

# **THE POLITICS OF COMRADE D.V. RAO AND HIS UCCRI**

***Self - glorification and negative attitude towards others. Out for immediate general political united front with USA and its friends.***

---

Today our people are on the move again. They have taken to the path of struggle. What are the tasks of the communist revolutionaries now? To orientate these struggles towards Agrarian Revolution. But today the revolutionary forces are divided. The friends of Indian Revolution all want us to overcome these divisions. Efforts are being made throughout the country towards this at various levels. We must patiently work for this. Patient discussions joint work on agreed points, leaving others for future discussion only in this process can we achieve unity among the communist revolutionaries. This is what the country and the present situation demands of us.

## **Self-glorification**

But comrade D.V. Rao and his unity centre for communist Revolutionary of India UCCRI seem to have rejected this path. They are concentrating all their attacks on the communist revolutionaries instead of on the enemies. They are publishing document after document, supplement after supplement, both in English and Telugu in the pursuit of this "sacred task.

The main attack is on the communist revolutionaries. They say : "Bar-ring a few exceptions, the groups have lost their revolutionary character. They can no more be called revolutionary groups. This is not to say that we deny the existence of revolutionary forces in them. Therefore most of the groups no more belong to a revolutionary wing representing revolutionary Marxism-Leninism. But then who are they? They are opportunists, though they claim to be Marxists-Leninists. It is this opportunism which has reduced them to pieces." (Proletarian Line No.7)

Naturally one will ask; are there no revolutionaries in other groups? They are kind enough to concede that there are 'some'. But from this one need not be hopeful of getting a certificate from them, because they hasten to add, "once their number was large, but now they are disintegrating" (Retranslation from Telugu)

Select abuses have been directed against our party. According to them, our line was Charu's line till 1977 March Parliament elections. During the

period of the Janata government it was one of class collaboration'' and "Parliamentary path''. At present, the leadership of the Party is trying for 'links with Indira Government. But they hasten to add that this link has nothing to do with repression on our Party ranks!

When we look at these 'certificates' from our friends, the communist revolutionaries are reminded of the past. Naturally we are reminded of Naxalbari, Midnapore, Mushahari, Srikakulam, Godavari valley ; we are reminded of more than 5,000 comrades, who have become martyr heroes of this period, those who have been subjected to inhuman tortures and the sufferings of the people. We are reminded of the land struggles and the revolutionary struggles still going on. Not only we, all others are reminded of this. But DV condemns all this as "condemned stuff".

What is the future of our country then? What is the future of our Revolution? Comrade DV assures all such doubting Toms that there are "communist revolutionaries" under his leadership to fulfill that task. According to him, his UCCRI is an "all-India organisation in the real sense of the term having its branches in considerable parts of our country" (Proletarian Line (Pr.L) no.7) With a fanfare he has announced "we communist revolutionaries are advancing towards unity step by step inspite of ups and downs. The major part of the task is over. The rest will be completed soon" (No.7)

For one who knows the real situation, this is nothing but undiluted self glorification and condemnation of all others who differ with him. What is the meaning of these abuses and slanders against communist revolutionaries? What does he want to gain with such performance? The secret is that he has come to new principles both in the national and international situation and is adopting new tactics, whose essence is general political alliance with US imperialism and its friends. He wants to cover up this performance under the cover of the barrage of attacks against others. That is why we are forced to give this reply.

His claim is that his 'line' has been proved to be 'basically' correct. He shouts, "The line is correct not only in words but in deeds as well. It has the experience of a decade of its practice which has proved the line basically correct." (No.7).

One need not fight over this through documents. The two lines-his line as well as ours-are there before the people for the last 12 years. Their results of the two lines are also clearly before the people to judge for themselves.

## **1. The struggle for the correct line**

The present CC of our Party has fought against Charu's line. We have conducted an ideological, political struggle for People's War based on mass line and the class collaborationist line of SN. We have conducted a serious ideological struggle against the rightist trend of comrade DV also.

Our Party has grown in the struggle against both right and left trends. In the course of the struggle, we have successfully evolved the correct tactical and political line. Its practical results and the movement it has built are there before the people.

Comrade DV refuses to see this reality. He claims that his line has been proved to be basically correct all through. Let us consider them now.

### **Tactics of struggle**

In the struggle between DV and our Andhra Committee, among our differences, the first one relates to tactics of struggle. How to mobilise the people for Revolution? How to combine people's mobilisation, People's resistance and Party organisation?

It was true that our comrades in Godavari Valley did commit certain mistakes in the beginning. They were influenced by left thinking and practice as reflected in the "Pagideru" incident. Our comrades have criticised themselves for this, admitted it in discussions and corrected it.

As comrade DV himself admits in his Proletarian Line No. 6, our comrades had declared then, "mainly mass mobilisation, squad activities and resistance — co-ordinating these three mobilising the masses on mass issues and various stages of resistance — basically agree with the Secretary's explanation on all of them".

With this correction our Andhra comrades had been successful in overcoming all these mistakes.

They have mobilised the people for struggles on various issues. They have defended themselves from the police onslaughts. With this the people's movement has advanced. DV and his friends had to admit in their letter's from jail at that time, in their document "present situation and our tasks" written by them at that time. This is what they write in their own document commending the forest movement; "It is clear from the reports that in the forest areas, the partial struggles are being carried on against exploitation in

the forest areas and that the people are achieving some gains, such as increases in labour's wages etc.". "the documents of these comrades as well as some reports show that these comrades have realised and rectified their mistakes", "We are not underestimating the efforts made by the comrades working in the forest areas, in building the mass movement of the Forest areas and in the struggle for self-defence".

At that time DV and his friends were so carried away with these successes that they even advocated in their "Present situation and our tasks" at that time, they even asked the Party to "carry on ambushes" against the enemy.

From all these writings, one thing is clear. In the beginning, and after going to the jail, they hailed the forest movement, they supported the tactical line of the Party. But within one year, they turned round to condemn the whole movement as left adventurism. What is the reason for this sudden change?

In 1969 April they took up arms in self defence under their leadership because of their 'revolutionary' tactics, all these leaders were arrested in 1969 December itself. The Andhra people, the Andhra Party members criticised them severely for this. It was in this situation that they praised the forest movement in their letters and their document ""Present situation and our tasks", to save themselves from the wrath of the comrades.

### **Assessment of the revolutionary situation.**

Our assessment has been that, in 1969, bot nationally and internationally, the revolutionary situation in the country was better than that at the time when the Heroic Telangana of 1946-51 took place.

DV could not accept this. He says ""It is wrong to say that the situation prevailing today is more favourable than the situation prevailing at the time of the 1946-51 Telangana armed struggle". (No.6).

What are the reasons according to him?

— That the working class has been subjected to parliamentary illusions by the ruling classes after 1947 :

— That the ruling classes have since 1947 increased their military

**and police strength after 1947 :**

**What absurd arguments! Is there any difference between this argument and those of the revisionists and neo-revisionists? Only those who oppose People's War and Chinese path could advance such arguments.**

**The Heroic Telengana struggle started in 1946. At that time the Chinese Revolution had not yet triumphed. By 1968, the national liberation struggles were pounding on the foundations of colonialism. They were advancing in the form of armed struggles.**

**1947 brought the "August" independence. Just then the Congress had come to power. It had created illusions among the people that it brought independence to our country. People had illusions on the Congress at that time. But by 1968, people were fast losing their illusions on the Congress. Of course people have still illusions on elections. But when compared with 1947, they have taken a downward trend. That is why we said that the revolutionary situation in 1968 was better than that in 1947.**

**The events after 1968 have amply proved this. The intensification of the people's struggles, strikes of the police personnel, rising tide of working class strikes, the contradictions and deep divisions among the ruling classes have proved this.**

**If we accept comrade DV's arguments, the struggle of the Mizos and Nagas is wrong. Naxalbari and Srikakulam should not have started.**

**Then about increased military and police strength of the govt. Increased railway and communication system — These are issues the revolutionary movement has to overcome in the course of its struggle, instead of sitting quiet with folded hands.**

**All their arguments on this question were arguments to run away from the revolutionary struggle.**

## **When to start the armed struggle?**

**Another point of controversy at that time was —When to start the armed struggle ?**

**According to comrade DV, the people have to first distribute among themselves the lands of the landlords, only then the armed struggle starts! He says that this is the experience of the Telengana struggle. And according**

**to this since our comrade in Godavary valley have taken arms before the people were ready for land distribution, the movement was bound to crumble like a house of cards, that this is another form of Charu's line.**

**Our comrades rejected these arguments. The government will not wait folded hands and allow the people to seize the lands of the landlords. It is bound to use fascist repression on the people even during the stage of partial struggles. So armed struggle is inevitable even during the stage of the partial struggles. It also said that only when this struggle is linked with the struggle for land, a protracted people's War could be successfully conducted. We asserted that the Telengana struggle itself had given this experience.**

**But Comrade DV and his friends asserted that the Telengna struggle started only after the distribution of landlord's lands.**

**But in 1970, in another document, they themselves had written : "The Telengana armed struggle (1946-51) started as a militant struggle against feudal landlords' forced labour, feudal atrocities and procurement of grain (forced procurement of grain from the peasantry by the government during the Second World War) even before 1946. Other sections of the people had participated in the struggle along with the rural peasantry".**

**This is exactly what our comrade advanced at that time. It is comrade DV who went back on this in 1971 June. It is shocking to see how even the experiences of Telengana struggle could change according to the whims and fancies of certain individuals to suit their conveniences.**

**What is Agrarian Revolution? What is its relation with land distribution? Our State Conference in 1973 had declared thus :**

**"The essence of People's Democratic Revolution is Agrarian Revolution .. In the course of the Armed Agrarian Revolution, the village people will not only distribute the government lands, the private lands of the landlords, their agricultural implements and other properties, but also will seize the political authority of the landlords and thus implement the policy of "land to the tiller".**

**"In our province, the land problem exists in various forms. Government banzars, waste lands in non-reserve and reserve forests, temple lands, waste lands, lands under the occupation of the landlords from the poor, private lands of the landlords—thus the land problem exists in various forms throughout the state. Along with all other kinds of lands, private lands of**

the landlords should be distributed. Only then landlordism could be abolished. So to prepare the people for the distribution of the private lands of the landlords, to build People's movement for this and conduct Armed Agrarian revolution to achieve this—this should be the basic aim of the Party.

“Distribution of the private lands of the landlords is the basic task of the Agrarian Revolution. But some people think that land distribution alone is Agrarian Revolution. That is wrong and we don't accept it. In the villages landlord exploitation takes various forms. The landlords exploit the agricultural labourers, the farm servants, tenants. He exploits through forced labour, usury both in kind and money, sale of surplus grain, by exploiting caste and communalism. These forms of exploitation exist in various forms. The struggle for just demands of agricultural labourers and farm servants, the struggle against forced labour, usury and loans— all these struggles form part of the Agrarian Revolution. All these struggles, which ever be the issue they should be oriented towards distribution of the landlord's land, which is the highest stage of Armed Agrarian Revolution. So all the struggles against landlord exploitation, should raise the consciousness of the agricultural labourers and peasants to directly participate in Armed Agrarian revolution. Our whole political campaign must be in this direction. All our activities must be directed towards this”.

This is how we explained our Programme for Agrarian Revolution. This is how we explained the relation between Agrarian Revolution and land distribution. We have clearly stated that even if the armed struggle starts on partial issues, it is not yet Agrarian revolution, that even then the struggle should be directed towards the distribution of the lands. Only then the basis for Protracted Armed Struggle could be laid. We never said that more actions on landlords will lead to Agrarian Revolution.

### **Self - defence and People's mobilisation.**

With the intensification of the People's struggles, government repression too increased. But people were not yet prepared to resist police repression. But our comrades could not work openly in the villages, as the previous period. We are faced with the problem of co-ordinating people's mobilisation, self defence for the cadres and defence of the people's movement. We have already said above that we committed certain mistakes in tackling this problem. But soon we corrected our mistakes through our own experience.

But comrade DV and his friends, counter-posed self-defence of the

**cadres to the defence of the people. They declared that there could be no defence of the cadre without the defence of the people. They condemned the formation of the squads, as abandoning mass work. They even lied when they said that we have confined ourselves to attacks on individual landlords.**

**We have explained our stand point very clearly on this. The landlords their goondas, the police are bound to attack the people even during the stage of the people's struggles. They would try to drown the people's movement in blood. In this situation, if the people are ready, our Party should lead the resistance struggle. And they should consciously work to lead the struggle for Agrarian Revolution.**

**If the people are not yet prepared for such resistance struggle our Party members and activists should not allow themselves to be arrested.**

**They should defend themselves. This self-defence will take many forms-individuals in secret or in the form of squads. They can work with arms or without arms for self-defence. The form of self-defence will depend on the conditions of the struggle in the area concerned — the level of the movement, the readiness of the people, geographical conditions of the area. Depending on the local conditions, even if armed squads are formed, it is not yet Armed Agrarian revolution, that the main task of the squads should be to mobilise and prepare the people for Armed Agrarian Revolution.**

**Though the armed squads have been formed for self-defence in 1969, we have been stressing in all our documents, that their main task is to politically mobilise the people for Agrarian Revolution**

**That is why, when comrade DV and his friends in 1970 proposed to carry on ambushes on the police, we rejected it. On the other hand, we formulated new tactics of struggle, "Propagation of revolutionary politics, people's mobilisation on people's issues, self defence from the police, necessary action against people's enemies" — These were four tactics of struggle that our party evolved to carry on the struggle. Is there any truth in the slanders of comrade DV that we at any time said that formation of self defence squads was itself Armed Struggle?**

**The people's movement advanced on the basis of the four tactics of struggle, described above. The movement advanced both in the forest areas and the plain areas by 1973. The mass base of the Party has increased. We have extended to the border areas of the Forest. People's mobilisation in the**



plain areas advanced. The movement gained new experiences. Based on this the four tactics of struggle were further improved in the State conference of 1973, which declared :

“Propagation of politics of Armed Agrarian Revolution, people’s struggles against the landlords and the government, mass organisations, volunteer organisations, people’s resistance to landlord-police violence, organisation of village committees-only by combining all these tasks and implementing them, we could mobilise the village people to directly participate in Armed Agrarian Revolution. Only then could we organise Agrarian Revolution. All our work on the political and cultural fronts, our work in the cities and towns, should help in advancing Armed Agrarian Revolution”.

These were the tactics of struggle that our party formulated both for the forest and plain areas. It is by implementing this programme, our movement has advanced in the province. In the forest areas, the people have participated in the land struggle on a very big scale. On the basis of village committees in the villages, on the basis of intensive propagation of revolutionary politics in the villages, people began resisting the police in various forms. Their support to the armed squads qualitatively increased.

In the plain areas, based on these tactics of struggle, we could mobilise the people, particularly the poor peasants and agricultural labourers for various anti-landlord struggles on a big scale. People began to resist the landlord violence in various forms.

By implementing these tactics of struggle, we could defend our movement, and extend it even under conditions of fascist repression and Emergency rule.

It is by implementing these tactics of struggle even after 1977, people have been mobilised for struggles on a big scale in Nallagonda, Khammam and Warangal plain areas, particularly in Karimnagar district. People have begun resisting landlord violence on a big scale. The movement gained new experiences. People’s struggles in other states too have advanced. Keeping these experiences in mind, recently, our Special Congress has formulated the following tactics of struggle :

“The main direction of the party work should be consciously oriented towards building revolutionary peasant movement. Selection of strategic areas, concentration of cadres, formulation of fighting and agitational slo-

ans with extensive discussions of the people of the area, mobilising the peasants for struggles on those issues, building the peasant organisations, arming the people with the locally available weapons in the anti-feudal struggles from the very beginning, organising of the village volunteer organisations, people's resistance to landlord-goonda-police violence and oppression and thus create, develop and defend areas of sustained resistance and thus advance to establish base areas in the country side''.

Now we are implementing these tactics of struggle in all the States. In Andhra we started with the four tactics of struggle. With the advance of the movement, we have gained new experiences. The tactics of struggle have also changed with the advance of the movement. We have rejected the path of annihilation of class enemies advocated by Charu. We have rejected the legal path of comrade DV. We have consciously combined people's mobilisation and People's resistance.

## **2. Bankruptcy of DV's politics.**

Enough of the tactics of struggle of comrade DV. Now let us consider of the political controversies between us and comrade DV. at that period.

### **Crisis of Soviet social imperialism.**

The revisionism in Soviet Union has taken to the Path of Social imperialism. It invaded Czechoslovakia in 1968, intensifying the contradictions and conflicts inside the revisionist camp. We said that is the sign of the crisis of Soviet revisionism, both at home and abroad.

But comrade DV rejected this. He declared that it was hasty to see crisis within revisionism and such a characterisation had no practical utility for us. They said :

"The difference between two revisionist groups of one and the same country, or the differences between the revisionist groups and cliques of two or more countries are not born of fundamental contradictions'' . (No.6) They further declared :

"Instead, viewing the accentuation of contradictions within the Soviet social imperialism in a mechanical and artificial way - even though the accentuation of the contradictions is true from a long range perspective and formulating that internationally it is already enmeshed in a crisis will not only be a hasty step on our part but also it would not be of any immediate advantage for the Indian revolution'' (No.6)

These controversies developed in 1970. On April 22, 1970, People's Daily article, "Leninism or Social imperialism" declared :

"Like all other reactionary and decadent classes, this new type of bureaucrat monopoly capitalist class is riddled with internal contradictions. In their desperate efforts to keep the power they have usurped, the members of this class are both working hand in glove with each other and scheming and struggling against each other. The greater the difficulties, the fiercer their strike, open and secret".

Thus it exposed the crisis of Soviet social imperialism both at home and abroad. This was in 1970.

But today, the crisis of Soviet social imperialism and the crisis of revisionism has come to the forefront more nakedly.

What is the meaning of the present events in Poland? Is it not a sign of the crisis of revisionism?

Now we see many indications of national chauvinism raising its head in the Soviet Union. Is it not a sign of its internal crisis? Whenever there are economic difficulties ministers are being changed in the Soviet Union. Is it not a sign of its internal crisis?

Soviet Union is being defeated again and again in the UN over the Kampuchean and Afghanistan problems. Is it not a sign of the crisis of its aggressive plans?

Recently its old traditional friends, the Italian and Spain Communist Parties, which once supported the policies of the Soviet Union, have now come out to oppose the hegemonism and aggressive policies of the Soviet Union. Now they are issuing joint statements with the Chinese Communist Party to fight for the preservation of world peace and fight against hegemonism. Is it not a sign of the crisis of the revisionist camp?

The Soviet Union has given priority to the production of deadly weapons in pursuit of its ambitions of world domination. Is it not a sign of its crisis? It is conspiring for world war and conducting wars of aggression. Is it not a sign of its crisis ?

In 1964 itself, Comrade Mao has said :

"The rise to power of revisionism means the rise to power of the bour-

**geoisie''**. Does this not mean that revisionism is riddled with the very same **fundamental contradictions** of the bourgeoisie?

Does this not prove ampy that the theory of comrade DV that there is **no crisis** within revisionism is a bankrupt theory?

***Rivalry of the two Super powers in India. Contradictions and divisions among the ruling classes.***

Ours is a semi-colonial and semi-feudal country. Many imperialist powers are contending for supremacy over our country, the most important being Soviet Union and USA. For this, they are organising groups among the ruling classes in support of their policies.

USA and Soviet Union are fiercely contending for world domination. The rivalry of the two Super powers for supremacy over our country is a part of this world wide rivalry. We have said that this rivalry of the two Super powers in India has led to deep divisions and conflicts among the ruling classes and they are continuously increasing. We said :

“The growing competitions and contradictions among various imperialist countries, mainly between American imperialism and Soviet social imperialism are bound to reflect in India. They try and are trying to gain dominance over the political, economic and military affairs of India by grouping up comprador bourgeois classes who are under their influence”.

“It is only because of this the two groups of comprador bourgeoisie pro-American and pro-Russian have emerged and started struggling for power. In the days to come this will get further sharpened”.

This was our line at that time. We have also explained that the pro-US groups mainly depending on USA for their existence in power, will also maintain economic and friendly relations with the Soviet Union, and that the pro-Soviet groups, while mainly depending on Russia for their existence in power will also maintain economic and friendly relations with the USA.

We have also said that the Indira Congress is the leader of the pro-Soviet group and that the Swathantra Party, Janasangh, Right Congress (at that time) represent the pro-US groups. We declared that there was a dog-fight between these two groups for power in India and it was being reflected in the election struggle of the President at that time.

**But what was the line of DV and his friends on this at that time? They declared :**

**“The truth is, in India the contradiction between Soviet social imperialism and the American imperialism is not so accentuated as to split their agent into two groups”. (No.6)**

**“In this region (West Asia) the contradictions between these two imperialisms got accentuated and reached a breaking point. This situation or more or less similar to this, has not yet developed in India”.**

**What is the meaning of this? That the contradictions of USA and Soviet Union in India have not yet reached a breaking point as in West Asia by 1970! That Indira Congress was serving as the agent of both! That collusion between the two super powers in India of 1970 was greater! Has not experience of our country in the last 10 years disproved all the fallacies of comrade DV and his friends?**

**Even when comrade DV and his friends were writing this, Indira Congress came to power, made a military agreement (Indo-Soviet Treaty) attacked Pakistan with Soviet support, and became a junior partner in the aggressive plans of the Soviet Union in Asia. The rivalry of the two Super powers has still further intensified in this region.**

**Now DV and his friends themselves admit that “the contradiction of the two Super powers have still further increased. They are getting intensified day by day” and that “India has become the centre of contention between the two Super powers”. (Retranslation from Telugu)**

**We are glad that our friends have realised this truth atleast after 10 years!**

**Once they said that there were no divisions among the ruling classes, that it was hasty to see the formation of pro-USA and pro-Soviet ruling class groups, that the “division in the Congress in 1969 does not represent two groups of comprador bourgeoisie”.**

**The past ten years experience has disproved their theory. Now they write that we should determine the character of ruling class groups depending on their attitude towards the two Super powers. We welcome their change.**

**Stability and instability**

Another controversy between them and us at that time related to stability and instability of the ruling classes.

As a semi-colonial and semi-feudal country, our country is a part of world capitalist system, which has entered the stage of general permanent crisis. The rivalry of the two Super powers in India is increasing. The struggle of the ruling class groups for power in India is increasing, resulting in instability of the ruling classes.

We said that inspite of Indira Congress victory in 1970-71, its stability was only temporary, within the confines of the permanent crises of world capitalist system. We declared that this was bound to break up again resulting in greater instability for the ruling classes.

What was the assessment of comrade DV and his friends on this? They declared :

“The ruling classes are trying for stability at the centre and States and have even succeeded to a very large extent”, “of all, the most important development in the emergence of ruling congress with a big majority in the centre and its forming a stable government, with this it is clear that the “instability of 1969 has transformed into stability”, that the Indira Congress “has achieved stability with a big majority in the mid-term elections”. They even declared that divisions among the ruling classes have not reached a breaking point”.

While accepting that the 'stability' of the Indira Congress at that time was only “temporary”, they advanced all arguments to show that it was going to stay for a long time. But the events after 1971 disproved all their calculations, exposed the unreality of all their assessments. Even by 1973 itself, the contradictions and conflicts reached a high stage. The JP movement, the student movement in Gujarat, General Strike of the Railway workers, the strike of PAC police in UP proved this fact.

Now our friends are admitting that there is no stability for the ruling class parties. We welcome this change.

### **Antagonism towards other communist revolutionaries.**

Relations with comrade Charu and his friends had broken by the time of the Andhra Party convention in 1969 April. Even then the Andhra Party Convention decided to maintain friendly relations with that group.

**Our Party continues to maintain that attitude towards revolutionary groups and organisations even now. Still we continued a principled struggle against the wrong policies and wrong tactics of struggle pursued by the Charu group. We never surrendered to them on any point of difference. DV and his friends find fault with us only on a single point-about the necessity of taking necessary action against certain landlords on certain occasions.**

**This is what comrade Mao had said on this issue : “the only effective way of suppressing the reactionaries is to execute at least a few in each country who are guilty of the most heinous crimes” (Huonan Report)**

**This does not mean that individuals should do this. People have to do this. They must be mobilised for this. This is not what Charu group did. They believed that they could achieve Agrarian Revolution by killing a few individual landlords. Our committee opposed this and rejected it.**

**We mobilise the people to fight against the exploitation of the landlords. If any one of them, becomes a CID, and carried on heinous crimes on the people with the support of the police, then we did take certain actions against such elements.**

**Even this depended on the demand of the people and with their support. We first exposed their crimes before the people. We called upon the people to oppose such crimes. We warned the police agents to desist from their crimes. Only when all these efforts failed, we took certain actions with the co-operation of the people. There is no people’s movement without people’s resistance.**

**There is no comparison between this concept of ours and that of Charu group. The practical results themselves show the difference. Our attitude towards other revolutionary groups and organisations is positive. The attitude of comrade DV and his friends is negative. Has not history proved that they are wrong and that we are correct. The change in the attitude of various organisations of communist revolutionaries proves this.**

**Yes, it is true that communist revolutionaries are divided in various organisations. Most of them have abandoned the path of annihilation advocated by Charu. Only an insignificant few still cling to that line.**

**Overwhelmingly, the organisations of communist revolutionaries have abandoned the path of “annihilation of class enemies”. In some form or other they are following the mossline. Yes one can discuss whether the**

mass line they are pursuing is correct or not. But this is one which has to be solved through mutual discussions, based on practical results, but not by taking an antagonistic attitude.

Let us take the example of Andhra itself. The comrades of "People's War" organisation, whatever be their ideology and principles, they are participating in mass work to an extent. For example they could advance people's movement in Jagtiala taluq of Karimnagar district to a certain extent. They are participating in student struggles. Practice will establish the correctness or otherwise of their tactics in this. But to say that they are a "condemned stuff" is an absurdity.

Similarly a Unity Committee under the leadership of comrade Kolla Venkayya is functioning. They are working among the people on different issues. To say that they are a "condemned stuff" is an absurdity.

We see similar changes taking place in other states too. Recently, we have seen that the communist revolutionaries in Tamil Nadu conducting anti-feudal struggles. Some comrades in Madhya Pradesh, like comrade Neogi, have been building a significant people's movement particularly among the working class.

We are not saying that the programme, tactics of other organisations of communist revolutionaries are fully correct. The welcome feature is they have turned away from Charu's line of "annihilation of class enemies". They have turned towards the massline. It is our confidence that the mass movement will correct them if there are any mistakes.

In short, this is the essence of the line pursued by us and by UCCRI

— We advocated a policy of combining the propagation of revolutionary politics, people's mobilisation and people's resistance, whereas comrade DV said that self-defence of cadres and people's movement is absurd.

— We said that Soviet social imperialism is riddled with contradictions and crises, whereas DV declared that there was no crisis for Soviet social imperialism.

— We said that the rivalry of the two super powers for hegemonism over India had intensified and that had led to a division of the ruling classes into pro-USA and pro-Soviet camps. Comrade DV refused to accept this



assessment.

— We said that revolutionary situation is better than that at the time of the Great Telangana struggle of 1946-51, which comrade DV held the contrary view.

— We held that the ruling classes are faced with instability, comrade DV denied this.

What has the experience of the last 10 years proved? We are glad to notice, that today they are repeating what all we have said earlier.

But still they claim that they had been basically right from 1968. Is there any particle of truth in this?

Now let us see the practical results of these two lines.

### **Practical results of the two lines :**

Our two lines have been implemented in Andhra for the last 10 years. What are the results ?

— The forest movement did not disintegrate as they expected. On the other hand, it expanded to new areas. The struggle for forest lands became a mass movement. The people have occupied about 3 lakh areas of this land and are still enjoying the greater part of it. Anybody could investigate into this. The forest movement had withstood the onslaught of thousands of police and hundreds of police camps with its barbaric emergency rule.

— The forest movement gave inspiration to the movement in the plain areas. Anti-feudal struggles have taken place in hundreds of villages in Khammam, Warangal, Nallagonda, Adilabad and Karimnagar districts. More than all that, the people's struggle in Kareemnagar district has drawn the attention of the whole country. It has resisted the counter-revolutionary violence of the landlords-goondas-police and the Disturbed Areas Act. Through resistance it has spread to new taluqs. The forest movement and the movement in the above districts have become resistance movements. Ofcourse in other districts, our movement is still confined to certain pockets and it is still in the stage of agitation. But it is a growing movement.

— In 1969, due to the "revolutionary tactics" of DV and his friends, we almost lost every thing among the students. But today our student movement is the biggest organised student movement in Andhra. It is spreading

to new areas.

— In the beginning we had no working class movement with the name. But today we are working in textiles, tobacco, mirchi, fertilisers, coal etc.

— Our state committee had been able to unite with the communist revolutionaries in Srikakulam, Vizag, Nellore and Prakasam districts. Today we are working under the leadership of a single State Committee. We have been able to overcome the divisions of 1968.

— More than all this, we are not alone as earlier, confined to Andhra alone. Today, we are an important part of our All India Party functioning in 15 states.

During the last 12 years, we have braved police camps, Disturbed Areas Act, Emergency rule, arrests, tortures and killings. But still we have emerged as an organised force with relatively stable mass base in certain areas of certain districts, effectively conducting numerous anti-feudal and anti-government struggles. We are leading a resistance struggle.

## **Results of DV's line.**

Let us compare the results of DV's line too. Their achievements are too limited, if any. Their mass base is confined to two or three places in the province. In all other places they have to be content with individual contacts. Their mass base is nominal. Their mass organisations are nominal. If there is doing any significant work from them it is on the civil liberties front, which is joint some useful work in bringing about government atrocities on the people in the press. But even in this their claim that they are doing more than other communist revolutionaries is nothing but exaggeration. Where are their anti-land lords struggles, and to what extent? Did they develop into militant struggles anywhere? Let them deeply consider themselves about this.

Look at the fate of some of the struggles they have conducted.

— At one time in 1969, there was a big peasant movement in Anantapur district under the leadership of comrade Nagireddy for the occupation of bazar lands. Where is that movement today?

— Where is the Bazar land struggle of Krnool district today?

— What has happened to the banzar land struggle in Divi taluq?

— What about girijan struggle of Kondamodulu ?

Now they talk of Maddulapalle village near Yellandu. They claim to have distributed about 300 acres of land to the peasants. Very good. But one should remember one fact here. In the taluqs of Yellandu and Burgampadu very near to this village, both in the forest and plain areas, there is a strong forest movement which has occupied about 3 lakhs of acres of forest lands. Today work is being done by us in hundreds of villages. This area is now under Disturbed Areas Act and police camps, subjected to police raids and heavy police repression.

You yourself have admitted, in your land struggle in Maddulapalle village, the police have visited the village only once and even they talked to you as gentlemen.

This only shows how “revolutionary” your struggle in Maddulapalle is.

Now for your All India organisation. Once Moniguha group joined them but now he had disappeared. They claimed some Punjab groups have joined them. But they too have disappeared. They claimed one group from Kerala has joined them. But this too has disappeared. All this is from their own publication of Proletarian line.

Now they claim that their group is an all India organisation with mass base throughout the country. But at the same time they call for building the All India Party.

Their attitude towards People’s struggles is negative, towards other organisations of communist revolutionaries is negative, towards People’s resistance is negative. In essence it is a legal movement and nothing more. That is why they have subjected themselves to extreme isolation. They cannot cover up their isolation by slandering and abusing others.

Now they slander that our leadership cannot conduct a principled ideological struggle, but only knows “organisational manipulation instead of defending the correct line”

Let us look at the organisational principles of DV and his friends.

Is it an organisational principle to announce a State committee in con-

bination of 4 persons from inside the jail? Even their document was not placed for a discussion before the jail comrades. They were only given an ultimatum to accept or not to accept. What organisational principle is this? First they recognised the PC outside. Then they announced that they have abolished it. What organisational principle is this? First they accused our line as "left adventurism", then they denounced it as "right opportunism" in the name of a baseless attack on comrade Madala Narayana Swamy. What was the crime he committed, except opposing their line? They unilaterally split the Party from inside the jail without any discussions. Has such a thing happened anywhere in the world. This is the special contribution of comrade DV and his friends.

What did we do? We conducted wide discussion inside the Party against Charu's line and defeated it. We placed all the documents of the jail comrades and those of the PC among the comrades for discussion and defeated them.

This explains clearly who resorted to organisational conspiracies, who depended entirely on wide discussion inside the Party for the success of the revolutionary line.

The experience of the last 10 years clearly expose the bankruptcy of the political line of comrade DV and his friends. Their line of struggle is nothing but a legal line. Still for him to claim that his line has been basically correct for the last 10 years is gross exaggeration to say the least. His baseless slanders against other communist revolutionaries is only a reflection of extreme isolation and frustration.

### **3. His present political line - New Theories.**

Now, let us consider, for a moment their new formulations concerning both national and international situation.

In essence, if taken to its logical conclusion, their new line is for an immediate general political united front with US imperialism and their friends in India. It is nothing but SN line against which we have fought bitterly and defeated it.

#### **International situation.**

We hold that the present international situation consists of the following most important factors :

— The two Super powers are the common enemies of the world people. Of this, US imperialism is on the defensive while Soviet social imperialism is on the offensive. Today Soviet Union is the Chief source of war danger and therefore greater danger to the world people.

— The Second world countries are a force to be reckoned with in the struggle against the hegemonism of the two Super powers.

— The Third World countries including Socialist China are the main force of struggle against imperialism and hegemonism of the two Super powers to advance their struggle.

Based on this analysis our political resolution has advanced a three point programme in the international field.

— Support all anti-imperialist struggles, particularly the struggles against the two Super powers, taking Soviet social imperialism as the greater danger to the world people.

— Today Soviet social imperialism is the chief source of war danger. Mobilise the people to resist Soviet aggression where ever and when ever it raises its head and unite with all that could be united including USA and Second world forces, to achieve this.

— Combine these tow tasks and advance the revolutionary movement throughout the world, step by step. In this process build international united front against Soviet social imperialism, including USA and Second world countries and their friends and defeat Soviet Union in it dares to start a Third World War.

This is our line in the international situation. It is based on the Marxist principle of utilising the contradictions of the enemy camp. This is how the international Communist movement worked under the leadership of comrade Stalin before the Second World War. This is how Socialist China is at present working. But DV and his friends are bringing new theories contrary to this.

## **The Principal contradiction in the world today.**

The contradiction between the two Super powers and the rest of the

world is the principal contradiction. The Third World countries are the main force of struggle against the Super Powers. Socialist China is the vanguard of this struggle. This is the understanding of Marxist-Leninist throughout the world.

Now DV and his friends are proposing a new formula. They say :

“In the present situation, it is the contradictions between the two Super powers on one hand and other socialist countries on the other, which have come to the surface. They are manifesting in their acute form between China and the two Super powers” . (No.1)

Hitherto all the Marxists-Leninists have been saying that Europe is the focus of contention between the two Super powers for world domination. Do comrade DV and his friends want to change this? If so why? Hitherto all of us have been saying that the two Super powers were the common enemies of the world people. Do DV and his friends want to change this. If so why?

Revisionists and neo-revisionists have been claiming that the contradiction between the imperialist powers and Russia is the principal contradiction. Now comrade DV is saying that the contradiction between the two Super powers and Socialist China is the principal contradiction. Both their arguments amount to abandonment of the three world theory.

### **Chief Source of War danger today.**

In our view Soviet Union is the chief source of war danger today. But DV and his friends, say that since Soviet Union is the aggressive force, war danger comes from the Soviet Union.

Does this mean that US imperialism is no more an aggressive force? Is not USA fighting for the preservation of its own present hegemonism and for hegemonism of the whole world? Are not the two Super powers engaged in a rivalry for arms production in their drive for world domination? Is not this rivalry leading to another world war and as such both these two Super powers responsible for world War? Both are responsible. There fore both are the common enemies of the world people. But today it is Soviet Union which is determined for a redistribution of the world in its favour and that is why we hold that Soviet Union is the chief source of war danger today and therefore a greater danger to the world people. The argument of DV and his friends is nothing but that of SN and his friends.

## **Is not USA an aggressor country ?**

Comrade DV says that USA is no more an aggressor country. For that he is quoting comrade Stalin. It is true that comrade Stalin divided the world in two—the aggressors and the non-aggressors—before the Second World War.

But at the same time he exposed the evil intentions of the non-aggressor countries which in practice was encouragement to aggression, giving freedom to war plans of the aggressors and convert the war into a world war, and encourage Hitler against the Soviet Union at that time.

That is why, while comrade Stalin did try for collective security with the West, at the same time he exposed their evil intention too. He supported all anti-imperialist struggles and revolutionary struggles. He understood the conspiracies of the imperialist powers and made a non-aggression pact with Hitler Germany. When Hitler invaded the Soviet Union in 1941, the weakened Western powers were forced to join hands with the Soviet Union against Hitler Germany.

Instead of telling these facts, only to quote Stalin about aggressor and non-aggressors is nothing but a call for immediate general political united front with USA. SN tried to deceive us with this formula, but failed. Now comrade DV has taken up this very same formula.

Economically USA is a stronger power than the Soviet Union. It is having economic, political and military control over greater number of countries in the world today. Military it is in a defensive position when compared with the Soviet Union, but when compared with others, it is on the offensive.

## **Is there united front between USA and China ?**

DV and his friends claim that there is already a united front between USA and China, that USA is in alliance with Third World countries. They say :

“USA has been forced to realise that it cannot defeat the Soviet Union alone” and that USA “which is in defensive, has made an alliance with the independent forces in the Third World countries and Socialist China” (Retranslation from Telugu).

**Soviet Union, revisionists and neo-revisionists, Albania-all spread this slander against Socialist China. Comrade DV also is repeating the same. Today Socialist China is supporting all anti-imperialist struggles against imperialism. At the same time, it is utilising the contradictions of the two Super powers. It is resisting the specific aggressive actions of the Soviet Union. It is uniting with all that could be united to resist specific acts of aggression by the Soviet Union. It is appealing to all the countries in the world to unite to defeat the war plans of the Soviet Union.**

**For example, China is resisting Soviet aggression in Zaire, Angola, Somalia, Yemen and now in Afghanistan. In this we see the western powers including USA joining with China in resisting Soviet aggression.**

**But at the same time China is also resisting American backed Israel's aggression and that of South Africa. It is helping the national liberation struggles of these countries to the extent it can.**

**China is the main supporter of the Kampuchean national liberation struggle against Soviet backed Vietnamese aggression in Kampuchea. The Western countries are opposing Vietnamese aggression in Kampuchea politically and diplomatically as reflected in the attitude of the ASIEAN countries.**

**But at the same time it is resisting the attitude of USA towards Taiwan and North Korea. China itself has been advocating "unity in action" or "parallel actions" against Soviet aggression. Thus we see that there is no basis for DV's contention that US imperialism is already in a united front with China.**

**Both USA and the Soviet Union are trying to unite with the moderates and reactionaries in the National liberation movements. They are trying to create their own compradors in these countries. To call this as USA being in alliance with independent forces in the Third World countries is most unreal.**

**In today's world situation, one can have united front with pro-USA forces on certain issues or join them in joint actions. There is no necessity to call such pro-USA comprador forces as forces of independence. Such attitude in practice will lead to tailing behind the pro-USA forces.**

**Today the Western countries including USA, are mainly following a policy of appeasement towards Soviet Union. As long as this policy of ap-**



peasement continues, to think of a general political united front with them is nothing but an illusion. In such a situation, support to all that could be united against specific acts of aggression of the Soviet Union and a merciless exposure of the appeasement policies of the western powers -only by combining these three policies, could we advance the world revolutionary movement in the world today. Only in this process of struggle, we can build an international united front against war of aggression from the Soviet Union, and not by calling USA and the pro-USA forces as forces of "independence".

## **National situation**

As far as the national situation is concerned, DV and his friends have come out with more naked formulations for an immediate general political united front with pro-USA forces in the country.

### **Is our country a semi-colony or a neo-colony ?**

In the beginning, we the communist revolutionaries did not clearly see the difference between semi-colonialism and neo-colonialism. While calling our country a semi-colonial and semi-feudal country, we also called our country a neo-colony. The Andhra 'Immediate programme' also called our country a neo-colony.

It was SN who claimed that our country was under the complete hegemonism of the Soviet Union. It is nothing but treating our country as a neo-colony of the Soviet Union.

Now DV and his comrades, while treating our country as semi-colonial they also call our country a neo-colony. But we see a difference between these two characterisations.

Now, the Marxists-Leninists of Indonesia, Malayasia, Thailand and Philipines call their countries as neo-colonies. We do not think that such conditions have already been created in our country.

To day ours is a semi-colonial and semi-feudal country. Is not the danger of our country becoming a neo-colony of the Soviet Union increasing ? Yes, the danger is certainly increasing because the Soviet Union is already dominant in the economic political and military affairs of our country. A pro-Soviet Indira Congress is in power. It has the political support of the revisionists. In Afghanistan about a lakh Soviet troops are waiting. That

is why we say that the danger of our country becoming a neo-colony of the Soviet Union is greater today. But it is wrong to say that our country has already become the neo-colony of the Soviet Union. Such an analysis only makes our party a tail of a section of the ruling classes opposed to the Soviet Union.

## **1947 August 15 Independence.**

Not clear on the above subject, DV and his friends are bringing some surprising arguments.

“With 1947 August 15th, our political independence began, but the subsequent congress governments were so subservient to imperialism that our independence has become nominal”. (Retranslation from Telugu)

They also say :

“We in India, had witnessed a marginal democratic change with the transfer of power from the British colonial regime to the congress leadership” (No.1)

What is the meaning of these two sentences ? It only means that our country had complete political independence in 1947 August 15th, and it became nominal with the subservience of the congress governments. This is nothing but distortion of history. This is nothing but accepting the theory of the revisionists and neo-revisionists.

India has been a semi-colonial and semi-feudal country right from the time of 1947 August 15th. Please see what comrade T.Nagireddy has said in his book “India Mortgaged”.

“The change of power was a compromise agreement between the Indian bourgeoisie and the British imperialism for joint exploitation of our country”.(Retranslation from Telugu)

## **Pakistan.**

With regard to Pakistan, DV and his friends are making still more atrocious theories : They declare :

“Pakistan, though a small country is an independent country has complete independence from Soviet social imperialism. It is independent from

**US imperialism to a very large extent. Thus it is full independent from both the two super powers''.**

**Pakistan came into existence on 1947, August 15th. Was it not then a semi-colonial and semi-feudal country? Now they say that it is a independent country. Is it possible simple because of Chinese support.**

**What is the imperialist capital in Pakistan ? In what sectors? What are its loans from the various international financial institutions? What is the share of USA in these loans? Where from is it getting its arms mainly? What is the meaning of present efforts of Pakistan to get arms from pro-USA Arabian governments? If we put these questions, one can easily see that US imperialism has got an upper hand in Pakistan.**

**Today imperialism is getting weakened. Two Super powers have emerged from the imperialists and are contending for world domination. In these conditions, the bargaining capacity of the rulling in semi-colonial an semi -fecidal countries has increased. With these and Socialist China as its neighbor and a friendly country, the bargaining capacity of the ruling classes in Pakistan has still further increased. One should not misunderstand this bargaining capacity for political independence.**

**Now DV and his friends say that Pakistan is an independent country. But it is different from their own theories made only a few months earlier. Look at the following :**

**“The countries of the Third World are former colonies and semicolonies situated in Asia, Africa and Latin America. They are all dependent on one or the other Super power or both. There is a fierce contention between the two Super powers for hegemonism on these countries” (No.1)**

**Is not Pakistan an Asian country? Then how has it become fully independent from the two Super powers?**

**They further say :**

**“Today’s Nepal and Srilanka and Pakistan of yesterday have manifested a measure of independence from both the Super powers”**

**“While Srilanka and Pakistan have given way to pro-US regimes Nepal’s monarchy has continued the same role” (No.1)**

These are the formulations of DV and his friends made in 1979 April, which showed that Pakistan was pro-USA government. How had it become fully independent later?

### **Principal contradiction.**

In India, almost all the revolutionary groups have been holding that the contradiction between feudalism and the broad masses of the people to be the Principal contradiction. DV and his friends still are keeping to this formula.

After long and deep discussions, our Party has declared the contradiction between the alliance of imperialism, bureaucrat capitalism and feudalism on the one hand and the broad masses of the people on the other as the Principal contradiction. We have also said that imperialism has got the upper hand in this alliance and that Agrarian Revolution is the essence of New Democratic Revolution. This is our opinion on this question.

**Why have we abandoned the old formula?**

The old formula does not show the relationship of feudalism with imperialism and bureaucrat capitalism. It does not show that imperialism (including Soviet social imperialism) dominates throughout the period of struggle for the success of the New Democratic struggle. Our present formula brings our main enemies sharply before the people.

This does not mean the abandonment of Agrarian Revolution. While imperialism is physically present here, it is only by directly fighting it that the liberation struggle will advance. But in a period of its indirect rule, it is only by fighting the big bourgeois-big land lords directly the liberation struggle would advance.

The most important point is that during the struggle for New Democratic Revolution, united front tactics will be changing in different phases, but armed peasant struggle remains the main form of struggle in all phases. This is the lesson that the Chinese Revolution has taught us. That is why, we have clearly stated in our political resolution that Agrarian Revolution is the essence of New Democratic Revolution.

**Is the country divided between pro-Soviet and anti-Soviet forces?**

DV and his friends earlier argued vehemently that our ruling classes were not divided into pro-Soviet and pro-USA forces. But now having gone to the other end, they say "This is the situation : The division between the pro-Soviet reactionary forces on one side and the anti-Soviet democratic force is the main one", Absurd, Why?

— The pro-Soviet forces, while depending mainly on the Soviet Union are also for economic and friendly relations with USA and second world countries. The Indira congress government earlier and now is proving this.

— The pro-USA forces, while mainly depending on USA are also for economic and friendly relations with the Soviet Union. The experience of the Janata government has proved this.

Therefore it is absurd to say that at present our country is divided between the pro-Soviet and anti-Soviet forces.

— We must also understand that the pro-USA forces are not in a position to take a definite anti-Soviet stand. Why?

Our ruling classes, whatever be their political character, they are all expansionist. They are showing their expansionist aims towards Pakistan, Bangladesh, Nepal, Srilanka, China etc., which are our neighbours. In today's world situation and the situation in South Asia, the ruling classes in India cannot depend on US imperialism which is getting weekend, to achieve their expansionist ambitions. On this they depend more on the Soviet Union. That is the reason none of the ruling classes in India demand the abrogation of Indo-Soviet Treaty.

Socialist China is standing in the way of the expansionist aims of our ruling classes. So the ruling classes in India are by nature anti-China.

That is why it is absurd to say that our country is divided into pro-Soviet and anti-Soviet forces.

Pro USA forces and pro-Soviet forces exist in all the ruling class parties to a certain degree.

The Indira Congress is led by the pro-Soviet forces. But it too has its own share of pro-US and pro-Second world forces.

The Bharatiya Janata Party consists of all these three forces, but is led by the pro-US forces.

The Janata party consists of all these three forces. The positions of the regional parties is not different from this.

The pro-Second world forces do not have a separate political party. They exist in all the ruling class parties.

Today even the national bourgeoisie does not have a party of its own but is linked with all the ruling class parties.

Thus we could see that every ruling class party in India consists of pro-Soviet and pro Second world forces, So it is absurd to say that our country is mainly divided between pro-Soviet and anti-Soviet forces.

**Are pro-US forces 'independent' forces? Are they 'democratic' forces?**

Now DV and his friends seem to be feverishly trying to find forces of 'independence' and 'democracy' inside the ruling class parties. In this frantic search, they are calling the pro-US forces as forces of marginal 'independence' and marginal 'democracy'. They say "There are some anti Soviet but pro-US forces... They are pro-imperialist forces. But to the extent they remain pro-USA they play an 'independent' and 'democratic' role to an extent. Because of the contradiction between the two Super powers, since Soviet Union is the main aggressor today, they could play this role". Now all our ruling class parties, the Congress (I), Congress (U), Janata, Lokdal or the Bharatiya Janata — they are all big bourgeois-big landlord parties. All of them are equally interested in preserving the present semi-colonial and semi-feudal system. Therefore it is absurd to look for 'independent' and 'democratic' forces inside the ruling class parties.

Now DV and his friends are characterising the Janata party as a Party of "Forces of marginal democracy and independence together with pro-US and anti-Soviet forces. Though we can not say which are stronger, we can say that the former are considerable" (No.8)

But in their political resolution they themselves have said : that the Janata Party "was refusing to sign on its dotted lines, though it has been adopting a pro-Soviet policy". They have further said: "Crimes are being daily committed on the ordinary people. Compared with the past, they are increasing. It has become the common thing under the Janata regime".

In 1980 March, the Janata Party was following a pro-Soviet policy,

LIBRARY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

that is employing repression on the people, but now they say that the Janata Party is a partly of 'marginal independence' and marginal 'democracy'.

Their characterisation about the Bharatiya Janata Party is still more comical.

In 1979, June they said that the RSS whether it is communal or not, it is consistently opposing the Soviet Union.

In 1980 August, they said that the Bharatiya Janata Party is anti-China, pro-Soviet in relation to South Asia. It is a communal and reactionary party representing landlord interests as well. It consists of ex-Jana Sangh and RSS forces in the main.

Once RSS was anti-Soviet, now it is pro-Soviet, and that only in South Asia. What about its role in other parts of the world? They alone could explain.

Today Soviet Union has got the upper hand in our country. The ruling classes in India are expansionist. So they are not in a position to take a definite anti-Soviet stand. These ruling class parties whoever is in power, in order to preserve the present system of exploitation will use fascism or bourgeois democracy, depending on the crisis of their system. Therefore it is absurd to look for 'democratic' forces inside the ruling class parties. If there are any such individuals, they will come out in the process of the struggle.

### **Joint action with other opposition ruling class parties.**

Does this mean that the working class will have united front with any section of the ruling class on any occasion? There are definitely such occasion, such as, if any Super power makes aggression on our country, if there is fascist dictatorship in the country, or if our country becomes the neo-colony of any of the two Super powers. During such definite periods, the working class will have united front with the ruling class opposed to that Super power behind those events on certain issues to a certain extent. But today there are no such occasions.

Does this mean that we should treat the pro-Soviet and pro-US forces as equal enemies? Certainly not. Soviet Union and its allies, the Indira Congress, CPI and CPM - whether in power or in opposition are a greater danger to our country at present.

How is the working class to utilise the contradictions of the pro-Soviet and pro-US forces? From issue to issue - economic and political, national and international. Our political resolution has declared :

“ We should utilise the contradictions of the two Super powers and those of the ruling class parties and groups, the central government and the provincial governments, ruling class parties and revisionists, from issue to issue both economic and political to advance the revolutionary movement, taking the Soviet Union and its allies as the greater danger”.

### **What are those issues ?**

Our Political resolution has called for united front struggles with pro-US and pro-Second world forces on such issues like civil liberties, immediate economic and political issues of the people, against Soviet aggression, particularly in Afghanistan against the efforts of the Soviet Union to convert our country into its neo-colony, and against the concessions that Indira Congress makes towards these efforts and against the conspiracies of the Soviet Union for a Third World War. Since these forces are mainly in the opposition, there is scope for such united struggles.

It is in this process of united struggles, and orientating them towards Agrarian Revolution, the revolutionary movement in the country will get strengthened. In this process the national bourgeoisie will break with the big bourgeoisie-big landlord forces, since it has got an antagonistic contradiction with them.

From all these points, one thing is certain. DV's line in its essence is nothing but SN line.

### **Blind hatred towards our Party.**

Our Political resolution is there before the people for nearly one year. DV and his friends have criticised this resolution only on two counts.

#### **First**

When Indira Gandhi demanded that the Soviet troops should be withdrawn from Afghanistan, our Party welcomed it. His whole attack is on this.

Before Indira Gandhi won the Parliament elections, she supported

OF MICHIGAN LIBRARY



Soviet aggression in Afghanistan. But after she came to power, in order to please and deceive the public opinion both in our country and the world, Indira Gandhi was forced to demand the withdrawal of the Soviet forces from Afghanistan. After her recent agreement with the Soviet Union to supply India with a military hardware worth Rs. 1400 crores, Indira Gandhi has been supporting the Soviet aggression more nakedly. The Indira government remained neutral on the UN resolution demanding the withdrawal of the Soviet forces.

What does all this show? The circus feats of Indira Gandhi on the Afghan issue. Even when she was demanding the withdrawal of Soviet forces from Afghanistan, we have been exposing all the 'lies' she was telling the people about Soviet actions in the country. Even at that time, we declared "we should remember that the present government of Indira Gandhi is a big bourgeois-big landlord class government, comprador in nature, subservient to imperialism and social imperialism and a pro-Soviet government. (New Democracy, No.2)

Are there no contradictions between our ruling classes and imperialism and social imperialism? There are. But they are friendly, and non antagonistic contradictions.

Now DV and his friends say there are no contradictions between the compradors and imperialism. But it can never stand the test of history.

But is it good for an opposition party to 'welcome' such friendly contradictions? This is the point to be considered and we will certainly take a proper lesson from it. But at the same time communist revolutionaries should utilise even the friendly contradictions of the enemy camp. This is a Marxist principle.

## **Second.**

Their second criticism is our attitude towards party members of CPM

We have declared that Soviet Union and its allies whether in power or in opposition are greater enemies of the Indian people at present.

But at the same time we have also declared that our party should take the initiative to unite with the members of CPM and their mass organisations at the village, factory or educational level to conduct united struggles on the immediate issues of the people.

**Communist revolutionaries should differentiate between the revisionist leadership and their followers. We should take a positive attitude towards ordinary party members. This is a Marxist principle.**

**In a village, are we to tell their party members not to join anti land lord struggler?**

**In the factory, are we to tell their followers not to join the workers struggle against the factory arrangement ?**

**In educational institutions, are we to tell their followers not to join the struggles on immediate issues?**

**One who is interested in building a People's movement cannot accept any such stupid proposal.**

**DV and his friends have criticised our Political resolution only on these two issues. Even their criticism has no basis in reality. So they have been forced to resort to white lies in their hatred towards our Party.**

**Now they want to slander our party by saying that our party leadership is trying for links with the Indira's Congress government. They say: "We all know that if a section of CPI (ML) has been pro-Janata, there are strong indications that another is turning towards Congress (I)".**

**What are the indications so 'clear' to DV and his friends?. They have the audacity to say that the repression on our party cadres should not be confused with the leadership's efforts for 'links' with the Indira Congress government.**

**We only say SN spread all these lies long ago. Now DV wants to utilise the services of the very same lies. Can he gain anything by such lies? This is what all those who have no confidence in their own politics resort to.**

**But still we cannot but ask a few questions. What is the link you have discovered between our Party and the Indira Congress? What are the indications for it? If you are sincere and bold enough, you must come out with the story!**

**Their circus feats over the election tactics.**

**The circus feats they are conducting over the election tactics are sur-**

prising.

In the beginning when the Charu group proposed the question of permanently boycotting the elections, who wrote the first article in Janasakti opposing their stand and proposing that it should depend on the principles of Leninism? What was the attitude of comrade DV and his friends towards that article at that time?

Our Party decided to participate in the 1977-78 Assembly elections. What was the attitude of comrade DV and his friends on this question at that time? Did they not announce that participation in election is parliamentarism?

Then they declared: "Ours is not boycottism or participation in elections?" Is this a Marxist principle? Where has such a principle been put in practice anywhere in the world at any time?

Now they say that conditions at that time were not clear for them to decide on participating in elections.

What was unclear about the 1978 Assembly elections? About the level of the movement?

Now they say that they are directly not participating in the elections because the constitution is reactionary. Is this a Marxist principle? Bourgeois constitutions are always reactionary, particularly in semi-feudal countries like ours. Does participation in election depend on the level of the movement and the consciousness of the people or the reactionary nature of the bourgeois constitutions? When has Marxism declared that our participation in elections will depend on the reactionary nature of the bourgeois constitutions ?

Now DV and his friends demand proportional representation. Even it is accepted, will the present constitution be a progressive one ? Do this mean that DV and his friends will not participate in the elections till the principle of proportional representation is not accepted ?

Now they say that they have participated in the 1980 parliamentary elections. How ? By campaigning for the defeat of those supporting the two super powers, particularly the Soviet Union. According to their own formulations, Indira Congress, Lokdal, CPI-CPM are the pro-Soviet forces. They have already said that the Janata Party is a Party of marginal 'independence' and marginal 'democracy'. After having said all this, asking the

people to defeat pro-Soviet forces-does this not amount to asking the people to vote for Janata ?

SN tried to impose such election tactics on our Party and our Party has defeated them. We have constested the election on the basis of our own strength.

## **Antagonistic attitude towards Communist revolutionaries.**

Today the revolutionary situation in the country is getting brighter and brighter. People are coming forward to participate in various struggles. The communist revolutionaries should lead these struggles and orientate them towards Agrarian Revolution.

Who are the communist revolutionaries ? Those who accept Marxism, Leninism-Mao Zedong Thought, those who accept Socialist China as a base for world revolution, those who accept these principles are communist revolutionaries. This is our understanding.

We need not recognise those who do not accept Mao Zedong Thought, who do not recognise Socialist China, as communist revolutionaries. At the same time we need not abuse them. This is our attitude.

At present, there is no unity between communist revolutionaries. But one need not get discouraged with this. As long as comrades belonging to other organisations are participating in people's struggles, as long as they are building people's movement, no single group by itself can defend these people's struggles. The necessity of defending the revolutionary movement and People's struggles is bound to unite all communist revolutionaries. This is our firm conviction.

Are there no differences between communist revolutionaries on important issues ? Are there no leftist trends and rightist trends, being reflected among their policies and practices ? Yes, there are. But the previous experiences, and the serious losses they brought, the experiences of their own party members will prevent these organisations from going to extremes. This is our firm conviction.

Why are there differences still present among the communist revolutionaries ? We had bitter experiences in the past. This has led to no confidence in each other. In addition, we have been living in different groups for

**the last 10 years. So we had no opportunity to mutually discuss these experiences and come to acceptable conclusions. So only the growth of the Agrarian Revolutionary movement will again create mutual confidence in the communist revolutionaries. So far, the movement built by anyone, including ours, is not yet strong enough to create confidence on the Path and politics of any one organisation. So we should concentrate on building the Agrarian Revolutionary movement. Only that could solve all other problems. This is our firm conviction.**

**The experience of the past 12 years has been very bitter. We may not be able to come to a common understanding on all problems of the past at once. It may take a long time. We should remember that this was the experience of even the Chinese Communist Party.**

**That is why our Party takes a positive attitude towards all communist revolutionaries of other organisations, including that of DV and his friends. We should have friendly discussions. We should work jointly on these issues on which is agreement, leaving others for future discussions. We should still dividing us, we can conduct friendly criticism in our papers on issues continue comradely discussions on ideological and political issues where we differ. There is no use of mutual condemnation. This is the experience of the last 12 years.**

**It is our firm conviction that such an attitude and practice will lead to unity of communist revolutionaries. As the revolutionary movement grows, no single leader out of sectarian attitudes or factional trends can stand in the way of unity of communist revolutionaries. Others will sweep such trends away and achieve unity.**

**This is our attitude towards unity of Communist revolutionaries. Whatever be the attitude of others towards us, this is our attitude towards others.**

**But DV and his friends have taken an antagonistic attitude towards other communist revolutionaries including our Party. They are shouting that they will continue this negative attitude as long as they fight against imperialism. They say that they will not join others even if they accept DV's programme.**

**The truth is DV and his friends will not join with others except on their 'basic line', their 'Andhra' experience and accept their leadership. Their statements and practice confirm this. This is the root of their isolation.**

Now they slander all other communist revolutionaries either as 'terrorists' or as 'agents' of Indira Congress. They should remember one fact. Terrorist movement has not been able to withstand repression anywhere in the world. But in India, the communist revolutionaries, inspite of all their left mistakes, have been able to withstand heavy government repression and have succeeded in building certain areas with a relatively stable mass base and that too in the face of heavy repression. The existence of our Party proves this.

The agents of the government cannot build a revolutionary movement. Today our Party in Andhra is the main target of repression by the government. To condemn such a party as a party of government agents only expose their hatred towards our Party.

Today the communist revolutionaries are subjected to fascist repression in various parts of our country. They are subjected to Disturbed Areas Act and police camps and inhuman police torture and goonda attacks of the landlords. Now in Andhra, we are facing similar attacks from the CPM. Just at this time DV and his friends attack other communist revolutionaries as 'condemned stuff'. They should calmly consider which camp they are joining.

All the enemies of the people are glad with the continuing differences among the communist revolutionaries. Even DV and his friends are glad that the communist revolutionaries have been broken into pieces. Is this the attitude of Communist revolutionaries ?

Though in general DV and his friends have taken an antagonistic attitude towards our Party and other communist revolutionaries, even they have been forced to make certain changes in their earlier policies.

Now they are forced to accept that the rivalry between the two Super powers for world domination, is getting intensified. They are now forced to accept that our ruling classes are divided. They have been forced to abandon their negative attitude towards People's movements led by the opposition. Today they are supporting the Assam movement. They are now supporting opposition agitation in Andhra. Now they say that they are participating in elections. They accept Marxism-Leninism-Mao Zedung Thought, and accept China as a socialist country. We welcome this.

But we warn them, blind hatred and antagonistic attitude towards communist revolutionaries will not take them anywhere. This is a historical

truth.

## **Appeal to all communist revolutionaries.**

**Comrades,**

The revolutionary situation both in India and abroad is growing. The economic and political crisis in our country is getting intensified. The ruling classes are engaged in a dog-fight for power. The people are coming forward for various struggles. We are on the eve of a big people's uprising. It is our duty to orientate this people's tide towards Agrarian Revolution. Let us work jointly on those issues on which we agree. Let us patiently discuss issues on which we differ. Only in this process, could we achieve the unity of all communist revolutionaries.

***Victory is ours !***

***Road to Liberation***

***28-11-1980.***