

words. DK has been forced into the world of pure colours free of the corrupt influence of sound.

Significantly enough, in the first solo exhibition, DK depicts man's soul (symbolised as a bird in twenty-five paintings and drawings) in a vast empty space. He has used acrylic emulsion and synthetic enamel paints to give a transparent, almost dream-like dimension to his paintings. In this semi-figurative world, grey and occasional black intensify the bright colours and emphasise joy even in suffering. DK's paintings are symphonies of passion. Yet everything seems to be under control. Tones are in harmony of juxtaposition. Colours are contrasted. Nothing is confused. There is a definite sequence of lines used in every composition. Although very subjective DK has been able to restrain his emotions. Especially 14, 24, 25 are like mirrors that throw back the image to the viewer.

DK's paintings are social comments of a different order. Social restrictions have paralysed man in such a way that he now finds himself unable to communicate the nuances of his feelings and emotions.

Letters

Peking And CP(ML)

Mr Arani Ghosh's (December 2) arguments are too weak to justify his doubts.

First, he ought to have known better when he wrote that "Charu Mazumdar was always the Chairman" of the CPI(ML). In fact, the Party had no Chairman and Charu Mazumdar was elected General Secretary when the Party was formed in 1969, and again, at the first meeting of the Central Committee held immediately after the Party Congress in May 1970.

Second, it should not cause surprise if leaders of the Chinese Communist Party pointed out that Lin's observation—"Guerilla warfare is the only way to mobilize and apply the whole strength of the people against the

enemy"—was related only to principles of warfare. One may refer to the following passages in Lin Piao's "Long Live the Victory of People's War": "In the enemy-occupied cities and villages, we combined legal with illegal struggle, united the basic masses and all patriots..." etc. (Chapter 3) and "The main form of struggle was war and the main form of organization was the army which was under the absolute leadership of the Chinese Communist Party, while all the other forms of organization and struggle led by our Party were co-ordinated, directly or indirectly, with the war." (Chapter 4). These will show that the Party leadership's interpretation of Lin's above observation on guerilla warfare—the interpretation that guerilla warfare is the only form of struggle or that "guerilla war is the only tactic of the peasants' revolutionary struggle"—was wholly wrong.

Moreover, guerilla war is a form of people's war and can be waged only with the active help and co-operation of the people. What the Party leadership called guerilla war was actually secret annihilation of individuals carried out by groups of militants secret from the people and secret even from the Party units not sufficiently accustomed to underground work. Naturally, there is a fundamental difference between individual terror practised by secret groups and the revolutionary violence of an aroused people, between "the battle of annihilation of class enemies" as understood by the Party and guerilla warfare as conceived by Lenin or Mao Tse-tung.

Thirdly, the "alleged letter" from Sanyal and others dealt only with the "valuable fraternal suggestions" from the Chinese Communist Party and the refusal of the Party leadership to benefit from those suggestions and correct its left-adventurist deviations. It referred to the abnormal situation within the Party and the breaking up of the Party into different groups and factions without naming their leaders and suggests the way of building a new unity. The purpose of the letter was not to offer an appraisal of the national or the international situation,

"Bangladesh and so on."

Mr Arani Ghosh declares that "from the middle of 1971 'the ultra-leftist activities' had in fact come to a virtual stop" but does not explain what he means by "ultra-leftist activities". Do these mean "the battle of annihilation of class enemies" around which the entire tactical line of the Party was built at a particular stage and which received approval at the Party Congress? If so, when did the Party repudiate that line and withdraw the Party Congress documents and other writings that initiated and upheld that line? On the contrary, the reports and reviews from different State Committees and Regional Committees, published in the July 1971-January 1972 issue of *Liberation* (that came out in March 1972), strongly upheld the annihilation-of-class-enemies line and "ultra-leftist activities". Mr Arani Ghosh's statement is not justified by facts.

One should understand the difference between paying tribute to a revolutionary and supporting his wrong line. Perhaps Mr Arani Ghosh is not aware that Chowdhari Tejeswara Rao and other "eminent" leaders of Andhra issued a pamphlet in the name of the Srikakulam District Committee of the Party about two years ago blaming the Party-line and the Central leadership for the setback in Srikakulam. Reference to this difference was made by the present Andhra State Committee in its review published in July 1971-January 1972 issue of *Liberation*. The "alleged letter" should not be a surprise to Mr Ghosh if he remembers that the leadership of all important areas of peasant struggle—Srikakulam, Mushahari, Monghyr, Lakhimpur-Kheri, Midnapur-Baharagora, Birbhum and Naxalbari, if the letter is treated as authentic—has rebelled against the Party-line, each in its own way and at different times.

Fourthly, Mr Ghosh argues that the six leaders could not have sent out the letter from prison without compromising their "proven integrity". It may be recalled that these leaders, who are all implicated in a case brought by the Andhra police against them,

met at Visakhapatnam during their trial in July this year and were reported to have sent out the joint letter. Will it be a revelation for Mr Ghosh that revolutionaries "languishing in jail under the strictest surveillance all round" have successfully maintained contact with their organizations outside not only now but also in the past? Does he not know that an article sent by Kanu Sanyal from jail was published by the CPI(ML) in 1971?

It is known to many that a Party representative, one of the most trusted comrades of Charu Mazumdar, visited Peking and brought back from the Chinese Communist Party "most valuable fraternal suggestions in respect of our liberation struggle in India in the month of November 1970", as stated in the "alleged letter". It is also known to many that the above Party representative, who made the report to Charu Mazumdar, remained a firm adherent of Charu Mazumdar's line and tried to implement it faithfully till his arrest by the police. Perhaps one may remember that in their *published* document on the national questions Asim Chatterjee and his associates (Bengal-Bihar-Orissa Border Regional Committee) demanded a circulation of this criticism. It will be seen from the *published* replies of Charu Mazumdar and the West Bengal State Committee that they did not deny the existence of the CPC's criticism but that they preferred silence on this question. If the "suggestions" contained in the "alleged letter" were not offered by the CPC, then what were the CPC's actual suggestions? Besides the Bengal-Bihar-Orissa Border Regional Committee, the West Bengal-Bihar Border Regional Committee and a member of the Central Committee of the Party are known to have demanded circulation of the Party representative's report but there was no response from Charu Mazumdar.

Mr Ghosh has said that "by the early part of this year Charu Mazumdar was himself advocating a more open-ended (united front strategy)". What he means by "open-ended united front strategy" is not clear. The

Party has always mentioned the necessity of building the united front. At one phase the Party leadership believed that "the battle of annihilation of class enemies could solve all our problems", including the problem of building the united front. If 'ultra-leftist activities' had in fact come to a virtual stop", what is the tactical line adopted to implement the "more open-ended united front strategy"? Will the Party work through mass organizations and participate in mass movements and try to rally the people around both economic and political slogans to implement the "more open-ended united front strategy" with a view to accomplishing the People's Democratic Revolution? Or, will the underground Party remain withdrawn within its own shell, as before? Indeed, a storm of people's struggles will soon break out in this country. If the Party could carry out democratic land reforms, i.e., if it could abolish feudalism, in some parts of the country, that would surely create a tremendous upsurge. But that presupposes the creation of base areas. Except in base areas, the agrarian revolution cannot be carried out. The question is, how can base areas be created? Previously, the Party leadership believed that only "the battle of annihilation of class enemies" could create base areas. If the class-annihilation-line has been abandoned, what is going to replace it? These questions may seem too much of this earth, earthy, and lacking in a dream-like quality, but mere wishing them away will serve no purpose. These questions can only be answered if the experiences of the struggles of the past years are summed up in the light of Marxism-Leninism-Mao Tse-tung Thought. It will not serve the cause of revolution if the science of Marxism-Leninism-Mao Tse-tung Thought is treated as a cult of *bhakti*. Chairman Mao said: "The troubles that have befallen our nation are extremely serious, and only a scientific approach and a spirit of responsibility can lead it on to the road of liberation. There is but one truth, and the question of whether or not one

has arrived at it depends not on subjective boasting but on objective practice. The only yardstick of truth is the revolutionary practice of millions of people." (*On New Democracy*).

Wrong politics ("the ultra-leftist activities", to quote Mr Ghosh) have shattered the Party into groups and factions: correct politics alone can rebuild the Party, strengthen it and unite the different revolutionary forces, and on the basis of this new unity the Party can link itself with the innumerable struggles of the people, lead and co-ordinate them in a vast struggle, the main form of which will be armed struggle. Under the leadership of such a Party—armed with Marxism-Mao Tsetung Thought and disciplined, linked closely with the masses, able to integrate theory with practice and ready to make self-criticism when mistakes occur—the people of our country will accomplish the People's Democratic Revolution and march towards socialism. The group of revolutionaries that can correctly sum up the experiences of past struggles, make concrete analysis of the concrete conditions in this country, and provide the correct political line in today's confused situation, will surely be able to rebuild the Party and unify and strengthen it.

AJOY ROY
Calcutta