

THE RIGHT OPPORTUNIST TREND
WITHIN THE PARTY

The Proletarian Line Publications

THE RIGHT OPPORTUNIST TREND WITHIN THE PARTY

(The article is Reproduced from the 8th Issue of
The Proletarian Line)

SUPPLEMENT

The Right Opportunist Trend Inside The Party

Ever since the Communist revolutionaries had broken away from neo-revisionism, they had to carry on a struggle on two fronts—one against revisionism and the other against left adventurism. Based on the formulation that the revisionism is the main danger, we carried on a struggle against neo-revisionism. In this, our struggle, we mainly based ourselves on the documents of the Communist Party of China, released in connection with its ideological struggle against international revisionism led by Communist Party of Soviet Union (General line for the International Communist Movement, Nine Comments etc.). In this ideological struggle, we rallied a considerable number of members and sympathisers of the Communist Party (Marxist), formed the Co-ordination Committee of the Communist revolutionaries and carried on the revolutionary activities.

The Charu Mazumdar group had already taken up the adventurist line by the time we had broken away from neo-revisionism. With its left adventurist slogans, this group had made serious efforts to split our rank and file and to finish us off. With this the struggle against the left adventurism had come to fore as an immediate problem. The State Co-ordination Committee had come to realise that the implementation of a militant mass programme was needed along with the ideological struggle and that only then would the ideological struggle be secured with the foundations of revolutionary practice. It had therefore drafted the circular "Lay Foundation for a Struggle Oriented Mass Movement", and released it to the units of the revolutionaries. Thus the State Co-ordination Committee had equipped the cadre with the necessary immediate programme to safe-guard the contact

with the masses and to organise and mobilise them into struggles.

Next, we formulated the Immediate Programme. The State Convention had adopted it. We had incorporated all the fundamental points of our programme and tactical line in it. Though this is not a fullpledged programme and tactical line that applies to the whole of India, we could never-the-less lay in it theoretical and programmatic foundations for our immediate ideological struggle and revolutionary practice. This document had been our guide until we formed into an all India organisation and formulated the programme and the tactical line. The experiences of the units that strove to build a revolutionary mass movement on the basis of these two documents have fully testified to the correctness of the fundamental points incorporated in these documents. The objective of the programme laid down in these two documents is to build agrarian revolutionary movement in the countryside and prepare the people for taking up the form of armed struggle.

The Charu Mazumdar group denounced the programme of agrarian revolutionary movement as economism and revisionism. In reply to this criticism, we released the document, "Left Trend among the Indian Revolutionaries", wherein we criticised the programme of "annihilation of class enemy" as well as other policies of this group. Eventhough this is mainly directed against the Charu Mazumdar group, it also applies to the revolutionaries as well since the remnants of this trend might be existing among them also.

It becomes evident from an analysis of the

main points of the document, "Khammam Area Committee's Reply" that the trend of the Charu Mazumdar group has also made its appearance in a different form in our party. In our document, "Left Deviation within the Party" we had analysed and offered our criticism on various points of this document and pointed out the correct line. Today, this document is with all the units

So far, both the attacks on the Immediate Programme have come from the 'Left' adventurist view point. Now Com. Somaiah is attacking the Immediate Programme from another angle. Attacking the Immediate Programme and the circular, "Lay foundations for a Struggle-Oriented Mass Movement", Com. Somaiah has, in his document "Immediate Programme - Our Experiences", formulated that they manifest economism and adventurism and that the organisational outlook of the State Committee manifests sectarianism. But this document is keeping mum on a number of important questions raised by the adventurists from within the party and without. Apart from being negative in approach, this document with all its revolutionary phrase-mongering manifests right revisionist subjective outlook. It is very essential for our party units to clearly grasp the form and content of the outlook manifesting itself within our party.

1. MUTUALLY CONTRADICTORY PRONOUNCEMENTS

Not only from the title but also from the various points discussed in this document "Immediate Programme - Our Experiences", it is clear that this document is aimed at attacking the Immediate Programme. In his introduction, to "this document" of his, Com. Somaiah himself states, about "differences on the fundamental questions". But at one place it states that the path of the armed struggle adopted in the Immediate Programme is correct. This may give rise to doubts in the minds of the Comrades as to whether this document is defending or attacking the Immediate Programme. An analysis of the following passages from this document makes it abundantly clear that it is not in the least defending but attacking the very fundamental points of the Immediate Programme

These passages run as follows :

"We issued a call for launching armed struggle in the rainy season without taking into consideration the preparedness of the girijan peasantry of Warangal and Khammam districts and without setting up the secret party organisational machinery. It should be realised that the understanding behind these adventurist assessments contained in the Immediate Programme itself is the fundamental reason for a number of adventurist actions that had taken place in the forest thereafter. These actions in the forest areas have only emanated from this poisonous seed sown in the Immediate Programme. If we loose sight of this poisonous seed and fix the responsibility for the actions in the forest, it would only amount to ignoring the real issues. Therefore the political and ideological foundations for the actions in Khammam and Warangal forest areas are in the Immediate Programme itself. This question should be considered self-critically."

Thus "Immediate Programme - Our Experiences" clearly states that the Immediate Programme contains "the understanding of adventurist assessments" and that the poisonous seed of "this understanding itself is its political and ideological foundation"

"The Khammam Area Committee's Reply" also says that "Our assessment of that time" was "exaggerated".

The similarity of these two statements is worth noting.

There are certain passages in this document purporting to support the Immediate Programme. After discussing the "ideological foundations" which according to him are "the poisonous seed" contained in the Immediate Programme and the circular entitled "Lay Foundation for a Struggle Oriented Mass Movement", this document goes on to state that :

"But by seeing these shortcomings of the movement as well as the losses suffered, it would be wrong to conclude that the

very path of peasant armed struggle which we have taken up hitherto is wrong. The path of armed struggle which we have adopted in the Immediate Programme is the only correct path. To take this line forward is but the main task before us. It will be wrong to argue that this main task should be revised. Such arguments should be opposed and defeated."

The defenders of the Immediate Programme need not be overjoyed by this passage. When the immediate Programme contains the "understanding of adventurist assessments" and when these "poisonous seeds" are its "political and ideological foundations" how could the path of armed struggle which we have adopted in the same Immediate Programme be correct? How could it be our "main task" to take this "adventurist line" forward? What else could the acceptance of the document 'Immediate Programme - Our Experiences' mean except revising the path of armed struggle set forth in the Immediate Programme? If Com. Somiah's document is analysed in its entirety it becomes evident that the foregoing passages are not meant for defending the Immediate Programme but purely for the sake of convenience. We will in due course understand as to the convenience these passages are meant. We should not forget that it is the legacy of revisionism not to clearly say so while differing with the basic formulations of a document, but to first say that they accept it and then to advance arguments basically differing with it and finally to differ basically with it. As far as the Immediate Programme is concerned, the attitude of this document towards it is same as the above.

2. "KONDAMODALU" AREA PEASANT REVOLUTIONARY MOVEMENT BUILT ON THE LINES OF THE "LAY FOUNDATIONS FOR A STRUGGLE ORIENTED MASS MOVEMENT" AND THE IMMEDIATE PROGRAMME

Kondamodalu is on the banks of river Godavari in the Agency area of East Godavari district. It comprises of 30 Villages with a population of two thousand. A young comrade went there from Guntur District with the circular

"Lay Foundations for a struggle-oriented mass movement" and began to work among the girijan since January 1969.

He imbibed its understanding, implemented its guidance and laid foundations for the girijan peasant revolutionary movement. Later some more Comrades had gone over there to assist them. They carried on propaganda among girijans on the importance of land question and the need for occupation of lands illegally seized by the landlords hailing from the low lands. Simultaneously with this propaganda, they had taken up the problems of agricultural labour and farm hands ('Palerlu') working in the fields of the landlords and rich peasants and carried on their work. First a demand for increase of wages of the farm hands from Rs 200/- to Rs. 400 - per annum was put forward. The landlords conceded the demand. But the fighting spirit of farm hands and surging tide of their movement had not receded. It only became more vigorous. With this the demand was raised to Rs 600/-. The government official (Collector) agreed even to this demand and guaranteed its implementation. Yet the surging tide of the struggle of the farm hands and the people had not receded. Then the people came forward with the demand for landlord's land. All this programme was implemented during the months of March-April, 1969.

After the State Convention, the preparations for the occupation of landlords' land had begun. The preparations for clearing and cultivating the forest lands had begun from January 1969 itself. During the months of August, September and October the people had, under the leadership of the party, implemented the revolutionary programme of occupation of lands in the possession of landlords and the confiscation of crops.

The village committees were formed and functioning in these villages since the very beginning. As the struggle reached higher stage the character and the tasks of these committees underwent changes in keeping with the needs of the struggle and they had in actual practice functioned as village Soviets. (They were not however named as village Soviets). It is under the leadership of these revolutionary peoples

committees that the mobilisation of girijans, and the occupation of land in the illegal possession of landlords were carried on. The mobilisation of the people in their hundreds for the occupation of lands is indeed a rare achievement.

The village volunteer squads were organised with the girijan youth. These squads were used not only for self-defence but also for the defence of peoples offensive activities such as occupation of lands, confiscation of crops, etc. The comrades have built such a revolutionary movement by implementing all this programme within the confines of the understanding and guidance given in the circular "Lay foundations for a struggle oriented mass movement" as well as the Immediate Programme. Gradually this movement had expanded to 150 villages.

We do not however claim that there were no shortcomings in the conduct of this movement. This movement had suffered a temporary setback with the failure to pursue united front policy on the question of occupation of land, with the failure to organise regular squads from the village volunteer squads and to take the resistance to the higher stage and due to the arrest of the leadership. Yet the experiences we gained in the revolutionary movement of this area within a matter of one year goes to prove that the programme and understanding which these documents give to the party is correct.

From this, it is evident that had this correct understanding, which has no place for either "left" adventurism or right revisionism, been implemented in Khammam, Warangal and other areas, the revolutionary movement would have advanced there also.

The document, "Immediate Programme - Our Experiences" recognises the movement of Kondamodalu area merely for a fact, but it fails to recognise it as a means, an instrument in the struggle against the "left" adventurism and right opportunism in the party.

The following passage from this document is noteworthy :

"In Kondamodalu area of the East Godavari District Agency Area. we have mobili-

sed the armed girijan peasantry into struggle on the land distribution programme. Like a ray of light in the utter darkness, a good effort has been made in the Kondamodalu area for building armed peasant movement on the basis of the agrarian revolutionary programme and in the light of the mass line. We achieved preliminary gains through it. The girijan peasants, men and women have joined the struggle that we have adopted in the Immediate Programme is the only correct path. We should therefore defeat any attempts aimed at revising or watering down that line".

The movement of Kondamodalu area is not a ray of light in the utter darkness. It is a peasant revolutionary movement which is a slap on the face of the "left" adventurism and right opportunism manifesting themselves in the party. Indeed, its importance is immense at this stage. Likewise what the peasants have achieved are not merely preliminary gains. The peasant movement had reached the stage of land distribution and taken the form of armed struggle. It has clearly demonstrated that even in the present situation, it is possible for the peasant agrarian revolution to take the form of armed struggle and advance.

When the path of armed struggle adopted in the Immediate Programme is correct as the document "Immediate Programme-Our Experiences" says, where then are the poisonous seed of economism and "left" adventurism in the Immediate Programme and "Lay Foundations for a struggle oriented mass movement"? How could the line containing these poisonous seed be a correct line?

Thus this document formally accepts the Immediate Programme and rejects its understanding. It also accepts the movement of Kondamodalu area merely for a fact, but it fails to examine its own outlook on the developments in Khammam and Warangal districts in the light of the experiences of the revolutionary movement of this area and come to correct conclusions. Not only it is confusing by itself but also it is confusing the other comrades as well.

3 CLASS STRUGGLE - MARXIST-LENINIST OUTLOOK.

In the Indian Communist movement, discussions have been going on economism since a very long time. The revisionists and neo-revisionists that have been following reformist, class collaborationist policies could never take a correct stand on this question. This has always been the case with the parties that pursue revisionist policies. We would be able to come to a correct understanding on this question only when we grasp it on the basis of Marxism - Leninism.

Com. Somaiah's document has once again brought up this question for discussion. It denounces the documents, "Lay foundations for a struggle-oriented mass movement" and Immediate Programme as having laid the foundations for economism. It criticises that we have subjectively overestimated the consciousness of the people. Though the Kondamodalu peasant revolutionary movement has fully refuted all these accusations, we should however examine this question still further since the right opportunist outlook is hidden behind the quotations cited in the document from Lenin's works.

On the political character of class struggle Lenin says that :

"Every class struggle is a political struggle. We know that the opportunists, slaves to the ideas of liberalism, understood these profound words of Marx incorrectly and tried to put a distorted interpretation on them. Among the opportunists there were for instance, the Economists, the elder brothers of the liquidators. The economists believed that any clash between classes was a political struggle. The Economists therefore recognised as "class struggle" the struggle for wage increase of five kopecks on the ruble and refused to recognise a higher, more developed, nationwide class struggle, the struggle for political aims. The Economists, therefore, recognised the embryonic class struggle but did not recognise it in its development form. The Economists recognised, in other words, only that part of the class struggle that was more tolerable to the liberal bourgeoisie, they refused to go

farther than the liberals, they refused to recognise the higher form of class struggle that is unacceptable to the liberals. By so doing, the Economists became liberal workers' politicians. By so doing, the Economists rejected the Marxist, revolutionary conception of class struggle.

To continue, it is not enough that the class struggle becomes real, consistent and developed only when it embraces the sphere of politics. In politics, too, it is possible to restrict oneself to minor matters, and it is possible to go deeper to the very foundations. Marxism recognises a class struggle as fully developed, "nation-wide", only if it does not merely embrace politics but takes in the most significant thing in politics - the organisation of state power.

On the other hand, the liberals, when the working class movement has grown a little stronger, dare not deny the class struggle but attempt to narrow down to curtail and emasculate the concept of class struggle. Liberals are prepared to recognise the class struggle in the sphere of politics, too, but on one condition—that the organisation of state power should not enter into the sphere. It is not hard to understand which of the bourgeoisie's class interests give rise to the liberal distortion of the concept of class struggle".

LENIN, Vol. 19, P 121, 122.

We have cited this lengthy quotation from Lenin hoping that it would be a guide to solve the problems on hand. This is the sum and substance of what Lenin says: The class struggle is a struggle carried on with a political objective for the organisation of state power. The economic struggle of the workers for wage increase is a political struggle in its embryonic form. But by merely having politics the class struggle would not become a struggle for the organisation of state power. The liberals would have no objection to support the class struggle without the objective of organisation of state power.

In the documents, "Lay Foundations for a Struggle - Oriented Mass Movement" and the

Immediate Programme. We have explained the class struggle not with the outlook of economic struggle, but with political objective for the organisation of state power. Criticising the negative attitude of the neo-revisionists adopted towards the peoples struggles on the plea that the party, mass organisations and the democratic movements are very weak, the first document says that :

"It is no doubt a fact that we should strengthen the party, the mass organisations and the democratic movements. It is also a fact that we need to further strengthen them wherever they exist and expand them wherever they do not exist. But only when the peoples struggles are organised on the basis of the peoples demands, especially on the basis of anti - feudal, anti - imperialist demands and only when the party, the mass organisation and the democratic movement are built on the basis of these struggles would it be possible for us to strengthen and expand them on proper foundations. Today the enemy is adopting a policy of repression. For the enemy to let loose repression against and at times of peoples struggle (some times, to nullify the gains people achieved through their struggles) and for the people to carry on resistance in defence of their struggles as well as the gains of their struggles is but a common thing. Thus it becomes evident that the party, the mass organisations and the democratic movements we should build are based on and intertwined with the new forms of resistance as well as the peoples struggles on peoples demands".

Here all the peoples struggles on peoples demands are basically political. Ours is an anti-imperialist, anti-feudal peoples democratic revolution. All the anti - imperialist, anti - feudal struggles are political and help the peoples democratic revolution. It is clear that these struggles acquire revolutionary character as they take new forms of resistance

We have stated all through these documents that the struggles on peoples demands should be led mainly as political struggles on anti-imperialist, anti-feudal demands. It is only with

the Marxist-Leninist outlook that we have stated this.

What is more, we have further explained the problem of state structure and formulated a programme for in this document :

Note the following passages from this document :

"We should as soon as the peoples mobilisation begins, organise the village committees (peasant organisations). They should play the main role in the implementation of the struggle programme. It is possible that in the beginning the rich peasant might dominate the organisations. We should, as the class struggle advances, takes steps to reduce their strength and replace them with the real revolutionary forces (especially from the poorer sections) so as to ensure that the forces carry on the functions of the village committees. These committees should, besides the implementation of the struggle programme assist the peasant and agricultural labour masses in all their problems.

Thus these committees should function as a skeleton administrative apparatus wherein there will be no place for corruption, inequality and oppression. We should consider it as a Government machinery in its embryonic form."

There are the village committees or peasant organisations that should emerge in course of building agrarian revolutionary movement in the countryside. There should be no place for oppression in these committees means, the oppression against the people, but not against the enemy.

Here the question of political power is discussed unambiguously. Had our outlook been an outlook of economism, the question of village committees taking as government machinery in its embryonic form would not have arisen at all.

In the Immediate Programme we have comprehensively explained the agrarian revolutionary programme as well as the organisation of the village Soviets and village committees. All this

clearly indicates not an outlook of economism, but the outlook, of Marxist-Leninist class struggle.

The fact is, in the peoples democratic revolutionary stage the agrarian revolutionary programme is political and revolutionary. The struggle of the agricultural labour against the landlords and the rich peasants for increase of wage rates and other demands are economic struggle. Though they do help the agrarian revolution, they are not similar to struggles for land. The occupation of land in the possession of the landlords is a political and revolutionary action. It is this programme that we have formulated in the documents "Lay foundations for a struggle-oriented mass movement" and the Immediate programme. It is baseless to denounce the outlook behind this revolutionary programme as an outlook of economism.

But the document "Immediate Programme-Our Experiences" is persistent in this contention that there is the outlook of economism in the Immediate programme. How is it possible? If we note the following para from this document, it would become clear as to how it has become possible for the "Immediate Programme-Our Experiences" to say that there is the outlook of economism in the Immediate programme.

..... But the whole dispute is on the question of basing on peoples struggles, on peoples demands. What is meant by peoples demands and economic demands? Is it not on these very economic demands that we wanted struggles? Is it not on the basis of the economic struggles on these economic demands that we wanted to build the future revolutionary movement?"

In the eyes of this document, peoples struggles on peoples demands have got miraculously transformed into "economic struggles on economic demands". It is only when looked upon from the viewpoint of economism that the peoples demands would get transformed into economic demands and peoples struggles into economic struggles. On the contrary, viewed from Marxist-Leninist outlook, they would be political demands and political struggles.

We have already pointed out relevant passages from the document "Lay foundations for a struggle-oriented mass movement" and made it amply clear that the peoples struggles means anti-imperialist, anti-feudal demands and peoples struggles means anti imperialist, anti-feudal struggles, that it means an agrarian revolution in countryside and that it means a struggle for the organisation of state power. But the document "Immediate Programme-Our Experiences" has conveniently omitted these passages, quoted only that part of "peoples struggles on peoples demands" and went on to interpret it in accordance with its own outlook of economism. The understanding of this document is in keeping with what Lenin says about economists; the economist recognise in class struggle only as a struggle for the increase of wages by five Kopecks per Ruble. Undoubtedly this is the understanding of economism.

When defending a view point, one should quote the main parts which state the view point and criticise different aspects of it. But to quote only the parts that are in tune with ones own subjective outlook and distort them is not a method of discussion. But this is precisely the method that the document "Immediate Programme-Our Experiences" has adopted.

4. POLITICAL STRUGGLES - ECONOMIC STRUGGLES.

In the Indian Communist movement, there has been a wrong conception about the agrarian revolution since a long time. The sum and substance of this concept is that only after the seizure of political power by the working class through an insurrection should feudalism be abolished and the land distributed to peasants and agricultural labour.

This conception is born out of the failure in grasping the colonial and semi-colonial character of India and consequently trying to mechanically apply the path of Russian revolution to India. As a result, notwithstanding the fact that agrarian revolution has been the main part of the programme of the Indian Communist Party; every peasant struggle led by the party inevitably terminated in the middle without reaching

the stage of land distribution and without taking the form of armed struggle

During 1943-51, the Telangana peasant movement under the leadership of the party developed into an agrarian revolution, reached the stage of land distribution and took the form of armed struggle. With this new line, a line that agrarian revolution under the leadership of the party can develop and advance without the seizure of political power by the working class through an armed insurrection, has come before the party and the revolutionary masses.

In the light of the experiences of already advancing Chinese revolution, it was formulated that the Chinese path would be our path and that this path would be in the form of Telangana armed struggle. The sum and substance of this path is that in course of its development, when the peasant revolutionary movement reaches the stage of agrarian revolution and takes the form of armed struggle, the revolutionary classes led by the working class would liberate countryside through the armed struggle, gradually liberate the cities and seize political power. This is the path of peoples war.

After 1952, the party had taken up the parliamentary revisionist path. The sum and substance of this path is that the land to the tiller could be achieved through parliament even if it is done slowly. This is an alternate path to the path that the agrarian revolution should be achieved through the armed struggle. This parliamentary path has failed.

Though the neo-revisionists praise the Telangana armed struggle skyhigh, they refuse to develop the agrarian revolution on the basis of their experiences of this armed struggle. For this, they are advancing a lame excuse that the conditions that obtained at the time of Telangana agrarian revolution were not obtaining in other parts of the country. They are reasoning out the cause for the failure of the agrarian revolution to reach the stage of land distribution and take the form of armed struggle in the Andhra area as follows :

"If the reasons for it are to be understood, we have to examine various socio-ec-

onomic aspects. The aspect, most important of all, is that in Telangana the contradictions between the landlord classes and the broad masses of people has reached its culminating point, and taken a most acute form. But at the same time the class contradiction has not taken this form in Andhra area. Here the peasant system is different in its structure from that of Telangana. Here the capitalist system and capitalist relations have developed. Class division among the peasantry has further developed. Consequently intensity of contradictions got reduced. Ever new contradictions have risen. However they have not yet ripened." (What are the reasons for the disruptive activities of Left-sectarianists." - Page 28)

This is a quotation from a document adopted by the Central Committee of the neo-revisionist party. They contend that in Andhra area the contradiction between feudalism and broad masses of the people has transformed itself into a contradiction between the capitalist class and the working class and hence the armed struggle has not developed in Andhra area. It is true that in Andhra area there are delta areas and areas of commercial crops where the capitalist relations are developed. But by this, it is however wrong to conclude that the domination of landlords is less here. In the vast backward areas, there still exists feudal system with its strong feudal relations. The entire agency area forms a part of it. There is no other reason except the revisionist policy of the party for the failure of agrarian revolution to develop in these vast backward areas. The girijan agrarian revolution of Srikakulam district 1960-70, the struggle for land in East Godavri and Rayalaseema districts during 1969-7. (a fullpledged agrarian revolution had developed in Kondamodalu area)--all these struggles reflect the potentialities of the agrarian revolution of Andhra area : They expose the hollowness of the contention of the neo-revisionists.

Even the deltaic and commercial crop areas are not in any way the amusement parks for the peasants and agricultural labour. Even in these areas where the domination of landlordism exists there are a number of opportunities to mobi-

lise the poor peasants and agricultural labour and to build an anti-feudal revolutionary peasant movement.

It is with such fallacious contention and with such an anti-Marxist-Leninist outlook that the neo-revisionists have diverted themselves from the agrarian revolutionary movement.

Now what about us? The document "Immediate Programme Our Experiences" shuts its eyes to the fundamental difference between the working class and peasantry. The fact that socialist consciousness to the working class to enable it to provide leadership to the peoples democratic revolution should come from without, from the revolutionary communist party and the fact that this is before us to do is indisputable.

But what about the peasantry? The poor peasants, the agricultural labour and the middle peasants, who participate and play the main role in the agrarian revolution, participate in the anti-feudal struggles with a bourgeois democratic consciousness. Land to the tiller is a bourgeois-democratic slogan. The agrarian revolution is in the main the bourgeois democratic revolution. Similarly the agrarian revolution forms main part of peoples democratic revolution.

Therefore, all the anti-feudal struggles of the poor peasants, agricultural labour, middle peasants (and even of the rich peasant on certain occasions) are but political struggles. Only when they develop into struggles for land would they develop into revolutionary struggles of higher stage, into a full-fledged agrarian revolution. We cannot sit back with folded arms looking on for the spontaneous development of struggles for land. We should lend revolutionary character to the anti-feudal struggles and develop them into struggles for land. The occupation of lands claimed to be the property of the landlords through peoples organised strength, without the concern of the present government and the laws is by itself a revolutionary struggle, a political struggle. All those struggles that are auxiliary to it and all those struggles that lead to it are but political struggles suitable under the given conditions.

The struggles of agricultural labour against

the landlords and rich peasants is a struggle against the capitalist exploitation. Yet near similar conditions of agricultural labour and the poor peasant, the strong desire of the agricultural labour for land, the anti-feudal tendency of the agricultural labour—all these, some times directly and some times indirectly, lend anti-feudal character to the struggles of the agricultural labour. They play their role in the development of struggles for land.

In Srikakulam, while working among the girijans and organising struggles against the landlords on wage rates, we carried on propaganda against the feudal exploitation and developed struggles. All these struggles gradually developed into the struggles for land distribution and took the form of agrarian revolution.

In Kondamodalu area of East Godavari district, the struggles of farm servants were conducted together with propaganda on land issues. These struggles themselves had gradually developed into struggles for land distribution.

In Telangana the anti-feudal struggles, started initially against the forced labour, atrocities and injustice perpetrated by the big landlords, had gradually developed into a full-fledged agrarian revolutionary struggle. The struggles of the agricultural labour had come up along with the struggles for land distribution itself.

An analysis of these experiences will reveal that the anti-feudal struggles at this stage are but political struggles. With the revisionist outlook the Economists limit themselves to the demands concerned and lead them as economic struggles. The revolutionaries lead them with objective of developing them into a full-fledged agrarian revolution and with the political objective, into struggles for the seizure of state power.

If the following extracts from the circular "Lay foundations for a struggle-oriented mass movement" are examined with this view, it would then become clear that they are completely correct.

"It is only as a part of this revisionists out-

look of the Polit Bureau that they are arguing that the partial struggles should be conducted only as partial struggles and not as political struggles. A few months back they had even gone to the extent of declaring that they would defend only the economic struggles. When the people are waging struggles for their legitimate demands, the government itself is changing the character of these struggles by unleashing armed forces against them. These struggles would then automatically transform themselves into political struggles. The people would, through their own experiences realise the necessity of fighting against the government and automatically get prepared to solve their economic demands. Thus, according to the learned lot of the P. B., a number of economic struggles that are going on today, are transforming themselves into political struggles.

During 1946-47, such a bankrupt theory was spread by the then party secretary P. C. Joshi. The then central leadership went all out for this bankrupt theory and betrayed the Indian revolution. Today this is precisely what the P. B. is doing.

"In the present period of crisis, all the economic struggle are being transformed into political struggles due to the policy of repression pursued by the government. We should conduct them as political struggles with the aim of advancing them to a higher stage. The slogan of "Abolition of feudalism and land to the tiller. should be the Central slogan of the rural movement. This policy should be propagated during every partial struggle. They gradually expanding the rural struggles, they should be extended to the distribution of banjar lands under the occupation of landlords, tenant-lands and the the landlords lands. We should never at any stage forget the fact that the land question is the crucial question."

The entire portion is quoted here in order to make clear our viewpoint expressed in the document.

We have advanced the above formulation while criticising the formulations of revisionists and neo-revisionists on the question of partial struggles. The document "Immediate Programme-Our Experiences" is keeping mum on the

formulations of the revisionists and neo-revisionists. At the same time, it is attacking our formulation which is opposed to them.

We have only used the word "people" keeping anti-imperialist, anti-feudal people in view, but not as a substitute for working class. Thus we have already explained that all the anti-feudal struggles of the rural masses should be conducted as political struggles that lead to fulfilled agrarian revolution and not as economic struggles. It is in detail, in the part of the document quoted here.

Now the question of partial struggles of the working class, middle class and the agricultural labour. Today majority of the partial struggles are being subjected to police repression. With this, these partial struggles have to be conducted not only against the employers but also against the government. It is for this reason that we say that they would acquire a political character. For instance, on the demands such as withdrawal of police, release of arrested leaders and cadres, compensation to those that suffered in the lathi charges etc. With the intervention of police, the workers, the middle class people and the agricultural labour would, through their own experiences, grasp the fact that their employers have the support of the government and that their respective economic demands could be solved only through the struggle against the government. The revolutionaries should make maximum use of it.

Here, when we say that the struggle should be conducted as a political struggle, as a struggle of a higher stage, we do not however mean that it should be developed into an armed struggle here and now itself. It is our contention that these struggles should be conducted not against the employers but also against the government and that resistance should be organised against the police and goenda repression. The political consciousness of the workers, the middle class people and the agricultural labour participating in these partial struggles would grow. They would readily come forward to participate in the future struggles. It is clear that this will become possible only when the people get trained and tempered on the basis of the experiences they gain through these struggles and

that it is but the revolutionaries who should fulfill these tasks.

These struggles are not by themselves sufficient to create the consciousness among the people that they should overthrow the government. Only when propaganda and anti-government struggles are conducted on the basis of the programme of the revolutionary communist party, and only when they participated in them would the consciousness that they should overthrow the government develop among them. Thus they would be able to play their role in the peoples democratic revolution.

Com. Somaiah writes that we and the Charu Mazumdar group are of one and the same opinion on this question.

"The Communist Party of India (M-L) is openly propagating the above theory. This is the sum and substance of their contention. The squads annihilate the class enemy. Next the police machinery commits atrocities against the people. Unable to bear, the people will then move into action and take revenge. Thus the people will move and participate in the anti-government struggles. In short this is their argument.

There is no difference between the argument and that of the party letter. Though the language and the explanation is different, the basis of these two is one and the same. The sum and substance of these two is that by the government repression the people would move into political struggles'.

(Immediate Programme-Our Experiences)

For Charu Mazumdar group, there are no anti-government struggles except the armed struggle. Hence the question of people participating in them does not arise. If at all the people have to participate, they should participate in the armed struggle. Otherwise, the squads themselves would carry on the armed struggle. They don't have any political and anti-government struggles as such. Therefore it is incorrect to see similarity between us.

The Charu Mazumdar group doesn't have the policy of organising and mobilising the people into political and economic struggles and the armed struggle through an anti-imperialist, anti-feudal programme and through an agrarian revolutionary programme in the country side. Consequently, this group does not have the policy of developing consciousness among the people, through these struggles. Our contention is that this repression would play a role in developing consciousness among the people. Likewise, in the armed struggle conducted on the basis of the agrarian revolution, the consciousness of the people would also reach a higher stage. It is from this that the saying "the people get trained and tempered through struggles" has originated. The Charu Mazumdar group says that the people would become conscious through police repression. But it has no place for any anti-imperialist, anti-feudal programme or for the peoples participation in this programme. In our understanding, there is due importance for the experiences that the people acquire during the struggles and for the consciousness that they gain through these experiences. The experiences that the people gain through their clashes with the armed forces of the ruling classes during their partial struggles or anti-feudal struggles or other political struggles are a part and parcel of the experiences of their respective struggles. Only those without the experience of peoples struggles can say that political consciousness would not be developed and that the existing consciousness would not grow through these experiences.

Viewed thus, it would become clear that on this question while there is no similarity between ourselves and the Charu Mazumdar group, on the contrary there is a fundamental difference between us.

Discussing these questions, Com. Somaiah has quoted a number of passages from Lenin's "What is to be done?" They were all directed against the economist who opposed the overthrow of the then Czars of Russia and embraced revisionist politics. The document "Lay foundations for a struggle-oriented mass movement" and the Immediate Programme have formulated the programme to prepare the people for conduct

ing the armed struggle and for the overthrow of the government. It is meaningless to club it with economism. He has not adopted Marxism-Leninist outlook of class struggle while advancing his arguments. He has not taken the experiences of agrarian revolutions of Telangana, Srikakulam and Kondamodalu into consideration. He could come to these conclusions only since he has examined the documents with the outlook of economism and subjectivism.

The following extracts make it clear that the understanding of the documents "Lay foundations for a struggle-oriented mass movement" and the "Immediate Programme" about the political character of the peoples struggles equally applies to the working class struggles also and that it is nothing but Leninist understanding.

"Is it true that, in general, the economic struggle "is the most widely applicable means" of drawing the masses into political struggle? It is entirely untrue. Any and every manifestation of police tyranny and autocratic outrage, not only in connection with the economic struggle, is not less "widely applicable" as a means of "drawing in" the masses.

Of the sum total of cases in which the workers suffer (either on their own account or on account of those closely connected with them) from tyranny, violence and the lack of rights, undoubtedly only a small minority represent cases of police tyranny in the trade union struggle as such. Why then should we, beforehand, restrict the scope of political agitation by declaring only one of the means to be "the most widely applicable", when Social-Democrats must have, in addition, other, generally speaking, no less "widely applicable" means?" (What is to be done? P. 58-59)

Lenin said this in order to show that the conception that 'only economic struggle is the most applicable means to make the people actively participate in the political struggles' is

incorrect. We have clearly stated that in India the people should carry on anti-imperialist, anti-feudal struggles and further explained the political character of the peoples struggles. Besides we have also pointed out as to how the workers economic struggles will acquire the political character with the unleashing of repression against them by the government. This is fully in accord with what Lenin said. Lenin said that the workers would face less of repression in economic struggles, When India is a semi-colonial country and when there is a revolutionary situation in the country, the strikes and struggles of the working class are not and cannot go on like the strikes and struggles in the West and Czarist Russia. All these strikes and struggles have to face severe repression. We should take notice of this repression which has come up as a specific feature in the present situation. The State Committee circular and the "Immediate Programme" have never said any where that the political struggles should be limited to the fight against repression alone.

We quote the following from Lenin's writings to show that the understanding contained in the passage — "in the present period of crisis the economic struggles are being transformed into political struggles due to the policy of repression adopted by the Government. We should conduct them with the aim of advancing them to the higher stage" — that we have written is in accord with Leninism.

"The demand 'to lend the economic struggle itself a political character' most strikingly expresses subservience to spontaneity in the sphere of political activity. Very often the economic struggle spontaneously assumes a political character that is to say, without the intervention of the 'revolutionary bacilli—the intelligentsia' without the intervention of the class conscious Social-Democrats. The economic struggle of the English workers, for instance also assumed a political character without any intervention on the part of the socialist. The task of the Social-Democrats, however, is not exhausted by political agitation on an economic basis; their task is to convert trade unionist politics into Social-

Democratic political struggle, to utilise the sparks of political consciousness which the economic struggles generate among the workers, for the purpose of raising the workers to the level of Social-Democratic political consciousness". (What is to be done? P. 72)

When Lenin said that the demand "to lend economic struggle itself a political character", is wrong, he said it in criticism of the outlook of economists that "political agitation" should be conducted "on an economic basis". At the same time he made it clear that "the task is to convert trade unionist politics into Social-Democratic political struggle" and to utilise the sparks of political consciousness..... for the purpose of raising the workers to the level of Social-Democratic political consciousness" and that this itself is the main task of the Social-Democrats.

We have explained this keeping in view the repression which is a daily problem for us. This is fully in accord with Leninism. Lenin explained one of the strike struggles of the workers of Dublin city of Ireland as having reached the stage of "Class War".

"The class struggles, which permeates the whole life of capitalist society everywhere, has become accentuated to the point of class war. The police have positively gone wild; drunken policemen assault peaceful workers; break into houses, torment the aged, women and children. Hundreds of workers (over 400) have been injured and two killed.-such are the casualties of this war. All prominent worker's leaders have been arrested. People are thrown into prison for making the most peaceful speeches. The city is like an armed camp". (Vol. 19 page 332).

This is what we see and experience in respect of every strike in India. The Government had resorted to ruthless repression to suppress the 1968 Central Government Employees Strike. It committed atrocities against officers, engineers and even against women who were in their homes and bath rooms. The repression that the government unleashed to suppress the 1970 Durgapur political strike was unimaginable. Lenin called such repression against a peaceful

strike a class war. We say that such class wars are political struggles and that they should be conducted as political struggles.

The understanding of combination of economic and political strike is fully in accord with Leninism. Writing that during the period of 1905 Russian Revolution, the strike movement had created "rare forms", Lenin says that the combination of economic and political strike was one of the main features of these forms. In the same context, giving the details of number of strikes during 1905, 1906 and 1907 he writes that :

"This shows the close and inseparable connection between the two kinds of strikes". (Vol. 18, P. 83-84)

Explaining the political and economic strikes Lenin writes that :

"In a political strike, the working class comes forward as the advanced class of the whole people. In such cases, the proletariat plays not merely the role of one of the classes of bourgeois society, but the role of guide, vanguard, leader. The political ideas manifested in the movement involve the whole people i.e., they concern the basic, most profound conditions of the political life of the whole country. This character of the political strike, as has been noted by all scientific investigators of the period 1905-1907, brought into the movement all the classes, and particularly, of course the widest, most numerous and most democratic sections of the population, the peasantry, and so forth". (Vol. 18, P. 85)

Here Lenin explains the political strike not as a struggle against repression but as a working class strike which provides leadership to the struggle of the masses against the ruling classes. This is undoubtedly a working class struggle which is essentially of higher level and related to the revolutionary consciousness. It means, it is wrong to say that a struggle against repression is not a political struggle. We have already shown what Lenin has said in this.

In India the Communist revolutionaries should strive so as to provide leadership to the working class struggle.

Explaining the importance of economic strike, Lenin writes that :

"On the other hand, the mass of the working people will never agree to conceive of a general 'progress' of the country without economic demands without an immediate and direct improvement in their conditions. The masses are drawn into the movement, participate vigorously in it, value it highly and display heroism, self-sacrifice, perseverance and devotion to the great cause only if it makes for improving the economic conditions of those who work. Nor can it be otherwise, for the living conditions of the workers in 'ordinary' times are incredibly hard. As it strives to improve its living conditions, the working class also progresses morally, intellectually and politically, becomes more capable of achieving its great emancipatory aims".

(Vol. 18, P.85)

Here Lenin explained the revolutionary importance of the economic strike. Also on a number of occasions Lenin explained as to how the economic strikes along with the political strikes played an important role in the 1905 Revolution. He also analysed and drawn revolutionary lessons from the Marxist outlook from the economic strikes that followed during the later period. All his articles in this respect prove to be a valuable guidance for us.

The sum and substance of what Lenin says here is that we should, with the Marxist outlook understand the class struggle only as a political struggle for the seizure of State Power, and that we should not, with a liberal outlook, understand it as a struggle for limited economic and political demands.

Where does the mistake lie in Com. Somaiah's understanding?

He confuses economism with economic struggles. We oppose economism as a revisionist theory, as a theory hostile to revolution.

This theory prevents the working class from playing its revolutionary role, its liberating role. It confines the economic struggles to economic demands and kill their revolutionary character.

He views the economic struggles from an economist outlook, instead of viewing them from a revolutionary Marxist outlook. Though he is unable to reject the economic struggles, he is unable to see their revolutionary character. He is unable to recognise the need for us, the revolutionaries, to utilise their revolutionary character and to develop socialist consciousness among them. He looks down upon the economic struggles.

India, is a semi-colonial country. The armed forces of the ruling classes and the counter-revolutionary forces are concentrated in the cities and the working class centres. Here the strikes cannot advance as they could in the West without clashing with the armed forces. To compare the economic struggles of India with the economic struggles of the West without recognising this specific feature is to refuse to see the specific conditions of India. He mechanically compares the Indian conditions with that of West.

"Political exposure" among the working class, is not by itself sufficient. We should develop revolutionary consciousness among the working class while organising and mobilising them into political struggles. This is the task of the Communist revolutionaries.

Understanding mechanically and from an economist outlook what Lenin, in his work "WHAT IS TO BE DONE" ? said about the economists, Com Somaiah tried to prove our revolutionary programme to be a "left" adventurist programme.

Accusing that the Immediate Programme has watered down the role of the working class, Com- Somaiah writes thus :

"In the Immediate Programme they have reduced this vanguard role to "the support and solidarity of the working class" and "the help of working class". They have

narrowed down the leading role of the working class to co-operation. Thus, in the struggle for peoples democracy in this stage, they have watered down, the vanguard role of the working class and mixed it up with the role of the other classes."

This is not true. It is enough to cite the following paragraph from the "Immediate Programme" to show that, quoting some passages from out of context, he has, with a subjective outlook, arrived at these conclusions.

"The United Front is very essential for the successful" conclusion of the Indian revolution. The United Front should be formed against imperialism, feudalism and their collaborator, the big bourgeoisie. Under the leadership of the proletariat, this United Front should be formed of the working class, peasantry, middle class and the national bourgeoisie. Unlike the election United Front of the revisionists, this would be a front for struggle which would emerge and develop in the course of the revolutionary struggles and the armed struggle of liberation."

The above passage clearly shows that we do not have any confusion and that we never undermined the question of leadership of the working class. Further, we have clearly stated in it the classes and the leadership of the united front, as well as the revolutionary character of the united front itself.

About the immediate work in the cities, the Immediate Programme states that :

"The armed struggle that we are conducting should have the support and solidarity of the urban working class. The help of the transport workers as well as the workers of various other branches of industry would be needed for the transportation of material and other technical assistance."

It is not the aim of this passage of the Immediate Programme, to explain the form and content of the leading role of the working

class. Its aim is only to explain as to the kind of immediate help that the working class should render to the armed struggle. We can think of it further if more than this could be possible.

In Russia the working class seized power through an armed insurrection. In China, the working class seized power through the path of peoples war. The forms of leadership of the working class in these two revolutions are different.

Since our cities are the centres of the counter-revolutionary forces and since ours is a semi colonial country, we have adopted the path of peoples war, in accordance with which we should first liberate the villages and then gradually liberate the cities. The working class of our country would be able to play its leading role in the same form as the Chinese working class played its leading role in the Chinese peoples war. Apart from this, the experience itself should reveal in what other forms the working class could provide its leadership.

Com. Somaiah writes that "the vanguard role of the working class is forgotten in the revolutionary movement we have launched, as also in the path of armed struggle. We can clearly see this main shortcoming of our understanding in the Immediate Programme." We have already made it clear that this is not true, and that in our understanding, we have recognised the leading role of the working class without any reservations.

If we examine the following passages from the document of the neo-revisionists, it would become clear that on this question, the outlook behind the criticism of Com. Somaiah and the outlook of the neo-revisionists are but one and the same.

"The leadership of the working class is not realised only through the party and its leadership of the peasant struggle but actually, in deeds, through the working class boldly championing the demands of the peasantry and coming to the assistance of the peasant struggles through its own action. The alliance must function in deed

and fact, and not only in theory. The working class is the friend in action, that must help the fighting peasants and must ensure victory over the common enemy."

It is only in keeping with this that they draw one of the lessons of the Telangana Armed Struggle as follows:

"Even in this Telangana Armed Struggle that went on for five years, there had been no solidarity and support of the working class. The towns and big cities which were very important both politically and strategically, remained firmly in the hands of the enemy who was brutally suppressing the peasant struggle. There was neither a working class demonstration nor a strike. The important Marxist-Leninist slogan, the slogan of worker-peasant unity remained a mere slogan. As long as the working class is politically weak, as long as the Communist party cannot mobilise the working class into action in support of the peasant struggle, the possibility of agrarian revolution achieving success is very little. As far as our country is concerned, it is more necessary to take this truth into account. Otherwise it would be a certain disaster."

(Prajasakthi 24 June 1971)
(Telugu Weekly of CPI (M))

We are going to issue a comprehensive comment on the tactical line of the neo-revisionists as well as on their review of the Telangana armed struggle on another occasion. For the present, we reject it totally and fundamentally. We are following the path of peoples war i. e., liberate the villages first and then liberate the cities gradually, since the cities are the centres of the counter-revolutionary forces and since the armed struggle is of a protracted nature. How and where does Com. Somaiah oppose the views of the neo-revisionists? They argue that the Telangana armed struggle had failed only because of the lack of direct participation of the working class, in their tactical line, they state that there should be the direct participation of the working class. Where is the difference between these views of the neo-revi-

sionists and that of Com. Somaiah ?

Com. Somaiah says that the peoples democratic revolution is conducted against imperialism, feudalism and comprador bourgeoisie. He further says that the Immediate Programme, by including the bureaucratic capital, is also including the big bourgeoisie in these classes. With this, according to the understanding of Com. Somaiah, the target of the peoples democratic revolution is being widened. Probably he is not aware of the fact that the bureaucratic capital was included in the target of the Chinese revolution.

Likewise, he merely says that "in this struggle, the national bourgeoisie would cooperate depending on the issue in question", and does not accept that they form a part of the united front. The Immediate Programme says that the national bourgeoisie form a part of the united front. In the Chinese revolution, the national bourgeoisie was also a party to the united front.

Similarly, in the agrarian revolution, the leading role is that of the working class and not that of the agricultural labour. In the countryside, the agricultural labour would participate in the revolution more militantly than the other class.

We are going to comprehensively discuss these questions at the time of explaining our programme. For the present, we can say this much that his views are not in accord with the Immediate Programme.

6. PEOPLE'S OFFENSIVE ACTIONS

When we said that the mass activity should be stepped up and the people should launch offensive actions against the landlords, Com. Somaiah with his own subjective outlook, distorted what we said, portrayed the actions as military activities and went to criticise us. In order not to misunderstand him, we are quoting hereunder, this lengthy passage from his document, "Immediate Programme-Our Experiences".

"...In this stage, while carrying on our activities, we eliminate the enemy who is the main obstacle for it. For this, we conduct necessary propaganda and isolate the enemy from the people. For the defence of our economic and political rights, we make the masses realise the danger from the enemy to the liberation struggle and eliminate him. Therefore, in this stage ours is a movement for self-defence. We are in the stage of self-defence against the enemy's attacks and his fascist repression. Police forces, big landlords sections, and the rowdy gangs are jointly attacking us. We should preserve our existence and defend ourselves from them and march forward. Today in the forest areas, the enemy i.e. the police and big landlords sections, are attacking us. We are defending ourselves from them. This is the actual situation today. But the Immediate Programme says that we should get prepared for offensive actions against the enemy. What we are conducting are 'self-defence actions', but not the offensive actions".

In this lengthy passage, Com. Somaiah not only criticises the military offensive actions that are not to be found in the Immediate Programme, but also says that "in the present stage ours is a movement for self-defence". The Khammam Area Committee's reply also clearly says that today, we are in the first stage of the armed struggle, that this is but the stage of self-defence and that this is what the experience of the two years have proved.

We have comprehensively discussed this question in the document "Left Deviation within the Party"? We have made it clear that there is a fundamental difference between the peoples self-defence and cadres self-defence, that today in the forest areas of Khammam and Warangal the people are not participating in the self-defence struggle, that the cadre forming themselves into squads are defending themselves, that it is wrong to call the struggle without the participation of people as the first stage of armed struggle and that this situation has developed since the armed actions are launched before the people are prepared for armed strug-

gle. We have defended the self-defence of the cadres.

From this, it becomes clear that the understanding of Com. Somaiah is not in accord with this but in accord with "Khammam Area Committee's Reply".

Now let us see the military "offensive actions" which cannot be found in the Immediate Programme.

"Intensify the mass activities: We should, in the next month intensify our activities both in the forest areas as well as in the plain areas. By May, not only these activities should be intensified and the village Soviets and peoples committees formed and start functioning, but also we should get prepared to launch offensive actions against the landlord class. It is at the higher stage of these mass activities that we should, implement the agrarian revolutionray programme. For this we should politically and organisationally get prepared from now on". (Immediate Programme)

If any one finds a reference to the military activities of the squads in this passage, it only goes to show that he has failed to grasp the passage itself. The entire para deals with the stepping up of mass activities. We will, at the time of explaining "muhoortham" (auspicious time) for armed struggle, explain about the question of organising of village Soviets and peoples committees by May. We have not said that the armed struggle should be launched or squads should be formed by May. While this being the case, the question of launching military actions against the police and the landlords does not arise. Even when the military actions are launched, they should be carried on only against such of those landlords who form a part of the armed forces of the government, but not against others. We have already made this aspect clear a number of times.

We have not used the term "enemy" or "police" anywhere in this passage. We have only used the term "landlords".

'Offensive actions against landlords' means only peoples offensive actions against landlords and not the military offensive actions of the squads. All the revolutionary activities of the people such as people moving in a body, confiscating and distributing grain from the houses of the landlords, and recovering money, grain and other things that the landlords illegally extracted from the people are but the peoples offensive actions. Only those without the outlook of mass movement, peoples revolutionary activities, and anti-feudal struggles could mistake the peoples offensive actions for the offensive action of squads.

The truth is today the people in the forest areas of Khammam and Warangal are not participating either in the armed struggle or in the anti-feudal struggles. This truth is acknowledged by all. It should be realised that the reason for this is only the failure of implementing the relevant points, in that mainly those in the above passage, of the Immediate Programme.

About the offensive and defensive actions of the working class Lenin says that:

"The strikes of 1912 are offensive, but not defensive in their character. The workers fought for the improved working conditions but not against the deterioration of working conditions."

Here Lenin explains the struggle for improved working conditions as "offensive" and the struggle against the deterioration of working conditions as "defensive".

When we say that the people should launch an offensive against the landlordism, it means to say that the people should launch anti-feudal struggles to win back their lost rights and to win new rights such as grain etc.

7. REBEL CONCIIOUSNESS OF GIRIJANS

Stating that at the time of adopting the Immediate Programme (April 1969), there was no rebel conciousness among the girijan

peasantry, and that the assessment of the immediate Programme to the effect that there was rebel conciousness among the girijan was subjective, Com. Somaiah writes that:

"We adopted the Immediate Programme in the convention in April 1969. But to think that the Girijan peasantry was already "revolting" against the government by that time itself, is not true. We were only conducting propaganda among the girijans to revolt. But the girijans had not revolted against the Government. We are imagining our political views as the politics of girijans."

But quite contrary to this, he writes in another context about the girijan revolt as follows:

"The girijans who are leading a miserable life are seriously discontented. This discontentment is suppressed since a long time. This suppressed discontent has led to frustration and hopelessness, to faith in fate and providence. On the other hand it aroused hatred and vengeance in the girijans. The girijan peasantry is in this condition in different states of India. The working class party that can lead them on the path of peoples war is not yet ready. In this situation, during past few years the discontented girijan peasantry rose in revolt in Madhya Pradesh, Gujarat, Banqal and Bihar States. They rebelled against the present social system. With this view, we should consider the movement of girijans of Khammam and Warangal areas also as a part of it. Therefore, this movement should be more of a rebellion with vengeance and frustration rather than a conscious girijan peasant armed struggle. The Naxalbari and Srikakulam movements should be viewed differently."

Here, in this passage Com. Somaiah admits that in our country, "the discontented girijan peasantry rose in revolt", contradicting his own views expressed in the earlier passage and yet, goes on to baselessly criticise us. He admits that the Naxalbari and Srikakulam

movements are conscious girijan peasant armed struggles. On the contrary he differentiates the movement in Khammam and Warangal areas from that of Naxalbari and Srikakulam by saying that the former belongs to the category of "a rebellion with vengeance and frustration, rather than a conscious girijan armed struggle". Thus he denies the conscious nature of the movement in Khammam and Warangal areas, whatever its level may be.

He fails to accept the fact that the Immediate Programme, taking this "movement" into consideration, has put forward a programme to give this movement an organised shape and to further develop it into an armed struggle. Failing to grasp this, he attacks the Immediate Programme.

He has quoted the following passage from the Immediate Programme as the basis for his criticism.

"The landlords, the money lenders and the forest officials are exploiting the ordinary people and the girijans inhabiting the forest and mountainous regions in ever so many ways. In these regions, the masses have become conscious and are revolting against the government and the exploiting classes."

Thus citing, he conveniently omits the very next sentence which reads that "the Srikakulam girijan struggle is a prelude to it". By this omission he omits the contention that the girijan revolt which started in Srikakulam is spreading through out the Andhra and distorts to make it appear as though this para exclusively speaks of the girijan revolt in Khammam and Warangal districts. In fact, in this as well as in the following para, the girijan problems in different parts of Andhra have been referred to, and a programme given for girijan peasant revolutionary movement. The struggle for land waged by the peasantry is but the politics of the peasants. Those who fail to grasp this would be merely chanting the words 'agrarian revolution', but they can never grasp its essence (We have already explained this aspect). If we work among the girijans with a correct revolution-

ary programme we would be in a position to prepare the girijans for the struggle for land distribution within a short time. Not only the Srikakulam struggle, but also the Kondamodalu girijan peasant struggle testify to it. If it is not a revolution organised against the landlordism and the government, what else can it be? When it is possible in Kondamodalu area, why can't it be possible in Warangal and Khammam districts? When the politics of the Srikakulam girijans could be the politics of the Kondamodalu girijans, why can't (in one and the same year) the politics of Kondamodalu girijans be the politics of Khammam and Warangal girijans, which is but on its borders?

The answer is but one for all these questions. The same revolutionary consciousness which is in the Kondamodalu girijans is also there in the Warangal-Khammam girijans.

Prior to the State Convention, useful work in accordance with the mass line was carried on to organise the girijans of Khammam and Warangal areas. The mass movement had also advanced in these areas. After the State Convention, the movement in these areas had taken to the "left" adventurist path. Also after the State Convention, the girijans of Khammam and Warangal areas have not been organised on the basis of the same mass line on which the Kondamodalu girijan revolutionary movement was organised. It is only for this reason that the agrarian revolution hasn't developed in these areas or to the level of Kondamodalu area. And an organised revolutionary movement has not been developed. To fail to grasp this and to say that there is no political consciousness in the girijans is nothing but underestimating the consciousness.

The revolutionaries analyse various struggles coming up in the country, take them as the touchstone for the consciousness developing among the people and formulate their policy on the basis of it. They work among the people, conduct the struggles and verify the correctness of the policy thus formulated with the experience thus gained. If need be, they make necessary changes in the policy and march forward.

In view of the struggles arising in different parts of the country as well as the Srikakulam girijan struggle, we assessed that the consciousness among the people of Andhra (as well as among the people of India) is growing. We resolved to shape it into an organised revolutionary movement and develop it into an armed struggle. Through the documents "Lay foundations for a struggle-oriented mass movement" and the "Immediate Programme", we supplied the party with a struggle oriented programme. Prior to the State Convention, the work in Khammam and Warangal areas also was carried on in accordance with this programme. Wherever this programme was implemented, it yielded good results and the agrarian revolutionary movement advanced to the extent it was implemented. Wherever it was not implemented and instead an alternate programme was implemented, it failed to yield these results. On the contrary the agrarian revolution has suffered a serious set back.

It is very surprising that Com. Somaiah still fails to realise it.

8. SPONTANEOUS MOVEMENT OR ADVENTURISM ?

While speaking about the "Spontaneous" movement and revolts of the working class, Lenin, in his work, 'WHAT IS TO BE DONE?' and on a number of other occasions makes it clear these are not revolutionary struggles waged with a socialist consciousness. If the working class has to come to power, it should follow Marxism, the ideology of the working class. This is indisputable.

But Com. Somaiah mechanically applies it to the peasant struggles and draws incorrect conclusions. He fails to grasp that all the anti-feudal struggles are of bourgeois democratic character and that all the revolts are of bourgeois democratic revolutionary character. In the stage of the peoples democratic revolution, it is to these struggle that a revolutionary character and an organised shape should be given under the leadership of the working class and conducted so as to make it possible to conduct a cou-

ntrywide peasant armed struggle. At this stage the question of developing socialist consciousness among the peasantry does not arise. It is after the conclusion of the peoples democratic revolution and in the stage of Socialist revolution that we would, under the dictatorship of the proletariat develop socialist consciousness among the peasantry. abolish the private property and advance towards the socialist construction. To develop socialist consciousness among the peasantry in the stage of peoples democratic revolution and while the anti-feudal struggles are being conducted is not in conformity with the revolutionary stage as well as with the actual situation obtaining, it doesn't however mean that we do not propagate socialism and the achievements of the peasants, of the Socialist countries and that Socialism alone is capable of solving all the problems of the peasantry. Among the peasants, we sow the seeds of ideas about their future through this propaganda.

Similarly, it is wrong to say that the outlook of spontainety which is a "bourgeois outlook" had worked in the leadership. We have drafted the documents, "Lay foundations for a struggle-oriented mass movement" and the "Immediate Programme" in order to draw into the field the militants that came forward during the struggle against revisionism. The aims of the documents is but to prepare the people in the countryside for agrarian revolution and thereby to prepare them for the armed struggle. To the extent we carried out this programme, we succeeded in developing an organised peasant revolutionary movement. (Ex: Kondamodalu Area)

From this view point, it becomes clear that these documents are meant to prevent our peasant movement from acquiring a spontaneous character and from falling prey to the "left" adventurism and individual terrorism of Charu Mazudmar group. In the areas where the programme, put forward in these documents was carried out, the aim of these documents was fulfilled to the extent it was carried out. Yet, a trend opposed to the correct line formulated these documents has taken root inside the party. Though it was only some students that followed this trend, it was however a part of the leadership itself that encouraged it. Under

the influence of Charu Mazumdar group, it manifested as an all India trend. Some of those that fell prey to this had joined the Charu Mazumdar group. Its influence inside our party used to be considerable by that time itself

The Immediate Programme and the "Review", the two documents adopted by the State Convention, represented two different trends. The Immediate Programme represented the correct revolutionary trend while the "Review" represented the "left" adventurist trend. A number of passages from the "Review", containing exaggerations, described some of the areas of Khammam and Warangal as though they were already prepared for armed struggle. Similarly the speeches in the Convention also gave expression to this trend. It is a fact that this "Review" was taken to be authentic since it was drawn up by a comrade from the struggle areas. It was also a fact that the danger from this trend was neither realised nor was it warned against. It is also a fact that this was adopted by the Convention. It was only after the squad actions were launched in the Khammam district that we realised the danger from this trend and launched a struggle against it. It is a mistake on our part not to have recognised it sooner and conducted a struggle against it. Not to have recognised sooner and conducted a struggle against the "left" adventurist trend in time, does not in itself amount to acceptance of this trend. Com. Somaiah confuses these two. Likewise he also confuses the "left" adventurism with spontaneity.

We discussed various aspects of this trend in our document "Left" deviation within the Party". We have also discussed in this document, the outlook of "Spontaneity" that manifested itself in the activities of the State Committee.

9. OUR WEAKNESS

Besides attacking the Immediate Programme and the other documents from the beginning to end, Com Somaiah in his document repeatedly points out the weaknesses in our movement and party. He writes as though it is a serious crime to think of the armed struggle until these weaknesses are overcome. (From

beginning to the end his contention is that the party and the mass movement are not prepared for it.)

Since we have our mass movement and party as a result of breaking away from neo-revisionism, the existence of a number of weaknesses and wrong tendencies in them are not natural. We can rectify them not by academic discussions but by combining correct understanding with revolutionary practice and thus laying foundations for a struggle-oriented movement and party.

In the plains areas, besides inactivity, the absence of a secret party organisation, mass organisations, useful for revolutionary movement and a method of work that can co-ordinate legal and illegal activities are the main weaknesses. We should, while implementing the Immediate Programme, make efforts to overcome these weaknesses. We have explained the weaknesses in the forest areas in the document "Left deviation within the party" and on the other occasions. It is needless to reiterate them here.

The main weakness of the Indian revolution is the failure of building agrarian revolutionary movement. A number of agrarian revolutionary struggles are coming up. They are being subjected to severe repression by the ruling classes. Some of them (Telangana, Naxalbari, Sri-kakulam) were led by the revolutionaries. But we can overcome our weaknesses and solve all problems to the extent we analyse the experience of these struggles in the light of Marxism-Leninism-Mao's Thought and draw lessons from them. Lenin analysed and solved the problems of Russian revolutionary movement in the light of Marxism and on the basis of the experiences of the Russian revolutionary working class movement. He successfully led the Russian revolution.

Mao analysed and solved the problems of Chinese revolutionary movement in light of Marxism Leninism and on the basis of the experiences of the Chinese peasant revolutionary struggles. He successfully led the Chinese revolution.

In India we should, along with the revolutionary working class movement, recognise the agrarian revolutionary movement as the fundamental task. We should analyse the problems of agrarian revolutionary movement as well as the problems of revolutionary working class movement. For this, the party should go among the peasantry and build the agrarian revolutionary movement. Wherever the party goes among the peasantry, there it should develop revolutionary organisational character in it. We should analyse the experiences gained there and on the basis of it we should overcome the weaknesses in our party and the movement.

If we start and carry on our work with an objective of armed struggle, we would be able to build a revolutionary party and a revolutionary movement necessary for armed struggle. What should be a revolutionary movement? What should be a revolutionary party?...such academic discussions even if they are carried on for years, would prove futile, in the end. If we start our work with the minimum understanding (if not maximum), we can solve the problems that arise with the experiences we gain as a result of our work. Our documents, "Lay foundations for a struggle-oriented movement" and the Immediate Programme provide us with such an understanding. They are but in accord with and not opposed to Marxism-Leninism-Mao's Thought.

The work of Comrades in Kondamodalu area testifies it. In the area initially there was not even a single party member, our comrades went and worked, developed, in a period of about 8-10 months, the movement there into one for land distribution and the party organisation into one that could lead such a movement and finally developed the people's armed struggle. With these experiences, it is possible to analyse the failures there and to overcome the weaknesses in the party and the movement.

According to the contention of Com. Somaiah the very thought of an armed struggle in 1969 in Kondamodalu area would seem ridiculous. But the experience of 8-10 months of agrarian

revolutionary movement has proved his contention to be incorrect. It has further proved that we can create conditions for armed struggle in course of building agrarian revolutionary movement.

10. IS IT NOT A PRACTICABLE PROGRAMME FOR THE PLAINS AREAS?

Com. Somaiah writes that ;

".. But the dearth of leadership with revolutionary experience and practical training is very serious. It is only due to this that we failed to set on revolutionary path and statewide movement that called us. We could not provide the movement in plains areas with a practicable programme and give it an organisational shape."

"The leadership with a revolutionary experience and practical training would only emerge when the revolutionary programme is implemented and the revolutionary movement is built. Even if there is a revolutionary programme, such a leadership would not emerge when it is not implemented and revolutionary movement is not built. As far as we are concerned, we are not lacking a revolutionary programme. The lacking is only in its implementation. It is solely because of the revolutionary path the statewide movement that followed us."

The Immediate programme formulated certain programme for the plains areas. It runs as under :

"Plains Area : There are dry and wet lands in the plains areas. To this day, the exploitation and atrocities of the landlords continue to be a serious problem in the dry lands. The food problem is a serious problem here. Vast areas of banjar lands are available for distribution. There are opportunities in these areas to organise and mobilise the people on ever so many problems such as land, cooly rates, food problem, against the domination of landlords and so on.

"Wet lands : ceaseless class struggle against exploitation of people should be carried on in these areas. Here, among the struggle

of the agricultural labour as well as the struggle against the general domination of the landlords we should mainly concentrate on the struggle of the agricultural labour and the tenant farmers. We should launch struggle for the abolition of government farming societies and for distribution of lands under their control among the poor peasants and agricultural labour. There is every possibility of starting and developing struggles on land issue in some districts. We should study where the possibilities for developing such struggles exist and make efforts to develop the struggles there."

Com. Somaiah does not explain as to how this programme is not practicable. But he clearly concluded it away that a practicable programme has not been given. If it is proved impracticable when this programme was implemented, or was sought to be implemented, he does not even mention those experience.

We do not say that there is nothing more to add to the programme for plain areas cited above (from Immediate Programme). But would this programme not form basis for each district committee to formulate a programme suitable to their respective areas?

Does Com. Somaiah suggest anything as to what should be "practicable" programme and what should be its main points? No, he does not do anything like that.

In the Ananthapuram district, based on this programme, the people in villages occupied banjar lands which were in the possession of the landlords. This developed into a vast revolutionary movement. Influenced by the struggle people of these villages, the people in other villages had also started to occupy the banjar lands. Due to the organisational weakness of the party leadership, we could not expand and advance this movement to a higher stage.

In Kurnool district, the land distribution movement was launched for the occupation of

forest banjar lands and the land of farming societies. In accordance with the circular "Lay foundations for a struggle - oriented mass movement, the district leadership launched the movement for the occupation of forest banjar lands as far back as February 1969 itself. In the forest village (Vondotla) about 100 village poor had participated in the movement.

After the state convention, the party in Kurnool District started off in a big way to implement the Immediate Programme. In about 15 villages of Nandyal, Nandi Kotkur and Koila Kuntla Taluques 1,000 acres of land was occupied in an organised way under the leadership of the party. In some of these villages it was even cultivated and 4-5 crops were harvested. In one of these villages, the people had used arms and built barricades to prevent the police intervention, carried on sowing and defended the crops. On all occasions the people had participated in an organised way. This programme beginning in February 1969 went on upto the end of July.

This was the organised part of movement. Apart from this, the village poor in the surrounding villages moved on their own and occupied forest banjar lands. In their entire area, exploitation and atrocities of the forest officials was put an end to. As a result of this struggle the self confidence of the people has increased. They have become conscious. And they are coming forward to participate in the struggle for land more than ever.

In the West Godavari district, the party leadership had after the State Convention, led the struggle in accordance with the Immediate Programme. Though agitation on this question was being carried on ever since 1965, it was only after State Convention that the people were organised and prepared for action. This struggle had its impact on the surrounding villages. The method of landlords acquiring government lands in the name of societies and other dubious means was to an extent contained.

It is wrong to belittle them on the plea that these are only local struggles and they have not

advanced to the higher stage. In a situation where our movement is in a state of inactivity, these struggles make it clear that even in the plains areas it is not only possible but also necessary to mobilise the village poor into struggles on land question. These struggles are giving us necessary experiences and self-confidence to draw lessons from them and to carry on the programme of organising and leading also the struggles for land in a big way in these areas. They are making it clear that the programme formulated in the Immediate Programme is practicable

11. CIVIL RIGHTS MOVEMENT

About one year back, we had given a programme to the party to organise civil rights meetings throughout the state and to mobilise the people against the government on this question. The comrades of the three member committee outside the jail had opposed it. Yet the Guntur and Ongole district committees had taken initiative and conducted district civil rights meetings. They were successful.

While saying that it is wrong to oppose the civil rights movement, Comrade Somaiah writes that :

".....This mainly goes on against the government and repression. Neither there are capable cadres nor an attempt to give it anti-feudal, anti-imperialist, anti-comprador bourgeois consciousness to it. The revolutionary writers with their policies are playing main role in this movement. Therefore, the party leadership should take initiative and direct it against imperialism as well as against repression. The speeches should be drafted for this. In course of time it would become possible to attract revolutionary intellectual and democratic sections to this platform "

It would be wrong if this means utilising the platform of civil rights movement for the propaganda of the party programme and policy. It would be nothing but committing the same mistake that the "revolutionary" writers are committing. Besides those that join in our united front, others would also join in this movement. All those that should join our united front may

not also join in this immediately. As the revolutionary movement advances, it would become clear as to who are for and who are against the revolution. In the present situation, along with the people's democratic revolutionary forces all those that demand civil rights should have a place in it.

If everybody is given the opportunity to propagate their own political programme from this platform, this would become a seminar rather than a civil rights movement. As far as, our comrades working in it are concerned there are possibilities of their occupying the place of the party instead of building the movement.

What should be done is, as those with other politics explain the question of civil rights from their viewpoint, we should explain the question of the civil rights from our own viewpoint. We should influence the revolutionary intellectuals with this viewpoint. But under no circumstances should not be allowed to become a "seminar" of the people with different political opinions.

Only when we build strong secret party, could we be in a position to make use of it as a limited legal platform. Even the opportunity of utilising this platform may get diminished as the revolutionary struggle advances.

12. ARMED STRUGGLE - FIXING DATE LINE.

While pointing out the Immediate Programme's call for implementing the programme of distribution of landlords land in the beginning of the rainy season and preparing for the armed struggle as the proof for the alleged "Left" adventurist poisonous seed" contained in it, Com. Somaiah writes that :

"It is not clear in the Immediate Programme, that the guerilla warfare should be launched when conditions such as the preparedness of conscious organised girijan peasantry, participation of working class squad organisation and the leadership of the party etc, are secured and that they should be touchstones for it. It is not explained in the Immediate Programme that we would launch the armed struggle after

studying the situation and finding it favourable and ripe. Instead irrespective of the situation we announced in advance that we would launch the armed struggle in the rainy season. We directed to fulfil necessary tasks in the meanwhile."

Likewise he comments on the Immediate Programme's call for organising village Soviets and peoples Committees as follows :

"First thing, the programme of forest and plains areas is mixed up. They said that the village Soviets should emerge by May. It means that state Convention assessed, that completing the agrarian revolutionary programme, and wiping out the governments armed forces, the village Soviets should be established by May, 1969. Naturally volunteer squads and guerilla squads are needed for the defence of the village Soviets means nothing but the establishment of rival state in its embryonic form."

As this comrade himself admits that the land distribution, establishment of village Soviets and the launching of armed struggle are the objectives of the Immediate Programme, it becomes indisputably clear that this programme is not a programme of economism, but a revolutionary programme with a political objective, the objective of seizing political power.

The words (month of May; beginning of the rainy season) concerning the date line in the Immediate Programme are wrong. We have already admitted this mistake. Due to this the programme which we should have kept secret, has been exposed to the enemy. Moreover the Immediate Programme is not meant only for the year in question. It would be needed for every area where the people have to be prepared for armed struggle. This is not a task that could be fulfilled within an year. It has to be done during a protracted period. From this viewpoint, there should not have been the words concerning the date line in it. But it is not from this angle Com. Somaiah criticises. His criticism is that we have given a call for organising guerilla warfare, village Soviets and peoples committees without the necessary conditions secured.

For the comrades who set out to implement the Immediate Programme, this call only proved to be encouraging and useful but not a cause for any set backs. On this call, the comrades working in Kondamodalu areas had in practise turned the already existing peoples committees into village Soviets and prepared the girijans to occupy the land in the possession of landlords under the leadership of the village Soviets. The girijans armed themselves and cultivated this land. All this was carried out while there were armed police camps and while the armed police raids were being carried out in this area. The call for armed struggle and fixing of date line had not in anyway come in the way of these comrades to implement the Immediate Programme. It is solely because these comrades had accepted and implemented the Immediate Programme that these results were obtained there.

In Ananthapur district, in connection with the distribution of banjar land under the occupation of landlords in 25 villages' the peoples committees of poor peasants and agricultural labour were constituted in these villages. Is it not in the plain areas that this programme was implemented? Is not this programme implemented on the call of the Immediate Programme?

Likewise, in Kurnool district, the occupation of forest banjar lands and the society lands were carried out. The poor peasants and the agricultural labour that occupied had defended them. All this was carried out in accordance with the party programme.

In view of this, it is wrong to say that the land distribution programme is meant for only girijan areas and not for plains areas. The Immediate Programme directs that this programme is as well for plains areas.

The village Soviets are mainly meant for girijan areas, while the peoples committees are mainly meant for plains areas. There is no mixing up in it; In the girijan areas, before the emergence of village Soviets, the peoples committees would function in the villages. Similarly in the plains, the village Soviets can be organised when the peasant struggle reaches the

higher level. If the village Soviets function for at least some time and if the people have an opportunity to under stand through their own experience as to what is meant by village Soviets it would add immense strength to the revolutionary movement. This would have become possible in Ananthapur and Kurnool districts had the peasant struggle advanced to higher level.

It is wrong to say that the village Soviets should be organised only after the enemy is wiped out and the agrarian revolutionary programme is implemented. This is almost a state where liberated areas emerge. Thus there would arise a situation wherein the government can be formed in the liberated areas. It is wrong to confuse this Government with village Soviets. At the time of setting out to implement the agrarian revolutionary programme itself we organise village Soviets and implement the agrarian revolutionary programme under their leadership. In some cases already existing village committees would with necessary changes, transform themselves into village Soviets with executive powers. All these are the development in the course of the peasant revolutionary struggle in the countryside.

Every letter, every sentence and every para in the Immediate Programme is but meant for the "Preparedness" of the people. It would become clear to anyone who carefully studies the Immediate Programme.

The talk that we would launch armed struggle when the conditions are mature is nothing but repeating the talk in vogue right from the time of neo-revisionism. This line of talk has but one use-to indefinitely postpone the armed struggle. The aim of the Immediate Programme is not the indefinite postponement of the armed struggle. Its aim is to provide the programme necessary for preparing the people for armed struggle.

The fact is, by the time of State Convention itself, a trend according to which we should launch armed actions irrespective of the preparedness of the people had raised its head inside the party. Responsible comrades with this trend had, by the time of State Convention

itself devised the "date line" for squad actions. They launched the squad actions according to their plan and "date line". These actions of theirs have nothing to do with the Immediate Programme. They have used the two words relating to the "date line" in the Immediate Programme to defend these actions of theirs. Com. Somaiah is but repeating the very same line of talk.

We have before us the experiences of the implementation of Immediate Programme in Kondamodalu as well as in Ananthapur and Kurnool districts. The revolutionary movement had registered an advance in these areas. In Kondamodalu area, the revolutionary movement had reached the stage of peoples armed struggle in Khammam and Warangal districts there was a good effort in organising the mass movement upto the time of the State Convention. But since the Immediate Programme was not implemented after the State Convention the progress of the revolutionary movement had come to standstill. Since the people are not participating in the "armed struggle, there has developed a situation where it has fallen to the lot of cadre self-defence, failing to analyse these experiences from a revolutionary viewpoint, and viewing the armed struggle with a neo-revisionist outlook, Com. Somaiah has come to the conclusion that the Immediate Programme carries "the poisonous seed of left adventurism".

13. WHAT IS NEXT PROGRAMME ?

In his covering letter to the document, Com Somaiah writes that "based on all these discussions and criticism, finally the party should basically come to certain conclusions". He does not say as to what are these "conclusions". Similarly he writes that the Immediate Programme has not given "practicable programme" to the plains areas. He does not say as to what is the "practicable programme, and what are its main points. We have to search and re-search although his document to find out as to what are his opinions about his programme.

Under the heading "Civil Rights Agitation" he writes that "our present armed struggle is in its primary stage. This is a self-defence struggle". With this it is clear that he accepts the activities

going on in Khammam and Warangal districts as the first stage of the armed struggle. It is also clear that this Comrade is unequivocally supporting the Khammam Area Committee's line that there would be an armed struggle without the participation of the people, that the cadres self-defence without the participation of the people should be termed as armed struggle, and that it should be considered as the first stage of the armed struggle.

We are not against self-defence. We are fully in support of the armed self-defence. Besides it is our firm opinion that the armed actions without the participation of the people, and unconnected with the agrarian revolution is not a people's armed struggle and thus the cadres self-defence is not the first stage of the armed struggle. In view of this, not only the Khammam Area Committee's line but also these opinions of Com. Somaiah are opposed to the Immediate Programme.

He writes that "political agitation against this bourgeois-feudal government and exposure of its anti-people laws, policies and fascist repression should be crucial to our revolutionary movement". In his document he has repeatedly referred to the question of "exposure." We can safely conclude that this itself is the main point of the programme he suggests.

It is always essential for the revolutionary movement to politically expose the government. When the mass movement is in a state of inactivity and when we set out to newly build the movement in an area when there is no movement, as a first step leaflets, secret papers, group meetings, and public speeches making use of the legal platform would prove useful. But without leading anti-imperialist and anti-feudal struggles and without organising the revolutionary movement through it, if we merely confine to "political exposure" and if we take up, the programme of "exposure" as an alternative to the programme of organising the revolutionary movement it would be but neo revisionism.

On the plea that the people are not prepared for revolutionary struggle the neo-revisionists have given up the task of organising the revolutionary movement and taken up the pro-

gramme of "exposure". Is there any basic difference between their policy and the policy that Com. Somaiah suggests? There is not any such difference.

Lenin gives immense importance to "political exposure". It is but essential to create socialist consciousness among the working class. Along with it, he gives utmost importance to the revolutionary struggles and build the revolutionary movement. We should not take the political exposure as an alternative to building revolutionary movement.

In Kondamadalu area we had from the beginning carried on the propaganda on land question. Along with it, we organised revolutionary struggles and revolutionary movement on the demands of farm servants, agricultural labour and other anti-feudal demands. By this line, we could in a short time-about 8-10 months-prepare the girijans there to occupy and cultivate the lands in the possession of the landlords. These experiences would apply to the plains areas as well. Depending on the local conditions in some areas it may take more time to prepare the people for revolutionary struggle.

Thus, while on one hand saying that he supports Immediate Programme and Kondamadalu peasant revolutionary movement Com. Somaiah is on the other hand saying that the armed actions and the self-defence which have nothing to do with the agrarian revolution and the participation of the people as the first stage of the armed struggle. Further, he is suggesting that the exposure of the government is the crucial task. This "Crucial task" doesn't include building of agrarian revolutionary movement. In this outlook, even though there appears to be left adventurism in the forest areas and revisionism in the plains areas, in both of them he refuses to recognise the immediate building of agrarian revolutionary movement as a practicable task Com. Somaiah with this revisionist outlook is opposing the Immediate Programme which has adopted the agrarian revolution as its immediate task.

14 REVISIONIST TREND

While on our side we are saying that the path of armed struggle advanced in the Imme-

mediate Programme is correct, Com. Somaiah is on the other hand writes in his document, "Immediate Programme-Our Experiences" that there are "poisonous seeds of left adventurism in it. He further writes that the Immediate Programme is correct, but there are weaknesses in the movement. Thus he says the "left" adventurist trend which had raised its head inside the party has its foundations in the Immediate Programme itself. It is his firm opinion that all responsibility for the "left adventurist activities in the party lies with the Immediate Programme.

Though Com. Somaiah, by accepting the Immediate Programme and by admitting the correctness of the Kondomodalu agrarian revolutionary movement, expresses his confusion to a certain degree with the assertion that the Immediate Programme manifest "left" adventurism, he has clearly expressed his revisionist outlook. His arguments manifest the following revisionist trends :

1. He does not realise that in the People's Democratic revolution, we are in the stage of agrarian revolution, that the distribution of landlords' land to the poor peasants and agricultural labour is the objective, and the main task of the agrarian revolution and that this is a task of the bourgeois democratic revolution and not of Socialist revolution. The peasants and the agricultural labour seize the landlords, land with the bourgeois democratic revolutionary consciousness. For the working class to lead the peasantry does not mean to create Socialist consciousness among them in the agrarian revolutionary stage, but to carry forward the agrarian revolution through to its conclusion and to make it a success is the role of the working class as the leader:

He has mechanically applied to the peasantry the tasks that Lenin, in his work "What is to be done?" laid down to create Socialist consciousness among working class. As a result he has forgotten the role of the agrarian revolution and the immediate importance of agrarian revolutionary movement.

2. The working class, ideologically and organisationally provides leadership to the people's democratic revolution and the people's war

through its party. In his document Com. Somaiah raises the question of role of the working class in the armed struggle and again reverts back to the path of insurrection. In the past the path of insurrection proved useful to divert the revolutionaries from the agrarian revolution and the path of peoples war to the parliamentary path. This is the same path the neo-revisionists are pursuing today. It is towards this path that Com. Somaiah is once again reverting back.

3. Pointing to the weaknesses in the movement, he portrays it as a crime to even think of the armed struggle without overcoming these weaknesses. He does not realise that weaknesses are only due to the absence of agrarian revolutionary movement in the past, that we can overcome these weaknesses only through the building of agrarian revolutionary movement and that all the main points of the Immediate Programme, are pointing to this it also means that we are for armed struggle which is its form in the next higher stage without agrarian revolution as the objective, we will have no programme as such in the countryside. To point to the weaknesses of the party and the mass movement and to waterdown the agrarian revolutionary movement on this pretext is the programme to neo-revisionists this is evident at all along in Com. Somaiah document. This is the same trend which is behind his assertion-"to politically expose the government is the crucial task today" This is what is the neo revisionist trend.

4. He has come to the conclusion that the Immediate Programme has "left adventurist poisonous seed" and "left adventurist foundations". He has interpreted all its main points as left-adventurism. In the present stage, no programme for the building of agrarian revolutionary movement can be termed left adventurism. Any trend without such a programme or any trend that waters it down-all this is but neo-revisionist. Only the revisionists and neo-revisionists can call the Immediate Programme left adventurist programme.

Com. Somaiah has, in his document, made it clear that self-defence is the first stage of the armed struggle and that at present we are in this stage. This stand is fundamentally opposed

to the Immediate Programme. There is no armed struggle as such unconnected with agrarian revolution, and with its main aspect the land, and without the participation of the people. Despite the fact that cadres armed self-defence is fully justified, it cannot however be a substitute to the peoples armed self-defence struggle. By taking this stand Com. Somaiah has come to the position of defending the contention that there is no need for agrarian revolution to launch the armed struggle in the forest areas. "The Khammam A. C. Reply" and its authors say that self-defence without participation of the people and unconnected with the agrarian revolution is the first stage of the armed struggle. They are implementing this line. Taking up this stand Com. Somaiah is trying to join on their side

Though this stand of Com. Somaiah is in the form of left adventurism, with the rejection of the need for building agrarian revolutionary movement, it becomes clear that it has only revisionist foundations.

Thus, through his document "Immediate Programme Our Experiences", Com. Somaiah is making it clear that he is moving away from Immediate Programme and following revisionist-trend. This trend is nothing but another form of neo-revisionist trend.

His revisionist trend has reflected in the organisational question as well. His criticism on organisational questions, reflects the same trend.

ORGANISATIONAL QUESTIONS

Com. Somaiah magnanimously writes that 'the path of the armed struggle which we have taken up in the Immediate Programme and adopted in the State Convention is the only correct path. We should defeat the attempts at revising or watering down this path'. But he himself is attacking the Immediate Programme from a revisionist outlook and rejecting that path. He does not stop there. He further expresses pessimism about the dearth of leadership, capable of implementing this line and criticises the organisational steps, the state committee has taken to guarantee the implementation of this path as "sectarian" actions.

1. PESSIMISTIC OUTLOOK ABOUT THE LEADERSHIP

Stating that the leadership needed for armed struggle would not emerge in near future, Com. Somaiah expresses his pessimistic outlook as follows :

"The state leadership's immaturity and lack of experience are only responsible for the failure in absorbing new blood into the movement. The dearth of leadership is due to the betrayal of the party leadership that led the party since four decades. It is unrealistic to say that we can overcome this dearth of leadership soon. We cannot so soon overcome the dearth of the leadership capable of applying armed struggle path to the Indian conditions (to India or to our state) and leading it".

With this Com. Somaiah conclusively declares his lack of confidence on the future of the path of armed struggle. He makes it clear to the party that the path of armed struggle besides containing the "poisonous seed of left adventurism", has no leadership capable of building it and that such leadership cannot emerge in near future. All this is in accord with the contention he has been advancing all along that it is ridiculous to think of armed struggle in near future.

The fact is, the emergence and the development of the revolutionary leadership takes place in the course of the development of the revolutionary movement itself and not independent of it. Instead of analysing it with the revolutionary outlook, Com. Somaiah analyses it with a pessimistic outlook. Consequently he arrived at pessimistic conclusion.

Com. Somaiah treated those that "Led the party for a period of four decades as an incarnations. Some of them deserted the revolution overtly while some other covertly. In his opinion, new incarnations capable of providing leadership to the Indian revolution has not yet made their "appearance. It would remain void until make their appearance. This is nothing but "nihilism" in the name of recognising the reality and demanding the postponement of

armed struggle. It is nihilism and not Marxism-Leninism-Mao's Thought.

We can develop the revolutionary leadership only through revolutionary programme and revolutionary practice. We can train the young leadership. We can rectify the weaknesses of the senior leadership. The main reason for our failure to carry it out is not the weakness in the Immediate Programme. It is only the absence of revolutionary practice capable of carrying it out. The "left" adventurists and the right opportunists inside the party are the main obstacles for this revolutionary practice. These wrong trends have clearly come to the surface in the documents, "Khammam Area Committee's Reply" and "Immediate Programme Our Experiences". It is on the determined struggle against these wrong trends that the future of our path of armed struggle depends. The party leadership should fulfill this task.

All the experiences of our people's struggle prove the correctness of the programme we have adopted. If we march forward with a correct revolutionary practice, we can undoubtedly provide a correct leadership to the revolutionary movement. When we could, in accordance with Marxism-Leninism-Mao's Thought, adopt a correct revolutionary line, we could also implement it. Com. Somaiah's criticism with its pessimistic outlook fails to see this bright future of revolutionary line. We should grasp that it is a part of the right deviation and carry on a struggle against it.

2. INNER PARTY SITUATION - EMERGENCY OF LEFT AND RIGHT GROUPS.

Comrade Somaiah criticises the Immediate Programme with a revisionist outlook. He has defended the main points of the "left" adventurist outlook. Now he is showing the factional activities of this left adventurist group as the activities of the party and opposing the struggle against them. It is necessary to take note of his mutually contradictory statements given below:

"More than the actions conducted, the common understanding that led to them is harm-

ful and main also. Therefore it is our main and crucial task to go deep into the question and rectify our political mistakes."

At another place he writes that:

"...One thing is clear, there is no common understanding among the leadership inside and outside the jail on all the questions. There are differences. There are differences among the leadership on the questions such as method of conducting armed struggle, the elections and mass movements. Therefore we should patiently study them in the light of experience and come to a common understanding. This effort should continue for a long period of time. But this effort cannot be completed through disciplinary actions. Moreover this may cause serious harm in the primary stage."

In the first part of the passage he writes that there is "a common understanding" and that this "common understanding" has led to the 'actions'. He says that he recognises it "as the main". In the very next moment, he rejects such a "main" thing and writes in the second part that "there is no common understanding among the leadership inside and outside jail on all questions. There are differences." His own words make it clear that the common understanding is not a fact and that it is fabricated to show that there are "poisonous seeds of left adventurism" and "Foundations for left adventurism" in the Immediate Programme.

The fact is, there are differences among the state leadership elected in the State Convention. The majority of the state leadership is bound by the Immediate Programme and its understanding. It is in accordance with it, they demand that the agrarian revolution should be developed and that the peoples armed struggle should be conducted. It is only with this understanding, they think, that it is possible to achieve unity on other problems facing the revolutionary movement. The experiences that should be gained while implementing the immediate Programme would be of immense help to achieve this unity. This is the way to apply Marxism-Leninism-Mao's Thought to the concrete conditions of our country and to our revolutionary practice.

Only three from the State Committee, fundamentally differ with the Immediate Programme. Com. Peddanna and another Comrade with him have formulated that the armed self-defence of the cadre without the programme of land distribution, the main point of the agrarian revolution, and participation of the people as the first stage of armed struggle and are fundamentally opposing the Immediate Programme and exhibiting "left adventurist trend. He has made this trend clear in several of his documents, especially in "Khammam Area Committee's Reply", while defending this trend, Com. Somaiah contends that the Immediate Programme contains the "poisonous seed of left adventurism", and "foundations" for it and opposes Immediate Programme from a revisionist outlook. His document "Immediate Programme Our Experiences" makes this opposition clear. Even though their unity appears to be strange, the basis for this unity is their rejection of the need for immediate building of the agrarian revolutionary movement.

It is but natural for these fundamental differences that they have on the Immediate Programme, differences reflected in other problems facing the revolutionary movement. They have already become clear on some problems we have in the document "Left Deviation within the party" pointed out and criticised the "left" adventurist trend on various questions inside the party. In the present document, we criticised the revisionist outlook inside the party on the Immediate Programme, and the organisation.

In view of this, the Immediate Programme and its under-standing command comfortable majority not only in the State Committee elected by the State Convention but also in the party. This is not an artificial majority. This majority is the reflection of the majority inside the party for the trend of the Immediate Programme. Whoever rejects this majority is also rejecting the Immediate Programme. The State Committee realised the danger of "left" adventurism inside party since the Pagideru actions. The struggle against the "left" deviation and taken a shape in the State Committee meeting of July 1969. With the arrest of State leadership

in December, this struggle had suffered a serious setback.

We have explained in the documents, "Problems facing the revolutionary mass movement of Khammam Area" and "Left Deviation within the party", the forms in which "Left" adventurism is appearing in the State Committee and the party, especially on the question of armed struggle. Criticising the "left" adventurism of the Charu Mazumdar group, the leadership of CPI (M-L), we drafted a document "Left trend among the Indian revolutionaries".

In these documents, we have criticised the attitude of the 'left' adventurists on all the problems facing the party and the revolutionary movement and at the same time made our stand clear. Similarly, through this present document, we have criticised right opportunism and shows as to how this would harm the progress of the revolutionary movement. These documents would make it clear as to how baseless is the criticism that we are not going deep into problems and analysing them.

The 'left' adventurism and right opportunism that rose their head inside the party have taken an organised form. While the left adventurists have formed themselves into a full fledged group and functioning as such, the right opportunism are currently taking preliminary steps to form themselves into a group. (We would further explain this aspect later). Without grasping this main aspect of the inner party situation, we can't formulate a correct organisational policy.

There is sufficient foundation to assert that the 'left' adventurist group had begun its activities prior to the State Convention itself. After the Pagideru actions in Khammam Area, it had emerged as an organised group under the leadership of Com. Peddanna. After the arrest of State leadership Suri along with the Mulugu area party had made a vain bid to merge with Charu Mazumdar group. At the time of reorganisation of party leadership, Com. Peddanna's group managed to gain majority in the three member committee that was formed to carry on the responsibilities of P. C. Centre. The document 'Khammam Area Committee's

Reply" is a proof to show that the Khammam Area Committee has emerged as an independent group at one time which later merged with the rival centre.

When a group has emerged against the party programme and party line, it does not merely confine to difference of opinion. The activities of Peddanna's 'left' adventurist group are in proof of the fact that such a group would expand its activities with a clear cut alternate programme and policy and try to seize control of the key positions in the party and gradually the whole party itself. Now the activities of right opportunist group under the leadership of Com. Somaiah have begun.

While this is the position, Com. Somaiah's writing that "However we are working adhering to the principle of democratic centralism with what is left". Putting limitations saying "what is left" is only to ridicule the principle of democratic centralism but not to sincerely implement it. When the "left" adventurist and right opportunist groups have emerged and are working for their domination inside the party, the party leadership would not take steps after the fashion of resolving ordinary differences. While on one hand carrying on an ideological struggle against the "left" and right deviations, the party leadership would on the other hand remove the group leadership from the key positions and gradually reduce the group domination. They would rectify those of the group that follow wrong line. They would abolish the group and establish centralised leadership. This is the process in which unified and centralised party develops.

In view of this, the decisions that the State Committee has adopted are only aimed at bringing the Immediate Programme into force and on the basis of it to unite the party. But they are not the decisions unrelated to politics. The arguments of Com. Somaiah that those are sectarian decisions are only like the arguments of a lawyer but not like the argument that would prove useful for the advance of revolutionary movement. We do recognise the need to conduct discussions patiently, and for a long period of time on these trends opposed to

the party and the revolution. As long as the groups and rival centres are not organised inside the party discussions are conducted on the basis of the principles of inner party democracy with the emergence of groups and Rival Centres the form and content of these discussions would also change. Only those that fail to grasp the extraordinary situation created due to the emergence of groups and Rival Centres, could with that the discussions should go on in the ordinary process. What is more, comrade Somaiah's silence about the "left adventurist group only makes it clear that his talk that the line we had taken up in the Immediate Programme which was adopted by the State Convention, is the only correct line and that we should defeat any attempts at revising or watering it down—all this talk has little value. Leaving aside revising or watering it down he is travelling in the direction of entirely scrapping that line.

3. THE QUESTION OF REORGANISING OF STATE CENTRE.

* Since the majority of the State Committee are arrested and in jail, the State Committee leadership consented to constitute, besides the State Committee, a three member committee for carrying on the State Committee responsibilities outside. We hoped that this committee would work in accordance with the programme adopted by the State Convention, unify the party and strive for the development of the revolutionary movement. But nothing of the sort has happened. On the contrary this committee has given up the party and taken up the line of Charu Mazumdar. It has attempted to split the party. The circulation of "Khammam Area Committee's Reply" and other document testify to it. Not stopping with it, it has further attempted to get the wrong line pursued by the Khammam Area Committee adopted by the convention and to implement it as an official line.

If this committee implements the Immediate Programme and suggests improvement in the Immediate Programme on the basis of the experiences acquired in course of its implementation, such suggestion or suggestions would be worthy of consideration. But the three member committee has done nothing of the sort,

Starting with the subject that armed struggle should be co-ordinated with the mobilisation of the people, it has brought out documents into circulation which defend Charu Mazumdar line and a line that says that it is wrong to link the armed struggle with the land distribution. Claiming that the experience has proved it, they have defended this line. What else it is if not the propagation and practising of an alternate line to Immediate Programme?

Com. Somaiah claims that "there is not any basis to say that "the three member committee, formed one year after the Pagideru actions, has not implemented Immediate Programme". Why has he failed to comment as to what is the content of the "Khammam Area Committee Reply"? And why has he failed to comment as to what is the objective of this document? What is there for us to say when, knowing as he does, feigns innocence?

For Com. Somaiah who made a vain bid to prove that there is economism and "left" adventurism in the party line itself, it is recklessness to say that the three member committee has confidence in the Immediate Programme, or it has implemented this programme. The fact is, leaving aside the implementation of the Immediate Programme, this committee has implemented Charu Mazumdar's programme, its a different form which is diamatically opposed to it and attempted to make this programme as the official programme of the party.

Com. Somaiah claims that after the Pagideru actions, the comrades responsible for these actions had admitted and rectified their mistakes. We too had hoped that they would rectify their mistakes. But the experience has proved that they have only formally admitted their mistakes and only to implement their own line. Com. Somaiah is taking their deceptive talk and drawing his conclusions on its basis. We have come to this conclusion on the basis of not only their talk but also their documents as well as their activities, especially their practice. Thus we have come to the conclusion that the implementation of the Immediate Programme by the three member committee is out of question

and that this should be reorganised in a Committee capable of implementing this programme

While discussing this question, Com. Somaiah is setting aside the need for the implementation of the party's political line and defending the continuation of the existence of three member committees in the name of organisational principles. On this question, while the revolutionary outlook is not expressed towards the party organisational principles, his lack of confidence on party line and his opposition to it becomes clear. He is concealing the fact that the continuation of three member committee and the implementation of Immediate Programme are mutually contradictory. Let us also examine his arguments, advanced in the name of organisational principles.

The main thing in his argument is that with the recognition of the three member committee as P. C. centre, the State Committee which is in the jail ceased to exist and it had on its own accord ceased its existence. Simply because of the arrest, the State Committee doesn't and can't cease to exist. It doesn't and can't give up its responsibility of exercising its powers and helping the revolutionary movement, whenever the need arises. The members of the State Committee would continue to shoulder their revolutionary responsibilities until they are hanged or shot dead by the enemy. To carry on their responsibilities thus is the duty of every revolutionary.

Even in the past, while they were in the jail, the State leadership had taken decisions on a number of important issues. During 1962-63 the decision to start Janasakti was taken in the jail itself. It was from the jail that we made preparations to break away from the revisionists. Also during 1965-66, we had taken decisions on a number of important questions and implemented them. Eventhough the State Committee was formed and functioning outside, the State Committee had continued to function from jails. Never had the question of questioning the authority of the committee in jail arisen.

Until some time after the arrest, the present state Committee had also been providing leadership to the activities outside the Jail. It

is nothing but bourgeois legalism to presume that the committees would lose their powers just because they are arrested and the newly formed committees would be committees with full powers. The arrested committees and comrades should recognise the limitations they have due to the arrests, and should, as the necessity demands, assist and the committees and comrades outside should within these limitations obtain the leadership. Even though there are differences in the party, this would go on smoothly so long as the groupism is absent. This is impossible if there is factionalism. When there are both fundamental differences as well as factionalism inside the party, it is not only not possible but also it would give rise to new problems. These problems should be resolved keeping in view as to how best would it serve the implementation of the party's revolutionary line.

Another argument of his is that the State Committee ceased to exist as soon as the Three Member Committee was formed, that as a result the State Committee would remain only as a subordinate committee to the Three Member Committee and that the State Committee would have no powers to abolish that Committee. (It is in accordance with this that he is referring to the State Committee not as State Committee but only as jail leadership). The fact is, the State Committee has not abolished itself. After the formation of the Three Member Committee, the State Committee had entrusted all its responsibilities to it. It stopped carrying on the responsibilities by itself. It did not accept the leadership of the Three Member Committee. But it decided to help it, by way of sending guidance and suggestions in regard to the implementation of the party programme. It recognised the Three Member Committee as a Committee shouldering the responsibilities of conducting the movement outside.

It does not mean that the State Committee had in the interest of revolutionary movement permanently transferred its authority and that it would not intervene if it becomes necessary. Such a thing may happen in the case of transfer of property but it would not and should not happen in the case of the affairs of a revolutionary

movement. There can't be a more counter-revolutionary outlook than treating the affairs of a revolutionary party organisation as a question of property transfer and apply their principles to it. Is it not wrong for the State Committee to recognise the Three Member Committee? We mark it clear that when we have got the right to recognise this committee with the hope that it would implement the Immediate Programme we would also naturally have the right of abolishing it when this committee fails to implement the party programme, and that we are exercising this right in the interest of the revolutionary movement. It is another argument of Com. Somaiah that we have abolished the Three Member Committee without asking for any explanation from it. It has become necessary for us to take this decision since they are functioning as a rival centre and since they have decided to hold another State Convention soon.

Com. Somaiah says that revising or watering down Immediate Programme should not be tolerated. By recognising the Three Member Committee still as a State Committee and by calling the State Committee as jail leadership, is he not admitting that they need not implement the Immediate Programme? What should we call it?

4. THE POLITICS BEHIND THE DECISION TO CONVENE ANOTHER STATE CONVENTION.

Defending the Three Member Committee's decision to convene another State Convention Com Somaiah writes that:

"According to the principles of party organisation, the P. C., has got every right to convene such a convention, opportunity should be given to discuss the documents sent from jail in the convention. In the prevailing political and organisational situation, the P. C., should seriously consider if an objection to convene the convention is raised from jail. The question of postponement of the convention should be reconsidered unless it is unavoidable to convene the convention".

He also suggests that the convention should be postponed till the judgement of conspiracy case so that those released could participate in the convention. Thus he had only not decided as to when the convention should be held. Otherwise he fully defends the convening of a convention.

In order to understand his opinion about the convention more clearly, we cite hereunder passage regarding the convention from the letter that a member of the Three Member Committee addressed to us about the convention.

"We decided to hold State Plenum including in it both the areas. It was decided that the P. C., should first meet and draft proper document for it. The delegates to it will be 22 from the Forest Area, 3 from forest area R. C., 3 from P. C., 11 or 12 from the plains areas. Both the R. C.'s will be represented in it. The convention will be for 7 to 8 days.

"Plenum Agenda : - (1) Party Programme (2) Party Organisation (3) Lessons of the past two years of Armed Struggle (4) Political resolution on the post-election situation (5) The differences between the jail Committee and the present State Committee (6) Previous P. C.'s draft on Khammam Movement - Khammam Area Committee Reply etc..... (7) Similarities and dissimilarities between China and India. Application of the path of Peoples War to India (8) Any other subject.

"I request that your views and suggestions on plenum, its agenda and the political and organisational questions that would come before it may be sent atleast by 15th June. You have to send your opinions also on the documents "On morals" which has already been sent to you. The P. C., would like to have the opportunity to discuss that first".

This was written on 5th June. They wanted our views and suggestions to be sent by 8 to 10 days. The committee of Three failed to show in this letter the need for holding the convention so hastily. With this, it becomes clear that there are not any significant reasons to hold the convention.

The Three member Committee also is aware of the fact that we have differences with it on all the fundamental questions. The issues on the Agenda for discussion in the convention are not local issues nor are they issues limited to state. They are mainly all India questions. The Three Member Committee is aware that it is impossible to convey our opinions on these questions unless we know their opinions on these questions. Thus it is only as a formality that this Committee has asked for the views and suggestions but not recognising the need for it.

Com. Somaiah's document makes it clear that he recognises the fulfilled authority of the Three Member Committee. But with him, the entire party does not recognise its fulfilled authority. Instead of recognising the fact that under the circumstances the convention under the aegis of this committee is not acceptable to the party, he passes the judgement that in accordance with principles of party organisation, the P. C., has got every right to hold such a convention. It is not a great thing for anybody to hold that conventions by themselves. But how could they be the conventions of the entire party?

Comrade Somaiah requests the Three Member Committee to allow the documents sent from jail for discussion. But his leaders have issues orders giving only one week time to send the views and suggestions. He could not comment anything on this,

NOW LET US CONSIDER THE AGENDA.

1. **Party Programme :** Prior to the arrest, the State Committee discussed the party programme in two of its meetings. It was arrested at the stage of finalising it. It is clear that the Three Member Committee is not going to place before the convention the document finalised by that State Committee but the document drafted by it,

2. **Party Organisation :** In the present situation wherein a Rival Centre has emerged in the party, and this centre gained majority not only in the Forest Regional Committee but also in the Three Member Committee, the organisational principles that this committee adopted would but be a means for the implementation

of the politics of this Committee, but would not be a means to discuss the issues in the party programme and to implement the main points of the party programme and tactical line which we have already formulated in the Immediate Programme.

3. Two years of Armed Struggle-Lessons

The Three Member Committee has already made these lessons clear in different documents. "Khammam Area Committee's Reply" is the latest of these documents. The sum and substance of these lessons is to term the armed self-defence, which the cadre are carrying on forming into squads without agrarian revolution and without the participation of the people as the first stage of the armed struggle. This is fundamentally opposed to the path of People's War. It is clear that Three Member Committee is going to legalise through the convention its line which is opposed to peoples war.

4. Political Resolution on the post-election situation

: In the political documents of the Three Member Committee, there already appears a trend to tactically despise the enemy. This trend is opposed to Mao's Thought. It is always necessary that "strategically we should despise all our enemies, but tactically we should take them all seriously".

5. The Differences between the Jail:

Committee and the present "State Committee": It is clear that the Three Member Committee admits that there are differences and is attempting to settle them through this convention. As far as we are concerned we have made clear some of our important views in the document "Left Deviation within the party". We will also make the rest of our views clear in the documents we are going to release.

6. P. C.'s Draft on Khammam Movement

Khammam Committee's Reply : These documents as well as our criticism on Khammam Area Committee's Reply are before the party.

7. Similarities and Dissimilarities between China and India : Application of the Party of People's War in

India : We do not have any doubt that this application of the path of people war to India would be such that it would defened the self-defence as a first stage of armed struggle.

A brief explanation of the agenda will lay bare the political aims of the convention. Any one can understand that this convention is meant to divert the party from the Immediate Programme, to lead it to the "left" adventurist path, and to officially adopt the "left" adventurist political line which the Three Member Committee is pursuing at present.

While saying that the Three Member Committee has got every right to hold such a convention, Comrade Somaiah suggests that in case of objection from jail for holding the convention the "P. C." should reconsider the question of postponement of the convention, unless it is unavoidable to hold, as though he is unaware of the fact that the committee is holding the convention only under avoidable circumstances and not as a routine affair. What are these circumstances? For them it has become necessary to hold a meeting in the form of a convention and to get in shortest possible time their policies adopted officially, without putting them for discussion in the party units, while the State leadership is still in jail and while there is confusion inside the party. Under the circumstances the condition "unavoidable" will not be in the interest of the party. To firmly reject will alone be in its interest. The State Committee has rejected holding of this convention. The State Committee's resolution in this regard is before the party. Com. Somaiah stipulates the condition 'if an objection is raised from jail' as though he is not aware of the State Committee's decision. Why should he write as though he is not at all aware, when he is fully aware of it?

In the note to his document "Immediate Programme - Our Experiences", he writes that his document should be circulated as one of the documents for discussion in the convention. By this it is evident that he is for holding the convention immediately. When he himself considers it "unavoidable", where is the need to suggest that the question of postponement should be considered? The need is, the conspiracy case is going to be concluded within a

few months. It should be postponed so as to facilitate the participation of such of those comrades who will be released and do not fall within the confines of preventive detention act. It is clear that Com. Somaiah is asking for the postponement of the convention not for political reasons but in the view of the impending judgement of conspiracy case. We are rejecting the convention and the Committee that wants to hold the convention, only for political reasons. The political reason is to prevent them from taking the party on the "left" adventurist path. On the pretext of organisational principles, Com. Somaiah is supporting not only the committee but even the convention. Thus he is aiding them in their endeavour to take the party towards left adventurism. Perhaps this is how he defends the immediate programme.

We demand that discussion should be conducted in the units on the party programme as well on all questions concerning the policy. We are conveying our views and criticism of left and right deviations to the party units by means of documents. The party should implement the immediate programme so as to enable it to formulate a fulfilled programme and policy. The form and substance of guidance by organisation is to form a committee capable of conducting fulfilled discussions simultaneously with the implementation of immediate programme. The experience has proved that the Three Member Committee cannot and will not fulfil this responsibility.

5. CIRCULATION OF DOCUMENTS.

The circulation of new documents by the Three Member Committee, doesn't merely concern the powers of that Committee. The question of circulation of the documents is inter-linked with the question of whether the party policies should be taken to the party units and the people. Com. Somaiah's acceptance of the Three Member Committee doesn't in any way alter the nature of this problem. About the powers of the Three Member Committee Com. Somaiah writes that:

"The P. C., alone can discuss and take final decisions on the articles and documents, sent by the jail leadership. The

P. C., can examine the seriousness of the documents and articles of the jail committee. It can with the experiences outside correct them if need be. It can reject them in case it thinks them harmful. This right was transferred to P. C."

We will not come in his way if Com. Somaiah of his own accord transfers all his powers to "P. C." But as far we are concerned, we have already made it clear that we have not transferred the revolutionary rights and responsibilities to any one and that they will be with us as long as we are revolutionaries. When discussing the affair of circulation of documents, it is necessary to understand the attitude of Com. Somaiah on the question of circulation of his document, "Immediate Programme Our Experiences". We are citing the letter he sent along with this document.

Comrades,

Discussions are going on in the Revolutionary Communist Party on certain political and organisational questions. From jail and outside, both the committees have put these discussions in writing and circulated among the cadres. Differing with these two committees, I have written my views in this and sending it for inner-party discussions. But in the last committed meeting, there was an opinion that the Committee should draft and circulate a reply along with my document in case my views were to be found objectionable. The discussions are already going on in the party, we hear that the party convention is going to be held. Therefore, I demand that this difference of opinion should also be circulated without any delay and in time for inner-party discussion. The criticism on this may also be circulated for party discussions. Likewise the outside committee also may circulate its criticism. Finally the party has to come to certain general conclusions on the basis of these entire discussions and criticisms. We should thus conclude these discussions.

Therefore, I demand that my difference of opinion on the fundamental questions should be immediately circulated for inner-party dis-

ussions without holding it back until a reply is drafted."

It is not correct for Com. Somaiah to write that "we hear that the party convention is going to be held". We have given him the letter which a member of the Three Member Committee had officially written. He read it. He officially learnt that the party convention was going to be held. Yet he writes that he is only 'hearing'. It means it is clear that in order to mislead the party, he is telling a lie that the State Committee has not informed him of it officially.

Com. Somaiah is fully aware that we firmly rejected the proposal for holding the party convention. Com. Somaiah participated in the meeting wherein we passed a resolution rejecting the proposal for holding the convention. His view was that the convention should go on as usual he also knows the fact that it was circulated to the lower committees. When we rejected the convention itself, the question of circulating this document for discussion in advance of convention does not arise. The question did not come up before the committee in this form. In the committee meeting Com. Somaiah said that he was opposing the document "Left Deviation within the Party" and the party letter and that he would send his views in writing and demanded that his document should be circulated immediately. He did not even explain the main points of his views. He expressed his opposition to our resolutions concerning the organisation excepting the one on all India centre.

Without explaining his differences of opinion and even before he submitted his document to the state committee, he demanded that a decision be taken on circulating it. He did not explain which organisational principles warrant such a procedure. Every one knows that it is harmful for the party to circulate without a note of criticism, such documents which are opposed to the party policy and which sow confusion in the party. What is wrong in saying that in case his views were to be found objectionable, a reply will be drafted and circulated along with it? Is it not the task of the Committee to do so?

His "Immediate Programme-Our Experiences" is a document which attacks not only the party programme and policies, but also the organisational activities from a right opportunist outlook. He wants such a document to be circulated first without a note of criticism and then circulate the note of criticism. He wants special privileges for the documents opposed to party policies.

Similarly, he had no objection whatsoever for the Three Member Committee circulating documents opposed to party programme and policies. On the contrary, he is defending it. All that he opposes is the circulation of documents of the State Committee that are in conformity with the party programme and policies. This is what is secret of his assertion that the Three Member Committee has got every right to reject these documents.

The experience of any movement can be analysed with a revolutionary outlook, as well as with a "left" adventurist outlook. Lessons and conclusions can be drawn in conformity with the given outlook. When analysed with a revisionist outlook, revolutionary programme would appear to be a "left" adventurist programme. When analysed with "left" adventurist outlook, it would appear to be a revisionist programme. The Three Member Committee which is working with a "left" adventurist outlook has failed to analyse the experiences with a revolutionary outlook. Hence it has taken up adventurist programme which is detrimental to the interests of the revolutionary movement. According to the organisational principles of Somaiah it is correct for this Committee to thus reject our documents.

In a situation when the Three Member Committee was circulating its "left" adventurist documents and not circulating our documents which are in conformity with the party programme, naturally we had to give a serious thought to the question of circulating our documents. The problem we were confronted with was not one of powers but whether the Party programme and policy should or should not go before the party.

(We sent the articles, "Armed struggle in India" and "Revisionism", in the beginning of

himself. After a long time they published it in "Janasakti". We sent an ideological article at the time of starting of "Janasakti". So far we don't know what has become of it. These two are uncontroversial articles. The third is a long article "Left Trend Among the Indian Revolutionaries". This is a criticism of Charu Mazumdar's group. This was also published very late. We understand that the Three Member Committee had not published them on its own accord but on the only pressure from the lower committee members).

Under the circumstances, in a letter to a member of the Three Member Committee, the P. C., Secretary had given certain suggestions and sought for certain clarifications. The relevant passages from this letter are as follows:

"4. You have informed us that your committee had been formed. But we do not know the way the Committee was formed, the discussions before the formation, the problems that arose, the way they were solved, the way the committees decided to function, the nature and extent of responsibilities it decided to shoulder and such other details. Send these details immediately. Mulugu meeting was held prior to Madras arrests. I think that in that meeting, the question of merger with M-L party was discussed. Send the reports and resolutions, of the meeting. Send if you have the details of the discussions. If you don't have write to the area for them.

"5. If you do not circulate the documents sent, what will be their use? What is meant by the words "whatever methods possible"? By the time you three see them, will it not take a long time and will they not lose their usefulness? It will be better if you circulate the documents immediately and send your criticism. We will accept if the criticism is correct. Otherwise we will reply in detail. We are drafting all the basic documents connected with party policies. Among the records sent to you, there are some important documents such as party programme, party membership and problems facing the Kha-

mmam Area Movement. What is your attitude on them?"

This letter was written in the beginning of the second week of November 1970. In the second part of this letter it was asked as to what do they mean by "in whatever method possible". The reason for asking this question was, in one of their earlier letters, they wrote that they would "make use" of the documents we send "in whatever method possible". It is in that connection that this clarification was sought for.

Com. Somaiah is raising serious objection for this letter. The first point of this objection is that the secretary had acted without the knowledge of the Committee. The second point is that the Secretary is defying the authority of the Three Member Committee. There appears to be no politics in both of these points. Yet it is wrong to assume that there are no politics in them.

We have already stated that this was a letter written when our documents were not being circulated. Yet during this period, their documents were being printed and circulated. Among them, there are two important documents connected with the party policies. In the pamphlet "Armed Struggle in India - Some aspects to be noted", a number of ideological and political issues of India have been touched and their views expressed. We have in our document "Left Deviation within the Party", criticised the "left" adventurist outlook manifesting in it. The second is an English Pamphlet, "Some problems concerning the path of peoples war in India". This is in criticism of Charu Mazumdar policy. Since this is drafted in English, it can be safely assumed that it is meant for all India circulation. This contains formulations fundamentally opposed to our Immediate Programme. In this, the co-ordination of partial struggles and armed actions is shown as the line of our armed struggle. This is completely opposed to the path of peoples war. The difference between us and Charu Mazumdar group are minimised stating that they concern only the question of interpretation of Mao's Thought. The fact is that Charu Mazumdar line is fundamentally opposed to Mao's Thought.

The Three Member Committee, without consulting us and without our concern printed and circulated these pamphlets that manifest "left" adventurism existing in the party and sent a copy for us to study. Till, today, Com. Somaiah does not feel it necessary to think about the ways and means by which these "left" adventurist documents were printed and circulated, about the secret behind it and about the politics of its circulation. He does not also feel it necessary to think about the politics behind the delay in circulation of our documents, that are in accord with the party's policies which is but a part of the above. So he stoutly defends both of their actions. When it was suggested that our documents, which are in accord with party's policies should be circulated without withholding them he opposed the suggestion. What is behind such an opposition if not anti-party politics? Their documents clearly show that they are anti-party politics.

Till today, there is no satisfactory reply to the first part of the above cited letter neither from the Three Members Committee nor from any of the members of the committee. One member of the committee has written that their's fulfilled and authoritative committee. Replying the second part, one member wrote that with discussions on the documents they do not wish to turn their committee into a forum for discussions. Second member questioned, as to in accordance with which party form the document "Problems facing the Khammam Area Revolutionary Movement" was circulated? All joined together adopted and sent the following resolution:

The State Committee has discussed the letter from the jail comrades suggesting that every document they send should be immediately circulated to the lower units. On this the P. C., takes the following decisions:

The State Committee functions as a fulfilled, authoritative State Committee with powers of taking political and organisational decisions and implementing them. When the present committee was formed, it was decided in the joint meeting of all squads of forest areas as well as in the meeting of the district representatives of plains areas,

that the Committee formed at present should function as a State Committee.

It is only after this that the Three Member Committee began to function as a full fledged State Committee.

Majority of the members of the State Committee elected by the convention are in jail. The suggestions and guidance of those comrades should be given due importance. But the jail comrades want that every document they send should be circulated to the party members even if they differ with the decisions of the State Committee. The jail comrades say that in case if the State Committee differs with their documents, they would send proper reply if such differences are referred to them. It is nothing but reducing this State Committee into a Committee without any powers. Earlier in their letter, the jail comrades themselves wrote that they would be sending suggestions and guidance and that the outside committee itself should take the final decisions. What they are writing now is different from it.

All the jail documents that do not will differ with the decisions of the State Committee should be circulated to the party members.

When there is difference of opinion, the State Committee should inform the jail comrades of the differences of opinion.

Still if the jail comrades insist that their documents should be circulated to the party members together with the State Committee's differences of opinion.

Immediately after adopting this resolution, the Three Member Committee decided to circulate the Khammam Area Committee's Reply.

It proved itself to be a Committee which has taken responsibilities only to take the party towards Charu Mazumdar line and to disrupt the party. This is what is the understanding of the

Three Member Committee about functioning as a committee, empowered to take political and organisational decisions.

Com. Somaiah is defending their stand without any reservations. If this lengthy resolution is examined, it can be seen that the Three Member Committee has not stated anywhere in this resolution that they would adhere to the Immediate Programme adopted by the State Convention and adopt political and organisational decisions in accordance with it. Not stopping at it, they go ahead and loudly declare in the very next resolution that they are going to implement and are actually implementing a "left" adventurist line in the name of "Khammam" Area Committee's Reply" which is opposed to the party line.

They and Somaiah argue that the State Committee has also said that the outside committee should take the final decisions. The fact is, they do not want to take the suggestions of the State Committee. They do not want to discuss with it. The way the two documents, which we have cited above, were circulated can be cited as an example of this.

What is more, we hoped at the time that this committee would function according to the Immediate Programme. There is nothing wrong in taking political decisions within the confines of the Immediate Programme. At that time they declared before the party that they would implement the Immediate Programme, that they had drawn invaluable lessons from Pagideru actions and that they had no differences with the State Committee. We have already made it clear that it was wrong on our part not to have realised that this declaration, like a bourgeois election promise would go unfulfilled. As we began to realise this, we began to rectify our mistakes.

Com. Somaiah is concealing the fact that they have their own politics behind the Three Member Committee's arguments regarding the powers. Today there are the three trends in the party. The revolutionary trend followed by the State Committee. This trend is in accordance with Marxism-Leninism-Mao's Thought, the "left" adventurist trend of the Three Member Committee. The third is revisionist trend of Com. Somaiah.

Ours is not only a revolutionary trend but also it is the official line of the party. Even though there is a committee outside, the documents that are in accord with this line should be circulated. It is because of this that we demanded in our letter that our documents should be circulated without withholding. The Three Member Committee which follows a "left" adventurist line, and Com. Somaiah who follows a revisionist trend had opposed and are still opposing our demand in the interest of their respective lines.

When the Three Member Committee has no right to implement the "left" adventurist line and it has no right to circulate the documents that represent this line. Hence the question of reducing its powers does not arise at all. This committee cannot be a party committee or State Committee which can adopt 'left' adventurist political and organisational decisions. It is because this committee had attempted to become an official committee with powers to take "left" adventurist political and organisational decisions, that we made clear in our document "Left Deviation within the party" and "Party Letter" that this committee had become an agent and a supporter of the Rival Centre.

Thus it becomes clear that the Three Member Committee and Com. Somaiah raked up the question of official committee and the question of abolition of the State committee only to suppress the party's official revolutionary line and to gain freedom of implementing and propagating their respective "left" adventurist and revisionist lines. If they do not have these designs, it is not in any way wrong or impossible for Three Member Committee to reduce its powers for defending party line or for Com. Somaiah to accept it.

Once the politics of the "official committee" have become clear, it becomes evident that the above passages of the secretary's letter are not only not in any way objectionable but also necessary.

Since the state Committee's meeting to discuss the political and organisational questions had not taken place after the Secretary had

written this letter, it was not informed to the members thinking that it can be placed for discussion along with the reply of Three Member Committee, soon after it was received. This is a letter that the secretary had written in exercise of his powers. He exercised those powers only to defend the party line, but not abuse his powers as the Three Members Committee had done.

We have not circulated the document "Left Trend among the Revolutionaries" anywhere. It is a lie to say that we have circulated it. As usual we sent a copy to the outside party centre. We sent another copy of its translation into English. Thus only two or three comrades connected with this work could have seen it. When we have enquired about the arrangements for its circulation, we were informed that the Three Member Committee had taken it up for discussions. They began to publish that document in Janasakthi after the secretary's letter. It is understood that the pressure from plains Area Regional Committee members is also one of the reasons for its publication.

Com- Somaiah alleges that the document "on mass organisations" which he drafted is suppressed. It is a fact that he drafted a document on this question. We have not recognised this document as the basis for discussion. We decided to draft another document. This document was also drafted by the end of 1970. In view of the obstacle for the circulation of documents outside, we have not finalised and sent it. We are going to send it soon. In accordance with the Leninist principle, the State Committee is following the policy that we can join and function in any reactionary trade union. Agrarian revolution itself is our immediate aim in the country side. Therefore our aim of agrarian revolution will be in jeopardy if we join the already existing peasant organisation of the revisionist and neo-revisionists which are but paper organisations. Therefore it is the opinion of the State Committee that we should not join them. According to Com. Somaiah's document, we should join and work in them. It is for this reason that we have not even taken it as the basis for discussion. If he considers it as a "suppression", it only reflects his subjective outlook.

Com. Somaiah is defending the Three member Committee for not having circulated the documents merely on the technical reasons. Even that Committee itself has not shown these reasons. They have directly brought up the question of authority. We too have acted accordingly. We too realise the technical difficulties.

We view the questions of the circulation of documents, the powers of the Three Member Committee and the circulation of Somaiah's document as questions related to the implementation of the party's revolutionary line. All our steps are but meant for the implementation of the party line. For this reason, all this is defensible. Contrary to this Com. Somaiah is on one side stating that he is supporting Immediate Programme and at the same time opposing all the steps we have taken in accordance with it. Thus Com. Somaiah is following a dual policy. In order to hide this, he is alleging that the Secretary is following a dual policy.

6. THE AFFAIRS OF COMRADE PEDDANNA

After the State Convention, Com. Peddanna's issue had come up before the party as a serious problem. The State secretariat had discussed and taken decisions on this issue. Not only Com. Somaiah was a party to the decisions thus taken, but also he accepted all those decisions. However, portraying it as a "new problem", he is suggesting a "proper method" for its solution as follows:

"No one has got any objection to the allegation that Com. Peddanna has committed serious mistakes or to examine and take necessary (disciplinary) action for having committed those mistakes. But we cannot punish the P. C. for Peddanna's mistakes; So far, there has been no proposal to examine Peddanna's role in the movement, the mistakes he committed in it and to take necessary disciplinary action for it. This is the proper method."

In his attempt to suggest a "proper method" Com Somaiah is hiding the whole history. The charges brought up against this comrade after

the State Convention are of two kinds. The first is personal behaviour. The second is violating the party policies and indulging in political and organisational activities in pursuance of an anti-party line. Stating that the attitude of this comrade is very harmful to the party and showing adequate basis for the above two charges, Mulugu Area Committee had adopted a resolution demanding for his removal from all responsible positions in the party. The State Committee had, in its July 1969 meeting, comprehensively discussed all this. Though the majority opinion of the State Committee was in favour of accepting the suggestion of the Mulugu Area Committee and taking disciplinary action, though Com. Peddanna lost his self confidence and had himself asked for removal from responsible positions, he was asked to rectify his mistakes and be useful for the party and retained in responsible positions. The State Committee decided to inform the party units of his mistakes.

Com. Peddanna had not utilised the opportunity afforded by the State Committee and never rectified his mistakes. Staying in Khammam Area, taking advantage of the political immaturity of the Area committee, he has been putting into effect what he had planned through and in the name of Area Committee. He once again began to commit the same mistake for which the State Committee afforded him with an opportunity to rectify and has been trying to hide them behind the decisions and opinions of the Area Committee. For instance, when the State Committee decided that the woman comrade — should not be taken back to the area, contrary to it he made the Area Committee to pass a resolution to take her back, and he himself tried to take her back. This attempt had failed due to the intervention of both the Secretariat member and P. C., member. Similarly while there is P. C.'s decision not to go in for offensive actions against the police, he caused adoption of a resolution for taking up such actions and made it clear that they would carry out offensive actions if the P. C., does not convey its opinion by 1st October.

The Secretariat member intervened and prevented such an action being carried out.

Later on the Secretariat made it clear that this attitude was wrong.

Thereafter the Secretariat, in its meeting of Sept '69, examined Com. Peddanna's persisting his own old trend and his refusal to rectify his mistakes and decided to place before the State Committee the proposal that he should be removed from all responsible positions. Com. Somaiah was also a party to this decision.

It is the duty of every revolutionary to place the truth before the party. This is the only proper method. Way does Comrade Somaiah keep mum about the above truth? How far is it a "proper method?"

Com. Peddanna drafted the document "Khammam Area Committee's Reply" himself and got it circulated to the lower units through the Three Member Committee. With this, along with the committee he too had become mainly responsible for the split in the party. How far is it correct for Com. Somaiah to keep mum on such an important aspect as this?

We have explained in our documents, the differences between us and Com. Peddanna. His views have come out in the form of "Khammam Area Committee's Reply" and in the documents of three member committee. In our document "Left Deviation within the Party", we have explained our criticism on the main points among them. We have also criticised the stand that he has taken in the documents that he has hitherto drafted against the party line. We will continue this criticism as long as it is necessary.

Com. Somaiah demands that the party should recognise the role of Peddanna in the movement. Is it not for this very reason that the State Committee afforded him an opportunity to rectify the above mistakes? Misusing this opportunity, establishing an alternate centre in the party and attempting to seize control of the party through it — to defend all this in the name of 'organisational principles' is an important aspect deserving attention.

In view of it, it should be admitted that on the problem of Committee has acted very patiently and in a very proper manner. Now it is

taking all necessary steps to safeguard the party's revolutionary line and the party organisation from the opportunist, disruptionist forces like Comrade Peddanna. This is fully defensible.

JAIL LIFE

We were in Jails in recent periods from 1962 to 63 and 1965-66. The conditions prevailing there in the past were different from the present day conditions. Important among them are: At that time we were detainees. Today we are prisoners under trial. We have the additional problem of defence due to the case. It is as a part of this that there has been the problem of people from other parties being with us (it is them that Comrade Somaiah is calling as people hostile to revolution), as also the problem of fund and lawyers etc. It would be possible for us to solve these problems if we view them as problems emanating from the Government policies, jail life and police attack. As far as we understand, a number of political and organisational problems arose in jails during the periods 1962-63 and 1965-66. Majority of them were solved as a part of the party's organisational and political problems. We all know the fact that the problems such as Sundaraiah's Moscow document, the affair of Thammina Pothraju were solved only with the split in the party and not through the discussions and decisions of the committees.

Since the Comrades in jail are for a long period of time, away from mass movement, there is the danger of weaknesses latent among the comrades taking a serious form. Especially, subjectivism and retreating tendencies usually grow to serious proportions in the jails. The comrades should note with proper care and ensure that such wrong trends do not develop. When they raise their head and grow to serious proportions the party has to take steps to carry on a struggle against them.

The present jail life of the comrades is also not above it. It is not our aim to say that there are no shortcomings in jail life or there is not any need to over come them. We are doing every thing we can to rectify the jail life. We

will continue our efforts. When the time comes, we would also take necessary steps to place the jail problems before the party. It will serve no useful purpose to introduce and discuss jail problems in the documents meant for open discussions. Yet, since it has become necessary to answer the criticism from Comrades Somaiah, we are replying only to it.

At present, there are also members of district leadership together with the State leadership in the jail. There are also local cadres. Some were with the party for some time and later joined with the revisionists and neo-revisionists. There are still some who are also going to join them now. It is about them that Comrade Somaiah is writing that there are people who are hostile to revolution along with the revolutionaries. It is because of his subjective outlook that Comrade Somaiah has failed to realise that this situation has developed since the government has put not only the revolutionaries but also those that are hostile to the revolution in the jails as well as for the conspiracy cases are concerned. Does he not know that prior to 1947, the revolutionaries had to live in jails along with the counter-revolutionary Congressmen?

For some time we conducted weekly classes and review of news as we used to do in the past. But we had to discontinue it since it became impossible. After some time, we divided all the party members and set up units with convenors. We asked them to discuss all the political, organisational questions as well as questions concerning the movement. We also allotted a State Committee member to give necessary assistance to these units. Yet, the unit meetings and discussions were not going on. It will become possible if the leadership of the units take initiative.

After this we are gathering all the comrades showing interest in ideological study and carrying on joint study of ideological works. Collective discussions are going on. These are proving useful for the development of those comrades.

The State Committee members themselves are acting as the jail committee members. In his document, comrade Somaiah has treated them only as jail leadership. It is clear that he has adopted this method only to give an impression that there is not any organisation in jail, and that there is only a vague network comprising of some revolutionaries and jail leadership. Yet, in one or two instances, he could not but use the term 'jail committee'. When jail committee is in existence, his saying that there is no jail committee and to vaguely term it as 'jail leadership' is but a reflection of his subjective outlook and not the recognition of the objective reality.

It is because of comrade Somaiah's subjective outlook that the meeting of the jail committee proved to be fruitless. It is because of his attitude that the meetings have not taken place of late. Anyone who sees his document "Immediate Programme-Our Experiences" can understand that he is completely under the spell of subjectivism.

It is but natural that the present inner-party problems would also have an impact on the comrades in jail. We should carefully analyse and solve these problems.

The allegation of Com. Somaiah in respect of elections is totally baseless. We decided to boycott the mid-term poll far in advance of elections. We sent out our views. Within the limitations imposed on us, we worked to implement them and boycott the elections.

Likewise, it is baseless to say that the Secretary had not taken any action when an individual had written a letter to the outside stating that Com. Nagi Reddy was going to participate in the elections. In fact the Secretary had asked that individual to withdraw such a letter and to write another. The said individual did accordingly.

We discussed the question of election in the party units. Since some people had already discussed about this question outside, to treat it as very important and to hide all the efforts is not a proper method. We should understand

that these are our first experiences with boycott of elections, and we have to yet analyse and draw lessons from them.

In another connection, this comrade wrote that "every one is thinking that any important comrade released in the conspiracy case would be rearrested under P. D. Act." It is due to legal politics behind these words that all the problems in connection with the defence are arising. Due to the tendency that the only obstacle for us is the P. D. Act. the problems that are very minor from the political point of view are being magnified.

We are going ahead with the confidence that we can overcome all these obstacles

8. Guntur District Committee's Letter on Comrade Somaiah's Disruptive Activities

Through his document "Immediate Programme-Our Experiences" Com. Somaiah made it clear that he is differing with the State Committee on all ideological, political and organisational policies. In the name of discussing these views of his "in proper methods", he tried to rally the Committees and cadre in favour of his views. It is precisely such attempts that we call factional activities and disruptive activities in the parties. We cite the following passage from Guntur District Committee's letter on such activities of this comrade :

"We have seen the letter that Com. Somaiah wrote through ... But we came to know that he told some of the District Committee members and other than District Committee members also that he differs with the majority of P. C., in jail. He expressed that if mention is made in the party letter that one of the P. C. members is differing from the P. C., and if such a letter falls into the hands of the government, the government would come to know that it is he (Com. Somaiah) who is differing. He also posed the question why one should not conclude that the P. C., is trying to put the outside comrades in a tight corner through its reply to the Khammam Area Committee, and that the P. C., is thus trying to save itself. Then he

concluded that for all these mistakes the foundation was laid in the convention itself. Further comrade Somaiah said that he was not being informed of the news received from outside.

All these are disturbing to us. But in his letter to... , he has not written any of this. Now, we are forced into a situation wherein we have to face a number of questions from a number of people. A number of questions are being posed.

Hitherto we have been wrong with certain confidence, where is the place for discipline if Com. Somaiah speaks like this during his visits? How can we maintain discipline in our functioning and ask others to be disciplined? If there happen to be any differences they should be communicated through documents. But this method of communicating, we should say, is not proper."

It is not merely a question of discipline as the Guntur District Committee says. Com. Somaiah has tried to rally comrades in favour of his views. It is a different matter as to how far he had succeeded in his attempts.

The arguments he employed for it are very cheap in character. We have clearly stated a number of times that we recognise the Immediate Programme as a revolutionary line and adhere to it. In the document "Left" Deviation within the Party", we defended the Immediate Programme at every step and criticised the 'left' adventurism. In his view it is wrong to defend Marxism-Leninism - Mao's Thought and criticise "left" adventurism.

It is the fundamental principle of Marxism-Leninism-Mao's Thought to criticise the mistakes of the committee in the struggle areas as mistakes. Without such criticism, no revolution or no revolutionary struggle advances. His attitude will only help to hide the mistakes committed in the name of revolution. We are criticising the "left" adventurism not to put the comrades in "tight corner" and to free ourselves from jail. We do it only to rectify the mistakes that the comrades in struggle area are committing and to develop the mass movement there

into a revolutionary movement and peoples armed struggle. We are carrying on this revolutionary task of ours only because of our unwavering convictions in Marxism-Leninism-Mao's Thought.

Today it is only the revolutionary mass movement and the peoples armed struggle that the ruling classes are afraid of. The ruling classes are aware that it is easy to suppress the armed actions which have nothing to do with the consciousness of the people. It is the "Immediate Programme" that advances the revolutionary line of preparing the people for armed struggle. How could defending the Immediate Programme mean putting outside comrades in a "tight corner"? Those who indulge in such kind of talk should alone understand it.

We cite hereunder the factual incidents which Com. Somaiah is fully aware of and which at the same time go to prove that we steadfastly adhere to and defend the path of armed struggle.

1. The DIG of police of Andhra Pradesh met us in the police station while we were under police custody in Madras. He asked us to denounce armed actions. He offered to call the pressmen and arrange a press conference if we agree to do so. On behalf of all of us Com. Nagi Reddy made it explicitly clear that anything like that was out of question and that there would be no change whatsoever in our party policies. DIG went back with empty hands.

2. While we were in jail, one of the high officials of Andhra Pradesh government met Com. Nagi Reddy and tried to find out if there would be any change in our policies. Com. Nagi Reddy made it clear that there would be no change whatsoever in our party policies.

3. We made it clear to the lawyers defending the conspiracy case that the whole defence of the case should be subordinated to the path of armed struggle and that it should under no circumstances go against it. And we have necessary guidelines for it. Com. D. V. and Nagi Reddy have taken up their own defence in order

to have a free hand to defend the path of armed struggle unhindered.

4. In one of the General Body meetings in jail, the Secretary made it clear that the armed struggle would not be withdrawn under any circumstances and that the revolutionary movement and the armed struggle would be taken forward adopting the tactics in accordance with the consciousness of the people. In this meeting, there were party members as well as other than party members.

5. V. V. C. cooked up rourers, that in the State Committee two were in favour of withdrawal of armed struggle while three were against it and sent a person to find out from us "if it was true". We made it clear to that person that nothing like that had happened in our committee, that there were no differences whatsoever among us and that there would be no change whatsoever in our policies. It is clear that he did this on the instructions from the Government.

6. In his statement to the lower court and the court of the Magistrate Com. Nagi Reddy explained the content of the path of armed struggle. In this he defended the armed struggle without any reservations. In the higher court still more comprehensive statements would be issued.

7. The Immediate Programme is the basis for the present conspiracy case against the Communist Revolutionaries. This Immediate Programme is the bone of contention between us and the government. The "left" adventurist line is not the basis for this conspiracy case. Nor is it the revisionist line. In our documents we are defending the Immediate Programme at every step and criticising the left adventurism and right revisionism.

It is not Com. Somaiah alone who knows of these incidents. Those are known to all the party members as well as friends and enemies inside the jail. All those who have confidence and interest in the path of armed struggle correctly understand and welcome these incidents and statements. If Com. Somaiah had any doubts, they should have been cleared by these documents. Instead, he baselessly accuses the

the P. C., of placing the outside comrades in a "tight corner" and thus attempting to get out of the jail at their cost. This clearly shows that he has neither confidence nor interest in the path of armed struggle. This also clearly shows that he himself has, with his subjective outlook, turned his back to the path of armed struggle.

Why should Com. Somaiah entertain the thought that the government would come to know of his views? Has he not by the very way he stated his views, facilitated the government to come to know of them?

Com. Somaiah merely stated that he was not accepting the document "Left Deviation within the Party" and that he would submit his views in writing. He announced his views without informing them to the State Committee. This is what he calls the "proper method"!

Perhaps it is to "defend and safeguard the Immediate Programme" from being "watered down" and "from being revised" that he indulges in this sort of activities!

9. THE REMNANTS OF NEO-REVISIONISM INSIDE THE PARTY

Com. Somaiah writes that "in Andhra State, though a section under the influence of revolutionary ideology and politics joined us, we would be deceiving ourselves if we think that this cadre which worked under the influence of revisionist politics for so long a period has consciously got out of the mire of revisionism in all fields. It is unrealistic to think that all these cadres are dedicated to the politics of class struggle. This would be evident if we examine the cadres at various levels. Our experience so far would also testify to it".

This means, in Com. Somaiah's considered opinion all our cadres are arm chair revolutionaries and revisionist trash. We oppose this. This is contrary to reality. The formulation of Immediate Programme as well as its implementation testify to it. Today the whole trend that defends the Immediate Programme and works in accordance with it is a revolutionary trend. In the party, there is a revolutionary trend that follows Marxism-Leninism-Mao's Thought, as well

as 'left' adventurist and revisionist trends that are opposed to it. What Com. Somaiah writes above comes under the category of right revisionist trend. Com. Somaiah need not search all over the party for revisionism. Revisionism is abundant in his document and in himself. The sooner he realises it and selfcritically examines himself, the better for him and the party. We have to fight against this revisionism and neo-revisionism. We should examine in whatever form it raises its head and criticise it. If we adhere to Marxism-Leninism-Mao's Thought and begin to build the revolutionary mass movement through our revolutionary practice we can overcome revisionism and neo-revisionism.

10. CONCLUSION.

We have done our best to point out and criticise the right opportunist trend manifesting in Com. Somaiah's document. "Immediate Programme-Our Experiences". We hope that this criticism would help comrades in correcting their mistakes which are obstacles for the revolutionary practice.

Throughout his document "Immediate Programme-Our Experiences" Com. Somaiah has made his policies clear. Starting with revisionism, he joined hands with the "left" adventurism of Three Member Committee and is travelling in the direction of disrupting the Party. His quotations from Lenin, his revolutionary phraseology, his nominal support for the Immediate Programme-none of this can hide this journey of his.

The revolutionary masses of India are getting prepared for the final struggle against imperialism, feudalism and their collaborator, the big bourgeoisie. The armed struggle of Naxalbari and Srikakulam are a prelude to it. Terrified by this, the Indian ruling classes are concentrating all their mite to suppress the peoples revolution. All the reactionary forces are forming into an unholy alliance against the revolution. The revisionism and neorevisionism is aiding and abetting it directly and indirectly.

Under the circumstances, while the "left" adventurist and right opportunist trends inside the party are not useful for the revolutionary mass movement, they are on the contrary main obstacles for its progress. "Left" adventurism established itself inside the party as a petty bourgeois trend which is opposed to proletarian revolutionary trend. We are carrying on an uncompromising struggle against it. Besides this right opportunism is also entrenched inside the party. We have also started an uncompromising struggle against it. We don't have any doubt that this struggle would prove useful for the building of revolutionary mass movement

Eversince the split from the neo-revisionism, the revolutionaries could not function in one and the same organisation. Due to the "left" adventurist influence, revolutionaries started to form and function in different parties and groups. We find that the parts are splitting again and again. Thus the process of some dropping out is but natural. This process need not demoralise anybody. As a result of this process of uniting and splitting, the revolutionary trend would get consolidated: The "left" adventurist and right opportunist trends would get isolated. The differences among the revolutionaries on the question of application of Marxism-Leninism-Mao's Thought to the Indian conditions as well as the differences on the question of understanding the experiences of revolutionary struggles are getting resolved and the conditions for all the revolutionaries to come together into one organisation are emerging. None can stop this advance of the revolutionary forces. This is but the aim of our ideological struggle, this is but the aim of building a revolutionary movement and a revolutionary party. The fulfilment of these tasks would alone ensure the advance of armed struggle. The fulfilment of these tasks would alone ensure the triumph of the Indian revolution.

ANDHRA PRADESH REVOLUTIONARY
COMMUNIST COMMITTEE.

