropes. But the rough water and the high waves caused the ropes to sway and dance.

What was more, there were not enough doors. So our men had to swim the river again and borrow some lumber. Just at the moment our organizations' entire personnel and their horses were all gathered on the river bank, the enemy planes chose to come out in the rain. But the Chairman was completely unperturbed. Turning to a staff officer, he said:

"Give me the radio messages!" And he sat down on a wet bare rock and concentrated on reading through the messages. In a little while our radio transmitter was set up, and the sound of "di-di-da-da" rang on the river bank.

The calm and steadiness of our leader gave us additional strength. When only the last section of the floating bridge remained to be built, local people finally arrived with many doors and pieces of lumber, and helped us lay them one by one upon the ropes. The floating bridge was finished. Comrade Wang Tung-hsing ran to the middle of it and jumped up and down a few times. The little bridge swayed wildly, but it was quite sturdy. He hurried back to the Chairman and reported: "We can cross!"

Only then did the Chairman rise and take the lead, crossing the bridge with large strides. The other leaders also crossed, one by one. Finally, our detachment, in single file, crossed over, group by group. The pack animals were too heavy with their loads. All we could do was unload them and have men carry the things across piece by piece on their backs.

Gradually the rain slackened. The firing, however, did not stop. Confronting the enemy's concentration of troops and artillery fire, our guards detachment held its position and repulsed the enemy. Chairman Mao and the Central Committee organizations at last crossed the Chialu River safely.

There were no enemy on the north side of the river, and we followed along its bank towards the west. Soon the sound of firing could no longer be heard. That day we never left the river side. Sometimes we walked on a mountain slope; sometimes we turned into the river valley. It was not until nightfall that our leaders decided to billet in Yangchiayuantse.

Yangchiayuantse happens to be on the south side of the river, which meant that we had to cross the Chialu a second time. We were clearly at the upper reaches. But it had just rained, and the water was very turbid. When we tried wading, however, it only came up to our

waists. Crossing on horseback, you could avoid getting wet. Chairman Mao rode his old black horse, and we rolled up our trouser-legs and started wading. Just as we reached the middle of the river, we heard a roaring sound. People on the opposite shore shouted:

“Hurry! A mountain torrent is coming!”

Looking back, we saw a huge wall of water tumbling down towards us. Guard Wang Chen-hai pulled the Chairman's horse for all he was worth from the front, while we shoved mightily from behind. But the animal refused to hurry.

“You all go ahead quickly,” said the Chairman. “The mountain torrent can't sweep me away!”

Of course we would not let go. Dragging and pushing, we finally managed to avoid the torrent. When we looked back from the opposite shore, the narrow stream had become a vast sea.

“Notify the comrades on the other side quickly not to come over,” said the Chairman. “Have them wait until the water goes down, then we'll see.”

It was already very dark, and everyone was soaking wet from head to foot, including the Chairman. The pack animals with the blankets were still on the opposite shore. The Chairman could not even change his clothes. On entering the cave, he at once got busy reading radio messages. We built a fire to dry our clothes. Because the brushwood was too wet, it filled the cave with a choking smoke. We could not stop coughing, and our eyes streamed with tears. Removing his jacket, the Chairman sat cross-legged on the kang, continuing to look through the radiograms. We wanted to go back to the other shore for his clothing and blankets so that he could get some sleep. But the Chairman said:

“That's not necessary. I have a lot of things to read here. I don't want to sleep now.”

*“In His Mind a Millian Bold Warrior -
The Reminiscences of the
Life of Chairman Mao Tsetung
during the Northern Shensi Campaign”*



Naxalbari uprising:

Get Prepared for the Golden Jubilee Ideological Political Campaign

The next year is going to bring the golden jubilee celebrations of Naxalbari uprising, "The Spring Thunder over India", so cherished by the international communist leadership of CPC Stature. On May 25, 1967, the uprising faced the bullets from the 'United Front' left government in which Jyoti Basu, leader of CPIM was the home minister. The martyrs included seven women and two children. The uprising marked a turning point in the revolutionary struggles of the Indian people. The process of re-organization of the communist party in India on the basis of Marxism, Leninism, Mao-Tse-Tung-Thought began with the ideological vibrations caused by the thunder clap of the agrarian revolution.

The 50th anniversary of Naxalbari uprising must hold high both the aspects of its legacy. It's legacy as a glorious manifestation of the revolutionary class struggle, as well as its ideological legacy of sharp demarcation with revisionism, on the basis of Marxism, Leninism, Mao-Tse-Tung-Thought. This occasion along with the centenary year celebrations of October Revolution must be an occasion for ideological consolidation of communist revolutionary forces with the perspective of accomplishing the already delayed task of re-organizing the communist party in India. We are publishing some writings in this issue as part of preparation for the ideological political campaign for the golden jubilee celebrations.

-- Editor

**Naxalbari and
Indian Revolution**

**50 Years of Distinct
Ideological Phase**

The transformation of the agrarian struggle of Naxalbari into a revolutionary agrarian rebellion, in May 1967, was the beginning of a new phase on the Indian political scene. The Naxalbari rebellion was a great historical event. It was an outcome of the long assiduous endeavor for the building of this struggle by the communist revolutionaries with in the Communist Party of India. The Naxalbari jolt did not only gave an exemplary phillip to the peoples' struggles of various sections in the country but it also brightened the prospects of

the advance of the revolutionary movement by providing new direction and revolutionary political content to these struggles.

Naxalbari rebellion, after the Telangana armed struggle happened to be a new milestone in the history of communist revolutionary movement of India. Leadership of the Communist Party of India had betrayed the glorious struggle of Telangana. But despite this betrayal its mask remained somewhat intact. It had not had to pay a heavy political price for it; had not faced any effective ideological political challenge. But the revolutionary jolt of Naxalbari rebellion had burnt the masks of revisionist leadership. It drew a line of demarcation between communist revolutionaries and revisionists. Naxalbari rebellion gave birth to a new upsurge of revolutionary struggles and great ideological political upheaval. This upsurge became a touchstone for the demarcation between communist revolutionary and revisionist ideology, politics and practices. After breaking away from the so called Marxist party, the communist revolutionaries, for the first time, clearly and distinctly upheld the Marxism-Leninism-Mao Tse Tung thought as their ideology. Thus, the Naxalbari rebellion played the role of projecting and establishing the real ideological status of Mao Tse Tung thought.

At the time of the Naxalbari rebellion, struggle against Khrushchovite revisionism was advancing on the international plane under the leadership of the Communist Party of China. This struggle began with the Great Debate that took place in the second half of sixties. The process of polarization between the communist revolutionaries and the revisionist on the international plane was going on. After the Naxalbari rebellion, the banner of steadfast support to the ideological political positions of the international communist revolutionary camp, being taken under the leadership of the Communist Party of the China, in a clear and distinct form, was hoisted on the Indian soil. Thus, the communist revolutionaries of India acquired their due place in the international polarization between Marxism and Revisionism. During the process of international polarization initiated by Great Debate, the Communist Party of India got divided into two parts. The leadership of the Marxist party that came into existence, pretended to oppose the Khrushchovite revisionism and the leadership openly appended to it. But this opposition was cautious, fake, formal and vague. It was being done to take advantage of the rage of the revolutionary cadre against

the revisionist leadership for its own factional interests. The 'Marxist' leadership was deliberately avoiding taking firm and distinct positions regarding the international line of the communist revolutionary movement. More significant was that it refused to make a break with traditional revisionism on the question of programme and path of the Indian revolution in the light of correct international line. It wanted to mislead the cadre by changing the appearance of the traditional revisionist frame while remaining within it. Its avoidance to accept Mao-Tse-Tung Thought as a creative enrichment of Marxism Leninism was deliberate. It could not afford to take a firm and distinct position in favor of the correct international line because adoption of this line meant rejecting the parliamentary path in India and taking to the path of Peoples' war. It meant declaring Indian state and ruling class parties as compradors of imperialism and to reject collaboration with them. It meant declaring the institutions of Indian state, its assemblies and parliaments as a mask for the autocratic state that has been continuing since the colonial rule of the British imperialism. It also meant freeing the people from its illusions and taking to the path of building parallel state power by making agrarian revolutionary struggle as its axis. 1967 elections had made it quite clear that leadership of the Marxist party was sunk in the quagmire of parliamentary opportunism even deeper than the CPI.

But the Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution of China on the international scale and the Naxalbari rebellion on the national scale compelled the revisionist leadership to hurriedly come up into its true colors. It started demonstrating its "divergent views" with the Communist Party of China. It started slandering the Cultural Revolution. It not only tried to defame the revolutionary struggle of Naxalbari, but in the capacity of a ruling party in West Bengal, it did not even hesitate in shedding the peasants' blood to crush this glorious struggle.

Thus, the Naxalbari event which occurred at the developed and higher round of the polarization started with the "Great Debate", had provided a great boost to the efforts to uphold the flag of correct revolutionary positions and practice, by the communist revolutionaries of India, on the question of international and national line of the communist revolutionary movement. With this event a clear cut line of demarcation was drawn with the "apologists of neo-colonialism" on the national and international scale. With this began

the process of projecting and establishing the correct conclusions about the transformation of 1947 in India and the character of the country as the issues of demarcation with the revisionists. The transformation of 1947 was declared as fake independence and continued new form of colonial servility. Thus, communist revolutionaries of India threw away the domination of the tri-color (flag). Naxalbari rebellion and the other well known revolutionary struggles of peasants connected with it, became the concrete reference point for consideration and discussion about the characterization of Indian society, stage of the revolution and its path. These struggles once again revealed the semi-feudal content of the agrarian relations in India and the central importance of the slogan of the "land to the tiller". While declaring India as a semi-feudal semi-colonial country, the communist revolutionaries projected the programme of the new democratic revolution and declared the agrarian revolution as its content. As against the parliamentary path, they presented the path of the development of the protracted peoples' war with agrarian movement as its axis. As against the collaboration by the revisionists with the ruling class parties in the parliamentary sphere, the concept of struggle oriented united front of revolutionary classes against the imperialist feudal alliance was projected.

The ideological political struggle initiated by the Naxalbari rebellion, propagated on a wide scale, the Marxist Leninist understanding and approach regarding parliamentary institutions. Allurement towards these institutions and the approach to depend on these or nurturing and spreading illusions about the role of these institutions, all such streaks of thinking and tendencies became the established identification-features for the recognition of the affects of the revisionist ideology and politics. With the practical touchstone of revolutionary class struggles, especially the revolutionary agrarian struggles, becoming the parameter of the identification of friends and enemies, the revisionist tendency of seeking and making allies, with in the framework of the ruling class parliamentary politics, started getting exposed. The allies of revisionists from within the parliamentary "united fronts" came forth as shameless advocates of reckless repression and false police encounters. The Akalis, the Jan Sanghis, the Socialists, pseudo communists et al were fully exposed by the jolt of Naxalbari.

At the time of the Naxalbari rebellion, debate about the

illusionary view of “peaceful transition” projected by the Khrushchovite revisionist clan was going on. Indian revisionists were getting succor from this view. Naxalbari rebellion provided new strength to the struggle against this view. This rebellion proved to be a practical refutation of the views of peaceful transition. It exposed the reality of the state as a ferocious force for perpetrating repression on oppressed classes and preventing the path of revolutionary change. It projected the central importance of parallel state power for carrying out the programme of revolutionary social change. The experience of Naxalbari revealed that without building parallel power people cannot get implemented the reforms declared by the ruling classes themselves what to speak of carrying out a revolutionary agrarian programme! On the other hand, it revealed the unbound revolutionary potential of masses of the people for challenging the state's might and taking the power into their own hands on their own. Thus the Naxalbari rebellion deepened the line of demarcation between the revisionist followers of “peaceful transition” on the one hand and communist revolutionaries on the other hand.

On the whole, this rebellion has revealed that the leadership of the 'Marxist' party, like the leadership of the CPI, is also the drum beater of fake independence of 1947. It is fully engrossed in the infatuation of parliamentary institutions. Owing to this very infatuation, it is declaring the autocratic Indian state as a bourgeois democracy. It stands for collaboration with ruling class political parties. It is sunk in the quagmire of legalism and reformism. Its line of demarcation with Khrushchovite revisionism is sham. Because of its need for collaboration with Russian Social Imperialism, it takes the contradictory position of characterizing the leadership of Soviet Union as revisionist as well as the socialist one. For this very reason, it shows displeasure towards the onslaught by the Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution of China against the forces of capitalist restoration. It is because of these reasons that it falls in the camp of revisionism on the national as well as on the international scale. Thus, the Naxalbari movement played an historic role in drawing the clear line of demarcation between the communist revolutionary camp and revisionist camp in India.

It is 49 years since the Naxalbari event, during this period the communist revolutionary movements on the national as well as international level has gone through the process of great upheavals,

achievements and setbacks. The communist revolutionary movement in India has to face several ideological political attacks from within it. But the ideological political basis provided by the Naxalbari rebellion to the communist revolutionary movement of India had always remained a parameter for identifying the deviationist tendencies of every hue and an instrument for exposing these. As the communist revolutionaries of India have evolved their line in light of the general line and conclusions of the international communist revolutionary movement as well as in light of the basic assumptions of Mac Tse Tung thought regarding the revolutions in the imperialist dominated countries. The ideology and politics of Naxalbari has taken a more concrete form. This concrete line evolved on the basis of ideology and politics of Naxalbari, provides the reliable basis of recognizing any wrong trend, deviation or faltering and giving a fight against it.

By casting a glance on the deviations, trends and tendencies arising at times from within the communist revolutionary movement for deviating it from the track, it can easily be seen that thrust of these: (1) remained directed at revising, reversing, negating or undermining, in one way or the other, the conclusions adopted by the international communist movement during the Great Debate (2) remained directed at revising, reversing, negating or undermining the path of Indian revolution evolved in the light of these conclusions, especially the protagonists of wrong trends, deviations and tendencies have been refusing in direct or indirect form, from the conclusions and their practical implications regarding the relation of the backward countries (of servility) with imperialist system and countries; regarding the character (comprador) of these states and their ruling cliques; regarding the basic differentiation between the revolutions (Socialist) in the imperialist countries and the revolutions (New Democratic) in the countries under imperialist domination; regarding the importance of agrarian question, protracted peoples' war and united front in the revolutions of these servile countries. For the deviations arising from within the Naxalbari movement, may it be the call given by them for building united front of "anti Russia non fascist forces" under the cover of infamous theory of Three Worlds; may it be the question of putting forth the alternative conclusions regarding the characterization (semi-feudal, semi-colonial) of the country, its relation (of indirect servility) with imperialism and about the stage

(New Democratic) of the revolution under the argument of Capitalistic changes in the agrarian relations and “new features” of the neo-colonial phase or may these be the efforts of denying the strategic importance of backward countries in the world revolution and the strategy of protracted peoples' war in these countries under the theory of conjectures. In all these cases a common thrust can be seen that of revising the basic conclusions of the Great Debate times and the conclusions of the Naxalbari movement, drawn in light of the conclusions of Great Debate, regarding the programme and the path of Indian revolution, and thus, revising the basic assumptions of Mao Tse Tung thought.

The common content of left or right deviations or falterings from the correct revolutionary line often takes the prominent form of drifting away from the building of agrarian revolutionary movement and from the path of protracted peoples' war. At times it took the leftist form of projecting the annihilation of “class enemy” as an alternative for the agrarian revolutionary movement. And at times it took the rightist form of presenting the building of open party in the name of utilizing the legal opportunities or collaboration in the parliamentary sphere with ruling class political forces while setting aside the parameter of attitude towards revolutionary agrarian movement.

But despite the onslaught of wrong trends, deviations, tendencies and falterings, and despite the resultant temporary damages to the communist revolutionary movement, the parameter of Naxalbari ideology and politics has always remained the basis for identifying the wrong tendencies and trends and putting up struggle against these. It is the basic frame of communist revolutionary line evolved on the basis of Naxalbari ideology, which is becoming today the basis for the efforts at re-polarization of communist revolutionary forces and reorganization of the communist party in India.

Despite the major problems and challenges before the communist revolutionary movement, the dissemination of new direction and energy instilled in its temper by the jolt of Naxalbari still flows in its blood. This basic differentiation between the pre 1967 phase of the communist movement of India and its later phase is result of the long lasting imprint of Naxalbari rebellion.

The path of Indian revolution will keep on shining with the glow of Naxalbari till its victory.



Spring Thunder Over India

Peking Review - July 14, 1967, no. 29

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

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

The Indian peasants' rebellion and the Indian people's revolution are inevitable; reactionary Congress rule has left them no alternative. India under Congress rule, though nominally independent, in fact is still a semi-colonial, semi-feudal country. The Congress government represents the interests of the Indian feudal princes, big landlords and bureaucrat-comprador capitalists. Internally, it mercilessly oppresses and ruthlessly exploits the Indian people. Internationally, while continuing to be dependent on its old suzerain, British imperialism, it throws itself into the lap of its new boss, U.S. imperialism, and the latter's number one accomplice, the Soviet revisionist clique, thus selling out the national interests of India on a big scale. Thus imperialism, Soviet revisionism, feudalism and bureaucrat-comprador capitalism weigh like big mountains on the backs of the Indian people, especially on the toiling masses of workers and peasants. The Congress government has intensified its

suppression and exploitation of the Indian people and its pursuit of the policy of national betrayal in the last few years. As a result, famine has stalked the land year after year. People dying of starvation is a common sight. The masses of the Indian people, above all the peasant masses, have found life, impossible. The revolutionary peasants in the Darjeeling area have now risen in rebellion, in violent revolution. This is the prelude to a violent revolution by the hundreds of millions of people throughout India. The Indian people will certainly cast these big mountains from their backs and win complete emancipation. This is the general trend of Indian history which no force on earth can check or hinder.

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

As long as 40 years ago our great leader Chairman Mao Tse-tung pointed out: ***"In China's central, southern and northern provinces, several hundred million peasants will rise like a mighty storm, like a hurricane, a force so swift and violent that no power, however great, will be able to hold it back. They will smash all the trammels that bind them and rush forward along the road to liberation. They will sweep all the imperialists, warlords, corrupt officials, local tyrants and evil gentry into their graves."***

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

shaking changes in the enormous countryside, and defeat any powerful enemy in a soul-stirring people's war.

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

The specific feature of the Indian revolution, like that of the Chinese revolution, is armed revolution fighting armed counter-revolution. Armed struggle is the only correct road for the Indian revolution; there is no other road whatsoever. Such trash as “Gandhiism”, “the parliamentary road” and the like are opium used by the Indian ruling classes to dope the Indian people. Only by relying on violent revolution and taking the road of armed struggle can India be saved and the Indian people achieve complete liberation. Specifically, this means to boldly arouse the peasant masses, build up and expand the revolutionary armed forces, deal with the armed suppression of the imperialists and reactionaries who are temporarily stronger than the revolutionary forces by using the whole set of the flexible strategy and tactics of people's war personally worked out by Chairman Mao, and to persevere in protracted armed struggle and step by step seize the victory of the revolution.

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

India is an enormous country; the countryside, where the reactionary rule is weak, provides the extensive areas in which the revolutionaries can maneuver freely. So long as the Indian proletarian revolutionaries adhere to the revolutionary line of Marxism-Leninism, Mao Tse-tung's thought and rely on their great ally, the peasants, it is entirely possible for them to establish one advanced revolutionary

rural base area after another in the huge backward rural areas and build a people's army of a new type. Whatever difficulties and twists and turns the Indian revolutionaries may experience in the course of building such revolutionary base areas, they will eventually develop them from isolated points into a vast expanse, from small areas into extensive ones, in a wave-like expansion. Thus, a situation in which the cities are encircled from the countryside will gradually be brought about in the Indian revolution to pave the way for the final seizure of the cities and winning nationwide victory.

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

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

("Renmin Ribao" editorial, July 5.)

Raising the Red Flag in India
The Darjeeling
Peasant Armed Struggle

Peking Review
July 14, 1967, no. 29

A peasant armed struggle base has been set up in the countryside

in Darjeeling District, West Bengal State, under the leadership of the revolutionaries in the Indian Communist Party. A glowing spark of the fire of revolutionary armed struggle launched by the Indian people under the guidance of Mao Tse-tung's thought represents the general orientation of the Indian revolution at the present stage.

A Red District - Indian papers have disclosed that this armed struggle area is located around the three villages of Naxalbari, Kharibari and Phansidewa in Siliguri Sub-Division of Darjeeling District in the mountainous area of north West Bengal. This Red district, first established in early March, covers an area of some 270 square miles and has a population of 80,000. For nearly four months since its formation, it has withstood encirclement by the White regime. Nearly 20 hamlets where the revolutionary power is comparatively strong have raised the red flag.

In 1965, the revolutionaries in the Indian Communist Party in Siliguri put forward the slogan of arming the peasants and setting up rural bases in preparation for armed struggle. For two years they devoted themselves to mobilizing and organizing the peasants. After the fourth general elections in early March this year, a non-Congress "united front" government in which members of the Indian Communist Party participated was formed in West Bengal (see *Peking Review*, No. 24. p. 3). It served as a tool of the Indian reactionaries to deceive the people and benumb their revolutionary militancy. Then the members of the Indian Communist Party in the state who want to make revolution unfolded a movement of "deserting the united front government" and "joining the Darjeeling struggle." They went to Naxalbari and other villages to lead and organize the peasants to carry out the agrarian armed struggle.

Led by the revolutionaries in the Indian Communist Party, poor peasants and farm laborers began to arm themselves by the thousands. They established their own political power and organized peasants' societies. Trampling in the dust the reactionary government's law which protects the landlords' property, they

occupied by force the estates of the landlords, plantation owners and reactionary government. They plowed the land, drove away the plantation owners, used force to harvest the paddy in the fields of the landlords, seized grain, guns and ammunition from the homes of the big landlords, collected money and grain from the landlords, and forbade hoarding and speculation. They established people's courts to try and punish the local bullies and bad gentry. Ignoring the reactionary government's order prohibiting assembly of more than four persons and forbidding the carrying of weapons, they held armed demonstrations and moved about in armed groups.

In the hamlets the organized peasants, armed with bows and arrows, guarded their homes day and night against police "sweeps." They set up alarm systems to warn the villagers of the police's approach.

Defeating Counter-Revolutionary Dual Tactics - Soon after the armed struggle area was established, the Indian reactionaries resorted to counter-revolutionary double-dealing political deception and armed suppression to clamp down on the people's revolutionary armed struggle.

In mid-May, the West Bengal state government sent a land and revenue minister to Naxalbari to induce the local people to lay down their arms and seek a "political settlement." But the revolutionaries in the Indian Communist Party who led the struggle refused to meet him.

When these "soft" tactics failed, the state government resorted to a hard line. It dispatched large numbers of armed police to Naxalbari. However, the rebelling peasants successfully ambushed the reactionary troops and police sent out on "mopping-up" operations.

On May 24, when a police team went to Naxalbari to "round up" and arrest the peasants taking part in the struggle to seize land, they were ambushed and encircled by 400 armed peasants. Four police officers were wounded. On May 25, a police party led by the Siliguri sub-divisional officer and the deputy superintendent of police went to a place near Naxalbari to fire on the peasants harvesting the paddy in the fields of the landlords. They were attacked by armed peasants, one of the party being killed and three others wounded. On May 26, 500 peasants encircled a landlord who had guns in his house. Altogether, in various conflicts in late May, one police officer and over

ten policemen were killed and the rebellious peasants eliminated the police stations in the three villages.

When this suppression failed, West Bengal Chief Minister Mukherjee (member of the Bengali Congress Party which split from the Congress Party) went personally to Siliguri on May 27 and called an emergency meeting of district officials of north West Bengal to plot further moves.

The Darjeeling District

Darjeeling in West Bengal State is a mountainous district of great strategic significance in northern India. Situated not far from Bihar and Assam States, its 1,100 square miles border on several neighboring countries. Naxalbari is only 4 miles from Nepal, 30 miles from Sikkim, 14 miles from East Pakistan and 60 miles from China's Tibet. Siliguri is a trading and communication centre through which runs the only railway linking Assam with other parts of India.

Darjeeling District is West Bengal's major tea-producing area. It also produces rice and other grain. Large tracts of its land have been seized by plantation owners and landlords who brutally exploit and oppress the laboring people. Most of the population are Santhals and other tribesmen, the majority being landless farm laborers who are the most heavily exploited and oppressed.

Of the 60,000 acres of farmland in Siliguri, 19,000 acres belong to the Indian Government and the rest to the big landlords. Under the protection of the Congress government, the big landlords and plantation owners often forcibly occupy land reclaimed by the poverty-stricken peasants and plunder them of their crops.

In mid-June, Mukherjee sent two companies of police from Calcutta to reinforce Siliguri and prepare for suppression of the people's armed struggle. Troops and police also blockaded the frontiers in Darjeeling bordering Pakistan and Nepal. Meanwhile six state ministers were sent on June 12 to Naxalbari for political maneuvering. They tried to fool the local people with promises that the government authorities would "pay immediate attention" to their complaints. At the same time they issued an ultimatum, threatening that the government would resort to armed force after June 20. The Hindustan Standard admitted on June 20 that "for three days the six

ministers worked very hard to bring what they called the "misguided" leaders to the conference table, but their ... efforts could make no headway against the increased tempo of lawlessness in the affected areas."

The Darjeeling peasant armed struggle has greatly encouraged the revolutionary people of West Bengal and has had wide repercussions throughout India. On June 27, the revolutionary masses staged a demonstration in front of the West Bengal state assembly house in Calcutta to support the Darjeeling armed struggle led by the revolutionaries in the Indian Communist Party. They shouted: "Red Salaam (salute) to Naxalbari!" and "Down with the revisionists!" They also raised slogans in praise of Mao Tse-tung's thought. As revealed in the Indian press and Western news agencies, peasant armed action is "on the rise" in many areas of West Bengal and "more and more places are developing in the direction of becoming 'Naxalbari districts.'

Panic-Stricken Reactionary Government - This situation has greatly alarmed India's central government. Congress Party President Kamaraj rushed back to New Delhi from the state of Madras, and the first meeting he held with Indian Prime Minister Indira Gandhi on June 8 was to discuss the West Bengal situation. On June 13 Interior Minister Chavan's report to parliament on Naxalbari touched off a heated row within the Congress Party. Some members advocated a presidential take-over of the "non-Congress" government in West Bengal. However, the Congress high command vetoed this proposal, feeling that they need this "non-Congress" government to put out the revolutionary fire in Darjeeling.

What is worth special attention is the fact that the reactionary central government is not frightened of the West Bengal government in which a number of Indian Communists are in power, but allows this "non-Congress" government to continue as part of the apparatus for its own reactionary rule. However, when the peasants' armed struggle led by revolutionaries within the Indian Communist Party started in three villages in the state, this made the reactionary central government quake with fear. This clearly proves that "peaceful transition," the "parliamentary road" and other revisionist wares cater to the needs of reactionary rulers. Only through revolutionary armed struggle can the reactionaries be dealt heavy blows; only in this way

can the foundations of reactionary rule be shaken.

----- ----- -----

Thirty-seven years ago, summing up the experience of the Red political power of the Chinese worker-peasant armed independent regime, Chairman Mao wrote in his article "A Single Spark Can Start a Prairie Fire". . . in semi-colonial China the establishment and expansion of the Red Army, the guerrilla forces and the Red areas is the highest form of peasant struggle under the leadership of the proletariat, the inevitable outcome of the growth of the semi-colonial peasant struggle, and undoubtedly the most important factor in accelerating the revolutionary high tide throughout the country."

Like pre-liberation China, India is a semi-colonial and semi-feudal country. To liberate themselves, the Indian people must proceed along the path pointed out by Comrade Mao Tse-tung. The establishment of the Darjeeling peasant armed struggle area under the leadership of the revolutionaries in the Indian Communist Party shows that the Indian people have begun to advance along this victorious road.



On September, 09:

Grasp and Defend the Mao-Tse-Tung Thought as an Integral Whole

Comrade Mao-Tse-Tung left this turbulent world in the midst of birth pains of a new glorious communist world, on September 09, 1976. But the treasury of his immortal teachings, the Mao-Tse-Tung Thought, has come as a multi ideological-material force of our times.

Four years after the death of this great helmsman, one of the communist revolutionary organizations in its tribute called his death anniversary, "a yearly reminder that comrade Mao-Tse-Tung is no more among us for blazing trails of revolutionary advance and enthusing our spirits." The tribute correctly noted both the aspects of post-Mao phase of international communist movement i.e. the immediate absence of an international Marxist authority to guide as well as the potential to ultimately fill this gap on the very basis of combining Marxism Leninism Mao-Tse-Tung Thought with class struggle in a turbulent world situation. It made the point in following words:

"September 09, 1976 marked the onset of a new phase in the development of international communist movement wherein it faces a unique challenge of passing through an ideological political trial-fire. Henceforth, for some time to come, it will have to map out its revolutionary course, in any case tortuous, without having the benefit of an international Marxism-Leninist authority's guidance. No doubt, it has the peerless compass of Marxism-Leninism-Mao-Tse-Tung Thought, for ascertaining the direction to be followed still, sailing the heavy seas depends, to a large extent, on the helmsman.

Comrade Mao-Tse-Tung put great reliance on the revolutionary masses of people of all lands and the correct revolutionary line. In the early sixties when international opportunism headed by the revisionist leading clique of the CPSU was rampant in the international communist movement and looked quite formidable, Mao-Tse-Tung reposed great confidence in the fledgling of the international Marxist-Leninist movement and exhorted it to dare the storm. Under his inspiring leadership, it did dare and beat back the revisionist offensive. Similarly, inside China he invoked the blooming

revolutionary forces for disposing of the rot that had set in the CPC and the proletarian state of China and exhorted them to dare the tide and bombard the bourgeois Head Quarters. Under his inspiring leadership, they did dare and beat back the counter-revolutionary bourgeois onslaughts of renegades Liu-Shao Chi, Lin Piao and Teng-Tsiao Ping and kept the flag of the dictatorship of the proletariat flying for two decades.

Dispelling all pessimistic views, Mao Tse-Tung proclaimed to the world that international opportunism, including the revisionist usurpers of proletarian state-power, are paper-tigers, doomed to bite the dust, and that Marxist-Leninist forces, how so ever weak they may be for the moment, are destined to triumph over their class-enemies, sooner or later."

(The Proletarian Path, October 1980)

"The new phase" of the above mentioned, "tortuous revolutionary course" and "ideological political trial-fire" yet seems far from over. So the defence of distinct placing of Mao-Tse-Tung Thought in Marxist-Leninist capital of ideology has become all the more necessary. It does not mean that the validity of the thought as an objective scientific truth in dynamic world reality has anyway become difficult to prove. Rather, the phenomenon of capitalist restoration, though negative, has confirmed scientific truth of its ideological foundations and exposed the ideological poverty of its opponents. The defence means defence from subjective thinking contending to reject or replace its essentials in one or the other form.

There is a range of attacks, distortions and revision of Mao-Tse-Tung Thought. A particular method and form of revising, is to pick and choose certain parts of Mao-Tse-Tung Thought for lip service and to claim adherence, but certain others to criticize and make a dent in integral body of Mao-Tse-Tung Thought. For example, some people accept the theories of Mao-Tse-Tung Thought regarding new democratic revolution as correct but join Chinese revisionists to dismiss his theories regarding GPCR. Some claim to accept the theory of continuing the revolution under the dictatorship of proletariat, but take the theory of peoples' democratic revolution in oppressed countries as invalid. Further there may be acceptance to the principal of armed revolution as against revisionist principal of peaceful transition, but silence about the general validity of people's war theory in semi-feudal countries. "Khrushchev's phony

communism” may be called remarkable but at the same time “apologists of new colonialism” may be better forget. Struggle against modern revisionism is appreciated by some but only to conceal disagreement, rejection or suspicion regarding vital parts of general line of ICM. In all such manifestations the running thread is to make some crippling dent in integral body of Mao-Tse-Tung Thought at one or the other crucial spot.

Such a phenomenon further underlines the significance of grasping and defending the Mao-Tse-Tung Thought as an integral whole. The defence of whole body of great debate principles is crucial in particular. The unity declaration of the four organizations who decided to merge into a single unified organization later named as CPRCI(ML) in 1993, said the following:

“The principles of the Great Debate led by Comrade Mao Tse Tung must be upheld by all genuine communist revolutionaries. Based on these principles, the forces of the proletarian revolutionary trend in the communist revolutionary camp could and would counter the attempted distortions and revisions (such as the class-collaborationist Three World Theory of the Deng clique and its reneging on Mao's theory of continuing the revolution under the dictatorship of the proletariat; the two world theory of the Hoxha clique; the overt or covert attacks on the 1935 line of the Communist International led by Stalin by certain “left” opportunist or right opportunist tendencies in the international communist movement, etc.) of the general line of the international communist movement. Today, some of these distortions have been exposed by world developments too. Nevertheless, the pernicious influence of other distortions of the principles of the Great Debate continue, in one form or another, in the communist revolutionary camp (particularly concerning the utilization of contradictions in the enemy camp; and the character and role of the states and ruling classes under neo-colonial order, etc.). It is a continuing task to fight all such distortions.”

(The Comrade, Jan.- Mar. 1994)

Let us vigorously respond to the need of assimilating, grasping and defending all the cardinal principles of Mao-Tse-Tung Thought in their inter-relationship. It is the way to make it a real weapon of revolution in our hands and pay homage to the great helmsman.

On Salient Components of Mao-Tse-Tung Thought

(A part of an article in "Proletarian Path", March 1980)

Mao Tse Tung Thought is an integral body of teachings of Mao Tse Tung which is a continuation and development of Marxism Leninism.

Mao Tse Tung grasped and applied the science of dialectical materialism in a masterly fashion and, in the process, greatly enriched it. Carrying forward Lenin's observation that the law of contradiction is the kernel of dialectics, Mao Tse Tung definitively formulated that the law of the unity of opposites is the basic law of dialectics. Thus, he specified the inter-relationship of various laws of dialectics.

Consistently upholding the principle of universality of contradiction, he applied it to socialist society and the communist party as well. Not only did he further develop the concept of two types of contradictions, i.e., antagonistic and non-antagonistic contradictions to be resolved by two different methods but more importantly, he explored the identity of these two opposites i.e., under certain conditions, antagonistic and non-antagonistic contradictions undergo transformation into their opposites. Thus, he provided the theoretical frame for conceiving the political phenomena of formation and dissolution of united front between different class forces, and of alternating periods of milder and acute forms of struggle in the development of socialist society as well as communist party, under varying conditions. Applying it to socialist society, he propounded the theory of continuing revolution under the conditions of the dictatorship of the proletariat his most outstanding theoretical contribution to scientific socialism. Applying it to the communist party, he put forth the organisational concept of struggle between two lines in the communist party, inter-linking the inner-party struggle and the class-struggle in society. Thus, he clearly pin-pointed the class-content of the motive force of development of socialist society and that of the development of the communist party.

In his analysis of the law of contradiction in things, Mao Tse Tung laid special emphasis on the study of particularity of contradiction and underlined its great importance for guiding the course of revolutionary practice. Exploring the problem of the particularity of contradiction, he ascertained a new dimension of contradiction representing in its particularity the unevenness of forces that are in contradiction, i.e., the uneven character of development of various contradictions in a process (the principal and non-principal contradictions) and that of the two aspects of a contradiction (the principal and non-principal aspects), and more importantly, the mutual transformation into each other of the principal and non-principal ones. Thus, he greatly enriched the concept of the particularity of contradiction and provided a comprehensive methodology for determining the strategic and tactical policies of a proletarian party. ["The study of the various states of unevenness in contradictions, of the principal and non-principal contradictions, and of the principal and non-principal aspects of a contradiction constitutes an essential method by which a revolutionary political party correctly determines its strategic and tactical policies both in political and military affairs." ("On Contradiction")]

Applying this comprehension of the particularity of contradiction to such pairs of opposites as were generally considered to be undergoing a change in the respective positions of their aspects, namely, the productive forces and the relations of production, theory and practice, the economic base and superstructure, Mao Tse Tung observed that the productive forces, practice and the economic base generally play the principal role but in certain conditions the relations of production, theory and the superstructure in turn manifest themselves in the principal role. Thus, he restored the true spirit of dialectical materialist outlook in the international communist movement suffering from a mechanical materialist streak in its viewpoint, particularly on questions related to the construction of a socialist society. This provided the ideological basis of the recognition of prime necessity of revolution in the superstructure after basically completing the socialist transformation of the economic base. The Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution in China was the result.

Grasping the uneven and dynamic character of various

contradictions in the process of development of a thing and that of the two aspects of a contradiction, Mao Tse Tung observed: although the fundamental essence of a process remains basically unchanged till the culmination of the process, marked changes in the inter-relation of various contradictions in process (and that of two aspects of a contradiction) take place at times during the development of a process: the respective periods encompassed by these marked changes have their distinctive characters or particularities representing, respectively, qualitatively (partially) different states of contradictions in their inter-relationship. Thus, he crystallized the concept of definite stages in a process of development of a thing.

Mao Tse Tung's comprehension of the phenomenon of definite stages in a process of development of a thing entailed the development of another law of dialectics, that is, the law of quantitative changes leading to qualitative changes. In this connection, he ascertained that, in the process of development of a phenomenon, along with uninterrupted quantitative changes many partial qualitative changes too take place before the final qualitative leap occurs. ["In any lengthy process of change, before entering the final qualitative change, the subject passes through uninterrupted quantitative changes and a good many partial qualitative changes. But the final qualitative change cannot come about unless there are partial qualitative changes and considerable quantitative change." (Critique of Soviet Economics Mao. p. 56)¹

Mao Tse Tung's conceptual grasp over the law of contradiction in things, especially, the uneven and dynamic character of contradiction: the possibility under certain conditions, of mutual transformation of principal and non-principal aspects of a contradiction, of partial qualitative changes in a process on the way to total qualitative change permeates all of his important military concepts, which constitute the most developed form of proletarian military thought till date the strategy and tactics of protracted people's war. For instance, at a strategic plane the concept of a revolutionary' base-area under people's state power amidst the countrywide counter-revolutionary state power (under certain conditions, the mutual transformation of non-principal aspect revolutionary power and principal aspect counterrevolutionary power in a relative and

partial way), the concept of strategic defensive stalemate strategic offensive (three main stages of development of the process of transformation of people's military power from non-principal position, through transient relative balance or equilibrium, to principal position in its struggle against initially superior military power of the enemy): and at a tactical plane, the concept of miniature counter-encirclements by the people's armed forces within the overall encirclement by the enemy forces, and the concept of "ten against one" in tactical operations (the possibility, under certain conditions, of relative and partial transformation of the non-principal force into principal force).

Mao Tse Tung integrated the universal truth of Marxism-Leninism with the concrete practice of the Chinese revolution. In grasping and solving the complex fundamental problems of national democratic revolution of semi-colonial and semi-feudal China and of its transition to socialist revolution, Mao Tse Tung illuminated the general course and features of the revolution in the colonial and semi-colonial countries. Carrying forward the teachings of Lenin and Stalin on the colonial revolution, he dissected the native bourgeoisie, studied the characteristics of its segments, drew a clear line of demarcation between the big bourgeoisie (comprador bureaucrat capital) and the national bourgeoisie, treating the former as a target and the latter as a potential (though vacillating and unreliable) ally of the revolution in its first stage preceding the socialist stage; concretely solved the peasant question by providing proletarian leadership to the agrarian revolutionary movement and relying on the peasantry as a main force in the national democratic revolution; ensured the consummation of the national democratic revolution and the transition to the socialist revolution by charting out a course of maintaining the independence of the proletariat as a political force, forging the worker-peasant alliance under the leadership of the proletariat (which irrevocably effected the supercession of the bourgeoisie by the Proletariat as the leader of the national democratic revolution), establishing the hegemony of the proletariat over all the political forces engaged in the revolution, including the national bourgeoisie, thus making it a new democratic revolution, in its political character.

Mao Tse Tung critically absorbed the first experience of the proletariat of building socialism in USSR and the loss of proletarian state power there and drew illuminating conclusions for steering the development of socialist revolution in China. Complementing, with this experience, the experience of concrete practice of socialist revolution in China, he arrived at a most profound generalization: "... in the historical period of socialism, there are still classes, class contradictions and class struggle, there is the struggle between the socialist road and the capitalist road and there is the danger of capitalist restoration...." Hence, he brought forth the foremost position occupied by class contradictions in propelling social development throughout the historical period covered by socialist society, and laid down the cardinal precept that for properly appreciating and tackling all problems of the development of socialist society (for that matter any class society) proletarian revolutionaries must proceed by taking class struggle as the key link. He stressed the great significance of thoroughgoing changes in the relations of production and the superstructure for greatly boosting the development of productive forces during periods of revolutionary transition of society. He pointed out that socialist society (in which the relations of production and the productive forces, the superstructure and the economic base, stand both in harmony as well as in contradiction, moreover, the old harmony constantly giving way to new contradiction due to the rapid development of productive forces), being a long historical period of revolutionary transition, calls for unrelenting revolutionary effort to adapt the relations of production to the constantly emerging requirements of the development of productive forces, and transform the superstructure to bring it in tune with the socialist economic base so as to consolidate and develop the latter. He further observed that as every socialist transformation in the relations of production and the superstructure corrodes the socialist basis, influence and power of the old exploiting classes and new bourgeois elements, it encounters their frantic resistance. And, this class-struggle between the proletariat and the bourgeoisie gets intense expression on the political front. Hence the paramount importance of political revolution for successfully effecting revolutionary transformations in the cultural as well as economic

sphere. Further, summing up the experience of deepening socialist revolution in China, he pointed out that after the smashing of overt bourgeois political resistance, the chief political representatives of the bourgeoisie are to be found hiding within the Communist Party the Party persons in authority taking the capitalist road - against whom the sharp edge of class struggle must be directed. For successfully conducting this complex class struggle to defend and consolidate the proletarian revolutionary line, affect all-round socialist revolution in ideological, political and economic spheres, defend and consolidate the dictatorship of the proletariat, and march forward, step by step, towards the realization of communist society, Mao Tse Tung exhorted the proletarian revolutionaries to rely on revolutionary masses of the people and revolutionary mass movements bringing into full play their creative initiative and genius. The glorious decade of the Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution of China, led by proletarian revolutionaries headed by Mao Tse Tung, witnessed the practice and maturing of this theory of continuing revolution under the conditions of dictatorship of the proletariat, marking a great leap forward in the revolutionary experience and achievements ("socialist new things") of international proletariat.

These are, in brief, the salient components of Mao Tse Tung Thought.

We do not subscribe to the notion of infallibility of great revolutionary persons, no Marxist does. Mao Tse Tung, like other great teachers of international proletariat Marx, Engels, Lenin and Stalin, cannot be free of errors and inadequacies. But such errors and inadequacies, if noticed, are to be analyzed in a total and historical perspective, on the basis of Marxism- Leninism-Mao Tse Tung Thought, and to enrich it. Whosoever ventures to challenge the validity of Mao Tse Tung Thought, as an inalienable part of Marxism-Leninism, for illuminating the path of world proletarian revolution in our times, must come to grips with this ideological edifice as a whole, especially his contributions to Marxist philosophy which constitute the basic frame of this edifice.



*Ideological Development of
Shaheed Bhagat Singh*

During his jail life, prior to his martyrdom, Shaheed Bhagat Singh had come up as an elegant and talented communist personality. The extraordinary pace of his ideological progress, owing to his deep study catapulted him into the class of the leaders of the country's communist movement. During the jail period, he had taken upon himself the responsibility of forming the communist party and moulding the revolutionary movement in accordance with the communist objectives and methodology. The draft of the revolutionary program issued by him from the jail, in the last phase of his life just before martyrdom, corroborates this.

Otherwise the communist party was formed in India in December 1925, when Shaheed Bhagat Singh and his compatriots had still not become communists. In the earlier phase of its infancy, the communist party had made good achievements. It had played an important role in giving red colouring to the working class movement. Efforts were made in different provinces for forging links with the people through open platforms of the Kirti Kisan Party and influencing the anti-imperialist national movement. However, the task of organizing, building and projecting the party to the required extent as a countrywide secret center for effective and impressive proletarian leadership had awfully lagged behind. Apart from other reasons group-sectarian tendency of the middle class had played a significant role in it. Furthermore, much of the energy got consumed in getting itself established as "left wing" of the Congress through the platform of Kirti Kisan Party and other mechanisms. Later on, the Communist International, the Chinese Communist Party and some other communist parties had pointed out the special importance of establishing a distinct and independent identity of the Party. (Source- A pamphlet issued by C.P.I. regarding the guidelines of party history). Perhaps it was a significant reason apart from other reasons responsible for Shaheed Bhagat Singh not coming into the organizational fold of the Indian Communist Party despite having come into the fold of communist ideology. But leaving aside this question of organizational unity of all the communist forces in the country, it is evident that in the final phase of his life Shaheed Bhagat

Singh on his own was assiduously engaged in the important endeavor as a communist organizer rather than a mere revolutionary nationalist.

The most significant aspect distinctly pointing to the transformation of Shaheed Bhagat Singh's communist ideals from those of the middle class nationalist follower into a communist personality imbued with proletarian awareness was his bidding farewell to revolutionary terrorism. Some necessary conditions were required for Shaheed Bhagat Singh's thinking to cover such a distance. The development of his revolutionary personality got materialized through his deep study of the literature of the revolutionary movements of the world as a whole and by grasping it. Even when he had not become a communist in true sense of the term, his views were based on theoretical foundations. He had been influenced by the thinkers and theoretical commentators of the anarchist movements. As a result, his faith got strengthened that when situations demand revolutionary changes, revolutionary terrorist militant actions do play a tumultuous role and arouse the revolutionary force of the masses into action.

In the absence of a communist party of stature in the country, further development of Shaheed Bhagat Singh was dependent on the fulfillment of some essential requirements. One such essential requirement i.e. the contact with the Communist International was not available to him. (When Bhagat Singh was in jail, the Hindustan Socialist Republican Army had planned to send some of its important leaders to Soviet Union but this plan could not be executed). The second means could have been, the positive process of the building of the revolutionary class struggle of the basic classes i.e. of workers and peasants. The Hindustan Socialist Republican Army couldn't avail the opportunity of going through this practice. The third means could have been the process of contact and theoretical discussions with the communist leaders in the country. Shaheed Bhagat Singh did have this opportunity through his contact with the leaders of the Kirti Kisan Party in Punjab but its limitation was that a high level Marxist theoretical explanation was necessary to impress Bhagat Singh. Despite their other merits the leaders of the Kirti Kisan Party in Punjab were not capable then to the required extent for fulfilling this condition. Sohan Singh Josh has admitted that notwithstanding the refutation of revolutionary terrorism they were not in a position to

provide requisite explanation of its differentiation from Marxism on the basis of sound theoretical foundations (Source Sohan Singh's writing, My Encounters with Bhagat Singh)

In these circumstances theoretical development of Shaheed Bhagat Singh depended on his deep direct contact with Marxist literature, its intense study and his capacity to grasp it on his own. On account of this requirement having been met, during his jail life, and on account of powerful grasping capacity of Shaheed Bhagat Singh, his ideological development took a qualitative leap. One more significant factor played a helpful role in this. Though, owing to intermingled reasons, Shaheed Bhagat Singh's organization could not pass through the required positive experience of building the worker-peasant class struggle, nonetheless some negative perceptions arising out of their experience did provide a meaningful material for drawing correct conclusions through deep pondering combined with intense study.

Pace of the development of Shaheed Bhagat Singh during his jail life casts an amazing effect. In the earlier phase of his revolutionary activity, Shaheed Bhagat Singh would, thus, refer to the anarchist leader Peter Kropotkin:

"One such act may, in a few days, make more propaganda than thousands of pamphlets. The government defends itself, bursts in a pitiable condition of anger. But by doing so it provokes new acts of revolt, individual and collective, it drives the rebels to heroism. One act generates the other. Opponents joins the ranks of rebellion. The government is divided into factions. Mutual antagonism sharpens the contradictions. The concessions come very late and revolution erupts ... There is no need for more money, organization and literature. A single human with a torch and a dynamite in hand can give directions to the whole world."

But during his jail life, Shaheed Bhagat Singh makes the following deep comment about terrorism:

"The path of bomb has been there since 1905 and it is a sad comment on revolutionary India. Terrorism is a repentance of revolutionary psyche in not having been able to go deep among the masses. Thus it is also a confession of our failure Its history in every country is a history of failure; France, Russia, Germany, Balkan countries, Spain, everywhere story is the same. Seed of defeat sprouts within it."

The comment of Shaheed Bhagat Singh regarding "repentance" resembles the comments of Lenin regarding revolutionary terrorism. But Shaheed Bhagat Singh goes further. Significantly he says that in respect of practical results the impact of terrorism and Gandhism on the revolutionary movement is identical in content. Referring to the limitations of revolutionary terrorism he says, even if the revolutionary terrorism succeeds, by applying its full force, in accomplishing "what has never happened in history earlier, even then terrorism can, at the most, compel the imperialist force to compromise. Such compromises would always fall short of our objective -- the complete independence. Thus terrorism can squeeze a compromise and an installment of reforms and that is what Gandhism is striving for."

Basing on the experience of Ireland, Shaheed Bhagat Singh calls revolutionary terrorism "a national idealism devoid of revolutionary social basis", which "despite all circumstances being favorable may be lost in the quagmire of compromise with imperialism" and he questions the revolutionary intimidators, "Should India still copy Ireland, though it may be possible even then should we"? His overall conclusion is that "Satan of terrorism need not be applauded".

At that time revolutionary terrorism was not a trend within the communist movement in India. It was represented, generally, by middle class nationalist sections. Nevertheless the above stated comment of Shaheed Bhagat Singh can be compared to some extent with those comments of Lenin which he made regarding the common content of the revolutionary terrorism on the one hand and economism-reformism on the other as wrong trends within the workers' movement.

Another glimpse of deep demarcation which Shaheed Bhagat Singh makes vis-à-vis dreamy conceptions regarding the role of revolutionary terrorism in creating revolutionary conditions and initiating revolution is found in the draft of revolutionary program issued by him. In this draft he exhibits the clear-cut awareness that the success of revolution depends on the fulfillment of necessary objective and subjective conditions. He mentions three necessary conditions stated by Lenin for the success of October revolution: political economic condition, mental preparation of the masses, and a trained revolutionary party capable of providing leadership in testing times. For him coming into action for the fulfillment of second and third

conditions is the "primary task" of communist activists. He also stresses the forging of program for practical revolutionary activity, "keeping this issue in mind". He considers "preparing and mobilizing the masses for militant activity" as the primary duty of the activists.

On the question of alignment of class political forces for the revolution in the country as well, the thinking of Shaheed Bhagat Singh and his comrades seems taking significant strides. Regarding the role of workers-peasants as the motive force of revolution, the view point of Shaheed Bhagat Singh has been coming under discussions. His comments regarding danger of "betrayal" on the part of Congress and "Indian Capitalism" has quite often remained subject of discussions. However the important thing is that the writings of Shaheed Bhagat Singh and his comrades seem tending towards examining the role of imperialist capital in the Indian economy as well as its political implications. It has been clearly stated in these writings that with the import of imperialist capital the layer of big capitalists tied in a relation of common interests and servility to it, on the one hand goes on developing and on the other hand the "deterioration" of this layer in respect of defending national interests becomes inevitable. The direction of this thinking of Shaheed Bhagat Singh comes in conflict with the direction of anti-imperialist united front with the entire capitalist class which, later on, determined the limitations of the revolutionary leading role of the Communist Party of India. The interesting thing is that Shaheed Bhagat Singh and his comrades seem inclined towards the direction of getting free from the conception of considering the entire bourgeois class as a class having common interests. As mentioned earlier, they have used the word "big bourgeois" for the bourgeoisie strung in the relation of loyalty and commonness with foreign capital. On the other hand such comments are there which point towards strangling of the independent development of capitalism in India owing to imperialist domination and thus become indications of the existence of capitalist class having conflicting interests with foreign capital. The behavior of British imperialists towards the company of Gurdit Singh Kamagatamaru has been cited as a significant instance of antagonistic relation between imperialist domination and Indian capital. Apart from it, in the jail diary of Shaheed Bhagat Singh a lengthy reference is there from an article of Bipin Chander Pal. In this writing the concerns and aspirations of those Indian capitalists are

addressed who see the import of foreign capital in India as colliding with their own interests. Leaving aside the discussion as to what extent the so called radical leaders within the congress did or did not represent the layer of this capitalist class, it is noteworthy that this writing, while explaining the meanings of sawraj, connects it with the right of severe restrictions against the import of foreign capital in the country, goes to the extent of "won't allow the English to enter the country", it considers the wholesale recruitment of Indian representatives in the bureaucracy as meaningless if the conditions of the state administration and its policies remain intact, and it also claims that getting free from the strangling restrictions Indian capitalism can defeat British capitalism in global competition and it can reach out to attain the status of parallel "Indian imperialism" . This reference noted with deep interest by Shaheed Bhagat Singh, combined with his comments regarding "big capitalists", brings forth the seeds of approach of making differentiation within the Indian capitalist class on the basis of basic relationship of economic interests that it has with imperialism.

It was this very differentiation in awareness which through the experience of Chinese revolution got itself reflected in Mao Tse Tung's thought in the form of distinct marking of contrasting class features of the comprador bourgeoisie and national bourgeoisie and which became the basis of the direction of united front with national bourgeoisie while making the comprador bourgeoisie as the target. Of course, the leadership of the Communist party of India has also been making differentiation between the "left" and "right" wings of Indian capitalist class but this differentiation was being made on the basis of the role of different sections of this class rather than their character. The class interests of the entire bourgeoisie including the big bourgeoisie were being seen as in conflict with foreign imperialism. The section that was being declared as the right wing was the one which was considered prone to running away from the defence of the interests of the entire "Indian capitalism" which were considered conflicting with and independent of imperialism and to the danger of succumbing before imperialism. According to such a conception the whole bourgeoisie becomes an intermediate class with dual and vacillating character and no section of which remains the target of revolution as a reactionary class.

In this context, the marking of big bourgeoisie by Shaheed

Bhagat Singh as tied to the imperialist interests becomes quite important. This marking contained the seeds of differentiation from the course adopted by Communist party of India, marching on which it had been offering all its might to the strengthening of the congress platform considered by it as the anti-imperialist national united platform.

In his effort to outline the course of Indian revolution a great importance was given by Shaheed Bhagat Singh to pre-empt the danger of the possible betrayal of the anti-imperialist revolutionary movement by the big bourgeoisie and its congress representatives. Hence the special urgency for Shaheed Bhagat Singh for the creation of people's own party i.e. the Communist Party in order to confront this danger. A Party, free from the illusions regarding the role of congress and big capitalists, and able to intervene properly and timely in the revolutionary situation and taking the reins of revolution in its hands, may lead it to victory

However, certain ideological limitations were yet to be overcome. Shaheed Bhagat Singh's warnings about the betrayal by capitalist class and Congress were partly influenced by his objective of seizing state power through revolution and utilizing it immediately for the establishment of socialism. On the basis of his Marxist understanding he had already rejected the objective of establishing capitalist state modeled on European countries and America. The concept of anti-imperialist anti-feudal revolution in the imperialist dominated countries under the leadership of working class, as not being a proletarian dictatorship or solely of a worker-peasant state, instead being the common democratic dictatorship of all revolutionary classes and the concept of a united front of all revolutionary classes including the national bourgeoisie for such a revolution, got distinctly established later on through the experience of Chinese revolution. The important writings of the Communist International regarding the question of revolution in the imperialist-dominated countries were not then accessible to Shaheed Bhagat Singh. Lenin had been emphatically affirming in connection with the imperialist-dominated backward countries that socialism cannot be immediately imposed upon these countries. He made another significant affirmation that the readymade books of Marxism cannot serve the purpose of the communists of these countries. They would have to chart out their own concrete course for their revolutions by

grappling with their conditions. Of course the leadership of the Communist Party of India did give weightage to these warnings by Lenin against "imposing" communism but it failed in charting out a correct course for the Indian revolution through hard mental labor. Instead the Lenin's warnings became for it the justification for forming united front with the big bourgeoisie loyal to imperialism, in the name of anti-imperialist united front and even for accepting its leading role.

The phase of Shaheed Bhagat Singh's jail life was such a phase of his ideological development in which he was addressing the question of concrete revolutionary program for social liberation of the people. Without such a concrete program, "appeal to national sentiments" seemed to him "meaningless". He was of the view that the effort for "American type Indian Republic" through "national revolution" in the country is unrealistic. He held the view that the bourgeoisie fears workers and peasants, on whom the "national revolution depends", thus "imperialism" cannot be dethroned through "national revolution" but through workers' revolutions. "Anything else cannot fulfill this objective". "We need to keep in mind that neither should we wish for any other revolution than the workers revolution and nor can it succeed". Masses ought to "be explained that revolution is in their interests and it is theirs. It is worker proletariat's revolution for the proletariat". In this light Shaheed Bhagat Singh makes socialistic economic steps the basis for his program for the abolition of imperialism and feudalism. But in the context of such a program the importance of noticing the existence of anti-imperialist capitalism in the country gets diminished.

In the context of above deliberations and Shaheed Bhagat Singh's capacity to rapidly grasp Marxist literature, the non-accessibility of theoretical material of Lenin and Communist International regarding the revolution in backward countries to Shaheed Bhagat Singh proved to be very significant unfavorable "coincidence". In the situation of its availability, Shaheed Bhagat Singh would have been confronted with the problem of seeking and shaping the contours of such a revolution, which despite not being a means for the immediate establishment of socialism, should not become the means for the establishment of capitalism rather should become a part of socialist revolution going to happen in the next stage. In respect of some aspects mentioned earlier, Shaheed Bhagat Singh seemed to be in quite better a position for grappling

with the point and in the event of having grasped it to address the question of class alignment for the revolution. His approach tending towards differentiation between different sections of capitalist class, combined with the concept of a revolution taken as an alternative for the capitalist revolution but prior to socialism, had the possibility of attaining distinct importance. "Seizure of political power by the people and for the people" while putting forward this concept of revolution, Shaheed Bhagat Singh's definition of the "people" and the "nation" is important. For him meanings of "people" and "nation" are not solely limited to working class. On the other hand he warns that "nation are not the loudspeakers of Congress". He includes 95% of masses in the "people". Shaheed Bhagat Singh had before him the model of Russia's October Revolution as an alternative to the bourgeois nationalist revolution. In the situation of having obtained the Leninist theoretical material regarding the specificity of revolutions in backward countries, his concept of seizure of political power by the people in the concrete Indian conditions had the possibility of coming forth in a distinct and crystallized form; had also the possibility of being presented as the concept of united democratic dictatorship of all revolutionary classes under the leadership of working class. Such a concept, basing itself on the immediate requirements of the democratic revolution, could have become a positive alternative for the course taken by the Communist party of India regarding the united front with the entire capitalist class. But the history could not get the opportunity to witness, assess and test the probable glimpses of the emerging communist revolutionary talent of Shaheed Bhagat Singh.

It is also interesting to note that Lenin had been especially emphasizing two points to convince the middle class nationalists of the backward countries who were having education in Marxism in the Soviet Union and were going to become communists. One point was regarding the uselessness of revolutionary terrorism and the other point was regarding the uselessness of the efforts to immediately "impose communism" on the masses of backward countries. (Source Indian Revolutionaries in Soviet Union.) Basing on the strength of his intellectual capacity and available Marxist literature Shaheed Bhagat Singh had attained clarity regarding the first point. On the other significant point required study material was not available to Shaheed Bhagat Singh. His vision of the state of "95%" people; his approach towards liberation from imperialism as based on the program of social

liberation; his clarity regarding the loyalty towards imperialism of a section of the capitalist class and his tending towards the existence of the capitalist class having conflicting interests with it; his concept of the building of the communist party as an independent leading force of revolution -- these significant elements and his ideological awareness seem to be demanding only the next ideological clue. This suggestive clue of Lenin that the march of the backward countries towards socialism depends on comprehending and carving specific contours of democratic revolutions of these countries, had the probability of making Shaheed Bhagat Singh "someone else", had it been available to him in those times when Shaheed Bhagat Singh was yet a youth of 23 years and India was searching for its "Mao Tse Tung". Just before his martyrdom Shaheed Bhagat Singh was studying a book by Lenin. In his own words he was having "an encounter" with Lenin. Alas! Had this "encounter" been longer! And had it really happened ... this thought will keep on always arousing the heart-throbbing curiosity in the minds, discerningly studying Shaheed Bhagat Singh.

However more important for the successors of Shaheed Bhagat Singh today is this comment of Pash that they ought to study Marxism-Leninism further from thereon where Bhagat Singh has left the page of Lenin's book folded, while going towards the gallows.

(from www.surkhrekha.blogspot.com)



The Question of Response to Fascist Reaction

The central leading committee of CPRCI (ML) in its recent meeting has discussed the question of response to recent peculiar aggressive features of the RSS-BJP combine behaviour and has concluded to emphasise the following points.

- The current aggressive features of Sangh family behaviour do not provide basis for policy differentiation between ruling class political forces.

- The question of relative tactical emphasis regarding struggle against different ruling class political forces is starkly different from the question of policy differentiation. The latter may imply partial temporary alliance with some enemy force.

- There are indications of a tendency among CR forces to overlook or undermine the above mentioned difference. This tendency is manifesting itself in forms like sharing platforms with social democratic ruling class parties in the name of opposing the Sangh family's Hindutava fascism. Such a tendency finally happens to be a variety of class collaboration, at least objectively.

- The current aggressive behaviour of Sangh-family forces should not be viewed in isolation. Rather, it should be taken as the sharpest and peculiar expression of the general compulsion and behaviour of the ruling class political forces in face of growing economic-political crisis and instability.

- All the ruling class political forces are worried about the future of their class rule and seek to strengthen the pillars of autocratic state power to cripple the class struggle. All of them are for use of fascist methods as necessary aids to this process. Along with growing state violence devoid of even facade of constitutional accountability, a variety of extra state violent networks is a phenomenon in the polity and social life of the country. There are violent reactionary mobilisations backed by a variety of sectarian politics and chauvinist ideology. National chauvinism communalised or otherwise provides an ideological chord for

countywide reactionary mobilizations on fascist lines. This weapon even with a communal twist was brought in operation by the so called secular congress at national scale in 1984 to demonstrate its efficacy in stabilizing the autocratic state power.

- The BJP-RSS variety of communal national-chauvinism is peculiar because of the sharper cutting edge of its reactionary ideological thrust. It combines religious, national, cast and male chauvinism into a single reactionary stream of Hindutava ideology which is stronger ideological carrier for spread of fascist infection. The other peculiar aspect is its present position as all India ruling party which is being used to consolidate Hindutava by capturing positions of power in crucial spheres. No less significant is the strength of its networks as instruments of large scale mobilisations on communal fascist lines. These peculiarities are to be counted for deciding immediate tactical emphasis regarding struggle against different aggressive ruling class political forces.

- The proper way to resist reactionary aggressive behaviour of ruling class political forces is to strengthen peoples' class unity through class struggle. Such behaviour provides an opportunity to deepen and broaden the class struggle by further embracing its own dimension of struggle against social oppression and violence. CR forces should keep this factor in mind.

- The phenomenon of fascism in semi feudal semi colonial countries does not emerge as negation of bourgeois democracy by the bourgeoisie itself, as in capitalist countries. It, rather operates as an aid to autocratic rule of feudal-comprador classes. So, it is not correct for the communist revolutionaries in these countries to think in terms of classical model of "anti-fascist front" to confront this phenomenon. The lack of necessary awareness regarding this may be another underlying basis for the tendency of united activities with ruling class parties in the name of resisting communal-fascist threat of BJP-RSS combine.



➤ **An article from old files related with the subject on next page**

From old files:

Let the Revolution Overtake the Advance of Fascistic Reaction

(The following article from "The Comrade" (January-March 1991), is relevant even in present context of aggressive reactionary behaviour of the RSS-BJP combine and the related policy questions. The Comrade at that time was CCRI's Organ which was later adopted by the unified CPRCI(ML) as its official Organ)

In a way most of those who were shocked by the Ayodhya outrage and the subsequent Bombay carnage, felt more anger and disgust towards the prevaricating Rao-government than towards the direct perpetrators of that barbarity. That was so because the Rao Govt., rather than the Sangh Parivar or the Shiv Sena, was mainly responsible for the use or non use of the power of the Indian state in connection with the Ayodhya outrage and the 'Bombay carnage. In that respect, its attitude and conduct, as expressed in the communally selective non-use as well as use of state-power, made the Indian state an accomplice of the Hindu chauvinists in the communal-fascist assault on the Muslim community. That factor i.e. role of the state lent the communal fascist assault a terrible effectiveness that was out of proportion to the actual worth of the Sangh Parivar or the Shiv Sena, and made them look an overwhelming force to the victims. Their actual worth, like that of any other bully, would show up only when confronted by an organized force, whether of the state or of the people's self-defence.

The palpable anger and disgust towards the Rao-government, as noticed among sections of common people- particularly the Muslim masses, and among most of the intelligentsia too, were the result of their shattered expectations from the government. The sections of common people (because of the lack of any other source of protection) and sections of the intelligentsia (because of their illusory notions regarding the modern bourgeois democratic character of

the Indian state system did entertain the minimum expectation that the Rao-government like any other central govt. would not slide to such abysmal levels of politicking as to irretrievably compromise the public image of the Indian state.

No doubt, the Rao-government is guilty of extreme dereliction of elementary state-duty towards its citizens, particularly the Muslim masses. Still, its conduct in this matter is not out of character either with the Indira-Rajiv legacy since 1982 or with the thrust of its current economic policy measures.

The 1984 anti-Sikh pogrom in Delhi and some other cities with the connivance of the Rajiv-government was a curtain-raiser to this medieval show of a state virtually washing its hands of the civil security of ordinary citizens, particularly the religious minorities. The Rao-government is only generalizing and carrying ahead that process of political degeneration of the Indian state.

The thrust of the current policy-measures which are essentially backed up by all the ruling classes' political parties, is towards slashing the governmental expenditure on developmental investment, social services' and social welfare schemes, and on the other hand, towards dismantling all formal restraints on the rampage of the foreign and native monopoly capital. That means the state lets drop the mantle of its obligation to bother about the economic survival of the great mass of ordinary people.

Thus, the disgusting conduct of the Rao-government in the whole chain of events connected with the destruction of the Babri Masjid in Ayodhya, in essence, is not something peculiar to a particular congress government or only to the congress party government. Rather, its conduct is merely a specific expression of the general disregard of the fate of ordinary masses that runs through the ruling classes' politics and economics today. While specific expressions may vary under compulsions of electoral politics, the essential conduct or attitude of other ruling class parties is no different. However, the unabashedness of their respective expressions of such disregard generally

vary in proportion to the proximity of these parties to the seat of governmental power, for they are obliged, then, to clearly reflect in their conduct the prevailing perception and orientation of the ruling class. No wonder the two major political parties of the ruling classes, namely the congress and the BJP, today are also the major-actors in the politics of jeopardizing the livelihood and security of the ordinary masses.

It follows from the preceding observations that while the congress and the BJP deservedly attract more ire of the democratic and secular people, on account of the pronounced role of these parties in directly or indirectly promoting Hindu communal fascism, this menace needs to be seen and combated as a necessary dimension of the unconcealed anti-popular thrust of the ruling classes' economics and politics today, and of their stepped-up violence against the common people. That means, the targeting of a particular political party of the ruling classes does not have much significance for tackling the menace of Hindu communal-fascism. Rather, that can prove to be a point of derailment of the people's struggle against communal fascism. Further that means, the struggle against communal fascism cannot be effectively waged without focusing on the class-political substance of this fight. Without laying bare the underlying economic-political stakes in this fight, the common people cannot be mobilized for a combative struggle against communal-fascism and the whole thing would boil down to a toothless, liberal campaign of preaching communal fraternity and peace.

Unlike conventional communalism and religious fundamentalism, the struggle against which never acquires the status of a major political task of the revolutionary movement but generally takes place as a part of long-term ideological struggle against social reaction, communal-fascism confronts the people as a political challenge and requires to be treated in tandem with the major political tasks of, the moment. It is so because, it goes beyond playing a mere diversionary and divisive role and acts as a major

channel of the unfolding class-offensive of the ruling classes against the people. Because of that, the struggle against communal-fascism gets bound up with the anti-feudal and anti-imperialist struggles of the people.

Now, Hindu communal-fascism has obvious anti-Muslim orientation. However, the crusade against the Muslims is the convenient casing under which it seeks to attain its substantive and strategic objective, i.e., the reinforced subjugation of the Indian people to the differently painted yoke of ruling classes' oppression and exploitation.

The anti-Muslim edge of Hindu communal-fascism does pose the issue of dignity and security of the Muslim community. Yet, the Muslims constitute only about 14% of the Indian population. Their subjugation, as such can serve no worthwhile socio-political purpose of the ruling classes. So, actually the target of subjugation mainly comprises of the Hindus themselves. Accordingly, the communal-fascist coercion and atrocities would tend to move on from the Muslims to the Hindus who do not fall inline. This inherent tendency of diversification and expansion of the range of communal-fascist onslaught eventually gets focused upon the democratic movement and organization of the people that is where it really belongs to. That means, the issue of dignity and security of the Muslims, though an important issue, is not the central issue of the struggle against Hindu communal-fascism; democracy is the central issue, i.e. real democracy that resides and grows in the struggles and organizations of the people, particularly the working people.

There is another aspect too to the dynamics of Hindu communal-fascism. Religio-communal sentiments are highly inflammable but poorly sustainable material as a source of mass motivation and mobilization for political activity. The protagonists of Hindu communal-fascism seek to make up that deficiency by whipping up virulent national chauvinism. Their pseudo-nationalism is addressed not to the problem of sovereignty of Indian people, thus remaining on the

safe side of imperialism, but to the problem of territorial integrity of India so as to stamp out any assertion of national identity and self-determination by various nationalities in India.

In the given historical and geo-political background the carefully nurtured hostility between India and Pakistan enables Hindu communal-fascism to couch its communal appeal in patriotic exhortations against Pakistan; and the resultant combination acquires greater potency for evoking elemental passions. In view of the fact that Indian Muslims are hardly in competition either 'in economy or in civil and military bureaucracy, they objectively make a weak source of social heart-burning and insecurity among the non-Muslims. Demonization of Pakistan along with bracketing of Indian Muslims with Pakistan is the vital pin that plugs that gap in the actual social situation of Indian Muslims and the projected threat-perception from them. Thus, national chauvinism, mainly with reference to Pakistan as 'the enemy' is the indispensable prop of Hindu communal-fascism: at the immediate level, for stoking the ambers of hate-campaign against the Indian Muslims and; at a deeper level, for black-washing and ruthlessly suppressing national assertions by various peoples in India; and finally, for intimidating into silence all those who do not subscribe to national-chauvinism, by branding them anti-national .

While it should be obvious that the platform of opposition to Hindu communal-fascism has to be a consistently secular platform, so much so that even the issue of dignity and security of Indian Muslims must be addressed only from a secular platform, it won't do to pit an anemic liberal-bourgeois secularism against Hindu communal-fascism, that has the weight of social orthodoxy and reaction behind it. To be effective and full of punch, it has to be a platform of secular defense of people's democracy against the dictat, coercion and tyranny of sociopolitical and religious hierarchies, a platform of secular opposition to national chauvinism for the defense of just national concerns of Indian people, collectively and severally.

Only thus can it be a militant, mass-based secular platform that can go into political offensive against Hindu communal-fascism.

The main reason why Hindu-communal-fascism has faced no serious challenge from any of the main stream bourgeois political parties despite there being a lot of fretting and fuming on their part against communalism and for national integration in recent times, is this that none of them would venture to attack Hindu communal-fascism on the substantive issues involved, namely, it's extremely anti-democratic thrust and national chauvinism. They won't do that because they themselves are either hostile to or scared of people's democracy, and steeped in national-chauvinism.

Opposition to Hindu communal-fascism at this juncture of time has its own importance. By now, Hindu communal fascism has revealed, its sinister features enough to cause revulsion and concern among large sections of the people throughout India, but it has still not consolidated itself and, given a determined fight on correct lines by the secular, democratic and revolutionary forces, can be stopped in its tracks. Although this menace cannot be taken lightly since (a) its communalized national-chauvinist credo do fetch social backing from some sections of the people, along with a sort of communal-political legitimacy for its gangsterism, and (b) the ruling classes have not been able yet to devise a better alternative for embodying their requirement of a sterner regime; Hindu communal-fascism's inherent limitations out-weigh its strong points.

Far from being a homogenous community the broad Hindu community encompasses great diversity, not only of socio-economic entities but also of cultural and even religious entities, that is not amenable to politico-religious regimentation and commandeering by communal-fascists. Moreover, the caste divisions and antagonisms within the Hindu community are more pronounced and enduring than the tenuous religious affinity of its component parts. Even its major ideological plank of national-chauvinism has a

counter-productive potential too for being national chauvinism of a subservient bourgeoisie rather than that of an independent one. So, the conflicting demands of maintaining a 'super-patriotic' posture as an attribute of national chauvinism, on the one hand, and essentially complying with the increasingly arrogant, hegemonic wishes of imperialism on the other hand, indicate the vulnerability of Hindu communal-fascism on its apparently strong aspect. The political offensive against Hindu communal-fascism should miss no opportunity to press it hard on this sensitive spot while focusing on its utterly anti-democratic character and conduct.

Although the main deviationist trend, on this question, among revolutionary forces is that of over-estimating the sway and prospects of Hindu communal-fascism and seeking a united front with ruling classes' political parties to counter it, there also exists an erroneous notion that it can be countered merely by counter-posing economic or partial issues of the people. The root of such an erroneous notion lies in judging Hindu communal-fascism to be just a diversionary phenomena and not a serious political challenge to the popular forces and movement. The negative experience of the past one year of Hindu communal-fascist onslaught particularly the Bombay carnage should have jolted out such economistic notions lurking in revolutionary quarters. The painful reality of the failure of working class centers generally to react, not to speak of emerging as bulwarks of resistance to the rampaging mobs of hooligans marshaled by Hindu communal-fascists, and the fact that in many cases the combine of Management and reactionary trade union leadership could debar the Muslim workers from returning to work after the disturbance subsided, tellingly reveal how far the long sway of economistic orientation has politically disarmed the workers and blunted their class-Initiative. On the other hand only such elements among the workers and other sections, howsoever small in number, as realized the necessity and importance of politically responding to that onslaught, could boldly

initiate some oppositional moves under difficult circumstances and, thus, at least give the message to friend and foe that Hindu communal-fascism should not and would not go unchallenged. Only when the economic or partial issues of the people are projected as a part of, or in association with, the political campaign against Hindu communal-fascism can they contribute in countering it.

The mainstream bourgeois political parties and the bourgeois media continuously foster parliamentary cretinism. On this question too, they foster the erroneous notion, which finds its echo in democratic quarters, that the fate of Hindu communal fascism is dependent on the electoral fortunes of this or that political party. Accordingly, it is made out as if the people have no option but of voting for this or that political party so as to prevent Hindu communal fascist to acquire parliamentary supremacy and governmental power. Such a notion objectively plays the same role as does the fore-mentioned main deviationist trend the role of tying the popular forces arrayed against Hindu communal-fascism to the apron strings of the ruling classes' political parties. The status of Hindu communal-fascism is essentially determined by the shift, one way or the other, in its social support-base as a result of the extra parliamentary political battle for the minds of the people. Election-results can, at best, reflect that ground reality and to that extent get determined by it (and that too can meaningfully occur in bourgeois democratic republics). Any electoral outcome can, in turn, possibly play a mere supplementary role, in the process of development of Hindu communal-fascism, on the basis of the obtaining balance of sociopolitical forces outside the sphere of parliamentary politics. It is true though, Hindu communal-fascism is fully effective by operating in league with the Indian state set-up, yet parliamentary majority or ministry is not the only access-route, for it to the levers of state power; presence of its votaries in the Administration, the judiciary and the security, force was so evident in their biased conduct during the past one or two years. Moreover, no set of

elected bourgeois parliamentarians can be counted upon to act as barriers even to the parliamentary ascendancy of Hindu communal-fascism, considering the frequency and fluency of their defections and home-comings (witness the, latest case of Yashwant Sinha ex-minister, in the Janta Dal-National Front govt., led by V.P. Singh; ex-minister in the congress-supported SJP government led by Chander Shekhar; till recently senior, leader of SJP and vociferous critic of the Hindutva combine defecting to the BJP.)

While parliamentary political parties are expected to go on playing their games around secularism and communalism, the democratic and revolutionary forces will do well to think out the concrete problems and steps towards building up the political offensive against Hindu communalism, as a part of combating the overall economic-political attacks and, stepped-up violence by the ruling classes. Since intimidation of common people and attacks on the opponents are salient features of the mode of operation of communal-fascism, the political offensive against it cannot be conceived without the attendant plan for organizing people's self-defense on secular lines and democratic basis. The execution of such a plan is going to be quite a tough and complicated job, particularly in the urban areas but shirking it would amount to abandoning revolutionary responsibility and inviting political passivity and irrelevance in the face of overwhelming onslaughts of communal-fascism.

The growing process of degeneration and loss of prestige and credibility of the Indian state is paving the way for the advance of fascistic phenomena including the Hindu communal-fascism; it is doing so still more for the advance of Indian revolution. Let the revolution overtake the advance of fascistic reaction.

December 1993, No. - 14

◆ ◆ ◆ ◆ ◆

On Chinese Fascism - The New Autocracy

Zhou Enlai - August 16, 1943

I. Statement of the Problem

Ever since the formation, of the Anti-Japanese National United Front and the beginning of the War of Resistance, there has been a lack of understanding, both inside and outside the Party, both at home and abroad, of the essential nature of the rule of Chiang Kai-shek's Kuomintang, that is, the rule of the big landlords and big bourgeoisie. It was Comrade Mao Zedong who pointed out before the War of Resistance that Chiang Kai-shek's Kuomintang was wavering and passive and who stated in the early stage of the war that it was conciliationist and two-fad. Today he has gone further and pointed out that it is fascist. All these insights have been historical clarifications of epochal significance. Therefore, I would now like to discuss Chinese fascism.

I must take up a few queries first.

Someone may ask: Why didn't we say earlier that Chiang Kai-shek's Kuomintang was fascist, rather than wait until now? Our answer is that before the War of Resistance our policy was focused on winning the Kuomintang over to the resistance, so we emphasized that it could change and that it had a revolutionary aspect. At that time it was enough to point out that it was wavering and passive. In the early stage of the anti-Japanese war, our policy was focused on persuading it to join in a protracted war of resistance and total resistance, so we stressed protracted war, unity and progress, and opposed capitulation, splitting and retrogression. This required a deep understanding of the conciliationist and dual character of Chiang's Kuomintang. Now it is, playing a smaller and smaller role in the resistance and a greater and greater reactionary role. Furthermore, Chiang has written the book entitled *China's Destiny*. If this is allowed to go on, it is bound to lead to defeat in the War of Resistance and the rekindling of civil war. Therefore, we must publicly reveal the fascist essence of the Kuomintang today. We did not lay so much stress on this in the past because it hadn't gone so far as it has now, and not because there were no fascists in it.

Another may ask: Since Chiang Kai-shek's Kuomintang is fascist, how is it that it can put up resistance to Japan? Our answer is Comrade Mao Zedong tells us that Chiang is a comprador-feudal

fascism: Because of its comprador aspect, when the Japanese imperialists invaded China, the Kuomintang could rely on other imperialists in resisting the aggressors, and it played a revolutionary role, riding the wave of popular concern for national salvation. But at the same time it has a feudal aspect so now that the Allied countries are gradually coming to pay more attention to the War of Resistance waged by the Chinese nation it relapses into its former mode of thinking. It wishes to restore the ancient ways and opposes everything foreign, thus playing a reactionary role. It is precisely because it represents the big landlords and the big bourgeoisie that it always opposes, fears and oppresses the people, and its resistance can never be thoroughgoing. The proletariat and its political party must win and consolidate leadership in the national democratic revolution and must never tail behind the big bourgeoisie. Comrade Mao Zedong warned us on this point at a Party conference of the Soviet areas before the anti-Japanese war.

Then still another may ask: Since fascism means national aggression and since Chiang Kai-shek's Kuomintang is resisting the Japanese aggressors, why do we call it fascist? Our answer is that this is exactly why Comrade Mao Zedong calls it Chinese fascism. National aggression is one of the characteristics of fascism, but not the only one. Chinese fascism has all the characteristics of fascism pointed out by Georgi Dimitrov in his report except that of national aggression. Both in the past and at present, Chiang Kai-shek's Kuomintang has launched ruthless attacks on the people, on the working masses. It has even unleashed civil war to suppress the revolution and introduced rampant reaction and counter-revolution. It has thus become the arch-enemy of the whole Chinese people. It is only because China finds itself in the position of a colony or semi-colony that the Chinese big landlords and big bourgeoisie are powerless to invade other countries. Isn't their treatment of China's own minority nationalities based on the sense of superiority inherent in Han chauvinism and on the traditional notion of a "vassal nations" policy. Even in foreign affairs, are there not people in the Kuomintang who advocate a greater Chinese federation which would include Annam, Thailand, Burma, Korea and even the Malay Archipelago? Georgi Dimitrov once said: "The development of fascism and fascist dictatorship itself assumes different forms in different countries, according to historical, social and economic conditions and owing, to

the national peculiarities or the international position of a given country." Stalin also said long ago that the emergence of German fascism must "be regarded as a symptom of the weakness of the bourgeoisie, of the fact that the bourgeoisie is already unable to rule by the old methods of parliamentarism and bourgeois democracy, and, as a consequence, is compelled in its home policy to resort to terroristic methods of rule". In a certain sense, we can also apply this to the rule of China's big landlords and big bourgeoisie. We may say that Chinese fascism is the open terrorist rule of China's big landlords and big bourgeoisie, that is, rule by Chiang Kai-shek's Kuomintang and bureaucrat-capital through special agents.

Then again someone may ask: This being the case, why oppose only the reactionaries inside the Kuomintang and not the Kuomintang as a whole? Why call only for the abolition of fascism and not for the liquidation of the fascist chieftains? Our answer is: because the pro-British and pro-American big landlords and big bourgeoisie represented by Chiang Kai-shek's Kuomintang still have a dual character, and they have not yet reached the point of being purely reactionary. Since their banner of resistance has not yet been furled, the Kuomintang can still exert influence on certain persons, though their number is daily diminishing. Nor has it yet dared to call for fascism openly. (It has not yet dared to acknowledge its true nature publicly, not only because the War of Resistance is still going on but also because China's big landlords and big bourgeoisie are too weak to assert their independence.) Therefore, we oppose only the reactionaries inside the Kuomintang, and not those Kuomintang members who are willing to resist the Japanese and who favour democracy. Moreover, we hope they 'will join us in opposing the reactionaries. Therefore, we advocate liquidating only fascism and hope these Kuomintang members will get rid of fascism of their own accord and truly put into practice the revolutionary Three People's Principles advocated by Dr. Sun Yat-sen. And we call for the disbanding of the fascist secret police only and not of the Kuomintang organization as such. Since the big landlords and big bourgeoisie are becoming more openly fascist every day and have even' published the book, *China's Destiny*, advocating the extremely reactionary view that the Communist Party should be liquidated, we must draw attention to the nature of Chinese fascism and emphasize the danger it presents. This will be not only a warning and an education for the

Chinese people, and first and foremost for the Party, but also a most practical ideological lesson helping to rid the Party of any tendency to capitulate to the big bourgeoisie.

Yet again, someone else may ask: Since this is how things stand, does the fascism of Chiang Kai-shek's Kuomintang have an ideology, historical roots, a programme, tactics, an organization and activities? Our answer is: yes, it has. We are going to take them up now under separate headings.

II. The Ideology of Chinese Fascism

Waving the banner of the War of Resistance and the Three People's Principles, Chinese fascism nevertheless has its own ideology.

Chiang Kai-shek's philosophical thought is characterized by extreme idealism. He is very fond of quoting the old saying, "The mind of man is restless, prone to err; its affinity to what is right is small. Be discriminating, be single-minded in the pursuit of what is right, that you may sincerely hold fast to the Mean." At the same time, he emphasizes the role played by the "mind" and gives an extremely idealist interpretation of Dr. Sun Yat-sen's remark: "If I believe something to be feasible, I may one day bring it to pass, although it may be as difficult as removing a mountain or drying up a sea. If I believe something to be unfeasible, I will never achieve it, although it may be as easy as turning my hand over or breaking a twig." Chiang, wanted to eliminate the Communist Party, so he posed as if he believed that "without sincerity nothing would be achieved", and stated with a heavy heart that if he could not resolve the problem of the Chinese Communist Party, he would not be able to close his eyes even in death. In fact, this is something he can never achieve because he is lacking in the virtue of sincerity. Although he had acknowledged the legal status of the Border Region in his Lushan interview and despite the fact that it had been approved by the 333rd session of the Executive Yuan, in reality he wanted to eliminate it and revoked the approval on his own authority. This is an example of, his insincerity as long as he can achieve what he wants, he does not even bother with sincerity.

Chiang Kai-shek advocates a philosophy of "action first". Its core is having the people blindly obey him and carry out his orders without knowing what they mean. When Chiang was following a

policy of non-resistance, he demanded that the people accept his internal pacification policy rather than resist Japanese aggression. In the early period of the War of Resistance, he wanted the people to blindly follow his policy of partial resistance. Now he wants the people to blindly follow his passive resistance to Japanese aggression but active opposition to the Communists. In fact, as early as the civil war period, it was his boast that if he failed in the suppression of the Communists, he would commit suicide to make atonement to his fellow-countrymen, but he has never been true to his word. When he failed, he was going to punish everyone who was even remotely connected with the enterprise, but he himself was never punished. Before the War of Resistance, he also boasted that, provided he had upwards of 600,000 genuinely revolutionary troops who would strictly obey his orders and operate under unified command, there could be no doubt that with his brilliant tactics he could defeat these little Japanese bandits. But when the Japanese attacked Shanghai on August 13, 1937, although the troops who were strictly obeying his orders numbered more than 600,000, we never saw any sign of his brilliant tactics for defeating the Japanese. Now that the number of his own troops those who strictly obey his orders is considerably greater than 600,000, he stands ready to collaborate, with Japan. It is apparent that his philosophy of "action first" is not only an idealist philosophy for keeping the people in ignorance, but also a braggart's philosophy, a gangster's philosophy, no different from Hitler's.

To build morale, Chiang Kai-shek emphasizes "independence and self-reliance": In fact, because of the comprador aspect of his nature, he relies on foreign power, and he is anything but independent; the feudal aspect of his nature sometimes leads to xenophobia, but that is not the same thing as national self-reliance. He stresses sincerity, but he is totally insincere. From the earliest Kuomintang-Communist cooperation to the present co-operation in the fight against Japan, he has been insincere with regard to the Soviet Union, the Communist Party and the people, that is, to the revolution and the War of Resistance. When he talks about sincerity, he means that others should follow him with blind devotion, while he hasn't a shred of sincerity in his dealings with others.

In his ethical teachings Chiang emphasizes an abstract morality based upon the Four Principles and Eight Virtues. But as soon as we get down to realities, we find that he and the ruling group under him

have completely abandoned the Four Principles of "propriety", "righteousness", "honesty" and "honour". They deprived Madame Sun Yat-sen of the freedom of residence; they deprived "Lin Sen, Chairman of the National Government, of the right to convalesce; they are anti-Soviet and anti-Communist although they have had assistance from both the Soviet Union and the Communist Party; and they oppress the people although the people supported them. The whole government indulges in hoarding and speculation and is riddled with corruption, yet no one is punished. Those who work with the enemy and betray the country or who trade in contraband and pocket the soldiers' pay likewise go unpunished. What sense does it make to talk about national loyalty and filial piety when you are cowardly in resisting Japan but take the lead in waging a civil war? How can you talk of benevolence and love when people are driven to the battlefield by your officials and are forced to rise in revolt? How can you utter a word about faithfulness and justice when the War of Resistance has been going on for six years and you're still collaborating with the Japanese aggressors, and when war has been declared against Germany and couriers are still being exchanged with that country? How can you talk about peace and harmony when you incite Japan to attack the Soviet Union and your planes are bombing civilians in revolt? Obviously, these idealist moral principles of his are all hypocritical. But he tries to use them to befuddle people and get them to practice the virtues of loyalty, filial piety, benevolence, love, faithfulness, justice, peace and harmony towards his Kuomintang, so that he can oppress and attack the masses more freely.

Chiang Kai-shek's conception of history is a rag-bag of feudal ideology centering on a return to the ancients; it reflects the traditional, all-pervasive ideology of the exploiting class. In his *China's Destiny*, Chiang writes, "On the basis of Confucius' teachings, Mencius arose to draw a distinction between justice and utility and between rule by power and rule through virtue.... He refuted the teachings of Yang Zhu and Mo Di and rectified the hearts of the people. He thereby laid the foundation for the orthodox school of thought which has enjoyed an unbroken line of development in China over the past thirty centuries." That is why he made much of the study of *Collected Essays on Government Affairs of the Empire* and *Chen Hongmou's Five Treatises on Moral and Educational Subjects*.

Chiang Kai-shek's conception of the nationalities is Han chauvinism, pure and simple. He calls the Mongolian, Hui, Tibetan and Miao nationalities merely "frontier inhabitants" and refuses to recognize them as nationalities. So far as his actions are concerned, he practices racial discrimination and oppression.

Chiang Kai-shek's conception of the state is a one-party dictatorship of the big landlords and big bourgeoisie or, more precisely, a new one man dictatorship a fascist rule by secret police under the facade of a national State and a government by the entire people. The reason for this is that the more he senses the weakness of the big landlords and big bourgeoisie; the less he dares adopt bourgeois- democratic methods, or even one-party rule, and the more he resorts to terrorism, the rule of secret agents and one-man dictatorship.

Chiang Kai-shek's conception of war is that armed strength decides everything. It is a combination of the warlord ideology common in modern China (the traditional ideology of the Hunan and Anhui warlords, Zeng Guofan, Hu Linyi, Zuo Zongtang and Li Hongzhang) and Napoleon's thesis of unification by force of arms. This is why we call it the "new warlordism", or "new autocracy". Because he attaches importance to military power alone, he thinks it impossible to mount resistance to Japanese aggression independently and looks to foreign aid. He openly declares: "[Japan] can take all of China's coastal areas and all regions contiguous to inland waterways not within ten days, but within three days, regardless of where they are in the west, not just Chongqing, but even Chengdu; in the south, not just Guangdong, but Wuzhou and Yongning." "If they [meaning the Japanese] issue the order, it will actually take them only three days to capture all of China's vital regions and subjugate our country." And again: "What have we got to fight them with? We have neither weapons nor the conditions for war operations: our economy, education, politics is any one of them up to operations against a modern country?" Therefore, his national policy concerning the War of Résistance has long-been based on the assumption that "the Soviet Union is the target of [Japan's] army and Great Britain and the United States are the targets of its navy. If Japan wants to swallow China, it must conquer Russia, gobble up the United States and defeat Britain." But now that Japan, having neither conquered Russia nor gobbled up the United States, has thrown its

might against China, he has become worried, passively - resisting while preserving his strength for a civil war on the one hand and standing ready to collaborate with Japan on the other. As he places great stock in military strength, he sticks to the idea of internal unification by force of arms and stands for "rule by the military". During the eighteen years of his rule, from the Incident of March 20, 1926, to the present, hardly a single year has gone by when he was not fighting a war of some sort, and not a single hour when he was not planning civil war. First there was the Incident of March 20 before the Northern Expedition, and after the expedition there was the split between the rival governments in Nanjing and Wuhan and then cooperation between the two. During the civil war there were wars both inside and outside the Kuomintang. During the War of Resistance, there have been military operations against the Communist Party and against other forces not his own.

Chiang Kai-shek's conception of political parties is to have all the parties and groupings in the country dissolved into his Kuomintang and Three People's Principles Youth League. He openly states: "The Kuomintang is the artery of our nation and the members of the Three People's Principles Youth League may be likened to new blood corpuscles." And again: "The Chinese nation is able to exist only so long as the Kuomintang exists. Without the Kuomintang, there would be no China today.... In a word, China's destiny hinges entirely on the Kuomintang." Hence, he says, "all adults should join the Kuomintang and all youths the Three People's Principles Youth League." What a blatant exposure of the idea of one doctrine, one party, and one leader! Yet he still has the effrontery to declare: "As for the different ideologies and organizations in the country, not only do I have no intention of obstructing them, but I even hope they will grow and succeed, so long as they don't set up separate regimes, oppose the revolution, organize armed forces or undermine the resistance, and so long as they really work in the interests of the state and nation and revolutionary reconstruction." I will not speak of the Chinese Communist Party and the armed force and Border Region under its leadership, for they are carrying on the resistance and are a revolutionary organization, armed force and political regime. But why is it that other political parties, which possess neither armed forces nor political power, do not enjoy an iota of freedom and, far from "growing and succeeding", are subjected to oppression everywhere?

Isn't it true that even some groupings inside the Kuomintang, in particular that of Madame Sun Yat-sen, which sincerely follows Dr. Sun Yat-sen's Three People's Principles, enjoy no freedom either but are subjected to oppression? Both the Kuomintang and the Three People's Principles Youth League belong to Chiang and have long since ceased to be the Kuomintang reorganized by Dr. Sun Yat-sen, or the Kuomintang under which there was freedom of thought 'and various political groupings coexisted.

Chiang Kai-shek's view of the people is that they are just beasts of burden. That is why he stresses Confucius' remark, "The people may be made to follow a course of action, but they should not be brought to understand it." He wants the people to obey his words and abide by his law so that he can exploit and rule them at will. So for all his talk of "democracy", the Kuomintang's power reigns supreme and democracy has long since ceased to exist. The consultative councils at the various levels, the new county system," etc. are all just showpieces designed to deceive people. To go one step further, it is not even party power that is supreme, but military power, the power of the secret agents.

Finally, Chiang Kai-shek's economic thought is also that of the semi-feudal and semi-colonial landlord and comprador classes. On the one hand, he prates about a planned economy aimed at industrialization, while on the other, he is longing for the utopian "great harmony" described in the Book of Rites. Under the guise of the Principle of People's Livelihood, in effect he preserves the most backward and reactionary feudal and comprador economic thinking, that is, the concept of an agricultural China and industrialized foreign countries. Not only is this thinking incapable of solving the economic problems of the people, it is bound to bankrupt China's economy even further; the people's life will become still harder, and it will become still more difficult for the Chinese nation to extricate itself from its colonial and semi-colonial economic status.

In Chiang Kai-shek's ideology as outlined here, we can discern only Chinese fascism, and no trace of the revolutionary Three People's Principles set forth by Dr. Sun Yat-sen. The idealist views and negative elements in Dr. Sun Yat-sen's thought have been developed by Chiang and have become his own ideology. But Dr. Sun's thinking also included some rational elements and quite a few revolutionary views, especially in his later years when he drew close

to the Communist Party, adopted a number of measures from the Russian revolution and turned his Three People's Principles into the revolutionary Three People's Principles. Chiang Kai-shek's doctrine is of quite another order and is nothing but China's brand of fascism.

III. The Historical Roots of Chinese Fascism

The fascism of Chiang Kai-shek and his ruling clique has its own historical sources. Chiang always prides himself on being a disciple and student of Dr. Sun Yat-sen, but he has long since departed from the right course. He turned traitor once, and now he has again betrayed Dr. Sun's revolutionary Three People's Principles.

Comrade Mao Zedong has pointed out that China's fascism is a comprador and feudal fascism. To be specific, it is a combination of bureaucrat-capital (that is, the capital, land, and tools of production are concentrated in the hands of a handful of bureaucrats and financial magnates) and a secret police system. In Chiang Kai-shek we have a mixture of warlord, stockbroker and underworld boss. His thinking is an agglomeration of all forms of reaction past, and present, domestic and foreign.

Let us take a look at Chiang Kai-shek and his ruling clique. Chiang himself comes from a feudal family. When the Revolution of '11 broke out; he started as a platoon leader under the warlord Zhang Zongchang, and on orders from Chen Qimei he arranged the assassination of Tao Chengzhang, a revolutionary political party leader in Zhejiang, and thus stole the fruits in the recovery of Zhejiang by the revolutionary forces. Dr. Sun was successful because he had been able to bring together his revolutionary party, the New Army and the various secret societies. But by their gangster acts, Chen Qimei and Chiang Kai-shek created a split in the revolutionary party at its very inception. At the same time they laid the foundation for the gangster politics which they have dealt in ever since the 1911 Revolution and which grew out of the alliance of the big landlords and big bourgeoisie with the underworld gangs of Shanghai, all under the protection of the imperialists.

From 1917 to 1920, Chiang Kai-shek, Dai Jitao and Chen Guofu joined forces in stock market speculation. Later this tradition was carried on by H. H. Kung, T. V. Soong and others. Then this comprador clique gradually became the nucleus of the group that has ruled China for the last twenty years. It is true that when he was in

Guangdong, Chiang Kai-shek opposed the Guangdong compradors who served British interests. But right from the beginning, Dai Jitao and Chen Guofu, who stayed behind in Shanghai, opposed Dr. Sun Yat-sen's Three Great Policies of alliance with Russia, the Communist Party and the workers and peasants. And no sooner had Chiang arrived at the lower reaches of the Changjiang River than he threw himself into the embrace of the big bourgeoisie of Jiangsu and Zhejiang Provinces and took the lead in calling for opposition to the Soviet Union, the Communist Party and the workers and peasants. So Chiang has never really recognized or carried out the Three Great Policies set forth by Dr. Sun Yat-sen.

Although Chiang Kai-shek organized the Whampoa Military Academy and directed the Northern Expedition, he retained his warlord mentality and his love of speculation after he "joined" the revolutionary ranks. Even in the course of his study tour in the Soviet Union, what he really admired was not the Russian revolution but Napoleon's Russian expedition. In the early days of the Whampoa Military Academy, he opposed the Soviet advisor. When he got arms from the Soviet Union, he began to shout that the Third International was the nerve-centre of world revolution and that China should follow its instructions. But not long afterwards, on March 20, he gave orders to surround and attack the residence of the Soviet advisor in Dongshan, Guangzhou. To educate the cadets at the academy, he did not teach them revolutionary strategy and tactics, but first of all Zeng Guo fan's and Hu Linyi's Quotation on Military Affairs and The Life of Napoleon. He led troops in the Eastern Campaign and was soon competing with Xu Chongzhi for control of territory. His expulsion of Wang Jingwei was a further instance of warlordism. He led the troops on the Northern Expedition but expelled people outside his own circle in the various armies and created his own private troops. Thus, even before the split between Nanjing and Wuhan he was already thinking and acting like a new warlord. Nonetheless, so long as he was in the revolutionary ranks, he still had to wave the revolutionary banner in order to exploit the strength of the people and expand his own forces and influence. But as soon as he went over to counter-revolution, he became a butcher of the people. And the clique he was leading followed his every step.

The ten years of civil war showed us this warlord, stock broker and underworld boss in act⁴. Whether he was dealing with struggles

and war inside the Kuomintang or with the "suppression of Communists", he employed the same methods. What's more, he learned new fascist tricks from Germany, Italy and Japan. Over the past ten years he has sent a number of Whampoa students to study there and has invited the German general Von Seeckt, the Berlin police commissioner Blomberg and other German secret agents to teach.

From the Xi'an Incident to the sixth year of the resistance he has given a really marvelous conjuring performance. While we must not forget the revolutionary side of the dual character of the big landlords and big bourgeoisie in a semi-colonial country as represented by Chiang Kai-shek, still less should we forget their other side, the reactionary side. And he is becoming more and more experienced in playing his reactionary role. With the experience of a decade of civil war behind him, he has been brazen enough to wage a partial civil war in the present War of Resistance. At the same time, when he was sure which way the wind was blowing, he could also deliberately make a show of restraint. But we should not be taken in by him. There is nothing profound about him once we strip off his disguise. The best way to counter his action is to follow Comrade Mao. Zedong's revolutionary dual policy; adhere to the principle of waging struggles on just grounds, to our advantage and with restraint; and adopt the method of tit-for-tat struggle.

IV. The Political Programme and Tactics of Chinese Fascism

Although Chiang Kai-shek loudly propagated the Three People's Principles, he never sincerely carried out the Three Great Policies in the period of the Great Revolution, and he ignored them completely in the period of civil war. At the beginning of the War of Resistance, when he advertised a programme of armed resistance and national reconstruction, he was simply deceiving people. He interpreted the articles of the programme as opposing total resistance, opposing communism and opposing democracy and implemented them in that way. As a result, he produced not a programme for resistance and national reconstruction in accordance with the Three People's Principles, but a programme of fascism.

We may sum up Chiang's programme in the following twelve points:

1. Carry out passive resistance, while preparing for a compromise with Japan;
2. Betray Dr. Sun Yat-sen's Three People's Principles, embrace German-Italian-Japanese fascism, oppose Soviet socialism and reject British and U.S. liberalism;
3. Work in collusion with the enemy and oppose the Communists in order to sabotage the War of Resistance; make use of foreign aid to fight a civil war;
4. Clamp down on the activities of the minor political parties, bully and humiliate the minority nationalities, ignore the difficulties of Chinese nationals abroad and turn a blind eye to the sufferings of victims of natural disasters at home;
5. Rely on military power, get rid of people outside one's own circle, build up the secret police and usurp the power of the Kuomintang;
6. Trample on the rights of the people, deprive them of their freedoms, make use of the bao-jia [mutual-surveillance] system and impose dictatorship;
7. Rely on bureaucrat-capital to monopolize the economy, encourage commercial speculation and disrupt industrial production;
8. Issue unlimited amounts of paper currency, raise prices of commodities, monopolize the people's means of livelihood and exploit labour power;
9. Concentrate the ownership of land at the expense of the people's food supply and press-gang able-bodied men for military service at the expense of the labour force;
10. Allow corruption to go unchecked, increase taxes and levies, wink at trade in contraband and carry out arbitrary searches;
11. Ban books and, persecute scholars, corrupt young people, threaten and cajole, and destroy moral integrity; and
12. Violate law and discipline, debase the national morality, wreck the culture and ruin the nation.

Of course this programme of Chinese fascism is not openly proclaimed and will never even be publicly admitted. Yet it is being carried out nonetheless, article by article, item by item and, if anything, goes further than these 12 points. This duplicity reveals the weakness of Chinese fascism as well as its shamelessness and cowardice. How can Chiang Kai-shek's Kuomintang lead the War of Resistance to victory when carrying out a programme like this?

Without a doubt, it will lead China to splits, disintegration, chaos and collapse. It will lead the War of Resistance to defeat.

We Communists uphold resistance, unity, democracy and progress. We will never allow the War of Resistance to fail. As Comrade Mao Zedong has pointed out, we must strive for leadership. We must first expand and strengthen our own forces before we can give strong leadership to others, prevent the middle-of-the-roaders from the wavering, isolate the die-hards and firmly press ahead with our anti-Japanese Ten-Point Programme and our administrative programme embodying the "three thirds system".

So far as the tactics of Chinese 'fascism are concerned, they are applied flexibly, according to the general orientation of its programme and the dual character of that section of the big landlords and big bourgeoisie represented by Chiang Kai-shek's Kuomintang.

Towards Japan the fascists pursue a policy of alternating fighting with cajoling in the hope of entering into an advantageous compromise.

Towards Britain and the United States they alternately coax and threaten them in the hope of getting their aid with which to pursue the civil war.,

Towards the Soviet Union, they blow hot and cold, hoping that the U.S.S.R. will contain Japan, thus making it easier for them to resolve domestic strife in their favour.

In dealing with local forces and the minor political parties, they combine threats and inducements in an attempt to sow dissension, isolate us and thus destroy their opponents one by one.

They treat national capitalists, enlightened landlords and senior members of the Kuomintang now well and now badly in order to determine whether or not these persons are loyal towards the ruling group.

They publicly suppress and privately seduce progressive men of letters, intellectuals and students, so as to alienate them from us and make them oppose us.

They keep a close watch on the toiling masses of workers and peasants and obstruct all their relations with us.

Finally, as for their attitude towards us, everything is aimed at eliminating us, though their tactics may vary from soft to tough. But the soft tactics are only a temporary expedient and never mean a change for the better; at the very same time they are prepping the next

tough move. At times when toughness doesn't work, they can temporarily soften up a bit. Now take the different periods. In the civil war period, Chiang Kai-shek took a hard line, imposing war on us, arresting our people and killing without mercy. Around the time of the Incident of September 18, 1931, however, he supplemented this hard line with certain soft tactics, such as the policies of inducing our people to recant and planting agents inside our ranks. Since the start of the War of Resistance, he has ostensibly turned to unity; but he engaged first in veiled strife, then in open struggle. Chiang Kai-shek's Kuomintang has changed its tactics from restricting and corroding the Communist Party to attempting to liquidate us. Its policy of using secret-agents is well adapted to the different tactics adopted in these three periods. If we fail to recognize the consistency with which Chiang Kai-shek's Kuomintang has opposed the Communist Party, we will not be able to maintain keen vigilance and carry on appropriate struggles against it. At the same time, if we fail to recognize the changes in its anti-Communist policy, we will not be able to analyze and understand it correctly and deal with it according to differing circumstances.

V. The Organization and Activities of Chinese Fascism

Chinese fascism is organized. The fascist organization was nurtured inside the Kuomintang and then usurped control of the party; it was nurtured inside the Three People's Principles Youth League and then gained control of the League; it was nurtured inside the army and then began to rule the army. It is an organization of secret agents.

It consists of three branches:

The first branch the CC Clique is inside the Kuomintang. It existed in embryonic form in 1916 and after the defeat of the Great Revolution in 1927 it was formally established with the Bureau of Investigation and Statistics of the Kuomintang Central Headquarters as its core and seat of power. There are bureaus and offices of investigation and statistics from the central to the local levels. The power of the CC Clique, that is, the power of the secret agents, envelops the whole party, reaching into the country's administrative and educational systems, into some of the construction and communications institutions, certain financial and tax offices and banks (e.g., the Bank of Communications and certain privately owned

banks) and into relief organizations, overseas Chinese associations and women's organizations. It has a grip on the cultural and propaganda institutions, including the publishing industry, and the top priority of its propaganda policy is to combat the Communist Party. The budgetary party expenditure of the Koumintang for fiscal year 1943 is 284 million yuan, the bulk of which will be spent on party activities by the secret agents. And this figure does not include special expenses.

The second branch is inside the Three People's Principles Youth League. Its predecessor was the Fu Xing Society which has become the organization of secret agents inside the League. The Fu Xing Society existed in embryonic form in the Society for the Study of Dr. Sun Yat-sen's Doctrines and the Alumni Society of the Whampoa Military Academy. It was founded as the Li Xing Society after the Incident of September 18, 1931 and later took the name Fu Xing. It was incorporated into the Three People's Principles Youth League at the beginning of the War of Resistance. The special task force and the special training course under the leadership of Kang Ze were added, and it became the core of the secret agent unit inside the league.

The third branch is inside the military system, in the Political Training Section and the Bureau of Investigation and Statistics of the Military Council. There are a number of military secret agents in the Political Training Section under He Zhonghan, and even he officers hate them. The Bureau of Investigation and Statistics of the Military Council was founded by Dai Li in 1932. In the early period, it was a secret agent group of the Fu Xing Society under him; now it has become a full-fledged branch on its own. It is enormous, and it has many employees and a very large budget. The bureau itself is divided into departments, under which there are district offices, stations, groups and squads. Its tentacles reach far and wide. Under its control it has the intelligence officers at the various levels, who are directly under the second office of the Military Command Department of the army; the commissioners of investigation and statistics in the military organs; the supervision and instruction group in the border region; the Peace Preservation Department, from its head and the chief of its third section down to intelligence personnel at the grass-roots level; and the civilian and military police throughout the country (except for a few provinces). The entire tax collection system of the country is supervised by its anti-contraband units and inspection departments.

The communications institutions are controlled by its supervisory departments and supervisory centres. The intelligence agents among diplomatic personnel both at home and abroad, including military attaches, are all under its administration and are sent out on its recommendations. It has customs officials and secret agents throughout the national economic structure. Work in the enemy-occupied and puppet areas is under its control. It is also responsible for planning military actions and intelligence work to disrupt our army and the areas under our control. These last activities are carried out in parallel to those of the CC clique.

From all this it can be seen that China under the Kuomintang has become a country ruled by secret agents. Moreover, the Kuomintang secret agents have ties with the special agents of Japan and of the puppet governments. Both in their organization and in their activities, they are utterly reactionary, evil, and ruthless.

But, after all, the world is changing. World fascism is moving to its doom and Chinese fascism is no exception. China's resistance will be victorious in the end; the Chinese people have their own path to liberation. For all the efforts of Chiang Kai-shek's Kuomintang to keep China on the road to fascism, the Chinese people will get to know the Chinese Communist Party and accept its leadership and education, shake off the influence of Chinese fascism, avoid its traps and take the road to a bright future.

China will never succumb to fascism!

China will become a New Democracy!!



While it should be obvious that the platform of opposition to Hindu communal-fascism has to be a consistently secular platform, so much so that even the issue of dignity and security of Indian Muslims must be addressed only from a secular platform, it won't do to pit an anemic liberal-bourgeois secularism against Hindu communal-fascism, that has the weight of social orthodoxy and reaction behind it. To be effective and full of punch, it has to be a platform of secular defense of people's democracy against the dictat, coercion and tyranny of sociopolitical and religious hierarchies, a platform of secular opposition to national chauvinism for the defense of just national concerns of Indian people, collectively and severally. Only thus can it be a militant, mass-based secular platform that can go into political offensive against Hindu communal-fascism.

*"Let the Revolution Overtake
the Advance of Fascist Reaction"*

But the revolutionary jolt of Naxalbari rebellion had burnt the masks of revisionist leadership. It drew a line of demarcation between communist revolutionaries and revisionists. Naxalbari rebellion gave birth to a new upsurge of revolutionary struggles and great ideological political upheaval. This upsurge became a touchstone for the demarcation between communist revolutionary and revisionist ideology, politics and practices. After breaking away from the so called Marxist party, the communist revolutionaries, for the first time, clearly and distinctly upheld the Marxism Leninism Mao Tse Tung thought as their ideology. Thus, the Naxalbari rebellion played the role of projecting and establishing the real ideological status of Mao Tse Tung thought.

*"Naxalbari and Indian Revolution:
50 Years of Distinct Ideological Phase"*

Although the Great October Revolution, as a political phenomenon, has passed for once into history, its ideological verdict on the historical obsolescence of bourgeois democracy and bourgeois nationalism (the ultimate ideological-political disguises of the exploiters' class-domination) and on the superiority and relevance of proletarian democracy and proletarian internationalism holds good and shall go on resounding throughout the span of the present epoch. The episodic twists and turns of history in its progressive course of development may, for a short while, blur or obscure this ideological verdict; nevertheless, its stamp on modern history is indelible. This ideological legacy of the Great October Revolution is a great source for revitalizing the self-confidence and revolutionary spirit of the proletariat, the faith of the proletariat in its tremendous revolutionary strength and inevitable victory.

"Cherish the Legacy of October Revolution"

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

"Spring Thunder Over India"