

LEFT TREND
AMONG
INDIAN
REVOLUTIONARIES



Left trend among revolutionaries

Foreword to the Telugu edition

The All India Coordination Committee of Communist Revolutionaries (AICCCR) proclaimed itself to have formed into CPI (ML) on May 1, 1969. By that time, our committee's merger (In 1968) into AICCCR, as well as its 'expulsion' from it were completed. There were at that time, various revolutionary groups outside this organisation, which were functioning as committees in various states. Thus the CPI (ML) was formed into a party leaving a considerable section of revolutionaries, outside its fold. This development made it clear that, despite an agreement on Marxism-Leninism - Mao's Thought among all revolutionaries, the newly formed party could not represent various trends existing among them. On the contrary those of the same trend have joined in it.

For the existence and development of a revolutionary party, it is necessary to carry on principled discussions on various trends and opinions; to review in the light of Marxism-Leninism Mao's Thought the experiences gained in the course of revolutionary practice, to draw correct lessons from it and formulate the future programme; and to resolve the unresolved problems. For this it is also necessary to have a programme and policy (Tactical Line) as the basis. The CPI (ML) leadership consisting of only one trend, has failed to fulfil this fundamental task, though it had announced a programme.

It was clear that we had differences on various issues when we examined the discussions we had with the leadership of AICCCR and their writings. Some among us (they are on more with us now) adopted a liberal attitude towards the differences sought to minimise them and renounced theoretical struggle. We on our part realised the need for theoretical struggle, and also the need of a correct foundation for it and took preliminary steps to resolve a programme and policy. The documents '*Lay Foundations for a Struggle-oriented Mass*

Movement' and '*Immediate programme*' served this purpose. (Please note that the two documents were published in the last issue.....of P L -Ed). Though they were not documents that comprehensively dealt with the programme and policy, our experience has proved that they could provide the guidance necessary for the advancement of the revolutionary movement in a particular phase.

With the CPI(ML) leadership's criticism of Immediate programme as economism and revisionism, it was clear to us that though they parroted the word agrarian revolution, they had no such programme and that, all their understanding of armed struggle was devoid of agrarian revolutionary programme and agrarian revolutionary movement. This understanding that was manifest in all main issues as but the "left" trend and we undertook this criticism as part of our theoretical struggle against it.

This "left" trend appeared not only inside CPI(ML) party, but outside it also. There were armed actions in Khammam and Warangal districts without attempting to develop the agrarian revolutionary movement to the level of armed struggle and without preparing the people. Thus it was clear that this trend existed not only in CPI(ML), but also within our ranks. It is for this reason that we called it as 'left' trend existing among revolutionaries in general rather than as one confined to a single party. Our experience has also proved that there existed an inseparable connection between that trend which minimised our differences with the AICCCR leadership to the least and the 'left' trend amidst our own ranks.

It is 32 months since we had this criticism. There took place very important events in this period. The ruling party had stable majority in 1970-71 elections; there was a War with Pakistan, and Bangladesh, had emerged; the Govt. had tightened up controls on the economy through nationalisation of banks, there was flood of Soviet economic and military aid. Notwithstanding this the ruling classes had no political stability and failed to come out of the economic crisis. Ins-

stead, the political instability grew at the state level and economic crisis had worsened. Though the armed struggle in Srikakulam and the armed resistance (whatever its nature may be) in various areas suffered a temporary setback, mass struggles are surging forward. With the revolt of the state armed forces in UP recently, the Indian revolution took a new turn. There is more favourable situation today than 32 months ago, both nationally and internationally.

Despite this, the CPI(ML) leadership, which claims to be the sole representative of Marxism-Leninism-Mao's thought has failed in proving leadership to the Indian revolution. The armed struggles led by that party received set backs and what is more, the party itself is split.

There are many who criticised the policies adopted by the CPI(ML) leadership during this period. Revisionists, Neo-revisionists, and leaderships of groups that split away from CPI(ML) are among them. And then there is also the leadership of CP (Chandra Pullareddy) group that had split away from us. It is but natural if they adopt an attitude of "We said so". But then, mass struggles and armed struggles receive temporary setbacks and regress not only because of wronglines practised by the leadership, but also because of superior strength of the enemy and changes in objective situation. Viewed from this angle, the temporary setback for armed resistance by itself cannot be a justification for the correctness of their criticism. To be correct their criticisms have to be in accordance with the fundamental principles of Marxism-Leninism Mao's Thought. Their practice should accord with their criticism, should be revolutionary and should help advance revolutionary movement. Only then will their criticism be correct. If when we examine their criticisms it becomes clear that they are contrary to these fundamental premises.

Some belonging to CPI(ML) are justifying the policies adopted by them hitherto to be correct in toto. Some others (the open letter by six comrades) broadly admitted their mistakes and expressed their desire to correct. But it is not possible here to discuss them all comprehensively and in detail. We are confining ourselves presently to individual terrorism, which has been

the main among points under discussion.

I. The Criticism of the revisionists and Neorevisionists:

The revisionists have dedicated themselves to defend the present Indian State. And towards this end, they have revised, the fundamentals of Marxism-Leninism and developed their own opportunist theories. Soviet Revisionism is providing leadership to them. The revisionist policy is in accord with the Soviet policy of putting all her energies to defend the Indian State. Parliamentary path is the main aspect of their policy. When the leadership of CPI (ML) adopted individual terrorism under the label of 'the programme of annihilation of class enemy', though the people carried on armed struggle, the revisionists condemned not only the leadership's policy but also the entire armed struggle of the people as individual terrorism and thus exhibited their loyalty. We need not be surprised at this.

However, the neorevisionists do not appear to be of this category. They claim that they are bound by the tactical line of 1951 which included a point that repudiates individual terrorism and say they are committed to it. They have quoted some extracts from the writings of Lenin and Mao which explain the necessity of forms of struggle to accord with the peoples consciousness and pronounced the following judgement on 'Extremists'.

'The methods of struggle adopted by the extremists are contrary to what Lenin had said that they should originate from the needs of the mass struggle and from the people. Nor can it be said that the concerned form of struggle is indispensable in the concrete historical conditions of the day. Nor is there any ground to say that armed struggle was adopted in view of the preparedness and equipment of the people as Mao said. Thus the extremists have adopted forms of struggle which do not accord with any fundamental principle and any basic criterion. This is the only reason why they degenerated to individual terrorism and dacoity. Since our party did not permit these adventurist tactics, they are slandering and spreading prejudices against our party. They have created a prejudice that our party does not at all have the understanding of armed struggle

gle". (From: 'Bankrupt politics of the extremists'-P. 34 of telugu original - Moturu Hanumantha Rao).

This para betrays their theoretical bankruptcy throughout its length and breadth. (The same is the plight of their article.) In both Naxalbari and Srikakulam, the form of armed struggle was adopted only after all the legal forms of struggle by the peasantry were exhausted. The history of the peasant movement of these areas is itself the testimony for this. Thus they are forms of struggle, armed, adopted by the people. They are in accordance with the tenets of Marxism-Leninism-Mao's Thought, but not contrary. They, not realising this are not only resorting to Himalayan Lies but are betraying their opposition to armed struggle in this very para, thus needing no 'Propaganda' of any sort about themselves:

The leadership of the CPI(ML) led these struggles. Some of the mistakes in the conduct of the Naxalbari struggle were explained by its leadership in the Kanu Sanyal (Teral) report. It is not a comprehensive review, which is yet to be issued. In the Srikakulam Girijan People's armed struggle, the leadership adopted the policy of individual terrorism under the label of the "programme of annihilation of class enemy". The same was gradually extended by them to all areas in India where they are working. This policy is opposed to the agrarian revolutionary programme and to the principles of Guerilla warfare. Only when the leadership conducts an armed struggle in accordance with agrarian revolutionary programme and principles of guerilla warfare, can it survive as protracted armed struggle. It was because of individual terrorism, which has nothing in common with the former, that the armed struggle, could not advance and suffered setbacks. It was because of this that revolutionary mass movement could not start and develop in various areas. However, what is presently under discussion is not such areas. It should be kept in mind that the point under discussion is only the individual terrorism adopted by the leadership when the people reached the form of armed struggle.

To point at individual terrorism and to declare that they are also for armed struggle is not by itself Marxism-Leninism. Revisionists as well

as liberal reformists denounce individual terrorism. All arm-chair revolutionaries were eloquent about armed struggle. Viewed from this angle; some other criterion is necessary for Marxism-Leninism. While fighting against individual terrorism, one has to propagate about the need of peoples armed struggle; and together with it prepare the people for it. When people take to the form of armed struggle, it has to be led with a correct programme and tactics (political, economic and military) and this is the real criterion.

It is necessary for all revolutionaries to diligently study what Lenin said on the subject :

'At all events, we are convinced that the experience of revolution and counter revolution in Russia has proved the correctness of our party's more than twenty year struggle against terrorism as tactics. We must not forget, however, that this struggle was closely connected with a ruthless struggle against opportunism, which was inclined to repudiate the use of all violence by the oppressed classes against their oppressors. We have always stood for the use of violence in the mass struggle and in connection with it. Secondly, we linked the struggle against terrorism, with many years of propaganda, started long before December 1905, for an armed uprising. We have regarded the armed uprising not only as the best means by which the proletariat can retaliate to the government's policy, but also as the inevitable result of the development of the class struggle for socialism and democracy. Thirdly, we have not confined our selves to accepting violence in principle and to propaganda for armed uprising. For example, four years before the revolution we supported the use of violence by the masses against their oppressors, particularly in street demonstrations. We sought to bring to the whole country the lesson taught by every such demonstration. We began to devote more and more attention to organising sustained and systematic mass resistance against the police and the army, to winning over, through this resistance, as large as possible, a part of the army to the side of the proletariat in its struggle against the government, to inducing the peasantry and the army to take a conscious part in this struggle. These are the tactics we have applied in the struggle against terrorism,

and it is our firm conviction that they have proved successful.

(Lenin: collected works: Vo. 23, pages 123-124 Moscow, 1964 edition).

Though it is too long, the above paragraph provides us with a comprehensive Leninist understanding about the struggle against terrorism. The 'Marxists' (CPM) do not have such an understanding. They are lying when they say peoples armed struggles are not what they are. They are uniting with the revisionists when they say that people are not ready to take the form of armed struggle and that there are no conditions favouring armed struggle. Saying that armed struggle is not "inevitable", they are showing legal parliamentary activities as an alternative to armed struggle. They are betraying their faith in parliamentary path. And the tactics explained by Lenin above have no place at all in their practice. Thus there is no fundamental difference between their (CPM) understanding and that of the revisionists and liberal reformists towards individual terrorism. They can not become Marxists just because they claim: 'We are also denouncing terrorism and we are also favourable to armed insurrection'. On the contrary, they are exposing themselves as bankrupts on the theory, by such postures.

The fact that they also use the word "extremists", which is used by the ruling classes to denigrate the revolutionaries, exposes the character of their understanding.

Even the ruling classes are admitting that the people in Naxalbari and Srikakulam have abandoned the peaceful (legal) ways in favour of violent (revolutionary, armed struggle) ways. This important aspect is not accepted by the 'Marxists' even to the extent accepted by the ruling classes. But they maintain that these 'forms of struggle' are not indispensable. The people take to new forms of struggle on the basis of their own experience and when they become indispensable, they will accord with their consciousness and organised strength. To say in such conditions, that those forms of struggle are not indispensable, means that they are watering down the forms of struggle adopted by the people and

imposing the forms of their own choice on them. They say armed struggle is not indispensable. They impose parliamentary path on the people and say that it is indispensable.

The 'Marxists' may claim that they are not following the Chinese path and that they are only following a path that is suited to Indian conditions. But the point is, to negate peoples armed struggle is no path at all. To negate armed struggle in Indian conditions is nothing but parliamentary path.

It is quite natural that all revolutionaries reject this path.

Thus it is clear that the 'Marxists' have no basis whatsoever to assume that their criticism on individual terrorism has been proved correct; that their criticism is basically the same as that of the opponents of armed struggle and that their criticism is contrary to Marxism-Leninism. This is one of the fundamental aspects of their neo-revisionism.

2. The Criticism by the Leadership of CP Group:

The leadership of the Chandra Pulla Reddy (CP) group, acting in the name of 'Andhra Pradesh Revolutionary Communist Committee', also criticised the wrong attitude of the CPI (ML) leadership. They published a pamphlet 'Some problems concerning the peoples war path in India', which also contains their comment on the 'Programme of annihilation of class enemy'.

In their very comment that the leaders of CPI(ML) is adopting a 'Wrong attitude' we can clearly see their weakness of being unable to criticise on the theoretical basis and in the light of Marxism-Leninism-Mao's Thought. In this way, they have shown a conciliatory attitude towards left opportunism of CPI(ML) leadership and are shielding it. It is opportunism.

Peoples armed struggle is carried on against the armed forces of the ruling classes with a view to defeat them to make the revolution victorious. But it is not carried out to wipe out all or some of the landlords, who are the main section of the ruling classes. To wipe out landlords as a class

means to smash their state power, to enable the people seizing it and to seize their lands. This is what we call class struggle. Viewed from this angle, even the partial struggles are political struggles in their embryonic form.

Today, the peoples Democratic Revolution in India is in the stage of agrarian revolution. This will continue for the present as agrarian revolution only. When it reaches the level of resolving such fundamental issues as land distribution, the peasant's armed struggle will commence. If partial political struggles are carried on at that time on various issues, not only the land distribution programme will gain in strength, but also the mass base will extend and strengthen armed struggle. Agrarian revolution will continue as protracted armed struggle. Naxalbari and Srikakulam armed struggles commenced only when the agrarian revolution reached a higher stage. So did the Telangana armed struggle.

But this is not the understanding of the leaders of the CP group towards armed struggle. According to them, armed struggle commences with the formation of some militants into squads, with the ostensible purpose, of either facing police repression or of facing landlords' high handedness. Then they will render strength to the armed struggle through 'class struggles and other mass struggles.' (For them class struggles only mean partial struggles).

Viewed from this point, there is an unanimity between these two leaderships. In that, the armed struggle commences without any relationship with the agrarian revolution reaching the level of land distribution. This is the most important and basic point. If at all there is any difference between them, it is only on the question of partial struggles. The leadership of CP group says armed struggle has to be coordinated with partial struggles, while the CPI(ML) leadership feels that it is not necessary. It is too small.

With regard to the 'programme of annihilation of class enemy', the following lines show how the CP group leadership moved closer to the CPI(ML) leadership:

"As class struggle and armed struggle gets intensified some of the landlords and their agents who become notorious as people's enemies will

definitely be killed. But the main objective of armed struggle is not to kill some landlords as individuals, but to destroy the class society". (Some problems concerning the path of peoples war in India P. 22).

We have no evidence to say that the objective of "Programme of annihilation of class enemy" of the CPI(ML) leadership was not to destroy the class society. They say that "Annihilation of class enemy" is necessary to destroy the class society. The only difference between them is that if it says that a large number of landlords need to be annihilated through armed struggle, the leadership of CP group says that 'Some' of them have to be annihilated. (They are called peoples enemies or some such name is given to them. But then they are all different names for 'class enemy'.) The only difference between these two leaderships is not on the necessity or otherwise of killing the landlords, but only on their number, whether large or small. The above lines make it clear that they are unanimous on this question and this is a unity of fundamental nature. The difference about the number is insignificant and secondary.

We have examined the 'programme of annihilation of class enemy' of the CPI(ML) leadership from the stand points of theory and practice and arrived at the conclusion that it is individual terrorism. Because the leadership of the CP group has fundamentally accepted this view (of CPI(ML) and is implementing it, their criticism is just formal and purposeless.

Reporting that a particular raid had been conducted by CPI(ML) followers, they described it thus:

"They (CPI-ML followers-Tr.) mobilised about 50 militants in Anantapur district and raided the house of a rich merchant in Kadiri Tq. They seized golden jewellery on the persons of the women. They failed to seize the bonds he held or cash from him. Meanwhile the owner of the house opened fire from the top floor. A militant was seriously injured and they came out with him. Where as two items of jewellery were seized, only one was given over to the party leader and the other was retained by them. One militant quit the party with that jewellery and made good his debts. When another tried to sell a costly necklace

In the market, the buyer suspected him and secretly informed the police. When police arrested and tortured him, he not only revealed all secrets but turned an approver. Besides this, the raider could kill a landlord who was asleep and a money-lender who was passing by. But there was no attempt to seize their property. None of these incidents involved mass mobilisation. As such even the standing they had among the people before was lost'. (Ibid. p. 37).

It is not our intention here to decide whether the above incidents were truthfully reported by the CP group's leadership or not. It is mean on their part to have described the incidents like a prosecution story, even while addressing the CPI (ML) leadership as 'brothers'. This description will be useful to the enemy and the police, but in no way to the revolutionary movement. In theoretical discussion, importance should be given not to the details of the incident, but to the understanding that led to such incidents. It is indisputable that when the leadership of a party or a group abandons Marxism-Leninism-Mao's Thought and sets on a wrong path, their activities will lead them away from the people.

They have not examined these incidents comprehensively. What is the role of rich merchants in the peoples democratic revolution? What should be the attitude of communist revolutionaries towards them? Such are the questions that need to be discussed, but they have not touched them. All the same, we can know their understanding if we examined some of their comments.

While saying that the CPI(ML) followers failed to seize bonds or cash from the rich merchant, they suggest that they should have done that. The raid itself and the other concerned were not wrong according to them. Their suggestive comment makes this clear that it would have been really good if, in addition, they had also seized the bonds and cash. Likewise, they say, the raiders could kill a landlord and money-lender who were passing by, but made no attempt to seize their property, thus suggesting that they should have done it. That is, there was nothing wrong in killing them; only they should have also seized their property. That such is the understanding of the CP group's leadership is evident from their comment. They also say that because these

incidents did not involve mass mobilisation they lost the influence among the people considerably. The essence of their comment boils down to this: If they had mobilised people and indulged in these raids and murders as per the advice given suggestively by them, it would have been a correct policy.

These are the 'great victories' scored through the programme of annihilation of class enemy'. When they say that these raids and murders, conducted according to the programme of the CPI (ML) leadership in districts other than Srikakulam, are defective because they have no relationship with mass mobilisation. The leadership of CP group feels no such thing happened in Srikakulam district. People did participate in the early stages of armed struggle in Srikakulam district. But, instead of carrying on guerilla war, based on agrarian revolution that has reached the higher stage (of land distribution), the leadership implemented the 'programme of annihilation of class enemy'. As a result the peoples participation in the armed struggle had dwindled. It is one of the reasons that led to a setback to the armed struggle. But the leadership of CP group is not in a position to understand this development. For a leadership which has an understanding that 'as the class struggle' and armed struggle gets intensified, some of the landlords and their agents who become notorious as peoples enemies will definitely be killed'; it is impossible to understand the programme of annihilation of class enemy, which was implemented in Srikakulam armed struggle and the harmful role it has played.

Thus the leaderships of both these groups have been following individual terrorism. The CPI (ML) leadership gave it the label of the 'programme of annihilation of class enemy'. Whereas the CP group leadership calls it the 'inevitable killing of some landlords and agent provocateurs who acquired notoriety as peoples enemies'. There is no basic difference between the understanding and practice of the two.

3. Lenin's article on Guerrilla warfare and the Programme of annihilation of class enemy.

The Srikakulam peasant revolutionary movement could not advance as protracted armed

struggle, and suffered major setbacks. The guerilla war in Calcutta city fizzled out. The raids and murders, conducted without relation to people and without effort to develop peasant revolutionary movement, could not develop into armed resistance. In this background reports emanated that the CPC is not accepting the positions taken by the CPI(ML) leadership on various issues and that CPC gave some suggestions to correct them. As a result of all this there was chaos in the party. As the 'Programme of annihilation of class enemy' was the prime issue, discussions started on it and the party was split into several groups. There are three important groups among them. There are those who argue that the theories of Charu Mazumdar are cent per cent correct. Then there are those who say that his are 'left' opportunism theories and accept the suggestions of the CPC only formally, but follow the same theories with slight changes from another group. This latter group declared their party to be the official. Then there are some others who declare they have not formed into a group. They are expressing their desire to deeply examine the suggestions of the CPC and to have self criticism.

The followers of Charu Mazumdar are citing Lenin's article on Guerrilla warfare to justify their programme of 'Annihilation of class enemy'.

They are unable to cite from Mao's writings to defend their arguments. Taking the fundamental principles enunciated in this article by Lenin as the basis analysing and summing up the experiences of the Chinese revolution, Mao developed guerilla warfare to the level of strategy and tactics, rather than confining it to just a form of struggle. Articles explaining these aspects can be found in Mao's works. They are the latest. Revolutionaries leading liberation struggles in colonies and semicolonies are applying the Mao's theories to the concrete conditions existing in their respective countries and are carrying on protracted armed struggles.

Ours is a semicolonial, semi feudal country as China was before liberation. It is for this reason that we undertook protracted armed struggle as the means to complete the peoples democratic revolution. Guerilla war occupies a primary place in this. Only when we wage guerilla war

based on principles enunciated by Mao, can we conduct protracted armed struggle. Viewed in this perspective to think about guerilla war without relation to protracted armed struggle will be wrong.

Lenin wrote the article on Guerilla warfare at the end of September 1906. Keeping in mind the armed uprising of December 1905, the partial military revolts upto July 1906 and the partial peasant revolts (autumn 1905 to autumn 1906), Lenin examined some of the incidents and saw in them forms of struggle that come to the fore in the interval of two 'big engagements' in the period of armed insurrection.

He said this form of struggle was adopted even as the exclusive form of struggle by the vagabond elements of the population, the lumpen proletariat and anarchist groups in the Russian areas. He said the struggle was pursued with the aim of assassinating individuals, chiefs and subordinates in the army and police and with the aim of confiscating monetary funds both from the govt. and from private persons. He explained how the Lettish Party, a section of the Russian Social democratic Party, organised it in the most developed form and imparted it a mass character. He pointed out the inseparable connection between the revolutionary movement and guerilla warfare, on various occasions.

According to what Lenin said in this article, he only defended the assassination of individuals of chiefs and subordinates in the army and police. But nowhere it is said that landlords and capitalists can be assassinated. He said money from the govt. and private persons can be confiscated but did not say that govt employees and individuals can be assassinated. The Lettish party (the party of a small country), in its daily paper with a circulation of 30,000, used the published lists of spies and appeal to the people to exterminate them, used to make the people conscious by proclaiming those who assist the police as enemies of the people. This was the principal feature of this form of struggle. Lenin denounced the tendency to label such a form of struggle, with its mass character, as terrorism.

However, the programme of annihilation of class enemy has no comparison whatsoever with the above form of struggle with its revolutionary mass character. The objective of the former programme has been to kill landlords, rich merchants, Govt. employees and private individuals, whereas the objective of guerilla war is to defeat and smash the state armed forces. It was in this way that guerilla warfare came to the fore as a form of struggle in Russia and other areas under conditions of armed insurrection. Our revolution is in the stage of agrarian revolution. When the revolutionary peasant movement reaches a higher stage, that is, when land distribution and other basic issues appear on the agenda, then the guerilla warfare will be a form of struggle. To develop it as protracted armed struggle, it has to acquire revolutionary mass character (in our context, the character of peasant revolution reaching a high stage). In the context of the Russian conditions, Lenin accepted armed insurrection as the main form of struggle and guerilla warfare as the secondary form of struggle and explained guerilla warfare accordingly. We should not forget this.

Refuting the arguments that the Guerilla warfare disorganises the organised movement and leads to demoralisation among people and revolutionaries, Lenin explained that such a situation does not result from guerilla warfare, but from not conducting it along correct lines. But that explanation in no way helps to defend the programme of annihilation of class enemy. When Lenin referred to the movement, we should keep in mind, he referred to a movement that has reached a stage where it can take the form of guerilla warfare. At such a stage, if the guerilla warfare is not conducted the organised movement will get disorganised. And demoralisation sets both in the people who carry on the struggle and in the revolutionaries who lead it. The same situation is encountered when the leadership leads it with a wrong understanding and with wrong methods. Similar will be the results of a guerilla war when it is conducted in the absence of a movement or when it has not reached the necessary higher stage. This applies to our peasant revolutionary movement in toto. There is nothing in common between guerilla warfare and the 'programme of annihilation of class enemy,' which is a variant of individual terrorism. It is based on an

understanding contrary to Marxism-Leninism-Mao, a counter-revolutionary (conspiratorial) organisation. It was because of practising such a programme that the Srikakulam peasant revolutionary movement that has reached a higher stage, as also other movements which did not reach that state, got disorganised. That was why demoralisation set in among people and revolutionaries. This situation was all the more acute in those areas where masses were not in action. In Srikakulam, some fundamental mistakes were committed even in the conduct of guerilla warfare (for example, under-estimating the enemy tactically, overestimating our strength etc.). However, the 'programme of annihilation of class enemy' is a mistake not with in this scope, but outside it. Unless this aspect is recognised, it is impossible to face it theoretically or to correct it. It will appear again and again in ever new forms in new conditions. The state of affairs with some of the groups, who criticised the programme of annihilation of class enemy, or accepted as wrong continues to be the same even today.

In this connection, it is necessary for all revolutionaries to study Stalin's article (1908) on 'Economic Terrorism'. In that article, Stalin explained how killing of capitalists and factory managers and burning down of factories is contrary to Marxism-Leninism. Stalin hailed the workers of MIRZOYE when they openly denounced this terrorism and declared that they had nothing to do with it. (Stalin collected works - Vol 2 p, 113-116. ECONOMIC TERRORISM AND LABOUR MOVEMENT).

There is a possibility for the leadership to follow the line of individual terrorism, even when there are no objective conditions to encourage the activities of individual terrorism (massupurge being on down-grade and conditions of lull); when the leadership of the revolutionary party has no basic understanding of Marxism-Leninism-Mao's Thought; when it has romantic views about revolution, when it has no knowledge of strategy and tactics of revolution and of principles of guerilla warfare. Such a situation can arise even when people are participating in revolutionary struggles and when there are conditions for insurrection. The actions of 'annihilation of class enemy' committed by the leaders and followers of CPI (ML), in Srikakulam, and areas where there is a peasant

revolutionary movement together with a number of areas where there are no symptoms of revolutionary movement or where there are people not in action, are standing examples for this.

Individual terrorism, that has been implemented under the label of 'the programme of annihilation of class enemy', had been denounced by Marxism-Leninism in unmistakable terms and had also been proved wrong by our own experiences of armed struggle. That Lenin's article on Guerilla warfare does in no way justify it, is clear from the above explanation.

4. International Advice and self Criticism

Indian communist movement always received help and cooperation from international communist movement. International communist movement recognised from time to time how India, the second most populous country in the world, the biggest country in the world capitalist system, has been playing a key role in the international strategy firstly of the British and then of the U S imperialism and presently of the Soviet Social Imperialism. There has also been a clear assessment that when India is liberated from the yoke of imperialism, there would be a qualitative change in the world politics and that such a change would definitely be favourable to independence, democracy and socialism and that it would be a death-knell to imperialism. With such a view, the international communist movement has been helping, the Indian communist movement, to the best of its ability.

The leadership of the Indian communist movement has been in the habit of academic discussions, dogmatism and blind following and failed to make good use of international advice. It has been jumping now towards left and now towards right. Factionalism has been a chronic disease of the party leadership. It has to be said that there was almost no struggle inside the party for correct line except during the period of Telangana armed struggle.

Experience has proved that the (CPI)(ML) leadership was also affected by this disease. After they have travelled far a way along the left opportunist road, they have received some international advice to come to the correct path.

The leadership has not only not accepted it, but has even refused to discuss it. All this is known through the 'open-letter' written to their party comrades by six important leaders of that party from inside the Visakhapatnam jail. In this letter, they mentioned some of the suggestions given by CPC and announced that they have accepted them and that they would have self criticism basing on them. We feel that their attitude is correct and it is welcome. We hope that these comrades would fulfil their task in a proper way.

There is no fundamental difference between our understanding on various issues as discussed in this document and the understanding contained in Immediate Programme and other documents related to it. We have accepted and explained the points about which we were wrong, in our documents written subsequently.

5. Armed struggle in Warangal and Khammam Districts

We have mentioned about armed struggle in Warangal and Khammam districts on various occasions in this document. We feel some explanation is necessary about this.

By September 1968 itself, we evolved a programme to reorganise the mass movement on revolutionary foundations and to develop it to the level of armed struggle. We set out to implement it. This programme is explained in the circular "Lay foundations for struggle-oriented mass movement". We evolved a comprehensive agrarian revolutionary programme in "Immediate Programme", applicable to various areas in Andhra Pradesh and implemented it. We expressed our views of Srikakulam district Girijanarmed struggle clearly in another document. All these go to show our understanding about agrarian revolution and armed struggle.

There are areas where this programme was implemented and there are others where it was not done. Though it was implemented to an extent in the beginning in Warangal district, armed actions started and continued in Warangal and Khammam districts ever since April 1959, even before the movement reached a higher stage. As against this, this programme was completely and comprehensively implemented in Konda Modaly area (literally Konda Modaly means 'foot of a

hill)-Tr.) of East Godavari District.

The armed actions conducted in Warangal and Khammam districts are against our fundamental line. They were discussed right in the beginning and we came to a decision about them. We started our criticism with our document 'Problems facing the revolutionary mass movement of Khammam area' and elaborated in the later documents on the basis of theory and practice. In the first open statement we issued in this connection, there is a portion which needs special attention:

"At this juncture, some are forming into groups without relation to people and mass movement and indulging in raids on landlords and other exploiters. We would like to make it clear that it will not be possible to destroy the landlord system, nor would the mass movement advance, with such raids conducted without relation to revolutionary peoples movement. Only through revolutionary mass mobilisation, through revolutionary organisation and peoples armed struggle can we abolish the present big landlord, imperialist, big bourgeois class setup. This is what Marxism-Leninism-Mao Thought teaches us. And this is the task for all the revolutionaries.

Viewed in this perspective, it should be realised that the raids conducted by them are opposed to Marxism-Leninism-Mao's Thought and are detrimental to the revolutionary movement. They should set themselves to take the correct path'.

These few lines make clear our views on the raids conducted not only under the leadership of CPI (ML), but also under the leadership of CP group (which was then a part of our party) in Khammam, Warangal and Karimnagar areas. Though we had such an understanding theoretically in our open statements we called these armed actions as armed struggle. Along with them, we mentioned them in similar terms in some of the correspondence and documents. 'The Left Trend among Indian Revolutionaries' the present document is one of them. Though it may be debatable how far it is correct to call armed actions as armed struggle in open statements, we admit that

it is wrong to call them as peoples armed struggle, going on along correct path. In documents meant to discuss experiences of revolutionary movement. We make it clear that this criticism is applicable to the past as well as the continuing armed actions in this area.

Revolutionaries who hitherto considered the 'programme of annihilation of class enemy' and its variants as peoples armed struggle are today reconsidering their attitude. It is welcome development. We hope they will examine the experiences of armed struggle and of other revolutionary struggles in the light of Marxism-Leninism-Mao's Thought and will come over to the path of peoples armed struggle. The fact all the revolutionaries are concentrating their attention in discussions on agrarian revolutionary programme and on the tactical line that provides for all forms of struggle necessary to implement it, it forms the basis of our hope.

Ours is the mass line. That this is fundamentally correct is proved by experience to date. Those who label that we, who follow this line, are revisionist do not deserve to be called revolutionaries. They prove themselves to be the dead enemies of Marxism-Mao's Thought. And that is the fate of those who oppose the mass line, which is the revolutionary line.

We completed this document. "Left Trend among Indian Revolutionaries", by October 1970 in the jail. Because of this the full text of this could not reach the revolutionaries and the people. Some parts of it were however published in 'JANASAKTI' (Telugu journal of Communist revolutionaries-Tr) We are publishing the full text of the document, at a time when all the problems of the Indian revolution are being discussed comprehensively and we hope that it will help the discussions.

June 28, 1973. —ANDHRA PRADESH COMMUNIST COMMITTEE (REVOLUTIONARIES)

FOREWORD TO ENGLISH EDITION

This pamphlet, originally written in Telugu, was completed by October 1, 1970, by the leaders of Andhra Pradesh Communist Committee (Revolutionaries), while they were in jail, (From December 1969 to May 1972). It was to have been written even earlier, because of its urgency as well as importance, because there were manifestations of "Left"-opportunism in Charu Majumdar's group after a few months of the formation of All-India Coordination Committee of Communist Revolutionaries of India. It was not possible for the Andhra Committee as it was pre occupied with facing a crisis, by a section of its leadership, leading to dislocation of entire party organisation.

A section of West Bengal Communist revolutionaries were the first to come out of the CPI (M), the neo-revisionist party, in 1967 when they were expelled from it. The point of departure between the two was the peasant armed struggle of Naxalbari (a small border area in the state). While Communist revolutionaries had upheld and led it, the major part of central and state leadership had characterised it as counter revolutionary and proceeded to suppress it. (A left front government led by CPI (M) was, at the time, running state administration in West Bengal). Subsequently others from various states have joined them and formed All-India Coordination Committee of Communist revolutionaries (AICCCR). While maintaining the closest possible contacts with the leadership, before and after its formation, the Andhra Communist revolutionaries did not join it when it was formed or immediately afterwards. The main reason for this was that they constituted the overwhelming majority in the entire state organisation together with a majority in the leadership also. The leadership felt that it was necessary to carry on an explanatory campaign among the rank and file on the fundamental differences which were not confined to the attitude towards Naxalbari peasants armed struggle, alone. They were in fact, between a new variety of revisionism i.e. neo-revisionism' and Marxism-Leninism, Mao ze Dong thought. The campaign was successful with an over whelmingly major section of the party and the mass movement,

getting rallied behind communist revolutionary line. It was an internal struggle which ended in success in favour of Communist revolutionaries, as far as Andhra Pradesh is concerned. On the contrary they had come out in small groups or as individuals in other states, including West Bengal, with no mass movement (some where negligible), behind them. The neo-revisionists were allowed to have their own way with it, in major part of the country.

By this time, Charu Majumdar and his closest associates, who formed into a clique, could control the central Head quarters of AICCCR while others in the leadership (for example Sushital Roy Choudary and his associates) began to loose their say in the central activities. Charu's clique (formed and had come to stay) was rather afraid of Andhra Communist Revolutionaries, joining AICCCR, because they were a formidable force who could not be expected to follow its dictates. Therefore it had unleashed a campaign of slander against them, by branding them as opportunists for not coming out of CPI (M) at a time of its choice or according to its dictates. It had simultaneously carried out factional activities by organising a group of its own in almost all states, including Andhra Pradesh. It became a rival centre for disruption. Obviously, such steps were meant to prevent genuine revolutionaries to come together with their respective leaderships from joining AICCCR.

The differences between Charu's clique and the leadership of Andhra Communist revolutionaries were not limited to the time of coming out of CPI(M) and joining AICCCR. They extended to the tactical questions as well, such as the concept of armed struggle, attitude towards elections, the need for participation and building of mass organisations etc.. By the end of 1968, both the leaderships had agreed to work in AICCCR, without compromising in the differences. As a result the Andhra organisation had merged with the All India organisation, towards the end of October. It was obvious that an internal struggle, was to begin inside the AICCCR. But the Charu's clique

did not allow it to materialise. It decided to "expell" Andhra Communist revolutionaries and to form the party without them. It had come into existence by 1st May of 1969 with the name of Communist Party of India (Marxist-Leninist) leading to major split in the AICCCR itself. Some aspects of its draft programme and the political resolution of its "First Congress" are commented upon in this pamphlet as "Left"-opportunism.

The "Liberation" had been official organ of AICCCR to being with and CPI(ML) subsequently. A number of problems connected with Indian revolution were dealt with in its issues. The Journal, in the main, reflected the 'Left'-opportunism of Charu's clique. The years 1969-70 saw the sway of the theory and practice of "annihilation of class enemies" which was its main aspect. The Journal carried the articles and reports of activities whose content was this deviation. Those Communist revolutionaries who were behind the bars during this period and afterwards (upto 1972), had no access to all the issues of the journal or to the required material. Therefore, this pamphlet which was written in the jail and was sent out for circulation, does not cover all the points related to the subject. At the same time, all the basic questions were covered with the available material.

The question of principal contradiction has been a point of controversy among the communist revolutionaries for the last one decade. It was dealt with in the pamphlet though not in detail. It was correct to formulate that the principal contradiction in the present phase of revolution is between the feudalism and the masses of the people. It holds good even to-day because there is no new development which demands us a change in our attitude in spite of fast changing world situation and advancing world revolution. It is a fact that US Imperialism, as a super power has weakened considerably and reduced itself to a power No. 2, when compared with Soviet Union who has grown into a super power No. 1. The present international situation bears witness to this. There is a change in the national situation accordingly. Control of Soviet Union over India, has increased considerably during the last one decade and more. As a result of this, the contradictions between the two super powers have intensified further, and are intensifying every passing day. Soviet Union is on the way of becoming no. 1 super power even in our country in relation

to defence and foreign affairs (militarily and diplomatically) though US imperialism continues to control our economy. Soviet Union is also heading towards controlling the economy. But she is still far away from reaching her goal. Notwithstanding the inter changing of their positions in one respect or other, the fact remains that the position of imperialism as a whole and that of one super power or the others does remain the same. We never characterised as the principal contradiction between US Imperialism and the nation when it was more or the most powerful imperialist power internationally and nationally. Our characterisation at the time was that it was between feudalism and mass of the people. It continues to be so when one super power replaces the other in its bid for hegemonism over our country. Those who were opposed to the agrarian revolution to be the main task and those who have relegated it to a secondary or an insignificant position have been advancing the theory that the principal contradiction is between soviet social imperialism and the nation, as against feudalism and mass of the people. Such a theory demands the renunciation of agrarian revolution as the main task while its opposition to imperialism or soviet social imperialism for that matter is more a phrase mongering than a real revolutionary struggle. It is because that once the revolutionary movement is derailed from the task of agrarian revolution, the rest becomes an empty task. In this connection, it is worth remembering that the present revisionist section in the combined party, advocated that the task of agrarian revolution to be abandoned and support congress government in the main implying that the principal contradiction is between US imperialism and the nation.

However, there is a discrepancy in the original text (English Typed Copy) which is removed from this pamphlet. It runs as following :

'.....Since the big bourgeoisie has allied itself by acting as the agent of feudalism this contradiction also extends to the big bourgeoisie. Thus it should be said that the principal contradiction at the present stage is the contradiction between feudalism and the big bourgeoisie on one hand and the broad masses of the people on the other'. The same idea has been included in the first concluding point, towards the end.

When we speak of fundamental and principal contradiction, we speak in relation to our society the character of the revolution and the position of concerned classes. Ours is the semi-colonial and semi-feudal society. As a result the fundamental contradiction is between imperialism and feudalism or semi-feudalism on one hand and anti-imperialist anti-feudal revolution classes on the other. The peoples' democratic revolution alone can resolve this contradiction. The fundamental contradiction is clearly explained thus. It is obvious that the revolution liquidates not only imperialism and feudalism (semi-feudalism), but also the reactionary forces which are inseparably linked with them. The comprador or big-bourgeoisie is one such force and important force at that. In spite of this, we have not mentioned it in connection with fundamental contradiction, because it is not a distinct class by itself. It can not be separated from imperialism and feudalism. Therefore its mention becomes superfluous, when we have to explain the fundamental contradiction. Of course, it is one of the targets of our revolution and we mention it or rather take it into account in this connection.

The same is the case with the principal contradiction. When we say that the principal contradiction is between feudalism and the mass of the people, we work out the main task of the revolution for the given phase accordingly i.e. the task of the agrarian revolution. This does not mean that it is not directed against comprador or big bourgeoisie or there will not be any revolutionary movement directed against this section of the bourgeoisie to overthrow it. Being one of the ruling classes, and inseparably linked with imperialism and feudalism, the agrarian revolution can not and will not leave it aside. In fact, it develops and advances against the ruling classes in general as represented by political party or parties in power. Therefore the big comprador bourgeoisie, as a target of revolution will continue to be always, even when the principal contradiction is between imperialism and the nation. Therefore the correct way of explaining the principal contradiction in the present phase of the revolution is its being between feudalism and mass of the people. Such a characterisation in no way comes in the way of advancing agrarian revolution in particular and people's democratic revolution in general. On the contrary it strengthens the course of

revolution because communist revolutionaries work out their tasks and implement them with a correct understanding. We hope that we will have the occasion to deal with this in more details sooner,

|||

We have earlier mentioned the limitations under which the committee completed the pamphlet, the main one being lack of sufficient material. In spite of this the committee was bold enough to characterise that the armed struggle in Naxalbari was not a sudden development, unrelated to the past, meaning that it had a background of mass movement which took the form of armed struggle at a particular phase when the people lost legal illusions to solve their problems. The same was the case with the armed struggle in Srikakulam. The necessary details of the background for the latter were within the reach of the committee because of its association with it. But it was not the same with Naxalbari. The report, which was said to be a self-critical one, mentioned in the pamphlet (Kanu Sanyal's Taral Report) does not provide the least indication of it. It was the article 'more on Naxalbari' by the same author, which was prepared and published long after (some time in 1974) which confirms this contention. We are aware that the article "More on Naxalbari" raised a number of questions which have to be answered, either by the author, or by those who are in know of things, or by those who have taken upon themselves the task of analysing it to draw correct conclusions. This is not to say that the former comrades are not interested in this task. But it is not enough that one should have an interest in it. It is necessary that one should have a correct line and correct orientation towards the problem. The different assessments and the conclusions, which are being arrived at, by different parties, groups and individuals are the result of their different orientations. Such differences are part of many others, fundamental or otherwise, which are now existing among the groups of the former CPI(ML) or those between Communist revolutionaries on one hand and the other groups on the other.

This question bears a practical importance today, because these groups are continuing the same deviation in a different form, in the context

of present day conditions. While a section of them are practising parliamentary path together with individual terrorism, others are practising the latter in a modified form. i.e. they are sometimes "linking" it with "mass mobilisation". It becomes clear that this so-called "mass mobilisation" has nothing to do with building mass revolutionary movement about which they have no understanding at all. Their "mass mobilisation" if any is an eye wash and a shield to cover their individual terrorism which is going on in the name of "annihilation of class enemies" and "money actions". Those who are coordinating the legal activities including participation in elections and the so-called illegal activities of "annihilation" and "money actions" etc., are sailing in the same boat in renouncing the task of building a mass revolutionary movement. Here in lies the commonness and identity of views and practice of these sections. It is a new variety of right and "left" opportunism, against which communist revolutionaries are carrying on struggle.

IV

The Andhra Communist revolutionaries had to work out fundamentally a correct line, defend, develop, and elaborate it under very difficult conditions which are common to all, not only in our country, but every where in the world. The attack of the ruling classes together with revisionists and neo-revisionists is usual. They are steeled in the battle against these enemy forces. Equally a ferocious battle had to be waged against "left" opportunism, whose main content has been individual terrorism in its variety of forms. This trend, alien to Marxism-Leninism-Mao Dse Dong thought, was rampant inside and outside the organisation. The leaders of trend this adopted unscrupulous methods to enforce their wrong and disruptive line. They had initial successes too, only to hasten disorganisation of revolutionary ranks as well as the movement beyond conceivable proportions. As a result the unification of the revolutionaries and revolutionary movement has become the most difficult task of the day.

Andhra Communist revolutionaries, while facing these difficulties had to explain their attitude towards armed struggle at different times in different contexts. There are two which need some explanation for the present. *Firstly*: We have demarcated ourselves from the anti marxist anti-Leninist understanding of "left" opportunists and made ourselves clear that ours is the understanding of people's armed struggle. Not with-

standing this, there were isolated pockets, an individual village or a small group of villages where people took up arms and there were genuine peoples' armed struggles. Obviously, a "left" opportunist leadership could only disrupt them. Here we differentiated the leadership with the people. We characterised it as peoples' armed struggle and defended it as such. At the same time we have denounced the "left" opportunist leadership for what it is. It was correct on our part, as Marxist-Leninists, to do so and we did it. (See: Preface to Marxism-Leninism and Armed Struggle: The Proletarian Line No. 3.).

There was another occasion, when we characterised the activities of "left" opportunists of our organisation as nothing but another form of "annihilation of class enemy" of charu's group. The views connected with the trend were under discussion inside our own organisation. It was a peculiar situation when the struggle against various forms of individual terrorism was taking place simultaneously inside and outside the organisation. Normally the leadership does not choose to condemn openly the mistakes committed inside the organisation. Instead of this, they are corrected after a comprehensive self criticism. The Committee took the same position. It is a correct step which regard to mistakes of a secondary nature or those committed in a different situation or in a different context. But when an open debate is taking place regarding the theory and practice of armed struggle, and the points under discussion are one and the same, we can not treat our own mistakes, rather the deviation inside the organisation as an internal affair. We have self critically examined this point and accepted the mistake committed by us in the preface to Telugu Edition. We think that the positions we have taken are consistent and do not contradict each other. On the contrary they clarify the relevant point further.

V

We are aware that we are yet to explain some more points raised by our 'critics', and defenders of right and 'left' opportunism. Consideration of space (in the journal) is one of the main points which prevents us from doing so. We will have the occasion to explain all these points in due course.

We have a limited objective in publishing this pamphlet, in the form of this supplement. It to inform our readers that the struggle against 'left' opportunism had begun as long as 1969-70, shortly after it had raised its head. And the struggle took a correct direction, and not a wrong one, as was adopted by right and 'left' opportunists. Those who contend that there was no correct line for communist revolutionaries at any time during last one decade and more are expected to know that there has been a correct line, which has been and still is defending against right and left opportunism, from a correct stand point, 25.9.79.

—Adityan.

Left Trend Among Indian Revolutionaries

It is imperative that the Indian Communist movement, after comprehensive discussion about right and "left" deviations, will have to arrive at proper conclusions. Notwithstanding this, it is undeniable that the leadership of the Communist Party of India has failed to lead the Indian Revolution. The revolutionaries in the country hoped that, when the All India Co-ordination Committee of Communist Revolutionaries was formed, it would organise itself into a party, and be able to lead the Indian Revolution under the guidance of Marxism-Leninism and Mao's Thought. But even the leadership of this committee did not take long to deviate into "leftist" line. Even though this "left" trend could be seen even before they formed themselves into CP (M.L.) it became crystal clear and very dangerous only after the formation of the party. It is natural that the revolutionaries in the country are anxious to understand the phenomenon fully.

We have made our stand clear on all these questions through the press statements and the documents of our state convention. Further it has also been explained in our article "Some problems of peoples War" in reply to their tirade against our "immediate programme". Yet they refuse to rectify their incorrect policies and practice. What is more they are baselessly slandering us as "revisionists" in spite of the fact that we are conducting the armed struggle on the one hand and simultaneously developing the revolutionary movement into armed struggle on the other in accordance with Marxism-Leninism and Mao's Thought. In their view there appears to be no difference whatsoever between those that are conducting armed struggle and struggle and striving to overthrow the ruling classes and those that are pursuing the parliamentary path and defending the very same ruling classes. It has therefore become essential to thoroughly examine their wrong policies.

These are the important questions under discussion today.

1. The principle contradiction at the present stage of the Peoples Democratic Revolution and its relation with other non-principal contradictions.
2. What is a revolutionary situation ?
3. Economism and the revolutionary mass struggles.
4. Problems of armed struggle.
5. The problems of nationalities in India: The movement for separate Telangana.
6. Unification of the Revolutionaries.

These are not questions for academic discussions, these are the questions of theory and practice arising in the course of armed struggle and the building of revolutionary movement, on the correct solutions of which the advance of the revolution depends.

The analysis of the concrete Indian conditions advanced by the leadership of the Indian Communist movement in the past was totally erroneous. Further their work was neither based on revolutionary practice nor on the universal truth of the basic principles of Marxism-Leninism-Mao's Thought. Merely chanting them or attempting to mechanically implement them with utter disregard for the revolutionary practice, or revising them in the name of creative Marxism. This in general is what the revisionist leadership has been doing all along. Analysing the concrete Indian conditions in the light of Mao's Thought and on the basis of the experiences of the Telangana armed struggle, the Andhra Communist leadership had, during the Telangana armed struggle (1946-51), proved the applicability of the Chinese revolutionary path to India. The ideological struggle for a correct Marxist-Leninist path has once again come to the fore with the Naxalbari armed struggle.

The Communist revolutionaries within the Communist Party (Marxist) led this ideological struggle. Some of these communist revolutionaries formed the Communist party (Marxist-Leninist). But they have failed to make a comprehensive analysis of the concrete Indian conditions and to apply them to their revolutionary practice. They are merely chanting the basic principles of Mao's Thought. Thus while themselves pursuing incorrect policies, they are willfully distorting the correct policies pursued by the Andhra Pradesh Revolutionary Communist Committee. They themselves claim to be following Mao's Thought in India today. While failing to unify the revolutionary forces, this attitude of theirs has only led to further division and disruption of the revolutionary movement itself. It has therefore become imperative for the revolutionaries to grasp this erroneous and harmful attitude and to carry on a determined struggle against it.

However, it should be clearly understood that they did not have these erroneous tendencies at the time of the formation of the All India Co-ordination Committee of the Communist Revolutionaries. In the beginning their attitude was also correct on some questions. But gradually they have drifted towards this wrong line.

Though at the time of discussing these problems the differences on some of the questions of armed struggle have not yet come to the fore, it is essential that they should be discussed taking their practice as the basis of the discussion. We hope that the experiences put forward here would be of use to the revolutionaries.

I. Contradictions:—Principal Contradiction :

The Indian revolution must go through two stages—the bourgeois democratic revolution in the first stage, and the socialist revolution in the second stage. Today the Indian revolution is in the stage of the bourgeois democratic revolution. India is a semi-colonial and semi-feudal country. Therefore ours is an anti-imperialist, anti-feudal revolution under the leadership of the proletariat. Hence the peoples democratic revolution. The contradiction between the anti-imperialist, anti-feudal democratic revolutionary character and the semi-colonial, semi-feudal character is the fundamental contradiction for the entire stage of the people's democratic revolution. This will remain unchanged until the completion of the people's democratic revolution.

Only by smashing imperialism and feudalism and establishing people's democracy through the people's democratic revolution can this fundamental contradiction be resolved. This revolution will be an armed revolution in the form of protracted war.

A number of contradictions appear in the course of the Indian bourgeois democratic revolution. Important among them are:—

1. The contradiction between Imperialism and the oppressed classes of Indian society.
2. The contradiction between feudalism and the vast masses of Indian people.
3. The contradiction between the bourgeoisie and the working class.
4. The contradiction between the bourgeoisie on one side and the peasantry and urban middle class on the other.
5. The contradiction among the groups of the reactionary ruling classes.

Since there are a number of contradictions, not only do they appear in a complex form, but also some additions and alterations are taking place and have taken place among them. It is therefore essential to bear this in mind.

Only the British Imperialists were directly ruling and oppressing the country prior to 1947. Subsequently the British imperialists exploitation did not come to an end. On the contrary it has been going on just as before and even more so. That is not all. The American Imperialists and the Soviet Social Imperialists have also stepped in, and are plundering the country. The policies of the Government serve the political and economic interests of these Imperialist powers. West German and Japanese imperialists, come next in the order of plundering the country. Of all these Imperialists, the American Imperialists and the Soviet Social Imperialists are the most aggressive. They support and safe-guard the reactionary forces of India. Thus they stand out as the main enemies of the Indian revolution. The ruling classes of India namely the big bourgeoisie and the land lord classes, are serving them as their agents.

Until 1947, feudalism had been serving as the agent of British Imperialists. There after it has been and is still serving as the agent of American Imperialism and other Imperialists. By converting a part of their hoarded wealth into capital and aligning themselves with foreign bourgeoisie and the Indian big bourgeoisie, many of the feudalists have themselves become big capitalists. Even though the Princely states and the Zamindaris have been abolished, the same class, as the big land lords and big bourgeoisie, occupy an important place in the ruling set up. By aligning itself with the big bourgeoisie, this class is ruling and plundering the masses. Thus India is being plundered by the Imperialism the big bourgeoisie, and the land lord classes.

Since India is a country with a vast population under the capitalist system, the world imperialist powers are competing among themselves to plunder its wealth and the people. It is possible that in the future these inter-imperialist contradictions might become intensified and erupt in India. We should therefore watch these developments closely. In view of the above, it becomes clear that the principal contradiction at the present stage of the people's democratic revolution is the contradiction between feudalism and the broad masses of the people.

The entire Indian bourgeoisie is not a national bourgeoisie. It also includes the big bourgeoisie which is an ally of imperialism. This class of big bourgeoisie comprises of 1) comprador 2) bureaucratic and 3) feudal bourgeois classes. The comprador bourgeoisie are those who depend on the foreign imperialists for their loans, technical know-how, exports and imports and who act as their collaborators. The bureaucratic bourgeoisie are those who depend upon the Government budgets and plunder for their profits. Those of the feudal land lords and princes who have converted a part of their hoarded wealth into capital are the feudal bourgeoisie. All these three types of the bourgeoisie are allied with and acting as lackeys of imperialism and feudalism. All of them are the enemies of the Indian people's democratic revolution. There are no contradictions between this section of the bourgeoisie, imperialism and feudalism, leaving this section, the other section of the Indian bourgeoisie is the national bourgeoisie. When the section of the Indian bourgeoisie namely the big

bourgeoisie has joined the camp of imperialism and feudalism that is exploiting the people, the second section namely the national bourgeoisie is likely to join in the revolution against the former. Imperialism and the big bourgeoisie suppress the national bourgeoisie without allowing it to grow. Therefore there would arise a situation where it would become inescapable for the national bourgeoisie to unite with the people in the anti-imperialist national liberation struggle.

The contradiction between the working class and the bourgeoisie operates subordinately to the above. At the stage of the people's democratic revolution, the working class overthrows the big bourgeoisie as well as imperialism and feudalism. But as far as possible it endeavours to draw the national bourgeoisie into the united front.

The contradiction between the bourgeoisie on the one hand and the peasantry and urban middle classes on the other is also of the same type. The bourgeoisie is exploiting not only the working class but also the peasantry and the urban middle classes. But the big bourgeoisie having allied itself with imperialism and feudalism is ruthlessly exploiting the peasantry and the urban middle classes. The liberation of the peasantry and the urban middle classes depends upon the overthrow of them from power. Therefore they should unite under the leadership of the proletariat, build the united front to the extent possible with the national bourgeoisie to overthrow imperialism, feudalism and the big bourgeoisie and seize the political power in their own hands.

The Indian ruling classes are divided into different parties and groups. Some of these parties and groups are leaning towards American imperialism while some are leaning towards Soviet Social Imperialism. The contradictions among these imperialist camps are reflected in the contradictions among these groups and parties.

Prior to 1947 the British imperialists stationed their armed forces in India and directly ruled our country. The principal contradiction at that time was the contradiction between imperialism and the oppressed classes of India. After 1947 there is no direct rule by British imperialists. Yet the British, American and other imperialists as

well as the Soviet Social Imperialists are preserving their interest through the present ruling classes. Instead of military they are making use of political, economic and cultural means. Thus an alliance is formed between Imperialism and the big bourgeoisie, big land lord classes. As a result the contradiction between Imperialism and the oppressed classes of the country was temporarily relegated to the secondary place, thus occupying an auxiliary position.

This does not however mean that the contradiction between Imperialism and the oppressed classes of the country has disappeared or been resolved. This contradiction will disappear only when Imperialism is totally absent in the country or when it is nominal or weak. (In the present situation the Imperialist domination is prevailing in all the oppressed countries.)

It is from this point of view that the formulations of the leadership of CP (M.L.) should be examined.

They write that:

"..... The principal contradiction in our country at the present phase is between feudalism and the masses of our peasantry". (political Resolution, Liberation May 1969).

This formulation is undoubtedly wrong. The role of the peasantry in the overthrow of feudalism is no doubt principal. But this does not however mean that the peasantry alone could fulfil this task all by itself. The peasantry, as a part of the broad masses of people under the leadership of the proletariat, plays the main role in the armed struggle and the overthrow of feudalism. The people's democratic revolution is otherwise known as the agrarian revolution only because this revolution is mainly a peasant revolution. The leadership of the CP (M.L.), who refuse to recognise this, is equating the peasantry with the broad masses of people, and the agrarian the revolution with the people's democratic revolution.

After a while (perhaps after some discussion) they write that:-

"In short in our country of all the main contradictions, the most important contradiction is between the land lord and poor peasant i.e.,

between feudalism and the broad masses of the Indian people". (Draft Programme, Para 29)

Though there appears to be some difference between this formulation and the formulation seen in their political resolution, the content of these two formulations is one and the same. The poor peasantry does not mean the whole of the peasantry, let alone the vast masses of people. Instead, the poor peasant is a part, a main part, of the peasantry as well as of the Indian masses and will continue to remain as such. To look at the contradiction between feudalism and the peasantry as only between the poor peasantry and feudalism and to understand this as the contradiction between feudalism and the broad masses of the Indian people—all this clearly shows how defective their understanding is. Further it is clear that a broad perspective of the people's democratic revolution—a revolution in which the peasantry, as the main force unites itself with the broad masses of people under the leadership of the proletariat and overthrows feudalism—is also absent in their outlook.

Similarly, in their writings there is no mention of the contradiction between Imperialism and the oppressed masses which has been temporarily relegated to an auxiliary position. Thus the struggle against Imperialism, i.e. mainly the struggle of the working class and the urban middle classes, is completely ignored by them. Only by conducting armed struggle against feudalism and the present ruling classes on the one hand and by simultaneously organising and intensifying the struggle against Imperialism on the other would we be able to mobilise the revolutionary classes to seize the political power into their own hands.

In this respect Com. Mao's formulation should be borne in mind. Com. Mao says that:

"In a semi-colonial country such as China the principal contradiction and the non-principal contradictions present a complicated picture". (On Contradictions")

Thus he pointed out that the non-principal contradiction also exists side by side with the principal contradiction and that it is essential to grasp the relation between the two. But does not mean that we should only take note of the principal contradiction and should refuse to recognise or totally ignore the non-principal con-

tradiction. At the same time Com. Mao had explained that "the principal contradiction existed between feudalism and the vast masses of the people", but not between feudalism and the peasantry, or between land lords and the poor peasantry and nowhere did he say that this and the contradiction between feudalism and the masses of the people, is one and the same.

Com. Mao explained the contradiction between feudalism and the broad masses of people as follows:—

"But in another situation, the contradictions change position. When imperialism carries on its oppression not by war, but by milder means—political, economical and cultural—the ruling classes in semi-colonial countries capitalise joint oppression of the masses of the people. At such a time, the masses often resort to civil war against the alliance of imperialism and the feudal class, while imperialism and the feudal classes, often employ indirect methods rather than direct action in helping the reactionaries in the semi-colonial countries to oppress the people, and thus the internal contradictions become particularly sharp". ("On Contradiction S.W. 675).

What does this mean?

In the absence of war imperialism applies political, economic and cultural means to plunder the semi-colonial countries. When the people resort to civil war, the imperialist would in addition send military aid to the countries, ruling classes and help to suppress the revolution. Thus the feudal classes of a semi colonial country enter into an alliance with imperialism and plunder the country. With the imperialists aiding the reactionary ruling classes to suppress the revolution, the internal contradictions would become especially sharp.

Does this formulation of Com. Mao apply to our country as well?

Surely it applies. Just because the British have left and their armies have been withdrawn from our country, British imperialism has not come to an end in our country. On the contrary British imperialist capital remains as always in our country. What is more it has further increased many times. Added to it, American imperialist and Soviet Social

imperialist capital has entered the country and become dominant. Today our country is entirely dependent upon foreign countries for technical know-how. The country's political policies are in keeping with the interest of the imperialists and the social imperialists. Thus the imperialists of all kinds have turned the country into their neo-colony by using political, economical and cultural means and are ruthlessly plundering it. They are fully supporting the reactionary ruling classes to suppress the people's revolution. Since the ruling classes are allied with imperialism, the internal contradictions have become especially sharp.

This means that the internal contradiction is between feudalism and the broad masses of people.

Is there any comparison between this and the contradiction between feudalism and the poor peasantry that the leadership of the CP (M.L.) is advancing?

Together with the principal contradiction in the Indian semi-colonial, semi-feudal society at the present stage of the revolution, we should also take the non-principal contradictions into consideration and strive to build the revolutionary movement. Only then would this revolutionary movement, without confining itself to feudalism and the big bourgeoisie, extend itself against imperialism and take the shape of people's democratic revolution. This revolutionary movement would go on in the form of armed struggle and political and economic struggles in the countryside and in the form of political and economic struggle in the urban areas. Together with the peasantry the broad masses of people would also be mobilised. Thus only when, making use of the present contradictions, the broad masses of people are fully mobilised into the revolutionary movement and firmly unite against imperialism, feudalism and the big bourgeoisie would the revolution achieve all round progress.

II. What is a Revolutionary Situation?

Today there are no differences of opinions among the revolutionaries on the question of the existence of a revolutionary situation in the country.

The fact that we should adopt new tactics (forms of struggles, slogans and forms of organisation) to build the revolutionary movement while there is a revolutionary situation in the country is indisputable. The peasantry in the countryside, the urban working class, the students, the youth, the middle classes and the other sections of the people in the cities are increasingly participating in the struggles in different parts of the country. These struggles are going on for both political as well as economic demands. The anti-feudal peasant revolts have become a common feature in the countryside. The use of fire arms, the shooting and killing of people by the dastardly government has become a part of the country's daily life.

Armed struggle of the peasantry has started and is continuing in our country. It has started in Naxalbari of West Bengal in 1967. It has started and is continuing in Srikakulam district of Andhra Pradesh in 1968, and in Telangana in 1969.

By this it is evident that there is a revolutionary situation in the country and that it has already taken the form of armed struggle. The old and new revisionists who argue that there is no revolutionary situation in the country, or that it is only gradually maturing must have either failed to see this objective reality or they must be willfully hoodwinking and betraying the people. Evidently it is the latter.

Here we should also note the fact that neither all nor even a majority of the struggles being carried on against the ruling classes all over the country are taking the form of armed struggle. The people in the vast areas of the country are yet to join the revolutionary struggles. Even though this is due to lack of revolutionary leadership in some areas, the experience in some other areas also shows that the people have not yet joined the revolutionary struggles despite the existence of a revolutionary leadership.

This is mainly due to the unevenness in the development of the revolutionary mass movement in the country. In some areas the revolutionary mass movement has already reached the stage of armed struggle, while in some it is still at the stage of only anti-government political and economic struggles. Yet in some other areas it is either in its very primary stage or there is not any mass

movement. Besides the vastness of the country, the parliamentary path pursued by the revisionist parties cloaked in communism and masquerading as the genuine communist parties is also mainly responsible for this. The specific economic conditions obtaining in some areas can also be responsible for this situation to some extent.

The feudal relations are strong in the vast rural areas of the country and the worst kind of feudal exploitation in various forms is going on. When revolutionaries adopt the correct agrarian revolutionary programme and tactics and work among the masses of these areas, the revolutionary movement would rapidly develop into armed struggle. This is what the experience of the areas where the armed struggle is going on today shows. There are also some areas where the worst feudal relations are not obtaining. In such it areas will take some time for the revolutionary movement to reach the stage of armed struggle.

Similarly in some areas, the movements of the peasant, landless labour, youth and the middle classes are under the influence of the old and the new revisionists. In some areas they are under the influence of castism, religion and regionalism. All these are legal and reformist movements. However, in the present revolutionary situation the masses participating in these movements are gradually realising the pro-ruling class policies of these various leaderships and are in quest of a revolutionary path. The armed struggles that have been launched recently are awakening these people.

The sum and substance of all this is that today;

- 1) The revolutionary situation in the country is ripe.
- 2) The development of the revolutionary movement in the country is uneven.
- 3) Among the masses of various classes, some are following the form of armed struggle, while some, being under the influence of the revisionist, reformist and communal parties, are, through their own experience, gradually leaning towards the revolutionary path.
- 4) In some areas there is not any movement at all,

- 5) There is a lack of revolutionary leadership in the vast areas of the country, excepting a few.

Only when the revolutionaries properly grasp these concrete conditions will it be possible for them to carry on the armed struggle on the one hand and simultaneously build the revolutionary mass movement and develop it to the stage of armed struggle in the other areas on the other.

The leadership of the CP(M.L.) is lacking such a broad perspective of the revolutionary situation. Further they think and act as though there is a revolutionary movement throughout the country and that it has already reached the stage of armed struggle.

To quote them, this is what they say:
 "TU'S serve as training schools for the proletariat only when there is no revolutionary situation, in a country....."

"..... In such a revolutionary situation, the party organisation becomes the only class organisation of the proletariat."

"..... So, when we say that revolutionary situation now prevails in India, it necessarily follows that in India, our task today is to build underground revolutionary party organisations and not mass organisations". (Liberation, September 1969) 'Guerrilla warfare is the only tactic for carrying on peasant revolutionary struggle'. (Liberation, July 1969)

We will separately explain our stand on the inter relation of the armed struggle, the other forms of struggles and the mass organisations. All their above quotations mean only one thing—that since there is a revolutionary situation in the country, there is no need for the working class to realise through their own experience the need for armed struggle; that the working class does not need trade unions; that likewise the peasantry and other masses of people do not need any mass organisation; that the revolutionary mass movements are not needed, and that the peasantry is directly adopting the armed struggle as the form of struggle and hence they have adopted this as their tactics.

This line of thinking is opposed to the objective reality that the level of the revolutionary movement in the present revolutionary situation is uneven. Further, this line of thinking also implies that the general mass movements as well as the revolutionary mass movements have reached the stage of armed struggle throughout the country. This is not only theoretically wrong, but also it is contrary to the objective reality. The very fact that many of the State units of the CP (M.L.) are still unable to start armed struggle is itself proof of this.

If we see what Lenin, Stalin and Mao have in the course of the mighty Marxist movement, said in this respect it would be fully evident as to how utterly wrong their line of thinking theoretically is.

Lenin, in his speech on the revolution of 1905, has said that:

"The real education of the masses can never be separated from their independent political, and especially revolutionary, struggle. Only struggle educates the exploited class. Only struggle discloses to it the magnitude of its own power, widens its horizon, enhances its abilities, clarifies its mind, forges its will".

(Collected Works, Vol. 23, Page 241)

Lenin explains here how the masses in the revolution of 1905 became conscious through struggles, how they got trained, tempered and steeled and how they were prepared for the insurrection. This equally applies to us as well. We should also help the masses to realise their own revolutionary potential through revolutionary struggles, especially political struggles, and to exhibit their united might and will to fight. Only then would they, through their own experience, be prepared to recognise the need for the armed struggle.

Stalin also speaks, as follows, about the necessity of people learning through their own experience.

"The point here is not that the Vanguard shall realise the impossibility of preserving the old order of things and the inevitability of its overthrow. The point is that the masses, the mil-

lions, shall understand this inevitability and display their readiness to support the Vanguard. But the masses can understand this only from their own experience".

(Fundamentals of Leninism P. 75)

The necessity for overthrowing the old order should be learnt not only while there is no revolutionary situation but also while there is a revolutionary situation. In a revolutionary situation people can learn quickly. In any situation, learning is a must. Therefore what Stalin has said applies to us as well.

Mao speaks as follows about the unevenness in the development of the Chinese revolution:

"As China at the present stage is a large semi-colonial and semi-feudal country dominated by a number of powerful yet conflicting imperialist countries and by the feudal forces of China, her economic and political development is extremely uneven and lacking in uniformity. This determines the extreme unevenness in the development of China's new-democratic revolution and renders it necessary for the revolution to go through a protracted, tortuous struggle before nationwide victory can be achieved." (Revolution, China Communist Party, 6th Central Committee, 7th Plenary Sessions).

As in China, the economic and political development of our country is also uneven. Today when the armed struggle is in its primary stage, the development of the revolutionary movement in our country is also uneven. Just as Mao stressed the unevenness of the Chinese revolution, even when the Chinese Communist party under the leadership of Mao had already built the peoples army, established liberated areas and was marching forward, the unevenness of the revolutionary movement in our country should be of special significance for us. The formulation of the leadership of the CP (M.L.), which, without taking this aspect into consideration, says that only since there is a revolution in the country can the armed struggle be launched directly with out preparing the masses for it, is therefore theoretically wrong.

From this it is clear that in the present revolutionary situation should realise the necessity of

mobilising the masses into revolutionary struggles especially into political struggles, and helping them to realise through their own experience the necessity of overthrowing the present semi-colonial, semi-feudal society and establishing the people's democracy in its place and that we should strive to fulfill this task while at the same time carrying out the armed struggle,

III Is it Economism to mobilise the masses into Revolutionary Movement?

Economism has become predominant in the Indian revolutionary movement. In the working class which should lead the revolutionary movement, and in the Communist Party (undivided) that should be the Vanguard of the working class and it is playing the main role in impending the advance of revolution. It is indisputable that the progress of the revolution depends upon waging a bitter struggle against the remnants of economism among the revolutionary ranks, against the deep rooted economism that still has its roots in the revolutionary movement, and rooting it out completely.

The Trade union movement as well as the peasant and landless labour movements in the country today are reformist movements. Even the struggles on economic demands are rare under their leadership. We see that to an extent the struggles for wage rise and other demands related to it are going on under the leadership of the trade unions and winning partial success. Recently the so called "Land grab" movement was launched under the leadership of the peasant organisation. The main feature of the movement was the courting of arrests by the cadre as soon as they reached the lands of the landlords and the government. Some of the trade union cadre courted arrests in this movement and christened it the "alliance of working class and peasantry". These actions led by the Right Communist Party are not revolutionary struggles. They are not only reformist movements, but also individual satyagrahas.

Such movements, if they are movements at all, are being led by the old and new revisionist Parties and SSP. All these parties are representing the social democracy in India. Whether some of them are supporting or others apparently opposing the ruling classes, they are all pursuing the parliamentary path. Therefore the policies they

preach to the working class peasantry and the middle classes are only reformist and class collaborationist politics and not revolutionary politics.

Thus what they follow is economism. The concrete form of economism is to strictly confine their own activities as well as the struggles of the working class, peasantry and the landless labour to the limits of winning economic demands while preaching class collaborationist politics.

To combat economism, it is not enough to merely point it out. The mass movements of various classes should be organised for political as well as economic demands. The masses who participate in these struggles should be helped to realise through their own experience the need to overthrow the present ruling classes and to build a new society in the place of the old. Especially when the backward sections of society join the economic struggles, we should strive to make them politically conscious. We should not confine ourselves to general political propaganda alone. To prepare the peasantry for armed struggle, to lead the peasant armed struggle where ever they are ready and to propagate this armed struggle, the path of people's war and Mao's Thought among the masses—this is what is meant by propagating revolutionary politics among the masses. This is what Communist revolutionaries should do.

The masses, including the peasantry, will not be prepared for armed struggle with the propagation of revolutionary politics alone. By the propaganda of revolutionary politics and by realising the need for armed struggle through their own experience in the political and economic struggles, the masses will become ready for armed struggle. The revolutionaries should lead them in such a way that these struggles develop as armed struggle or as Auxillary struggles to the armed struggle. All struggles confined to economic demands without the perspective of armed struggle are merely economic struggles. Their perspective is nothing but the perspective of economism. But the leadership of the CP (M.L.) does not view economism from this angle. They are formulating differently.

This is what they say:

"..... economismaccording to which the workers and the poor and landless pea-

sants will be unable to accept revolutionary politics, unless they are led into open struggles on economic demands. This line of thinking weakens all our work like propagating revolutionary politics, propagating the politics of seizure of power and building revolutionary base areas in the country side".

(Charu Majumdar, Liberation, Sep. 1969).

We agree that economism is an obstacle in the way of the propagation of revolutionary politics, and the politics of political power and the building of the revolutionary base areas. Similarly if the struggle are confined merely to the economic demands, not only the building of revolutionary base areas is not possible but also the propagation of the politics of armed struggle would become nominal. Therefore only when the revolutionaries, while carrying on the economic struggle give importance to the political struggles and thus help the masses to realise the need for the path of armed struggle through their own experience, would it be possible for them to prepare the masses for building revolutionary base areas.

This is not the line of thinking of the leadership of the CP(M.L.). Their line of thinking is that the armed struggle could be carried on with the mere propaganda of politics of armed struggle without the need for the political and economic struggles. Even though they say here and there that they are not opposed to economic struggles, they are in actual fact propagating and practicing the same line as above.

Due to the political and economic struggles that they have already waged in some areas and due to the realisation of the betrayal of the old and new revisionists the reformists and the reactionaries have betrayed in some other areas, there are the masses who have realised the correctness of the path of armed struggle. In such areas the armed struggle could be and should be straight away launched without the need of political and economic struggles. But in the other vast areas of the country, the masses when the politics of armed struggle are merely propagated, might accept them as "good". Yet they would not accept them in actual practice. Only when they participate in political and economic struggles and thus realise through their own experience the need for the path of armed struggle, would the

masses take up the armed struggle in actual practice.

The experience of the revolutionary movement in the areas where the armed struggle is launched is also testifying this as correct.

By the time the armed struggle was launched in the Naxalbari area, the people become politically conscious through political and economic struggles going on there since some time before. As a result the people could realise as to who were their friends and who were their enemies. Further they could also realise the utter futility of the parliamentary path and take up the path of armed struggle instead.

In the Srikakulam agency area the revolutionary movement was built through political and "economic" struggles before the launching of armed struggle. The masses, out of their own experience in these struggles, realised the futility of legal methods and then adopted the path of armed struggle.

Since there was already the influence of the armed struggle in Telangana area, the people, with the propagation of the politics of peoples war while developing the economic struggles, could realise through their own experience the futility of old legal methods and take up the path of armed struggle.

Then they, through their own experience realised the utter futility of the legal methods, they came fully under the influence of the politics of armed struggle that we were already propagating. They had easily accepted the path of armed struggle.

Had there been no place for revisionism in the party, and had we been pursuing the path of armed struggle from the beginning the masses in these areas would have taken up the path of armed struggle even earlier than the other areas. It is totally wrong to say that with mere political propaganda the people would accept the politics of armed struggle. The fact that in many of the areas where the cadres of the CP (M.L.) are working, the masses are not yet ready for armed struggle is enough of a proof for this.

The leadership of the CP(M.L.), who refuse

to recognise the role of political and economic struggles in preparing the masses for armed struggle, is completely ignoring the revolutionary role that the land question had played in the Naxalbari armed struggle.

In accordance with their one way of thinking, they are formulating about Naxalbari Peasant struggle as follows:

"If the Naxalbari peasant struggle has any lesson for us, it is this: Militant struggles must be carried on not for land, crops etc., but for seizure of state power".

(Charu Mazumdar, Liberation 8, 1968)

The struggle of the Terai Peasants is an armed struggle-not for not for land, but for state power".

(Sanyal, Liberation, 9, 1968)

Here they are claiming that the Naxalbari armed struggle was not a struggle for land but for political power alone. Thus they are counterposing them to each other as though they are mutually exclusive. Because of this erroneous line of thinking, they failed to grasp the importance of land question for the development of armed struggle. They have failed to implement the programme of land distribution on a large scale. They have admitted their failures in the Naxalbari armed struggles as follows.

"Our failure in establishing the revolutionary political power and carrying out land reforms blunted the edge of the class struggle both during and after the struggle".

(Sanyal Report on Terai)

Here they say that the edge of the class struggle was blunted due to their failure in implementing the revolutionary land reforms and thus accept the loss suffered for not having realised the importance of the land question. At another place they say that the Naxalbari struggle was not a struggle for land. Which of these two do they believe?

The land question and the armed struggle are not opposed to each other. On the contrary the land distribution strengthens the armed stru-

ggle. The land question occupies the main place in the agrarian revolution. Agrarian revolution is the axis of the peoples democratic revolution. The armed struggle is the main form of struggle for completing the agrarian revolution. Therefore the land question and the armed struggle are closely interlinked. If the land distribution is the main issue of the agrarian revolution, the armed struggle is the main form of struggle for achieving it. The leadership of CP (M.L.) who fail to grasp this are counterposing these two as if they are mutually exclusive.

In this connection, it is very essential to take note of the comments of CPC on the Indian peasant revolutionary armed struggle.

"They (i.e., Indian peasants-author) are unfolding struggles to seize land and dealing violent blows at the foundation of feudal rule".

"They (Indian revolutionaries, Naxalbari-author) pointed out the Naxalbari peasants struggle is a struggle not only for land but also for political power". (Liberation, July 1969).

These comments were made by the Chinese comrades even before 1969. In spite of these comments of the Chinese comrades, they refuse to admit their mistakes. They argue that the question of land is an economic demand and therefore organising struggle on the question of land is nothing but economism.

The struggle for land is not same as the struggle of the factory workers for wage rise. The workers struggle within the capitalist system against the onslaught of the capitalist class as well as for rise in wages. But the struggle for land is a struggle to overthrow feudalism. In this stage of peoples democratic revolution, the distribution of a land is implemented as an important item of agrarian revolution. When co-ordinated with the armed struggle for seizure of political power, and when carried on for strengthening the armed struggle, the land distribution would acquire special significance. Equating the land question, which had such a revolutionary significance, with the workers economic demand for wage rise, is solely due to the failure to grasp the present stage of the revolution, the principal contradiction, the revolutionary programme and their inter-relation. In the

agrarian revolutionary programme, not only the question of land but also the problems such as forced labour, feudal atrocities and suppression etc., and the militant struggles of the rural people would be of much significance. If the revolutionaries adopt proper tactics and lead these struggles with proper understanding, these struggles would develop as struggle for the distribution of land and take the form of armed struggle. Thus the entire agrarian revolutionary programme has to get a great revolutionary significance.

In the present situation the urban masses, the working class, the students, the middle classes are often joining the economic struggles. They are also joining the political struggles though to a lesser degree. By propagating the politics of peoples war among the urban masses, especially the working class and the students, we could not only win the support and solidarity for the armed struggle going on in the country side, but also we would be able to mobilise them to participate in the armed struggle in various forms.

While leading the political and economic struggles of urban masses, the revolutionaries should at the same time give importance to the political struggles. To mobilise the urban masses into anti-ruling class struggles on various political issues and to propagate the politics of armed struggle and rousing revolutionary consciousness among them should be the main task of the revolutionaries.

The Telangana armed struggle (1946-51) started as a militant struggle against feudal-landlords forced labour, feudal atrocities and procurement of grain (forced procurement of grain from the peasantry by the government during the second world war) even before 1946. The other sections of the people had also participated in the struggle along with the rural peasantry.

All the sections of rural masses were united against the feudal land lords. On the other hand the working class and the students came into struggles in the urban area. Influenced by the armed struggle, the urban masses themselves joined the struggles after 1946. They stood in support and solidarity of the struggles in the countryside as well as armed struggle. The students joined the armed struggle in large numbers

and strengthened it. Thus the experiences of Telangana armed struggle only confirm the significance of the anti-feudal struggles as well as the political and economic struggles of the urban masses. They do not in any way reduce their significance.

It would be immensely useful if we try to grasp the following from Com. Mao's united front in cultural work.

"All work done for the masses must start from their needs and not from the desire of any individual, however well-intentioned. It often happens that objectively the masses need a certain change, but subjectively they are not yet conscious of the need, not yet willing or determined to make the change. In such cases, we should wait patiently. We should not make the change until, through our work, most of the masses have become conscious of the need and are willing and determined to carry it out. Other-wise we shall isolate ourselves from the masses".

The meaning of this is very clear. The problem is not solved if we alone realise that there is no need for political and economic struggles for the masses and that the armed struggle is the only correct form of struggle. The masses should realise this. They should become conscious. They should come forward with determination. This would become possible only when the people realise the need for armed struggle through their own experience.

About the inter-relation between the political and economic struggles during the period of a revolution, Com. Lenin has said as follows:

"A distinctive feature was the manner in which economic strikes were interwoven with political strikes during the revolution. There can be no doubt that only this very close link-up of the two forms of strike gave the moment its great power".

(Collected Works, Vol. 23, Page 240-1)

This equally applies to us, who are in the era of revolution and who follow the path of peoples war. This makes it clear that the political and economic struggles are not only necessary for the people to reach the stage of armed stru-

ggle, but also they are essential to effectively carry on the armed struggle. Our experience also confirms this.

It seems from their writing the leadership of the CP (M.L.) are afraid that if they admit the necessity of the political and economic struggles, their party might get bogged down in the mire of revisionism. A party based on the theoretical foundations of Marxism-Leninism and Mao's Thought need not be frightened of this. By participating and leading these struggles, the party cadres would acquire theoretical knowledge as well as the experience in practical work, and become capable of leading the armed struggle. Having witnessed the organised strength and the revolutionary potential of the masses, they would fulfil their tasks with greater self-confidence. Instead if the political and economic struggles are given up for fear of revisionism, there is the danger of the people who simply talk of politics without any practical experience in the building of revolutionary movement, joining the party and turning out to be cadres that merely keep chanting Mao's Thought, but could not endure the stresses and strains of the armed struggle.

Let us hope that the leadership of the CP (M.L.) have already had this kind of experience.

Thus both in the name of the existing revolutionary situation and economism, the leadership of the CP (M.L.) refuses to mobilise the masses into revolutionary movements. They refuse to lead the people in such a way so as to help them realise the need for armed struggle through their own experience. They are propagating a queer sort of theory that with mere propaganda of the politics of peoples war the masses would be ready to participate in the armed struggle. It is clear that this queer sort of a theory is neither based on Marxism-Leninism and Mao's Thought nor does it conform to the experience of the revolutionary movements that the revolutionaries have carried on hitherto.

IV. The Problems of Armed Struggle:

We have shown as to how in the name of the existing revolutionary situation as well as fighting the economism, the leadership of the CP(M.L.) refuse to recognise or under-estimates the necessity of mobilising the masses into revo-

lutionary movement. Now let us analyse their understanding of the armed struggle.

I. Indian Conditions :

For a correct understanding of the armed struggle, we should have a correct assessment of the Indian conditions. What are the conditions obtaining in India today ?

Internationally the revolution are marching ahead in the countries of Asia, Africa and Latin America. The revolutions were successfully completed in North Vietnam, Algeria and Cuba after the second world war. The world revolution has not halted with it. The armed struggles are victoriously marching forward in the South-East Asian, African and Latin American countries. South Vietnam, Cambodia, Laos, Palestine, Congo and Angola are important among them. The people of India are very much influenced by these revolutions. They are being inspired by them.

The great Chinese revolution has profoundly influenced the Indian revolution. The great Cultural revolution of China which has successfully concluded recently has also greatly influenced the Indian people. The experiences of the Chinese revolution are available to the people and the revolutionaries of India today as never before. There are tremendous opportunities today to advance the Indian revolution in the Chinese path of peoples war basing on these experiences. As a matter of fact it is only in the Chinese path that the Indian revolution is advancing today.

Together with the experience of the Chinese revolution, the experiences of the revolutions going on in the various countries are also available to the people and the revolutionaries of India today. It is very essential for the Indian revolutionaries to study these experiences in the light of Marxism-Leninism and Mao's Thought and to draw correct lessons from them.

Besides this favourable situation, the revolutionary situation is also mature in India. Despite the ruthless repression let loose by the ruling classes against the revolutionary movements, the struggles of the peasantry, working class, students and the middle class people have become a common feature of the country's daily life. Besi-

des, the armed struggle has begun and is advancing. The main obstacle in the way of advance of revolution is the disunity, and the organisational weakness of the revolutionaries who are leading or should lead the revolution. It is imperative that the revolutionaries should overcome this obstacle.

Even though the Indian revolution has begun, in such a situation when the world revolution has reached an advanced stage and taken a serious form, we should understand that ours is a revolution which has commenced very late. The armed struggle that developed in Telangana as well as in other areas during the period of 1946-51, were called off owing to the betrayal of the then reformist leadership of the communist party. This revolution once again commenced with the Naxalbari armed struggle of West Bengal in the year 1967. Making use of the time thus gained, the ruling classes have over and above, the armed forces that they acquired at the time of transfer of power, expanded the armed forces on a very large scale. In the name of strengthening the country's defence against China, defence of borders, and the central reserve police, they have enormously increased the strength of the armed forces. Today we find them using their central reserve police as well as the military to suppress the revolution of the Indian people.

We should understand here that in one respect the situation is not as favourable to us as it was to the Chinese revolutionaries. By the time the Chiang-kie-Shaik gang joined the imperialist camp betraying the revolution and was out to suppress the Chinese Communist Party and the Chinese revolution in 1927, the Communist Party of China has already had about 40,000 peoples army under its leadership. It had become possible for the communist party of China to strengthen its position on all fronts including the military because of its participation of the bourgeois democratic revolution. Thus establishing and safeguarding the base areas with the help of the 40,000 peoples army, the Communist Party of China had marched forward under numerous odds and led the revolution to a victorious end.

We were neither having such an army in the year 1968 when we commenced the armed struggle, nor are we having it today. We have no

other way of building the revolutionary army except building it from the people in the course of the revolutionary movement. Without being confined to any single areas, it should be built in various areas out of the raising revolutionary struggle and the armed struggles of the peoples. The revolutionary army thus developed alone could be capable of facing the armed forces of the counter revolutionary ruling classes.

The development of the revolution in the country is uneven. The peasant revolutionary movements are vigorously going on in the areas where the feudal relations are strong. The mobilisation of the masses would not be so vigorous in the areas where the feudal relations are comparatively weak (such areas are very few and far in between). If there is a proper revolutionary leadership there is the possibility for the revolutionary movement to advance in the vast areas where the feudal relations are strong, and class contradictions got intensified. Thus the lack of revolutionary leadership is also one of the main reasons for the uneven development of our revolution. Having a strong Communist Party which we donot have, to lead the revolution is a specific feature of China. However, there is a similarity between us and the Chinese revolution on the question of uneven development of the revolution. It would be possible to at least reduce if not totally eliminate this unevenness by simultaneously developing the revolutionary movement in various parts of the country.

All the high ways and big cities were at the time of Chinese revolution concentrated in the coastal areas and the rest of the vast areas of China were either totally devoid of any roads or negligible if there were any. As a result the counter-revolutionary armies had to face numerous difficulties in encircling the revolutionary base areas and attacking the revolutionary peoples armies. Yet the revolutionary peoples armies had to face big attacks from the enemy forces and fight fierce battles to smash them.

Contrary to this, the roads, railways and the highways in India are more developed than in China of revolutionary period. They are spread to different parts and states in the country. Various cities, valleys, plains as well as the areas where commercial crops are grown are linked by roads,

while the roads were already there at the time of the direct rule of the British imperialists, the Indian ruling classes have, with the aid of foreign imperialists further developed them very much. It is therefore the reactionary ruling classes are provided with greater opportunities to swiftly deparch large numbers of their counter-revolutionary armies to attack and encircle the revolutionaries and the revolutionary masses. The roads, in the girijan areas and some other backward regions are not developed.

Under the circumstances, despite the fact that the areas without roads are important in terms of development of the revolutionary movement, the revolutionaries should also give importance for the building of revolutionary movement in the regions where the roads are developed. The working class should play a major role in building the revolutionary movements, safe-guarding and conducting the armed struggle in such areas.

As our country was under the rule of British Imperialists for a very long time, as the national movement against Imperialism was headed by the reactionary big bourgeoisie, land lord classes, as the bourgeoisie class has not at any stage played any revolutionary role, and as the revolutionary influence of the working class movement which was in the grip of economism and the Communist Party, upon the masses is feeblar while the influence of the foreign imperialist as well as the bourgeoisie's reformism in the country is stronger than what is was in China during the revolution. (The Indian national bourgeoisie has not played the revolutionary role such as the Chinese nation bourgeoisie played under the leadership of Sun-Et-Sen). After 1947, with the strengthening of the American imperialism in the country, with the adoption of parliamentary path as well as revisionism by the Communist Party, with the influence of the Soviet Social Imperialists in the country the influence of bourgeoisie reformism has got further strengthened upon the masses. In the present stage when the imperialism is in its last stage, and when the world revolution and with it the Indian revolution are on the ascendance, the bourgeoisie reformism does not have any future. Despite the fact that the armed struggle would smash away the bourgeoisie reformism with its foundations, its influence upon the people should not be under estimated, it is very essential to conduct the revolutionary movement so as to

smash its influence upon the masses.

After the end of the direct rule of the British Imperialist, the American imperialists and the Soviet Social Imperialists have stepped in and become predominant in our country. The German and Japanese Imperialists have also followed them. All of them are plundering the country. Main among them are the American imperialists and the Soviet Social Imperialists. Even though the Indian ruling classes are generally linked with all these Imperialists, the American Imperialists and the Soviet Social Imperialists are predominant among them. Though the inter-imperialist contradictions are fundamental, they have not yet become accentuated. Due to the changes that would come about in the international situation, and due to the advance of Indian revolution in the future the advance of the Indian revolution would itself undoubtedly bring about major changes in international situation. These contradictions would become intensified. In view of the principal contradiction between the feudalism and the broad masses of the people, while concentrating on the development of the agrarian revolution, the revolutionaries should also at the same time strive to develop the anti-imperialist revolutionary struggles.

It is a fact that these differences do exist between the conditions of China at the time of Peoples democratic revolution and the conditions of India today. Yet in the present situation when the world revolution has greatly advanced even though we do not have conditions that were present in China the Indian revolution should march forward basing itself on the maturity of the revolutionary situation in India. This is the most favourable situation which has never been before. This is the only correct line.

The old and new revisionists refuse to recognise the India's semi-colonial, the semi-feudal and neo-colonial character. They refuse to accept the experiences of the Chinese revolution on the plea that there is a fundamental difference between the conditions of China at the time of revolution and the conditions of India. Adopting the parliamentary path and defending the ruling classes, they have christened this revisionist path of theirs as the "Indian path".

The neo-revisionists have also adopted the parliamentary path notwithstanding the fact that they appear to be alternately supporting and opposing the ruling classes. They too argue that there is a fundamental difference between the Chinese conditions and the Indian conditions and thus refuse to accept the experience of the Chinese revolution.

Thus both of them display an identity of outlook in accepting to parliamentary path and rejecting the path of peoples war. This is the basis for their revisionism.

Since India is a semi-colonial, semi-feudal, and neo-colonial country, since the world revolution is far advanced and since the revolutionary situation itself is ripe in India, the Chinese path of Peoples War applies to India as well. By adopting the path of the Peoples War alone would the Indian revolution become victorious.

In the specific conditions obtaining in India today, the revolutionary peoples army capable of carrying out the path of peoples war would emerge and grow from the revolutionary mass movement. Hence the revolutionaries should build the mass movements and advance them to the stage of armed struggle. We should in the process of these struggles from the peoples army and implement the path of peoples war. The revolutionaries would have to adopt a new line applicable to the specific conditions of India. The revolutionaries should therefore be prepared for this.

2. The Revolutionary peasant movement is the Foundation for the Revolutionary mass movement:

What are the movements that constitute the revolutionary mass movements? The revolutionary movement is main in the stage of peoples democratic revolution of India. The revolutionary peasant movement is the foundation for revolutionary movement. As the proletariat is to lead the revolution, the revolutionary working class movement is important. In view of the revolutionary role played by the students and youth can play in the semi-colonial and semi-feudal countries, their revolutionary movements would also be important. Besides, all the movements against imperialism feudalism and their

Lakeys, as well as the movements carried by the middle class and other revolutionary classes would also constitute revolutionary mass movements. As these revolutionary movements for the seizure of political power would merge in a single current and advance, culminating in the completion of peoples democratic revolution with the seizure of political power by the revolutionaries.

Since seventy to eighty percent of the rural masses in the country are mainly the peasantry and form the main base for the revolution, the revolutionary peasant movement can alone form the base for the revolutionary movement. The other revolutionary movements would become auxiliary to this movement. However the importance of these movements should not be underestimated.

The revolutionary mass movements should be built, mobilising the masses on the political and economic demands. The concentration should centre mainly on the political demands. Only when the revolutionary movement reaches the higher stage, it would take the form of armed struggle.

The leadership of the CPI (M. L.) do not have this understanding. They are giving no importance for building revolutionary movement. They argue that we should start and carry on the armed struggle irrespective of the revolutionary movement. They have, actually started the armed struggle and are carrying it on these lines.

3. Armed struggle: the main form of struggle:

The leadership of the CP(M.L.), who fail to grasp the importance of revolutionary mass movement as well as the importance of building it, also fail to grasp the inter relation of the tactics, the form of struggle, the main form of struggle and the other forms of struggles. As a result they fail to make use of them for the revolutionary movement as well as the armed struggle. They write:

"Guerilla Warfare is the only tactic for carrying on peasant revolutionary struggle".

(Liberation, June 1969)

The form of struggle alone does not mean

the tactic. The form or forms of struggle, the forms of organisation, the slogans etc., which the leadership adopts in a particular struggle to achieve success would as a whole form tactics. For instance, we adopt forms of struggle such as processions, protest demonstrations etc., before the peoples war takes the form of armed struggle. We would adopt organisational forms such as the secret and open party organisation, the revolutionary mass organisations etc.. We adopt slogans such as "Down with the atrocities of the land lords", "Refund of illegal levies" etc.. We build secret party organisation while carrying on armed struggle. We advance the slogan of distribution of land to the landless and poor peasantry. We refer to all this, as a whole as tactics.

The leadership of the CP (M.L.) who are lacking in this understanding have reduced tactics to a mere form of struggle. They have equated the form of struggle, which is but a part of tactics with the whole of the tactics itself and formulated that guerilla warfare is the only tactic for the peasant revolutionary struggle. (Here both armed struggle and the guerilla warfare are used in one and the same meaning.

In actual fact, in a situation when the revolutionary situation is ripe and the Indian revolution has begun, armed struggle would be the main form of struggle of the people, especially of the peasantry in the first phase of the revolution. This is what is meant by this.

Where ever the peasant struggle has not reached the stage of armed struggle owing to the unevenness in the level of the revolutionary movement, the other necessary forms of struggle should be adopted with a view and the aim of taking the peasant revolutionary movement to the stage of armed struggle.

Wherever the revolutionary peasant movement has reached the stage of armed struggle, the peasant struggle should be carried on there adopting the form of armed struggle.

Even in the areas where armed struggle is going on, there also other necessary forms of struggles should be adopted to mobilise the backward section of the peasantry.

Thus, only when the armed struggle is

combined and co-ordinated with the other necessary forms of struggles, it would not only strengthen the armed struggle but also help the peasantry, who have not yet taken the form of armed struggle; to raise their consciousness and adopt the form of armed struggle.

Here, when it is said that other necessary forms of struggles should be adopted, it does not however mean that every form of struggle should necessarily be adopted. It means that we should adopt all the forms of struggles necessary for the peasant revolutionary movement. Any form of struggle which is not necessary for the revolutionary movement should not be forced upon the peasantry. This principle equally applies not only to the peasantry but also to the other sections of the people.

In this connection, it is essential to study the following passage, from an article by Mao published in a monthly, 'Communist' during the year 1939.

"The second stage was the war of the agrarian revolution. By that time our party had already built up its own independent armed forces, learned the art of fighting independently, and established peoples political power and base areas. Our party was already able to achieve direct or indirect co-ordination of armed struggle, the principal form of struggle, with many other necessary forms, that is, to co-ordinate it on national scale with the workers struggle, the peasants struggle (which was the main thing), the struggle of the youth, the women and all other sections of the people, the struggle for political power, the struggles on the economic, the anti-espionage and the ideological fronts, and other forms of struggle. And this armed struggle was the peasant agrarian revolution under the leadership of the proletariat".

Com. Mao says that though the importance of armed struggle in its first phase was recognised, it was not understood comprehensively, that is it was not understood as the main form of struggle. He explained the importance of the second stage as above,

In this, Com. Mao has not said that the armed struggle is not the main form of struggle even in the second stage. On the contrary, he

has pointed out armed struggle as the principal form of struggle and stressed the need for co-ordinating other forms of struggles with the armed struggle.

He further says that these struggles should be not only of the peasantry but also of the workers, youth and women. They should be carried on not only for political power but also for economic demands. They should be carried on in the economic and ideological fields as well as for political power. The armed and the other forms of struggles should be co-ordinated both indirectly and directly. Thus he stressed the importance of the other forms of struggles and their co-ordination with the armed struggle even in the second stage.

By the time Com. Mao wrote this article in the year 1939, the armed struggle, under the leadership of the Communist Party was in a greatly advanced stage. The peoples army was formed. The base areas were established. Political power was established in those base areas. Even though the armed struggle was in such an advanced stage, Com. Mao did not in the least minimise the importance of the other forms of struggles, as well as the necessity of co-ordinating them with the armed struggle. On the contrary, he has emphasised the importance of the other forms of struggles.

We are still in the primary stage in building the revolutionary movement as well as conducting armed struggle. The importance of what Mao has said would therefore be all the more greater for us here. By giving due importance to the struggles of the working class, youth and other people along with the struggles of the peasantry, and by giving due importance to the other forms of struggles as the secondary forms of struggles along with the armed struggles we can strengthen the armed struggle. Moreover it is very essential, indeed, a must to co-ordinate other forms of struggles with armed struggle in order to build the revolutionary movement and to advance it speedily to the stage of armed struggle.

The experience of the Telangana armed struggle (1946-51), as well as the experiences of the armed struggles that are being carried on today amply prove that what Mao has said here fully applies to our revolution as well as to our armed struggle in its primary stage. We adopted

various other forms of struggles in Telangana before it reached the stage of armed struggle. During the period of armed struggle too, we adopted other forms of struggles in both urban and rural areas where the armed struggles was not yet commenced. Even in the areas of armed struggle, while adopting the form of armed struggle against the main enemy, we at the same time adopted other forms of struggles, (Such as processions, demonstrations, strikes on agricultural and forest cooly rates. Against others who were not the main enemy. They proved very usefull for strengthening and extending the armed struggle.

Not realising the importance of building the revolutionary movement as well as the importance of the secondary forms of struggles, essential for it, the leadership of the CP(M,L.) has formulated that for this stage armed struggle is the only form of struggle. Thus they are depriving the armed struggles, that they carry on, of its revolutionary base. They themselves are weakening the armed struggle and making it nominal. Thus their understanding of the armed struggle, the main and not the sole form of struggle, is different from Mao's Thought.

4. The Peoples Revolutionary Armed Struggle Itself is the Guerilla Warfare.

It is indisputable that guerilla warfare is the main form of struggle when there is a revolutionary situation in the country. We have explained that in the vast areas where, due to the uneven development of the revolutionary movement, the revolutionary movement has not yet taken the form of armed struggle, other forms of struggles should be adopted and that they should be co-ordinated with the armed struggle. How should we conduct the armed struggle when the revolutionary movement has reached the higher stage and taken the form of armed struggle? Is the "annihilation of the class enemy" an armed struggle? Is the "annihilation of the class enemy" correct in the areas where the revolutionary movement has not yet reached the stage of armed struggle? These questions are worth examining.

It is necessary to examine the following passage of an article published in the Liberation, January 1970,

"..... Guerilla warfare can be started only by liquidating the feudal classes in the countryside. And this campaign for the annihilation of the class enemy can be carried out only by inspiring the poor and landless peasants with the politics of establishing the political power of the peasants in the countryside after destroying the domination of the feudal classes. That is why the annihilation of class enemy is the higher form of class struggle while the act of annihilation of class enemies through guerilla action is the primary stage of the guerilla struggle". Page, 56-67.

We have already explained that by inspiring speeches and door to door propaganda we would only be able to acquaint the peasantry with the politics of armed struggle, but that the peasantry could not be prepared for armed struggle by mere propaganda alone. Only when mobilised into the revolutionary struggles on political and economic issues would the peasantry, through their own experience, get prepared to overthrow the present ruling classes. We have also explained that today when there is a revolutionary situation in the country, this would not take long and that depending on the intensification of class contradictions as well as the class consciousness of the masses, the masses would in a short time be ready for the armed struggle that smashes the domination of feudal classes.

Even in their passage above, the leadership of the CP(M,L.) does not show this understanding. On the contrary, they only exhibit their usual line of thinking that the peasantry should be inspired through the propaganda of the politics of peoples war among them. Besides, they are advancing the following formulations:

- Guerilla warfare can be started only by liquidating the feudal classes.
- The annihilation of class enemy (Feudal Classes) is the higher form of class struggle.
- Annihilating class enemies through guerrilla action is the primary stage of the guerrilla struggle.

The very basis of these formulations is

wrong. They are totally opposed to Marxism-Leninism and Mao's Thought.

In any revolution, the people and the revolutionaries leading them would come to power not by annihilating all or majority of the counter revolutionary class or classes but by smashing up their state machinery. They would build the new state machinery on the ruins of the old.

This is what is to be done in the peoples democratic revolution which has begun in our country today. The fundamental task of the revolution is to smash the state machinery of imperialism, feudalism, and the big bourgeoisie who are the enemies of the peoples democratic revolution today and to establish the peoples democracy in its place.

As a first step towards the fulfilment of this task, we should start the revolutionary movement, based on the peasantry to liberate the rural areas. The armed forces of the government would then step into the field to suppress this revolutionary movement. If the peoples democratic revolution has to fulfill its fundamental task, successfully, this revolutionary movement should be safeguarded from the armed forces of the ruling classes. It should be extended to the new areas and various parts of the country. Even in the areas to which the revolutionary movement has extended, it has to be safeguarded from the armed forces of the ruling classes. It is only to fulfil this task that the people adopt the form of armed struggle. It is only through the armed struggles that the people destroy the armed forces of the ruling classes, smash the state machinery and establish the Peoples Democracy. In this programme, abolition of the feudal system (and the feudal class) is the important component.

Thus the peoples armed struggle would begin with the defence of the revolutionary movement, the revolutionary gains, the revolutionary organisation etc., from the attacks of the armed forces of the ruling classes. But in the primary stage, the strength and the kill of the armed forces of the ruling classes would be many times greater than that of the armed forces organised by the people. The form of armed struggle adopted by the people at this stage is the guerrilla warfare. As the peoples armed forces grow in number, and the strength of arms and skill at a certain stage

become favourable to the revolutionary masses, armed struggle would reach the higher stage. Then the armed struggle would take the form of mobile warfare and later the form of positional warfare.

To defend their annihilation programme leadership of the CP(M.L.) often cite the following quotation from Lin Biao.

"Guerrilla warfare is the only way to mobilise and apply the whole strength of the people against the enemy." (Long Live the Victory of Peoples War.)

It should be understood that Com. Lin-Biao has not said this in order to defend the annihilation programme of CP(M.L.) but to stress the superiority of guerrilla warfare over the mobile Warfare as well as the positional Warfare.

Viewed thus, it would become clear that the peoples armed struggle that begins in the form of guerrilla warfare, begins against the enemy's armed forces and not with the annihilation of class enemy.

But how to destroy feudalism?

Only by means of smashing up the state machinery which is safeguarding feudalism, establishing the peoples democracy, abolishing feudalism, distributing the lands under the possession of the landlords to the poor peasantry, and abolishing all forms of feudal exploitation, would we be able to destroy feudalism. This would become possible only when the peoples democratic revolution is completed.

It is practically impossible to annihilate every individual class enemy or at least a majority of the class enemies belonging to the feudal classes. Even assuming for a while that it would be possible, we should not lose sight of the fact that so far as the state machinery safeguarding them is remaining intact and feudal relations are dominant, feudal exploitation as well as the feudal atrocities would continue to be perpetrated by their heirs or some body else if not by themselves. Feudalism would not be abolished and the feudal state would not be destroyed. This is the universal truth, the basic principle of Marxism.

Before the peasant revolutionary movement had taken the form of armed struggle, there were peasant revolts in the past in our country as well as in other countries. In these revolts, the despots from among the feudal classes were killed by the peasantry. But feudalism was not abolished by this. The state machinery that safeguards feudalism had not been smashed. This being the lesson that the history teaches us, the outcome of the annihilation programme of the leadership of C P (M. L.) could not be otherwise.

But, would the counter-revolutionary feudal classes sit back with folded hands during these revolutions? When the feudal classes, joining hands with the armed forces of the government, are perpetrating atrocities on the people; aiding government's armed forces in suppressing the revolutionary movement and in capturing or shooting down the revolutionaries; and while the landlords themselves are participating in all these atrocious actions; and continue the exploitation and the atrocities that they have been hitherto perpetrating, should the revolutionaries and the people remain mere spectators?

As a class the feudal class depends upon the government's armed forces to suppress the revolutionary movement. Therefore the abolition of this class or its political liquidation depends upon the capacity of the guerilla armies and the revolutionary masses to successfully face the government's armed forces. When the revolutionary movement begins and takes the form of armed struggle, it is possible that some from among the feudal classes, especially lower ranks among them who are not capable of bearing the brunt of the revolutionary movement, would play a neutral role. They do become neutralised.

While this being so, the despot or despots of a particular village or area would arm themselves, form a part of the government's armed forces and carry on attacks against the revolutionaries as well as the revolutionary movement. Treating them as part of enemy's armed forces, revolutionary masses would implement the programme of annihilation against them through the guerrilla warfare. As the enemy's spy-wing also forms a part of the enemy's armed force, the peoples revolutionary armed forces would as well attack this wing. It is inescapable for those of the

feudal classes who thus arms themselves and serve the enemy's spy-wing from becoming the targets of attack by the revolutionary armed forces.

With this perspective, it would be incorrect to annihilate an individual or individuals of the feudal classes on the plea that they are carrying on the feudal exploitation. When they form a part of the enemy's armed forces and partake in its activities, the annihilation programme which applies to the enemy's armed forces should also be applied to those of the feudal classes who become part of the enemy's armed forces. The exploitation of those of the feudal classes who do not participate in these activities should be abolished through the revolutionary movement, the revolutionary programme, and smashing up of the state machinery that is safeguarding feudalism,

The same attitude would also apply to the goonda gangs of the feudal classes. Unable to bear the brunt of the revolutionary movement, these goonda gangs are likely to be disintegrated in the very beginning itself. As far as possible the revolutionary masses themselves should wipe out these gangs. If it is not still possible, they should be wiped out by way of guerrilla warfare. Fighting by individuals or groups of individuals of the feudal classes, as well as their agents, some of them armed and some of them as secret agents, against the revolutionary masses and the peoples armed forces is not a thing that happens only in the beginning. Their counter-revolutionary struggle would go on as long as the armed struggle goes on. Hence, as long as peoples armed forces exist and armed struggle goes on, these counter-revolutionary elements need to be fought.

Therefore it would be wrong to formulate that annihilation of such elements as above forms the primary stage of the guerrilla warfare. Under certain circumstances, depending upon the actions of the counter revolutionaries this programme might have to be given importance in the beginning. But the revolutionaries should generally adopt only the attitude explained above.

When the annihilation programme adopted by the leadership of the CP (M.L.) is incorrect even in the areas where the peasant revolutionary movement has reached the stage of armed struggle,

It would as well be wrong in the areas where the revolutionary movement has not yet commenced and where it has not yet reached the stage of armed struggle. The activities based on this annihilation programme would cause serious harm to the revolutionary movement of these areas.

As the revolutionary movement has not yet commenced in these areas, it would not be clear as yet as to who among the rich and feudal classes would become neutralised and who would work as counter-revolutionaries. Here, since the antagonism towards many of the "rich" is lacking among the masses, since the antagonism even towards the individuals of the feudal classes is also lacking in some cases or whatever antagonism is there being merely nominal, and since the consciousness of the masses has not yet reached the stage of armed struggle the mass cannot understand the programme of annihilation with a revolutionary perspective. Often they also misunderstand it. In such a situation the "actions of annihilation" such as this serves no purpose.

Owing to the wrong understanding, there is the danger of youth adopting such actions in these areas as an alternative to the building of revolutionary movement. Instead of helping them to take the difficult but sure path of mobilising and organising the masses on political and economic demands and building of the revolutionary movements, this understanding would only be useful to spread among the youth the easy notions that the revolution could be brought about with the annihilation of a few 'class enemies'. These notions are opposed to Marxism-Leninism and Mao's Thought.

They argue that even though there is no revolutionary movement, such actions are necessary to prevent the concentration of the enemy's armed forces in the struggle areas or to divert them. They think that in this way it would be possible to prevent the enemy from sending the armed forces from different parts to the struggle areas. This is very un-realistic.

Today in the absence of a country wide revolutionary movement, the enemy concentrates his armed force in a large number in the struggle areas. The enemy need not concentrate his armed forces in large numbers in order to suppress such

actions that are unconnected with any mass movement or revolutionary movement. Therefore such actions can't reduce the enemy's concentration on the struggle areas. To reduce the concentration of the enemy's armed forces on the struggle areas; the only and the best way for revolutionaries is to go to the masses in the areas where the revolutionary situation is ripe, to build the revolutionary movements, and to take them to the stage of armed struggle. As a result, the enemy's armed forces would be locked up in the areas where the revolutionary movement is going on and thus would not be in a position to move to the other areas. This development would be favourable for the revolutionaries and the revolutionary movement. Only such people who fail to grasp this would resort to such armed actions unconnected with the mass movement.

They argue that the people of a particular village or a region would become inspired by the actions of annihilation against the despotic landlords and thus these actions are a means of rousing the masses. It is no doubt a fact that the people of a village or an area would be glad if a despot of the village is annihilated. But that action would not be useful to develop the revolutionary movement in that village or the area. At least it would not be useful even to begin such a movement. These actions that take place in a situation where the masses are not even conscious to unitedly resist the atrocities of the despots, let alone the consciousness of overthrowing the ruling classes through armed struggle, would not have any importance from the point of view of the revolutionary movement. Therefore, owing to the absence of the conscious and organised resistance against repression that would be let loose by the ruling classes following these actions, the masses would become disorganised. The opportunity for starting the revolutionary movement would suffer and become remote.

Further they argue that the masses would become conscious with the repression let loose by the ruling classes. As a result of repression let loose by the ruling classes against an organised struggle on political and economic demands, the masses would become more and more organised and conscious and reach the stage of armed struggle. But they never become conscious as a result of repression that follows this kind of "actions" without any movement.

Again some people argue that to carry out some "action" would be better than sitting back with folded hands. Some "action", even though incorrect, may be pardonable in the absence of a correct path, but it could never be a correct "action". Therefore the revolutionaries should carry out a correct "action" and not some "action". This is the building up of revolutionary movement. It is the only path for the armed struggle, however arduous it might be.

Thus the programme of "annihilation of the class enemy" without the revolutionary movement or unconnected with the revolutionary movement would not raise the political consciousness, the organised strength and the revolutionary consciousness of the masses. On the contrary, it would only cause a serious set back to the building up of the revolutionary movement. It would come in the way of making the masses conscious that they have to achieve their own liberation. On the contrary it would create illusions among the masses, that without themselves playing any revolutionary role they would gain their liberation from the exploiting system by the heroic actions and sacrifices of some individuals (even if they are heroic and self-sacrificing). This is opposed to Marxism-Leninism and Mao's Thought.

In the Telangana armed struggle (1946-51) the revolutionary movement had taken the form of armed struggle only after it had reached the higher stage. In the beginning the Volunteer squads had, with whatever arms available for use in their daily life, faced the armed despotic landlords as well as their armed goonda gangs. To some extent they had also resisted the armed police bands of the government. As armed forces had increased, the guerrilla squads were formed and the resistance was carried on by them. The guerrilla actions were only carried on against the despotic landlords and their agents who joined hands with and formed a part of the government armed forces and the secret services. The revolutionaries had provided the leadership for this entire programme.

Armed resistance was also carried on in the CIRCAR districts during the same period. The congress government, the land lords, and their agents had let loose severe repression against the mass movement under the leadership of the Communist Party in CIRCAR districts which was helpful for the

Telangana armed struggle. They resorted to repressive measures such as arresting and torturing the people, shooting and killing the militants and the cadre etc., There arose a situation where the mass movement and the Party could not be safe-guarded unless the repressive measures are resisted. The party had given a call to face the force of the ruling classes with force. The Communist Party and the people had, through numerous hardships, carried on the resistance against the atrocities of the ruling classes. So far it was correct.

But after some time, especially after the police action (1948), armed struggle was launched in CIRCAR districts even before the mass movement had reached the stage of armed struggle. It was wrong to have launched the armed struggle in these districts, to assist the Telangana armed struggle and to prevent the congress government from concentrating its armed forces and armed police on Telangana or diverting from it. It was wrong only because the mass movement in this area had not yet reached the stage of armed struggle. As a result, this movement could not withstand the severe repression let loose by the ruling classes. The armed struggle had suffered a serious set back. The party and the mass movement had suffered serious losses.

During any repression, losses are inevitable for the party. But what the leadership of the party should and could do is to minimise the losses as far as possible by adopting a correct policy. It would have been a correct policy during that period to keep only the cadre essential for safe guarding of the mass movement, the party as well as the party's contact with the masses in CIRCAR districts and to shift the remaining cadre to the agency areas in various districts and concentrate on developing the mass movement in those areas. The cadre could have been saved by this. The movement in the plains areas could have been safe-guarded with a very few losses. New mass movements could have developed in the agency areas. Instead, with the launching of armed struggle the movement had suffered a serious set-back.

We should examine the form in which this policy has appeared in the Srikakulam armed struggle which had begun in the end of 1968. The movement of the district had reached the stage of

armed struggle only after adopting all forms of struggles. As such, this had begun as a peoples armed struggle. All the armed actions of the guerilla squads against the landlords and their agents who had joined with and formed a part of the Government armed forces and the secret services are correct. To what extent had these guerilla actions exceeded these limits, and whether the landlords who had not joined hands with the government armed forces and the secret service were also considered as "class enemies" and whether armed actions were carried out against them also are the questions to be examined. Besides, it was also attempted to rouse the masses through the implementation of revolutionary mass programme, the distribution of land etc.. Though the masses were temporarily glad with this, their enthusiasm had gradually waned away. Instead of expanding to wider areas, the armed struggle had shrunk confining itself to the limited areas. As a result it had suffered serious losses. It should also be noted that after it was launched, the armed struggle was carried on based on the policies of leadership of CP (M.L.)

In the same connections some armed actions were also carried out under their leadership in the Cirkar and Rayalaseema districts. They had with great pride propagated this as an armed struggle, as "the annihilation of the class enemy". Even though the targets of all the raids were land lords and the rich, it could not be said that they were all despots. The mass movement of these areas had not reached the revolutionary stage in which the land lords and the rich would be directly confronted. The situation wherein it would become possible to demarcate as to who would join the government armed forces and the secret service and who would not had not yet arisen. Only a few could be said to be despots depending on their role. Nothing useful has accrued to the mass movement of these areas due to the raids of "annihilation" carried out against them. As they claim the masses were not roused. What is more, there is nothing to show that the masses have atleast helped them. All the actions that do not have any connection with the mass movement are nothing but the naked acts of terrorism.

During the same period, some cadres of this party went to the agency areas of Visakhapatnam and carried on the propaganda of the

politics of peoples war for some time among the masses. The masses had naturally appreciated these politics. But the masses could not withstand the police raids when they were actually launched. Some of the cadres were arrested. The remaining cadre had left the agency areas. Their experiences in the agency areas of Visakhapatnam speak for themselves as to how unrealistic is their formulation that without getting trained and tempered through the political and economic struggles, the masses would become inspired and be ready for the armed struggle by mere propaganda of the politics of peoples war. The experience would prove valuable for those who are willing to take the lessons from them. But who would be their use for those who are unable to take lessons from their own experiences?

Naxalbari struggle was a peoples armed struggle. Before launching the armed struggle in that area, the masses began political and economic struggles, recognised the need for armed struggle through their own experience and thus carried on the armed struggle. The leadership of CP (ML) had, in their own report (Sanyal report), however uncomprehensive it might be, very clearly stated as to how the leadership had failed in providing leadership for this struggle. But this report remains a mere formality. Basing on the experiences of Naxalbari, had they understood and rectified the shortcomings in their understanding, they would have been of a great help to the Srikulam armed struggle as well as to the revolutionary movement of other regions.

In this connection, Mao writes as follows regarding the attitude that should be adopted towards the enemies.

"With regard to politically alien elements we should not be off our guard, but neither should we be unduly apprehensive of treachery on their part and adopt excessive precautionary measures. Distinction should be made between the land lords, the merchants and the rich peasants, and the main point is to explain things to them politically and win their neutrality, while at the same time organising the masses of the people to keep an eye on them. Only against the very few elements who are most dangerous should stern measures like arrest be taken". (Strategy in China's Revolutionary War)

In another context Mao, in his "Strategic problems of guerilla Warfare", writes that when resisting enemy's attacks on the base areas, the

traitors should be suppressed declaring Martial law in the base areas. Mao explained as above regarding the attitude that should be adopted towards the not so dangerous enemies during the period of anti-Japanese war and when base areas were in existence. We have to apply it to our conditions, where the armed struggle is in its primary stage. Those that could be neutralised should be neutralised by showing necessary discrimination and explaining our political line. Only under unavoidable circumstances should we adopt stern measures. We should adopt the same attitude for the entire stage of armed struggle. There is no comparison between the formulation of the leadership of CP (M.L.) that all feudal classes as well as all the class enemies should be annihilated and that this itself is the first stage of the armed struggle and what Mao has said. These two are opposed to each other.

5. The Importance of Terrain :

While summing up the experiences of armed struggle that they carried on hitherto, the leadership of the CP (M.L.) concluded that there is no need for a favourable terrain, mass movement, mass organisation, as well as mass participation and that the armed struggle could be straight away launched without any of them. We have already explained that though there is a revolutionary situation in the country, the masses would gain revolutionary experience by carrying on political and economic struggles and adopting armed struggle as the form of the struggle. Let us now see as to what would be the importance of terrain for the armed struggle.

Since guerilla warfare is an armed struggle which should be based upon the masses, the formulation that wherever there are masses armed struggle could be launched and carried on is correct. Since our masses, the majority of rural peasant masses that are living in the plains areas the question of guerilla warfare is simply unthinkable without considering the plains areas. Telangana armed struggle (1946-51) began in the plains areas. Organised peasant movement (more or less majority of it is reformist movement) of various states is only in the plains areas.

Our task would not be over merely with the launching of guerilla warfare. It should be able to sustain and develop for a long period of

time, and be useful to build the base areas which is our strategic aim. Though there are conscious peasant masses and powerful peasant movements in the plains areas, due to the concentration of roads the danger of enemy forces quickly penetrating into the rural areas, encircling and wiping out of the guerrilla forces is great. Only when there is a revolutionary organisation and a revolutionary movement capable of containing the movement of the enemy's armed forces, would it be possible to carry on an interrupted guerilla warfare. In view of the fact that next to the cities plains are the strongholds of the enemy, we should carry on our activities giving priority to these areas in building up of revolutionary mass movements as well as the revolutionary mass organisation capable of resisting the enemy's attacks. Guerrilla warfare should be launched in these areas as the revolutionary movement reaches the stage where it would take the form of armed struggle. It would be incorrect, if the struggle is not launched thinking that it might not be able to sustain for a long period of time. After launching the struggle, when an unfavourable situation develops due to the concentration of the enemy's armed forces, we would have to adopt appropriate tactics and safeguard our guerilla squads.

If we select the areas where the enemy is politically, economically and socially weak, build the revolutionary movement and launch the guerilla warfare as the revolutionary movement reaches the stage of armed struggle, it would lead to the building of base areas where the guerilla warfare could sustain for a long period of time. Hills, forests and plains without roads are such areas. When we speak of such areas, we mean only the areas where there is habitation of people. If there are only hills and forests without people, there would be no guerilla warfare for us to carry on. Such areas are not therefore useful for guerilla warfare.

The armed forces of the enemy can enter the hills, forests and the plains without roads with great difficulty. The feudal relations being strong and the people being subjected to the worst kind of exploitation, the masses in these areas would quickly revolt as a result of the efforts of the revolutionaries. Such areas would be useful to carry on the guerilla warfare for a long period of time to defeat the enemy's armed forces and to build the base areas. As such we give priority to the hilly and forest regions. The

guerilla warfare in these regions would be greatly useful for launching and carrying on the guerilla warfare in the plains areas with roads. When the pressure from the enemy's armed forces increases in the plains areas, some of the guerilla squads could be transferred to the nearby hilly and forest regions. Whenever the situation in the plains areas becomes favourable the guerilla squads could once again go back into the plains areas. Thus co-ordinating the two areas, guerilla warfare could be developed.

Prior to police action (1948) the girijan armed struggle during the period of Telangana armed struggle was carried on in the forest areas of the present Khammam district. With the intensification of raids in the vast girijan areas of Warangal, Karimnagar and Adilabad districts, it became impossible for the revolutionaries and guerilla squads to stay in the plains areas. It had therefore become necessary for them to move in large numbers into the forest areas. Going into the forest areas, they worked among the girijans, built the revolutionary movement and prepared them for armed struggle. The armed struggle had also started and continued to the end in these areas. Had there been armed struggle from the beginning in the forest areas, it would have been easy to retreat or to advance co-ordinating the guerilla warfare of both of these areas. Many of the losses suffered could have been avoided.

Though there is a strong peasant movement in the plains areas, in view of these experiences we have built the revolutionary movement in the areas where there are hills and forests and launched the armed struggle in the Telangana districts where the revolutionary movement had reached the stage of armed struggle. It does not however, mean that we are not going to conduct armed struggle in the plains areas. We would also develop the revolutionary movement in the plains areas and launch the armed struggle as it reaches the stage of armed struggle.

Com. Mao in his "Strategy in Guerilla Warfare" explain the importance of mountain regions for the guerilla warfare as under :

"In places surrounded by the enemy on all sides or on three sides, the mountainous regions

naturally offer the best conditions for setting up base areas....."

Our experiences of guerilla warfare also testify to the correctness of what Mao has said above. But the experiences of the leadership of CP(M.L.) speak otherwise !

6. The importance of the slogan of defence:

The armed struggle that the people carry on against the ruling classes is by itself an offensive struggle. And the guerilla warfare is more offensive than any other war. Yet, when compared to the armed forces of the ruling classes, the numbers, the arms as well as the skill of the peoples guerilla forces would not only be inferior but also would continue to remain so for a long time. Hence we would be in a defensive position. In this period we would have to advance the revolution defending our guerilla areas. We would therefore at this stage advance the slogan that the armed struggle is essential for the defence of the revolutionary gains of the masses as well as the self-defence of the revolutionaries. By this it would be easy to mobilise the masses not only of struggle but also the people of the country in support of the armed struggle. We would have the advantage of mobilising broad masses of people, including the backward masses on the slogan of defence of revolutionary gains.

Even though the overthrow of the Nizam rule prior to police action and the overthrow of Indian ruling classes after the police action was declared as the aim of the revolutionaries during Telangana armed struggle, the slogan that we were carrying on the armed struggle in defence of the peoples revolutionary gains was used to convince the masses in the country and to win their support and solidarity to the armed struggle.

Besides this slogan, Mao also explained the importance of the defensive position as follows :

"With the slogan of defending the revolutionary base areas and defending China, we can rally the overwhelming majority of the people to fight with one heart and one mind, because we are the oppressed and the victims of aggression. It was also by using the form of the defensive

that the Army of the Soviet Union defeated its enemies during the Civil War. When the imperialist countries organised the Whites for attack, the war was waged under the slogan of defending the Soviets; even when the October Uprising was being prepared, the military mobilisation was carried out under the slogan of defending the capital. In every just war the defensive not only has a ruling effect on politically alien elements, it also makes possible the rallying of the backward sections of the masses to join the war".

(Strategy In China's Revolutionary War)

The Chinese as well as Soviet comrades were many times more stronger than us at the time of giving the defensive slogan. Their revolutionary movement was also many times more stronger. Those comrades would have been more fit than us to give the slogan that "the annihilation of the enemies is alone our aim". Yet they had not given such a slogan. They launched, carried on and victoriously concluded their armed struggle, civil war and the anti-imperialist war with the same defensive slogan.

For the leadership of the CP(M.L.) who refuse to recognise the importance of the revolutionary movement for the launching of the armed struggle, it is but natural to refuse to recognise the necessity of defending the revolutionary gains as well. It is only in consequence of this that they are advancing the slogan of "annihilation of the class enemy" instead of the slogan of the defence of the revolutionary gains. What Mao has said above clearly shows as to how far removed is this from Mao's Thought.

In order to mobilise all the people of the country in support of the armed struggle which is in its primary stage it is very important to place the slogan of self-defence and the defence of the revolutionary gains before the country. Only those that are blind to the interests of the revolution would refuse to recognise the importance of the defensive slogan.

Though the aim of the armed struggle which is going on today in Telangana is the overthrow of the ruling classes, it is going on the slogan of the self-defence and the defence of the revolutionary gains.

7. Need of the mass movement :

The leadership of the CP(M.L.) has come to yet another conclusion that no mass movement is necessary to launch the armed struggle. When the annihilation of the class enemies is their only aim, they would naturally have no need for any mass movement in order to merely to kill the class enemies by either raiding their houses or by waylaying them. We have already said that in order to make the masses realise the need for armed struggles through their own experience, we should mobilise them into revolutionary struggles on political and economic demands. There was mass movement in Naxalbari by the time the leadership of the C.P.(M.L.) launched the Naxalbari peoples armed struggle. The revolutionary ghrjan movement was already there in Srikakulam district by the time the armed struggle was launched there. Struggles were also carried on against the despotic landlords before the launching of "armed actions" in the Mushahari area of Bihar state. While the truth is such, why should they want to distort their own experiences and formulate that there is no need of any mass movement for the armed struggle? What do they mean by all this?

They have not stopped there. They have even gone a step further and formulated that there is no need for the participation of the peasantry in the guerilla warfare.

This is what they say :

"Obviously, the peasantry as a whole does not participate in this guerilla warfare. What happens is that the advanced class-conscious section of the peasant masses starts the guerrilla war. For this reason guerrilla war, at its initial stages, may appear as struggle for only a handful of people".

(Charu Majumdar. Liberation, July 1969)

Here they clearly admit that all the peasantry would not participate in the guerrilla warfare that they launch, that it would appear as a struggle carried on by a few people and that as a matter of fact the class conscious people would be very few. Then how is it that the guerrilla warfare they launch would be a peoples guerrilla warfare? How hollow and worthless is their

unceasing talk of relying upon the masses to carry on the armed struggle!

The objective reality is that they are not mobilising the peasantry into the revolutionary struggle on political and economic demands, especially on agrarian revolutionary programme. As a result, the majority of the peasant masses are not becoming conscious. Consequently it has become necessary for them to depend only upon the few conscious individuals. Their guerrilla warfare has therefore come to be deprived of the mass base. From this, they have propounded the formulation that "in the beginning the participation of the peasantry is not necessary" in the guerrilla warfare, which is opposed to Marxism-Leninism and Mao's Thought, and are propagating it. They would not have got themselves into this predicament had they taken up the task of building the revolutionary peasant movement.

Majority of the peasantry would participate in the guerrilla warfare which is launched on the basis of the revolutionary movement. As repression from the ruling classes starts and as it goes on intensifying, the forms of peoples participation in the guerrilla warfare would also go on changing. To secretly lend direct as well as indirect support to the guerrilla warfare would be the main form of peoples participation in the guerrilla warfare. The joining of the militants from among the peasants in the volunteer and guerrilla squads in appreciable numbers would be a touch stone for the peoples participation in the armed struggle.

They are advancing yet another argument that there is no need of the mass organisations to launch the guerrilla warfare and that the mass organisations should be only in the base areas. When there is no need for the participation of the peasant masses in the guerrilla warfare, (even if it is in the initial stages) what would be the purpose of the peasant mass organisations?

We could very well agree if it is said that there would be no need for the reformist mass organisations, since they are impediments to prepare the masses for the guerrilla warfare. But the sum and substance of their argument is that there is no need for the mass organisations themselves. If there are no revolutionary mass organisations, there would be no organisational form

for the revolutionary movement itself. The revolutionary mass organisations are therefore essential.

The question of whether a mass organisation is functioning openly or secretly should not be a yardstick to decide whether a mass organisation is essential or not. If they are functioning with a reformist programme under the reformist leadership, they would, as reformist mass organisations, become impediments to the armed struggle and the revolution. If they are functioning with a revolutionary programme under the leadership of the revolutionaries, they would, as revolutionary mass organisations, become useful for the armed struggle and the revolution. Therefore, we should strive to build only the revolutionary organisations in the struggle areas which would be useful for the armed struggle. When the movement is in its primary stage and when the mass organisations could not function even secretly owing to the severe repression from the enemy, we should make use of ordinary mass organisations to establish daily contacts with the masses. Especially we have to examine as to how we should work in the cities and rural areas where the movement has not yet reached the revolutionary stage and formulate our programme.

The question whether a mass organisation should function openly or secretly need not be a point of discussion. Since revolutionary mass organisations would be built as part of the revolutionary movement, there would be severe repression on the revolutionary mass organisations as well. It would therefore become necessary to function secretly. Unable to face the problems that the organising of secret revolutionary mass organisations would pose, the leadership of the CP(M.L.) decided for themselves that they have no need for the revolutionary mass organisations themselves.

Girijan organisation of Srikakulam district served as a revolutionary mass organisation. Though it had openly functioned in the beginning, it has functioned secretly during the period of repression and armed struggle and assisted the armed struggle.

"Andhra Mahasabha", the then revolutionary mass organisation, had functioned secretly

during the period of Telangana armed struggle (1948-51). It had functioned openly when there was no repression.

Efforts are being made to build revolutionary mass organisations in the countryside of Telangana where the armed struggle is going on today. Such work has been carried on in East Godavari district (circa districts) in connection with the building of Girijan movement.

As these experiences clearly show, at this stage the building of revolutionary mass organisations in the rural struggle areas is not only possible but also necessary. They might be disrupted when there is severe repression. But the building of these organisations should not be given up just because of this. We need not wait until the formation of liberated areas.

Mao in his "Report on Human Peasant Movement" explained that in the peasant organisations that functioned in Human during the period of peasant revolutionary movement the membership of the peasant organisations has increased many times and these peasant organisations were having authority and that their decisions were carried out by the peasantry. The experiences of the Indian revolution are also in line with this.

The principles formulated by Com. Mao as well as experience of the Indian revolution clearly show that the peasant masses have to participate in the guerrilla warfare, that for this the revolutionary peasant organisations and the other revolutionary mass organisations are essential and that only then would the guerrilla warfare be able to sustain as a protracted war. Those who think that "the annihilation of the class enemy itself is the armed struggle", would not find it necessary.

8. The agrarian revolutionary programme:

By carrying out the agrarian revolutionary programme alone would it be possible to build the revolutionary mass movement. And distribution of the landlords' land is the main item of the agrarian revolutionary programme. Thus the question of land as a revolutionary demand would have immense importance in the agrarian revolu-

tion. Though the struggles against the atrocities of the landlords, illegal levies, and for agricultural Labourers' wages are all partial struggles, would not take long for the peasant masses to take up the struggle for the distribution of land, provided these struggles are led with a revolutionary perspective.

Only after the establishment of the people democratic government would the feudal system be abolished all over the country. Only by implementing the agrarian revolutionary programme would we be able to mobilise the peasant masses into the armed struggle in the base areas. It does not however mean that we should not implement any programme until the establishment of the the base areas. Depending upon the preparedness of the peasant masses, we should implement the agrarian revolutionary programme including the distribution of land. Thus implemented, it would strengthen the armed struggle. It would provide the armed struggle with the support and solidarity of the peasantry, especially of the poor, middle and landless peasantry. It would not be possible to distribute all the lands of the landlords in the beginning itself. We should, depending upon the extent of preparedness of the masses, implement it as far as possible and would be able to wholly abolish feudalism only after the formation of the base areas. In order to implement this programme, we should base ourselves on the poor and landless peasantry and unite with the middle peasantry. It is the poor and the landless peasantry that gets land in the agrarian revolution. Also it is only these people that are to a greater extent subjected to the feudal exploitation as well as the atrocities of the landlords. Therefore they would stand in the forefront to successfully complete the agrarian revolution.

Since the domination of the landlords would come to an end with the abolition of feudalism, the middle peasantry would unite with the poor and landless peasantry as against the landlord class.

The leadership of the CP(M.L.) are advocating that the guerrilla warfare "is not for land, but for political power". This clearly shows that they do not attach any importance to the agrarian revolutionary programme. When they

say that we should rely upon the poor and landless peasants, they do not mean that we should do so in order to implement the agrarian revolutionary programme. On the contrary, it is only to propagate the politics of peoples war and to win their support for their programme of 'annihilation of the class enemy'.

In our view, Srikakulam armed struggle is a peoples armed struggle which is based on the revolutionary mass movement. The revolutionary activities such as establishment of local authority, peoples courts etc., were correctly implemented in this revolutionary movement. But owing to the incorrect line of thinking of the leadership, the implementation of the agrarian revolutionary programme has not been given importance. As a result, the mobilisation by the masses has gradually waned away. We hope that the leadership while reviewing this movement would give due importance to this and other similar questions and draw proper lessons from it.

During the Telangana armed struggle (1946-51), the armed struggle gained strength solely due to the implementation of the agrarian revolutionary programme, in that especially the distribution of land. With the support and solidarity of the peasantry, the guerillas could face the armed forces of the Nizam in the beginning and the armed forces of the Congress Government thereafter.

In the armed struggle which is going on in Telangana today, the revolutionaries are implementing the agrarian revolutionary programme as far as possible. Consequently, the peasantry is participating in the armed struggle in various forms and thus lending their support and solidarity to the revolutionaries. This clearly shows that the experiences of Telangana armed struggle are applicable even today.

9. Party organisation : Revolutionary mass movement.

The party organisation is essential to prepare the masses for the armed struggle, as well as to carry on armed struggle wherever the masses are ready for the armed struggle. The party would gain strength and get steeled only in course of armed struggle. Since a revolutionary party

would be under attack from the ruling classes, it would naturally be a secret party. While functioning as a secret party, they should make use of all legal opportunities, however limited they might be.

In the beginning, the leadership of the CP(M.L.) were not of the view that the party organisation is essential to carry on the armed struggle. They used to be of the opinion that armed struggle could be carried on under the leadership of the co-ordination committee itself. Srikakulam armed struggle was launched under the leadership of the co-ordination committee.

Later on, realising the necessity of the party organisation, they began to organise the party. Acceptance of the "Programme of annihilation of the class enemy" in the name of Mao's Thought or atleast not opposing it was the basis on which this party was organised.

They too want to build a secret party organisation. They are also striving for it. But a party without the revolutionary mass movement can not be in live contact with the masses. It can not sustain for a long period of time. At best their party organisation could remain as mere groups that carry on limited propaganda among the people and squads that carry on the programme of annihilation of the class enemy. This is what the organisational position of their party is today.

The same defect is found even in the 'technique' they are adopting in the implementation of the programme of annihilation of the class enemy. The sum total of this technique to implement this programme with the strictest secrecy, discipline and caution, even without the knowledge of the masses.

As we have already stated, the class enemies are of two kinds. Some carry on exploitation and commit atrocities. The masses would be sick of them. Such class enemies should be tried in the peoples courts and duly punished. Some would become part of the enemy's armed forces and the secret services and thus join hands with them in torturing and murdering the revolutionaries, the guerillas and the people. Our attitude towards such class enemies should be stern and we should

take stern action against them. Otherwise guerilla warfare cannot go forward. Such class enemies, as a part of the ruling classes would remain under the constant protection of the enemy's armed forces. Therefore we should be well organised, disciplined and cautious when we have to take stern measures against them.

In this respect, the revolutionaries should understand that despite the strictest of secrecy adopted, it would be an illusion to think that there would be no repression or at least less of repression. The enemy would only intensify repression as it becomes difficult for him to secure the secrets. To think that with the mere propagation of the politics of peoples war, the masses would become capable of resisting this repression, is only to betray the utter lack of experience. There should be a mass movement capable of withstanding the repression. If the masses have become conscious that they should achieve their own liberation, they would become capable of withstanding any amount of repression.

10. Extension of the Revolutionary Movement.

The leadership of the CP (M.L.) do not recognise the necessity of revolutionary movement as well as the necessity of extending it to new areas, for launching armed struggle. On the contrary, they think that the extension of the programme of annihilation of the class enemy itself is the extension of the armed struggle.

According to their understanding, if 'at the rate of one per district' twenty 'actions of annihilation of the class enemy' are carried out in the twenty districts of a state, it means that armed struggle is extended to all the twenty districts. By such actions the armed struggle can easily be extended to any length. But such an armed struggle can never be a peoples revolutionary armed struggle. Such actions would merely remain as the 'actions of annihilation of the class enemy' which have nothing to do with the people or the peoples revolution.

The peasant movement should not be confined to any one area. Our organisational strength would also grow while building the revolutionary movement in an area. The strength of our cadre

would also grow so that they could go and build the movement in other areas. Seeing the struggle in one area, the peasantry of the near and adjacent areas would also come forward to join the anti-feudal struggles. The cadre newly developed in the peasant movement should, with their experience, go and build the movement in the new areas. Thus the movement should be constantly expanded. This would enhance the self-confidence of the fighting peasantry. The movement would be able to advance even in the face of ruthless repression from the enemy.

If the peasant movement is expanded and the armed struggle is launched in the vast areas, the guerillas could in the face of the enemy's attacks escape from one area to another and resist the enemy's armed forces. This would greatly help to defend the revolutionary movement.

This is not all. Once an armed struggle is launched, it should never be confined to any single area. It should be continuously extended to new and adjacent areas. Thus the armed struggle should be extended to new areas. If the armed struggle has to be extended to the new areas, the mass movement would also have to extend to the new area.

By the time our cadre and the guerilla squads go to the new and adjacent areas, often the main section of the landlords would be armed and united and be ready to face the masses. Whatever be the demands on which the masses are mobilised, they would come down with severe repression.

Whenever the situation is not as above it would be easy for us to extend the peasant movement. But wherever there is armed enemy concentration, we should carry on resistance in self-defence on the one hand, and simultaneously build the peasant movement on the other. Such self-defence by the revolutionaries and the guerilla squads should not be taken as an alternative to the peasant revolutionary movements. The revolutionaries and the guerilla squads would defend themselves until the peasant revolutionary movement reaches the stage of armed struggle in the new areas. Thereafter they would arm themselves and fight in defence of the "revolutionary movement. In other words, the armed struggle in

the new areas is for building of the revolutionary movement in the first stage and for the defence of the revolutionary movement in the second stage. The tactics to be adopted in different stages would also conform to this.

While carrying on the resistance and building the revolutionary movement in the new areas, the old areas should not however be given up. We should go on continuously consolidating them retaining the cadres necessary in these areas. We should intensify this especially when the concentration of the enemy's armed forces is eased,

In the beginning, the ghrjan movement in Srikakulam was confined to the central areas of the Parvathipuram, Palakonda and Pathapatnam taluqs. Prior to the beginning of the armed struggle, the movement was extended to Tekkali and Sompet Taluqs. Even though decision was taken to extend the movement to still wider areas, no work was carried in this direction. The armed struggle did not gain the strength which it would have otherwise gained had the movement been extended to vast areas.

We should march forward consolidating the revolutionary movement and guerilla warfare on the one hand and simultaneously expanding it on the other.

11. Co-ordination between struggle area and non-struggle areas

Our cadre is working in the struggle areas as well as other than struggle areas. The leadership of the CP(M.L.) do not adopt any other form of struggle excepting the armed struggle. They do not have an understanding of the tasks that should be fulfilled in these areas.

In these areas, our cadre should carry on extensive propoganda of our programme, the betrayal of the revisionists and the necessity to prepare for armed struggle among the masses of people.

They should mobilise the masses into struggles on political and economic demands where ever, whenever and on whatever issue there is preparedness among them. They should through

these struggles mobilise the masses to take up the form of armed struggle.

They should build the secret party organisation and develop it extensively.

They should send the assistance necessary for the armed struggle areas.

They should explain to the masses as to how the masses in the struggle areas are defending their gains through armed struggle, as to how heroically they are fighting and marching forward and win their support and solidarity for the armed struggle.

We should organise movements in support and solidarity with the armed struggle. We should expose the repression unleashed by the ruling classes. Thus we should co-ordinate activities of the struggle areas with the activities of other than struggle areas.

12. Co-ordination between the Struggle areas and the cities.

Today our cities are the centres for imperialism, big bourgeoisie and the rich classes. It is in these cities that the Government machinery as well as the armed forces of the ruling classes are concentrated. These cities are also the centres of the counter-revolutionary parties and the ideologies.

At the same time it is also in these same cities that the revolutionary working class, the students and middle classes are concentrated. And these are the classes that would march in the fore front of the anti-imperialist struggles as the economic and political crisis is getting accentuated. These classes of people are coming into political and economical struggles as the political and economic crisis is deepening. The ruling classes are unable to suppress these struggles even by unleashing severe repression. On the contrary, struggles have become a daily feature. While concentrating our attention on the development of armed struggle and other peasant struggles in the countryside, we should at the same time develop the revolutionary movement in the cities. We should organise the revolutionary movement so that the armed struggle would gain its support and solidarity.

The leadership of the CP(M.L.) has no programme whatsoever for fulfilling of this task. They direct the students and youth to go to villages and integrate themselves with the peasantry. This is not the kind of task that could be achieved by mere directives.

Of late, this leadership has been giving the programme such as throwing of bombs on schools, colleges and primary health centres, burning of the portraits of the bourgeois leadership etc.. These actions would not be useful to mobilise the discontented masses into the revolutionary mass struggles. They would not be a support to the rural peasant struggles. Therefore these struggles are futile.

Militant workers and students who are steeped in the revolutionary struggle should be sent to the areas of armed struggle. We should give them the tasks of party cadres as well as military responsibilities and ensure that they integrate themselves with the rural masses. Besides this, we should have a programme for building revolutionary movement in the cities.

While mobilising the working class and the students on their own issues, we should at the same time mobilise them mainly into the political struggles. We can organise anti-government struggles on a number of issues which are daily coming up continuously. The economic struggles could be used as a means for making the backward working class politically conscious.

While carrying on the propaganda of the armed struggles going on in the rural struggle areas, the gains that the masses are achieving in this struggle, the repression that the ruling classes are unleashing and the heroic resistance of the masses among the urban masses, especially working class and the students, we should win their support and solidarity for the armed struggle and also explain to them, that the armed struggle is the only path for their liberation as well.

Liberate the villages, encircle the cities and gradually liberate them this is the sum and substance of the path of peoples war. For this, we should build the revolutionary movement and prepare the masses in the cities. We should build a secret

party organisation capable of fulfilling this task. We should build mass organisations suited to the prevailing conditions and develop close contacts with the masses.

Thus we should develop close contact and co-ordination between the revolutionary trade union movement and the revolutionary student movement in the cities on one side and between the armed struggle and the revolutionary peasant struggles in the rural areas on the other.

13. Establishment of base areas and their development.

We have already stated that though there is a revolutionary situation in India, the guerilla warfare takes a tortuous path of development owing to the uneven development of the revolutionary movement, the disunity among the revolutionary ranks, and the ability of the ruling classes to concentrate large numbers of their armed forces against the guerilla warfare. Only when we have a correct and realistic assessment of this actual situation, would we be in a position to prepare ourselves and surmount these difficulties.

Without such a realistic assessment, if we delude ourselves into believing that the guerilla warfare would advance with great strides winning success after success, we would be overwhelmed by unforeseen difficulties and get clouded upto the point of suffocation. But this is what is exactly the assessment of the leadership of the CP (M.L.). Look at their line of thinking.

"The revolutionary situation in India is daily becoming more excellent. The year 1970 has arrived with the promise of the birth of a disciplined peoples army and the emergence of extensive liberated areas".

(Charu, Liberation, February 1970, Page-5)

This is not merely a formal speech meant for the occasion of new year's day, nor is it meant merely to inspire the cadres. This is their assessment on the Indian situation as well as on the immediate future of the armed struggle. This same line of thinking is reflected even in their other writings. But the experiences of 1970 have proved that these assessments and the astrological

predictions are totally unrealistic. The Indian revolution does not and is not traversing on a straight line. It is going through a tortuous path, full of ups and downs, full of obstacles. The losses that the revolutionaries have suffered as well as the consequent disasters that have befallen the revolutionary movement during the year are themselves a clear proof of this. No doubt the revolutionaries would certainly overcome these setbacks, develop the armed struggle and carry it forward. But what the leadership of the CP (M.L.) says above only betrays the chief defect in their grasp of the Indian situation as well as the question of building of base areas and the peoples army.

It is essential that we should grasp as to what is a base area and how are they established.

Com. Mao says as follows :-

"What, then, are these base areas? They are the strategic bases on which the guerilla forces rely in performing their strategic tasks and achieving the object of preserving and expanding themselves and destroying and driving out the enemy". (Military writings, Page 167).

If we have to fulfill the main tasks which should be fulfilled in order to successfully carry on the armed struggle for achieving the peoples democratic revolution, we should base ourselves on this kind of base areas. Base areas can not be established by conducting sporadic raids here and there. Mao called the tendency to conduct this kind of raids as the tendency of "roving rebels" Mao says that the guerilla forces would begin to build the base areas only when a struggle is carried on against this tendency and it is rooted out from among the guerilla forces. The wrong attitude adopted by the leadership of the CP (M.L.) today is also similar to this 'Roving Rebel' tendency.

Mao says that the base areas are of three types — 1) In Mountainous and forest regions, 2) In plains areas, 3) in the areas of river lake estuaries. The mountainous and forest regions are the most favourable of all and that there the guerilla warfare could be carried on for the longest of period. The river lake estuary regions are comparatively less favourable than these areas. The plains areas are still less favourable. But yet it is not impossible to develop guerilla warfare and establish base areas in these regions also. For the armed struggle in the plains areas, we should also bear the season in mind. It would be better if the leadership of the CP (M.L.), who argue that there is no importance for the regional as well as seasonal factors in developing guerilla warfare, study Comrade Mao's directive.

'We must develop guerilla warfare and set

up base areas in all the mountainous regions behind the enemy lines".

(Strategy in guerilla war)

Com. Mao says as follows regarding the basic conditions that should be secured for the establishment of base areas.

"A base area for guerilla war can be truly established only with the gradual fulfilment of the three basic conditions i.e., only after the anti-Japanese armed forces are built up, the enemy has suffered defeats and the people are aroused". (Problems of Strategy in guerilla War).

In this, the fundamental task is the building of armed forces. At this stage, we could only build these armed forces from the youth of the poor and the landless peasantry who are steel-ed in the agrarian revolutionary struggle as well as struggles against the enemy's armed forces. Though the propaganda of the politics of peoples war is essential, the youth would not come forward in sufficiently large numbers to join the peoples armed forces with this propaganda alone. Even if they happen to come forward, their numbers would only be very less.

In the beginning these armed forces would only be in the form. As the struggle gets intensified, the guerilla squads grow increasing the number of guerillas. We should gradually build the regular army. Thus we would be in a position to establish base area only when we could build the armed forces capable of defeating the enemy in an area. This task can not be fulfilled by merely forming a few squads with a few people drawn from the petty-bourgeoisie, the poor and the landless peasant classes. It would be possible to build a peoples army only when the guerilla warfare begins and advances to a certain degree in a wide area.

The second condition is that the peoples armed forces should, with the support of the masses, be capable of defeating the enemy.

Here defeating the enemy means the defeating of the enemy's armed forces in the armed struggle. But by this it does not mean the annihilation of all the landlords, the class enemies. This would become possible only when the majority of the enemy's armed forces attacking the guerilla armies are annihilated. The annihilation of the enemy's armed forces and the annihilation of the class enemies is not one and the same thing. We should bear in mind what Mao has said here.

The third condition is the rousing of the masses into struggle against the enemy by applying all our strength including our armed forces.

Here also Mao says that with the launching of armed struggle, the masses also should be mobilised into struggles. The mass organisations should be built in the course of the struggle. He has no where said that we should build the mass organisations and mobilise the masses only after the liberation of a particular area. In China it became possible for the Communist Party which was conducting armed struggle with regular armies. In our country where such a regular army is not obtaining, the revolutionaries should build the base areas by building the guerilla armies through peoples struggles, in that mainly the peasant struggles by building the revolutionary mass organisations, by rousing the masses through revolutionary programmes and by defeating the enemy's armed forces. Ours is a protracted war. Besides the victories, it is also a path of many ups and downs. In spite of the existence of a revolutionary situation in the country, in spite of the mounting crisis among the ruling classes, and the weakness of the ruling classes being more clearly seen in Bengal, still the enemy when taken on country wide basis is much more stronger than us in terms of his armed forces. Taking advantage of the uneven development of the revolution in the country, they are able to concentrate a very large number of their armed forces in the states of West Bengal and Andhra Pradesh.

To think that we would build the peoples army and go on from there to the building of base areas under these conditions would be nothing but merely indulging in utopian ideas, and in day dreaming. Our experiences in the first half of 1970 have already confirmed this.

However we need not get discouraged by this. The ups and downs that we have already faced and are still facing are but natural in course of an armed struggle. We should surmount these difficulties and develop the peasant revolutionary movement in the vast areas of the country. We should take them to the stage armed struggle. Then the armed struggle would be launched and carried on simultaneously in all these areas. The areas where the guerilla warfare is carried on are the guerilla areas. When such guerilla areas are established throughout the country, the enemy would become weak in terms of the armed forces. Then the situation would become favourable for the establishment as well as the expansion of the base areas in one or two areas. The academic discussions as to whether it is possible to build the base areas before that or not are unnecessary for us. This would depend upon the relative strength of the revolutionary forces and that of the enemy. If some fundamental changes take place in the situation in favour of the revolutionary forces, and if the revolutionary forces have the organisational strength to take advantage of these favourable

changes and press forward, it might in such a situation become possible to establish base areas even before that.

Viewed from this angle, it would become clear that it is nothing but wishful thinking to presume that the base area has already been established or the conditions for its establishment have been created because of the peasant revolutionary struggles, guerilla squads, disputes among the local ruling classes, and the dislocation of the Government machinery. No doubt we have to take advantage of the weaknesses and the cracks which have thus developed among the ruling classes as well as the government machinery and develop the revolutionary movement and the armed struggle. But at the same time, the revolutionary should understand that an area should pass through many stages of development before it reaches the stage of a base area. When the ruling classes fail to suppress the peoples armed struggle with the state police forces, they would deploy the central reserve police forces to suppress it. Today it is this same central reserve police which is ruling in West Bengal and Andhra Pradesh. They are police only by name. But in actual fact they are the military forces built for the purpose of suppressing the revolutionary peoples struggles. As soon as the guerilla forces are in a position to face the central reserve police, the regular armies would step into the field in larger numbers and with more sophisticated weapons. It would be possible to establish base areas only when the guerilla forces could face and defeat them as well. The revolutionaries would be able to fulfill these tasks only when they concentrate on the armed struggle on the one hand and simultaneously start building country-wide revolutionary movement. It is a wonder if the leadership of the CP (M.L.), who lack such a comprehensive understanding, forget the tasks which should be carried on in all the fields for building of base areas and wish to build the peoples army as well as the base areas in 1970 itself.

Similarly they are propagating that the frequent shifting of their guerillas from place to place is what is mobile warfare. This is also wrong. Mobile warfare is the form of warfare conducted after guerillas have developed in terms of their numbers, weapons and training and formed into regular armies. We are far, away from this stage of mobile warfare.

14. MAO'S THOUGHT AND THE TELANGANA ARMED STRUGGLE

During the period of 1946-51, armed struggle was carried on under the leadership of the Communist party in Telangana. In the beginning it was carried on against the Nizam's military and against the congress military after September 1948. The people of Telangana as well as the revolutionaries were very much influenced by the Chinese revolution. Also it was the first attempt to apply the experiences of the Chinese revolution to the Indian conditions. Basing on the experiences of the Telangana armed struggle, the then Andhra Communist Committee, which led the Telangana armed struggle, had made it clear that like the Chinese revolution the Indian revolution has to be a protracted war, that the political power could not be seized as in the case of Russia through insurrection in the semi-colonial and semi-feudal India and that as in China the New Democracy has to be established in India. This is anybody's knowledge (an important document connected with this was even published in "Liberation".) It was in Telangana itself that the Mao's thought was for the first time applied to the Indian conditions. Therefore it should be said that the Telangana armed struggle is the form of peoples war in India.

The leadership of the CP (M. L.) who refuse to recognise this historical truth say that the Mao's Thought was for the first time applied in India in the Naxalbari armed struggle. This is what they say:

"Naxalbari represents the first ever application of Mao's thought on the soil of India. It was in Naxalbari that the peasants, for the first time, launched their struggle for the seizure of state power. For this reason, Naxalbari symbolises the path of liberation for exploited masses of the Indian people, thus ushering in a new era in the political history of India.

(Charu Mazumdar, Liberation, September, 1969)

It is indisputable that the Naxalbari armed struggle has got historical significance. The Naxalbari armed struggle has clearly proved

that the parliamentary system has become outdated in India, that there is a revolutionary situation in the country and that the conditions for armed struggle are mature in several parts of the country. It has also reiterated the fact that the Chinese path is the only path for the liberation of India and that it is the path of peoples war. This served as a warning for all the Indian revolutionaries and on this warning they started to prepare the masses for armed struggle in their respective areas. Thus the Naxalbari armed struggle has not only heralded the present Indian revolution, but also it has once again proved that the Mao's Thought is applicable to the Indian conditions. It was only after the Naxalbari armed struggle that the armed struggle was launched in Srikakulam and Telangana, and is being carried on now. While such is the significance of the Naxalbari armed struggle, the leadership of the CP (M.L.) don't view it from this angle. They say that what was followed by the revolutionaries and the masses during the Telangana armed struggle was not Mao's Thought, and that the pursuance of Mao's Thought began only with the Naxalbari armed struggle and thus refuse to recognise the historical truth. During that period, based upon Mao's Thought, the armed struggle was carried on not only in Telangana but also in the princely state of Tripura which was closely linked with West Bengal.

In the course of this armed struggle, the people under the leadership of the revolutionaries established village Soviets (Grama Rajya) in 3000 villages of Telangana. They organised the peoples armed forces. They distributed 10 lakh acres of land of the landlords among the poor and landless peasants and introduced many revolutionary reforms in the interest of the masses. They laid foundations for the Peoples Democracy. In Telangana it was proved in practice that the Indian revolution would be in the form of protracted war to achieve the peoples Democracy (then known as New Democracy).

Just because the then leadership of the Communist Party of India betrayed the revolution in 1951 and took to the parliamentary path the significance of the Telangana armed struggle does not become unimportant in any way. The valuable experiences gained by applying Mao's Thought in the armed struggle are also

very essential for the revolutionary struggles and the armed struggles going on today. To refuse to accept them is to refuse to learn the lessons of the Indian revolutionary struggles. This is a thing that no revolutionary should do.

The Naxalbari armed struggle which has so much of significance has not however continued as a protracted war. They have even accepted the mistakes that have led to the failure of this struggle as follows :

1. Lack of strong party organisation
2. Failure to rely whole-heartedly on the masses to build a powerful mass base
3. Ignorance of military affairs
4. Thinking on old lines and a formal attitude toward the establishment of political power and the work of revolutionary land reform.

(While we accepted the teachings of Mao in words, we persisted in revisionist methods in practice. Party organisation in every area actually remained inactive.

5. Party members were all active at the beginning of the struggle but they were swept away by the vast movement of the people.
6. We did not politically assess, nor did we propagate among the people, the significance of the 10 great tasks performed by the heroic peasants. We now admit frankly that we had no faith in the heroic peasant masses who were swift as a storm, organised themselves, formed revolutionary peasant committees, completed the 10 great tasks and advanced the class struggle at a swift pace during the period from April to September 1967" (Sanyal report on Terai)

At another place they wrote as follows :

"Our failure in establishing the revolutionary political power and in carrying out revolutionary land reforms blunted the edge of class struggle both during and after the struggle". (Ibid)

It is a good thing that they own their failures in Naxalbari at least to this extent. The same

and substance of their failures is that the struggle was spontaneous and that they could not give it an organised form. The main points that they have accepted are as follows.

The leadership of CP (M. L.) accepted Mao's Thought in words and followed revisionism in practice. Even today this leadership is merely chanting Mao's quotations but they are not in actual fact applying Mao's thought to the Indian conditions. (We have already explained as to how they are not taking the Indian conditions into consideration and working contrary to Mao's Thought.)

They themselves admit that they did not rely upon the masses. The position with them is same even today. The experiences of Naxalbari show that no leadership can successfully lead the peoples struggles without fully relying upon the masses. In spite of their loud talk about relying upon the masses, they are not in actual fact still prepared to undertake the revolutionary mass mobilisation. Therefore this self-criticism of theirs has come to be nothing but formal. On the one hand they admit that they did not realise the significance of revolutionary land reforms. But on the other hand they are formulating that "the Naxalbari struggle is not a struggle for land but for political power" They have gone back on this question which is one of the items of their own self-critical report and thus refuse to admit it.

The Naxalbari leadership could have in fact avoided these mistakes, had they studied and correctly grasped the experiences of the Telangana armed struggle. They could have redoubled the organised struggle of the Naxalbari peasants with the distribution of land, establishment of the village Soviets and building of peoples armed forces and be in a position to carry on the protracted war. It was solely because of their failure in fulfilling these tasks that they have failed to provide leadership to the Naxalbari struggle. They fail to recognise this main defect. They are at the same time denying the historical truth that the Telangana armed struggle was based on Mao's Thought. When we say that the Telangana armed struggle was based on Mao's Thought, we do not however mean that no mistakes were committed during the armed struggle. Despite certain mistakes, the Telangana armed struggle could

go on for 5 years, only because it had the organised might of the masses behind it, together with Mao's Thought as its guide.

It is clear that it is only for the purpose of refusing to take the experiences of Telangana armed struggle that they are refusing to admit the fact that the Telangana armed struggle was guided by Mao's thought. It is indisputable that the revolution today would also be guided by Mao's thought. But for a revolutionary to reject the experiences of the armed struggle, especially the Telangana and Tripura armed struggles that went on during the period of 1946-51, under whatever pretext is unpardonable. Similarly, drawing correct lessons from the experiences of the Naxalbari, Srikulam and other armed struggles going on today, the revolutionaries should enrich their revolutionary experiences. Only then would they be able to provide correct leadership to the armed struggle going on in their respective areas.

Formulating and implementing our programme and policy based on the experience of the Telangana armed struggle, we could in a short time build a revolutionary movement, launch the armed struggle and even win some victories. We are able to defend our revolutionary gains and carry on the armed struggle. We would always strive to utilise the experiences of the Telangana armed struggle as well as the experiences of the struggles going on in other parts of the country.

The leadership of CP (M.L.) have failed to take correct lessons not only from the experiences of Telangana armed struggle but also from the experiences of struggles under their leadership. They have given up the task of building the revolutionary mass movements. They are portraying their "annihilation of the class enemy" as guerilla warfare, and thus depriving the armed struggle of its necessary mass base or atleast weakening it.

15 Deviation from Marxism-Leninism and Mao's Thought

If we have to correctly understand this deviation in the Indian revolutionary movement, we should study what Mao has said

about the "Roving Rebel Bands" during the armed struggle in China as well as what Lenin has said about terrorism."

In saying that "Some People want to increase our political influence only by means of roving guerilla actions but are unwilling to increase it by undertaking the arduous task of building up base areas and establishing the peoples political power", Mao explained one of the characters of the Roving Rebel Bands. In order to rectify this tendency, he says that we should, besides conducting propaganda about this deviation in the party and the revolutionary peoples army, "Draw active workers and peasants experienced in struggle into the ranks of the Red Army so as to change its composition". (Correcting Mistaken Ideas in the party)

We have explained that though the leadership of the CP.(M.L.) wish to build the base areas and to establish peoples political power, the slogans that they advance are in no way useful for this purpose. On the basis of the momentary enthusiasm that their "actions of annihilation of the class enemy" create among the masses, they have claimed in unmistakable terms that such actions would rouse the masses and enhance the influence of the revolutionary forces. Thus the "actions of annihilation of the class enemy" that they carry on disregarding the building of revolutionary mass movements are similar to the actions of the Roving Rebel Bands that Mao pointed out. Mao says that the active worker and peasants with struggle experience should be drawn into the revolutionary peoples army in order to rectify this tendency. For this reason Mao attaches great significance to the struggle of the peasantry and the working class.

Besides what Mao has said above about the Roving Rebel Bands, it is essential to study what Lenin had said about "terrorism".

On "terrorism", one of the resolutions of the second Congress of the Russian Social Democratic Labour Party," Lenin writes thus:

"The Congress decisively rejects terrorism, i. e. the system of individual political assassinations, as being a method of political struggle which is most inexpedient at the present time, diverting the best forces from the urgent

and imperatively necessary work of organisation and agitation destroying contact between the revolutionaries and the masses of the revolutionary classes of the population and spreading both among the revolutionaries themselves and the population in general utterly distorted ideas of the aims and methods of struggle against the autocracy". (Collected Works Vol. 6, Page 474)

While writing about the struggle of the Bolshevism against the petty bourgeois semi-anarchical revolutionism, he explains the struggle within the Socialist revolutionary Party on this question, as follows.

"— This party considered itself particularly "revolutionary" or 'Left', because of its recognition of individual terrorism, assassination—something that we Marxists emphatically rejected. It was, of course, only on grounds of expediency that we rejected individual-terrorism"

(Collected Works, Vol. 31, Page 33)

"Without in the least denying violence and terrorism in principle, we demanded work for the preparation of such forms of violence as were calculated to bring about the direct participation of the masses and which guaranteed that participation."

(Collected Works, Vol. 6 Page 195)

This is what Lenin has said about the struggle against individual terrorism that stood in the way of preparations for the 1905 insurrection. Notwithstanding the fact that we are now following the path of peoples war and not insurrection, the basic principle that there should be mass participation in the revolution and that we should prepare the masses to this end remains the same in both the cases. The insurrection is a form of struggle in which the working class seize the political power through an armed insurrection, while the peoples war is the form of struggle in which the political power is seized through protracted (peasant) war. Viewing from this angle and analysing our experience we should find it inescapable to prepare the masses, the party and the armed forces in order to launch and carry on the armed struggle. It is on this that our victory solely depends.

Lenin did not merely reject violence and terrorism as a matter of principle. He directed that all marxists should reject violence in the form of individual terrorism. He pointed out that while not being useful it is extremely harmful to the revolution. Thus he denounced terrorism as unacceptable.

Like all the other revolutions, our peoples war is also undoubtedly a violent revolution. All the peoples armed struggles going on in different parts of our country today are also like-wise violent struggles. Not only we accept violence in principle, but also we actually practice the the revolutionary violence. We have already explained this problem while discussing the problems of armed struggle. It is only the actions which are going on in the form of "actions of annihilation of the class enemy" that we are opposing. We oppose this form because in our opinion, the indiscriminate actions without preparing the masses for armed struggle would be harmful for the armed struggle.

Not only the "actions of annihilation of the class enemy," carried out by the followers of the CP (M.L.) in the Circar, Rayalaseema and Telangana districts of Andhra Pradesh, possess the characteristics of "Roving Rebel Bands" and terrorism as pointed out by Mao and Lenin, but also they have yielded exactly the same results. These actions were carried and based upon the line of thinking of CP (M.L.) leadership on the programme of annihilation of the class enemy". They have caused irreparable losses to the revolutionary movement as well as to the armed struggle in Andhra Pradesh. It cannot be said that this wrong line of thinking of the CP (M.L.) leadership has been implemented in Andhra alone. It is clear that the revolutionary movement, in different parts of the country has suffered to the extent this programme was implemented by their cadres.

We have explained that the "programme of annihilation of the class enemy" does not reflect a correct understanding of the armed struggle and that it is opposed to Marxism Leninism and Mao's thought. We have also shown that it does not conform to what ever experiences of armed struggle we have. The experiences that have already been acquired

clearly show as to how harmful is this deviation. There is no doubt whatsoever that this deviation of theirs is close to the concept of "Roving Rebel Bands" and the individual terrorism" described by Mao and Lenin. If they fail to analyse their own experiences in the light of Marxism-Leninism and Mao's thought, and rectify this deviation, they would travel in the same wrong path and ultimately become divorced from Marxism-Leninism and Mao's Thought.

16. Common points between the revisionists and the leadership of CP (M. L.)

We have so far analysed the incorrect views as well as the incorrect practice of the CP (M.L.) on various questions concerning the armed struggle. Their failure in realising the need for the revolutionary mass movements as well as the struggles for the development of armed struggles has become evident. This has ultimately resulted in the annihilation of the land lords in the name of "annihilation of the class enemy" and claiming it as the armed struggle.

An interesting thing here is that the leadership of the CP (M. L.) have got a main point in common with the old and new revisionists, the very same revisionists whom they are vehemently denouncing day in and day out. The old revisionists who support the ruling classes, who follow the parliamentary path, and who assert that the social changes could be brought about without a revolution, have given up the revolution as well as the revolutionary struggles of the workers and peasants. Though the neo-revisionists sometimes appear to be hesitating in supporting the ruling classes, they are also following the parliamentary path on the plea that there is no revolutionary situation in the country and given up the peasant and working class struggles. Thus both the revisionists have thus given up the building up of revolutionary movement through revolutionary struggles as well as leading of the revolution.

The leadership of the CP (M. L.) who accept the necessity of armed struggle for the revolution and claim that the masses could be

roused through their programme of "annihilation of the class enemy" has also given up the task of building the revolutionary movement through the revolutionary struggles of the workers and peasants.

Thus the old and neo revisionists and the leadership of the CP (M. L.) completely agree on the question of giving up the task of building the revolutionary movement through the revolutionary struggles of the workers and peasants.

The leadership of the Communist Party of India followed a "Left" line during 1948. The theory which this leadership propounded was that since there was a revolutionary situation in the country, the political power could be seized through the "insurrection" by the working class without revolutionary struggles. Following this line of thinking they rejected the path of peoples war. They Vehemently denounced the Andhra Communist Committee as reformist for having proposed the path of peoples war. Similarly the leadership of the CP (M.L.) have also given up the peasant revolutionary struggles, but they have done so in the name of the very peoples war itself. They are denouncing the Communist Revolutionaries of Andhra, who are organising peoples war through peoples revolutionary struggles, as revisionists. Thus what they follow is nothing but the "Left" line. The difference between the Left deviation of 1948 and that of present day lies merely in their slogans of insurrection and peoples war and not in their character. One was advanced in the name of Leninism while the other is being advanced in the name of the Mao's Thought.

There is nothing to wonder about the Left deviation of 1948 as well as the Left deviation of the present day. But what is really surprising is the glaring similarity between the present day revisionism and the leadership of the CP (M. L.) on the fundamental question on the question of rejecting the peoples revolutionary struggles. Yet this is an objective reality. Both these deviations stem from one and the same source. The only difference is that while the revisionism is outside the revolutionary ranks, the Leftism is within the revolutionary ranks.

When there are no differences on the fundamental points between the old and new revisionists and the CP (M.L.) leadership, why should the old and neo-revisionists denounce the leadership of the CP (M.L.)?

For the old and new revisionists who defend the ruling classes, or follow the parliamentary path—the peoples revolutionary struggles, the resistance in self-defence, the armed struggle—all would appear as terrorism. It is exactly for this reason that the old and new revisionists are denouncing all the revolutionaries as terrorists. While the old and new revisionists are denouncing the "left deviation of the leadership of CP (M.L.) from a revisionist stand point, we are pointing out their "LEFT" deviation in the light of Marxism-Leninism—and Mao's Thought and on the basis of the experiences of peoples revolutionary struggles of India. We do so because as Mao says we have to take the lessons from our past mistakes in order not to repeat them in future. The reason for this is to cure the disease in order to save the patient.

We should carry on a serious ideological struggle against the revisionism as well as the "LEFT" deviation and march forward taking all the aspects of armed struggle in to consideration and properly co-ordinating them, if we have to take advantage of the existing revolutionary situation in the country and lead the Indian revolution to a victorious finish. We should Mobilise the masses into peoples revolutionary struggles and simultaneously carry on the armed struggle

V. The Problem of Nationalities : Separate Telangana Movement :

The people of India are not of one nationality as the ruling classes of India claim. There are several nationalities in India. The Peoples Democracy recognises the right of self-determination of all these nationalities. "National Integration", the counter revolutionary slogan of the ruling classes, denies the right of self determination of the nationalities. Giving it their own interpretation, the old and new revisionists are supporting this counter revolutionary slogan of national integration. The Communist Revolutionaries unconditionally support

the right of self determination of the Nationalities. Though the leadership of the CP (M.L.) declare that they recognise the right of self-determination of the nationalities, their understanding as well as their practice is opposed to Marxism-Leninism.

Though a comprehensive study of the problem of nationalities in India is very essential, we would however confine ourselves to the question of Andhra and Telangana which forms a part of A P.

Their understanding of the struggles of various nationalities is as follows :

"—Communists should not be leaders of national struggles. The communists should, however, forge unity with national struggle but the duty of the communists is to develop class struggle and not national struggles. In order to prevent disruption of class struggle, the communists (declare) that every nationality has the right of self-determination including right to secede. Such a declaration will assure the nationalities that by uniting they will not fall into the clutches of a new set of exploiters. And only when they feel assured of this will they participate in the class struggle. We, communists can never become leaders of national struggles even if we try. By trying to become leaders we can only reduce ourselves into mere appendages of the bourgeoisie of various nationalities."

"— as we march forward as the leader of the class struggle, the character of various national struggles it self will begin to change. And on the eve of victory, every national struggle will ultimately be transformed into class struggle."

(Charu Mazumdar, Liberation Nov. 9. 1968)

This is the sum and substance of the above :

- 1) The right of self-determination of the nationalities has to be recognised since the class struggle would be disrupted otherwise.
- 2) The Communists should lead the class struggle, but they should not however lead the struggles of the nationalities.
- 3) We should strive to unite with the struggles of the nationalities.
- 4) Every national struggle would in its

final stage transform itself into a class struggle.

When the leadership of the CP (M.L.) speak of a class struggle, let us assume that what they mean by a class struggle is revolutionary struggle for the seizure of political power. Then what are the classes that participate in a national struggle? Under whose leadership do they participate? And against whom do they fight? What is the relation between the peoples democratic revolution and the right of self-determination of the nationalities? They have no reply for these questions as well as many other questions.

Today to a great extent the linguistic states have been formed in India. The whole of "Hindi" speaking region has not been formed into a single state. [Besides, there are also sub-states, fully attached to the union territories-like this the agitations for the formation of separate states is going on in ever so many forms.] However all these agitations are based on the principle that these states should necessarily form a part and parcel of the Indian union and be under the strict confines of the constitution. In keeping with their class interests, the Indian ruling classes are solving these problems in what ever form and to what ever extent it is necessary to solve them. It goes on endlessly.

The ruling classes have not taken any measures to unite the people on the basis of language even to the extent the linguistic states are formed. The administrative affairs are not being conducted in the popular language. The medium of instruction is not in the popular language. The existing economic and cultural disparities between different regions are not removed. On the contrary, they are further increasing. As a result agitations for small separate states for each region are going on for separate Telangana, Andhra, Mahavidharbha, Maharashtra-all these agitations are of this type. Though these are linguistic states, they are not however based on the unity of nationality. The desire behind these agitations is the formation of smaller states within single linguistic states. These states also wish to remain a part and parcel of the Indian Union.

Though the Indian ruling classes are not so favourably disposed towards these reforms today, it would however be wrong to think that they would oppose these reforms even in the future. If necessary, they might in some form or the other accept the demands for the formation of such small states. In order to safe-guard their class interests.

Such agitations are being led by the feudal and bourgeois classes of these areas. Some section or the other of the big bourgeoisie are at the back of them. Apart from these agitations, the struggles for the right of self-determination of nationalities are also going on in our country. The struggles of Naga, Mizos and the people of Kashmir are of this type. These struggles are going on against the Indian ruling classes. As the Indian ruling classes are dependent upon imperialism for their existence, these struggles are also against imperialism. The local national forces are leading these struggles.

As the agitations and struggles for the right of self-determination are today going on in these areas, similar agitations and struggles may also begin tomorrow in some more states. Thus the right of self-determination is not a local problem. This is an Indian problem. This problem has arisen solely due to the domination of imperialism, big bourgeoisie and feudalism in India. This problem would be solved only when these classes are overthrown through Peoples Democratic Revolution. As the leadership of the CP (M.L.) say, this is not merely a question that saves the class struggle from getting disrupted. But this is a question of great importance for the successful completion of the peoples democratic revolution.

While leading the peoples democratic revolution, the communist revolutionaries also at the same time lead the struggles for the right of self-determination of the nationalities. It is evident from the experiences of the people of Kashmir as well as Nages and Mizos that the reactionary ruling classes would not accept the right of self-determination of nationalities. Yet it is not the communist revolutionaries but the national forces who are leading the struggles for the right of the self-determination in these areas. As the peoples democratic revolution advances under the leadership of the communist revolutionaries, they would as

well take up the leadership of the struggles for the right of self-determination in other states as well as in the whole of India. This would form united front with the national forces. Then they would not only be the leader of the struggle for the right of self-determination but also of the united front.

In another situation, when the national forces are leading the struggle for the right of self-determination of a particular nation or nationalities, the communist revolutionaries, while leading the revolution would at the same time form united front with the national forces. In such a situation, the national forces would dominate and the communist revolutionaries may not be in a position to take up the leadership, into their own hands. In both the situations, as a part of the revolution, the communist revolutionaries would also lead the revolutionary movement for the right of self-determination of the nationalities. Therefore it is wrong to say that the communist revolutionaries should not lead such movements. It is equally wrong to say that when we decide to lead them we would not be in a position to take the leadership into our hands. By our taking up the leadership, the national forces including the petty bourgeoisie would come in to the united front, there by under the leadership of the communist revolutionaries, but the question of communist revolutionaries going under their leadership and becoming appendages to them does not arise. It would be nothing but underestimating the latent revolutionary potentialities of the right of self-determination of the nationalities and keeping them away. By this we would only be isolating ourselves from the masses and handing over the leadership to the petty bourgeoisie and other such forces.

It is not so difficult to understand the inter-relation of the class struggle and the national struggle. Since the peoples democratic revolution is not only directed against the imperialists but also against the big-bourgeoisie, this becomes a national revolution for the whole of the peoples as well as for the people belonging to each of the nationalities of the country. Since it is directed against feudalism and reactionaries that collaborate with feudalism, this becomes a democratic revolution. Thus the national character and the democratic

character are inter-linked in the Peoples Democratic Revolution. Since Peoples Democratic Revolution, in the stage of agrarian revolution is not only directed against the feudalism, but also against the big-bourgeoisie and the Imperialism, this would also have the national character. The leadership of the C P (M.L.) who fail to see the identity between these two are formulating that the class struggle under the leadership of the revolutionaries would in the process take the form of national struggle, that this national struggle would ultimately take the form of class struggle and conclude victoriously.

It would be better if we study what Mao says in this respect.

"In a struggle that is National in character the class struggle takes the form of national struggle, which demonstrates the identity between the two". (Independence and initiative within U. F.)

This was said in respect of anti-Japanese war. In our case, when the peoples democratic revolution is in the stage of agrarian revolution the national character of our struggle would be subordinated to the agrarian revolution. The domination of imperialism together with the domination of the big-bourgeoisie belonging to the other nationalities and the use of the military and the central reserve police belonging to one nationality against the people of other nationalities by the ruling sections from other nationalities to perpetrate their rule would lead to the peoples revolutionary struggles taking the form of national struggles. Therefore at this stage what Mao says would apply to us also. Failing to grasp this, the leadership of the CP (M.L.) are distorting what Mao has said in this respect and misinterpreting it by formulating that the class struggles would at certain stage take the form of national struggles and that the national struggle would in the end take the form of class struggle.

Now let us examine the Telangana problem.

All the Telugu speaking people are Andhras. They live in Telangana (9 districts), in Circar districts (previously 7 and now 8 districts) and in Rayalaseema (4 districts) and in the neighbouring areas. Prior to 1953 the Circar and Rayalaseema districts were part of the Madras

state, while the Telangana districts were a part of the princely state of Hyderabad. With Circar and Rayalaseema districts the Andhra state was formed in the year 1953. Afterward Telangana districts were included in this and Andhra Pradesh was thus formed in the year 1956.

The feudal classes, a section of the traders, businessmen and the employees belonging to Telangana opposed the formation of the Andhra Pradesh. They opposed it on the ground that their interests would not be safe under the political and economic domination of the upper classes of the developed Circar districts.

The then communist party declared that "the peoples Raj in Visalandhra" was their aim claimed that Visalandhra was the national ambition of the Andhras, that it would strengthen the democratic forces and thus carried on a big agitation for the formation of Visalandhra (Andhra Pradesh is the name given to Visalandhra).

It was at this time that the communist party had withdrawn the Telangana armed struggle, given up the revolutionary path and taken up the parliamentary path. Taking advantage of this opportunity the Indian ruling classes took steps to form linguistic states, as one of the political and economic measures to strengthen their position. As a result, the ruling classes could strengthen their own position even in Andhra Pradesh where the position of the communist party was very strong. Gradually the communist party lost even the strength that it gained before 1951 when it was pursuing a revolutionary path. This is solely due to the parliamentary path pursued by the communist party. Failing to recognise this, the old and new revisionists, CPI and CPI (M) started to argue that democracy would flourish in Andhra Pradesh, and that if Telangana is separated there would be nothing but the fascist dictatorship of the land lords in Telangana. They alone should know as to how there would be democracy at one place and the dictatorship at another place as far as the ruling classes remain to be one and the same.

After the formation of the Andhra Pradesh even the national spirit that all the Telugu-speaking people are one has not been strengthened, not to speak of the strengthening of the democratic forces. The main reason for

this is the absence of any democratic and progressive measures in the political, economic, as well as the cultural fields. Owing to the bankrupt policies of the ruling classes, the position of the middle classes has deteriorated. The fear of unemployment has spread among the students. The development in the state remains as ever. This is but the situation obtaining throughout the country today. Besides this the ruling classes are split up. Taking advantage of the discontentment among the middle classes, students, tradesmen as well as the businessmen, the sections of ruling classes who are eliminated from power have launched an agitation against the sections of the ruling classes in power. They have fashioned the struggle on the slogan of separate Telangana.

Hyderabad, Secunderabad and other towns of Telangana joined this movement. Further a strong section of the land lords has also joined and assumed the leadership of the movement.

In short, it is a struggle of the middle class people and the students led by a section of the land lords and the other upper classes of the ruling classes eliminated from power. Separate Telangana state is the aim of this movement. It has also been supported by a section of the big-bourgeoisie.

While such is the objective reality, the understanding of the leadership of the CP-(M.L.) on the Separate Telangana movement is as follows-

"Heroic Telangana is again in revolt". (Liberation, May 1969)

In Saying "again", the leadership of the CP (M. L.) are comparing the Separate Telangana movement with the heroic Telangana Armed Struggle of (1946-51). They are only betraying the bankruptcy of their own revolutionary perspective by comparing the heroic Telangana armed struggle which heralded the Peoples Democratic Revolution in India with the narrow regionalist Separate Telangana Movement. They are hiding the fact that the peasants and workers of Telangana have not participated in this revolt and that this has not got the character of a peasant revolt. Thus the people in some of the towns fought

heroically facing even the bullets from the police. Even then, it is wrong to compare this separate Telangana Movement with the heroic revolutionary Telangana Armed Struggle of 1949-51.

Look at their understanding of the Separate Telangana state:

"The APSCCCR (The M.L. authors) have supported the just struggle of the Telangana people and issued a call to them to intensify their struggle against feudalism, and the rule of the land lords and the comprador bureaucratic capitalists, overthrow them and establish their own peoples state of Telangana."

"No, the people of Telangana will not allow their fate to be decided at Delhi by their sworn enemies..... They are taking to the path of armed struggle to overthrow the rule of the land lords and other exploiting classes and establish their own state".

(Liberation, May 1969)

We have already stated that the peasants and workers have not participated in the Separate Telangana Movement. They remained neutral. Therefore, however militant this struggle might have been, it had only remained a struggle of the middle class people. It was because of the fact that, this struggle was led and supported by a section of the same big-bourgeoisie and feudal classes who are exploiting them.

The "Peoples Raj" in Telangana or in any other part of the country without the overthrow of the ruling classes is inconceivable. Such being the case, only the people who advanced such a slogan should alone know as to how could there be "Peoples Raj" in Telangana alone. In the past the Communist Party advanced the slogan of "Peoples Raj" in Visalandhra". Visalandhra has been formed But there has been no "Peoples Raj". On the contrary we have got the big land lord, big-bourgeoisie rule. In the light of these experiences, it could be easily said that the fate of the slogan of "Peoples Raj in Telangana" would not be different from this. Separate Telangana could be formed now. But there could be no "Peoples Raj". Once again there would be the rule of the big land lords and the big bourgeoisie.

In the peoples democratic revolution, it is the nationality and not a part of a nationality which would be the basis for the right of self-determination. The people of Telangana form only a part of the Andhra nationality and not a separate nationality by themselves. Therefore, it is the nationality of Andhra as a whole that has the right of self-determination and not the peoples of Telangana separately by themselves.

No peoples struggle can take the path of armed struggle without the participation of the peasants and workers. Hence it can not be victorious. Similarly the Separate Telangana movement which came up as a middle class revolt could not take the path of armed struggle.

Together with the opposition towards the ruling classes of Andhra Pradesh, the fate against the people of the Andhra region had also become the basis for this movement. To call upon the peasants to participate in such a movement is nothing but tailing behind the upper classes leading the movement. This is nothing but rank opportunism.

It is wrong to think that the present ruling classes are against the formation of Separate Telangana or such other small states. In order to strengthen their own position, they would never go back even to divide a linguistic region into a number of small states. The formation of such small states has already began in other forms. "Meghalaya" is an example of this. Giving additional Powers to Telangana Regional Committee is also an aspect we should bear in mind.

In pursuance of the directives, the followers of the leadership of the CP (M.L.) had participated in the Separate Telangana movement. What were the results that they had achieved? How far could they advance the revolutionary movement? How far could they march fatward?

Today the ruling classes are caught in a crisis and there are splits among them as a result. The break-away groups are coming out with many slogans, in order to take advantage of the discontentment among the masses, divert them from the revolutionary movements, bring them in to their hold and thus enhance

their own influence. Seperate Telangana is one such slogan. They are also able to mobilise people, especially the urban middle class people on such slogans. Even after seeing all this, if the revolutionaries still support these slogans and the movements, there could not be any betrayal worse than this.

In all cases such as Seperate Telangana movement, the revolutionaries should unmask the counter-revolutionary and reactionary nature of these movements and thus demote themselves. We should warn the people of Telangana that they, as a part of the people of Andhra and of India, would only be able to achieve their own liberation by overthrowing the ruling classes through agrarian revolution, and that they should not waste their energies on the diversionist slogans such as this. Taking advantage of the splits and the internal struggle among ruling classes, we should formulate proper programme and take the revolutionary movement forward. If we do not immediately intensify our struggle against the sections of exploiting classes fighting the government, and concentrate our struggle against the sections of the ruling classes supporting the government we would be able to easily develop the revolutionary movement.

By pursuing such a line the communist revolutionaries could develop the revolutionary movement in the districts of Telangana. On the contrary the leadership of the CP (M. L.) actually aided the reactionary classes by supporting the slogan of Seperate Telangana. They failed to give a revolutionary programme to the people of Telangana.

while the CPI and the CPI (M) were supporting the section of the ruling classes in the name of intergration, the leadership of the CP (M. L.), under the cover of their revolutionary phrasemongering and in the name of 'Peoples Raj' in Telangana supported the reactionary leadership of the Seperate Telangana movement which is but a part of the revolutionary ruling classes. This is nothing but rank opportunism.

VI. Unity among the revolutionaries :

Today all the followers of Mao's Thought are not in a single party in India. One group has formed the communist party of India

(Marxist-Leninist). The other group is the Communist revolutionaries. They have not yet formed an all India Party. There are also groups other than these two in some states.

Today the development of the revolutionary movement is uneven in the country. The revolutionaries are working based upon this. Majority of the revolutionaries who are having mass contact and building the revolutionary movement, are being subjected to repression by the ruling classes. It has therefore become imperative for them to carry on their work secretly.

There is confusion among the revolutionaries on the ideological, programmatical and tactical questions facing the Indian revolution. They are able to realise the past mistakes to an extent. But still they are not in a position to come to a correct understanding. It is the duty of the leadership not only to point out but also to correctly solve the problems facing the revolutionaries.

It is with this view that we have formulated our immediate Programme. While incorporating in it the main points of the general programme, we have at the same time given to the revolutionaries the necessary programme for developing the agrarian revolution in the countryside. We have also given a programme for implementation in the cities. Mainly we have kept the experiences of Telangana armed struggle (1946-51) in view in formulating this programme.

This is not a programme meant for scholarly discussions. It is only aimed at helping the immediate activities of the revolutionaries. The revolutionary movement has developed to the extent the revolutionaries have implemented this programme. Reaching the higher stage today the movement has taken the form of armed struggle in some areas. Thus this is a programme of armed struggle as well. The experiences of the past one and half years have proved the correctness of this programme. We realise that this effort also is not sufficient. We have to examine the experiences of various revolutionary groups in the past two or three years and take correct lessons from them. Though the Telangana armed struggle (1946-51) is important among all struggles, yet we have to review the other peasant

revolutionary struggles. We have to a greater extent base ourselves on the experiences of these struggles to explain the incorrect attitude of the leadership of the C P (M. L.) on various issues.

side by side with this there is a need for serious ideological struggle among the revolutionaries. We should for this purpose examine our past experiences and ensure that the past mistakes are not repeated. Conducting ideological struggles after the fashion of academic discussions without any relevance to the revolutionary practice is not new for us. However the ideological discussions that went on during the period of Telengana armed struggle (1946-51) were not of this nature. Basing itself on the problems of the armed struggle of that day, the Andhra Communist Committee resolved that our revolution also should follow the path of the Chinese revolution and placed it before the party for discussion. The then all India leadership which had nothing to do with the revolutionary practice, rejected the Chinese path as revisionism. Since the ideological struggle carried on thereafter was conducted only within the confines of parliamentary path, naturally it had no relation whatsoever to the revolutionary practice.

Today all the revolutionaries accepting Mao's Thought as the Marxism-Leninism of this era are not of one opinion on the problems and practise concerning the Indian revolution. The revolutionaries would have come closer had they correctly grasped their experiences of the past two years in building revolutionary movement as well as conducting revolutionary armed struggle. But the group leading the CP (M. L.) is not able to correctly apply Mao's Thought to the Indian conditions. This leadership is failing to properly understand its own experiences and to take correct lessons from them. In order to hide this fact, they are purposely slandering the fellow-revolutionaries as revisionists, counter-revolutionaries, so on and so forth. Merely chanting Mao's quotations, they claim themselves to be the sole heirs of Mao's Thought. They are revising the fundamental principles of Marxism-Leninism and Mao's Thought in the name of learning lessons from the so called new experiences. In the discussions on various questions, we

have so far tried to apply these principles correctly.

Let us examine some of their formulations that stand in the way of unity among the revolutionaries.

Is Mere Chanting of Mao's Name - Internationalism ?

They are trumpeting that they are internationalists and that Mao is their party's Chairman. This trumpeting of theirs has got nothing to do with the proletarian internationalism. Our proletarian internationalism should possess the following main characteristics :

- (1) We should to a greater extent make use of the experiences of the Chinese revolution to successfully complete the Indian revolution. We would be able to fulfil this task only by applying Mao's Thought to the Indian conditions and conducting the revolution. We should examine the experiences of the revolutions that went on so far, as well as the revolutions still going on in various countries and apply them to the extent they are applicable to us.
- (2) We should defend Marxism-Leninism and Mao's Thought from the attacks of Revisionism and Left Sectarianism.
- (3) We should face the attacks of the Imperialists and the Social Imperialists and defend the policies of the Communist Party of China.
- (4) We should expose the war preparations and the conspiracies of the Indian ruling classes against China and Pakistan with the overt and covert support of the Imperialists and the social imperialists. We should mobilise the masses against these war preparations and conspiracies. If the Indian ruling classes launch a war of aggression against China, we should intensify the revolution, convert it into a Civil War and hasten the overthrow of the ruling classes.
- (5) Successfully completing the peoples democratic revolution, which smashes the imperialism and social-imperialism in India by itself is the greatest of our international duties. This would not only liberate the Indian people from imperialism but also it would weaken the

chief architect of imperialism as well as its ally, prevent the world war and pave the way for world peace.

This is what ought to be our proletarian internationalism. Distorting this revolutionary outlook, the leadership of this group has reduced it to the few words, "the Chinese Chairman is our Chairman". They thought that they need not in actual practice follow Mao's Thought if they keep repeating these few words. They are only saying this for the purpose of defending their own wrong theories.

As they have distorted the armed struggle and reduced it into their "programme of annihilation of the class enemy", they have also distorted the Mao's Thought and reduced it into the few words, that "the Chinese Chairman is our Chairman".

This and their claim that Mao himself is personally leading them only shows that they have no confidence in their own policies. Further, it is clear that in their own party the ordinary cadre and the party members are not prepared to accept them unless they are said to be Mao's policies. They should be prepared to bear the responsibility for their own incorrect policies. They should take lessons from their experience and rectify them. But it is unpardonable to cash on them in the name of Com. Mao.

This is nothing but a deliberate attempt of silencing the criticism of their wrong policies from the ordinary cadre and the fellow revolutionaries or at evading the responsibility of answering the criticism of their own ranks if any. Just because of this the revolutionaries would not go back to criticise them. They are fast realising through their own revolutionary experiences, as to how utterly wrong are the policies of the leadership of the CP (M.L.) and criticising them. We believe that this criticism of ours would help them in their endeavour.

In the name of suggestions and directives from International leadership, the All India leadership had, on many occasions in the past forced their wrong policies, especially their reformist and revisionist policies on the party

and betrayed the Indian revolution. The leadership of the CP (M.L.) is now travelling in the same path. They are forcing their wrong policies on their cadres and party members in the name of Com Mao.

2. United Front with the followers of Mao's thought :

In their draft programme and other articles they have suggested united front with the other groups of communist revolutionaries in the country who were carrying on the armed struggle.

Today there are people, other than the communist revolutionaries in the country, who are also carrying on armed struggle in the Naga and Mizo areas. They are conducting armed struggle against the Indian ruling classes for their right of self-determination. It would have been correct, if they had proposed united front with such groups. But it is not with them that the leadership of the CP (M.L.) proposes the "united front".

We have already mentioned that there are groups other than CP (M.L.) who are following Mao's Thought in India today. "The Revolutionary Communist Committee of Andhra Pradesh" is one of them. In Telangana the armed struggle is going on for the past 18 months under the leadership of this committee. In the beginning, the leadership of the CP (M.L.) carried on a vilification campaign against the leadership of the "Revolutionary Communist Committee of Andhra Pradesh" stating that the leadership of the "Revolutionary Communist Committee of Andhra Pradesh" was opposed to armed struggle, and that they were revisionists, thereby trying to defend themselves for not having admitted "the Andhra Pradesh Revolutionary Communist Committee" into their committee. Within a short time afterwards, the armed struggle was launched in Telangana under the leadership of the "APRCC". With this they should have at least realised their mistake. Instead they tried to bluff that "In opposition to the anti-armed struggle the leadership of Andhra Pradesh local cadres started it". The fact is, we have never recognised "the programme of annihilation of the class enemy" by the squads as an armed struggle. Our policy is to 'prepare

the masses for the armed struggle and to carry on the peoples armed struggle basing on the experiences of Telangana armed struggle (1946 - 51). This is fully in accord with Mao's Thought. It is on this basis that we are working in Andhra Pradesh to prepare the masses for armed struggle. We have launched and are carrying the armed struggle in a vast area of Telangana where the masses were ready for armed struggle. There are no differences among the leadership nor are there any between the leadership and the cadre on the question of armed struggle. They must be dreaming of such differences.

In any case, as the launching of armed struggle in Telangana is an objective reality, probably unable to withstand the pressure from their cadres the leadership of the CP (M.L.) is giving this slogan of "united front" in order to show that they are adopting a positive attitude towards the armed struggle launched by the communist revolutionaries. This is nothing but rank opportunism.

In India today, armed struggle is the deciding factor between Revisionism and Mao's Thought. Whoever follow Mao's Thought and lead armed struggle could not be revisionists nor could they be petty-bourgeois revolutionaries. They are the communist revolutionaries who follow Marxism-Leninism and Mao's Thought.

It is evident that there are differences on the question of how to conduct the armed struggle. It would be possible to resolve these differences through experience. We strongly believe that by now most of their followers have realised the incorrectness of the armed struggle policy of their leadership, that it is terrorism and also that the peoples revolution could not be developed by this. All of them should follow the path of peoples armed struggle sooner or later.

Instead of admitting and rectifying their mistakes, a very serious mistake, and uniting with the communist revolutionaries, the leadership of the CP (M.L.) are giving the slogan of "united front" with the local cadres only to carry on their wrong policies in another form. Thus they are prolonging the division among the revolutionaries.

The united front, we build during the peoples democratic revolution would also be the united front to carry on the armed struggle. The bourgeois groups as well as the petty-bourgeois groups that carry on armed struggle would also find a place in it. Such groups would have separate ideologies of their own class. They would also have separate programmes of their own. They would accept the peoples democratic programme, join the united front, and carry on the armed struggle along with the revolutionaries. The communist revolutionaries would lead the armed struggle as a party. Who ever carry on armed struggle on the basis of Mao's Thought can not be bourgeois or petty-bourgeois. They are the communist revolutionaries. For this reason, all those that are following the Mao's Thought and conducting the armed struggle should form one single party and not a united front. They should resolve their differences through inner-party discussions. Abandoning this basic principle which would strengthen the unity among the revolutionaries, the leadership of the CP (M.L.) is proposing the principle of "united front" which would only increase the divisions.

At the same time, it is essential that they should understand another thing. Many of the cadres and units of CP (M.L.) are not conducting the armed struggle. It is not so difficult for some of the cadres and militants to form themselves into squads and carry on 'the programme of annihilation of class enemy.' Yet their followers are not implementing this programme. They should have either refused to implement "the programme of annihilation of the class enemy" despite the directives of their leadership or the leadership should have retained them in the party in order to boost numerical strength even though they refuse to implement this programme. Why is it that this leadership is not openly denouncing these units and cadres who are not implementing "the programme of annihilation of the class enemy" as revisionists? Is it not opportunism? Why the double standards?

3. Form non-antagonistic contradiction to antagonistic contradiction :

With the formation of the All India Co-ordination Committee of the Communist Revolutionaries in 1967, all the revolutionaries

were happy about the possibility of all the revolutionaries following Mao's Thought coming together and forming a revolutionary party. The communist revolutionaries throughout the country did not come out of the CPI (M.) all at a time. On one side they were carrying on the innerparty struggle against the neo-revisionist leadership and at the same time mobilising the communist revolutionaries in their respective states for coming out of the CPI (M)

The leadership of the All India Co-ordination Committee who did not understand the importance of mobilising all the revolutionaries under one single Centre, openly criticised this as "opportunism". Instead of allowing the communist revolutionaries that came out of the CP (M) in each state forming a single Co-ordination committee, they started forming separate Co-ordination committee with their supporters.

In some of the states the majority of the revolutionaries refused to join these committees which had become the centres of various opportunist forces. Through their group in the states they carried on propaganda against such of those revolutionaries that refused to join them as revisionists. Thus, having left with no alternative, they formed separate committees. Thus in many states the attitude of this leadership itself had led to the formation of two separate centres. Andhra is one among such states.

At the time of joining the AICC, the representatives of the APRCC had frankly expressed that the attitude of the leadership on the question of nationalities as well as the elections was also not acceptable to them. At the same time, they expressed the opinion that they could, being in the same committee, resolve these differences through internal discussions and experiences. They had also pointed out that it would not be possible to conduct the armed struggle if all the revolutionaries, preparing the masses for armed struggle did not form a party and therefore urged them to take necessary steps for the formation of a party. They had joined the All India Co-ordination Committee with these views.

But this did not yield the results that the

revolutionaries hoped for. This merger became merely nominal since the leadership of the AICC had continued to carry on their group politics in Andhra as well as other states. Making use of the already existing differences as well as the differences cropping up just then, they carried on a propaganda that the Andhra leadership was opposed to armed struggle, misled the Srikakulam committee which was already leading the armed struggle; took them to their side and formed the communist party of India (Marxist-Leninist) with the groups they had under their leadership by them in various states. They had expelled the APRCC from the AICC in Feb 1969 itself and announced that they would maintain non-antagonistic relations with them. Thus they laid the foundations for the formation of two or more separate centres of the revolutionaries in India.

In spite of their announcement that they would maintain 'non antagonistic' relations with the APRCC, they had in actual practice pursued antagonistic relations with them. Their followers had tried to disrupt and wipe out the communist revolutionaries with blind hatred and antagonism. But they had utterly failed in their attempts. In 1969 the armed struggle was launched in Telangana under the leadership of the communist revolutionaries. Some efforts towards this end were also made in other districts. The groups of communist revolutionaries from various states who refused to join the CP (M.L.) wished to work along with the "Andhra Pradesh Revolutionary Communist Committee".

The leadership of the C P (M. L.) did not welcome this development. This served as an eye opener for many of their followers whose aim was armed struggle, and also made them realise the need for rethinking about their attitude towards the Andhra Pradesh Revolutionaries. Yet their leadership has not recognised their mistake and tried to rectify it. They have been making a vain bid to isolate the Andhra leadership and to win over their cadre.

Thus even the armed struggle launched in Telengana could not become a basis for unity. It could not at least help for a return from antagonistic relations to non-antagonistic relations. Finally two centres have taken the

organisational form.

Not only the organisational functions of these two centres is separate, but also they are following two separate lines. We have already discussed these questions and expressed our views. It is possible to be in one party and to resolve these differences through innerparty discussions. But with the leadership of CP (M. L.) who are incorrectly implementing the Mao's Thought who are denouncing the APR CC who are correctly implementing the Mao's Thought as revisionists, and forming a separate party, the two centres came into existence.

The leadership of the CP (M. L.), whose aim is not the unity of the revolutionaries on the basis of Mao's Thought, have gone from the non-antagonistic relations to antagonistic relations with the leadership of the "Andhra Praesh Revolutionary Communist Committee" who are carrying on armed struggle following the Mao's Thought. This is nothing but the direct result of their own policies.

4. It is only when correct leadership is provided to the Revolution that revolutionary authority is established ;

We have already shown as to how the CP (M. L.) has failed in the field of ideology, armed struggle as well as achieving the unity among the revolutionaries. Unmindful of such a serious mistake at the very outset, they are now going to establish their "Revolutionary Authority". They are openly declaring that the recognition of their "revolutionary authority" is the prerequisite for the revolutionary unity.

See what they are saying :

"Today, the situation is such that if we are to advance the revolution in the face of the attacks of revisionism and the reactionaries we must conscientiously and seriously wage a struggle to establish the revolutionary authority of comrade of Charu Mazumdar. Our slogan is, internationally we must follow Chairman Mao, vice-Chairman Lin Piao and the great, glorious and correct Communist Party of China as well as world-lessons of the Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution. Nationally, we must be loyal to Chairman Mao, vice-Chairman Lin Piao, and the Communist Party of

China, and must fully accept the revolutionary authority of the leadership of Comrade Charu Mazumdar. Only thus can the revolutionary unity be built and the revolution win victory." (Liberation, February 1970, Pages 49-50)

We, the communist revolutionaries accept Mao's Thought as the Marxism-Leninism of this era. We accept it as a guide for our revolutionary practice. We firmly believe that only by correctly applying Mao's Thought to the concrete conditions of India and leading the revolution would the Indian revolution become victorious. The kernel of Mao's Teachings, Lin Piao's writings, the revolutionary experiences of the Proletarian Cultural Revolution itself is the Mao's Thought.

Contrary to this, the leadership of the CP (M.L.) are merely chanting the names of Mao, Lin Piao and the Chinese Communist Party. They have totally failed in applying Mao's Thought to the concrete conditions of India. While this is the truth, they are making use of these names to make their wrong policies attractive to their cadre as well as to escape the responsibility of answering their criticisms

This leadership has failed in leading the Naxalbari armed struggle. The recent experiences show that they have also failed in leading the Srikakulam armed struggle. In Bengal, when ruling classes are enmeshed in a serious crisis and when the revolutionary situation is ripe, this leadership has confined itself to "the actions of annihilation of the class enemy", instead of mobilising the masses for armed struggle through revolutionary mass programme and revolutionary mass movement. This leadership has completely failed in leading the armed struggles, in the very primary stage. It is clear that they are chanting the names of Mao and others solely for the purpose of hiding this utter failure of theirs.

The revolutionary authority of the leadership could be established only in the course of revolution and by providing correct leadership to the revolution. Similarly the revolutionary unity also could only be achieved in the course of the revolution. By providing correct leadership of the revolutionaries should successfully complete the revolution. For a leadership

which has failed to fulfill all these tasks, it would be ridiculous to bring up the question of establishing their revolutionary authority".

We might, in the beginning commit mistakes owing to our limited or lack of experience in conducting the revolutionary struggles. Drawing correct lessons from these mistakes, we should strive to provide correct leadership. This is what a humble leadership should do.

There are no leaders in India who can even sit along side Mao and Lin Piao. The Indian revolution has yet to produce such a leaders. The sooner the leadership of CP (M.L.) realises this the better for them.

They are denouncing us as revisionists. But they have failed to point out even a single formulation either in our thinking or in our practice, which revises Mao's Thought. It is clear that they are adopting this method for the purpose of misleading their followers.

From this it is evident that the unity of the revolutionaries is possible only through serious ideological struggle. The experiences show that the unity of the revolutionaries would become possible only when the revolutionaries within the CP (M.L.) carry on an uncompromising struggle against the erroneous "Left" policies of this leadership and unite with the revolutionaries outside the CP (M.L.) on the basis of Mao's Thought.

We have discussed here the main differences between us and the leadership the CP (M.L.), shown where they are making mistakes and put forward our stand. The following is the sum total of these discussions

1. The principle contradiction in the present Indian Society is the contradiction between feudalism ~~(and big bourgeoisie)~~ on the one hand and the vast masses of the people on the other. It is wrong to show this as a contradiction between feudalism and the poor peasantry. Due to this, the revolutionary nature of the struggle against feudalism would degenerate to the nature of economic struggle and narrow down. While carrying on the armed struggle for the seizure of political power and abolition of feudalism, the masses would also carry on revolutionary struggle to resolve the contradiction between them and the imperialism.

2. There is a revolutionary situation in the country. But at the same time the development of the revolutionary movement is uneven in the country. Basing on this, we should mobilise the masses into the revolutionary struggle and prepare them for armed struggle. Just because there is a revolutionary situation, it would be wrong to abandon the revolutionary struggle and take up the "programme of the annihilation of the class enemy". In the name of armed struggle.

3. As it is wrong to confine the masses to economic struggles, (which is known as economism), it is also wrong to refuse to mobilise the masses on political and economic demands, especially on political demands in the name of bhunning economism. Through these struggles the masses would, out of their own experience realise the need for armed struggle. In the present revolutionary situation, the masses in different parts of the country would quickly realise the need for armed struggle depending upon the level of the mass movement of the respective areas.

4. The armed struggle which has got the base of the revolutionary mass movement would alone become successful. For this, the building of revolutionary mass organisations, the implementation to the extent the masses are ready of the agrarian revolutionary programme which is a peoples revolutionary programme is essential. When we say that the armed struggle is the main form of struggle in the present revolutionary situation, it would be wrong to say that the armed struggle is the only form of struggle and to reject all the other necessary forms of struggles. Likewise it is also wrong to equate the "programme of the annihilation of the class enemy" with the armed struggle. Based upon the peoples democratic revolutionary programme, the masses would take up the armed struggle as the main form of struggle to overthrow the ruling classes, would defeat the armed forces of the ruling classes and seize the political power into their own hands. In any stage of the armed struggle - even in the primary stage the programme of annihilation of the class enemy could not be a programme of the armed struggle. Similarly it is also wrong to say that we should rouse the masses through "the programme of annihilation of the class

85

⊗ please see pages 32 and 33 for an explanation of this point.

enemy". Like "economism", terrorism also gives up the task of building the revolutionary movement through revolutionary mass movements. Both "Economism" and "Terrorism" are one in this respect. There is terrorism in the armed struggle outlook of the leadership of the CP (M.L.).

5. The support of the leadership of the CP (M.L.) to the separate Telangana movement is incorrect. They tailed one of the groups of the ruling classes. The people of Telangana do not form a separate nationality. The separate Telangana movement was not a struggle for the right of self-determination. This is not a national struggle for the unification of the nationality of Andhra. Further the very slogan of "Peoples Raj" in Telangana is opposed to Marxism-Leninism. It is impracticable. The "Peoples Raj" in India and in Andhra as a part of India could be established only when the ruling classes are defeated through Peoples war. But to advance a slogan of "Peoples Raj" in Telangana alone would be a fraud on the masses. When the ruling classes are fighting among themselves, we should make use of these contradictions and advance the revolution but should not tail behind one of these groups of the reactionary ruling classes. This is nothing but opportunism.

6. We do not recognise the revolutionary authority of the leadership of the CPI (M.L.). They have failed in fulfilling of the main tasks—the task of leading the revolutionary struggles as well as the task of unifying the revolutionaries. The leadership that could fulfil these tasks would alone have the revolutionary authority. This would be possible only in the course of the revolution. We would be able to fulfil this task only when we apply Marxism-Leninism and Mao's Thought to the concrete conditions of India, unite the revolutionaries on the basis of the armed struggle and leading the revolution. It is essential to do this as early as possible.

These are the differences on the fundamental questions. Based on our limited experiences, we have endeavoured to analyse them in the light of Marxism-Leninism and Mao's Thought. The essence of this wrong trend of the leadership of CP (M.L.) is "Left opportunism". It is due to this deviation that they

refuse to recognise the decisive role of the revolutionary mass movement for the overthrow of the ruling classes through armed struggle. In the organisational field, they are adopting groupism and thus obstructing the revolutionary unity of the revolutionaries on the basis of Mao's Thought.

"Left" opportunism is not new in the Indian revolutionary movement. The Communist party fell into the hands of the "Left" opportunist leadership in 1948. Through its "Left" policies this leadership did irreparable damage to the party. On some of the main issues, there is a similarity between the policies of the two. With the slogan of insurrection, in the name of Marx, Engels, Lenin and Stalin, the then "Left" leadership rejected the protracted war based on the Mao's Thought and agrarian revolution. The present "Left" leadership refuses to apply Mao's Thought to the Indian concrete conditions in the very name of Mao, Lin Piao and the Chinese Communist Party. In the name of "annihilation of the class enemy", they are taking the armed struggle on a wrong path. Both of them reject the decisive role of the revolutionary mass movement in the seizure of political power, by the people. Both refuse to take the experiences of the Telangana armed struggle for formulating the path of armed struggle in India. In the name of the suggestions from the International leadership, both forced their "Left" policies on the party. Though these two "Left" policies belong to two different historical periods, it is interesting to note the similarities between the two.

When the Chinese communist Party was under the influence of the "Left" opportunism, Com. Mao waged a serious struggle and defeated it and carried forward the Chinese revolution creating a glorious history. Today in India also, it is essential to carry on a serious struggle against both revisionism and "Left" opportunism. Only then would the Indian revolution march forward.

The Indian revolution that has begun very late and facing many ups and downs is going on under a very favourable national and international situation. The victory of the proletarian cultural revolution in China, the advance of the revolution in Indo China, Africa, Latin America and Arab countries, the imperialism caught in the crisis and leading towards its end,

and the exposure of the anti-people, pro-imperialist policies of the Soviet Social imperialists all these offers us internationally favourable conditions. The remarkable role of Peoples China as the centre of the world revolution stands as a powerful safe-guard for these favourable conditions. Due to the divisions and controversies growing among the ruling classes of the country, they are enmeshed in a serious crisis. There is not only a revolutionary situation, but also there are revolutionary struggles raging throughout the country. The experiences of the Chinese revolution as well as the experiences of various revolutions are available for the revolutionaries in the country. The bankruptcy of the parliamentary path of the social democratic parties is getting exposed. Nationally these are the favourable conditions. Yet the disunity among the Indian Revolutionaries stands as an impediment to the progress of the Indian revolution. Though the revolution had suffered losses due to the fascist repression unleashed by the ruling

classes and as a result the advance of revolution has to some extent suffered a temporary setback, the revolutionary forces would undoubtedly overcome these setbacks and march forward.

We hope that our criticism would prove useful to the Indian revolutionaries to conduct a healthy discussion on all the problems facing the Indian revolution today.

Let us unite on the basis of

**MARXISM-LENINISM AND MAO'S
THOUGHT**

Andhra Pradesh Revolutionary Communist
Committee.

1-10-1970

(This document is the translation from its
Telugu original)



THE PROLETARIAN LINE

For the Six months starting from July the subscription rates will be as following :

Single copy	Rupees 4 (Inland)	U. S. Dollars 4 (Foreign)
Six months	Rupees 24 (Inland)	U. S. Dollars 24 (Foreign)

+
+ +

6. Bakunin, Mikhail Alexandrovich (1814-76) Russian anarchist, a vowed enemy of Marxism Expelled from First International at Hague congress (1872) for splittism.

7. Mulberger, Arthur (1847-1907) German physician, petty bourgeois publicist, proudhonist.

8. International (cited in Para 3 of letter) The International Working Men's Association known as the First International. Marx formed it in 1864, headed by Marx and Engels. Guided economic and political struggles of workers of different countries. Fought against Proudhonism Bakuninism, trade unionism, Lassalleanism. Virtually ceased to exist after Hague congress (1872), dissolved in 1876.

9. Hague (cited in para 3 of the letter): Reference to Hague congress (Sept. 1872). Attended by 15 national organisations, directed by Marx and Engles. Culminated the struggle against various kinds of petty bourgeois sectarianism. Led to formation of working class parties in a number of countries.

CORRECTION

1. Towards the end of first para of the letter, "true Lassalleism" is mentioned. The word "true" was emphasised by Engles. Emphasis is missing in print.

2. The first sentence on page 59 of THE PROLETARIAN LINE should read as : But both the General Association of German workers and

10. Volksstaat : (cited at the end of para 3 of the letter): Reference is to Engel's article " In the International" published in Der Volksstaat (the People's State), the Central organ of Eisenachers Biweekly, later triweekly, period 1869-76. Liebknecht and Bebel led it for revolutionary cause. Marx and Engels guided it and contributed articles.

11. Neue Social Democrat (New Social Democrat) : Lassallean triweekly of 1871-1876. Accomodation to the Bismarck regime, sectarian and opportunist. Consistently opposed the First International, supported anti-proletarian elements. After Gotha Congress (1876), which tronned Lassalleanism, it fused with Volksstaat to come out as Vorwärts (Forward).

12. Hegel (1770-1831) (cited in para 5 of the letter) : Hegel's sentence is from his work 'Phenomenology of mind'. Hegel - outstanding classical German philosopher, objective idealist. Exponent of idealist dialectics in its most comprehensive form.

and the Social-Democratic WORKERS 'party to-still form only a very small minority of the German working class.

3. Please see column 2 on page 59, 12 line from below : The word "infamies" is misprinted as "inflammies".

CORRECTION

In "The Proletarian Line" of November 1979 (Number Four) we had published the document "Loft trend among the Indian revolutionaries", originally written in 1970 as the supplement. The readers are requested to make the following corrections.

In the above article there are a few referenes to Lin-Piao. We had to refer to him because the late Charu Majumdar did it, and by that time Lin-Piao's treachery was not known to the world.

On page 19 column 2 of the document we

have quoted Lin-Piao to show that the leadership of CPI (ML) has used the quotation wrongly to defend its programme of class annihilation. So our comment on the quotation is correct and hence we do not withdraw the comment. Similarly there are references to his name on page 50, 51 and 52 of the Article. These references to him should have been omitted while editing. We did not do this because of oversight. We request the readers to treat them as omitted.

"ADITYAN"
1-12-1979.

