AN APPEAL TO THE NAXALITES

In our previous issue dated June 1 last we had examined the question of the stage of the Indian revolution and shown why in social character our revolution would be a socialist revolution and not a people's democratic revolution. We do not intend to elaborately deal with the points discussed there in this article. Anyone interested may go through the said issue of ours and our other publications. Here we shall only reiterate the salient points very briefly.

Stage of Revolution

"The fundamental question of every revolution is the question of state power." **(Lenin. A Dual Power)** Stalin elaborated it by saying "In the hands of which class, or which classes, is power concentrated; which class, or which classes, must be overthrown; which class, or which classes must take power—such is the main question of every revolution." **(The Party's Three Fundamental Slogans On The Peasant Problem)** Following the analysis of the Russian situation after the February-March Revolution, as made by Lenin in his **Letters On Tactics**, we reach the following conclusion.

Before 15th August, 1947 the state power in India was in the hands of one class, namely, the British imperialists, who were then ruling our country politically. After the transfer of power through compromise to the Congress leadership, which represented the national reformist section of the Indian bourgeoisie, that was leading the anti-imperialist national movement for the establishment of an independent sovereign national bourgeois state, on the 15th August 1947, the state power is in the hands of *another* class, a *new* class, namely, the Indian bourgeoisie.

To quote Lenin, "The transfer of state power from one class to another *class* is the first, the principal, the basic sign of a *revolution,* both in the strictly scientific and in the practical meaning of the term." **(Letters on Tactics)** *To this extent,* therefore, the bourgeois-democratic revolution in our country *has been completed,* even though almost the entire economic and social tasks of the bourgeois-democratic revolution still remain unaccomplished.

The immediate task of our revolution, therefore, is to overthrow the present bourgeois national state and concentrate state power in the hands of the revolutionary alliance of the workers, poor peasants and other exploited masses of the people under the leadership of the revolutionary proletariat and complete the unaccomplished economic and social tasks of the bourgeois-democratic revolution. Thereafter, with the deepening of the revolution and just in accordance with the strength of the class-conscious and organised proletariat, it will pass on to socialization of different aspects of social life. But since the overthrow of a bourgeois national state by the revolutionary alliance of the workers, poor peasants and other exploited masses of the people under the leadership of the revolutionary proletariat is the political task of a socialist revolution and since the political task and, not immediate economic and social tasks, determines, in the main, the social character of a revolution, the Indian revolution is a socialist revolution in social character. In passing, reference may be made in this connection to the great November Revolution in Russia. The November Revolution was a socialist revolution, because its immediate political task was to overthrow the bourgeois state and concentrate state power in the hands of the proletariat and poor peasants led by the revolutionary proletariat, even

(Continued to page 4)

Proletarian Era

ORGAN OF SOCIALIST UNITY CENTRE OF INDIA

(Fortnightly)

Editor-in Chief—**Shibdas Ghosh**

VOL 3 | JULY 1, 1970 | PRICE
No. 8 | WEDNESDAY | 20 P.

HOW THE CPI(M) FIGHTS JOTEDARS

(By a Staff Reporter)

Icha Mohammad Naskar, a lower middle peasant of Koabati in Kultali P.S. under 24 Parganas district of West Bengal, owns about 5 acres of land. He himself cultivates this land. But the local workers of the Krishak Sabha under the C.P.I(M) leadership last year forcibly took away the entire paddy from the field cultivated by Icha Mohammad and compelled him with force of arms to sign *Bhag Chas* receipt A complaint was then lodged by Icha Mohammad with the local Thana stating the whole fact. But no action was taken by the Police.

This year also, a few days back, when the workers of the Krishak Sabha came to forcibly cultivate the land, Icha Mohammad and other villagers resisted, as a result of which several persons had been injured. This is an instance of the C. P. I(M)'s Krishak Sabha's action against a lower middle peasant owning about 5 acres of land, with a large number of members to maintain, and anyhow eking out an existence.

This is one side of the picture. Let us draw the other side. Dhiren Pal is a known jotedar of the locality, He has in his possession several hundred acres of land in differnt villages in Kultali P.S. and Joynagar P.S. Last year when the landless peasants and agricultural labourers of Palerchak recoverd and cultivated the Benami lands of the jotedar, Dhiren Pal, the workers of the C. P. I(M)'s Krishak Sabha along with some notorious anti-social elements of the locality came to the aid of the jotedar against the struggling landless peasants and agricultural labourers. At the time of harvesting they openly sided with the jotedar, killing a poor peasant named Sahid Ali Mondal.

Koabati is not very far off from Palerchak. At Koabati the C.P.I(M) is forcibly occupying the 5 acres of land, only means of levelihood of a poor peasant, while at Palerchak it is with a big jotedar against the local landless peasants and agricultural lobourers. The two sides make a complete picture. The picture of how the C.P.I(M) is conducting its main class struggle against the the jotedars in the rural arears. The C. P. I(M) ranks will kindly think.

COSTLY LAW AND ORDER

The Hindusthan Standard (June 10) reports that nearly Rs. 10 lakh has been spent by the West Bengal Government for using private lorries for the movement of police personnel in Calcutta since President's Rule had been imposed in the State on March 19. Nearly 200 such lorries were used daily, the average expenditure for each lorry, including price for petrol and allowance for the drivers and cleaners, being Rs. 100 daily. The number has now been reduced to 96 for which the monthly expenditure comes up to roughly Rs. 3 lakh. This is unbudgeted extra expenditure and for 'maintenance of law and order' in Calcutta only. To what extent the anti-social activities of hoodlums have been controlled as a result of this huge expenditure is anybody's guess. Don't worry, the money will be paid by Gouri Sen, half-fed half-clad citizens.

LEFT ADVENTURISM OF THE NAXALITES

(Continued from page 1)

though its immediate and direct economic and social aim was "a bourgeois-democratic aim, namely, to destroy the relics of mediaevalism and abolish them completely." **(Lenin. Fourth Anniversary Of The October Revolution)** Thus, the fundamental political slogan of people's democratic revolution or of national democratic revolution, as is being raised by the parties moving in our country with the name **Communist** attached to them, is definitely erroneous.

Military Tactics of Guerrilla Warfare

Besides this mistake of fundamental character relating to the stage of the Indian revolution, the so-called Communist Parties in our country suffer from other serious mistakes also. In this article we shall discuss some of the mistakes of only the Naxalites, leaving the others for the present about whom we shall discuss later on. It seems that the Naxalites confuse the military tactics of guerrilla warfare, as developed by Mao Tse-tung and Che Guevara, to be the same as and identical with the strategy and tactics of the people's democratic revolution. The military tactics of guerrilla warfare not only apply to the people's democratic revolution but equally apply in case of other revolutions, national revolution, socialist revolution, as well. The military tactics of guerrilla warfare are, however, suitable between big engagements in a revolutionary war **(Vide Lenin's Guerrilla Warfare)** and in cases, like China, Cuba, Vietnam, etc., where the revolutionary war had or has been protracted, continuing for years together, as explained by our leader and teacher, Com. Shibdas Ghosh. It should be borne in mind that the strategy and tactics of a revolution are dependent on the alignment of class forces and not on the military tactics ; rather the other way round—the military tactics are dependent on and subject to change and adjustment according to the strategy and tactics of the revolution. Furthermore, it should also be realised that for the success of guerrilla warfare solid mass base is essentially necessary. Mao Tse-tung repeatedly reminded the Chinese activists of the necessity of mass base in conducting guerrilla warfare. This note of caution by Chairman Mao has fallen on deaf ears of the Naxalites.

Left Adventurism of the Naxalites

Then again, the Naxalites have called upon our people to start immediately agrarian revolution by conducting guerrilla war so as to create liberated Red areas in villages amid encirclement of White political power. They claim that several hundreds of such liberated Red pockets have been created by them in the mean time. Certainly, this is a false claim. Be that as it may, one thing comes out clearly from this Naxalite stand. They are for starting revolutionary war here and now for seizure of power throrugh agrarian revolution in villages.

It is uncontestable that our people must be liberated from the present bourgeois rule. It is also undeniable that for the emancipation of our people from all sorts of exploitation, oppression and social injustice revolution is necessary. But it is equally true that revolution cannot be made to order nor can it be imported from outside. It takes place mainly on the maturity of the internal contradictions in the given country, where the link in the chain of world imperialism is the weakest, of course, aided by international conditions, in accordance with the law of development of mass struggles culminating in the revolutionary overthrow of the ruling class from state power by the exploited masses of the people led by the proletariat. It calls for painstaking revolutionary activities to develop mighty country-wide democratic mass movements, raise them to higher and still higher pitch, remove bourgeois and petty-bourgeois illusions from mass mind, expose the political bankruptcy of the bourgeois and petty-bourgeois parties and isolate them from the people, establish political and organisational leadership of the revolutionary working class party over the masses of the people and create subjective and objective grounds for mass upsurge for seizure of power. "Kindle the flame and it will automatically spread like a prairie fire"—this so-called "spark-theory" of revolution is nothing but bowing down to the much condemned theory of spontaneity. This idea of revolution is alien to Marxism-Leninism. It is true that a single spark can start a prairie fire but it can occur only when the grounds for revolutionary mass upsurge for seizure of power have been fully prepared and are ready.

For the victory of the Indian revolution it is essential, *first* that majority of the people consciously realise revolution to be necessary and, accordingly, organise themselves under the leadership of a **real Communist Party** to carry on protracted revolutionary war against armed counter-revolution ; *secondly*, that the millions of the downtrodden people occupying the intermediary social strata between the proletariat and semi-proletarian masses on the one hand and the bourgeoisie on the other hand have adopted an attitude of passive support, if not active support, to the revolution or at least of benevolent neutrality in the revolutionary struggle ; *thirdly*, that the the ruling bourgeoisie cannot continue in the old way, *i.e.*, a national crisis develops ; *fourthly*, that the rulers themselves are divided, resulting in splits in the bureaucracy, police, armed forces, etc. ; *fifthly*, that the forces of revolution have their own liberation army necessarily strong or have strong support and powerful nuclie among the standing armed forces of the state—army, navy and air forces—so that at the opportune moment at the call of the revotionary leadership for insurrection they will rise in arms in favour of the revolution ; and *above all*, that a **real Communist Party** strong and powerful and capable of inbuing the masses with revolutionary politics, transforming them into a disciplined organised force, rousing them to revolutionary mass actions and ultimately leading them to power.

Any person, who is not suffering from blindness and party fanaticism will readily admit that these conditions for successful revolution are absent now in our country. When lakhs and lakhs of workers still follow the Congress and other reactionary parties, when economism is rampant among the workers and employees, when parliamentary illusions are deep-rooted among the people, when parties of extreme right reaction, like the Jan Sangh, etc., are emerging stronger in the northern part of the country, when the bourgeois and petty-bourgeois parties still have no insignificant influence over the people, when the parties nominally known as Communist are tarnishing the nobility and image of communism itself by their activities, when, let alone revolutionary mass struggles, even the development of mighty country-wide democratic movement is a far cry, when the masses have no organs of their own for struggle, when, in place of closer unity, disruption of working class unity and of democratic movement owing

(Continued to page 5)

Concretisation of Marxism-Leninism on the soil Necessary

(Continued from page 4)

to left opportunistic politics of the CPI(M) is increasing and when the revolutionary organisations are in an embryonic stage only here and there in so vast a country as ours, to call upon the people to start agrarian revolution by guerrilla warfare for seizure of power is the height of petty-bourgeois romanticism, ultra-left adventurism, an infantile disorder.

Blanquism or Mass Line

Every Marxist-Leninist worth the name knows that revolution never succeeds, if it depends only on the cadres of the revolutionary working class party. Lenin said : "Victory cannot be won with the vanguard alone. To throw the vanguard alone into the decisive battle, before the whole class, before the broad masses have taken up a position either of direct support of the vanguard, or at least of benevolent neutrality towards it.....would be not merely folly but a crime." (**"Left-Wing" Communism, An Infantile Disorder**) By premature confrontation of their forces (which can be transformed into revolutionary forces provided correct revolutionary leadership is there) with the forces of reaction and thereby giving an additional plea to the ruling bourgeoisie to not only massacre their forces but also curtail further the democratic rights of the people, the Naxalites are committing this "crime" and doing more harm than good to the cause of the Indian revolution.

Moreover, what after all the Naxalites are alleged to be doing in the name of the agrarian revolution ? We deliberately use the word, 'alleged'. For, we have no direct knowledge as to whether the Naxalites are doing the acts or not. These are reported in newspapers to have been done by the Naxalites. But these newspapers are bourgeois newspapers ; they can well malign the Naxalites to prepare grounds for carrying on fascistic police oppression against them. From reports published in **Deshabrati,** organ of the Naxalites, it is gathered that their so-called struggles so far have succeeded in assassinating individual jotedars, government officials and policemen, confiiscation of monetary and other funds of the jotedars and such other acts. By no means these can be called mass struggles, when the masses are not involved in them. Lenin condemned them as Blanquism. He said :"...in the first place, this struggle aims at assassinating individuals, chiefs and subordinates in the army and the police ; in the second place, it aims at the confiscation of monetary funds both from the goverenment and private persons. The confiscated funds go partly into the treasury of the party, partly for special purposes of arming and preparing for an uprising, and partly for the maintenance of persons engaged in the struggle we are describing. * * * The...struggle we are describing is that it is anarchism, Blanquism, the old terrorism, the acts of individuals isolated from the masses, which demoralise the workers, repel wide strata of the population, disorganise the movement and injure the revolution." (**Guerrilla Warfare**) No serious Marxist-Leninist can be opposed to armed form of struggle in principle. But every serious Marxist-Leninist condemns the individual acts of Blanquism as injurious to the cause of revolution.

The present time in our country calls for the formation of a revolutionary organisation and not immediate attack for seizure of power. To quote Lenin, "We, therefore, declare emphatically that under the present conditions such a means of struggle is inopportune and unsuitable ; that it diverts the most active fighters from their real task, the task which is most important from the standpoint of the interests of the movement as a whole ; and that it disorganises the forces, not of the government but of the revolution. * * * In other words, the immediate task of our party is not to summon all available forces for the attack right now, but to call for the formation of a revolutionary organisation ready at any time to support every protest and every outbreak and use it to build up and consolidate the fighting forces suitable for the decisive struggle." (**Where To Begin**) Where there is no effective and powerful revolutionary organisation, the formation of it is the principal task.

Emergence of the Leader on the Soil necessary for Revolution

"We must win because Chairman Mao Tse-tung is our Chairman also, because the Chinese way is our way." This is a well-publicised slogan of the Naxalites. We appreciate the Naxalites showing respect to Mao. But does the slogan really show respect to him ? We think, it does not. The best way of showing respect to Mao is to make our revolution successful. The Naxalites should realise that without the concrete expression of collective leadership, without the historical emergence of a leader on the soil, and his appearance as the most dependable and correct authority of Marxism-Leninism as applicable to the concrete conditions of it, no country has ever succeeded in making its revolution under the leadership of the proletariat victorious. Look at the history and you will find examples of it. The projection of Marx and Engels as authority of Marxism was inadequate for the victory of the Russian revolution. Historical emergence of Lenin as the personified expression of collective leadership of the Bolshevik Party and his appearance on the Russian soil as the most dependable authority of Marxism of the day as applicable to the world revolution in general and Russian revolution in particular was a necessary pre-condition for the success of the November Revolution there. Similarly, the projection of Marx, Engels, Lenin and Stalin as authority of Marxism-Leninism was not sufficient for making the Chinese revolution successful. Historical emergence of Mao Tse-tung as the personified expression of the leadership of the Communist Party of China and his appearance on the Chinese soil as the most dependable authority of Marxism-Leninism as applicable to "colonial, semi-colonial and semi-feudal-society" (**Mao Tse-tung. On New Democracy**) of China was a necessary pre-condition for the success of the new democratic revolution in China. For the victory of the Indian revolution also the historical emergence of a leader as the concretised expression of collective leadership of the *real* revolutionary working class party in our country and his appearance on the Indian soil as the most dependable authority of Marxism-Leninism of the day as applicable to the Indian conditions is a necessary pre-condition. To refuse to recognise it means to recognise the necessity of concrete leadership and its emergence on one's soil without which no revolution can be victorious. The slogan "Chairman Mao Tse-tung is our Chairman also" reflects non-Leninist idea about leadership and ignorance of the Leninist principle of party organisation. We are constrained to say it.

Concretisation of Marxism-Leninism on Indian soil Essential

The other half of the slogan is "Chinese way is our

(Continued to page 6)

A Party That Parrots Others' Words Not A Real Communist Party

(*Continued from page 5*)

way". What was the Chinese way ? It was "armed revolution against armed counter-revolution", as Stalin aptly put and confirmed by Mao times without number in his writings. (vide **The Chinese Revolution and the Chinese Communist Party**). It goes without saying that, in spite of many vital changes in the international situation since the second world war, the law of violent revolution is still the general law of revolution (the prospect of peaceful revolution at present, as advocated by modern revisionists, is an aberration of theirs ; it is as unreal now as building castle in the air). So long as the law of violent revolution will remain valid, armed revolution against armed counter-revolution will be the general picture of revolution in every country. But do the Naxalites mean by the term, Chinese way, this general picture ? No. By this term they mean that just as the Chinese people had done, the Indian people also should create liberated areas in villages by guerrilla warfare, hold these base areas under revolutionary regime amidst encirclement of White (counter-revolutiouary) political power, carry on protracted revolutiouary war to extend the base areas, encircle the cities from the countryside and proceed gradually to take over the cities and ultimately win nation-wide victory. It means carbon-copying the Chinese revolution regardless of the fundamental differences in the concrete conditions between present-day India and pre-revolution China.

He is not a Marxist-Leninist who carbon-copies the revolution of another country. Integrating the general principles of Marxism-Leninism with the actual practice of the revolution in a given country is necessary for victory of its revolution. This is what is called "concretisation of Marxism-Leninism on the soil", as told by Com. Ghosh, our leader. The Naxalites' line of argument is as follows. "Do you follow Mao ?", they ask. Then they quote something from the Red Book torn out of context. They conclude by saying : "If you follow Mao then you must accept it." This is not Marxism-Leninism, not the teachings of Mao. This is parroting Mao. Every communist recognise Mao as an authority of Marxism-Leninism. But Marxist conception of sense of authority is not *Guruvad, i.e.,* authoritarianism. Com. Shibdas Ghosh, our General Secretary, in his **An Open Letter to Khrushchev, On Steps Taken by CPSU Against Stalin** made the position clear. He said that authoritarianism "precludes struggles with the authority, is based on blind acceptance of the authority, considers the authority infallible and above criticism and ultimately deifies it. Such a blind sense of authority is incompatible with the dialectical understanding of the sense of authority which does not preclude, rather presupposes, struggles, not of antagonistic nature, with the authority precisely with the object of uniting with and strengthening it." So, to be a disciple of Chairman Mao does not presuppose to follow him blindly, quote extracts from his writings torn out of context, mechanically copy the policies formulated by him to make the Chinese revolution victorious and take his name, in the manner a devout *Vaishnab* tells his beads. To be his disciple demands adherence by us to the methodology he used in making the Chinese revolution successful *i.e.* the dialectical materialist method, analysing the Indian situation independently, creative application of the revolutionary teachings of Marxism-Leninism according to the concrete conditions of our country, determination of the ways and means that would best answer the situation here and change of the ways and means as the situation would change. Mao is a disciple of Stalin. He has openly admitted it. The world also knows it. But did Mao ever follow Stalin blindly ? Never. He, on the contrary, even went against Stalin's advice in order to creatively apply the teachings of Stalin to make the Chinese revolution victorious. We are referring here to the advice, which Stalin gave to the Communist Party of China towards the end of the second world war urging it not to continue the revolutionary war there in the new situation, as it might, in the opinion of Stalin, end in defeat of the revolution in China. Mao Tse-tung gave due weight to Stalin's reading, independently analysed the new situation, came to the conclusion that the revolutionary war would be continued, worked out the policies and tactics suited to the new situation independently, carried them through and made the Chinese revolution victorious. After the victory of the revolution in China, Stalin was all praise for Mao Tse-tung for his correct appraisal of the Chinese situation even though it went against the advice of Stalin and creative application of the teachings of Marxism-Leninsm on the Chinese soil. Marx, Engels, Lenin, Stalin, Mao, everyone of them, has taught us not to follow them blindly. In the circumstances. how can the Naxalites blindly copy the Chinese revolution on alleged Mao authority.

To return to the question of creation of liberated areas amidst encirclement of counter-revolutionary political power, extension of the base areas, encircling the cities from the countryside, taking them over gradually and ultimately winning nation-wide victory. This was possible in China for some specific peculiar conditions. Mao Tse-tung himself had said : "The phenomenon that within a country one or several small areas under Red political power should exist for a long time amid the encirclement of White political power is one that has never been found elsewhere in the world. There are peculiar reasons for this unusual phenomenon, *It can exist and develop only under certain conditions.*" (Emphasis ours-Editor, P.E. **Why Can China's Red Political Power Exist** ?) What are these conditions ? Mao Tse-tung elaborately dealt with them. We are only mentioning the bare points here. These conditions, according to Mao, are (1) "localised agricultural economy (instead of unified capitalist economy)", which indicates self-sufficing pre-capitalist economy and the absence of any centralised capitalist national market. This self-sufficing localised agricultural economy kept unhampered even in the midst of encirclement of White political power the economic life of the liberated areas necessary for carrying on the revolutionary war and sustaining the life of the people ; (2) division of the country into different spheres of influence of foreign imperialist powers backing "the various cliques of old and new warlords" ruling these areas with their own armies and "the incessant splits and wars within China's comprador class and landed gentry", which indicates the existence of a pre-capitalist mediaeval loose type of state and absence of modern state machinery with centralised administration and developed system of communication ; "In addition to this, the existence and development of such armed independent regime require the following conditions : (1) a sound

(*Continued to page 7*)

RECOGNITION BY COMMUNISTS ABROAD IS NO PROOF THAT A PARTY IS A REAL COMMUNIST PARTY

(Continued from page 6)

mass basis, (2) a first-rate Party organisation, (3) a Red army of adequate strength, (4) a terrain favourable to military operations and (5) economic strength sufficient for self-support." **(The Struggle In The Chingkang Mountains).**

Are these conditions present in India now? Certainly not. In place of "localised agricultural economy instead of unified capitalist economy" where "national capitalism has not become the principal social-ecomic form", as was the case in pre-revolution China, in India national capitalism not only has developed and become principal social-economic from; it has given birth to monopolies, fused industrial capital with bank capital giving rise to finance capital, established the dominance of monopolies and finance capital, been exporting capital outside and exploiting foreign countries and emerged as a junior partner of international monopolist combines, trusts and cartels. Thus form the point of view of development of capitalism present-day India and pre-revolution China are, so to say, poles apart. Here, in India where self-sufficing local agricultural economy is a thing of distant past, where so much development of capitalism has taken place, unhampered economic life necessary for the continued existence and extension of liberated Red areas amid encirclement of white political power as in pre-revolution China is an impossibility. For this reason alone, not to speak of other conditions, the continued existence of liberated areas amid encirclement of counter-revolutionary political power is sure to fail here. And so far as the form and character of the state is concerned, the difference is all the more glaring. While pre-revolution China had a pre-capitalist mediaeval, loose type of state, having no centralised administration and developed system of cnmmunication, India possesses a modern type of state machinery like that in the advanced capitalist countries of the West. This fundamental difference in the character of the state makes the Chinese pattern of revolutionary war all the more unsuitable in India. In the circumstances, before the centralised military operation by the state the creation and continued existence of liberated areas in villages amid encirclement of counter-revolutionary political power is not possible. In any event if their creation is possible their continued existence, as in China, is definitely impossible, unless the armed struggle in the rural belt is backed by simultaneous revolutionary upsurge by the workers and other exploited people throughout the country.

It should further be noted that in China the main centre of counter-revolution was the village, foreign imperialism and native feudal landlord class, which formed "the principal social basis for the rule of imperialism over China," being the main enemy of the Chinese revolution. Whereas in India, the bourgeoisie being in power, the bastion of counter-revolution cannot be the village, it is the industrial area. The revolutionary struggle in villages for seizure of power, therefore, can succeed here only if it is backed by simultaneous revolutionary uprising by the workers, peasants and other exploited people throughout the country. We conclude this portion by drawing the attention of the Naxalites to what Mao Tse-tung's Party has said. "On the one hand, it is necessary at all times to adhere to the universal truth of Marxism-Leninism. Failure to do so will lead to Right opportunist or revisionist errors.

"On the other hand, it is always necessary to proceed from reality, maintain close contact with the masses, constantly sum up the experience of mass struggles and independently work out and apply policies and tactics suited to the conditions of one's own country. Errors of dogmatism will be committed, if one fails to do so, if one mechanically copies the policies and tactics of another Communist Party, submits blindly to the will of others or accepts without analysis the programme and resolutions of another Communist Party as one's own line." **(Letter dated June 14, 1963 of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of China to the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union)** Mind that this **Letter** is not the product of the 'Chinese Khrushchevs'. It is a product of Mao leadership, in conformity with Maoist line and fully upheld by the Ninth Congress of the Communist Party of China.

Are the Naxalites proceeding from reality of the Indian situation? No. Are they maintaining close contact with the masses, constantly summing up experience of mass struggles and independently working out and applying policies and tactics suited to Indian conditions? No. In fact, they are isolated from the masses; in place of mass struggles they are indulging in acts of individual terrorism and, so, the question of summing up experience of mass struggles does not arise at all and instead of independent working out and application of policies and tactics suited to the conditions of our country, they are mechanically parroting without analysis what the Radio Peking is transmitting and accepting them without analysis as their own line. We do not accuse the Chinese leaders. They are analysing the Indian situation to the best of their ability on the basis of materials sent to them from here. Whether their analysis of the Indian situation is correct or not, whether their analysis would be accepted as correct or not is the duty and responsibility of the Indian Communists The revolutionaries of our country have a duty to examine the analysis on the basis of concrete conditions obtaining here and, accordingly, accept or reject it. It is not expected by the Chinese leaders that it should be accepted blindly without independent analysis. It the Naxalites do not perfrom this bounden duty, the fault is theirs. Besides, it should also be realised that had it been possible for any outside Communist Party, no matter how big and important it is and how wise its leadership is, to draw up policies and tactics of revolution of another country simply depending on the materials supplied to it without any living organic day-to-day relation and connection with the people and society of the latter then there would have been no necessity of independent and separate existence of different Communist Parties. We can not help saying that the way Naxalites are using the name of Chairman Mao Tse-tung in support of their non-Marxist behaviour, wrong activities and erroneous political line is tarnishing the image of that great revolutionary leader to the unconscious commonmen of our country to the detriment of the real cause of the Indian revolution.

A Party that Parrots the Words of Others is no Communist

We again refer to the said **Letter of the CPC to the CPSU.** It further states : "If it is not a party *that can use its brains to think for itself andacquire an accurate knowledge of the trends of*

(Continued to page 8)

RESTORE UNITY OF THE WORKING CLASS DEVELOP DEMOCRATIC MOVEMENTS

(*Continued from page 3*)

The split is not limited to the AITUC alone. The workers and employees in West Bengal have for a long time been feeling the necessity of developing an instrument of broad democratic united movements in the state. This aspiration of theirs found organisational shape several years back in the formation of the Rastriya Sangram Samity. Even though efforts were made to form units of the RSS in different states as effective instruments of united democratic trade union movements in the respective states, the effort bore fruit in West Bengal. And to the Rastriya Sangram Samity in West Bengal goes the credit of developing and conducting many successful united movements of the workers and employees against vested interests and reaction as well as against the Central and the State Governments. Left opportunistic policy and sectarianism of the CPI(M) have been responsible for the virtual death of this instrument of united democratic trade union movement also. It should be realised that a body, like the RSS, for developing and conducting united broad democratic movements by the workers and employees can only function on the basis of agreement and unanimity on questions of policy, principle and ideology. As soon as any single party or a combination of some parties will try to foist its or their own politics on other constituents, the unity of the body is sure to be disrupted. The working people of our country have previous experience of it. But throwing to the winds this lesson of history, the CPI(M) leaders working in the RSS, even in the face of opposition by other constiuents forcibly thrust on the R S S their own wrong party line with regard to the United Front and staged a demonstration under the flag of the RSS alleging conspiracy of some parties to break the UF thereby dragged the serious political differences, that were then threatening the very existence of the United Front, into the RSS and destroyed all possibilites of the platform of united broad democratic trade union movements in the state. As a result, the RSS is now virtually defunct since the last month of last year.

The same thing has happened in other organisations for united trade union movements. The CPI(M) in the ABTA, ABPTA and the Co-ordination Committee of the associations and unions of the workers and employees of the West Bengal State Government similarly tried to convert these organisations for united broad democratic movements of the secondary school teachers, primary school teachers and state government employees, as the case may be, into appendages of the CPI(M), by thrusting against the opposition of all others including non-party teachers, employees and workers the sectarian wrong politics of their party on these organisations. The result is the same. The ABTA has split, though the split has not yet been formally announced. Another organisation of the primary teachers in West Bengal is in the offing, indicating split in the ABPTA. Parallel units of the Co-ordination Committee of the State Government Employees Unions and Associations are already functioning in different districts, showing split there also. Same is the position in individual associations and unions of government servants.

All this has followed the breakdown of the United Front in West Bengal due to left opportunist and sectarian policy of the CPI(M). One should realise that to forcibly thrust one's politics on such organisations for united broad democratic movements and precipitate splits in them is is not the way of establishing one's leadership over the class and the masses. United democratic movements against the common enemy and relentless ideological struggles to expose the wrong politics and political bankruptcy of others and thereby isolating the latter from the class and the masses without at the same time weakening the united movement against the common enemy—this is the only correct way of establishing one's leadership over the people. Revolution and emancipation of the people from the yoke of capitalist rule will remain on paper only unless conditions for it are created by developing mass democratic movements and skipping them to higher and higher levels. But compared to right opportunism at present left opportunism practised by the CPI(M) poses a greater danger in the path of development of united democratic mass movements. In the interest of the people the CPI(M)'s left opportunistic policies have got to be defeated. The working people should know it and act accordingly.

AN APPEAL TO THE NAXALITES

(*Continued from page 7*)

the different classes in its own country through serious investigation and study, and integrate it with the concrete practice of its own country but instead is a party that parrots the words of others, copies foreign experience without analysis, (Emphasis ours—Editor, P. E.) runs hither and thither in response to the baton of certain persons abroad, and has become a hodgepodge of revisionism, dogmatism and everything but Marxist-Leninist principle ;

"Then such a party is absolutely incapable of leading the proletariat and the masses in revolutionary struggle, absolutely incapable of winning the revolution and absolutely incapable of fulfilling the great historical mission of the proletariat.

"This is a question all Marxists-Leninists, all class-conscious workers and all progressive people everywhere need to ponder deeply."

We also request the Naxalites to ponder deeply. We know that the leadership of the CPI(ML), to confuse its ranks, will put the question —if the CPI(ML) is not a *real* revolutionary working class party then why is the Communist Party of China extending recognition to it ? True, the Communist Party of China is, in a way, recognising the CPI(ML). But that is a complex with the Communist Party of China. We leave aside for the present the discussion of this question. We shall discuss it sometime later. We simply remind the Naxalities that the international communist leadership at Stalin's time, the leadership of the Communist Party of China also, used to recognise the undivided Communist Party of India. But subsequent facts have established beyond any shade of doubt that, notwithstanding this recognition, the CPI has never been a *genuine* Communist Party. Recent events, particularly those following the split in the international communist movement centring round ideological differences, have exposed the non-proletarian non-revolutionary character of many Communist Parties, which so long enjoyed recognition by the international communist leadership, including the leadership of the Communist Party of China. So the logic of recognition by the CPC, as a proof of being a *real* Communist Party does not stand. In any case we again appeal to the Naxalites to deeply ponder all the questions raised by us hereinbefore.

Printed at Paribesak Press, 21 Hyat Khan Lane, Cal.-9 and Edited & Published from 48, Lenin Sarani, (Dharamtola St.) Cal.-13
By Sukomal Das Gupta.